

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 command him for that, and I think that it is in fact the responsible and right thing for us to do. And so I hope my colleagues will join in strong support of not only this rule but this very important legislation.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

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

□ 1107

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The \$100 million for Jordan I wanted to mention specifically because I said the bill was what the President asked for. Actually, the President asked for the entire Wye River commitment that he made when the Wye River agreements were reached. He asked for all of that to be done in this bill, and we did not do that. The reason is that we think that the part of the Wye River agreement that relates to Israel and

the Palestinian Organization should be handled in the regular order as we go through the FY 2000 appropriations bills. But because of the death of King Hussein and the important role that he played and the establishment of the new kingdom and the new king, his son, King Abdullah, we thought it would be appropriate to move expeditiously to show a sign of support for Jordan.

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

Mr. Chairman, we need to expedite this bill. The monies that we will appropriate today will not go from our Government to another government. Because of the oversight responsibilities that the Congress has, and the Committee on Appropriations specifically, we do have an obligation to our

taxpayers to make sure that any money that we appropriate is spent the way that we intend it to be spent.

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

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

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

(The table follows.)

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

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

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

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

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

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Office of the Secretary				
	Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-815	-815
	Federal Highway Administration			
	State infrastructure banks (rescission)	-6,500	-6,500
	Federal Transit Administration			
	Trust fund share of transit programs (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-665	-665
	Interstate transfer grants - transit (rescission)	-600	-600
GENERAL PROVISIONS				
106-3	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 1001) 1/	-82,000	-40,000	+42,000
Total, Chapter 6:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	-100,000	-1,028,580	-928,580
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(-82,000)	(-40,000)	(+42,000)
	Rescissions.....	(-18,000)	(-836,500)	(-818,500)
	Rescission of contract authorization.....		(-2,080)	(-2,080)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations.....		(-150,000)	(-150,000)
Total, title I:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,307,862	191,293	-1,116,569
	Rescissions.....	(-18,000)	(-836,500)	(-818,500)
	Rescission of contract authorization.....		(-2,080)	(-2,080)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations.....		(-150,000)	(-150,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(1,207,862)	(586,862)	(-621,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(-82,000)	(593,011)	(+675,011)
	Advance appropriations.....	(200,000)		(-200,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....	(6,000)		(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations).....		(7,000)	(+7,000)
	(Loan authorization).....	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	
TITLE II - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS				
CHAPTER 1				
THE JUDICIARY				
Supreme Court of the United States				
	Salaries and expenses.....	921	+921
106-3	Emergency appropriations.....	921	-921
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration				
106-3	Operations, research, and facilities.....	1,880	-1,880
106-3	Fisheries finance program account.....	3,120	-3,120
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES				
RELATED AGENCY				
United States Information Agency				
	Buying power maintenance (rescission).....	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Chapter 1:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	5,821	-19,079	-25,000
	Appropriations.....	(5,000)	(921)	(-4,079)
	Rescissions.....		(-20,000)	(-20,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(921)	(-921)
CHAPTER 2				
INDEPENDENT AGENCY				
	United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.....	3,000	+3,000
EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE				
	Export-Import Bank of the United States (rescission).....	-25,000	-25,000
Total, Chapter 2:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	-22,000	-22,000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1115

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

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

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

Secretary of the Treasury Rubin, in a letter to us on this issue, described this action as an ill-advised step which car-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some have cited a 1994 rescission as a precedent for this proposal. The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed the paid-in and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach

back to capital to which we have formally subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets.

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

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. RUBIN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The availability of these funds has demonstrated that the U.S. is serious about helping Russia implement the agreement once it is completed, by helping design and construct key infrastructure in Russia to safely and securely dispose of weapons plutonium. To now withdraw this "earnest money" would be to call into question U.S. reli-

ability. Russia may well perceive such a withdrawal as a breach of good faith. Withdrawing this money would severely set back—and might even bring a halt to—our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue.

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign

Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge Members to support the bill as written.

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

□ 1130

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

From the start, Mr. Chairman, I thought that this would be an easy vote, that we would recognize the emergency nature of what happened in

Central America and that we would proceed without an offset. That was the understanding I had from our distinguished chairman, and then other voices weighed in, and here we are in conflict today.

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

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

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

I fully support the \$100 million in the bill for the Jordan. This is a down payment on additional military and economic assistance to help Jordan stabilize itself in the wake of King Hussein's death. As I have said, I oppose, I must unfortunately oppose the bill because of the offsets used in this package. The bill insists offsets for the dis-

aster mitigation programs and the emergency fund farm assistance but does not insist on offsets for the \$195 million to restore the Department of Defense hurricane cost. Why the inconsistencies? Our young people, part of the American military, bravely, courageously, unselfishly and tirelessly assisted the people in Central America at the time of this hurricane, in the immediate wake of the hurricane. Certainly we want to pay back the Department of Defense for services rendered; that does not need to be offset, it should not be, I agree with that. But why treat other assistance differently than the military assistance, the assistance of the military in this bill?

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

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

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

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

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

scrap the whole concept of emergency funding.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

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

DEBT RELIEF

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secondly, I feel we need offsets. I have been in support of this for some

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I do not like to say it, but I think the Republican party has given in to isolationist tendencies. By turning our backs on the world, we only hurt the

global economy further and hurt exporters like farmers who are getting pummeled by the downturn in Asia and elsewhere. The delay has hurt the financial bottom line for thousands of farmers across America. There is a near depression happening in many parts of our farm economy. Hog farmers in my district cannot even sell hogs at half the break-even price, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1145

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

I wanted to mention that the bill contains some very important language that has to do with the Russian food aid package that is currently being delivered, over a billion dollars of Russian food aid, and yet very few

checks by the government of the United States in order to assure that that product is not diverted and graft does not occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNITED STATES FOOD AID

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

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

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

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

FUTURE FOOD AID

5. What is the evidence that Russia will need additional food aid later in the year?

What are projections for grain and livestock production in the coming year?

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

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

RUSSIAN AGRICULTURE

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

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

INVESTMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The magnitude of this package is unprecedented.

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

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

Thus the report language in the bill states:

RUSSIAN FOOD AID

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

The Secretary of Agriculture shall report to the Committee by June 15, 1999, regarding his efforts to increase oversight and monitoring; the extent to which other federal agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations have contributed to the monitoring effort; the number of frequency of spot-checks and their findings; how the agency handled reports of diversions; and the extent to which the distribution of commodities was coordinated with local government officials and private farming organizations. The Committee also expects

the Secretary to report on how the food aid package was coordinated with the State Department to meet our strategic goals in the region and the involvement of the Interagency Task Force assembled by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to oversee these shipments. The Secretary shall also report on how this and subsequent food aid shipments contribute to the development and reform of private agriculture in the Newly Independent States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am going to ask the majority to seriously consider an amendment that I will offer, and I will ask for unanimous consent that the emergency declarations in this bill be stricken and that instead of using the offsets in question for agriculture in the development bank and also the offsets dealing with nuclear, one of the most irresponsible decisions this body could possibly consider doing at this time with all of the problems in the world, Kosovo we are

talking about today, how we could possibly do that I do not know.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, this is a strange bill, particularly all of these speeches we hear about offsets. In my

judgment, this bill is a legitimate emergency, under the budget rules can be handled as an emergency without being offset and that is how it should be handled, but we are going through this pretense that we are making offsets when in reality we are not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SABO. No outlay savings?

Mr. CALLAHAN. No.

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

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

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Among others things, it says this:

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

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

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

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

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

I agree with that letter. What the committee is doing, as my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) pointed out, is a sham. In fact, if we take a look at the four items I am try-

ing to deal with in my amendment, those items pretend to save \$853 million.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ministration so that the bill can be passed and signed into law as quickly as possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, the budget cuts also touch those in this country who are suffering the most—the unemployed and the poor. This bill rescinds \$31 million worth of funds that are used by the Labor and Health Human Services Departments. A good portion of those funds, \$21 million, go towards funding state unemployment funds, which are in great need

in my district because of energy-crisis related layoffs which have reached unheard of limits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Four decades after the war, the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 finally gave the United States a ten-year window to acknowledge the injustice done to more than 120,000 Americans and legal residents of Japanese ancestry.

The Act provided the internees with a Presidential apology and a \$20,000 payment, as restitution for the terrible losses that they suffered.

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

The shortfall resulted from several factors:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The regrettable aspect about this legislation is that it does many good things. The committee's report contains language that was of particular importance to me concerning the possible disproportionate impact that these natural disasters could wreak on women living in communities hit by the storm. Fully one-third of the households in Central America that lost homes are headed by women, and women are primarily responsible for taking care of the family health, finding emergency services for their families, and procuring adequate food and clean water. When attempting to return to normalcy, unfortunately, jobs that women traditionally tend to depend on have been hard-hit. For example, many of the agricultural jobs that women are at the end of the processing chain, such as packing fruits for export. These end-

of-chain jobs will not be replaced for another 3-5 years; until new crops are ready for harvest. Frustratingly, women are most often barred from the kinds of short-term employment, such as construction, clean-up, and road building, that the disaster has created. Women must remain a focus as we provide disaster relief for these countries. I commend the emergency supplemental package's partial focus on microcredit programs, which are targeted primarily at women. And I urge those coordinating disaster relief programs to remain aware of the continued plight of women as they help to rebuild society, and to institute processes to ensure that women are able to participate in needs assessments. Programs must ensure that women workers are gaining equal access to employment and credit. Gender differences and women's specific needs must be taken into account in the emergency relief and development programs. The committee's report addresses this concern.

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

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

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

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

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

In order to lease the necessary transponders on the replacement satellite, NPR must have the necessary funding to contract with the satellite vendor. This bill provides the full \$48 million to allow NPR to complete the negotiations and assure the continuation of service. It provides \$30,600,000 in fiscal year

1999 and \$17,400,000 in fiscal year 2000. Let me assure members that the fiscal year 1999 funding is fully offset with rescissions of unneeded funds in other accounts and the fiscal year 2000 funding will be absorbed within our allocation.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

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

□ 1215

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATIONS
CHAPTER 1
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FARM SERVICE AGENCY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

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

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

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page 9, line 24 through line 10 of page 10, Strike "*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Def-

icit Control Act of 1985, as amended. *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

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

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

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

And on page 13, strike lines 3 through 10.

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

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

Obviously I reluctantly offer this amendment, but by the same token, the argument that I made before in general debate and I will make again now, I believe that the emergency should be stricken. I happen to agree with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) when he says we should pay for these emergency spending. My difference is I disagree with

the manner in which the majority has chosen to pay for it. Two or three of those I think will do irreparable harm to this country's best interest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

price to be paid and that there is a better way for paying for this today. That is my argument, and I would ask support for my amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

taken by the majority party on the Stenholm amendment.

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is really a sad day that we are here debating an emergency bill because of offsets, and it leads us to wonder whether the only time we are ever going to be able to respond to an emer-

gency without offsets is if we declare war. I oppose the offsets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to PL-480, they claim that \$30 million will be saved because

of budget authority cuts, but in fact that translates only into a deficit reduction of \$16 million.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the chairman is referring to is unobli-

gated funds, money that will not be spent and that we will keep from spending by rescission.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

And I could not agree more with the chairman a moment ago in his expla-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The offsets that we recommend in this bill are monies that have been appropriated, and most of the money for those programs will be spent in fiscal year 1999. But portions of that appro-

priated money, money that has already been appropriated, will not be obligated in fiscal year 1999. And because this is "no-year money", if you allow me to use that phrase that appropriators use and budgeters use, "no-year money," those funds will eventually end up being spent somewhere. So we are just going to take advantage of those unobligated funds and use them now to meet this emergency.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I would

simply say that response is incorrect. The offsets for the military only are \$195 million. The add-on to the deficit under their bill is \$455 million. So they still have not fully offset this bill and they ought to quit pretending that they have.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The gentleman spoke very factually a moment ago. But precisely because

America is one of the few if not the only country in the world that has been backing these institutions is why I offer the amendment today.

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—77

Baird	Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bartlett	Jackson (IL)	Roemer
Bereuter	Jefferson	Rush
Blagojevich	Kaptur	Sanchez
Blumenauer	Kennedy	Sawyer
Boucher	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Boyd	Kucinich	Shows
Brown (OH)	LaFalce	Sisisky
Capps	Lampson	Smith (MI)
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Clayton	Lofgren	Stabenow
Condit	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Cramer	Luther	Tanner
Crowley	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Danner	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Davis (IL)	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Meehan	Thurman
Doggett	Minge	Udall (CO)
Dooley	Moakley	Udall (NM)
Emerson	Nadler	Vento
Eshoo	Neal	Watt (NC)
Ford	Oberstar	Wu
Gonzalez	Obey	Wynn
Goode	Pelosi	

NOES—345

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Collins
Ackerman	Bonior	Combest
Aderholt	Bono	Conyers
Allen	Borski	Cook
Andrews	Boswell	Cooksey
Archer	Brady (PA)	Costello
Armey	Brady (TX)	Cox
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Baker	Bryant	Crane
Baldacci	Burr	Cubin
Ballenger	Burton	Cummings
Barcia	Buyer	Cunningham
Barr	Callahan	Davis (FL)
Barton	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Bass	Camp	Deal
Bateman	Campbell	DeFazio
Becerra	Canady	DeGette
Bentsen	Cannon	DeLauro
Berkley	Cardin	DeLay
Berman	Carson	DeMint
Berry	Castle	Deutsch
Biggert	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bilbray	Chambliss	Dickey
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bishop	Clay	Dingell
Biley	Clement	Dixon
Blunt	Clyburn	Doolittle
Boehlert	Coble	Doyle
Boehner	Coburn	Dreier

Duncan	Klink	Reyes
Dunn	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Edwards	Kolbe	Riley
Ehlers	Kuykendall	Rivers
Ehrlich	LaHood	Rodriguez
Engel	Lantos	Rogan
English	Largent	Rogers
Etheridge	Larson	Rohrabacher
Evans	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	LaTourette	Rothman
Ewing	Lazio	Roukema
Farr	Leach	Royal-Allard
Fattah	Lee	Royce
Filner	Levin	Ryan (WI)
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Ryun (KS)
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Fossella	Linder	Sanders
Fowler	Lipinski	Sandlin
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Frost	Maloney (CT)	Scarborough
Gallagly	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Ganske	Manzullo	Scott
Gejdenson	Markay	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	Martinez	Serrano
Gephardt	Mascara	Shadegg
Gibbons	Matsui	Shaw
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Shays
Gillmor	McCullum	Sherman
Gilman	McCrary	Sherwood
Goodlatte	McDermott	Shimkus
Goodling	McHugh	Shuster
Gordon	McInnis	Simpson
Goss	McIntosh	Skeen
Graham	McKeon	Skelton
Granger	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
Green (TX)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Green (WI)	Meek (FL)	Snyder
Greenwood	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Gutierrez	Menendez	Spence
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Spratt
Hansen	Mica	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Millender-McDonald	Stearns
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Strickland
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Stump
Hayworth	Miller, George	Sununu
Hefley	Mink	Sweeney
Herger	Mollohan	Talent
Hill (IN)	Moore	Tancredo
Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)	Tauzin
Hilleary	Moran (VA)	Taylor (NC)
Hilliard	Morella	Terry
Hinojosa	Murtha	Thomas
Hobson	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Hoefel	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Hoekstra	Ney	Thune
Holden	Northup	Tiahrt
Holt	Norwood	Tierney
Hooley	Nussle	Toomey
Horn	Olver	Towns
Hostettler	Ortiz	Traficant
Houghton	Ose	Turner
Hoyer	Owens	Upton
Hulshof	Oxley	Velazquez
Hunter	Packard	Visclosky
Hutchinson	Pallone	Walden
Hyde	Pascarella	Walsh
Inslee	Pastor	Wamp
Isakson	Paul	Waters
Istook	Payne	Watkins
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pease	Watts (OK)
Jenkins	Petri	Waxman
John	Phelps	Weiner
Johnson (CT)	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Johnson, E.B.	Pitts	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Wexler
Jones (NC)	Porter	Weygand
Jones (OH)	Portman	Whitfield
Kanjorski	Price (NC)	Wicker
Kasich	Pryce (OH)	Wilson
Kelly	Quinn	Wise
Kildee	Radanovich	Wolf
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Woolsey
King (NY)	Ramstad	Young (AK)
Kingston	Rangel	Young (FL)
Klecka	Regula	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Frank (MA)

Sabo

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (NE)
Brown (CA)
FletcherLowey
Myrick
Peterson (PA)Slaughter
Stupak
Weldon (PA)

□ 1318

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COBURN,

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York and Mr. OLVER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON and Messrs. KIND, SMITH of Michigan, WATT of North Carolina, JEFFERSON and POMEROY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 67, the amendment from the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, I inadvertently voted "aye." I would like the RECORD to reflect I intended to vote "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment made in order by House Resolution 125 offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 13, strike lines 3 through 10 (relating to Department of Agriculture, Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts.)

Page 13, strike lines 11 through 18 (relating to Department of Energy, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, Other Defense Activities).

Page 15, strike lines 16 through 25 (relating to International Financial Institutions, Reduction in Callable Capital Appropriations.)

Page 18, strike lines 9 through 13 (relating to Export-Import Bank of the United States).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very complicated, as the vote on the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) indicated, so I apologize for the fact that I will have to ask for an extension of time to complete my remarks in explaining it.

Mr. Chairman, sometime in the near future, as we all know, we are likely to be in a state of high confrontation a quarter of the world away, in Kosovo and in Serbia. Of all the times, this is the least desirable moment for the United States credibility to be questioned. Yet the action that this Congress is taking today on this bill will bring into question our commitment to the international financial institutions that we built at the end of World War II in order to try to stabilize the world's economy. It will also bring into question our commitment to work out in negotiations with the Russians to see to it that 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium is converted to a more safe use in nuclear power plants. So I am offering this amendment to remove the foremost egregious offsets that the majority party has inserted in this bill.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the cut of \$25 million in the Export-Import Bank funding because I believe that we should not be disarming ourselves in protecting American jobs and in protecting our markets abroad. That is what we do when we reduce the amount of money in the Export-Import Bank

war chest, which is there for the purpose of sending a signal to the world that if other countries artificially subsidize exports by their corporations into world markets, we will use that money to do the same, so that we do not lose jobs in the process.

The second thing this amendment will do is to say that we will not at a time when our farmers have seen huge drops in their market prices, we will not choose this time to cut back on Public Law 480 funds. This is the device we use to try to facilitate the export of American farm products abroad. The amendment does two other things. It says that we will not add to the uncertainty of international financial markets, by for the first time in our history rescinding previously-appropriated callable capital funds.

The Secretary of the Treasury has already indicated if this provision remains in the bill, this bill will be vetoed, and it should be vetoed. We cannot afford to add uncertainty to international financial markets.

Fourth, what this amendment would do is to eliminate the \$150 million rescission which will in the words of our own Department of Energy and in the words of our arms negotiators make it much less likely for us to be able to resume negotiations with the Russians on the conversion of that plutonium which is now within the borders of Russia, to convert that plutonium to a use other than for the purpose of building 15 to 25,000 more nuclear weapons.

□ 1330

I think it is imperative that this Congress support this action this afternoon.

What I think is really happening here is this: We know that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) tried to bring a bill to the floor which would have been a bipartisan bill, but he was then given different orders by his House leadership.

He is being a good soldier, but we know that if the Committee on Appropriations had been left to its own devices, we would have a far different bill before us here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what we really have here is this: The House could have produced a bill which would have epitomized cooperation between the executive and legislative branches on an item that the President felt was an emergency. Instead, because of the instructions given to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Congress is instead choosing to follow the path once again of confrontation with the President. It is setting up a bill which is going to be vetoed, which will get no help to anybody.

Secondly, let me make this observation: We have had various Republican

voices say that this administration's foreign policy is faulty. I will be the first to admit it is far from perfect, but I would suggest that this action comes after a series of other actions taken by the majority party which calls into legitimate question its understanding of the world or its willingness to recognize our responsibility to lead.

This is the same party that has refused to pay our bills at the United Nations, which brings into question our leadership capacity in that institution. It is the same party which for over a year held up action on the International Monetary Fund request by the President. That action again added uncertainty, especially in the Asian markets, and made it more difficult for us to sell our products in those markets.

It is the same party that has really at various times come at the Bosnia and Kosovo questions from both sides. Now it is the same party which is saying that we ought to bring into question our commitment to support the international financial institutions, and their role, after all, is to help stabilize international markets primarily for our benefit. We started those institutions so we would not have to carry the full load.

Lastly, the majority party is also attempting to put roadblocks in the way of the administration's ability to negotiate that crucial plutonium agreement. It just seems to me that on that issue alone, this amendment ought to be passed. If this amendment is not passed, the bill before us should be voted down.

