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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

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

To the Congress of the United States:

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

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

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

To the House of Representatives:

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

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

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

In the short term, H.R. 2606 fails to address critical national security needs. It suggests we can afford to underfund our efforts to keep deadly weapons from falling into dangerous hands and walk away without peril from our essential work toward peace in places of conflict. Just as seriously, it fails to address America's long-term interests. It reduces assistance to nations struggling to build democratic societies and open markets and backs away from our commitment to help people trapped in poverty to stand on their feet. This, too, threatens our security because future threats will come from regions and nations where instability and misery prevail and future opportunities will come from nations on the road to freedom and growth.

By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition. For if we underfund our diplomacy, we will end up overusing our military. Problems we might have been able to resolve peacefully will turn into crises we can only resolve at a cost of life and treasure. Shortchanging our arsenal of peace is as risky as shortchanging our arsenal of war.

The overall funding provided by H.R. 2606 is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan in 1985, and it is 14 percent below the level that I requested. I proposed to fund this higher level within the budget limits and without spending any of the Social Security surplus. The specific shortfalls in the current bill are numerous and unacceptable.

For example, it is shocking that the Congress has failed to fulfill our obligations to Israel and its neighbors as they take risks and make difficult decisions to advance the Middle East peace process. My Administration, like all its predecessors, has fought hard to promote peace in the Middle East. This bill would provide neither the $800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation nor the $500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River Agreement. Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process. We should instead seize this opportunity to support them.

Additional resources are required to respond to the costs of building peace in Kosovo and the rest of the Balkans, and I intend to work with the Congress to provide needed assistance. Other life-saving peace efforts, such as those in Sierra Leone and East Timor, are imperiled by the bill's inadequate funding of the voluntary peacekeeping account.

My Administration has sought to protect Americans from the threat posed by the potential danger of weapons proliferation from Russia and the countries of the former Soviet Union. But the Congress has failed to finance the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI), which is designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction and weapons technologies from falling into the wrong hands and weapons scientists from offering their talents to countries, or even terrorists, seeking these weapons. The bill also curtails ETRI programs that help Russia and other New Independent States strengthen export controls to avoid illicit trafficking in sensitive materials through their borders and airports. The ETRI will also help facilitate withdrawal of Russian forces and equipment from countries such as Georgia and Moldova; it will create peaceful research opportunities for thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists. We also cannot afford to underfund programs that support democracy and small scale enterprises in Russia and other New Independent States because these are the very kinds of initiatives needed to complete their transformation away from communism and authoritarianism.

A generation from now, no one is going to say we did too much to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safeguard their nuclear technology and expertise. If the funding cuts in this bill were to become law, future generations would certainly say we did too little and that we imperiled our future in the process.

My Administration has also sought to promote economic progress and political change in developing countries, because America benefits when these countries become our partners in security and trade. At the Cologne Summit, we led a historic effort to enable the world's poorest and most heavily indebted countries to finance health, education, and opportunity programs. The Congress fails to fund the U.S. contribution. The bill also severely underfunds Multilateral Development Banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from our request. This will virtually double U.S. arrears to these banks and seriously undermine our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. These markets are critical to American jobs and opportunities.

Across the board, my Administration requested the funding necessary to assure American leadership on matters vital to the interests and values of our citizens. In area after area, from fighting terrorism and international crime to promoting nuclear stability on the Korean peninsula, from helping refugees and disaster victims to meetings its own goal of a 10,000-member Peace Corps, the Congress has failed to fund adequately these requests.

Several policy matters addressed in the bill are also problematic. One provision would hamper the Export-Import Bank's ability to be responsive to American exporters by requiring that the Congress be notified of dozens of additional kinds of transactions before the Bank can offer financing. Another provision would allow the Export-Import Bank to operate without a quorum until March 2000. I have nominated two individuals to the Bank's Board, and they should be confirmed.

A third provision could be read to prevent the United States from engaging in diplomatic efforts to promote a cost-effective, global solution to climate change. A fourth provision places restrictions on assistance to Indonesia that could harm our ability to influence the objectives we share with the Congress: ensuring that Indonesia honors the referendum in East Timor and that security is restored there, while encouraging democracy and economic reform in Indonesia. Finally, this bill contains several sections that, if treated as mandatory, would encroach on the President's sole constitutional authority to conduct diplomatic negotiations.

