

Quinn	Sherman	Thurman
Radanovich	Sherwood	Tiahrt
Rahall	Shimkus	Tierney
Ramstad	Shows	Toomey
Rangel	Shuster	Towns
Regula	Simpson	Trafficant
Reyes	Sisisky	Turner
Reynolds	Skeen	Udall (CO)
Riley	Skelton	Udall (NM)
Rivers	Slaughter	Upton
Rodriguez	Smith (MI)	Velazquez
Roemer	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Rogan	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Rogers	Smith (WA)	Vitter
Rohrabacher	Snyder	Walden
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Walsh
Rothman	Spence	Wamp
Roukema	Spratt	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Stabenow	Watkins
Royce	Stark	Watt (NC)
Rush	Stearns	Watts (OK)
Ryan (WI)	Stenholm	Waxman
Ryun (KS)	Strickland	Weiner
Sabo	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Salmon	Stupak	Weldon (PA)
Sanchez	Sununu	Weller
Sanders	Sweeney	Wexler
Sandlin	Talent	Weygand
Sanford	Tancred	Whitfield
Sawyer	Tanner	Wicker
Saxton	Tauscher	Wilson
Schaffer	Tauzin	Wise
Schakowsky	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Scott	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey
Sensenbrenner	Terry	Wu
Serrano	Thomas	Wynn
Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Young (AK)
Shadegg	Thompson (MS)	Young (FL)
Shaw	Thornberry	
Shays	Thune	

NOES—2

Chenoweth-Hage Paul

NOT VOTING—7

Blumenauer	LaHood	Scarborough
Fletcher	McKinney	
Jefferson	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1725

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2606, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 307, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R.

2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 27, 1999, at page H8831).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

This matter that we are addressing now is something that has been discussed for a great many months. During the rule we talked about the amount of money. True, it is \$2 billion below what the President requested. True, it is less than last year. But it is all the money that we can afford under the circumstances this year.

So I ask the Members to consider where we are and what we are offering, and that is an opportunity for the administration to have an effective foreign policy capability with the monies that are available without increasing taxes. The President has suggested that we increase taxes to meet these new needs. This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is not going to do that, and I think both sides of the aisle as well as the President recognize that.

So we are not going to include any new taxes. This Congress has said that we are going to live within the budget caps so we are not going to break the budget caps. This Congress is not going to interfere with the ability that we fund adequately Social Security. So we are not going to break Social Security. We are going to cut foreign aid below the President's request, cut foreign aid below last year. I think it is a responsible thing to do because this is the very thing we are asking Americans to understand in every domestic policy that we have facing us.

So we have a good bill. We have worked in a bipartisan fashion to bring together a bill that recognizes and facilitated the needs of most every Member of Congress that came before us. They came and they asked for assistance to Africa. We increased the assistance to Africa. They came and they asked that we increase child survival. Mr. Speaker, I created the child survival account so I willingly went along with the gentlewoman from California to increase child survival to \$700 million, a great step in the right direction.

We tried to hold down on earmarks where we would not hamstring the administration into having to spend money in areas that they did not want to. So we removed most all of the earmarks. We have given them a responsible piece of legislation that affords the President and the Secretary of State to have an effective capability of running the State Department and running our foreign policy.

So we have a good bill, no one disputes that. The only argument that we are going to hear this afternoon is, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough money. But keep in mind, it is not uncommon for this Congress, in fact to the best of my recollection, in every Congress for the last 25 years, the Congress has reduced the President's request. This request is lower than his request, and I am sorry, Mr. President, but we do not have any more money. We are not going to raise taxes; we are not going to take it out of the national defense.

**H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES</b>						
Subsidy appropriation .....	765,000	839,000	759,000	785,000	759,000	-6,000
Emergency funding (by transfer) .....	(10,000)					(-10,000)
(Direct loan authorization) .....	(1,333,000)	(1,687,000)	(1,350,000)	(1,333,000)	(1,350,000)	(+17,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(12,702,000)	(13,825,000)	(10,400,000)	(10,500,000)	(10,400,000)	(-2,302,000)
Administrative expenses .....	50,000	57,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	+5,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding) .....	400					-400
Negative subsidy .....	-25,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	+10,000
<b>Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States .....</b>	<b>790,400</b>	<b>881,000</b>	<b>799,000</b>	<b>825,000</b>	<b>799,000</b>	<b>+8,600</b>
<b>OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION</b>						
<b>Noncredit account:</b>						
Administrative expenses .....	32,500	35,000	35,000	31,500	35,000	+2,500
Y2K conversion (emergency funding) .....	840					-840
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections .....	-260,000	-303,000	-303,000	-303,000	-303,000	-43,000
<b>Direct loans:</b>						
Loan subsidy .....	4,000	14,000	10,500	14,000	14,000	+10,000
(Loan authorization) .....	(136,000)	(130,000)	(85,000)	(100,000)	(130,000)	(-6,000)
<b>Guaranteed loans:</b>						
Loan subsidy .....	46,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-36,000
(Loan authorization) .....	(1,750,000)	(1,000,000)	(850,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-750,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding) .....	1,260					-1,260
<b>Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation .....</b>	<b>-175,400</b>	<b>-244,000</b>	<b>-247,500</b>	<b>-247,500</b>	<b>-244,000</b>	<b>-68,600</b>
<b>TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY</b>						
Trade and development agency .....	44,000	48,000	44,000	43,000	44,000	
<b>Total, title I, Export and investment assistance .....</b>	<b>659,000</b>	<b>685,000</b>	<b>595,500</b>	<b>620,500</b>	<b>599,000</b>	<b>-60,000</b>
(Loan authorizations) .....	(15,921,000)	(16,642,000)	(12,685,000)	(12,933,000)	(12,880,000)	(-3,041,000)
<b>TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>Agency for International Development</b>						
Child survival and disease programs fund .....	650,000	555,000	685,000		715,000	+65,000
UNICEF .....				(105,000)	(110,000)	(+110,000)
Emergency funding .....	50,000					-50,000
Development assistance .....	1,225,000	780,440	1,201,000	1,928,500	1,228,000	+3,000
Transfer out - UNICEF .....				(-105,000)		
<b>Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery</b>						
Fund (Emergency Funding) .....	621,000					-621,000
Emergency funding (transfer out) .....	(-17,000)					(+17,000)
Development Fund for Africa .....		512,560				
International disaster assistance .....	200,000	220,000	200,880	175,000	175,880	-24,120
Emergency funding .....	188,000					-188,000
<b>Micro &amp; Small Enterprise Development program account:</b>						
Subsidy appropriation .....	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
(Direct loan authorization) .....	(1,000)					(-1,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(40,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(40,000)	(30,000)	(-10,000)
Administrative expenses .....	500	500	500	500	500	
<b>Urban and environmental credit program account:</b>						
Subsidy appropriation .....	1,500	3,000		1,500	1,500	
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(14,000)	(26,000)		(14,000)	(14,000)	
Administrative expenses .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	5,000	
<b>Development credit authority program account:</b>						
(By transfer) .....		(15,000)		(7,500)	(3,000)	(+3,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....		(200,000)			(40,000)	(+40,000)
<b>Subtotal, development assistance .....</b>	<b>2,942,500</b>	<b>2,078,000</b>	<b>2,093,880</b>	<b>2,111,000</b>	<b>2,127,380</b>	<b>-815,120</b>
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund .....	44,552	43,837	43,837	43,837	43,837	-715
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development .....	479,950	507,739	479,950	495,000	495,000	+15,050
Emergency funding (by transfer) .....	(8,000)					(-8,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding) .....	10,200					-10,200
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development						
Office of Inspector General .....	30,750	25,261	25,000	25,000	25,000	-5,750
Emergency funding (by transfer) .....	(1,500)					(-1,500)
<b>Total, Agency for International Development .....</b>	<b>3,507,952</b>	<b>2,654,837</b>	<b>2,642,667</b>	<b>2,674,837</b>	<b>2,691,217</b>	<b>-816,735</b>