There is no rational reason to take \$150 million off the table at a time when we put that there in order to make certain that the Russians would come back to the negotiating table.

I understand that the staff of the subcommittee is unhappy because they were not involved in the original decision to include this money in the Omnibus bill, but I think that staff pique over that issue is not sufficient reason to put our national interest at question when it comes to dealing with this plutonium question.

I would urge, in the name of responsibility, that the House vote for this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we actually could have gone ahead with a vote because we really have debated these issues all morning long. I am going to speak to just one of the issues and then other Members of the Committee on Appropriations will address several of the others.

The concern that the gentleman has expressed about the PL-480 program, this bill includes a \$30 million rescission this program and as I have repeatedly said throughout this debate this should not cause any problem on that side of the aisle, certainly not at the White House. In fact, there have been very substantial carryovers in this ac-

count for the last few years. In fact, in 1999, there was a \$40 million carryover in the PL-480 account.

The administration, the White House, has proposed cutting Title I funding in half for the past 3 years, and Congress has restored most of the program each year. So even with this rescission, the program will be operating substantially above the requested level.

For fiscal year 2000, the administration has again proposed to cut Title I in half and to reduce the other two food aid programs, Title II and Title III.

In testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies in recent weeks, the administration said these cuts would not cause any problems, in part because the administration has created a new food aid program for Russia of more than \$700 million using funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So ours is a responsible rescission, and we still have more money in the fund than the White House would have. The White House would certainly not attempt to cut these funds if they thought it was going to hurt the program, because it is a good program, and I support the PL-480 program and I always have, even back years ago when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I used to debate on callable capital almost every day of our lives. I support the PL-480 program, and we do not do any damage to it because there was a \$40 million carryover. So I would suggest that this is not a real argument.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am confused as to whether the gentleman's party intends to follow the CBO accounting on these issues or not.

Is not it, in fact, true that the CBO indicates that \$16 million of the funds that the gentleman is rescinding would, in fact, be spent absent the rescission on the PL-480 issue? Is not that the case?

Does not that, therefore, demonstrate that those funds are needed?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am not sure that I understand exactly the point that the gentleman is trying to make. All I am saying is that our rescission is less of a rescission than the administration asked for when they sent their budget up here.

Mr. OBEY. The point I am trying to make is this: The gentleman is saying this will have no significant programmatic impact, and the gentleman has indicated numerous times that this money is not going to be spent anyway.

The fact is the Congressional Budget Office, which scores these items for all of us, indicates that, in fact, \$16 million of that would, in fact, be spent without the rescission; that \$16 million

which is unavailable to assist American farmers in exporting their products, and if ever they need assistance to export their products this is the time.

The administration did not volunteer to support the agricultural funds that were provided in last year's supplemental either, but both parties ran to do that because we recognized the severe need out in farm country.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The key issue here is how much money is left in Title I of the PL-480 fund. The funds that are left there, in our opinion, are substantial.

Now, when we go to the CBO scoring issue, this is something that the gentleman and I are going to have to work with very diligently over the next few weeks and few months because CBO scoring, as the gentleman well knows, is very much different than OMB's scoring.

We are going to have to deal with this great difference between the scoring of the OMB and the CBO. We are not going to solve that problem here today. We will talk more about that tomorrow when we deal with the budget resolution, but the gentleman is correct. CBO scoring is a serious problem that we are all going to have to face up to, especially since it is so different than OMB, but we will discuss that tomorrow.

This rescission is less of a rescission than the White House would make, and I am satisfied that there is more than enough money left to carry out the intent of the PL-480 program.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House Republicans have loaded up this bill, which should be noncontroversial, with all sorts of peculiar provisions. Remember, this bill was supposed to be a bill to help out the victims of Hurricanes Mitch and George and to provide loans to United States farmers hurt by low commodity prices, but instead the Republicans have loaded it up with controversial proposals that virtually guarantee a presidential veto.

For whatever reason, the Republicans have apparently decided to demand offsets, that is, cuts in other programs, in order to ensure the emergency relief that is in this bill. So they decided to use the bill, in other words, as a mechanism to target cuts for programs that the isolationist wing of the GOP simply does not like.

Forget that we have a budget surplus. Forget that we can afford to help our Central American neighbors and help our farmers here at home without having to slash these other programs.

No. The House Republican leadership wants to use this bill to rescind programs for international financial banks, slash funding for safeguarding of dangerous nuclear weapons material from Russia and slash funding for global warming studies.

First their supplemental would cut \$150 million that would have been used

to dismantle and safely store fissile material, bomb grade material, from thousands of Russian nuclear bombs. This is material which could be used for thousands of nuclear bombs. It could be sold to rogue nations or terrorists for use against the United States.

It is in our national interest to help the Russians dismantle their weapons and to store them in a form which is no longer usable for nuclear explosive purposes.

Just one week ago, the Republicans felt so strongly about the need to spend tens of billions of dollars on a dubious missile defense system to protect us against nuclear attack that they actually brought up a resolution to this floor saying that it was the policy of the United States to deploy a missile defense system.

Now this week they are apparently no longer concerned about weapons of mass destruction except, of course, when it comes to blaming Bill Clinton for the fact that the Chinese spies had penetrated Los Alamos back during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Apparently it is Bill Clinton's fault that the Governor of Arkansas failed to prevent the Chinese from penetrating Los Alamos during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

So based upon the record of the last few weeks, we now find that the GOP is willing to spend billions on missile defenses of doubtful utility, it is willing to blame Bill Clinton for things that happened when we had a Republican in the White House, but it is not even willing to spend even \$150 million to dismantle nuclear warheads that might end up in the hands of Saddam Hussein or Slobodan Milosevic.

Of course, if that ever happens I am sure that they will try to blame Bill Clinton that this money was cut.

Right now we are in a very sensitive situation with the Russians. Russian Prime Minister Primakov actually has turned his flight around in mid-air on the way to the United States to protest the NATO plans to bomb the Serbians.

At this point in time, do we really want to send the Russians the message that we are no longer interested in helping them dismantle their nuclear warheads? At this tense moment in our relations with Russia, is that really the message we want to send?

Despite our disagreements with Russia over Serbia, we still have a vital national security interest in working with the Russians to prevent bomb grade materials from getting into the wrong hands. This bill undermines that effort.

In addition to this fatal shortcoming, the Republican supplemental bill would rescind \$648 million appropriated to guarantee the U.S. commitment to the World Bank, to the Asian Development Bank and to the Inter-American Development Bank.

□ 1345

Now we are living in a global economy. We can no longer insulate our-

selves from what happened around the world. If the economy of Russia or Brazil collapses, our stock market, our investors, feel the effects. If the financial markets conclude that this Congress is walking away from its commitments to sustained financial stability, then it would be a mistake.

I hope that the Obey amendment is adopted.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the rules of the House require that when we are speaking on this Floor, that we ought to address our comments to the Speaker or Chairman, and certainly during this debate the Chairman has paid close attention and probably better understands where we are than most any Member of the body.

But just to reemphasize our position, let me just say that 30 to 40 odd years ago many nations got together and decided that they would create these regional multidevelopment banks. As they did in 1945 with the World Bank, each nation would put in some usable capital, which they did. This paid-in capital funded each bank's initial operations.

The Founding members told them to be responsible in their efforts; that when a bank loans this money to a foreign country, they should be able to pay it back.

They told the banks: "We want you to remain solvent. Just in case, we are going to put up a designated amount of callable capital. In the event you get into a crisis and you need additional monies, you will be able to call on these various countries to receive additional capital, called callable capital."

The United States was the only nation that chose at that time to put up these billions of dollars into a callable capital account, which has never been used. It has been sitting there unobligated for all of these years. Congress stopped appropriating callable capital in 1980.

The problem, I would suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury, is not really the rescission of the callable capital. This is not going to impact the solvency of the bank. This is not going to do anything to the creditworthiness of the banks.

The full faith and credit of the United States stands behind all capital subscriptions entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury, after authorization by Congress. All of this \$52.5 billion in callable capital for the World Bank and the Inter-American and Asian banks has been authorized by Congress. Only \$11.5 billion has been appropriated. We are not rescinding the authorization. Whether or not 22 percent or 21 percent of the callable capital is appropriated or not, the full faith and credit of the United States still stands, so we are not changing anything substantive.

Naturally, the bond-raters would like to have the money sitting in the left-hand drawer rather than the right-hand drawer.

I should suggest to the people who are making the determination whether or not a multilateral bank is credit-worthy to look into their loan portfolio. Are the banks lending monies to countries—such as Russia—that cannot or will not pay it back? They ought to be concerned about that. I'd suggest that they consider the tremendous pressure to forgive all debt owed to MDBs by poor countries. I'd suggest they be concerned that there is no appropriated callable capital for the African, European, or North American development banks.

Are the multi-lateral development banks, in such sorry financial condition that they cannot be sure of their own solvency because of the bad loans they hold? We are not removing the full faith and credit of the United States, we are just taking the money back that we never needed to appropriate in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to urge Members to vote against the Obey amendment.

There has been some threat about a presidential veto. Let us keep in mind the whole scenario. The President went to Central America. The First Lady went to Central America. They are the ones who went and said, "help will be coming." They are the ones that came up with the designated request for money that we are going to spend.

I think that the President of the United States is not going to be in a position to veto a bill, just because we are rescinding some callable capital that has no substantive impact at all on the solvency of the bank. I know that the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that he is going to recommend a veto. However, I do not think the President could stand on the world stage and say, "the Congress is giving me the Hurricane Mitch reconstruction money, but I do not like where they are offsetting the money, so we are not going to accept the money and send it to help these people in Central America." The President has not told me that. I do not think he has told anybody in the Congress that he is going to veto it. This is coming from the Secretary of the Treasury.

If the President wants to veto the bill, tell him to veto it. Let him cut off the aid to these needy and desperate people in Central America. In my opinion, he will not do it because he cannot do it, because this is not going to impact the solvency of the banks.

Secretary Rubin is aware of this. Secretary Rubin is more concerned about the precedent; the fact that if we do this a second time, we are going to be coming back in a few years trying to rescind more callable capital. He is concerned about the precedent, rather than the reality of the problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, thank the gentleman once again for his leadership in bringing this to the Floor, and recognize our distinguished chairman for his first bill on the Floor, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I regretfully disagree with my distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, of which I am the ranking member.

Just reviewing Mr. CALLAHAN's own words at the end of his comments is an argument for the Obey amendment when he said, in his view, that Mr. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury, was not concerned about this amount of money but about the precedent it would set. That is known as uncertainty. Uncertainty is not a plus in the financial world.

The crisis in Asia speaks to our not taking this money from callable capital for the multilateral development banks, in particular the Asian Development Bank, because we need money for an emergency.

As appropriators we all know the hard fights that go into determining what an appropriation will be for a particular year. We should respect that process. We thought these were important priorities. We voted for this funding. Now, with this bill, we are saying, we did not need to spend that money anyway.

We should respect the regular order, and the regular order says that under the budget agreement we have caps, yes, but we also provide for emergencies not to be offset.

As I have said earlier in my comments against the bill as presented, if thousands of people die, millions of people homeless, entire economies wiped out in the countries hit by this storm, the hurricane, if that does not constitute an emergency, it is hard to see what would. There probably never would be an emergency, if the worst natural disaster to hit the Western Hemisphere is not considered an emergency.

What we are saying to the people of Central America is, we feel sorry for you but we do not consider you an emergency.

Our process calls for our appropriating funds in a very deliberative process. It also calls for us to have this emergency fund, just as any family in America would have some savings for a rainy day. Well, the rainy day came to Central America, and it came again and again and again, and those people were wiped out, both their economies, their personal lives, their homes, et cetera.

What we want to do is to help rebuild their economies. With our assistance, we want them to develop the private sector. We want them to be self-reliant. We want certainly to provide the emergency assistance to begin with, but we want them to develop their own economies.

Why should we have to do that at the expense of the callable capital for the

multilateral development banks, some of which lend into that area? Why should we do that by thrusting uncertainty into the markets about the credit rating of these multilateral development banks?

The Secretary of the Treasury said he was recommending a veto to the President of the United States for this bill if the callable capital provision was in the bill, for reasons of dipping into that fund in the first place, and as a precedent, certainly, to make matters worse.

So let us not try to gloss over the importance of a credit rating. Let us not gloss over the importance of certainty versus uncertainty. That is why we appropriated the money in the first place, because it needed to be there for us to do our share. If we pull the callable capital, what if the other countries do, too? Why is it not okay for them, if it is okay for us?

We are getting on some dangerous territory here. I think we should not confuse the message by having two fights, here. What we are talking about is the very reasonable amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that addresses the four areas we have talked about, one of them being the callable capital; another, the Exim-Bank and the war chest of the Exim-Bank, again putting our assistance for trade or export financing in doubt; the \$40 million cut from development assistance; and the \$45 million in cuts from Eastern Europe and the new independent states, just at a time when those countries are faced with such uncertainty.

Why, facing one problem, are we making matters worse in other parts of the world, when what we should be doing is using the money that the American people think we have saved for a rainy day to help meet the needs of the people who are devastated by the consequences of Hurricane Mitch, the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western Hemisphere? Certainly it is an emergency.

I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what I am understanding in this amendment is basically that the gentleman from Wisconsin is opposed to any offsets. Mr. Chairman. He has sort of designated some of the bigger ones, and particularly the Department of Energy defense activities, where there is \$150 million.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has misstated my position. I am not opposed to all offsets. There are a number of offsets in this bill that I have no objection to. My amendment is aimed at the four that I consider to be the most

egregious, but I am not opposed to all offsets.

Mr. TIAHRT. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, most of these four amendments that the gentleman put forth, or the four items in the account that he has attacked, are about 90 or 95 percent of the offsets.

The bottom line is, if we do not offset the bill, the money has to go from somewhere. It has to come from somewhere and go down to Central America. The only other amount of money that is available is the social security surplus. So if we do not offset this money, it is going to come from social security.

I think if we stopped the average person on the street in either Wisconsin or in Kansas and asked them, what would you rather spend your money on, social security or a foreign aid emergency, I think nine times out of ten they are going to say, we want to save social security.

So what we are trying to do is save social security and still provide money for the people who need it very much down in Central America.

Mr. Chairman, one of these accounts that we have heard so much about is the \$150 million that was supposed to go to properly secure and store the uranium or plutonium. There is still \$375 million in the account that the Department of Energy has to properly store and properly secure uranium that is in Russia.

There is some talk about putting the Nation at great risk because we were pulling back this \$150 million. This \$150 million was not obligated. There was no plan to spend it during this year, and there has been no agreement on how plutonium is going to be properly secured and properly stored in the country of Russia, so we had no immediate designation for this money. It was money that was put there, but now we are going to move it to a higher priority someplace where there is a greater need.

In the callable capital account, we heard the subcommittee chairman from the Subcommittee on Foreign Operation, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), tell us that we are only 16 percent of the obligation of the international commitment in callable capital. The international commitment is some \$150 billion. We are only about \$35 billion out of that.

None of the other countries have set aside money in an account like we have. We have \$12 billion sitting in that account. It is a checking account. What we are going to do, once again, is take money and move it to a higher priority. We are going to move it to the great need that currently exists in Central America.

If the money does not come from somewhere, we will have to turn to the social security surplus. That is the only money that is available. So the choice is very clear. If we vote for the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Members are choosing to take money from the social security surplus and send it down to Central America.

If Members choose to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, they will be accepting offsets, money that is unobligated, money that we have no current plans to use, and instead, establish a much higher priority by moving it down to the great need that exists in Central America.

□ 1400

So with this very clear choice, I think that most Americans would agree with this, that it is time that we secure the future for ourselves, for our seniors, for our children by choosing to preserve Social Security and by taking unobligated funds, funds that we did not have a plan to spend, and moving it to the priority down in Central America, in Honduras and Guatemala and Belize and those places that were so severely hit by Hurricane Mitch.

So I would urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to vote against the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The comment that we just heard, that without offsets this money will come from the Social Security Trust Fund, is absolutely ludicrous, absurd, and false. The fact is the committee pretends it is going to cut \$648 million out of callable capital. There is not one dime saved in outlays.

The way we measure what is available for Social Security or anything else is on the basis of outlays, not budget authorities, as the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) well knows or should know.

The gentleman from Kansas misstated my position, so let me correct it. The fact is that out of the \$648 million that my colleagues claim to save, there is not one dime of savings, so that does not cost Social Security one dime. If we take a look at the entire package, unless my colleagues assume that their committee chairman is correct, if they assume their chairman is correct and that the Act will not harm our agreements with the Soviets on uranium, then out of the entire amount of this amendment, only \$16 million will ever accrue as outlay savings. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of all the funds that we are talking about. So do not misconstrue this as being an attack on Social Security. That is blatant nonsense.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, and I do so on the basis of two particular aspects of the supplemental bill that I believe are particularly egregious. The first one is

the provision which would strike the ability to purchase from the Russians 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium.

Just a week ago we had a bill on the floor of this House which called upon our government to deploy a "Star Wars" system, a ballistic nuclear defense system, the physics of which are not even at this moment understood. There are serious questions as to whether or not this apparatus would ever work effectively.

Nevertheless, we are prepared to spend tens of billions of dollars on that program to deploy it, and at the same time we are rescinding from this supplemental bill a small amount of money which would enable us to purchase 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium from the Russians.

If we do not purchase that 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium, the likelihood is that some portion of it is going to end up in the hands of some terrorist organizations and the hands of some person like Saddam Hussein or someone else in some other part of the world that has the ability to threaten this country and threaten others.

The logic of this is absolutely astonishing. There is no logic to it whatsoever. How can my colleagues come here and be for a ballistic missile defense system one week, and then the next week come back and say we ought not to be purchasing weapons grade plutonium from the Russians when we know if we do not, it is going to get in the hands of people who mean us and others harm? This is totally ridiculous.

The other provision would, and this is more than half of the offsets which were offered by the majority, come from the multilateral development banks. We live in a global economy. We are still involved in a situation where there is a serious economic crisis in Southeast Asia, a serious economic problem in Central and South America, a terribly serious economic problem in Russia, all of which impact upon our economy.

We are seeing it particularly in our commodities, particularly in our agricultural commodities. Part of this bill is to help our farmers around the country. At the same time we pretend to be helping our farmers in the supplemental bill, we are going to make it more difficult for them to sell their commodities on the open market. Why? Because the crisis in East Asia has closed up markets there for commodities. The Canadians and the Australians which normally sell into those markets are finding it difficult if not impossible to do so. Therefore, they are impacting on our markets.

Our farmers are finding it difficult to sell in the markets that we normally have access to, let alone those that we hope to have access to. That is the principal reason why we are seeing such difficulty in the agricultural community all across our country.

In this supplemental bill, by these offsets, my colleagues are threatening every farmer that sells outside of the

United States, whether it is wheat, corn, soybeans, cotton. Regardless of what it is, my colleagues are threatening that part of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HINCHEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, these are two critically important deficiencies in this supplemental bill. We have before us some genuine emergencies as a result of the hurricanes and the devastation that those hurricanes caused, genuine emergencies. We have an emergency also in our agricultural community across the country. We should respond to those emergencies in the spirit of emergency. They are serious problems. They need to be dealt with, and they need to be dealt with now.

But instead of doing that, we have a bill before us which has within it an extraordinarily high political quotient. It is not designed to deal with the emergencies. It is designed to play a little bit of politics and to play some politics with the administration particularly.

I beg my colleagues, please, on behalf of the farmers of our country, on behalf of our national security, change this bill, support with us the Obey amendment. Do not take the rescissions from the multilateral development banks. Do not take the rescissions from the money that is required to buy 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium from the Russians. Let us help agriculture truly, and let us improve our national security by taking those provisions out of this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I very much support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to follow up on some of the earlier debate that I was having with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). On one hand, if I understood him correctly, he is opposed to the offsets because there is no actual outlays. But then it would seem, if he is opposed to offsets since there is no actual outlays, he would support using callable capital since it does not really cost anything.

On the other hand, if we do offset, if we do take the money from callable capital, then we are going to create a worldwide depression because of this. So I am a little puzzled on that.

The last part I would like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to address is that he says this money cannot come from Social Security. All the money that we have in the Federal Government is obligated except for what we have outlaid right here.

The money has to come from somewhere if it is not specifically designated in this piece of legislation. The only other money available is in the surplus that we have. The only money in the surplus is from Social Security.

So I would submit logically that if we do not offset the money in the bill, it does have to come from Social Security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) yield?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman is a new member of the committee, fairly new anyway, but I assume he understands the following: When we determine what our deficit is, we determine that not on the basis of what budget authority is, but what is outlaid in any given fiscal year.

Would the gentleman grant that?