In sum, this appropriations bill undermines important American interests and ignores the lessons that have been at the core of our bipartisan foreign policy for the last half century. Like the Senate's recent vote to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this bill reflects an inexcusable and potentially dangerous complacency about the opportunities and risks America faces in the world today. I therefore am returning this bill without my approval.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, one that maintains our commitment to protecting the Social Security surplus, properly addressing our shared goal of an America that is strong at home and strong abroad, respected not only for our leadership, but for the vision and commitment that real leadership entails. The American people deserve a foreign policy worthy of our great country, and I will fight to ensure that they continue to have one.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half hour to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the purposes of debate only.

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 veto message of the President to the bill, 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.

As my colleagues just heard, the President today vetoed the, I think, very responsible piece of legislation that the House and Senate and conferees worked on for some 6 or 7 months. The bill, I think, was a responsible bill that funded foreign aid at the $12.7 billion level, but did not do so at the expense of any Social Security monies. Basically, Mr. Speaker, it was a freeze at last year's funding levels, and I am amazed that the President now says he cannot live on what we gave him last year and that he wants a 30 or 40 percent increase.

I understand in reading his veto message that he wants about $4 billion more, but what the President does not say, even though he mentions Social Security in his veto message, is where are we going to get the money. So if we do not want to take it out of Social Security, which I am not going to agree to on any bill that I handle, we have other options.

We can increase taxes, which I am not going to have anything to do with either, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to burden the American taxpayers with additional money to help satisfy this insatiable appetite to give away our money that the President has. And, we are not going to take it out of Defense, Mr. Speaker. I know that some have suggested that that might be a way we could do it, but already our Defense budget is suffering, and we cannot afford to reduce our military moneys, because if we are going to comply with every request that the Department of State and the President makes with requests for foreign assistance in every Nation in the world, such as we witnessed in Kosovo, such as we witnessed in many other areas of the world, such as we are now facing in Indonesia, I think it would be a serious mistake to curtail the ability of the national defense, our military, by taking the money away from them.

So what the President does not tell us in his message is he is not suggesting what we do, other than to increase taxes, which we are not going to do. So maybe we are at an impasse.

But let me tell my colleagues something about the bill that the President just vetoed. One of the most popular provisions that I have ever seen since I have been in Congress with respect to the foreign assistance is the child survival account. We increased the child survival account over $70 million this year over the President's request; and yet, he says no, that we ought to maybe take some of the money out of child survival.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues that the American people, while they do not have an appetite to give away their money that they are sending to us to foreign countries to be squandered away, such as reports that have come back about Russia have said have been done, but they do in fact support our efforts to provide food, to provide medical assistance, to provide educational opportunities for those children who live in nations which cannot afford to provide them with this.

So, they encourage this. Dozens of letters, hundreds of letters, thousands of communications have come to my office supporting the child survival account, supporting this type of foreign assistance. The American people support this. So what the President is suggesting is that we cut back maybe on child survival, and we are not going to do that. So he has left me no alternatives.

The President, in his original message, for example, suggested that we cut Israel by $30 million. We said no, we are not going to do that, that Israel has been an ally of the United States, that we want peace in the Middle East. There was some question about the Wye monies. The President went out to the Wye Plantation, when those efforts were beginning to fall to pieces, and it looked like that the Palestinians and the Israelis were going to walk out of there without some agreement, and it is my understanding that he volunteered to just give them $2 billion. Look, we will help you. We will give you $2 billion.

So he goes out there, and then he comes back and he says, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I do not consider that an obligation. When the President goes to one of these meetings and raises his glass of wine and toasts these leaders and tells them, I will give you $2 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund, we are not going to stand for that. But that is exactly what he said.

In speaking with Mr. Netanyahu right after that meeting, Mr. Netanyahu told me he did not ask for the money, that the money was volunteered. Well, maybe that is good foreign policy, but I do not think that it is.