**H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Other Bilateral Economic Assistance</b>						
Economic support fund:						
Camp David countries.....	1,855,000	1,645,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	-160,000
Other .....	512,000	894,000	532,000	500,000	482,000	-30,000
Rescission.....	-5,000					+ 5,000
Subtotal, Economic support fund .....	2,362,000	2,539,000	2,227,000	2,195,000	2,177,000	-185,000
Emergency funding .....	211,500					-211,500
Emergency funding (transfer out) .....	(-3,770)					(+ 3,770)
International Fund for Ireland.....	19,800		19,800		19,800	
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.....	430,000	393,000	393,000	535,000	535,000	+ 105,000
Emergency funding .....	120,000					-120,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union .....	801,000	1,032,000	725,000	780,000	735,000	-66,000
Emergency funding .....	46,000					-46,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance .....	3,990,100	3,964,000	3,364,600	3,510,000	3,466,600	-523,500
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
<b>Inter-American Foundation</b>						
Appropriation .....		22,300				
(By transfer) .....	(20,000)		(5,000)	(18,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)
Total .....	(20,000)	(22,300)	(5,000)	(18,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)
<b>African Development Foundation</b>						
Appropriation .....		14,400				
(By transfer) .....	(11,000)		(14,400)	(12,500)	(14,400)	(+ 3,400)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding).....	137					-137
Total .....	(11,137)	(14,400)	(14,400)	(12,500)	(14,400)	(+ 3,263)
<b>Peace Corps</b>						
Appropriation .....	240,000	270,000	240,000	220,000	235,000	-5,000
Emergency funding (by transfer).....	(1,769)					(-1,769)
<b>Department of State</b>						
International narcotics control and law enforcement.....	261,000	295,000	285,000	215,000	285,000	+ 24,000
Emergency funding .....	255,800					-255,800
Migration and refugee assistance .....	640,000	680,000	640,000	610,000	625,000	-15,000
Emergency funding .....	266,000					-266,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	20,000	12,500	-17,500
Emergency funding .....	185,000					-185,000
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	198,000	231,000	181,630	175,000	181,600	-16,400
Emergency funding .....	20,000					-20,000
National Commission on Terrorism.....	840					-840
U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom .....	3,000					-3,000
Total, Department of State.....	1,839,440	1,216,000	1,136,630	1,020,000	1,104,100	-735,340
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>						
International affairs technical assistance .....	3,000	8,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	-1,500
Debt restructuring .....	33,000	120,000	33,000	43,000	33,000	
Emergency funding .....	41,000					-41,000
United States community adjustment and investment program .....	10,000	17,000				-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury .....	87,000	145,500	34,500	44,500	34,500	-52,500
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance .....	9,664,629	8,287,037	7,418,397	7,469,337	7,531,417	-2,133,212
Appropriations .....	(7,675,192)	(8,287,037)	(7,418,397)	(7,469,337)	(7,531,417)	(-143,775)
Emergency funding .....	(1,994,437)					(-1,994,437)
Rescission.....	(-5,000)					(+ 5,000)
(By transfer) .....	(10,230)	(15,000)	(19,400)	(38,000)	(22,400)	(+ 12,170)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations) .....	(11,269)					(-11,269)
(Loan authorizations).....	(55,000)	(256,000)	(30,000)	(54,000)	(84,000)	(+ 29,000)

**H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
International Military Education and Training .....	50,000	52,000	45,000	50,000	50,000	.....
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants:						
Camp David countries .....	3,160,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	+ 60,000
Other .....	170,000	560,000	250,000	190,000	200,000	+ 30,000
Subtotal, grants .....	3,330,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	3,410,000	3,420,000	+ 90,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+ 585)
Direct loans:						
Subsidy appropriation .....	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000
(Loan authorization) .....	(167,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-167,000)
FMF program level .....	(3,497,000)	(3,780,000)	(3,470,000)	(3,410,000)	(3,420,000)	(-77,000)
Total, Foreign Military Financing .....	3,350,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	3,410,000	3,420,000	+ 70,000
Emergency funding .....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund:						
Offsetting collections .....	-19,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	+ 13,000
Peacekeeping operations .....	76,500	130,000	76,500	80,000	78,000	+ 1,500
Total, title III, Military assistance .....	3,507,500	3,956,000	3,585,500	3,534,000	3,542,000	+ 34,500
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+ 585)
(Loan authorization) .....	(167,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-167,000)
<b>TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>International Financial Institutions</b>						
<b>World Bank Group</b>						
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Global Environment Facility .....	192,500	143,333	50,000	25,000	35,800	-156,700
Rescission .....	-25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 25,000
Subtotal, Global Environment Facility .....	167,500	143,333	50,000	25,000	35,800	-131,700
Contribution to the International Development Association .....	800,000	803,430	568,600	776,600	625,000	-175,000
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency .....	.....	10,000	.....	10,000	4,000	+ 4,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	.....	(50,000)	.....	(50,000)	(20,000)	(+ 20,000)
Total, World Bank Group .....	987,500	956,763	618,600	811,600	664,800	-302,700
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	25,611	25,611	25,611	25,611	25,611	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	.....
Fund for special operations .....	21,152	.....	.....	.....	.....	-21,152
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation .....	.....	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund .....	50,000	28,500	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank .....	96,763	79,111	25,611	25,611	25,611	-71,152
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	13,222	13,728	13,728	13,728	13,728	+ 506
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(647,858)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(+ 24,887)
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund .....	210,000	177,017	100,000	50,000	77,000	-133,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank .....	223,222	190,745	113,728	63,728	90,728	-132,494
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	.....	5,100	.....	5,100	1,000	+ 1,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	.....	(80,000)	.....	.....	(16,000)	(+ 16,000)
Contribution to the African Development Fund .....	128,000	127,000	108,000	.....	77,000	-51,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital .....	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	.....
Total, International Financial Institutions .....	1,451,264	1,394,498	901,718	941,818	894,918	-556,346
(Limitation on callable capital subscrip) .....	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+ 60,887)

**H.R. 2606 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>International Organizations and Programs</b>						
Appropriation .....	187,000	293,000	167,000	170,000	170,000	-17,000
(By transfer) .....	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	
<b>Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance.....</b>	<b>1,838,264</b>	<b>1,687,498</b>	<b>1,068,718</b>	<b>1,111,818</b>	<b>1,064,918</b>	<b>-573,346</b>
Appropriations .....	(1,663,264)	(1,687,498)	(1,068,718)	(1,111,818)	(1,064,918)	(-598,346)
Rescission .....	(-25,000)					(+ 25,000)
(By transfer) .....	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	
(Limitation on callable capital subscript) .....	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+ 60,887)
<b>TITLE VI</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>International Monetary Programs</b>						
Loans to International Monetary Fund .....	3,361,000					-3,361,000
United States Quota, International Monetary Fund .....	14,500,000					-14,500,000
<b>Total, International Monetary Programs .....</b>	<b>17,861,000</b>					<b>-17,861,000</b>
<b>Grand total .....</b>	<b>33,330,393</b>	<b>14,615,535</b>	<b>12,668,115</b>	<b>12,735,655</b>	<b>12,737,335</b>	<b>-20,593,058</b>
Appropriations .....	(31,313,456)	(14,615,535)	(12,668,115)	(12,735,655)	(12,737,335)	(-18,576,121)
Emergency appropriations .....	(2,046,937)					(-2,046,937)
Rescission .....	(-30,000)					(+ 30,000)
(By transfer) .....	(12,730)	(17,500)	(21,900)	(40,500)	(24,900)	(+ 12,170)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations) .....	(21,269)					(-21,269)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+ 585)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript) .....	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(2,349,702)	(2,335,702)	(+ 60,887)
(Loan authorizations) .....	(16,143,000)	(16,898,000)	(12,715,000)	(12,987,000)	(12,964,000)	(-3,179,000)
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
<b>Total mandatory and discretionary .....</b>	<b>31,246,456</b>	<b>14,615,535</b>	<b>12,668,115</b>	<b>12,735,655</b>	<b>12,737,335</b>	<b>-18,509,121</b>
Mandatory .....	44,552	43,837	43,837	43,837	43,837	-715
Discretionary .....	31,201,904	14,571,698	12,624,278	12,691,818	12,693,498	-18,508,406

□ 1730

We are not going to break the caps, and we are not going to touch Social Security. That is our position.

We received a letter today from AIPAC, the Jewish lobby who is so interested in helping our ally, Israel. AIPAC is supportive of this bill. We have provided, I think, as best we can; and certainly the Armenian people feel like we have provided adequately for them under the circumstances.

Everybody would like to have more money. But more money is not available for everybody. We can recommend to the White House some things they might do. The President might stop going to places like Africa with 1,700 people with him, spending \$47 million of taxpayers' money. We might save some money in areas like that.

I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we might impose a visitors' tax on the White House, not for American citizens, but for foreign dignitaries who come to the White House and are greeted with a royal dinner there.

Then after dinner, they all sit around with a glass of wine, and they toast one another, and they talk about what great friends we are. Inevitably, the President of the United States promises them some more money and then calls it an obligation that we, the Members of Congress, who have the responsibility of appropriating the monies that are available to us, must then decide on whether or not it is merited.