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I would agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me give my colleagues the numbers. This bill pretends that it saves \$853 million for Social Security. In fact, the most that it saves is \$19 million, unless the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is wrong on his assumptions about what will happen with the plutonium agreement. The fact is that the \$648 million so-called saving from callable capital results in no savings on the outlay side, so that does not put one dime in Social Security.

The \$25 million which my colleagues cut out of Ex-Im results, according to CBO, in only \$3 million of actual outlaid savings. The \$30 million which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said would have no impact, in fact CBO says does have \$16 million in impact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HINCHEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, that means in effect that there may be \$19 million in play as far as Social Security is concerned. The rest of it is not, unless the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is wrong on his assumptions on plutonium.

I would simply say this. If he is, I would ask every citizen of this country one question: What is more important, to save that \$80 million today that CBO estimates will be outlaid for that, or to use it to make sure that we do not have enough plutonium floating around the world for the Russians or terrorist organizations to build 15,000 additional nuclear weapons?

I think every Social Security recipient in the world would like to see us,

first of all, make certain that we make this world more safe from the possible threat from nuclear weapons. So do not bring that red herring across the table about Social Security. This debate has nothing whatsoever to do with Social Security except in the gentleman's own mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the \$150 million, the reason we left \$375 million in that account is so that we do not completely abandon the efforts that we have in Russia. In fact, we are very dedicated to the efforts in Russia.

But I do want to make a point about where this money is going to come from. We are going to write a check and send it to Central America. It is going to be used for the infrastructure. That money has to come from somewhere. It is not going to come out of thin air.

That money, \$648 million of it, is going to come out of a checking account that is at the World Bank. It is called callable capital. If we write a check, it gets a debit. It is going to go down to Central America. If my colleagues say there is no outlay, no savings, well, the money has to come from somewhere. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the only place it is available is the surplus. The only surplus that is available is Social Security.

So I would just in a very clear way say that we are going to write a check. That check is going to Central America, and the money has to come from somewhere.

In our personal lives, we do not write checks unless we have money to cover it. This is the money to cover it. If we do not take it from here, we take it from Social Security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) will continue to yield, let me simply point out again on one item that the gentleman from Kansas just cited, he is just flat-out wrong on the facts.

He indicated that if we rescind this \$150 million in the plutonium and uranium account, that there will still be \$375 million left. There will not be. Mr. Primakov is about to sign an agreement with the United States Government which will use \$325 million for the uranium agreement that we are working on with the Russians.

If my colleagues rescind the \$150 million of the \$200 million that is remaining in the account, and that is all there is, there will be only \$50 million left for us to proceed on our negotiations with the Russians on the plutonium account. That \$200 million was put on the

table in order to bring the Russians into the negotiations. If we get an agreement from them, that agreement will cost far more than \$200 million. It will cost at least \$1 billion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Obey amendment, and I want to really thank the gentleman for crafting a careful amendment that looked at every single detail of this bill.

Truly, others have dealt with the plutonium issues and with other aspects of the offsets, but in the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), he specifically targets the PL-480 program, and I really want to focus my remarks there in the time that I have.

I cannot believe that in the bill that the majority has given us, that they would attempt to take \$30 million or any amount, actually, from the PL-480 program. Now what is that? That is a program that lifts commodities off our market and sends them around the world. To not fund this program at the level requested really, and that is inadequate from the administration standpoint simply because they know Congress will add funds to that account in view of the situation, if we choose to cut these dollars, we are basically saying there are no more hungry people in the world.

□ 1415

That is an absolutely ridiculous position. Not only that, but here at home the need, the need, to move commodities is simply profound.

What is happening in rural America is something that we have not seen in our adult lifetimes, with the levels of price drops, whether we are talking about the milk market, whether we are talking about hogs, whether we are talking about grain, or whether we are talking about cotton. I mean, go down the list. Rice, historic price drops. We know what has happened in the Asian markets, we know what has happened to our former market in Eastern Europe because of the collapse of the ruble, the situations all around the world which have hurt our export markets. But here at home, because of good weather, we have an enormous surplus which has driven prices to all-time lows.

People in my part of the country are burying animals. This seems so illogical in a time when our feeding kitchens are absolutely begging for food. This is one tool that we have, PL-480, to help lift some of America's surplus, our bounty, to share it with those in the world that many of our esteemed Members, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TONY HALL), of my own State, and former Congressman Bill Emerson of Missouri, worked so hard to sensitize this Congress and the American people on the needs of the hungry around the world.

So I just find it incredible that this particular measure was inserted into this offset provision. And I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing it to the attention of not just this Congress but the American people and people of good heart everywhere. There is absolutely no reason that America cannot lift this bounty and share it worldwide, and why the PL-480 program was selected leaves me in a state of disbelief.

So I rise, Mr. Chairman, in strong support of the Obey amendment, particularly because of the ill-advised provision that deals with clipping the wings of PL-480, which does not need to be cut but in fact increased to benefit our farmers, our communities here at home, as well as those around the world who beg us for food.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me, and I am looking at testimony here by Keith Kelly, who is the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, and he talks about "The 1999 budget provides a total program level of \$979 million for PL-480, foreign food assistance." The Congress raised that to \$1.1 billion. According to his testimony, he says, "This will ensure the availability of adequate resources to meet the most serious food assistance needs."

So even with this rescission, we leave more money in the PL-480 program than the administration asked for in their hearing.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for pointing that out. If we look at what has happened with prices, the figure that the gentleman stated, the over \$1 billion figure, will help us to buy more with the American tax dollar to send abroad. That is true. But the amount of surplus that we have on domestic markets is drowning our rural communities.

As we sit here and argue today, and we will not produce a bill that will aid our farmers this spring, this Congress is going to fail in that responsibility. This should have been the first bill this Congress considered when we convened this year, and we have failed that responsibility to our own people. The surplus is gigantic, but the need abroad is even greater, if we look at what is happening in Russia, what is happening in Asia, and what is happening in Central America and Honduras.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, our very esteemed ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I would simply make this observation, Mr. Chairman.

We have people in both parties in this House who, on a daily basis, are putting out press releases talking about what they are going to be doing to try to help farmers get out from under the collapse of prices for many commodities. I would suggest in those circumstances that what we ought to be doing on both sides of the aisle is pushing the administration to provide more assistance to farmers, more assistance to increase our ability to export farm products to other markets, rather than cutting back on the funds in the budget available to do that.

If people are serious about the press releases they are putting out, that is what they will be doing rather than voting for this bill this afternoon.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I might also say that the administration's request to us through the Department of Agriculture was cleared through the Office of Management and Budget in the executive branch. My own guess is that the Department of Agriculture would like to increase the PL-480 program a whole lot more than the budget submission that reached this Congress. It has to go through the filter of OMB, and that is an unrealistic way in which to make decisions about policy.

We reflect the will of the American people here, and rural America is crying out to us. We ought to use every single tool that we have, and we should not cut a dime out of the PL-480 program, with all due respect to the gentleman, who represents a great citrus-producing State, a great beef-producing State, a great milk-producing State. There is a lot that happens there in the State of Florida, and I know the gentleman has to defend his party on the floor today, but truly this should not be in this bill.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me once again, because I wanted to respond to the comments the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just made when the gentlewoman yielded to him, about the agricultural request and what we should be doing and should not be doing.

Here is a copy of the communication from the President of the United States. He signed the letter on the first page. This bill does what the President asked for in the agricultural program. He asked for a specific amount of money, and that amount of money is in this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would mention to the gentleman, with all due respect, the President never asked for these offsets. And, also, I know that inside the Department of Agriculture they are drowning in commodities. When the administration sends a re-

quest up here, it is not always perfect because of what happens over at OMB.

I know, and the gentleman obviously knows, that silos across this country are bursting at the seams. We have food to send around the world, and our farmers need help on the price in order that they can make it through this planting year. The tragedy is that the credit program that is buried in this bill, that will help our farmers get their spring crops in the ground, will not happen fast enough for them.

They do not even have the assistance that was passed last year in the emergency bill that was passed at the end of the year. They will not get that until June. So shame on this Congress and shame on the administration, too.

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

Mr. Chairman, in some respects I am delighted this debate is going to be on C-SPAN today and the American people can see it. In other respects, though, this is almost an embarrassment.

Earlier, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) offered an amendment to make the rescissions across-the-board to pay for this special bill. I voted for it, but there were only about 75 of us that joined with that amendment, and I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I am glad he joined.

But in listening to this debate I became more and more frustrated just watching in my office, because what we hear from everybody is, well, I would like to have offsets too, but do not touch this program. We cannot touch PL-480. I like PL-480. There are lots of programs I like.

What this debate really is all about, if we stop and step back for a minute, is we are being asked to fund a little over a billion dollar bill which essentially is about 90 percent foreign aid, and yet we are not willing to make the tough decisions.

Now, a lot of talk has been made here on the floor about what is happening to farmers out there. And let me tell my colleagues it is tough out in farm country. Every farmer, every farmer, whether they are in Florida or they are in Iowa or whether in Kansas, they are trying to figure out how they are going to tighten their belts to get through the next year. To put that in context right now, we are looking at a Federal budget of about \$1,700 billion.

I hear the debate here on the floor today that we cannot find a billion dollars worth of offsets. Now, I am not good in math, but that is something like one-tenth of 1 percent. Now, maybe there are Members in this room who believe that we cannot find one-tenth of 1 percent worth of offsets. Maybe there are Members in the room who really believe that, but I got news for them, there are a lot of people outside of this room, a lot of people outside of this beltway who believe that is ridiculous. We can find the offsets and we should find the offsets.

Let me explain why. Because we are going to have a budget on the floor later this week, and we are going to say for the first time to the American people and for the first time to the senior citizens in the United States that we are going to save every single penny of Social Security taxes for Social Security. Now, I think that is a very important statement. That is a giant step forward, in my opinion.

And while it is only a small step, it seems to me if we do not find the offsets today, whether it is PL-480 or other foreign aid programs, whether it be offsets from the reduction in the callable capital, whatever it happens to be, if we cannot find those offsets today, it seems like we are taking a very small step in the wrong direction.

As I say, I think a lot of my colleagues in this room believe we cannot find those offsets, but I have news for them, a lot of people outside this room believe we can and believe we should.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply observe that there were 71 Democrats who voted for that amendment; there were only 6 Republicans who did.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for the arithmetic.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the committee for their leadership and their wisdom for trying to explain to us that this emergency supplemental appropriation is, in fact, creating an emergency and a crisis.

I am particularly interested in having our colleagues, Republicans and joining Democrats, recognize that we have a vital problem in the cuts that have been made in our international monetary efforts. In particular, the largest and most unwelcome of these cuts are in the international banks. This bill cuts funding to those banks by \$648 million, in an environment where those banks are often the best option for borrowers seeking shelter from a hostile economic environment.

This is so important to the Secretary of Commerce that he is threatening a veto if this legislation, the appropriations legislation, passes in this condition. And let me cite the comment of the minority commenting on these offsets that really tells us where we are internationally:

"It is also true that other member nations and many investors around the world are increasingly uneasy about the willingness of the U.S., and particularly the U.S. Congress, to make good on its legal and moral commitments. These same investors watch the Congress repeatedly refuse to provide the International Monetary Fund with the needed infusion of capital through the debts of the Asian financial crisis,

and are also aware that the Congress continues to refuse to provide the funds necessary to pay off the billion-plus in back debts of the United States."

These international monetary banks help our products. It helps our farmers' products get from production to market, it gives access to credit, it also helps to infuse dollars into the international economy and, therefore, keeps the American economy, of which so many people have come to not only accept but to think this is the norm, it helps to keep it stabilized. Why would we think that \$648 million, doing great jeopardy to this very fragile system, is where we need to go? I am very surprised we would even go in that direction and gamble with the financial future of this Nation.

I would also say the \$25 million from the Export-Import Bank, albeit seemingly small, this bank has been most useful in helping some of our smaller nations with small projects that generate jobs and opportunity, in fact keeping individuals home in their nations because they have the opportunity and access to credit, and as well, creating jobs.

I would also say that even though I have heard a number of explanations on why we are cutting \$150 million that deals in particular with funds used to purchase materials, uranium and plutonium, that could be used in nuclear warheads by our enemies, a program that has been unanimously supported by the President, and I think if we would inquire, by individuals in the street who say that we should bring down the possibility of more and more of our enemies having nuclear warheads, that, too, raises a question of balance and why we would do that.

Let me say also, having worked with the Department of Labor on the issue of a rapid response team program dealing with our hardest hit communities when there are enormous layoffs, particularly in my district and my community where there have been enormous layoffs because of the energy crisis, I am somewhat disappointed in the cuts that we have seen relating to job training, and would hope that we would be able to balance that.

Let me say finally, also, Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims for the Committee on the Judiciary, I am certainly gratified that we have in this supplemental appropriations, and viewed as an emergency, some \$80 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for increased border enforcement. I, however, raise the concern, as many experts have, that border enforcement without trained, experienced Border Patrol agents is of no value. So I hope that we recognize that we need trained Border Patrol agents. We need to have dollars as well to prohibit and inhibit border violence.

And the question of adding additional beds is not going to be the panacea that we would like it to be.

□ 1430

In fact, the real issue is the 1996 immigration reform legislation that in fact caused the INS to have to deal with locking up, if you will, immigrants who have been here, who 20, 30, 40 years ago may have had an infraction such as a traffic ticket. They are then arrested, separated from their families, filling up these private prisons; and the real criminals that we do not want to have on the street are not able to be incarcerated.

We have got to reform the INS legislation to go back to reality and sanity. We also have got to get these people out of private prisons and put them into the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

I hope some of these more reasonable aspects, Mr. Chairman, can be addressed later on. And I hope the Obey amendment will pass. I add my support to it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat to wade off into the number of issues that are being discussed, but there has been a lot of discussion today about the offset dealing with some of the nonproliferation funds. I think this is a very important issue. It is a very important part of our security. I want to take just a moment to discuss this in the larger context of our nonproliferation efforts.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I share some of the concerns that have been expressed over the course of the day. I think at the end of this bill, when it comes back from conference, it would probably be better if this offset were not taken, if this money were left alone. But I also think that we should not over-play the dangers that may result from this particular program.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I speak as one who on this side of the aisle has strongly supported much of what the administration has tried to do in our nonproliferation efforts and in our cooperative efforts with the former Soviet Union, but in those efforts there are priorities. Some things are more important than others.

For example, if we can spend money this year to put better security around plutonium or uranium which could be used for a bomb, that ought to come first. That prevents someone from walking out with it. That prevents someone from stealing it and selling it to someone who we would prefer not get their hands on it.

The program we are dealing with here is a different kind of priority. It is a long-term, a long-range sort of approach, and I think it becomes much more difficult to argue that the results would be catastrophic this year if this money were taken aside.

What is going on is that there are negotiations which have just recently begun with Russia on taking some of the weapons-useable plutonium that Russia now has, turning it into a fuel

which could be burned in a nuclear reactor, and thus preventing it from being used for weapons.

This involves international consortiums. This involves nuclear power companies from a variety of countries and some very delicate negotiations from Russia and from the United States. The goal is to take 50 tons of weapons-usable plutonium and ultimately turn it into a fuel for nuclear power.

We should not forget that we are sure that Russia has at least 200 tons of weapons-usable plutonium now. So what we are talking about, in the best circumstance, is taking about a fourth of this plutonium that we know they have and turning it into a fuel for nuclear reactors. That is going to take 20 to 25 years under the very best circumstances.

The Department of Energy indicates that under the very best circumstances, if everything goes perfectly in their negotiations, they might be able to obligate about half of this money in the year 2000 and maybe spend about a third of it. So taking this money off the table, as it were, would not have a catastrophic effect on this program designed to last 20 to 25 years.

The concern is that taking it off the table would make the Russians question the seriousness of our negotiations, and I think we ought to think about that. There are a lot of negotiations underway now with Russia, and they need to know that we are serious about working with them to control the proliferation of this kind of material, and that is not easy to quantify. It is hard to put our finger on exactly what the result would be. It is a concern that we certainly ought to take into account. But to say that this would have catastrophic consequences I think is not accurate.

As a matter of fact, the committee's action would leave \$375 million left in the fund for nonproliferation activities. It is possible that that could all be used for the uranium purchase this year. If the plutonium issue becomes a higher priority, of course it may well be possible to rearrange those priorities.

I think at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, for me it would be better if another offset is eventually found for these funds, but it is not true that this would completely obliterate our nonproliferation efforts, which are very important to our security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a leader in the area of dealing with issues of nonproliferation. He and I have worked together on a number of these issues and that is why I respect his opinion on this, but I wanted to respond specifically to some of his comments.

The first one was, at the end of the day in this process, after the con-

ference committee has finished its work, he would probably hope that this cut of \$150 million to take 50 tons of bomb-grade plutonium off the Russian marketplace, he hopes that rescission, that cut, would be thrown out.

And what I would suggest is that if this is such a terribly dangerous area we are dealing with, if we know it is the right thing to cut it out at the end of the day, why do we not cut it out on the first day right here in the House, let the House speak its voice today, saying we do want to do anything that might possibly risk the proliferation of such potentially catastrophic levels of nuclear bomb materials.

Secondly, he made a good point that I do agree with. He said that we should fund other programs to protect nuclear materials, whether they be in Russia or the United States, or elsewhere for that matter, and I agree with the gentleman. I want to work with the gentleman. But that does not in any way take away from the argument that when we have a real opportunity, as we speak today, to take 50 tons of nuclear materials off the marketplace that could be exposed to purchase and purchased by international terrorists or the very powerful Mafia in the former Soviet Union, we ought to take advantage of that today.

He talked about very delicate negotiations, and I would agree with that. And I would say to my respected friend that that is one of the very reasons I would use to argue during the middle of very delicate negotiations that not only include Russia and the United States but bring in other nations of the world, we ought not to be tinkering with this.

I do not know if there is a 5 percent chance, a 10 percent chance, a 95 percent chance this \$150 million cut could destroy those negotiations. I do not want to take a 1 percent chance that we might potentially unload bomb-grade nuclear materials on the world marketplace for terrorists. And I do not think there is any Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, who has spoken with the negotiators on the American and Russian side who would come to this floor and honestly say, after having talked with the negotiators involved in this process, there is a 99 percent chance that the negotiations would go on.

When we talked about national missile defense the other day, no one said there is a 90 percent chance someone is going to send an ICBM into New York City. But through the Republican leadership and bipartisan support of people like myself, we said we want a national missile defense system even if there is a 1 percent chance that a foreign nation would send their missiles into our Nation.

I have got to say to my friend that I recognize and I am fearful of the fact of the 200 tons of plutonium in the Russian area in terms of what we need to get our arms around. But where I disagree with my colleague, I do not think

that fact makes it any less important to try to take 50 tons of that 200 tons off the international terrorist marketplace while we have that opportunity.

Ultimately, I think we have to have some respect for the people directly involved in this. And I would like to read briefly the statement made by the Secretary of Energy, who has direct responsibility for overseeing these negotiations, part of which have already proven to be extremely successful.

He says, "Such a reduction," as proposed in this bill today, "would have severe consequences," severe consequences, "for the ongoing negotiations in pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons.

"To now withdraw this earnest money," he says, "would be to call into question U.S. reliability. Russia may well perceive such a withdrawal as a breach of good faith. Withdrawing this money would severely set back, and might even bring a halt to, our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue."

Now, if any of the proponents of this \$150 million cut have talked to the chief American negotiator and the chief Russian negotiator, I would be willing to donate my time at this time to listen to that Member tell me what they were told by those negotiators and to assure me that it is no risk to my family or their family to risk the breakdown of these negotiations.

The truth is there is not a House Member who has spoken directly to either one of those sides of negotiations and can come to this floor and say this is not risking potential catastrophe for the American civilian population or our servicemen and women abroad.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Obey amendment and to address primarily the issue that comes under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee which I chair, and that is addressing the two issues of the Russian programs.

I think there has been a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation that has been put out. Number one, the 50 metric tons of plutonium is not to be purchased by the United States. The money was not to be used to purchase it. It simply is to provide facilities in Russia that would degrade it and bring it down to fuel grade rather than weapons grade.

And secondly, that will continue. That effort will continue. It is not a one-year or a 1999 issue. Actually, it is a decade-long issue, but we will be funding it for the next few years. The negotiations are not even completed or hardly begun on how to do it and how to spend the money and what to do. So the money that we are rescinding this year would not be used for this year to any great extent.

Secondly, let me refer to the highly enriched uranium issue. That uranium

will not be converted into weapons of mass destruction. That uranium is already here in the United States. It is not in Russia. And so to use the argument that it would be used if we do not fund the \$150 million that we are calling to be rescinded, that it would be used to make weapons out of the highly enriched uranium, that is simply not true. The Russians do not have it, it is not there. It would have really no impact whatsoever upon proliferation because it is already here in the United States.