One thing I think is good foreign policy is for the Congress not to get too involved in dictating to the administration what they are going to do and where they spend the money. For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, I have worked, argued with Members of this body about earmarking monies, about policy in the bill, trying to give this administration the flexibility and the latitude that they need to have an effective foreign policy. So I have tried my darnedest to give the President all of the room that he needs to maneuver, to adjust, to reprogram, to do whatever with the $12.7 billion, for example, that we recommended be appropriated this year.

Now, all of a sudden, the President says, I do not care whether or not you are helping me with policy; I do not care whether or not you have taken out all of those obnoxious earmarks; I do not care that you have not hamstringed the administration and Mrs. Albright into trying to go to a foreign country and do the will of 435 Members of Congress. We get no appreciation for that.

The President said there has been a lack of communication. I read in the newspapers this morning where one of his complaints about the whole appropriations process is that there is no communication. But I called the President. I called him, Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago; and I said, Mr. President, this is the same amount of money we gave you last year, and just like every other area of government, you are going to have to live with what we gave you last year. We are not going to increase it. And I talked to the President and I told him about the policy omissions that were not in there which would hamstring his administration; and I promise my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I think I had the President convinced that this was a good bill and that he might sign it.

But, he said, let me talk to my principals, which I assume that he meant Sandy Berger, who is one of his aides, and Madeleine Albright, who is Secretary of State. And I said, well, I will tell you what, Mr. President. That is all right with me. But before you talk with them about this issue that I have just explained to you, let me come over there and tell them what I have just told you. And he says, that is a good idea, Sonny. Let me call you back.

Well, the President never called back. Sandy Berger called me out of a restaurant about 9:30 at night the next night and said, the President asked me to call you and tell you that he reluctantly says he is going to have to veto your bill. You see, they did not want me in the same room with Sandy Berger and Madeleine Albright. They did not want me in the room with the President putting forth the same arguments that I am telling you about today. Instead, they wanted to tell the President well, this might have a political advantage. Do not worry about this; we will get more money. All we have to do is back old CALLAHAN down.

□ 1745

Well maybe that is good strategy, but the President cannot say to anybody that I have refused to communicate with him and work with him when I did every single thing that Jack Lew, one of his other assistants, wrote me and told me to do with respect to policy.

The only issue he has is that this is not enough money. Well, I am sorry, Mr. President. Tell me where to get it, but do not come up with this same old nonsense about you are going to raise taxes to do it; you are going to raise fees to do it; you are going to take it out of the national defense or you are going to take it out of Social Security,

because I am not going to have any part of that. So we are at a stalemate.

Now here we are having to start all over because we do not have the votes to override the President's veto. It has turned into a partisan issue. Whereas most every Democrat, when the bill initially passed the House, voted for it, now they say that the policy provisions are insufficient; they want $2 billion, $4 billion more money. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where we are going to get it.

I have thought about some strategy of my own. I mentioned when the bill was passed and we sent it to the President for his signature that every time somebody walks in the White House with a turban on his head that the President gets a glass of wine, gives it to the king or whoever he is talking to, then they stand there in the Oval Office or wherever they stand in the White House and they clink those glasses together and lo and behold the President says, ''Let me give you a little bit of money.''

So the president or king or whoever he is, walks out and he goes back to his country and he says, ''The President promised me some money,'' and then the President calls up here and says, ''Sonny, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I made this commitment to this king, to this president.'' And that is not right. That is not an obligation of the United States of America.

In fact, I think I am going to call the President, and I am going to go down to the White House one day this week. But before I go, I am going to buy me one of those turbans. And I am going to walk in the Oval Office with that turban on my head. And I am going to suggest to the President that we each get a glass of wine, and I am going to tell him that I am representing the senior citizens of this country, that I am representing the taxpayers of this country, and that I am representing the people who are concerned about Social Security, and let us have a toast. Let us toast that we are not going to take this $4 billion off the backs of the senior citizens or off of our national defense and we are not going to raise taxes.

Then the President can come over here and say, ''Well, we have an obligation. I made a toast, and therefore you Congress people are obligated not to raid Social Security, not to increase taxes, not to take money out of Social Security.''