So we have a good bill. We have a bipartisan drafted bill. We have a good bill for the administration, because it gives them the flexibility that he needs, and it does not raise taxes, does not hurt Social Security, does not take away from the national defense.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Having recently returned from Israel, Lebanon, and the Palestinian Authority, I wish to urge the House to consider the great opportunity before us to use American food surpluses as a tool to build stability in the Middle East and aid in sustaining the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate the fiscal year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations conference report, I wish to focus the attention to the House on a nation in the Middle East is rarely mentioned on this floor, Lebanon. There are strong historical ties between the Lebanese people and the American people—ties that have been repeatedly reinforced by new generations of Lebanese who have immigrated to the United States.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, as we, hopefully, move toward a lasting and just peace in the

Middle East, we must recognize the importance of regional stability for the maintenance of that peace. Lebanon is critical to that stability. The pro-market orientation of Lebanon's economy has not alone been sufficient to create economic health in that country. The Lebanese people are struggling to rebuild a society and infrastructure devastated by 15 years of civil war.

We now have an opportunity to assist by allocating U.S. surplus commodities to Lebanon and allowing the proceeds of the sale of these commodities to be invested in medium and long-term development projects in that country.

A preliminary assessment by the Faculty of Agriculture and Food Security at the American University of Beirut suggests that commodities such as corn, soybeans, alfalfa, rice, and red meats would be well suited to the country's needs and circumstances. These commodities have high water requirements and are therefore not produced in water-scarce Lebanon.

Agriculture is an important sector in the Lebanese economy, and there are many areas in which its economic performance could be improved by investments in irrigation networks, an agricultural extension service, modern agricultural processing and marketing systems, scholarships, or endowments for agricultural science, establishment of a land resource database, or many other investments important to developing an agricultural economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to consider the importance of Lebanon to a long-lasting Middle East peace and urge the Departments of State and Agriculture to think creatively about ways to use American agricultural surpluses to sustain the peace process.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. As I have said earlier in the day, I do so with great regret, because I had hoped that, in the course of the legislative process, we would be able to come up with a bill that would meet the needs that we have as a leader in the world as well as one that addressed our concerns about export finance and helping to promote U.S. products abroad.

I do this, though, with great admiration and commendation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies. He did the best that he could with what he had, and that was not much. It was not enough. But he did have a balanced set of priorities in the bill that he did right.

I take issue, though, with what has been said here in this discussion so far and earlier when we debated the rule. It has been said that there is not going to be any more money for foreign aid because the Democrats want to take money from the Social Security fund to spend it on foreign aid.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and his colleagues know that that is a disingenuous proposal. The fact is that this bill would not be supported by the organization that the gentleman cited as supporting this bill unless they knew that the funding for

the Wye agreement would be put before this Congress and put before this Congress soon.

So do not on the one hand tell us we do not want to spend any more money on foreign aid and then on the other hand tell the outside groups, do not worry, the money for the Wye River agreement will be in the bill, just later, so we can make a presentation that says we do not want to spend money on foreign aid. They do, and they want to take it out of one's Social Security, when they know very well that that money is going to be in this bill but at a time that will not be in time for the Wye River agreement. That is why I have a serious concern.

The commitments for the assistance to the parties made at Wye River have become even more important now given the new timetable outlined in the Sharm-El-Sheikh agreement. This agreement calls for the completion of the framework status negotiations by February of next year.

The Wye funds are targeted to fund critical activities for both Israel and the Palestinians. It would make these negotiations more viable.

There are conflicting messages, as I said, coming from the other side about whether the Wye agreement, Wye funding would occur this fall. I for one say it is very, very important for us to have the money in this bill. Let us be honest with the American people about what funding is necessary for us to honor our commitments.

There are also other cuts in the allocation that are serious in addition: Two hundred twelve million dollars or 31 percent is cut from the President's request for democratization and economic recovery programs in Africa, Latin America, and Asia that are meant to give the administration tools to respond to new threats and crises.

Five hundred million dollars is cut from international banking lending programs to the poorest countries in the world, including from IDA, the Asia America Development Bank, InterAmerican Bank, and from the environmental mitigation programs of the global environmental facility. Eighty-seven million dollars is cut from debt relief programs. The additional resources the administration requested to fund the new historic G-7 plan for debt relief has not even been considered.

Two hundred ninety-seven million dollars was cut from the New Independent States programs, severely cutting back on the funding for combined threat reduction initiative. Also cutting funds for pro-reform governments, nongovernmental democratic reforms, and nuclear threat reductions. And \$80 million is cut from the request for the Ex-Im bank which helps American companies sell their products abroad.

I enumerate some of these cuts for the following reasons: Three of the pillars of our foreign policy which ensure our national security are stopping the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This bill cuts the funding for that.

Promoting democratic values throughout the world so that we are dealing with democratic governments, not authoritarian regimes which attack their neighbors and oppress their people. That funding is cut from this bill.

The funding for the Ex-Im Bank. One of the pillars of our foreign policy is growing our economy by promoting our exports abroad. That funding is cut \$80 million in the Ex-Im Bank alone.

When we are cooperating with other countries to help them grow their economies and promote their democracies, we are doing what is the right thing. But we are also developing markets for U.S. products abroad.

All of what we talk about in this bill is in the national interest of the United States. We are a great country. We are probably the greatest country that ever existed on the face of the earth. Yet, we act like pikers. We do not understand what our responsibilities are in the world when it comes time to living up to our responsibilities. Certainly we intend to save Social Security. We intend to save it first.

The Democrats will be second to none in saving Social Security. But do not hand this Congress and this country a bill of goods to say that my colleagues are not going to spend the money on the Wye River agreements when we know that they are. If they were not going to, there would be no way an organization like AIPAC would be supporting this bill, as the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) indicated that they were. They know they have a guarantee that that money will be there.

Well, we want it there now when it is in time for the February framework talks. We want our colleagues to be honest with this Congress about how much money will be spent.

When they do the Wye River money, are they contending that that money will be coming out of the Social Security account? If they are contending it when we are proposing it, then they have to contend it then. I do not think it is in either case.

So I encourage our colleagues to let us be honest about what we are talking about here today. Let us live up to our responsibilities. I said earlier today, the city I am proud to represent, San Francisco, was named for Saint Francis. The prayer to Saint Francis is our anthem.

The first line is familiar to my colleagues while they may not recognize its title. That is, "Oh, Lord, make us a channel of thy peace."

Our country can be a channel of peace in the Middle East, in the Balkans, in Northern Ireland, and other places throughout the world, but we cannot do it unless we have the resources to commit to promoting pro-democratic reform and stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass de-

struction. And we cannot do it unless we have the appropriate tools for the administration to carry out that great mandate that our country has.

Why should we, this great country, be about the last per capita in terms of the assistance and the cooperation we provide to other countries in the world?

So let us heed the words of John F. Kennedy who at his inauguration, my colleagues may be tired of hearing me say this, but it is my clarion call. Following his very famous statement, "My fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." The very next sentence said, "Citizens of the world, ask not what America can do for you; but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind."

For the freedom of mankind, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill until we can come back to the floor with a product that we can all be proud of, and we can all support. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out just how small a part of the Federal budget this foreign cooperation and assistance is. It is this little blue line in this big yellow pie.

So we are not talking about an opportunity cost for anyone in America taking money from anything else. What we are talking about is investing in a way that it rebounds to the benefit of every person in our country in terms of peace and freedom and exports abroad for America.

So I urge my colleagues to see what a small percentage, less than 1 percent, less than 1 percent, 0.68 percent of the national budget is spent on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I might just address the chart that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was talking about, that little sliver of pie. What she fails to say is that, included in our foreign aid policy is foreign assistance in the form of the military.

Every time there is a problem in the world, they call on the United States of America. They called on us in Kosovo. They called on us at Desert Storm. They called on us at Haiti. Part of that pie must be expanded.

That sliver becomes almost half the pie of our domestic spending because we utilize our military as foreign assistance to these countries who cannot afford to defend themselves, including Israel, because every time Israel is in trouble, the United States of America, where do my colleagues think we get the money for those missiles to shoot down those missiles that Saddam Hussein was shooting, that is part of our foreign assistance. No country can stand up to the United States of America when it comes to spending money to protecting and helping our allies.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. He is exactly right. Very much of the military budget is for foreign aid purposes and for foreign policy purposes. How much more expensive it is to go into an area because our foreign policy did not work.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), one of the members of our subcommittee, a man very knowledgeable in all aspects of foreign policy.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2606, the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations Bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies.

As a member of the subcommittee, I want to again commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for the outstanding work that he has done, hard work. Shepherding an appropriations bill, particularly this bill, to the process is no easy task. Yet, he has done it with diligence and impartiality, and he has done it, frankly, with extraordinary fairness, I think; and I commend him for that.

I also, of course, want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member. I am disappointed that she is going to oppose this bill.

But I want to thank the staff as well who have contributed so much to bringing this bill to the floor in a shape I think that is satisfactory.