Thirdly, as has been mentioned several times, we are rescinding or asking to rescind \$150 million of the \$525 million, not \$200 million. The \$200 million for plutonium could be reduced to \$50 million during the 1999 budget year. It does not have to be.

The administration still has the options and the flexibility to subtract \$150 million any way they wish. It can be from the enriched uranium program or the plutonium program. They can choose and decide where it would best serve the needs of our international relations with Russia.

Another point that needs to be made. The \$200 million was not originally planned to come from the taxpayers of the United States. That was planned to come from the international community. That was where the \$200 million was to come from. The United States was only to fund a prototype plant to determine how to deal with the Russian plutonium, and that is what the \$25 million per year that we funded last year, this year, and is in the President's budget for the coming budget year.

□ 1445

That money was to be used to build a prototype and the international community would fund the rest of it, in building the actual facilities that would degrade the plutonium from weapons grade to fuel grade. We have missed that point entirely. We have now funded the \$200 million in the omnibus emergency bill, and no one called for it. The President did not call for that. The Senate bill did not call for it. Our committee and the House did not call for it. But the fact is it was put into the emergency supplemental bill last year, and of course the President would support it after it was put in. Here was a half a billion, over a half a billion dollars that all of a sudden we gave to him that he could use for his public relations overseas. Of course he would support it after it was put in. But he did not feel it was of high enough priority to put in or request it when it was being processed through the normal process.

Now, let me speak to the plutonium issue itself. The negotiations are just beginning. Even if the \$150 million was taken out or \$50 million of it would be taken from the \$200 million of plutonium disposition, there would still be \$50 million remaining plus the \$25 million. There is still a significant amount of money in that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has expired.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the fact is it is a long-range program. There is money to start it this year if the negotiations are finished, and we have time to then address it in the normal process of budgeting through our committee process.

Let me remind Members that the Prime Minister of Russia, Mr. Primakov, as a result of the President's decision to bomb Kosovo, has gone back to Russia. So we have no assurance that there will be a signing of the agreement. We have no assurance that they will come back to the table. It could be delayed, and certainly it is for now. It could be delayed for the balance of the year. It will be very difficult to complete those negotiations and to draft the agreement and to get it implemented before the end of this fiscal year. Thus, the money will not and cannot be spent during this fiscal year in my judgment.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We can either look at this issue like we are green eyeshade accountants or we can look at this issue in terms of what will create the most security for the United States. The fact is that what the Energy Department tells us, what the Secretary of Energy tells us is as follows, in the letter he sent today.

He said the entire cut, in this bill, "would have to come from the \$200 million appropriated to dispose of Russian plutonium. Such a reduction would have severe consequences for the ongoing negotiations in pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. It could also severely impact the wide range of cooperative nonproliferation engagement under way and planned in Russia, including efforts to protect, control and account for weapons-usable nuclear material and to prevent the flight of weapons scientists to countries of proliferation concern."

Now, the facts are very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has again expired.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to continue to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. The administration did not put this in their original budget because at the time they submitted the FY 1999 budget, nobody thought there was a prayer of getting negotiations going on plutonium. Senator DOMENICI

saw an opportunity in October to take advantage of the fact that the facts had changed and it looked like we would now be able to move toward sitting down with the Russians on plutonium. And so he put the \$200 million in the Omnibus bill. It now remains available precisely because it is used as a magnet to draw the Russians to the table. It sends a signal to them that we are serious about this issue and we all know that if we do in fact get an agreement, the cost of that agreement is going to be at least five times the amount of the money which is presently available.

All I am saying is that it is absurd for us in my view to be arguing about fiscal years and expenditures in this year or that year when the fact is that the overriding concern ought to be to get that fissile material converted before it falls into the hands of terrorists or anybody else.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, first of all, if the administration is saying that the full \$200 million would be lost by rescinding \$150 million, I just do not understand their math.

Mr. OBEY. That is not what it says.

Mr. PACKARD. Number two, it is their choice. They do not have to take it from the \$200 million. It can come from the other area, the enriched uranium. Let me conclude my statement and then the gentleman may wish to speak further on someone else's time.

It is not as if we have neglected Russia. Since 1994, we have spent over \$1 billion in Russian programs to deal with their nuclear problems. There are Members of this Congress who feel that we could spend that money here in the United States because we have not adequately addressed our own nuclear waste disposition problem. We have not solved our own nuclear waste problems. They are saying, "Why don't we take care of problems here at home before we deal with overseas Russian waste?"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I just heard. The gentleman said that if the administration wants, it does not have to take this money out of the plutonium agreement, it can take it out of the other agreement, the highly enriched uranium agreement.

Is he seriously suggesting that it would be in the national interest of the United States for the United States to blow up an agreement—which Mr. Primakov was ready to sign this week until Kosovo got in the way—is he seriously suggesting that that should be a serious option that the administration looks at?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes, I am suggesting, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. OBEY. Let me finish and then I will be happy to yield.

I cannot believe that any thoughtful person in this House would say it is in the United States' interest to throw away the agreement on enriched uranium that we are about to get, that the Russians have already agreed to, except for signature.

The second point I would like to make, the gentleman says we have got a lot of Members who would rather see this money used in this country. I would say I am not at all worried about uranium and plutonium in American hands. I am very worried about uranium and plutonium in Russian hands, because their scientists and their military people have not been paid for months, and we are worried that for a small expenditure of money, they might very well be willing to supply some of that material to terrorist organizations around the world. I would suggest that anyone who believes that it is more important to worry about fissile material in the United States versus fissile material in the hands of the Russians simply does not understand the history of the last 50 years.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that he feels that this Member is not a thoughtful Member of this body because I disagree with him on this issue, but the fact is the President does have the option to determine where the priorities are in terms of the \$325 million project versus the \$200 million plutonium project. He has that option. If it is more important to fund the highly enriched uranium program, he can do that. But obviously he does not feel it is.

Mr. OBEY. Taking back my time, I would simply say it is crucial that we get both agreements. If you are blown up in a nuclear explosion which is delivered to this country by a terrorist organization, it does not much matter whether the bomb was made out of uranium or plutonium. You are just as dead. That is why we need both agreements.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman would yield further, in reference to the matter of the highly enriched uranium, again there is not a threat there because the uranium is here in the United States. So the money can be devoted to the plutonium program if that is what the administration chooses. The threat is not there for the highly enriched uranium. We may disagree on the issue.

The fact is, also, in reference to people wanting to have the money spent here, we are not neglecting Russian programs. The fact is we have a crisis on disposal of nuclear waste in this country and we have not solved that problem. We ought not to solve that problem in another country before we solve it in our own country.

Mr. OBEY. Again taking back my time, I would simply say, Mr. Chair-

man, that the threat to the security of the United States, to the survival of the United States, comes from nuclear weapons. The gentleman's party seems to be very concerned about building a Star Wars program at huge expense to defend us from nuclear weapons but they apparently are not willing to proceed as fast as possible to get tons of plutonium out of the hands of the people who might be firing those weapons. With all due respect, that dichotomy makes no sense.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman would yield further, if our committee were neglecting the programs that we are talking about in Russia, it would be a different story. But we are not. We are funding significant amounts every year with the American taxpayers' dollars to build facilities to dispose of enriched uranium and plutonium in Russia, not here.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, I think the gentleman is dead wrong on the issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Obey amendment to H.R. 1141, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

This supplemental bill was supposed to have been a bipartisan effort to provide desperately needed funds to assist American farmers, respond to hurricane damage in Central America and the Caribbean, support the new government of Jordan and correct the amount of money appropriated to the Office of Minority Health. Unfortunately, this bill now contains provisions masquerading as offsets that are both unnecessary and harmful. So much for bipartisanship.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I am particularly concerned about a provision that would rescind \$648 million in funds that were previously appropriated to guarantee the solvency of multilateral development banks. Neither the Committee on Banking and Financial Services nor my subcommittee were ever given an opportunity to consider this controversial rescission.

There are three multilateral development banks—the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank—that provide loans to developing countries to promote economic growth and development. These banks have collected guarantees from the United States to sell bonds to commercial banks. The development banks use the proceeds from these bond sales to make their loans to developing countries. These guarantees, known as callable capital, ensure that the bank's lenders will be repaid even if a substantial portion of the loans made by the banks are not repaid.

Prior to 1981, the United States appropriated funds to provide for our

share of the callable capital of the multilateral development banks. The development banks have always been able to repay their bonds on time without calling upon the United States. The United States Government's guarantees to these banks have never cost the American taxpayers one dime.

The supplemental appropriations bill includes a provision to rescind a portion of the banks' callable capital. The Republican supporters of this provision claim that it is an offset for the emergency spending in the bill. However, this is smoke and mirrors. This provision does not actually save any money and cannot be considered an offset.

Since the United States has never had to provide any money to the multilateral development banks to cover their bonds, there were never any outlays. Furthermore, it is unlikely that there ever will be any outlays. In other words, the supplemental appropriations act is rescinding money that would never have been spent, anyway. The proposed rescission of callable capital contained in the supplemental bill will have no effect whatsoever on the size of the budget surplus. Shame on them for making people think that this is a legitimate offset that is going to save some money.

Although the rescission of callable capital will not increase the budget surplus, it will, however, jeopardize the effective operation of the multilateral development banks. If the United States rescinds any of its callable capital, it will be a signal to worldwide financial markets that the United States may no longer be willing to meet its international financial obligations.

Over the past 50 years, loans to developing countries from the multilateral development banks have promoted economic growth and created new businesses and job opportunities as well as markets for American exports. These banks are especially important to the world economy today. Many nations in Asia and Latin America are facing a serious economic and financial crisis. They are dependent on loans from the banks to stabilize their currencies and allow their economies to recover. Asia and Latin American markets are desperately in need of this capital.

□ 1500

Let me just close my remarks by saying this was supposed to be a bipartisan effort, and the American farmers, the agricultural community that both sides of the aisle claim they care so much about, stand to benefit. That is Republicans and Democrats alike. If they mess up this supplemental appropriation by insisting on these offsets, they are going to hurt the very people that they are always mouthing off about that they care so much about.

Let us stop playing games. Let us stop with the smoke and mirrors about offsets that do not realize one single dime, one single cent. Let us get on with the business of a supplemental appropriation bill. We will do what we started out to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a long debate already, and it is about a topic that I guess every one of us on both sides of the aisle basically agrees that the human disasters that brought this bill to the floor in the first place were true emergencies. The devastating flood in Central America where Hurricane Mitch left 9,000 dead, 9,000 more missing, 13,000 injured and over 3 million homeless, the region's economy and its infrastructure and its environment has been totally devastated; and the second human disaster, namely the collapse of farm prices here at home, across the heartland of America where rural Americans are losing their farms and their livelihoods and their homes.

Under those circumstances, with true emergencies, we could well have funded these emergencies without the shenanigans that are going on here, but this bill finances our response to these crises with offsets which themselves have disaster written all over them, and I would just want to talk about one of these. I support the Obey amendment, which covers four of them, but I particularly wanted to talk about one of them that I consider to be the most dangerous, and that is the cut of \$150 million for nuclear disarmament nonproliferation programs with Russia.

Last year the Congress provided the Energy Department with \$525 million; we have talked about it, to dismantle nuclear warheads, dispose of excess weapons-grade plutonium and enriched uranium, mostly in Russia. Some was actually here in the U.S. Well, this \$525 million supports two of the most important "swords into plowshares" agreements reached by the United States and Russia since the end of the Cold War. And the critical \$200 million of it, although we have had at least one suggestion that we ought to virtually throw out the agreement that is already ready to be signed, which relates to the uranium, but I think that is not a very sensible thing to do, the critical \$200 million is to be used to implement a bilateral plutonium agreement to dispose of 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium that is currently on hand in Russia, 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium which could make 15,000 to 20,000 nuclear weapons.

This \$200 million does another job along the way. It leverages the nonproliferation contributions from others of the G-7 countries which are necessary in order if we are ever going to manage to get hold of all the plutonium that is around that might get loose among terrorists and rogue nations. The \$150 million cut in these two nuclear nonproliferation programs is an extremely dangerous move, in my view, and it is certainly one that I cannot support.

Last week 317 of the Members of this House were concerned enough about the dangers of nuclear proliferation to vote in favor of deploying a national missile defense system that would cost

us billions of dollars and do nothing about the possibility of terrorists getting hold of this kind of material. Today we are being asked to endorse a \$150 million offset which will make more likely the transfer of weapons-grade plutonium from Russia to rogue nations like North Korea, Iraq, Iran and Libya, and surely make it more likely that it could fall into the hands of terrorists.

If we are serious about eliminating nuclear threats to our national security, and this is one way of eliminating a major nuclear threat, we should do all we can to keep nuclear weapons material from ever reaching terrorists or the rogue states. We should not cut the nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation programs. Please support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, and if the Obey amendment fails, in opposition to the supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this emergency supplemental bill in its current form. I emphatically disagree with the offsets proposed by the committee. Before I address the troubling offsets included in this bill, let me comment on the nature of emergency supplemental appropriations, quote, unquote.

Emergency supplemental appropriations are by definition, and again, Mr. Chairman, I quote: discretionary appropriations that the President designates as emergency requirements and which are similarly designated by Congress in legislation subsequently enacted into law.

We anticipated the situation in which we now find ourselves and made provisions for it. Any spending designated as an emergency bill will result in discretionary spending caps being increased to accommodate the additional spending. That is in our rules.

We now are facing a serious situation which requires immediate action for American farmers who are encountering dire financial straits, and victims of natural disasters in Central America. These circumstances clearly fall in the category of needs that are urgent and immediate, unanticipated and essential; in other words, emergency requirements that deserve prompt action, without offsets.

American farmers, Mr. Chairman, are dealing with serious challenges that threaten their very existence. Not since the Dust Bowl days of the 1930's have farmers faced such severe economic difficulties. Forecasts for continuing low commodity prices in 1999 have significantly increased the demand for Department of Agriculture farm loans, as many farmers are being turned away from their normal sources of financing. The funding requested by the President is essential to finance the roughly \$1.1 billion needed for spring planting.

Of equal importance, Mr. Chairman, is providing the necessary assistance to

the victims of hurricanes Mitch and Georges. Mitch has already been described as the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western Hemisphere, causing over 9,000 deaths. Even before Mitch hit Central America, nearly one half of all Nicaraguans and Hondurans existed on a dollar a day or less. In the wake of Mitch's devastation it will be years before they can regain that level of poverty. This Congress needs to act expeditiously, quickly, decisively to provide relief for these victims.

Now I want to say my very good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, stood up here just a little while ago when I was on the floor and he said the President cannot veto this bill. The President went to South America, the First Lady went to South America, some of us have gone to South America and said we are going to help, it is an emergency. We told our farmers the same thing.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, they make this mistake almost every year, that they have the President in a box from which he cannot extricate himself, that they are going to intimidate him, they are going to buffalo him, they are going to push him around. They wanted to push him around when the Mississippi overran its banks and thousands and thousands of Americans were displaced, and they said, "Well, we know you want the emergency aid. Yes, we know it's necessary. We know it's needed now. But we're going to put some things in the bill that we know you don't like and try to shove it down your throat."

It did not work.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida who I know did not want to do this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend that there is nothing in this bill that was done for that purpose. I want him to know that.

Mr. HOYER. Now I understand what the gentleman from Florida is saying, Mr. Chairman, but I respectfully disagree with him, not in the sense that he wants to shove something down his throat perhaps this time, but there are things in this bill that the President said, "I view them so seriously that I will veto this bill." Now, he has not said that personally, but the Secretary of Treasury said it, and we know he is one of the President's closest advisers.

I want to say, as the ranking member said, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), Both of us, of course, have absolutely unrestrained affection and respect for the chairman of our committee. We are pleased to have him as our chairman, and like his predecessor, Mr. LIVINGSTON, he did not want to do this. He stands here because the leadership has told him to stand here and defend this policy, which is bad policy,

which is policy inconsistent with our rules, which is policy hoisted on the pedastal of their CATs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have a number of other amendments that we have to consider this afternoon, and I am not going to object, but I think I will notify the Members that I have been very generous in allowing time extensions and in allowing Members to speak more than once on the same subject. I think in any future request on this amendment I will have to object, but I will not object to this one.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, can I amend my request to an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Maryland would not.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. My point is this, and I will ask that the balance of my prepared comments be included in the RECORD. My point is this:

My colleagues, our neighbors sent us here to represent them and to represent America. They know we are going to play politics from time to time; that is the nature of this collegial body. But I was struck, as I said, when my friend from Alabama, who I also have great affection for and unlimited respect for, said that the President cannot veto this bill.

Why do they take this risk with peoples' lives and peoples' welfare? Why do they delay when they know that the President will veto this bill? He has shown us he will do it. He has done it before when the Mississippi floods came, and they said unless we take it their way, we are not going to give the folks in Mississippi and all up the Mississippi Delta the relief they need. We saw on television people floating around in their cities and towns.

Why do they do this? Why do they force the Committee on Appropriations to do it when their leadership on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and others, and Mr. LIVINGSTON before him, said this is emergency spending, we ought to pass it, pass it now and give the relief where it is needed.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for not objecting to that extra time, and I want to say to my friend that this is an important piece of legislation, but it is also an important principle, and I would say to my chairman

it is an important principle for the Committee on Appropriations itself and frankly we ought to stand as a committee and say to our friends who are not on this committee, when we have an emergency, when we need to act quickly, when we need to act without political controversy, this is the way to do it, the way the gentleman originally proposed, Mr. Chairman.

That is my point, and that is my hope for the future.

These provisions would jeopardize both this country's strong economic security and our Nation's efforts to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of terrorists.

The provision to offset \$648 million from money that was appropriated for the capitalization of multilateral development banks, alone will invite a veto from the White House. Treasury Secretary Rubin warned this committee of the negative impacts of this provision—significant pressure on MDB interest rates and destabilized currencies and markets in developing countries around the world.

Just last Congress, we appropriated \$525 million for the safe disposition of fissionable material from Russia. Now, less than a year later, the Republican leadership has proposed to rescind a critical portion of those funds.

This will severely impede efforts to continue the dismantlement of Russian nuclear warheads and the safe disposition of plutonium extracted from their nuclear weapons. This, to say the least, is a devastating possibility. What perception do we leave the Russian negotiators with if this money is refused?

Just last week, this House passed H.R. 4 which calls for U.S. policy to deploy a national missile defense system. How can we turn around and take away funding that will assist in the deactivation of Russian warheads and keep fissionable materials out of the hands of rogue states and terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I cannot support the offsets included in this bill. I, therefore, must oppose it.

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate has gone on for a while. Most of us, virtually all of us, agree that the supplemental, the motives of the supplemental, are appropriate. We ought to have a supplemental to relieve the needs that are met in that bill. But the offsets, the offsets are the issue. We do not need, we should not need offsets at all on this supplemental appropriations bill. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the offsets that are given to us today, specifically the cuts in the Russian plutonium disposal program, the World Bank and other development aid.

I sit on the Committee on Armed Services which is charged with providing for our Nation's security, and from where I sit these offsets are bad for our national security.

□ 1515

Last week, the House passed the bill to commit us to deploy a national missile defense system. Such a system is designed to defend against a limited ballistic missile attack, meaning a handful of missiles, from, at most, a North Korea or Iran.

That national missile defense system would cost somewhere between \$18 billion and \$28 billion. Last week, we committed \$18 billion to \$28 billion, or said we would commit that amount, to a narrow response to a limited threat.

This week, this bill cuts \$150 million from a program designed to prevent excess Russian plutonium from ending up in the hands of terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, what are we doing here? What kind of defense are we providing our country when we gut a key nonproliferation program to keep nuclear materials away from terrorists, yet commit billions to an untested system to intercept missiles? It does not make sense to me.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned earlier in the debate today that the Russians have over 200 metric tons. If they are inclined to sell to rogue or to terrorist groups, they would still have 150 tons after subtracting the 50 metric tons. So if they are inclined to do it, they can do it with or without this rescission.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the point is that this \$150 million can allow us to acquire and dispose of, safely enough, fissile material to make 20,000 nuclear weapons. To take that material potentially out of the hands of terrorists is a major advance. There is no point to cutting this \$150 million.

This bill also cuts funds to promote economic stability overseas and raise the standard of living in poorer countries. Our national security depends on our economic security. We do our prosperity a disservice by cutting vital funding from multilateral development banks, food aid, Russia and Eastern Europe.

Congress must not reject a cheap, wise and effective first line of defense against terrorism and nuclear weapons when just last week we chose to move ahead to a more expensive and technologically dubious line of defense.