So maybe I will try that strategy of going to the White House with a turban on my head and suggesting to the President that we, indeed, ought to keep this $12.7 billion where it is.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman very diplomatically said he does not know where the President is planning to come up with this money, but it is true, it is reality, we do not have to kid ourselves, he is talking about transferring money out of the Social Security trust fund.

It is going to be real hard for me to go home and tell my grandmother that, ''You know what, today you are going to have a little bit less money in your trust fund because the President wants to send it to foreigners.'' I can envision the conversation.

''Oh, you mean Americans who live in foreign countries who paid into Social Security?''

''No, ma'am.''

''What do you mean going overseas with my Social Security money?''

''Well, the President wants to send it to India and Pakistan and Russia and North Korea, and all of these kinds of places, grandmother. What do you think about that?'' And she is going to be horrified.

The reality is, we need not kid ourselves, what the President of the United States said today to America's seniors, we want to get the money out of the Social Security trust fund and send it overseas to foreign governments and many governments who are not always friendly to the United States, and that is a direct affront to American taxpayers.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It is an affront to me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting to see what is going to be going on in the heat that will be turned up in this cool fall in Washington, D.C. The President is vetoing bills because they do not spend enough. There is simply no other explanation for his action. He wants more money. Some had said he wanted $2 billion, he wanted $4 billion more.

According to the White House, the President is vetoing this bill because he thinks there is not enough spending in it. According to the White House, $12.6 billion is not enough money; but if this is not enough, I only have one simple question: Where does the President think more money will come from?

Day after day, the President walks up to the television cameras and says that tough choices need to be made, but then all he suggests is skyrocketing spending increases. That is not a tough choice. That is the easy way out.

Times have changed here in Washington. Even the President claimed not so long ago that the era of big government was over. If this is true, the tough budget decisions that need to be made must be to restrain spending, not increase it. Money does not just fall from the trees. It is not the President's money.

There are only two ways to maintain a balanced budget, three ways actually, and pay for the President's big government spending increases. He can either raise taxes, and I can say unequivocally this House is not going to raise taxes for more government spending. The President can raid Social Security surpluses. We are not going to do that. Even the President says he does not want to do that. There is only one other way he could get more spending increases, and that is to find cuts in other parts of the budget.

Frankly, if the leadership goes down to the White House tomorrow I think the message is going to be, ''Mr. President, we are not spending one dime of the Social Security surplus. Mr. President, we are not going to raise taxes for more government spending. Mr. President, if you want more spending, then tell us how to pay for it. Where are you going to cut it from? Where are you going to move money around? How are you going to pay for it?''

All he said in his veto message was there is just not enough spending. He wants more spending.

Now, the President vetoed this bill and he said that he wants a whopping 30 percent increase in foreign aid. Make no mistake about it, every dime of this increase, without offsets and cuts in other spending come directly out of the Social Security surplus.

I think this is so shortsighted. Raiding tomorrow's generations to cover the excesses of today robs America of its future. The Republican budget plan is committed to balancing the budget without raiding Social Security or raising taxes to do it, and we can say it over and over until we turn blue in the face. The President says we are already into the Social Security surplus. That is another Clintonism, Mr. Speaker. We are not into the Social Security surplus.

They get a CBO letter that uses false assumptions that we are not doing, and they wave the letter around saying we are spending the Social Security surplus. We are not there. This House is not going to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the budget will not balance itself. We in Congress are working very hard and making the responsible decisions for the future of America. All they are doing at the White House is throwing mud and hopes it sticks.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just borrowed the Constitution from the parliamentarian. I did not really need it because I am sure everyone in this room has memorized the preamble to it. ''We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.''

All of those goals stated in the preamble to the Constitution about insuring the safety of our country and the security of it and its future for our children are undermined by this foreign operations bill, and I salute President Clinton for his veto.

Although the Clerk has already read the veto message in its entirety, I want to call some specifics to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this foreign operations bill undermines the goals of our preamble to the constitution. President Clinton said it so well in his veto statement when he said, ''The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel danger, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

''This bill rejects all of those principles.

''It implies that we are too small and too insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and our prosperity.''

The President goes on to say that, ''By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition,'' and an expensive one, I might add.