From the beginning, we have worked in a bipartisan fashion to craft a foreign operations bill that reflects our Nation's international priorities, and the chairman mentioned those, while adhering to the budget constraints that we face today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight on a provision in the conference report designed to prevent back-door implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Despite what was said during consideration of the rule, in no way does this provision prevent the United States from engaging developing countries under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change signed by President Bush in 1992 and ratified by the Senate. Specifically, Articles 4, 6, and 17 allow voluntary measures and give developed country parties authority to engage in international education, listen carefully, international education, develop technologies, promote sustainable development, and assist vulnerable developing countries.

I point out to my colleagues that not one of these activities arises out of the Kyoto Protocol.

The funding prohibition states that no fund shall be used to implement or prepare to implement the Kyoto protocol.

□ 1745

Not one of the aforementioned diplomatic activities arising out of the U.N. Framework Convention is prevented by this prohibition.

The administration is free to engage developing countries under the U.N. Framework Convention. However, the administration cannot cross the line and engage other nations regarding ratification and implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, which the United States deems totally unworthy of ratification and implementation.

The conference report was crafted, again, in a bipartisan fashion and taking into consideration all of the views, certainly of everybody in this House. And the subcommittee, I think, has worked very well to bring all this together. We need to unite behind this fair bill that will maintain U.S. leadership and strengthen our influence across the globe.

I ask for Members certainly on the other side to rethink their thoughts about voting against this bill. We need to support this conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and a champion for democracy and peace throughout the world.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, reluctantly, to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, during the August debate, I was quite clear in expressing my strong reservations about this foreign aid bill. But I voted for it, hoping that some of the most egregious funding cuts would be remedied in conference and the overall flaws in the bill would be repaired through bipartisan negotiations.

I want to commend my friend and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and our ranking member and my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for their hard work in crafting this bill. Despite their best efforts, however, I believe that this bill, plagued by poor funding levels from the start, still has serious problems.

The \$12.6 billion measure remains \$2 billion under the President's request, \$1 billion below last year's level. Passing an inadequate foreign aid package will severely harm the United States' ability to maintain its position of leadership in world affairs.

And referring to the comments before of my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), in my judgment it will be a costly mistake. Conflict and problems that could be avoided with a modest allocation today may turn into expensive crises down the road. I would think that by now we should all have learned that lesson.

Let me take a moment to highlight a few of the conference report's biggest problems, in my judgment. First, the Wye River aid package is nowhere to be

found. Implementation of the Wye agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians is now on track and steadily moving forward. Both sides have begun to act on their commitments, and we must act on ours. But we have received no commitment from the leadership to include Wye in this fiscal year. Waiting until the spring for a supplemental is just unacceptable. This is a priority of the United States foreign policy, and it should be addressed immediately. Now is a dangerous time to turn our backs on the Middle East.

Secondly, debt relief in this bill is woefully underfunded. A debt relief program for the highly indebted poorest countries is not even authorized.

To further burden the poorest of the poor, the bill cuts \$175 million from the International Development Association. IDA is the primary World Bank lender on primary health care, basic education, microcredit, and a number of other critical development programs.

And in a final blow to the poorest of the poor, the bill provides \$22 million less than the President's request for international organizations and programs. This will be disastrous for the United Nations Development Program, which attacks the roots of poverty by creating jobs, promoting economic growth, and providing education and basic social services. Underfunding this program will decrease our contribution to UNDP and will decrease United States leadership in this critical organization.

The list of underfunded accounts is too long to enumerate. The bill is not good for our programs in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and throughout the world.

I stated very clearly during the initial House debate on this measure that my continued support was contingent upon an increase in overall funding levels and inclusion of the Wye aid package. I had high hopes that we would craft a final package that would merit everyone's support. But, regrettably, I must oppose this measure. I think we can do better, and I think that in the interest of our national security we need to try.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this conference report. Let us hope we can get back together again, work in a bipartisan way, and meet our priorities. The United States is the leader of the world. And, again, I think by investing now, we are saving millions and millions of dollars later on.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the foreign operations conference report, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee

on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for performing magnificently under very difficult circumstances.

I especially commend the gentleman from Alabama for the sections in his bill on family planning. While the gentleman has differing views, this bill clearly reflects the will of the House on U.S. contribution for the U.N.'s Population Fund.

Next week, the 6 billionth person will be born on this planet. When I was born, we had just over 2 billion people. World population is growing at such a rapid pace, we will likely have to support 12 billion people before our world's population stabilizes. It is long past due that we address this problem by rejoining the UNFPA.

I also want my colleagues to know that while this bill regrettably does not have the vital Wye River Accord Middle East Peace funding, it does contain over \$5 billion in current funding for our partners in the Arab-Israeli peace process. No one really doubts that Congress will eventually approve the Wye River Accord funding, which the gentleman from Alabama supports. And I am confident that that will happen. What is important to remember now is that this bill contains the full regular funding for our Israeli allies and their partners in peace.

This foreign operations appropriations legislation fully funds the administration's request to wage our war on drugs at its source and continues vital support for the International Fund for Ireland to promote economic justice at a critical point in the peace process.

I also commend the chairman and his committee for sustaining other key programs to support microenterprise development programs. These programs are the only ones that truly work in reaching the poorest of the poor throughout the world.

Moreover, this bill contains important funding to fight the spread of highly contagious tropical diseases. Our country already suffers from the AIDS epidemic that swept out of central Africa. My home State of New York now suffers from a new outbreak of encephalitis. We are going to have to fight these diseases far from our shores to prevent future outbreaks of that nature.

On the whole, this legislation is a good compromise, supporting our key allies in programs with the limited resources we have in this year's budget. We all wish we could do more, but we are also committed to protecting Social Security and other important social programs. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this foreign operations appropriations legislation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished ranking Democratic member on the House Subcommittee on Domestic and



International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her wonderful leadership in international relations and foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the conference report for H.R. 2606, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. This bill makes drastic cuts in vital foreign assistance programs and endangers the lives of millions of children and families who live in poverty in Africa and Latin America.

This conference report cuts funding for debt relief for poor countries to only \$33 million. That is \$87 million below the President's request. Moreover, it completely eliminates funding for the Highly Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC, initiative that provides debt relief to countries that desperately need it.

Last week, the International Monetary Fund, IMF, held its 1999 annual meeting right here in Washington, D.C. At this meeting, President Clinton announced his support for the cancellation of 100 percent of the debts owed by poor countries to the United States. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I applaud the President's decision; and I urge Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to make full debt cancellation a reality.

Many impoverished countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in essential social services, such as health and education, in order to make payments on their debts. In Tanzania, debt service payments in 1997 were equal to nine times the spending on basic health services and four times the spending on basic education. In Nicaragua, over half of the government's revenue was allocated to debt service payments in 1997. This was equivalent to 2½ times the spending on health and education combined. Now is the time for Congress to cut debt relief funding.

This inhumane conference report cuts funding for the African Development Fund to \$77 million. That is \$50 million below the administration's request. The African Development Fund is a vitally important program which provides low-interest loans to poor countries in Africa. Furthermore, the conference report also cuts funding for the African Development Bank, which provides market-rate loans to qualifying African countries.

The conference report also cuts refugee assistance to \$625 million, which is \$35 million below the administration's request. There are 6 million refugees and internally displaced people in Africa today. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said recently that the world is neglecting the plight of African refugees. Now is not the time to cut funding for refugees.

I just want to say that some people who would like to make it difficult for us to get up here and be advocates for other parts of the world would have us believe that we are taking the taxpayers' money and we are literally throwing it at undeserving people. Well, I do not think that is true. We are leaders, and we should act like leaders and do the right thing by these very poor countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on this conference report.

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

There has been a lot of conversation about debt forgiveness for these poorer nations or developing countries. Let me tell my colleagues when that came to our attention. Two weeks ago, as we were in the middle of our conference, then the President requested that we include an additional \$900 million. That was right after his trip to Africa where he took the 1,700 people with him and at the same time spent \$47 million of taxpayer money entertaining his friends in Africa. Then he comes back and says we want an additional billion dollars to forgive debt.

Let me tell my colleagues where that debt came from. The World Bank loaned it to these countries. So what we are saying is, we are going to forgive these countries and pay back the World Bank. We have already given the money to the World Bank. The World Bank made a bad investment, because these people cannot repay their loans. Now we are saying let us forgive their debts and open up their books to the poor where they will be more solvent and can borrow more money.

They are not willing to say we will not borrow more money and get right back in the same shape we are in. When the people who borrowed the money that were running these countries at that time absconded, they did not spend it on the bridges; they did not spend it on health care. They took the money, and they put it in Swiss banks. So now they want us to forgive the debt. Well, maybe that would be the right way to go if they would agree not to borrow any more money.