I would just go back, I know it has been mentioned before but the Secretary of Energy Mr. Richardson has said since the Department of Energy has already negotiated an agreement to purchase uranium from Russia for \$325 million, the entire cut, this entire \$150 million, would have to come from the \$250 million appropriated to dispose of Russian plutonium.

This is a very serious matter. I do not understand the other side. It seems clear to me dismantling Russian nuclear warheads and disposing of plutonium is solidly in the national interest. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment and make the right vote for our national security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to add my thoughts to the remarks that have already been made. I will not take the full 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Strictly, I am troubled and I say this to the chairman of the committee that my understanding is that, in fact, this committee has had every ability of working and bringing to us a basically contest-free nonprovocative motion here and that the leadership on that side has in fact imposed on us this debate and this particular decision that we must now make.

I think that the American public ought to know that and ought to know that the committee is perfectly capable of functioning and bringing things forward in a nonpartisan manner but that it is the party over there that chooses to make this into a partisan issue several days after some left Hershey under the misguided belief apparently that some chocolate was going to resolve everything and get people working on the same plane. If we are talking about doing what is in the best interest of this country's national security, then simply the vote that we took last week on national missile defense is a step away from that. It is technologically not feasible at present. The costs have not been considered and the impact it would have on treaty negotiations, I think, was not served well and not considered appropriately.

I would compound that today by saying that we are not going to put nonproliferation in the forefront of our national security interests. We are instead going to move and cut monies for a reduction in the plutonium and uranium. I think it sends the wrong message internationally. I think it sends the wrong message to the American people. In our first line of defense, we should be setting our priorities where the greatest danger lies, and we clearly are not doing that through this action.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would note that by destabilizing the economies in Asia and elsewhere we do not do anything for our national security. This particular attempt is not in the interest of our people and I think that the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) ought to pass and I think we ought to move forward with that amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Obey amendment to eliminate the funding offsets in this bill. We should not appropriate this money by putting the burden directly on the backs of our Social Security recipients.

The FY99 omnibus bill passed last October included \$525 million for two Russian programs, \$325 for highly enriched uranium and \$200 million for plutonium disposition.

The highly enriched uranium agreement was to be signed this week with the arrival of the Russian Prime Minister. However, with his visit being canceled, the use of this \$325 million remains in doubt.

Furthermore, the plutonium disposition initiative was funded at the \$200 million level, but with no request from the Administration, nor any information on how the funding will be used.

Today, we have immediate needs in Central America to be funded through this bill. There is no evidence either from the Administration or the Members from the other side of the aisle, that the \$200 million will be spent in fiscal year 1999. Although negotiations have begun, it appears doubtful, at best, that such funds would be spent during this fiscal year. And, although it is unlikely that any of the funds would be used in fiscal year 1999, we leave in tact \$50 million which will remain available. That is \$50 million in addition to the \$25 million appropriated in the regular budget process—for a total of \$75 million.

Once the negotiations are completed, the Administration plans to expend the \$200 million over the next 2 to 3 years. I am certain we can work with the Administration once they have a plan in place to provide the necessary funds to make sure this program is adequately funded.

The record is clear. The House and Senate have consistently supported U.S. programs to protect Russian nuclear weapons materials that could fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue nations. We have supported efforts to make sure Russian scientists will not be lured away by terrorists or rogue nations. And we have supported efforts to upgrade the Soviet-designed reactors to prevent another Chernobyl type accident.

Mr. Chairman, people are suffering in Central America. Let's do the right thing and vote to provide funding for those in immediate need. But let's offset this bill, so we don't have to put the burden on those who rely on Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]		
AYES—201		
Abercrombie	Boyd	DeFazio
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	DeGette
Allen	Brown (CA)	Delahunt
Andrews	Brown (FL)	DeLauro
Baird	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Baldacci	Capps	Dicks
Baldwin	Capuano	Dingell
Barcia	Cardin	Dixon
Barrett (WI)	Carson	Dooley
Becerra	Clay	Doyle
Bentsen	Clayton	Edwards
Bereuter	Clement	Engel
Berkley	Clyburn	Eshoo
Berman	Conyers	Etheridge
Berry	Costello	Evans
Bishop	Coyne	Farr
Blagojevich	Cramer	Fattah
Blumenauer	Crowley	Filner
Bonior	Cummings	Ford
Borski	Danner	Frank (MA)
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Frost
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Gejdenson
Gephardt	Marky	Rothman
Gonzalez	Martinez	Royal-Allard
Gordon	Mascara	Rush
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sabo
Gutierrez	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)	Sanders
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Sandlin
Hilliard	McGovern	Sawyer
Hinchey	McKinney	Schakowsky
Hinojosa	McNulty	Scott
Hoeffel	Meehan	Serrano
Holden	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Shows
Hooley	Menendez	Sisisky
Hoyer	Millender-	Skelton
Inslee	McDonald	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Snyder
Jackson-Lee	Minge	Spratt
(TX)	Mink	Stabenow
Jefferson	Moakley	Stark
John	Mollohan	Strickland
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Tanner
Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Kanjorski	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Napolitano	Thurman
Kildee	Neal	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Towns
Kind (WI)	Obey	Turner
Kleczka	Olver	Udall (CO)
Klink	Ortiz	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Owens	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pallone	Vento
Lampson	Pascarel	Visclosky
Lantos	Pastor	Waters
Larson	Payne	Watt (NC)
Lee	Pelosi	Waxman
Levin	Phelps	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Pickett	Weldon (PA)
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Weygand
Lowey	Rahall	Wise
Lucas (KY)	Rangel	Woolsey
Luther	Reyes	Wu
Maloney (CT)	Rodriguez	Wynn
Maloney (NY)	Roemer	
		NOES—228
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Archer	Dickey	Hutchinson
Armey	Doggett	Hyde
Bachus	Doolittle	Isakson
Baker	Dreier	Istook
Ballenger	Duncan	Jenkins
Barr	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Ehrlich	Jones (NC)
Barton	Emerson	Kasich
Bass	English	Kelly
Bateman	Everett	King (NY)
Biggert	Ewing	Kingston
Bilbray	Fletcher	Knollenberg
Bilirakis	Foley	Kolbe
Biley	Forbes	Kuykendall
Blunt	Fowler	LaHood
Boehlert	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Bonilla	Gallegly	LaTourette
Bono	Ganske	Lazio
Brady (TX)	Gekas	Leach
Bryant	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Burton	Gillmor	Linder
Buyer	Gilman	LoBiondo
Callahan	Goode	Lucas (OK)
Calvert	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Camp	Goodling	McCollum
Campbell	Goss	McCrery
Canady	Graham	McHugh
Cannon	Granger	McInnis
Castle	Green (WI)	McIntosh
Chabot	Greenwood	McIntyre
Chambliss	Gutknecht	McKeon
Chenoweth	Hall (TX)	Metcalf
Coble	Hansen	Mica
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Collins	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Combest	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Condit	Hefley	Morella
Cook	Herger	Nethercutt
Cooksey	Hill (IN)	Ney
Cox	Hill (MT)	Northup
Crane	Hilleary	Norwood
Cubin	Hobson	Nussle
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Ose
Davis (VA)	Horn	Oxley
Deal	Hostettler	Packard
DeLay	Houghton	Paul
DeMint	Hulshof	Pease

Peterson (MN)	Sanford	Tancredo
Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Tauzin
Petri	Scarborough	Taylor (MS)
Pickering	Schaffer	Taylor (NC)
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Terry
Pombo	Sessions	Thomas
Porter	Shadegg	Thornberry
Portman	Shaw	Thune
Pryce (OH)	Shays	Tiahrt
Quinn	Sherwood	Toomey
Radanovich	Shimkus	Traficant
Ramstad	Shuster	Upton
Regula	Simpson	Walden
Reynolds	Skeen	Walsh
Riley	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Watkins
Rogan	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Rogers	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rohrabacher	Spence	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Whitfield
Roukema	Stenholm	Wicker
Royce	Stump	Wilson
Ryan (WI)	Sununu	Wolf
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Young (AK)
Salmon	Talent	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Fossella	Slaughter
Myrick	Stupak

□ 1541

Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MEEKS of New York changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for the purposes of holding a colloquy.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the full committee chairman, for the opportunity to work on disaster assistance funds.

I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) that today I was prepared to offer a second amendment which would have transferred the Disaster Assistance For Unmet Needs Program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to FEMA because of the various problems associated with HUD management and the ineffectiveness of this critical program.

However, after discussions with the gentleman from New York and his staff, I will not offer this amendment. Instead, I will look forward to working with the gentleman during the Conference of this bill and make this a reality.

During the Senate Appropriations Committee markup of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI successfully offered this same amendment which would have transferred funds from this important program to FEMA, the one agency which has primary responsibility for assisting and responding to all natural disasters and for administering the most primary programs of disaster assistance.

As the gentleman knows, my congressional district recently suffered a 500-year flood which resulted in tens of millions of dollars in damage to homes, property, and infrastructure. During this one-day flood, nearly 600 homes and 100 businesses were destroyed, and many more lives were devastated.

Many of the families impacted by the flood were on fixed incomes and were simply unable to rebuild and move on with their lives. While current FEMA programs have been able to provide some temporary assistance, most of the families impacted are relying on this program to receive additionally needed buy-out assistance.

Unfortunately, HUD's track record has been disappointing. In particular, HUD has been too slow in releasing funds, and they have demonstrated their unwillingness to shed more light on how grant awards are made. In short, HUD is simply the wrong agency to administer this program.

I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), will he be willing to work with me during the conference to see that the funding is transferred to FEMA and to direct FEMA to work to ensure that communities with legitimate unmet needs, like those in South-Central Kansas, receive such assistance as is necessary and appropriate to compensate homeowners who are eligible to receive the buy-out assistance?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me first thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for his hard work in the area of disaster assistance. I know personally that he has been active and a vocal advocate in making sure that both FEMA, and in particular this committee are fully aware of the legitimate and urgent need for additional flood disaster assistance in Kansas.

I, too, share the same concerns that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has expressed regarding the current management of this vital program, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Kansas during conference to see that this program is managed more effectively.

Furthermore, I plan to work with both FEMA and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to ensure that the State of Kansas and, in particular, Butler, Cowley, and Sedgwick counties, receive such assistance as is necessary and appropriate to compensate homeowners who are eligible for the much-needed buy-out assistance.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 15, line 15 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 2, line 13 through page 15, line 15 is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928-1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, \$1,095,000,000, as follows: \$350,000,000 for guaranteed farm ownership loans; \$200,000,000 for direct farm ownership loans; \$185,000,000 for direct farm operating loans; \$185,000,000 for subsidized guaranteed farm operating loans; and \$175,000,000 for emergency farm loans.

For the additional cost of direct and guaranteed farm loans, including the cost of modifying such loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to remain available until September 30, 2000: farm operating loans, \$28,804,000, of which \$12,635,000 shall be for direct loans and \$16,169,000 shall be for guaranteed subsidized loans; farm ownership loans, \$35,505,000, of which \$29,940,000 shall be for direct loans and \$5,565,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; emergency loans, \$41,300,000; and administrative expenses to carry out the loan programs, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

ENFORCEMENT AND BORDER AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs" to support increased detention requirements for Central American criminal aliens and to address the expected influx of illegal immigrants from Central America as a result of Hurricane Mitch, \$80,000,000, which shall remain available until expended and which shall be administered by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided, further*, That of such amount, \$5,100,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$7,300,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That of such amount, \$1,300,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of

the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$69,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$300,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$8,800,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$46,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For an additional amount for "Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid", \$37,500,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 4

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, for an additional amount for "International Disaster Assistance" for necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, for an additional amount for "Economic Support Fund", in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, to provide assistance to Jordan, \$50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

EMERGENCY

DISASTER RECOVERY FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, for necessary expenses to address the effects of hurricanes in Central America and the Caribbean and the earthquake in Colombia, \$621,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and, except for section 558, the provisions of title V of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)): *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development", to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for administrative costs of USAID in addressing the effects of those hurricanes, of which up to \$1,000,000 may be used to contract directly for the personal services of individuals in the United States: *Provided further*, That up to \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General", to remain available until expended, to be used for costs of audits, inspections, and other activities associated with the expenditure of the funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated and expended subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the funding ceiling contained in section 580 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in Division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)), notwithstanding section 545 of that Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That funds in this account may be transferred to and merged with the "Forest and Rangeland Research" account and the "National Forest System" account as needed to address emergency requirements in Puerto Rico.

Restructuring", \$41,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to \$25,000,000 may be used for a contribution to the Central America Emergency Trust Fund, administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, for an additional amount for "Foreign Military Financing Program", for grants to enable the President to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for grants only for Jordan, \$50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be nonrepayable, notwithstanding section 23(b) and section 23(c) of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 301. The value of articles, services, and military education and training authorized as of November 15, 1998, to be drawn down by the President under the authority of section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of that section.

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Reconstruction and Construction", \$5,611,000, to remain available until expended, to address damages from Hurricane Georges and other natural disasters in Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount provided shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That funds in this account may be transferred to and merged with the "Forest and Rangeland Research" account and the "National Forest System" account as needed to address emergency requirements in Puerto Rico.

CHAPTER 6

OFFSETS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under Public Law 105-277 for the cost of direct credit agreements for Public Law 480 title I credit, \$30,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672, for an additional amount for "Debt

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
 ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
 OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
 (RESCISSON)

Of the amount provided under this heading in P.L. 105-277, the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, \$150,000,000 are rescinded.

EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE
 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
 TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-277, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
 AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
 DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-118 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, \$40,000,000 are rescinded.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
 ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-277 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, \$17,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE
 BALTIC STATES
 (RESCISSON)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT
 STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION
 (RESCISSON)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE
 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
 PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-277, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
 INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
 CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK
 FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT
 GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-277, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

REDUCTION IN CALLABLE CAPITAL
 APPROPRIATIONS
 (RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under the headings "Contribution to the Asian Development Bank", "Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank", and "Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" for callable capital stock in Public Law 96-123 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs, a total of \$648,000,000 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT
 Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. TIAHRT: Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$195,000,000)".

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment will guarantee that this House will stand for integrity by keeping its promise to protect Social Security.

I want to first thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his commitment to this country and for his dedication to the House of Representatives. His commitment to our national defense and to our national interest is second to none.

I also want to thank the chairman for selecting me to join others in the congressional delegation he sent to Central America to survey the mass destruction brought about by Hurricane Mitch. I will never forget the stories I heard firsthand or the human trauma and unspeakable devastation that hit our neighbors to the south.

Mr. Chairman, each of us who have worked hard to balance the budget can take great pride in what we have achieved. For the first time in a generation, we have balanced the budget. The CBO estimates confirm that we will have a surplus in fiscal year 1999. However, current projections for the surplus are made up of revenues that are completely derived from the FICA tax which employees and employers pay in to cover Social Security obligations.

Why does this matter? It matters because, if we do not reduce spending by \$1 for each \$1 in new spending in the emergency bill, the money will be taken from Social Security, just plain and simple.

That is why I am offering this amendment today, to fully protect Social Security and to prevent this Congress from sending to the President a bill that will use money intended for Social Security but to pay for this foreign aid package.

To offset the remainder of this bill, I have chosen the same account the Committee on Appropriations selected to offset 50 percent of the bill. It is the callable capital account. This is an account that the World Bank may draw on in case of defaults on international loans. The callable capital account has over \$12 billion in unobligated, underspent funds.

During the nearly 40 years of history, this account has never been used for its intended purpose. However, this account has been used previously as an offset.

In 1994, former Representative Vic Fazio successfully used \$900 million in this fund to offset funding for disaster relief in California. I am simply fol-

lowing the lead of the Committee on Appropriations and the precedent set by a former Member from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress from the aerospace industry, and I served 2 years on the Committee on National Security, and I understand very well the problems with our underfunded military. Even the President recognizes the need for additional funds. That is why this is appropriate. It is appropriate to use a foreign aid account to pay for the foreign aid disaster bill and not a Department of Defense account.

To my friends on the Committee on National Security, I will say, if we are unable to offset emergency bills, there will be no money available to cover the supplement for our Nation's defense.

So why do I come to the floor today with this amendment? My goal is to improve upon this bill. The Committee on Appropriations agreed to find offsets for 85 percent of the bill because they wanted to act responsibly and not grab over \$1 billion from Social Security. My amendment simply goes the distance on the path towards financial integrity.

Other outside groups also see the significance of providing offsets for this foreign aid emergency bill in order to protect Social Security.

The policy director of the Concord Coalition, Robert Bixby in his letter to me stated "tapping into the Social Security surplus for emergencies only leads to a breakdown in fiscal discipline. . . We therefore heartily commend your efforts to ensure that the FY 99 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill is fully offset."

In the 60 Plus Association letter to me, they said, they "enthusiastically endorse" this amendment. The United Seniors said they "strongly support" this amendment.

Each of these groups realize the importance of fully offsetting this foreign aid bill. They have heard the promises made by the President and by Congress that we would protect Social Security. That is what the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment does, fully protects Social Security.

If my colleagues agree that we should avoid using Social Security to pay for foreign aid spending, then support this amendment. If my colleagues agree that keeping Social Security safe from 85 percent of this bill is good, then they must conclude that protecting 100 percent of Social Security from this bill is even better. Mr. Chairman, it is not just the most prudent path politically, it is the right thing to do for our seniors, ourselves, and our children.

I encourage my colleagues to join with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and myself and support our bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk just a few minutes in support of this amendment. I fully concur and command the

gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for standing up in a courageous way to fully offset this supplemental.

I can tell my colleagues, if I went back to the Fifth District of Virginia and said they have a choice between a callable capital account and Social Security, overwhelming support in the district would be in favor of Social Security.

I have heard those words repeated roundly in these halls a lot this year and a lot last year. We have heard it on the hustings all across this country. This is an opportunity to say, yes, we are going to go with Social Security first, even in supplemental situations where there is an emergency.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tiahrt amendment. I have to say, and I mentioned this earlier today on the House floor, when a number of us met with the Speaker and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, earlier this year, we talked about this bill and how we would like to support it but, for a number of reasons we were not able to.

Much to the credit of Speaker Hastert, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, and now the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), we are really offsetting all of the costs of this supplemental appropriation bill. Because of that, we are not adding to the debt. We are not adding to the deficit. We are looking to make this bill work in the right way. I think all of our colleagues should support this bill and this amendment to make it even stronger than the committee reported out. I rise in strong support.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have got to support the Tiahrt amendment. It is important that we fully, fully put aside the Social Security funds. But the Tiahrt amendment is simple, fair, and fiscally responsible.

Some of my colleagues are concerned that this amendment would affect our defense programs. With our forces committed and fighting in Kosovo, our military must be strengthened, and everybody knows that this administration has slashed military spending. We know troop levels are dangerously low, retention is short, recruiting is down, and morale is at the bottom of the barrel.

I agree Congress must step forward and reverse these trends by putting more money in our defense budget. Our fighting men and women deserve the best.

This amendment does nothing to harm this goal. The Tiahrt amendment takes \$195 million of foreign aid money from a \$12 billion bank account that has never been used. It takes no money

away from defense. No Member should oppose taking \$195 million from a \$12 billion nondefense account that is not being used for anything.

I would also like to make clear that this is not a military emergency. The defense portion of this bill is a reimbursement for disaster assistance by our National Guard which it provided to our neighbors in Central America.

□ 1600

It is money that has already been spent. It is not an emergency and, therefore, should not be funded as one. I understand the concerns that some of my colleagues have, but in this case offsetting \$195 million from nondefense accounts is practicable, is reasonable and is fiscally responsible, not dangerous.

We are in Washington to be responsible. The Tiahrt amendment simply allows us to keep our promise to the American people that we will stop big government spending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment today. It is good for America.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this is a small step but it is a small step in the right direction. Full accountability, full offsets, keeping our promise to the American taxpayer is something that I think we all believe in here, and if we are going to be a fiscal conservative and think about the dollars going out, we have to support this amendment to make sure it is 100 percent pure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say this only once. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved for Social Security by the Tiahrt amendment? Not one dime. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved that would otherwise be spent under the Tiahrt amendment? Not one dime. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved that would otherwise be added to the deficit if the Tiahrt amendment passes? Not one dime.

The fact is that callable capital to our international financial institutions, is appropriated but it is never spent. There is never an outlay expenditure. When we measure the deficit, what we measure is not what the government thinks about spending. What we measure is what the government actually spends, and that is called an outlay.

If we take a look at this committee report, if we take a look at the Congressional Budget Office scoring of this bill, we will see that the Tiahrt amendment saves not one dime for Social Security or the deficit or anything else because this money was not scheduled to be outlaid. The only way that we can measure savings is on the outlay side. And since there were never going to be any outlays, there are no savings.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), by his amendment, is suggesting to the House that \$195 million

will not be spent that otherwise would be spent. That is false. Callable capital, by its nature, is never meant to be spent. So if anyone says that they are saving one dime for Social Security or saving one dime for the surplus or the deficit by the Tiahrt amendment, they are telling this House something that simply is not true.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. And with all due respect, I went on the same trip with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to Honduras, but his amendment does not help the situation in Honduras nor does it help the situation at home.