''The overall funding provided in this bill is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan,'' which this Congress supported; half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan.

There are many concerns that I will just briefly address about it, that the President mentions. He mentions that, ''This bill would provide neither the $800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation,'' for the Wye River agreement, ''nor the $500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River agreement.

''Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process.''

In addition, the bill is short in funding for economic support to the multilateral development banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from the President's request. This would virtually double the arrears. We are trying to have debt forgiveness. We are trying to go into the next century, the next millennium, giving these countries a chance, working with them, cooperating with them.

This is not about a handout. This is about a hand-up, and it is something that our country says that we profess. It will cost us less in the end if we can obtain markets for our products and promote peace and Democratic institutions in these countries. Ridding them of their debt will help do that. This bill also seriously undermines our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. If for no other reason, if we have no pragmatic sense or practical sense about what this means to us as a country, we do know that these markets, when developed, are critical to American jobs and opportunities. That is so much for what the President had said.

I would like to now talk about what Mr. HASTERT said.

□ 1800

The Speaker, in criticizing the President's veto, made these comments. He called this a responsible foreign aid package that funded our Nation's foreign aid programs at last year's level. Wrong. Wrong. Wrong. No matter how many times our colleagues on this floor in the majority say that this bill is funded at last year's level, it is not.

Our spending last year, when we combine the bill with our supplemental, and the supplemental does not include Kosovo and the Hurricane Mitch supplemental, we are below last year's funding significantly. But then the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) goes on to say that we want to take Social Security money and give this money to foreign nations, and he does it in a very offhand way. He says the Republicans will play no part in this scheme. The Congress will not use Social Security as a pot of gold to fund foreign aid.

This is such an act of desperation. I feel so sorry for this pathetic initiative that is being taken by my colleagues. They have all the big guns rolled out: The Speaker's statement. The whip spoke before I even had a chance to put our statement on the RECORD, and that was fine. I see the distinguished Majority Leader here, and of course the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, coming all out full force to make this statement.

This is an act of desperation by a majority party that does not have a case to take to the American people. The economy domestically is doing great. Unemployment is down. The stock market is up. Inflation is practically negligible, and they have to go find an issue and, how convenient, one with the neoisolationism of their caucus giving them impetus to do this.

This is a very sad day because, frankly, the arguments that my colleagues make about this argue to eliminate all the funding in the bill completely. Why have any foreign aid if this is such a bad idea as we review it?

Mr. Speaker, others will, and I do not have time right now to go into the illusion that my colleagues are trying to present about their not spending Social Security and other aspects of these spending bills. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will go into that and, if I have time, I will later.

But I want to reiterate that this bill is $12.7 billion. Last year, the bill and the supplemental that went with it were $1.1 billion higher. Let us not play a shell game. Let us be honest with the American people about what we are spending, and let us not have a $1.1 billion cut from last year, again not including the Kosovo supplemental or the supplemental on Hurricane Mitch. Let us not have a $1.1 billion cut, which we call a freeze.

In conclusion, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart. This is the total budget of the United States, $1.739 trillion. The foreign aid, as a percentage of the total budget of the United States, is less than 1 percent. In fact, it is .68 percent. With the President's request, it will be brought up to about 8 percent. It is less than 1 percent.

Within that 1 percent is the Export-Import Bank, which finances our exports overseas, creating jobs in the U.S., OPIC, Trade Development Administration, all of those initiatives that promote U.S. trade which have nothing to do with bilateral and multilateral assistance to any other country except the United States. It is all in our national interest. It is less than 1 percent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he shall consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his hard work on this legislative effort. First thing I would observe is the American people are a generous people. We are a kind people. We are a people that have always been willing to sacrifice of our own treasury, of our own resources, indeed of our own lives and our own peace to help the rest of the world obtain peace, safety, and security, and above all freedom. That has not changed.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) points out that our foreign aid budget has decreased as a percentage of the overall American Federal Government's budget over the years, and that is true.

Why has it decreased as a percentage of the overall budget? Not because we Americans have reduced our willingness or, in fact, our contribution to the rest of the world. Indeed, it still is exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world. But because the burdens and the responsibilities that our Government carries within our own country for our own people has grown.