But the point is that personifies the argument I have been making about the President's foreign policy trips. He goes overseas, and he takes 1,700 of his closest friends with him, with the taxpayers paying the bill. They go over there and hold the glasses of wine up, and the President says, relief is coming. And then he comes back and he calls me, and he tells me to include \$900 million more than what I have already requested.

□ 1800

And then it becomes an obligation. All of my colleagues, my great friend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), which are standing up saying fulfill the President's request. He just requested it a couple of weeks ago.

So how can we wait every week for the President to make another trip and come back and say, SONNY, now we need some money for Macedonia. Now we need some money for Albania. Whenever he goes, he comes back with a commitment he thinks that we must respond to.

So we can talk about all of this debt forgiveness we want. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) mentioned the African Development Bank, said we cut them. We did not cut them. We gave them \$1 million. We got zero last year. So we actually gave them more money than we got last year. And that was at the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON). He came back, and said we need to do this. So we gave it to them. Now they are saying, That is not enough. Now we need another \$2 billion.

Well, if we carry this thing over for another week or if we carry it over to October 21 when the continuing resolution comes out, good Lord, the President might make another trip and then the \$2 billion he is requesting is going to turn into \$3 billion. So let us go ahead and pass this thing today. Tell the President to catch up, slow down on his trips, slow down on his promises, and let us keep this budget balanced, keep Social Security intact, and maintain a strong national defense.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), a leader in international relations for our country, a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that I have a great deal of affection for both the chair and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Even as we speak, my office is seeking to facilitate one of the chairman's most recent requests.

But even though ever since Mr. CALLAHAN has become chairman of that Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have never before voted against a foreign operations bill or a conference report. I am compelled to do so now.

There are only two groups of people who should oppose this conference report: one are people who hate foreign aid, because this is \$12.7 billion of foreign aid; the other group are the people who like foreign aid, because this bill is woefully inadequate to meet the needs we have now.

That is not the fault of the chairman. He was given an allocation. He has done as well as he could possibly have done with that allocation. But the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) have all pointed out defects in this bill.

I want to focus on one particular item in the bill that is \$1.9 billion less than the President requested, a cut of

more than 13 percent. We are not talking 1 percent here, 3 percent, a 13 percent cut from the President's request, a billion dollars below last year's funding level, and when we count for inflation, way below any other bill that the chairman has asked us to vote for in the past.

But on the particular issue that he has spoken about with respect to the Middle East, this bill does not meet the administration's request or the interests that are served by promoting the peace process in the Middle East. Because this bill includes no funding for the Wye plantation supplemental request of the administration.

Now, some in the leadership on the other side say, oh, well, we will do that later. And I say, when? This year? And they say, oh, no, no, not necessarily. It might be next year. And I say to not do the Wye supplemental, to not appropriate those monies before the February framework agreement is to tell both parties that America's commitments cannot be accounted on, that the sacrifices and the compromises that need to be made cannot be carried out because the funding will not be there.

Who knows what is going to happen next spring or next summer when the Republican leadership may choose to bring up a supplemental, and who knows what will be in that supplemental. This is the time to deal with it. This is when we are concluding our budget request. This accord is being implemented as the parties agree now, and we can do no less than to try to fund something that is so essential to American foreign policy interests.

I urge a no vote on the conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who is a super guy and good friend of mine. And it has nothing to do with friendship, but I might tell my colleagues, he mentioned that there would be certain groups of people and mentioned how they ought to vote.

Let me tell my colleagues, there are some other groups of people they might consider, too. We might consider that they are the fiscally responsible group, those people who think that we ought to continue to have a surplus rather than creating another deficit as we encountered during the first, I guess, 30 years before we took charge of this House. So we have the fiscally responsible group who ought to vote for this bill because it reduces foreign aid.

Secondly, we have those of us who think that we ought to make absolutely certain that Social Security remains solvent. Who knows, we might even be able to solve the notch-baby problem if indeed we can make certain that Social Security is solvent. Who knows what the future holds there.

There are those of us who want to maintain a surplus instead of the deficit that we experienced for the 40

years before we finally, just during the last 2 or 3 years, reached this magnificent level of a surplus instead of a deficit. So there are many groups that ought to look at this bill from many different points of view.

One of them, those who want to protect Social Security, those who want to maintain a surplus instead of going back to deficit spending, those who want to protect the national defense, because one suggestion came that we take away money from the national defense and give it to foreign aid. This is a good bill.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the Democratic ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the charm of the chairman of the committee and the grace of the gentlewoman from California. I do not.

But let me say it as plainly as I can. It is not the fault of the chairman. They have got a disastrous budgetary process forced on them by the whip and the leadership of their party. They refused to really sit down and work out a bipartisan proposal. And the failure of this particular bill will cost us an enormous amount of more money.

We spent a billion dollars under George Bush in Haiti trying to deal with refugees that was flooding Florida, as the chairman of the full committee understands. We spent \$61 billion on the Gulf War. We got a lot of that back. But we had to lay out most of it up front. We have spent \$5 billion on Kosovo.

My colleagues do not want this President to travel. I have watched the President travel from Ireland to Israel. Wherever this President has traveled, America's interests have succeeded; and he has moved the peace process forward. We ought to encourage him to continue to do that because it is better for America.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the good friend of mine to tell him that I do not mind the President traveling. I think the President should travel.

We all know that in the last year and a half of any presidential term, especially when he is a lame duck, that every President wants to build up an international image. So we can expect the President to travel. I encourage that.

Use Air Force One, that magnificent airplane. Fly all over the world. Impress people. But do not take 1,700 people with him, do not spend \$47 million every time the wheels touch down; and every time a glass of wine is raised, do not promise these countries the moon and expect it to be an obligation on the part of the Congress of the United States to fund.

So let me encourage the President to travel. I wish he would go ahead and be

gone this week. We could probably settle all this stuff if he would just take a trip. Just do not take 1,700 people with him. Do not take a blank checkbook and make all these promises and expect me to come before this floor and convince the American people that they ought to cut back on their spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say I should have added "charm". I wish I was as articulate, but the proposition of my colleagues is wrong. We have got a proposal before us that does not meet America's interest. We ought to vote this down and come back with a bipartisan solution that deals with America's foreign policy interests. I thank the gentleman for his graciousness.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the gentleman would yield himself some more time so he could yield to me. He is so generous.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds in order to facilitate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as I have facilitated her at every segment of this process.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been most gracious. It is just that there is not enough money in the bill to meet our international responsibilities. But I did want to point out because the gentleman said that the President asked for \$900 million. That, as the gentleman knows, is not just for this year but over a period of time.

I also want to make sure I am inferring correctly from the remarks of the gentleman that since we are not going to spend any more money that there will be no money for the Wye Agreement. That is the conclusion that I draw from the statements that have been made by the gentleman and the other speakers from his side.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleague that the Wye Agreement request was not in the President's request. He did not submit that in the budget he sent over here. That came as an afterthought. And now we are saying, well, the President not only wants \$2 billion more, he wants \$2 billion plus the Wye monies. So we are really talking about the President wanting \$4 billion more than what is suggested here in this debate.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I heard during the debate on the rule that we do not want to spend our money

abroad, that we should not be spending all these tax dollars. Well, I suggest that we spend more money here at home that will have an effect all over the world.

I suggest that we do that by spending more money on the Peace Corps. It may sound like a broken record, but the Peace Corps has been our most effective and most popular foreign aid program.

The President requested more money for the Peace Corps because of the demand out there by the countries in which it serves up. The countries want us and American citizens want to participate in the Peace Corps. The only thing that is holding us from supplying that demand is the money that we appropriate.

Now, it is not the fault of this House. It has been terrific. The chairman of the committee has been terrific. But it is the appropriators on the other side. I suggest that those Americans who are interested in the Peace Corps and want more money in the Peace Corps ought to be petitioning the Members on the other side, particularly the appropriators, to put at least as much money in the budget as the House has.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the ranking member the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the time and certainly thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for his very evenhanded approach to drafting the House version of the foreign operations bill under very tight budget constraints.

Unfortunately, the conference report further cuts programs that I feel are vital to serving those who are less fortunate around the world. I guess the questions that many of us are trying to ask today is, if not now, when?

I was in the meeting when the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations met with Prime Minister Barak from Israel, where we gave him the impression that in this foreign operations bill that we would meet some of the Wye money agreement. There is no evidence in this bill that we are going to do that. So, if not now, when will we do it?

We made commitments to the Palestinian authority. If not now, when will we honor these commitments? We made commitments to the Jordanians. If not now, when will we honor these commitments?

What are the costs associated with peace in the Middle East completely collapsing? Have we measured it in terms of cost to our national defense, to our national security in the Middle East what those costs ultimately will be?

I cannot thank the chairman enough for the \$1 million that he was kind

enough to appropriate to fulfill one of our commitments to the African Development Bank. It is not enough, but it clearly is a start.