We have letters from the Department of Treasury, we have letters from the Bretton Woods committee suggesting that his amendment would indeed create financial risk. The logic of saying that we are going to protect Social Security when we are going to put the whole market at financial risk is just not practical.

The bill, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just indicated, does not fully offset the outlays in terms of new spending, because the bill will be measured by outlays, not by the Tiahrt amendment. This amendment does damage, not good; it does not protect and it does not get the funds to Central America which need it badly right now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the Tiahrt amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and in closing, let me simply say this bill, if it passes, will actually add \$445 million to the deficit, and the Tiahrt amendment, if it is adopted, will not save one dime of that number.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and, hopefully, in the process of doing so, have a dialogue with my friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TODD TIAHRT).

I would hope in the process of this discussion I might urge my colleague to consider, at least consider, withdrawing his amendment. Let me explain why I would even begin to suggest that this might be appropriate when I know very well how serious the gentleman is about this amendment and how hard he has worked to develop it.

The circumstances in Central America are critical circumstances involving humanitarian efforts that very much relate to our efforts to build relations south of our border. At the peak following that disaster we had some 5,000 troops in the region. We have flown nearly 1,000 humanitarian air sorties there. We have rescued over a thousand people from floods. The military was involved in building temporary bridges that allowed lifelines, food and medicine, to be delivered. Indeed, there are hundreds of temporary

structures built by those military personnel in an effort to respond to this emergency.

These are not classic military activities, but, nonetheless, we raised the American flag there in defense of the well-being of a sizable population of our neighbors for reasons well beyond just the humanitarian reasons alone. The American military is oftentimes the only one who can respond quickly enough and effectively enough to get the life saving job done.

In this case we are talking about the prospects of an offset that arguably is not really an offset. It is very clear when we are dealing with callable capital that we do not impact funds that might be available for Social Security, and I would urge us to be very careful about further discussion about that possible implication.

The reason for my touching on the edges of suggesting that the gentleman might consider responsibly to withdraw the amendment involves the fact that at this very moment American troops and materiel are involved in an incursion in Kosovo, a very, very serious circumstance where, in combination with our allies in NATO, we are involved in an effort that could cost not hundreds of millions of dollars, but a billion dollars or more.

Let me make this point to my colleague. Indeed, the amendment that the gentleman has before us could be a very serious precedent that could impact future requirements as it relates to Kosovo.

One of the most impressive experiences I have had in the time I have been in Congress has taken place over the last 10 days, an experience in which the President of the United States has invited Members from both bodies to the White House and, together, we have spent almost 10 hours discussing questions which swirl around how we meet the challenges in Kosovo and the Balkans. Democrats and Republicans from both bodies argued on both sides of our being involved. It was a very, very healthy discussion, bringing us to the point where there was a very healthy debate last evening in the other body, after which, finally, a vote took place in which support was given for America's effort, along with our NATO allies, in that region.

Today, we find ourselves in a circumstance where, indeed, action is moving forward. It is very important that the debate we have from this point forward be as nonpartisan, as positive as possible, and as nonsensational as possible. And, indeed, we must recognize as we go forward that there will be very real military costs. There will be a bill one day soon that will request a supplemental that may involve the kinds of dollars that I was describing earlier, maybe as much as \$2 billion.

Indeed, if one were to begin to talk about offsetting that expenditure, either from social programs, from callable capital or otherwise, we could find

ourselves in a debate that could undermine our ability to respond to that very critical circumstance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has expired.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the very time that we need to bring the House together with a unified voice in support of our troops in Kosovo and in the Balkans and, indeed, exercise our responsibility to lead in the world at this very important moment.

So I would urge my colleague to consider the question, a precedent, that says a \$195 million expenditure for an emergency in Latin America, asking for offsets in a very special category, could lead to a circumstance where \$2 billion becomes the question and should there be an offset. I would ask my colleague to recognize that this may very well be before us in a very short period of time, and I would urge the gentleman to respond, if he would, briefly.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who is very knowledgeable about the extreme needs we have in our defense at this point in time. The gentleman brought a very sobering point; that there is currently activity going on in Kosovo where our young men and women are at risk, and I hope that we will all keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the job our soldiers have done in Central America in meeting the immediate disaster needs. My concern is that if we do not find offsets now, we will never be able to achieve the future requirements that we need for our defense, and that is why I wanted to offer this amendment. But I thank the gentleman from California for the opportunity.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I guess the point that needs to be repeated is that callable capital does not provide real offsets that provide real funding for the military.

Indeed, if we go forward with this approach, we will be further taking these kinds of monies out of the hide of our basic military requirements. If we find ourselves later attempting to pay for the Kosovo requirements in a similar fashion, it could undermine many a critical program entirely across our military base. I urge the gentleman to reconsider his amendment, otherwise I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

I stood up, Mr. Chairman, to talk again about the multilateral banks and to talk about callable capital and to try and urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to identify this as meaningful and real offsets. However, before I do that, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in asking that we do nothing at this point that would prevent us from coming back with a supplemental that we may need in case we have to expand our operations or support our operations in Kosovo.

I think that is real. He is absolutely correct. We have spent a number of hours with the President, Republicans and Democrats alike, listening to and understanding what is going on there. And I think that he has done a favor to all of us by pointing out that we do not want to take this kind of action without understanding the seriousness of it.

Beyond that, I think that at this moment every member of the Congressional Black Caucus, every member of the Hispanic Caucus, every member of the Asian Caucus should be on this floor. They should be on this floor right now because what they are seeing is a precedent that will destroy the ability of developing countries to be able to have any kind of reasonable economic development and to develop.

I think every member of those caucuses, who have fought for so many years to try and be of assistance to these developing countries and develop markets there for our own economy, should come to this floor and help to make the argument why this should not go forward.

□ 1615

What is the reason for this when everybody understands now that this is not real capital, that this simply is money that would not be spent, that it is not money that is going to be added to the budget? Then why are they doing it? If they cannot answer that question, then they should not proceed with this.

This is not money that can be used to reduce the budget in any way. This is like a guarantee that in the event they are not able to pay back their loans it could be used. So if in fact the money is not going to reduce the budget, if in fact they are literally putting their foot on the necks of the most vulnerable countries in the world who desperately need the assistance of the multilateral banks, if they understand what we are trying to do in Africa and in Asia and in Central America, why then would they proceed with literally diminishing their ability to try and develop and to be independent and to feed their people and to provide markets for us? Why would they do it? It just does not make good sense.

And so, I am going to ask them, in addition to the argument that has been made about Kosovo and the possibility that we will have a supplemental bill on the floor to help out, to also think

about what I am saying. Why would anybody in their right mind want to do it if they are not going to yield any dollars for them?

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding. And I would like to remind her that this is a precedent that was established in 1994 when a previous bill came to the floor and \$902.4 million was taken out of callable capital.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, re-claiming my time, no, that is not correct.

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say the statement that this is similar to what happened in 1994 is again totally, absolutely wrong. What happened in 1994 was very, very different. It did not involve rescinding one dime of obligated callable capital.

I would simply recite from the Secretary of the Treasury the following from his letter. He says, "Some have cited the 1994 rescission as a precedent for this goal. The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed to paid-in capital and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach back to capital to which we have formerly subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets."

If any Member says that this is identical to what had happened in 1994, they are either ill-informed or they are misleading the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment. Last week the House Committee on the Budget, on which I have the privilege to serve, approved the budget resolution that saves the entire Social Security surplus, 100 percent of payroll taxes, and 100 percent of interest for future budgets. It is a budget resolution we will debate on this very floor tomorrow, and it stops the reckless practice of spending Social Security payroll taxes on non-Social Security programs.

My fellow committee members and I proudly held a press conference last week declaring that this Congress for the first time would no longer spend the Social Security surplus. And we are right. Over the next 10 years, the budget resolution locks away \$1.8 trillion for our seniors' retirement both for Social Security and Medicare; and that is \$200 billion more than the President called for in his budget.

This budget is an important first step towards our ultimate goal of real, long-

term structural reform of our Nation's retirement system; and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this budget later this week.

But would it not be ironic if the House passes an emergency appropriations bill that spends today's Social Security money in the same week that it passes a budget resolution that tries to save future Social Security funds? And that is exactly what will happen if the House does not adopt the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment that fully offsets the supplemental emergency appropriations bill. We have got an obligation to ensure that that does not happen.

The \$1.3 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill as written offsets all but \$195 million used to reimburse the Defense Department for its response to Hurricane Mitch. Any spending not offset in this bill will come from the Social Security surplus because the Federal Government still has an on-budget deficit in fiscal year 1999. The only surplus is the Social Security surplus.

My objection is not the Defense Department. It should be reimbursed for its work. My objection is certainly not the Committee on Appropriations. They have worked hard to offset the vast majority of the emergency spending in this bill. But we have come so close. Just 15 percent of the bill is not offset. And we should finish the job.

Our amendment finishes the job. It offsets the remaining \$195 million in emergency spending by rescinding budget authority for an account already used to offset in this bill. The Callable Capital Account has over \$12 billion in unused budget authority. It has not been used this decade. That is why democratic Congress used this same account as an offset in 1994.

Mr. Chairman, I consistently told senior citizens in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District that Congress should not spend Social Security dollars on anything other than retirement. And that is exactly what we should do.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment.

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

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is some impression out here that there is no money that is going to change hands here, that we are going to write a check to Central America but there is no money that is going to leave the Callable Capital Account and how this money will miraculously re-appear down in Central America.

We are going to write a check to Central America and it is not going to bounce. The money is going to come from somewhere. It is either going to come from the surplus or callable capital. If it comes from the surplus, it has

to come out of Social Security. It is really that simple.

I want to step back in time to 1994. In 1994, this Congress committed capital stock to the Callable Capital Account of \$902.4395 million. It was committed to the Callable Capital Account. But in the piece of legislation that was called the Fiscal Year 1994 Disaster Supplemental Appropriations, we rescinded that. We took the money back.

Now, they want to say it is completely different. We were going to send capital stock, \$902.4 million, and then we took it back, we rescinded it back; and now they want to say they did not have anything to do with it and it is not like it is this time. But if we look at the votes, it passed with a significant margin, 415-2.

Now, the gentlewoman said that I would like to have my foot on the neck of developing countries? Well, just a couple years ago the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) joined with the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and they voted for it. They voted for the very same thing they are arguing against today. And they are trying to demonize it somehow I guess by saying I want to put my foot on the neck of developing countries. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What I want to do is make sure that when we send money down to Central America that it does not come from Social Security. I want to find unobligated money, money that we can use to save Social Security. And that is what I have done with this amendment, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. Let me try to address some of the points that have been made.

First of all, with respect to the so-called 1994 rescission. I think the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has pointed out the definite distinction that exists between the present case and 1994. He also cited the letter from Secretary Rubin that says, "it is like apples and oranges, you cannot compare the two".

But most importantly, the vote that he referred to was the vote in favor of the final supplemental bill. There never was a discreet vote on the particular rescission in question, and so I hardly think that that is analogous. It certainly is not precedential on today's vote.

Secondly, I do want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) because he understands the significance of what we are doing today. We might be unable in the future if we act on behalf of the Tiahrt amendment and we act on the basis of the Tiahrt amendment's underlying rationale to

ever pass necessary emergency supplemental appropriations without wreaking havoc with prior past commitments. This is a dangerous precedent to get into.

Perhaps more important than anything else, it is imperative that we understand that we live in a very fragile global economy. The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services attempted in early 1997 to develop a legislative framework to deal with this fragile global economy by passing IMF legislation. It was from early 1997 until October of 1998 that we were able to pass that authorizing and appropriating legislation so that our multilateral development institutions could more appropriately deal with the deteriorating global economy.

In other words, this Congress played Russian roulette with the global economy. And we had a lot of problems in Russia, in Brazil, in addition to Asia. And now they want to do the same thing. They want to say the United States has made commitments, we have paid in those commitments, we have voted on the basis of those commitments because our voting rights are coextensive with the commitments that we have entered into, subscribed to, and paid.

And now they want to renege on them. They want to pull the carpet from underneath the IMF, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, etc. They want to play more Russian roulette with the global economy. This is a dangerous game to enter into.

That is why I am so pleased that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) spoke against it. I understand he can speak for himself. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services (Mr. LEACH) strongly opposed this I have been advised. He can speak for himself. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. YOUNG of Florida) might want to oppose this, too.

Clearly, Secretary Rubin said that he would strongly recommend a veto of the bill with a rescission of \$640 million of callable capital. This adds \$195 million more. It goes from terrible to far, far worse. This is not just veto bait. This is an absolute veto. Do not play this dangerous game.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we are coming to the end of this debate. I hope so because we do have other amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would have to say that I am somewhat reluctant because the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is a very important member of our conference, a very important member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a very thoughtful and studious Member. And I do not disagree with what he is trying to do here by way of offset. But I have to tell my col-

leagues that I do disagree with what he is offsetting.

For some years now, starting in fiscal year 1995 up through 1999, we have had deployments of American forces overseas in my opinion some very questionable deployments that have been very costly to the American taxpayer.

In that time period, we spent \$5.2 billion in Iraq, and that is after Desert Storm was over. \$9 billion in Bosnia. That was a deployment that was supposedly going to last for a year but is still going on today. It was supposedly going to cost a billion dollars. It has already cost us \$9 billion. In Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, Cuba, Korea and others we have spent another billion dollars for deployments of U.S. forces.

In the fiscal year 2000 budget sent here by the White House, there is another \$1.8 billion for Bosnia, another \$1.1 billion for Iraq. That does not include the \$300 million that we used in Desert Fox in that 3-day campaign against Saddam. And this total does not include what is going on in Kosovo today. And this whole thing in Kosovo could cost as much in one deployment as all these other numbers that I have mentioned because the situation in Kosovo could become far, far more dangerous and serious than what we have dealt with so far.

The point I am making here by reciting these numbers, we were asked to offset most of these monies and most of them were offset from the budget of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps.

□ 1630

We already have a declining investment in our national security. We already have many airplanes that cannot fly because of a lack of spare parts. We have housing needs for our troops that are terrible, places that Members would not let one of their kids live and they would not live but some of our kids in the military are living. We have 11,000 of our kids on food stamps. That is not right. We need to do more for our military and the men and women who serve in the military.

I have stated as chairman of this committee, I am going to object to offsetting money for the Defense Department when it is used in a national security deployment or an emergency other than for our own national defense requirements. And so I would say to the gentleman from Kansas that I do not really like to oppose his amendment, but we have got to make a stand somewhere on the issue of national defense. Our party in this Congress has made a strong statement on national defense.

Tomorrow during the debate on the budget, Members will find that there is a very serious problem with national defense, not so much from the standpoint of budget authority but the outlay figure is going to be unworkable. We have got to put a stop to offsetting anything from the defense budget. We need to be increasing our investment in

our national defense. I do not want to set the precedent that we are going to offset these type of deployments. This was a true emergency. American soldiers went to Central America, and they saved lives and they made it possible for people to have sanitary conditions. They made it possible to get medical care. This money is to replace the funds that they spent.

At this point in the RECORD I want to insert a letter from General Wilhelm describing the trip that our delegation took to Honduras. It provides insight into the terrible conditions there and the great job our troops did. I have eliminated some portions of his letter as a matter of confidentiality.

Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly oppose the Tiahrt amendment on the principle of we are not doing enough today for our national security effort, we need to do more, and we have got to stop raiding the budget as it relates to national defense deployments.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND,
Miami, FL, March 8, 1999.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Majority Members, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the personal interest that you have taken in our humanitarian and disaster relief operations in Central America. I regret that other obligations prevented you from traveling to the region this past weekend, but the committee and its interests were well represented by Congressmen Hobson, Tiahrt and Farr. I wanted to take just a moment to share with you my impressions of the visit and the status of Department of Defense humanitarian assistance/disaster relief operations.

While enroute to Honduras on Friday, I gave the delegation a detailed overview of DOD activities in the region to date. I started with our life saving and life sustaining activities during the first 30 days of the crisis when members of our Armed Forces plucked 1,052 men, women and children literally from death's door, delivered three and a quarter million pounds of food to communities cut off from the rest of their countries and the world by flood waters, and provided 65 tons of medical supplies and the clean water needed to successfully stave off feared epidemics of cholera, typhus and vector borne diseases which would have claimed many more lives. To place the disaster in an historic perspective, I mentioned that the 17,000 plus dead and missing in Central America equate to all of our losses in the Korean War. I stressed, however, that these grim statistics are parts of a closed chapter in our humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. I emphasized that four months have passed since Hurricane Mitch unleashed as much as seven feet of rain in less than five days on portions of Northern Honduras and turned it into an inland sea; that the waters have subsided, the dead have been recovered and buried, and that Hondurans, Americans and the international community have been working around the clock to replace despair with hope and restore some degree of normalcy to the region. The bottom line as I expressed it to the delegation was that rather than the absolute desolation and devastation that they would have seen during late October and early November, they would see an unfolding success story as key infrastructure is restored or recreated. Over the next two days, as we drove through Tegucigalpa and overleaf or visited hundreds of miles of the

North Coast, I hope these observations were reinforced.

Upon our arrival in Tegucigalpa on Friday we immediately boarded helicopters and conducted an aerial and ground tour of key bridge and other rehabilitation sites in and around the Capital City. The members were given a bird's eye view of a representative sample of the projects that were undertaken to reconnect Tegucigalpa with the rest of the country. This was an early priority for forces from the U.S., Mexico and other international participants in the relief effort. The effort in and around the Capital was sustained by the U.S. after withdrawal of other international contingents in mid-November. Among other projects, the members viewed the Juan Molina Bridge which will be a key point of interest during the Presidential visit. Upon landing, the USAID representative gave the CODEL a guided tour of temporary resettlement housing, after which we proceeded to the Presidential Palace for an extended and very significant meeting with President Flores that I will discuss later in some detail.

On the second day of the visit we again boarded U.S. Army and National Guard Blackhawk helicopters, one of which was piloted by a Chief Warrant Officer who had flown some of the critical early life saving missions. His inflight commentary was invaluable. During our lengthy overflight of the north coast the delegation was able to view at least a cross section of the infrastructure repairs that have been made throughout Central America during the second or "rehabilitation" phase of our operations. We landed and walked across bridges built by our engineers. We watched commerce laden 18-wheel tractor-trailers rumble over culvert bypasses that U.S. troops have built over rivers pending the reconstruction of permanent bridges. The members took the time to flag down passing pickup trucks and talk about conditions in Honduras with the simple people from the countryside who have been most affected by the disaster. I'm sure they will pass along to you the comments made by "mainstream" Central Americans about our presence and what it has achieved.

Later in the day, we landed in north-eastern Honduras and the members had the opportunity to visit a base camp established by members of the Guard and Reserve who are supporting the third and final phase of our engagement, the expanded New Horizons Exercise program. During this phase approximately 23,000 engineers, medics and support personnel from the Guard and Reserve will deploy to the region in two-three week increments during which they will build 33 schools and 12 clinics, drill 27 high capacity wells, repair and rehabilitate more bridges, bypasses and secondary roads and conduct medical, dental and veterinary outreach programs that will touch from 70,000 to 100,000 Central American men, women and children in remote parts of the countryside. I expect the members will describe to you the outstanding organization of the base camps, the uniformly high morale and positive attitudes of the troops involved in this undertaking, and the relevance of the work they will do.

I would like to mention two specific events that took place during the visit that I considered to be particularly meaningful. The first was the CODEL's visit with President Flores on Friday evening.

I was pleased and surprised when the 45-minute planned visit by the CODEL stretched out for an hour and a half, going well into the evening. I have never seen the President as relaxed, cordial or communicative as I saw him Friday night. Congressman Hobson speculated that perhaps this was because he found himself in the company of fellow elected officials as compared and con-

trusted with career diplomats and senior military officers. In sum, I think the members of the Delegation built a remarkable instant rapport with President Flores, put him at ease, and received from him a very personal, open and unabridged assessment of conditions past, present and future in Honduras.