It has grown in Medicare. It has grown in Social Security. It has grown

in Medicaid. It has grown in education. It has grown in defense. It has grown in the environmental concerns we express for this country, and any number of different ways our Government's budget keeps growing. With all of that growth, we maintain a commitment to the rest of the world that is still exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world.

So in that regard, again, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his dedication and his commitment.

Now, yesterday, put all this within the context of where we are today, we had both good news and bad news from the White House. I have to tell my colleagues I was pleased, I was enthusiastic, I was excited when I watched TV yesterday and saw the President's chief of staff, John Podesta, say, ''The President of the United States today shares the commitment that the Republicans in Congress have been fighting for to complete this budget without touching a dime's worth of Social Security for any other purpose.''

This is a historic change in the manner in which we use the taxpayers' money. For 30 years, the Federal Government has taken Americans' Social Security taxes and spent them on other purposes. Last year, for the first time ever, in all those 30 years, that did not happen. Last year, no dime of Social Security was used for some purpose other than Social Security.

We are trying to write a budget for next year that stays the same. This will not happen. It is time to stop the raid. So as we do that, we have to look at every manner in which the Federal Government might spend one's money and say, how can we pare back? Where can we make reductions? How can we engage in trade-offs, accept and set priorities and keep us within this one fundamental limit that we will not complete the budget for fiscal year 2000 with any money that spends Social Security taxes on any purpose other than Social Security?

That I take as a point of honor, a point of duty, a point of duty to two great generations, my parents and my children; my parents who are living off Social Security benefits today and my children who are paying the taxes so that that money is available for that purpose.

Now, the President has said we share with the House and the Senate this commitment. That was good news. We have waited a long time, Mr. President, for you to make this commitment to preserve Social Security. We were all startled. We were all disappointed when, in your own budget, you propose that 40 percent of the Social Security revenues be spent for something else. But now you have said, ''I agree with the Congress.'' I was heartened when I heard that.

I am delighted to go to the White House tomorrow at the President's invitation to discuss with the President of the United States how will we do this, complete this budget without spending a dime's worth of Social Security for any purpose other than Social Security. I am excited for this opportunity.

That was the good news. Now comes the bad news.

Within hours of this revelation from the White House, the President vetoes the foreign aid bill because he wants $4 billion more for foreign aid. We are left to ask, Mr. President, where will you get the money? We cannot take it from Social Security. You have expressed your commitment to not do so. Do you want to take it from education? You think that is a high priority, too. Should we take it from defense? We have got soldiers and sailors, men and women in our uniforms today, ill-equipped ill-prepared, ill-trained, and, frankly, ill-humored. Morale is a deterioration of readiness that this Nation can ill-afford.

Where would you take the money, the 4 billion additional dollars, Mr. President? We will work with you on the commitment. We will not take it from Social Security, nor will we deny any other domestic American priority that is equal or greater than foreign aid. That is our commitment. We look forward to working with you.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, a gentleman who served 10 years as the chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what a phony debate that I have heard here today. We hear our friends on the majority side of the aisle saying that somehow because the President wants us to meet some of our additional obligations overseas and because our President wants to have a well-rounded defense of our national interest overseas, that somehow he is spending more than our friends on the majority side want, and, therefore, is guilty of all kinds of fiscal sins.

I would point out it was not the President who added $16 billion to Pentagon spending for items that the Pentagon did not even ask for and then declared $6 billion of them emergencies so that they could pretend that that money was not being spent under the budget rules. It was not the White House that did that. It was our friends in the majority party.

Overall, they spent almost $16 billion more than the President asked for in the supplemental in the regular Pentagon appropriation bill. It was not the President who added $1.3 billion for a whole new ship the Navy did not want. It was our friends on the majority side because it was going to be built in the district of the Majority Leader in the other body, in Pascagoula, Mississippi. The President did not ask to spend that money, that pork.

The argument that we are hearing from the majority side comes from a party that has demonstrated time and time again its refusal to support our national interest in a well-rounded fashion around the world.