I am also seriously concerned about the low level of funding for debt restructuring, only \$33 million, \$87 million below the administration's request.

Many nations in sub-Saharan Africa are suffering from crushing levels of debt, both bilateral and multilateral, and these nations will never become self-sufficient until we help decrease some of these debt levels.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question becomes: If not now, if not in a regular appropriations bill, at what point in time will we begin to measure these deficits in terms of national security, in terms of our obligations beyond our borders so that we can have a sustainable growth and sustainable development in the world, which will ultimately cost us if in fact the development is not sustainable and it is not growing?

□ 1815

I have really enjoyed working on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and I certainly urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this inadequate conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the debate in my office, and I was compelled to come to the floor because I heard the gentleman outline some priorities we as a nation should adhere to, and the first priority should be domestic spending.

Now I have heard a lot of talk today about our responsibility around the world, and I agree we have a severe and awesome responsibility. But at the end of the day some of us who have voted to help Head Start, National Endowment for the Arts on this side of the aisle, that have participated in AIDS funding and things vitally important to our Nation, and I have to hear the demagoguery coming from the other side that we are being cheap?

Let us find out how cheap we have been over these decades. Let us think about the money that went out of our taxpayers' wallets to Duvalier and the Marcoses and all these other regimes that pocketed our money and sent them to Swiss bank accounts.

And let us talk about fiscal stewardship. We are in this Congress trying to save Social Security, and I keep hearing this constant refrain from the other side: we are being cheap. Well, Mr. Speaker, right outside the capitol door there are Vietnam veterans living homeless. We are doing nothing about them. But somehow today in foreign ops we have got to sit here, criticize the leadership, criticize the Republicans, call it a stacked deck. Somehow we are not caring for our overseas commitments. Has anybody asked where

the money is from the IMF that went to the Russian drug lords? Has anybody asked where that cash is?

The taxpayers of the United States of America are home right now paying the bills, and they pay them every April 15, and they pay them every day, and they pay our salaries, and we have to sit here and listen to this nonsense about our commitment and our responsibility.

And I accept the notion we have that, and I respect the President. He has done wonderfully on the Wye accord, he has done wonderfully in Northern Ireland. My God, he has been everywhere in the world, saving the world, helping Africa. God bless America and God bless him. But at the end of the day we have to save our own people's Social Security, we have to provide and protect Medicare, we have to help our children in education. We have to do for our own people at times and sacrifice some of the spending in foreign operations. And I applaud the gentleman for his leadership; I applaud the gentleman from Florida who has done a masterful job on the appropriation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am going to encourage my colleagues to vote against this measure. I will agree with the previous speaker that being a Member of Congress is all about setting priorities, and I will agree with him that the priorities start here at home.

This is a list from a recent Washington Post article that talked about young people in the United States military living on food stamps and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Turns out that there is about 12,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who are eligible for food stamps. Now in the defense authorization bill that was signed today, they got a 4.8 percent increase, but do my colleagues know what? 4.8 percent of nothing is still nothing, and we are not doing enough for them.

This young lady is the wife of a United States marine. Same article. She is picking up a used mattress off the side of the road so that other young marines will have someplace to sleep. 4.8 percent of nothing is nothing.

This is a young Marine lance corporal. His name is Harry Schein. He works two part-time jobs so that he can live on his salary that he earns as a United States marine.

It is all about setting priorities.

In this bill is \$5 billion for two relatively wealthy countries called Israel and Egypt. I happen to think that taking care of those folks is more important. I hope that a majority of my colleagues will think the same way.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

I note that the gentleman from Mississippi was arguing my case. I assume he is supporting the bill because we are trying to save the \$2 billion out of the

national defense that probably some are suggesting that we take in order that we can provide for these military people. With respect to the assistance to Israel and Egypt, it was this chairman that negotiated the reduction that is going to wean Israel from all economic support that then-Prime Minister Netanyahu agreed to. So we cut Israel by \$60 million and \$120 million in economic support, we cut Egypt, and we cut foreign aid.

So the gentleman, no doubt, was arguing in favor of a yes vote on this bill because we are doing exactly what he wants us to do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Commerce and an expert on environmental protection in the world.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I must rise in strong opposition to this bill as it stands, and I would like to alert my colleagues to something they may not know in that this bill unfortunately is infected with one of the host of anti-environmental riders that have really infested our appropriations process this year.

This bill currently has in it language which would shackle and stop the United States of America from negotiating with other countries, particularly developing nations, to try to get them to join us in efforts to stop greenhouse gas emissions from continuing, to do something about global warming. We must move forward to get other nations to join us.

Section 583 specifically says that none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for issuing rules, regulations, decrees or orders for the purpose of implementation or in preparation, in preparation for implementation of the Kyoto treaty. This is a major defect in this bill. Why is it there? We have alerted the committee to this problem, but this language is there because unfortunately there are those who want to act like an ostrich and put our Nation's head in the sands and not deal with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we need to defeat this bill, take this out, and reconsider the issue.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations as well and is very well knowledgeable in the foreign operations aspect of this.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement of managers notes that HIV/AIDS is much more of a problem in Africa than perhaps any other country. It has great consequences for economic and political stability. The Morehouse School of Medicine, which is the only African American school to be started in this century, can be and should be part of the solution as we address this horrible problem of AIDS. The President of Morehouse School of Medicine is the distinguished Dr. Lewis W. Sullivan, the former Secretary of HHS.

And the Senate has earmarked \$5.5 million dollars in this effort. Accordingly, AID must not delay informing a partnership with Morehouse so that AID resources that focus on Africa can be maximized to their fullest extent. There exists a strong community of interests between the people of sub-Saharan Africa and the African-American citizens of our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that in this bill additional new resources were added by the managers to fight HIV/AIDS in Africa?

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yes, that is correct. HIV or AIDS in Africa is a major issue, and Morehouse can certainly play an important role in fighting HIV/AIDS. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia has been able to convey my willingness to assist Morehouse College and especially the gentleman in whose district Morehouse college is, that it is imperative that we have a foreign aid bill in order to facilitate Morehouse, and I hope that the gentleman from Georgia can talk to his colleagues who are interested in seeing Morehouse College participate in this program, of the importance of voting yes on this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. OBEY for 11 years, I believe, was the Chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and is well aware of the challenge that we have.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the time. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years this House has been wrapped around the axle on foreign aid, or at least for 2 of those years because of Mexico City policy. For years those who supported the Mexico City provisions on family planning felt that that was so important that they needed to block assistance to some of the poorest people on the face of the globe. It was so important that they had to stop our payments of debts that we owed to the U.N. for years. It was so important that we had to block our contributions to the IMF in the middle of the Asian financial crisis last year.

But then this morning the Washington Post carries a story which indicates that the majority whip told the Republican caucus last night that they had to pass this bill as is today without Mexico City if they wanted to remain in control of the House of Representatives. So suddenly conviction apparently evaporates. It took us 2 years to learn that? I am really impressed. So much for conviction, so much for principle.

I think we need to understand why this is being done. It is being done so that the majority party can continue

to prevent or to pretend that they are preventing this spending of the Social Security surplus for the coming year. The fact is that my colleagues have already spent, Mr. Speaker, they have already spent almost \$25 billion of next year's Social Security surplus, and they know it even if they do not want to admit it. The soundness of Social Security has nothing whatsoever to do with this bill.

This year and next year we will wind up paying down over \$230 worth of debt. That is far and away the best thing we will have done to strengthen Social Security over the past 20 years. Only our Republican friends on the majority side can take a success like this and turn it into a crisis through false rhetoric. What this bill does do is fail to keep our word in the Middle East, it fails to do everything that we ought to be doing to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons within the former Soviet Union.

It is another of the long list of items by which the majority politicizes foreign policy to the detriment of us all, and it would be funny if it were not so sad. The majority party's budget, the plans which were announced today, declines to meet our responsibilities in housing, it declines to meet our responsibilities in education, it declines to meet our responsibilities in health care, it declines to meet our responsibilities to veterans, and a whole host of other crucial initiatives domestically and internationally.

This bill declines our responsibility to meet our international obligations and to defend our international interests as aggressively as we can. As the gentlewoman has indicated, this bill, under our colleague's level or anybody else's is far less than 1 percent of our total national budget. That is a small price to pay for protecting our national interests around the world, and I think we do a discredit to this body and the political dialog that takes place here when we pretend that this bill has anything whatsoever to do with Social Security.

□ 1830

That is a small price to pay for protecting our national interests around the world, and I think we do a discredit to this body and to the political dialogue that takes place here when we pretend that this bill has anything whatsoever to do with Social Security.

The only people I know who believe that are the people who are saying it. It is a laughing stock to everyone else in the country who hears it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, in doing so I want to point out a couple of issues that have come up in the course of the debate. First, let me say that I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill because it is beneath the greatness of our country.