The second event was a "casual conversation" that Congressman Hobson and I had with * * *. This exchange was significant because it involved a member of the private sector, well placed in the business community, with no real personal or professional ties to the Flores administration. Congressman Hobson asked * * * very directly what he, as a businessman, thought the United States should and should not do for Honduras. I found * * * 15 minute answer very instructive and more than a little bit reassuring from a DOD standpoint. * * * stated emphatically, that our emphasis should be on infrastructure repair and development. He mentioned specifically reinstallation of bridges and repair of secondary and tertiary farm-to-market roads. He stated emphatically that we should not give Honduras "checks". In his words "we are lousy managers," and he went on to assert that between local politics and bureaucracy there was reason for concern that this type of aid would not accomplish the purposes for which it is intended. I should add that * * * had absolutely nothing disparaging to say about the Flores administration. In fact, he later volunteered to me that he thought this was a fundamentally honest government doing its best to cope with a difficult situation. Congressman Hobson and I took these comments on board with considerable interest because this gentleman had no ax to grind. This was another example of the value of congressional visits. The conversation between Mr. Hobson and * * * was essentially one that took place between two businessmen. They spoke the same language and it provided some unique perspectives on the issues and decisions that confront us.

I believe that my testimony before Chairman Lewis and the members of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee last week was timely and their questions were very relevant. This visit was a useful adjunct. I'm sure that the points that I emphasized at the hearing and to this CODEL will come as no surprise. First, I think DOD resources are being applied in precisely the right way in Central America. We arrived in force on the front end of the crisis and provided the emergency support and assistance that only DOD can provide. We are now concluding the second phase of our involvement during which we have exploited our unique expeditionary capabilities, assisting the host nations to regain their equilibrium and restoring their ability to provide for the essential health and welfare needs of their people. Finally, as the third phase unwinds we will revert to our normal engagement activities but at a higher tempo and intensity. At the end of this phase we will resume normal activities in the region and complete the DOD disengagement that has occasionally eluded us at other times in other places. I am firmly convinced that if we skillfully play this hand out, at the end of the day we will emerge with a significantly strengthened posture in the region and with a "good will account" on which we may be able to write checks from some time to come.

Mr. Chairman, as you know better than most, none of this has been free. During the three phases of the operation, DOD will write checks totaling about \$215.3M. I hope that you will be able to provide supplemental funding for these unanticipated and unfunded requirements. If required to provide offsets, I'm afraid there will be little re-

course other than to extort funds from our readiness accounts and other programs that support and sustain our regional strategies. As you know, time is of the essence because at this moment important accounts that support other crucial worldwide engagement programs have been frozen to underwrite our expenses in Central America. As examples, because the \$50M Overseas Humanitarian Disaster and Civic Aid (OHDACA) account is encumbered, we lack resources to pursue important, high visibility humanitarian demining programs throughout our region and around the world. Because the \$20M CINCs Initiative Fund (CIF) is similarly committed, I have been unable to proceed with the publication of a crucial human rights handbook and training program that is designed to help the Colombian military overcome its deficiencies in that very contentious area. These are merely illustrative of stalled initiatives in Southern Command. The list could go on and on with other examples for EUCOM, PACOM, CENTCOM and ACOM.

I learned this morning that you are considering a visit to the region, perhaps during the third week of this month. I hope this can be arranged and I am clearing my calendar to accompany you, assuming I can wrangle an invitation. I believe you would gain valuable insights by observing what has been done and what is being done by DOD and others to help Central America get back on its feet. As I mentioned to Congressmen Hobson, Tiahrt and Farr on several occasions, it is important that we not lose sight of the fact that during the decades of the 70's and 80's Central America was engulfed by civil wars and was anything but a bastion of democracy. Today, all the nations are led by heads of state who serve at the pleasure of the people and all have market economics. However, these institutions are fragile and immature. We need to help them over the rough spots, and there is more than a little self-interest at stake. As I asserted in my annual posture statement, "In a larger strategic context, this unparalleled theater engagement opportunity may stem waves of migrants who might otherwise seek to rebuild their lives in the United States or neighboring countries." Again, many thanks for your interest in our region and for your support of DOD.

Very respectfully,

C.E. WILHELM,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern
Command

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) took the floor—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will suspend. A question of personal privilege may not be raised in the Committee of the Whole.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to correct the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California to speak out of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could inquire whether this relates to the debate. It is getting late. There are other amendments to be considered. I am not going to object if it relates to the debate that we are having, but if it is on a personal matter, the gentlewoman might want to take it up with the Member in question.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would not be here unless it related to the debate that we are involved in.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas indicated that I had voted for such an action as he is prescribing for the offsets. There is a letter that has been disseminated by Secretary Rubin that says, "The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed the paid-in and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach back to capital to which we have formally subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets."

For the record, it should be clear that it is not analogous and that I and others did not vote for money that had already been appropriated.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me once again address the chair, as I think the rules tell us we should do, and to sort of give a brief history of where we are with respect to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Republican Conference and others came to us and asked us to offset this emergency supplemental spending bill. Originally I was opposed to it, but when we finally agreed to it, we found areas within our scope of jurisdiction in foreign operations to offset every single penny of foreign assistance. We found ways to offset the necessary money for Jordan. We found ways to offset all of the money for the problems with respect to aid to Central America, and we found them within our own jurisdiction, our own little pot of money that we have that we call foreign operations. I think that that was a responsible thing to do and it is exactly what we did.

Now comes the gentleman from Kansas, and I know his mission is noble and I do not question that, but I think if he wants to find offsets, he should recognize that those of us on this small subcommittee of the Congress and the Committee on Appropriations have found our offset within our jurisdiction, within our little area of responsibility. Now he is saying, take some more money out of foreign assistance and give it to the military. Maybe that is right, maybe it is wrong. I think it is wrong. If he wants to find offsets from some other area, that is fine with me. But I think that history will show us that for the last 4 years that we have

acted very responsibly with respect to foreign assistance. We have cut the President's request every year by more than \$1 billion every year since I have been chairman of this subcommittee. We are probably going to cut his budget even more so this year, maybe as much as 3 or \$4 billion. We are doing the responsible thing. We did exactly what the people of our own conference requested; we found offsets. We found them within our area of jurisdiction.

I think if the gentleman from Kansas wants to find additional moneys to offset the military portion of it, he should do it elsewhere. I happen to agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) with respect to the fact that we are going to have to have another supplemental bill in just a few short months to handle this situation in Kosovo. And to raid the foreign operations account which has been handled in an admirable and I think efficient manner during the last 4 years is wrong.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Tiahrt amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. As chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I cannot support gutting the funding of the International Financial Institutions. I want to remind my colleagues that these financial institutions help guarantee the IRAs of millions of Americans whose mutual funds are invested in Asia. Currently we have a financial crisis in Asia that the financial institutions are key to combating. We are currently conducting military operations in Iraq and in Kosovo. We cannot afford an Asian crisis on top of those costly operations. This is the wrong time to undercut our financial institutions which are supporting reforms in Indonesia and in South Korea. In Korea, we face a crisis in North Korea and the strength of our South Korean ally's economy is critical to deterring aggression in that area.

I join with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) in strongly opposing this amendment. Cutting callable capital is not the way to save a dime but can trigger yet a third crisis that could involve our troops in Asia. Let us stick with the bill as drafted by the gentleman from Florida, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I commend the gentleman from Kansas for defending Social Security. I support that goal. But cutting callable capital for these institutions will not save one dime for Social Security. Let us work on reductions in other accounts not directly related to our Nation's security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes and that the time be equally divided, with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT)

controlling 7½ minutes and that I would control the other 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is understood that the limitation is on the amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, that is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will each control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in very strong support of the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by complimenting the Committee on Appropriations on their work. They did a tremendous job of offsetting 85 percent of this supplemental appropriation and they are to be complimented for that. But in point of fact, it is possible to offset the balance, to offset 15 percent. I think the most eloquent spokesman on that point was my Democratic colleague the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) who pointed out quite clearly that if we went home to Americans and asked them, do they want this additional \$195 million which would be offset by the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment, do they want that taken out of the callable capital account, an account which has never been used by the World Bank, or do they want that taken out of Social Security, their answer would be very clear, they do not want it taken out of Social Security, they want it taken out of the callable capital account.

There is a very good reason for that. This is an account which is there for the World Bank to draw on as a backstop. But as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) pointed out earlier, the United States is unique in the world in its funding of this account. Every other country participating in this account pledged their credit to fund the account if ever called upon. The United States by contrast put up the money. The money is sitting there and right now not being used for any purpose. It can clearly be used to offset the remaining 15 percent of the bill, of the emergency spending bill, and protect Social Security.

For the gentleman from Alabama who says we should not do this and for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I would point out that in 1994 an amendment passed this House, sponsored by Mr. FAZIO of the other side, going into the callable capital account to the tune of \$902 million. Now, if it was okay in 1994 to dip into that fund for \$902 million, tell me why then it is not appropriate to keep our word to the American people on

Social Security, to dip into it now for a total of \$843 million which is the figure which would occur if the Tiahrt amendment passes?

The simple truth is that we can dip into that account, the callable capital account, and protect Social Security. To my friend from the other side who was very offended that we are breaking our word to the world by not funding this account, where is it more important, that we would break our word, which, by the way, we are not breaking our word because we have put up the cash—the rest of the world has only put up their promise—but what about our promise to the American people that we would fund the Social Security trust fund?

I suggest that the Tiahrt amendment keeps faith with the American people. It keeps faith with our national accounts. The callable capital account is an account which has never in its 40-year history been dipped into. I suggest that Members of this body interested in protecting Social Security without a risk should support the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have the great privilege of representing a congressional district that has more people receiving Social Security checks every month than almost everybody else in this Chamber. I can promise Members that I would not cast a vote or take a position here that in my opinion would be detrimental to the Social Security program. To the contrary, I recall a few years back when Ronald Reagan was President, we had a very large tax increase to save the Social Security, and despite much criticism from many people in my district, I voted for that as a commitment to Social Security.

Tomorrow we are going to be debating the budget resolution where we talk about how much we will set aside for Social Security. I am going to support every effort to protect the Social Security program and to set aside all of the FICA tax because that is why we created that tax in the first place. We are dealing with fiscal year 1999 money here. We are not dealing with next year's budget surpluses or anything like that. We are dealing with fiscal year 1999 money.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The bill as presented by the committee which the House has supported to this point is a good bill. The offsets are reasonable and responsible. I am concerned, as I said just a few minutes ago, that we would begin the precedent over again of offsetting from our defense requirements and our defense needs and the needs of the men and women who serve in our military. I do not want to begin the precedent of offsetting their extraordinary deployments that they are required to attend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for not only opposition to this amendment but I ask for support of the bill. Let us get this

bill into conference and let us get the bill to the President and let us get the support to our friends in Central America where the commitments have been made.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just like to remind Members of the House that half this bill is currently offset by the callable capital account. That is a total of 85 percent of this bill that is offset. I do not find any reason why we should not offset the full amount.

I noted that the gentlewoman from California says she has a letter from Secretary Rubin. I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What happened in 1994 was that the increases to capital stock going into the capital account was rescinded under the disaster bill. That vote passed by 415-2.

So a precedent was set then, and I think I am just following that precedent was set, I am following what the committee has done before, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote for the Tiahrt amendment. I think it is sound fiscal policy, it is pay-as-you-go policy, I feel strongly about these offsets that they are good offsets, and it is very much needed for the disaster down in Central America.

So I would ask for support for the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply applaud the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for offering this amendment because to me what this amendment is about is simply asking the question: "Can you be one half pregnant?" I do not think that one can be. Someone either is or they are not, and what he has boldly said here is that either we are going to set aside every dime for the things that we say we are going to set aside for or we are not, because if not, though this number is small, we run down a very slippery slope on the things we end up spending for and end up not spending for.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 264, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—164

Aderholt	Bachus	Barr
Archer	Ballenger	Bartlett
Armey	Barcia	Barton

Bass	Goodlatte	Packard
Bilbrey	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Granger	Pease
Boehlert	Green (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Boehner	Green (WI)	Petri
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Pitts
Bryant	Gutknecht	Portman
Burr	Hall (TX)	Quinn
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Cannon	Hayes	Ramstad
Castle	Hayworth	Reynolds
Chabot	Hefley	Riley
Chambliss	Herger	Rogan
Chenoweth	Hill (MT)	Rohrabacher
Coble	Hilleary	Royce
Coburn	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Collins	Horn	Ryun (KS)
Combest	Hostettler	Salmon
Condit	Hulshof	Sanford
Cook	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Cooksey	Inslee	Schaffer
Cox	Isakson	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Istook	Sessions
Cubin	Jenkins	Shadegg
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Jones (NC)	Shays
Deal	Kingston	Sherwood
DeLay	Kucinich	Shimkus
DeMint	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Lazio	Souder
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Dunn	Linder	Stump
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Sununu
Ehrlich	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
English	Manzullo	Tancredo
Everett	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Fletcher	McInnis	Terry
Foley	McIntosh	Thornberry
Forbes	McIntyre	Thune
Fossella	Metcalf	Tiahrt
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Toomey
Gallegly	Moran (KS)	Upton
Ganske	Morella	Wamp
Gekas	Nethercutt	Watkins
Gibbons	Ney	Watts (OK)
Gilchrest	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Gillmor	Norwood	Weller
Goode	Nussle	Young (AK)

NOES—264

Abercrombie	Clement	Hall (OH)
Ackerman	Clyburn	Hansen
Allen	Conyers	Hastings (FL)
Andrews	Costello	Hill (IN)
Baird	Coyne	Hilliard
Baker	Cramer	Hinchey
Baldacci	Crowley	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Cummings	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Danner	Hoeffel
Barrett (WI)	Davis (FL)	Holden
Bateman	Davis (IL)	Holt
Becerra	DeFazio	Hooley
Bentsen	DeGette	Houghton
Bereuter	Delahunt	Hoyer
Berkley	DeLauro	Hunter
Berman	Deutsch	Hyde
Berry	Diaz-Balart	Jackson (IL)
Biggert	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Bilirakis	Dingell	(TX)
Bishop	Dixon	Jefferson
Blagojevich	Dooley	John
Biley	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Blumenauer	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bonilla	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Bonior	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bono	Engel	Kaptur
Borski	Eshoo	Kasich
Boswell	Etheridge	Kelly
Boucher	Evans	Kennedy
Boyd	Farr	Kilpatrick
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Brown (CA)	Filner	King (NY)
Brown (FL)	Ford	Kleczka
Brown (OH)	Fowler	Klink
Burton	Frank (MA)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Callahan	Frost	Kuykendall
Calvert	Gederson	LaFalce
Canady	Gephart	Lampson
Capps	Gilman	Lantos
Capuano	Gonzalez	Larson
Cardin	Goodling	Latham
Carson	Gordon	Leach
Clay	Goss	Lee
Clayton	Gutierrez	

Levin	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Snyder
Lewis (GA)	Oxley	Spence
Lipinski	Pallone	Spratt
Lofgren	Pascrell	Stabenow
Lowey	Pastor	Stark
Lucas (KY)	Payne	Stenholm
Luther	Pelosi	Strickland
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Talent
Maloney (NY)	Pickering	Tanner
Markey	Pickett	Tauscher
Martinez	Pombo	Tauzin
Mascara	Pomeroy	Thomas
Matsui	Porter	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
McCrary	Rahall	Tierney
McDermott	Rangel	Towns
McGovern	Regula	Traficant
McKeon	Reyes	Turner
McKinney	Rivers	Udall (CO)
McNulty	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
Meehan	Roemer	Velazquez
Meek (FL)	Rogers	Vento
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Menendez	Rothman	Walden
Millender-McDonald	Roukema	Walsh
Miller (FL)	Royal-Allard	Waters
Miller, Gary	Rush	Watt (NC)
Miller, George	Sabo	Waxman
Minge	Sanchez	Weiner
Mink	Sandlin	Weldon (PA)
Moakley	Sawyer	Wexler
Mollohan	Saxton	Weygand
Moore	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Moran (VA)	Scott	Wicker
Murtha	Serrano	Wilson
Nadler	Sherman	Wise
Napolitano	Shows	Wolf
Neal	Shuster	Woolsey
Oberstar	Simpson	Wu
Obey	Sisisky	Wynn
Olver	Skeen	Young (FL)
	Skelton	
NOT VOTING—5		
Myrick	Sanders	Stupak
Peterson (PA)	Slaughter	

□ 1704

Messrs. HINOJOSA, HILL of Indiana, SCOTT, FARR of California, GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GILCHREST, DAVIS of Virginia and BOEHLERT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 36, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 36, line 10, is as follows: INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(RESCISSON)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105-277, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

RESCISSON OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

Of the budgetary resources provided for "Small Community Air Service" by Public Law 101-508 for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1998, \$815,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS

(RESCISSON)

Of the available balances under this heading, \$6,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSON OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for the trust fund share of transit programs in Public Law 102-240 under 49 U.S.C. 5338(a)(1), \$665,000 are rescinded.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

Of the available balances under this heading, \$600,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1001. Division B, title I, chapter 1 of Public Law 105-277 is amended as follows: under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", strike "\$1,496,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,456,600,000".

TITLE II

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER 1

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses," \$921,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

RELATED AGENCY

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE

(RESCISSON)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 2

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

For necessary expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, as authorized by title II of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

(RESCISSON)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

(RESCISSON)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 105-83, \$6,800,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Federal Trust Programs", \$21,800,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$6,800,000 is for activities pursuant to the Trust Management Improvement Project High Level Implementation Plan and \$15,000,000 is to support litigation involving individual Indian trust accounts: *Provided*, That litigation support funds may, as needed, be transferred to and merged with the "Operation of Indian Programs" account in the Bureau of Indian

Affairs, the "Salaries and Expenses" account in the Office of the Solicitor, the "Salaries and Expenses" account in Departmental Management, the "Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management" account in the Minerals Management Service and the "Management of Lands and Resources" account in the Bureau of Land Management.

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

Under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105-277, strike "\$3,132,076,000" and insert "\$3,111,076,000" and strike "\$180,933,000" and insert "\$164,933,000".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CAPITAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR NURSING (RESCISSON)

Of the funds made available under the Federal Capital Loan Program for Nursing appropriation account, \$2,800,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT (RESCISSON)

Of the funds made available under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105-277, \$6,800,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCY

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

For an additional amount for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to remain available until expended, \$30,600,000 to be available for fiscal year 1999, and \$17,400,000 to be available for fiscal year 2000: *Provided*, That such funds be made available to National Public Radio, as the designated manager of the Public Radio Satellite System, for acquisition of satellite capacity.

CHAPTER 5

CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

HOUSE PAGE DORMITORY

For necessary expenses for renovations to the facility located at 501 First Street, S.E., in the District of Columbia, \$3,760,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol shall transfer to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives such portion of the funds made available under this paragraph as may be required for expenses incurred by the Chief Administrative Officer in the renovation of the facility, subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

O'NEILL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

For necessary expenses for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 501. (a) The aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Minority Leader of the House of

Representatives and the aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Majority Whip of the House of Representatives shall each be increased by \$333,000.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 502. (a) Each office described under the heading "HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES" in the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for a fiscal year may transfer any amounts appropriated for the office under such heading among the various categories of allowances and expenses for the office under such heading.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any amounts appropriated for official expenses.

(c) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 1999 and each succeeding fiscal year.

CHAPTER 6

POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for "Payments to the Postal Service Fund" for revenue for gone reimbursement pursuant to 39 U.S.C., 2401(d), \$29,000,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS (RESCISSON)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-130, the Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental to Meet the Needs of Natural Disasters of National Significance, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

Notwithstanding the 6th undesignated paragraph under the heading "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS" in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-276; 112 Stat. 2477) and the related provisions of the joint explanatory statement in the conference report to accompany such Act (Report 105-769, 105th Congress, 2d Session) referred to in such paragraph, of the amounts provided under such heading and made available for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) for grants for targeted economic investments, \$250,000 shall be for a grant to Project Restore of Los Angeles, California, for the Los Angeles City Civic Center Trust, to revitalize and redevelop the Civic Center neighborhood, and \$100,000 shall be for a grant to the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for development of a child care center in the City of Huntington Park, California.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Under this heading in Public Law 105-276, add the words, "to remain available until September 30, 2000," after \$81,910,000."

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 2001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 2002. (a) LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR CLUB WHEAT PRODUCERS.—In making loan deficiency payments available under section 135 of the Agricultural Market Tran-

sition Act (7 U.S.C. 7235) to producers of club wheat, the Secretary of Agriculture may not assess a premium adjustment on the amount that would otherwise be computed for club wheat under the section to reflect the premium that is paid for club wheat to ensure its availability to create a blended specialty product known as western white wheat.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a payment to each producer of club wheat that received a discounted loan deficiency payment under section 135 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7235) before that date as a result of the assessment of a premium adjustment against club wheat. The amount of the payment for a producer shall be equal to the difference between—

(1) the loan deficiency payment that would have been made to the producer in the absence of the premium adjustment; and

(2) the loan deficiency payment actually received by the producer.

(c) FUNDING SOURCE.—The Secretary shall use funds available to provide marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments under subtitle C of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7231 et seq.) to make the payments required by subsection (b).