We hear this same argument from people who do not want us to pay our bills at the United Nations, even though we risk losing our vote because of that. We hear it from the same people who are refusing to provide the funding to meet the promises that we had already made in the Middle East with respect to the Wye agreement.

I saw one Republican leader stand in the White House and tell the President standing 6 feet away from him that the President had absolutely no right to engage in military action against Serbia because it was a sovereign country. Then after the President reached a successful conclusion of that conflict, I saw that same Republican leader go to the press and denounce the President because he had agreed to a solution that allowed Mr. Milosevic to stay in power. What hypocrisy. How do my colleagues expect we remove Mr. Milosevic, through emaculate conception? It takes military action.

This is the same party that last week, in what I believe to be the most irresponsible action by this Congress in 25 years, it is the same party that ripped up the test ban treaty. Now, to understand why that treaty is important, we have to understand why it is linked to the nonproliferation treaty.

The United States, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has tried to convince the nonnuclear powers of this world not to achieve nuclear weapons status because it destabilizes the world. So we have tried to set a good example for them. We have said to them, Okay, if you do not develop your nuclear weapons, we will not test ours. Yet, last week, we saw the United States Senate majority party blow away any chance we have to exercise moral leadership on the issue of nuclear test ban treaties.

□ 1815

They say, oh, we do not know for sure that we will be 100 percent effective in detecting other people's tests. Well, we were going to be a whole lot more effective than we are right now, because that treaty would have allowed us to place sensors all around the world to detect all but the smallest nuclear explosions. But, no, they had to try to administer another political defeat to the President by defeating the nuclear test ban treaty.

So this is a party which has walked away from its responsibilities time and time again in the international arena, and now they try to pretend that they

are doing it all in the name of fiscal responsibility and because they want to save Social Security.

Are they kidding? Give me a break. The Republican Party is now the great savior of Social Security? The same party that tried to kill that program in the crib before it was ever created? The same party that has tried to turn Social Security over to the insurance industry for 30 years? They want to privatize it to death. The same party that wanted to take billions of dollars out of Medicare in order to pay for a big capital gains tax cut for their buddies? This is the party that we are now supposed to rely upon to save Social Security?

All I can say, if that is a record that demonstrates their support of Social Security, God save Social Security.

So what are they doing? What all of this is is a giant scam. Our friends in the majority party for the last year have tried to push a tax package through this House which would give 70 percent of the benefits to people who make over 100,000 bucks a year, and they took it home and they tried to sell it over the August break. And what did they find? They found that their constituents did not buy it. And what they found is that they had dropped 12 points to 16 points in the public opinion polls with seniors. So now what we have going on on this floor is operation crawl-back. And what it is, it is an effort to crawl back to another political position in order to try to win a few points back from senior citizens. It ain't gonna work, fellas. It ain't gonna work.

What is really going on here, the party that claims it is for fiscal responsibility has produced a budget this year which has more than $40 billion in gimmicks in order to pretend that they are staying within the budget ceilings and in order to pretend that they are not spending a dime in Social Security when, in fact, their own actions have already spent more than $23 billion of the Social Security surplus for other purposes this year.

Now, I just have to say, when they have over $40 billion in budget gimmicks, when they have already spent over $23 billion in Social Security, when they have engaged in a gimmick called advanced appropriations, which means they will move the money from this year into next year to hide the fact that they are actually spending it and committing it this year, when those advanced appropriations go from $4 billion to $27 billion, and then they come here and object because the President wants us to pay our U.N. bills, because the President wants us to meet our obligations to the Wye Accords to promote peace in the Middle East, pardon me if I do not take that with a straight face. Pardon me if I think there is just a little bit missing here.

When we put all the baloney aside on Social Security, what are the facts? The facts are that every year from 1983 until 1997 this Congress spent every dime that we generated in Social Security surpluses for other purposes and put IOUs in the treasury in order to recognize that fact. In 1997, we spent 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, as the Congress had for years, on other items. But starting last year, starting 2 years ago, I should say, that has been turned around. Two years ago, for the first time, we spent less than one-third of the Social Security surplus on other purposes, and we paid down debt by $60 billion. This last year that just came to a close, we paid down debt by over $100 billion.