We have an opportunity for peace in the Middle East, and yet this bill does

not include funding to the Wye River agreement, this historic opportunity. When Prime Minister Barak was here we all commended him, wished him well, and now we have no money to help meet our commitment to the Wye River agreement. Contrary to what has been said here, the President did make a request for the Wye River funding in his February budget submission, so this committee has in a timely fashion had that request.

Not only do we not include the Wye River funding, we removed the \$100 million for Jordan, a commitment that we made to King Hussein with his strong commitment to peace. He gave his life for peace, and we are removing the funding from the bill, while saying all along that it is an emergency that we help Jordan through this transition time. This opportunity in Wye River can be missed if we do not have the money now.

As I say, our colleagues cannot have it both ways. They cannot wink at that constituency that is concerned about Middle East peace with the idea it will be there later, and then say if we put it in today it is coming out of the Social Security fund. That simply is not a straightforward approach to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to save money too. This budget has been declining since the middle 1980s. We have a very low budget figure we are requesting. It is the least we can do for freedom and democracy and peace in the world.

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

Mr. Speaker, at long last we are going to reach that stage where we get to vote on this document. I love this place, and I love the personalities here and the people here. We have so many brilliant people with such diverse opinions that it is interesting to witness, as a Member of this House, the greatness of this House.

The gentleman from Wisconsin used to chair this very committee that I chair. I was a member of his subcommittee. But I will remind him when he was chairman of that subcommittee they created a \$100 billion deficit, in addition to the Social Security monies. Now in the last few years, we have been able to reverse that. And now we have a \$100 billion surplus. What a great accomplishment.

I do not take credit for doing all this by myself. I had a lot of help. The President takes credit for doing a lot of it, and he had a lot of help.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the gentleman that I led the opposition to those budgets 7 years in a row, the Reagan budgets, which saddled this country with \$4 trillion worth of unnecessary debt.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this was during the Clinton administration.

I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the President comes to the Congress, and this President has come to the Congress, and he has requested emergency supplemental assistance for Bosnia, he has requested emergency supplemental assistance for Kosovo, for Honduras, for Nicaragua. Now he is coming with Israel, with the Palestinian Authority and with Jordan. I will remind you also he came back in the middle of last year, in the middle of all of our negotiations, and wanted \$18 billion for the International Monetary Fund. So we have not been discourteous to this President in responding to his needs.

So we have to second guess what this bill does. I am contending it cuts foreign aid. We might second guess what the headlines might be. I do not have to go back to Alabama to apologize to anyone when I say folks, I voted against increasing foreign aid. They seem to like that, when I say to the people of Alabama that we have a more responsible piece of legislation because we are earmarking a great portion of it for child survival, to make certain that the money goes directly to the people we are trying to assist.

So the headlines might be, "Callahan votes to reduce foreign aid." That would be fine with me, if the Mobile paper wants to do that. It might say, "Callahan refuses to respond to the insatiable appetite the President has to spend more money." It might say, "Callahan saves Social Security." It might say, "Congress refuses the President's ridiculous request." We do not know what they will say. You can go home and answer any of the things your constituents want you to hear.

I am telling you, this is a responsible piece of legislation that responds to the needs of the administrative branch of government, while at the same time recognizing the priorities that we, especially on this side of the aisle, have, that we are going to insist that Social Security not be touched, that we are not going to tolerate taking money away from the national defense, as the gentlewoman from California suggested in the Committee on Rules, and giving it to foreign aid, and that we are not going to increase taxes in order to facilitate the whims of this President.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are today. We have a responsible bill. Yes, it cuts foreign aid. It cuts the President's request, it cuts it from last year. It does not raise taxes, it does not touch the Social Security program. As a matter of fact, it compliments that program.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members to vote for this responsible bill, and let us deliver it to the President's desk.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

American spending on our foreign policy priorities represents a tiny percentage of our national budget. It is clear, however, that modest investment in key foreign policy initiatives saves us major expenses when regional problems explode into national security crisis. Un-

fortunately, the bill before us today is vastly underfunded. This measure will only weaken the world leadership of the United States.

I want to take a moment to discuss what I believe is the most glaring omission in this legislation, the lack of any funding to implement the Middle East peace plan signed at Wye. The 1998 Wye Accord was a triumph in U.S. diplomacy. This agreement—which carefully balanced Israeli security considerations with Palestinian economic and territorial gains—put a long-stalled peace process back on track. And the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement, which the parties signed just one month ago, has already led to the implementation of key components of the Wye accord.

A successful Middle East peace process is in the security and economic interests of the United States. Now is clearly not the time for us to renege on the pledges we made at Wye. The \$1.2 billion Wye package would provide critical security assistance to Israel, desperately needed economic aid to the Palestinians, and important economic and social funding for Jordan.

Peace in the Middle East has been a paramount U.S. foreign policy goal for decades. This long-impossible dream is finally becoming a reality. Sadly, the funding bill on the floor today fails to address this exciting opportunity. I must oppose the bill and I hope that new legislation will be brought forward which enables the United States to continue its leadership role in world affairs.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2606—the Conference Report on Foreign Operations Appropriations. The report moves us in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, the conference report moves us into a dangerously low budget from foreign opps. Let me just say that we spend less than 1% on the total foreign aid budget when we spend almost a trillion dollars on defense and other related expenses.

People in my district when polled thought that we spend close to 15% on foreign aid. Recently, Governor Whitman suggested that we cut foreign aid to less developed countries. That's greedy and fails to accomplish what we are all about. How can we take away the meager \$1 a day that we give to 1.3 billion of the people in these nations that depend on this.

The conference agreement, which provides \$12.6 billion in funding, is nearly \$2 billion below the President's request and \$1 billion less than last year's bill. This low level of funding is untenable—it will be impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the world community with an inadequate foreign affairs budget.

Nearly every major account in the conference report is underfunded, and one specific initiative, the Africa accounts, are nonexistent. This omission is particularly troubling, as it signals a lack of support for the recent strides made by the countries in Africa. The Development Fund for Africa (DFA) is being cut almost 40% from last year (512 million). I know the other side will point to the other accounts like Child Survival that has funding for Africa. Let me say that the DFA traditionally supports less developed countries and the grassroots programs. Other egregious funding cuts include: \$175 million cut from essential loan program for the poorest nations; \$157 million cut from global environmental protection projects; \$87 million denied for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries; \$50 million

cut from African development loan initiatives; \$200 million cut from economic development and democracy-building programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; and \$35 million denied for Peace Corps programs, just months after Congress voted to support the expansion of the Peace Corps to 10,000 volunteers.

It is abundantly clear that this Foreign Operations bill just won't work. It will not allow the U.S. to continue to operate its important international programs at current levels, and will undoubtedly detract from the stature of the U.S. in the international community. We have learned from recent events that foreign assistance is a good investment—the dollars we spend today help avoid expensive national security crisis tomorrow. This bill will curtail our ability to help prevent the conflicts and curb the poverty that lead to instability throughout the world.

We cannot adequately pursue our foreign affairs priorities with this conference report. And not only does this bill underfund existing needs, but it ignores emerging global needs, such as earthquake recovery in Turkey and Taiwan, peace implementation in Kosovo, and debt relief for the world's poorest countries. We urge you not to settle for this dangerously underfunded bill. Vote "no" on the Foreign Operations Conference Report.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this conference report to the floor.

While this subcommittee works with one of the smaller allocations, this bill is usually one of the most contentious. The chairman and his staff have done an outstanding job of trying to address numerous concerns while working within the constraints of, what I consider, too small a budget for the important programs that this bill supports. I am pleased that the conference committee continues to recognize the needs of areas of conflict, such as Armenia and Cyprus and I hope that a peaceful settlement will soon be reached in both of these regions.

Further, I strongly support the committee's suspension of military aid to Indonesia and hope that this will be expanded to multilateral assistance until the results of the referendum in East Timor are permanently implemented. Finally, I am pleased with the language in the Statement of Managers supporting biodiversity programs within AID, specifically those implemented through the Office of Environment and Natural Resources, and strongly urge AID to increase funding for these programs to a level proportionally equal to that provided in 1996.

While I am pleased with many of the issues addressed in this bill, I am concerned that the funding for implementation of the Wye Memorandum is not included. This obviously is due to budget constraints and not because of a lack of congressional interest in furthering the Middle East peace process. Israel has made great strides in furthering this process in the last month and I know that the U.S. will find a way to provide the Wye money before the end of the year.

Finally, while I support this bill, I remain concerned with the continued decreases in U.S. foreign assistance. As I have said before, the U.S. is now the sole superpower and world leader. Yet, we are not leading. As our role in the world becomes more important, our budget for foreign operations continues to shrink, thereby, limiting the impact we can have on global development.