TITLE III TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 3001. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(a) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(a) in title III, under the heading "Rural Community Advancement Program, (Including Transfer of Funds)", by inserting "1926d," after "1926c,"; by inserting ", 306C, and 306D" after "381E(d)(2)" the first time it appears in the paragraph; and by striking "as provided in 7 U.S.C. 1926(a) and 7 U.S.C. 1926C".

(b) in title VII, in section 718 by striking "this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "annual appropriations Acts".

(c) in title VII, in section 747 by striking "302" and inserting in lieu thereof "203", and

(d) in title VII, in section 763(b)(3) by striking "Public Law 94-265" and inserting in lieu thereof "Public Law 104-297".

SEC. 3002. Division B, title V, chapter 1 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277) is amended under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service" by inserting after "\$23,000,000," the following: "to remain available until expended."

SEC. 3003. The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(a) in title II under the heading "Burma" by striking 'headings "Economic Support Fund" and' and inserting in lieu thereof 'headings "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund", "Economic Support Fund" and',

(b) in title V in section 587 by striking "199-339" and inserting in lieu thereof "99-399".

(c) in title V in subsection 594(a) by striking "subparagraph (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)",

(d) in title V in subsection 594(b) by striking "subparagraph (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)", and

(e) in title V in subsection 594(c) by striking "\$21 of the annual appropriations Act for

Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20 of this Act".

SEC. 3004. Subsection 1706(b) of title XVII of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r-262r-2), as added by section 614 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended by striking "June 30" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30".

SEC. 3005. The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(e) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(a) in the last proviso under the heading "United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Administrative Provisions" by striking "section 104(c)(50)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361-1407)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 104(c)(5)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361-1407)".

(b) in section 354(a) by striking "16 U.S.C. 544(a)(2))" and inserting in lieu thereof "16 U.S.C. 544b(a)(2))".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105-277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3006. The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(f) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading "Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances", by striking "during the current fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "from October 1, 1998, through September 30, 1999";

(b) in title II under the heading "Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management" by striking "\$180,051,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$188,051,000";

(c) in title II under the heading "Children and Families Services Programs, (Including Rescissions)" by striking "notwithstanding section 640(a)(6), of the funds made available for the Head Start Act, \$337,500,000 shall be set aside for the Head Start Program for Families with Infants and Toddlers (Early Head Start): *Provided further*, That";

(d) in title II under the heading "Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management" by inserting after the first proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for carrying out title XX of the Public Health Service Act, \$10,831,000 shall be for activities specified under section 2003(b)(2), of which \$9,131,000 shall be for prevention service demonstration grants under section 510(b)(2) of title V of the Social Security Act, as amended, without application of the limitation of section 2010(c) of said title XX.:"

(e) in title III under the heading "Special Education" by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: "*Provided further*, That \$1,500,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105-78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the Act to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities";

(f) in title II under the heading "Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund" by striking "\$322,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$180,000";

(g) in title III under the heading "Education Reform" by striking "\$491,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$459,500,000";

(h) in title III under the heading "Vocational and Adult Education" by striking "\$6,000,000" the first time that it appears and

inserting in lieu thereof "\$14,000,000", and by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: ":

Provided further, That of the amounts made available for the Perkins Act, \$4,100,000 shall be for tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions under section 117";

(i) in title III under the heading "Higher Education" by inserting after the first proviso the following: ":

Provided further, That funds available for part A, subpart 2 of title VII of the Higher Education Act shall be available to fund awards for academic year 1999-2000 for fellowships under part A, subpart 1 of title VII of said Act, under the terms and conditions of part A, subpart 1:";

(j) in title III under the heading "Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement" by inserting after the third proviso the following: ":

Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$1,000,000 shall be used to conduct a violence prevention demonstration program:

Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$50,000 shall be awarded to the Center for Educational Technologies to conduct a feasibility study and initial planning and design of an effective CD ROM product that would complement the book, *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution*";

(k) in title III under the heading "Reading Excellence" by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: ":

Provided, That up to one percent of the amount appropriated shall be available October 1, 1998 for peer review of applications";

(l) in title V in section 510(3) by inserting after "Act" the following: "or subsequent Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts"; and

(m)(1) in title VIII in section 405 by striking subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) OTHER REFERENCES TO TITLE VII OF THE STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.—The table of contents of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

"(1) by striking the items relating to title VII of such Act, except the item relating to the title heading and the items relating to subtitles B and C of such title; and

"(2) by striking the item relating to the title heading for title VII and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE VII—EDUCATION AND TRAINING".

(2) The amendments made by subsection (m)(1) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105-277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3007. The last sentence of section 5595(b) of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 309(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999, Public Law 105-275) is amended by striking "(a)(1)(G)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1)(C)".

SEC. 3008. The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended: (a) in title I under the heading "National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Operations and Research, (Highway Trust Fund)" by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph ":

Provided further, That notwithstanding other funds available in this Act for the National Advanced Driving Simulator Program, funds under this heading are available for obligation, as nec-

essary, to continue this program through September 30, 1999".

SEC. 3009. Division B, title II, chapter 5 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277) is amended under the heading "Capitol Police Board, Security Enhancements" by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph ":

Provided further, That for purposes of carrying out the plan or plans described under this heading and consistent with the approval of such plan or plans pursuant to this heading, the Capitol Police Board shall transfer the portion of the funds made available under this heading which are to be used for personnel and overtime increases for the United States Capitol Police to the heading "Capitol Police Board, Capitol Police, Salaries" under the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year involved, and shall allocate such portion between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate in such amounts as may be approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate".

SEC. 3010. Section 3027(d)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note; 112 Stat. 366) as added by section 360 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is re-designated as section 3027(c)(3).

SEC. 3011. The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(b) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading "Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities", by inserting "and shall remain available until September 30, 2000" after "Holocaust Assets in the United States", and

(b) in title IV, under the heading "Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Salaries and Expenses", by inserting "and shall remain available until September 30, 2000" after "Holocaust Assets in the United States".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BENTSEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Bentsen: Page 36, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3012. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to release from detention any criminal alien subject to mandatory detention pending removal from the United States.

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

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering today, which the gentleman has reserved a point of order against, would prohibit the use of any funds in this act or any other act for the release of criminal aliens from detention centers run by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This would only apply to criminal aliens subject to mandatory detention who are pending removal from the United States.

With the passage of the 1996 immigration reform law, Congress and the President placed a high priority on removing noncitizen criminals from the United States. This bipartisan reform law mandated detention of criminal aliens until their removal and provided the Immigration and Naturalization Service with two additional years to implement the law. It is worth noting that since 1996, Congress has doubled the funding for detention and deportation to \$730 million.

In February of this year, reports surfaced that the INS planned to release criminal aliens, many of whom are being held on felony charges. Specifically, the INS issued a memorandum on January 8, 1999, which alerted field offices of a shortfall in detention space funding and offered guidelines for the release of criminal aliens who comprise the vast majority of the INS detainees awaiting deportation.

In response, the INS eastern region's regional director released a draft plan in early February to free 1,550 criminal aliens under a point system that would give priority to those with the least serious convictions. Among those eligible for release under the proposal were criminal aliens who had been convicted in U.S. courts for such crimes as drug trafficking, assault, burglary, counterfeiting and alien smuggling.

After much congressional criticism, INS Commissioner Meissner reversed the agency's plan. However, it is incomprehensible why such an idea was considered in the first place. Quite simply, it is imperative that the INS continue to detain and remove criminal aliens subject to the mandatory detention requirements of the 1996 immigration law. To do so effectively, it is important to disallow the use of all INS funding alternatives, including funds appropriated in previous budgets from being used for the release of criminal aliens, not just those contained in the bill before us today.

The amendment I am offering would thus codify the stated plans of Commissioner Meissner who said before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims on February 25, 1999, that INS will not now release any aliens subject to mandatory detention under section 303 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

□ 1715

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the INS has been woefully inadequate in dealing with this problem. I know

there are a lot of concerns about the IRA/IRA law as it relates to certain resident aliens and people who were in the country legally, but this applies to people who enter the country illegally and who then commit either a felony or a misdemeanor and then are subject to deportation.

In my State of Texas, in the State of Florida, in California, in the eastern region of this country, this has been a serious problem. The INS has not been very good at getting back to us.

Earlier this year my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, from the Houston area, wrote to Commissioner Meissner asking that she address this problem. She did not respond to us until today, when I received a letter from her, coincidentally. In that letter, actually, it was from her Director of Congressional Relations, in the letter they did state that they have reversed the policy.

It states that various options are being explored which will give the agency some relief, both in the short-term and long-term detention, including the possibility of seeking additional funding or the restoration of temporary period custody rule release authority; that is, they want to go back to releasing people who have been convicted of felonies. That is unacceptable to the constituents in my district. I think it would be unacceptable to most Members' constituents in their districts.

So while it is unfortunate that the point of order will probably be raised on this, the fact remains that this is the only game in town right now. If we are not going to get around to dealing with this until we take up the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill, how do we know that the INS is not going to go back and change their policy once again?

I appreciate the chairman not wanting to load up his bill with a lot of amendments, but if this was the fiscal year 1999 bill, this would have been a straight limitation which I would have offered. At that time we did not know this was going to be a problem.

This does not add any new money. It does something that I think the Congress has already spoken on. I would hope the gentleman would not raise this point of order, and we could go ahead and have this adopted on a voice vote by the committee and move on.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, "No amendment to a general appro-

priations bill shall be in order if changing existing law." This amendment does not apply solely to the appropriation under consideration, and as much as I believe in what the gentleman is trying to do, and I think through the regular process we can do it, I must ask for a ruling of the Chair on this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) wish to respond to the point of order?

Mr. BENTSEN. The only thing I will say is, I am disappointed that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, would do this. We have an opportunity to address this today. There is no guarantee that the committee of jurisdiction would get around to it. It is unfortunate. This is a real problem, but so be it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

As stated at page 131 of House Practice, to avoid legislating a limitation must apply solely to the funds in the bill under consideration and may not be applied to funds appropriated in other acts.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) explicitly addresses funds in other acts. The provision therefore constitutes legislation, and the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of title II (page 26, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2003. (a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements to make payments for the settlement of the claims arising from the deaths caused by the accident involving a United States Marine Corps EA-6B aircraft on February 3, 1998, near Cavalese, Italy.

(b) DEADLINE FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall exercise the authority under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall make available \$40,000,000 only for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with the settlement of the claims arising from the accident described in subsection (a), unless the agreements made pursuant to the authority granted in subsection (a) provide for payments over a longer period.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment under this section in settlement of the claims arising from the death of

any person associated with the accident described in subsection (a) may not exceed \$2,000,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid to a person under this section is intended to supplement any amount subsequently determined to be payable to the person under section 127 or chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law for administrative settlement of claims against the United States with respect to damages arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—The payment of an amount under this section may not be considered to constitute a statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or otherwise as evidence of any material fact in any judicial proceeding or investigation arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, while I will not contest the point of order because this is legislating on an appropriation bill, I thought this issue was important enough to bring it before this body right now.

On February 3 of last year, near Cavalese, Italy, a Marine pilot inadvertently ran into a gondola on a ski lift and killed 20 people. It has been an international incident ever since.

While I agree and fully support the ruling of the court-martial that those pilots were not in error in this horrible tragedy, I do believe that we owe those people who died some monetary damages. We owe their families some monetary damages.

We have spent \$20 million repairing the gondola and the ski lift and the other things that were damaged near Cavalese, Italy, but we have not done really very much to take care of the people who were really hurt by this horrible tragedy, the families of those people.

The Italian court system takes between 3 and 10 years to settle these kinds of claims. It seems to me relatively inhuman to make these people wait that long before we pay them the damages to which they are entitled. They are suffering a great deal right now.

I do not know what kind of message it sends to the world when we take care of the ski lift but we do not take care of the Human tragedy that was involved. It is my opinion that the Defense Department has about \$68 million in unobligated funds from prior years from which to draw this money. We are talking about a maximum of around \$1 to \$2 million for each one of the families that were involved. I would just say to my colleagues, although I know there is going to be a point of order that is going to be sustained on this, that we ought to do something about this in the very near future.

I would urge the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Armed

Services, to do what they can to make sure reparations are dealt with in a very timely fashion. We do not want these people to suffer for another 3 to 10 years because this thing is being dragged out. Yell.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the United States was at fault. There is no question about that. While the pilots may not have been at fault, those maps did not have the gondola on them, did not have the ski lift on them. The altimeter on the plane, there is some question about whether or not it was working. When they flew into that valley, even though there was an optical illusion, there were other factors that factored into this that caused this tragedy to occur.

I would just like to say before I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, the United States owes a responsibility to the people of Italy that were harmed by this terrible tragedy, and we ought to make restitution as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, for bringing this measure. I would like to inform the Members about this issue with the ski lift in Italy.

When the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) made a comment about the monies have been paid for the damage to the ski lift, we put monies aside, there was \$20 million, but those monies have not been accessed. The ski lift has been replaced, the owner-operator has gone through the claims process in Italy, and it has not yet been adjudicated, so the \$20 million has not been accessed. I wanted to clarify that point.

We have a Status of Forces agreement in Italy, and for the claims process, the Navy has jurisdiction. Right now when there is a claim, they are to go through the Italian government. Through the Status of Forces agreement, we, the United States, pay 75 percent and Italy pays 25 percent, but they are to go through the adjudicative procedures through the Italian government.

Right now, because we have that agreement in place, I will give advice to my colleagues, let us permit the adjudication to go through the Status of Forces agreement.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), I applaud him and recognize his efforts, and the image that it shows around the world, but I would ask the gentleman to let us go through the adjudicative procedures that we have under our Status of Forces agreement in Italy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that the process the gentleman from Indiana just alluded to could take 3 to 10 years. I think that is too long. The other body passed this resolution that I

am talking about, this amendment, yesterday. I think it was Senator ROBB that sponsored it. It passed, I think, without any opposition whatsoever.

Those people who are suffering, and their families who are suffering right now, should not have to wait for an adjudication process that is going to go on for 3 to 10 years. They suffered enough. We need to get on with it.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) changes existing law. The amendment changes existing law by, among other things, waiving provisions of existing law and imposing new duties on the Secretary of Defense.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say, as somebody who is a strong supporter of the amendment that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TODD TIAHRT) brought to this Floor, that as we get ready to vote on final passage of this bill, we need to step back and ask ourselves what it is we are voting on.

We did not choose to further offset the defense spending with other savings from nondefense, but I think we need to look at what the committee has done. They have done a great job of saving over \$1 billion from the social security trust fund, essentially, because that is where that money comes from if we do not offset it. We need to recognize that and praise them for that work.

Today we have seen the President order bombings in Kosovo. All of us realize that while the President has made that decision and ordered the military to engage, we in Congress will be asked later to find the money to pay for that, and that it will become increasingly difficult to do so without jeopardizing our national defense.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues, all of us who share a desire to save social security, to recognize the good job that the committee has done in finding off-

sets for the domestic spending. More than \$1 billion has been offset. That means more than \$1 billion has been saved for the social security trust fund. They have done that without the help of the President, without the help of the White House, without the help of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They deserve to be recognized for putting social security as a top priority in this bill.

Although I was a supporter of the Tiahrt amendment, I thought it was the right thing to do. I am also prepared and think the right thing for us to do today is to vote yes on final passage, and recognize that we have begun a very arduous task of saying that we are going to make sure that we offset spending, make sure that we save social security by offsetting those requests for additional spending, and recognizing that we have to preserve that trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his good work, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I simply want to say, in light of the comments by the previous speaker, that repeating a misstatement of fact does not make it a fact, no matter how many times that misstatement is repeated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so to compliment the Chairman for having presided in this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union in a very professional and magnificent fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the final two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act".

□ 1730

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURRETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 125, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 211, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gilcrest	Oxley
Archer	Gillmor	Packard
Armey	Gilman	Pease
Bachus	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goodling	Petri
Ballenger	Goss	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pitts
Bartlett	Granger	Pombo
Barton	Green (WI)	Pomeroy
Bass	Greenwood	Porter
Bateman	Gutierrez	Portman
Becerra	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastert	Quinn
Berry	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Biggert	Hayes	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hayworth	Regula
Bilirakis	Herger	Reynolds
Bliley	Hill (IN)	Riley
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Boehlert	Hilleary	Rogers
Boehner	Hinojosa	Rohrbacher
Bonilla	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Hoekstra	Roukema
Boswell	Horn	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Houghton	Ryun (KS)
Burr	Hulshof	Saxton
Burton	Hunter	Scarborough
Buyer	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Hyde	Sessions
Calvert	Isakson	Shadegg
Camp	Istook	Shaw
Canady	Jenkins	Shays
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Sherwood
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Shuster
Chenoweth	Kasich	Simpson
Coble	Kelly	Skeen
Coburn	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	Kolbe	Souder
Cox	Kuykendall	Spence
Crane	LaHood	Stearns
Cubin	Largent	Stump
Cunningham	Latham	Sununu
Danner	LaTourette	Sweeney
Davis (VA)	Lazio	Talent
Deal	Leach	Tauzin
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	Lewis (KY)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Thomas
Dickey	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Thune
Dreier	Manzullo	Tiabrt
Duncan	McCollum	Toomey
Dunn	McCrery	Traficant
Ehlers	McHugh	Upton
Ehrlich	McInnis	Walden
Emerson	McIntosh	Walsh
English	McKeon	Wamp
Everett	Metcalf	Watkins
Ewing	Mica	Watts (OK)
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Miller, Gary	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Minge	Weller
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Fowler	Morella	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Nethercutt	Wilson
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Wolf
Gallegly	Northup	Young (AK)
Ganske	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gekas	Nussle	Ose

NAYS—211

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brown (FL)
Ackerman	Berman	Brown (OH)
Allen	Bishop	Campbell
Andrews	Blagojevich	Capps
Baird	Blumenauer	Capuano
Baldacci	Bonior	Cardin
Baldwin	Borski	Carson
Barcia	Boucher	Chabot
Barr	Boyd	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Clayton
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Clement

Clyburn	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Collins	Kennedy	Phelps
Condit	Kildee	Pickett
Costello	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Cramer	Kleczka	Rangel
Crowley	Klinitich	Reyes
Cummings	LaFalce	Rivers
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Rodriguez
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Roemer
DeFazio	Larson	Rothman
DeGette	Lee	Royal-Allard
Delahunt	Levin	Rush
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Deutsch	Lipinski	Salmon
Dicks	Lofgren	Sanchez
Dingell	Lowey	Sanders
Dixon	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Doggett	Luther	Sanford
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer
Edwards	Markey	Shakowsky
Engel	Martinez	Scott
Eshoo	Mascara	Serrano
Etheridge	Matsui	Sherman
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Shows
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Sisisky
Fattah	McDermott	Skelton
Filner	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Ford	McIntyre	Spratt
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Stabenow
Frost	McNulty	Stark
Gejdenson	Meehan	Stenholm
Gephardt	Meek (FL)	Strickland
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Tancredo
Goode	Menendez	Tanner
Gordon	Millender-Lee	Tauscher
Green (TX)	McDonald	Taylor (MS)
Gutknecht	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Hall (OH)	Mink	Thompson (MS)
Hall (TX)	Moakley	Thurman
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Tierney
Heffley	Moore	Towns
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Turner
Hinchey	Murtha	Udall (CO)
Hoeffel	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Holden	Napolitano	Velazquez
Holt	Neal	Vento
Hooley	Oberstar	Visclosky
Hoyer	Obey	Waters
Inslee	Hinchey	Watt (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Hoeffel	Waxman
Jackson-Lee	Jackson-Lee	Weiner
(TX)	Pallone	Wexler
Jefferson	Pascrill	Weygand
John	Pastor	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Paul	Woolsey
Jones (OH)	Payne	Wu
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Wynn

NOT VOTING—3

Myrick	Slaughter	Stupak
--------	-----------	--------

□ 1750

Messrs. HERGER, RADANOVICH, RYUN of Kansas, SENSENBRENNER, GUTIERREZ, ROGAN, BARTON of Texas, MCINNIS, MANZULLO, GRAHAM, POMEROY and MINGE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. JOHN and Mr. REYES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order Number 12131, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. EWING of Illinois,
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and

Mr. PICKERING of Mississippi.
There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR MEMBERS OF U.S. ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 130) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House, with the previous question ordered to its adoption without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 130

Whereas the President has authorized United States participation in NATO military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Whereas up to 22,000 members of the Armed Forces are presently involved in operations in and around the Balkans region with the active participation of NATO and other coalition forces; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and recognizes their professionalism, dedication, patriotism, and courage.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. While I have deep reservations about the direction of our policy in the Balkans and the wisdom of intervening on the ground in Kosovo, I have no reservations whatsoever about the patriotism, dedication, professionalism and courage of the men