It is simply embarrassing. We are the world leader, with the strongest most productive economy in history, yet we continue to refuse payments to global institutions, including the United Nations and World Bank, and provide the smallest amount of foreign assistance to the developing world of any industrial country, in relation to our GDP.

Many of these global institutions were created over 50 years ago and needed reforms to eliminate bureaucracy and changes to update them for the next century. The U.S. was correct in demanding these changes. However, now that many of these reforms have been made, we must live up to our word and pay our contributions. As we refuse payment, we erode our word and reputation. This must stop. I hope that those who are concerned with our multilateral assistance will take a serious look at the progress that has been made in effecting change at these institutions. I believe that they will find that many of their concerns have been addressed.

I look forward to reversing this decline in foreign assistance in the next century and furthering the values that we cherish here—democracy, human rights, rule of law and free markets—to other parts of the world. Again, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Alabama and his staff for their hard work and ultimate success in bringing a free-standing Foreign Operations Conference Report to the floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 211, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Coble	Gilchrest
Archer	Coburn	Gillmor
Armey	Collins	Gilman
Bachus	Combest	Goodlatte
Baker	Cook	Goodling
Ballenger	Cooksey	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Graham
Bartlett	Crane	Granger
Barton	Cubin	Green (WI)
Bass	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Gutknecht
Bereuter	Deal	Hansen
Biggert	DeLay	Hastert
Bilbray	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bishop	Dickey	Hayworth
Bliley	Doolittle	Hefley
Blunt	Dreier	Herger
Boehlert	Duncan	Hill (MT)
Boehner	Dunn	Hilleary
Bonilla	Ehlers	Hobson
Bono	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Horn
Bryant	English	Hostettler
Burr	Everett	Houghton
Burton	Ewing	Hulshof
Buyer	Fletcher	Hunter
Callahan	Foley	Hutchinson
Calvert	Fossella	Hyde
Camp	Fowler	Isakson
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Istook
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Cannon	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)
Castle	Ganske	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Gekas	Kasich
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kelly

King (NY)	Pease	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Petri	Souder
Knollenberg	Pickering	Spence
Kolbe	Pitts	Stabenow
Kuykendall	Pombo	Stearns
Largent	Porter	Stump
Latham	Portman	Sununu
LaTourette	Pryce (OH)	Sweeney
Lazio	Quinn	Talent
Leach	Radanovich	Tancredio
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Reynolds	Terry
LoBiondo	Riley	Thomas
Lucas (OK)	Rogan	Thornberry
McCollum	Rogers	Thune
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Toomey
McInnis	Roukema	Upton
McIntosh	Royce	Vitter
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Walden
Metcalfe	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Mica	Salmon	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Watkins
Miller, Gary	Saxton	Watts (OK)
Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Morella	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Myrick	Shadegg	Weller
Nethercutt	Shaw	Whitfield
Ney	Shays	Wicker
Northup	Sherwood	Wilson
Norwood	Shimkus	Wolf
Nussle	Shuster	Young (AK)
Ose	Simpson	Young (FL)
Oxley	Skeen	
Packard	Smith (MI)	

NAYS—211

Abercrombie	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
Ackerman	Forbes	McDermott
Allen	Ford	McGovern
Andrews	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Baird	Frost	McNulty
Baldacci	Gedden	Meehan
Baldwin	Gephardt	Meek (FL)
Barcia	Gonzalez	Menendez
Barr	Goode	Millender-
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	McDonald
Becerra	Green (TX)	Miller, George
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Minge
Berkley	Hall (OH)	Mink
Berman	Hall (TX)	Moakley
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Blagojevich	Hill (IN)	Moore
Bonior	Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Borski	Hinchee	Murtha
Boswell	Hinojosa	Nadler
Boucher	Hoeffel	Napolitano
Boyd	Holden	Neal
Brady (PA)	Holt	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Hoolley	Obey
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Olver
Capps	Inslee	Ortiz
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Carson	(TX)	Pascarell
Chenoweth-Hage	John	Pastor
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Clayton	Jones (NC)	Pelosi
Clement	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Phelps
Condit	Kaptur	Pickett
Conyers	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Costello	Kildee	Rahall
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Reyes
Crowley	Klecicka	Rivers
Cummings	Klink	Rodriguez
Danner	Kucinich	Roemer
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Lantos	Rush
DeGette	Larson	Sabo
Delahunt	Lee	Sanchez
DeLauro	Levin	Sanders
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Dicks	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dingell	Lofgren	Schaffer
Dixon	Lowe	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lucas (KY)	Scott
Dooley	Luther	Serrano
Doyle	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Shows
Engel	Manzullo	Sisisky
Eshoo	Markey	Skelton
Etheridge	Martinez	Slaughter
Evans	Mascara	Smith (NJ)
Farr	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder

Spratt	Thurman	Waters
Stark	Tierney	Watt (NC)
Stenholm	Towns	Waxman
Strickland	Traficant	Weiner
Stupak	Turner	Wexler
Tanner	Udall (CO)	Weygand
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Wise
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Vento	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer	McKinney	Peterson (PA)
Jefferson	Weeks (NY)	Pomeroy
LaHood	Paul	Scarborough

□ 1900

Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. BARCIA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 480, I was unavoidably detained and was absent during the vote. It was my intention to vote "no" on this rollcall vote.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## LATEX ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I use this occasion to recognize this week as Latex Allergy Awareness Week, October 4 through 10, 1999, and to talk about an important health issue, an issue which directly affects a constituent of mine, 9-year-old Jimmy Clark of River Forest, Illinois, whose parents have become leading crusaders to make the public aware of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Clark lives with an ailment that is virtually unrecognized by most Americans and the medical community. Jimmy is latex sensitive. Yes, Jimmy is latex sensitive. He is at risk for serious and potentially fatal allergic reactions when exposed to products made from natural latex.

It is critical that we become fully aware and acknowledge the broad and problematic scope of this issue which the American Academy of Dermatology has called the next major health concern of the decade.

Something as simple as eating lunch in his school's cafeteria could be fatal to Jimmy, since latex gloves are commonly used in the food service industries. Jimmy and others like him are allergic to thousands of items ranging from the balloons at his best friend's birthday party to the examining gloves in an ambulance or at a doctor's office.

It is heartbreaking to know that for thousands of American citizens like Jimmy, that exposure to even these seemingly harmless items could cause him to die. He cannot even receive needed medical treatment or enjoy eating lunch at school without fear of exposure to potentially deadly latex particles.

Reactions to exposure include immediate allergic reactions from skin contact resulting in itching and hives. Reactions to the airborne latex particles include inflammation of the eyes, shortness of breath, asthma, dizziness, and rapid heart rate.

The most severe cases can result in severe blood pressure drop and loss of consciousness. Latex allergy develops most commonly in people who have frequent or intimate exposure to it. At high risk are those who have had frequent surgical procedures, particularly in infancy and workers with occupational exposure, especially to latex gloves. A history of allergies or hay fever also may be a significant risk factor.

Some studies suggest that some individuals who have had dermatitis or

rash and wear latex gloves may be at greater risk. Although the American public knows little about latex allergy, the last 5 years have shown increasing evidence that latex allergy has become a major occupational health problem which has become epidemic in scope among highly exposed health care workers and among others with significant occupational exposure. This is largely because the use of latex rubber has increased, especially in medical devices, because latex is used as a disease-prevention barrier.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting who or what is at fault. Nor am I suggesting that latex is not an effective instrument in protecting humans from life-threatening diseases. I am suggesting that we need to increase research in this area and find ways to spare the citizens of this country from unnecessarily developing latex sensitivity.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that an increased awareness will go a long ways towards helping find a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that our researchers work cooperatively to achieve the right solution, a solution not influenced or marred by special interests from different sides of the spectrum, but a solution developed for those most affected by the disease.

Latex allergy organizations and support groups across this Nation have successfully established a State Latex Allergy Awareness Week in several States. I believe once this awareness of this disease increases, our Nation will see with sincere satisfaction the positive results from research and care for those who suffer from its effects. Hopefully, next year as this same time approaches, both Houses will see fit to declare this week National Latex Allergy Awareness Week.

Mr. Speaker, I close by thanking Mr. and Mrs. Clark and Jimmy for stepping up to the plate to help make Americans more aware of a health problem and a societal need. They embody the real spirit of democracy: if not I, then who? If not then, when? I thank both Jimmy and his parents and say to them that River Forest as well as all of America are proud of them.

## ISSUES OF CONCERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on several unrelated but very important topics. First I want to quote from an Associated Press story of a few days ago: "A billion-dollar-a-year air war forgotten by the outside world but droning on over dusty Iraqi towns does not appear to be getting Washington any closer to its ultimate goal of ousting President Saddam Hussein."

The Associated Press story said that we have dropped 1,400 bombs and missiles on Iraq since mid-December in