When all of the baloney is over, whether the Republican Party wins the argument or whether the Democratic Party wins the argument, in the end this coming year we will pay down debt by another $100 billion. Only the people running this House could turn that kind of a major policy victory into a crisis.

It seems to me if we want to be honest with the people of the United States, we will tell them that this action in paying down debt over the last 2½ years has done more to strengthen Social Security than anything that we did for Social Security since the Greenspan Commission saved it with congressional votes. That is the honest truth.

But, no, instead, we are going to see this partisan slugfest on Social Security. Well, I have to tell my colleagues that it is not going to fool anybody. It certainly is not going to fool people in the House. They may fool themselves, that would be nothing new, but I would urge my colleagues, in the end, to remember we have an obligation to meet our domestic responsibilities and our international responsibilities in a balanced manner. It would be nice, for once, if we could see that coming out of the Republican leadership in this House.

I do not see it today, but I am going to go home tonight and pray again, and maybe some day we will.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time now remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, my good friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this poses, for me, a very puzzling situation. I have so much respect for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I know that they have worked actively on behalf of all of us in the House of Representatives and this Nation in trying to provide for a stable, prosperous, and democratic world through foreign operations. But I put to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), that when he cites the fact that the amount of money that is offered this year is the same as last year, events that have happened over the course of the year causes us to have to take a different view.

While the gentleman and I may disagree and have ideological perspectives that are different, the fact of the matter is that the Wye Accords are important to all of us. And we did, whether the gentleman agrees that the President had that responsibility or not, we agreed to $800 million that we would provide; and we have not in this year's budget.

Now, I do not know how that plays out. I cannot argue with appropriators and those of my colleagues that know the inner workings of the budget better than do I with reference to who is at fault about what having to do with Social Security. But I know cuts when I see them: $212 million cut from economic recovery and democratization in Africa, Latin America and Asia in this budget; $44 million cut from disaster assistance; $53 million cut from refugee assistance; $35 million cut from the Peace Corps; $17 million cut from the NAD Bank Community Adjustment; $178 million cut from IDA lending to the poorest countries; $87 million from debt relief; $107 million cut from global environment facilities; $53 million from the Inter-American Bank; $80 million, 10 percent, for promotion of U.S. exports, which helps American, American, businesspersons.

What we need to know is that foreign aid is not a giveaway; foreign aid shows the way. And we cannot proceed along these lines in this great country and be looked to for the direction, as we are by countries all over the world, if we intend to provide a stable, prosperous and democratic world.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, to explain the real story of who is utilizing Social Security monies.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the question of Social Security is one that is important to all of us, especially those of us who have many people in their districts receiving Social Security checks.

I would just like to show this graph that is based on figures developed by the Congressional Budget Office. This graph shows that the money that was taken from Social Security under the Democrats in the Congress rose dramatically. The Republicans took over at this line, and we can see what happened. The number went way down, and for fiscal year 2000 it is going to be zero.

It is our determination, and that is one reason this bill does not spend as much money on foreign aid as the President wants, we are determined

not to take any money out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and we are determined that any spending requests that go over the budget surplus will be offset. It is a pretty simple plan.

But by doing this, we are going to maintain the balanced budget that we fought for years to get and finally achieved. We are going to preserve that balanced budget, and we are going to stop paying billions and billions and billions of dollars as interest payment on the national debt when we could use that money in more places than that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion because we now have a chance to reconsider this year's foreign aid bill which was plagued by low funding levels from the start and never really recovered. Now we are faced again with a very important choice. We can insist upon a dangerously underfunded foreign aid bill, jeopardizing not only the United States' leadership around the world but also our national security; or we can work to rectify some of the most egregious funding cuts to our initiatives abroad, maintaining the United States of America's international stature, and acting in the best interests of our own national security.

We really have no choice, in my judgment. This bill, as it stands now, will severely erode our ability to pursue our interests abroad. And our stinginess now will be an expensive mistake. Saving now but paying double and triple later is no way to protect the global interests of the American people. It is just plain irresponsible.

While the majority engages in political brinkmanship, we are already feeling the effects of turning our back on what has historically been a cornerstone of United States foreign policy. Funding for implementation of the Wye River agreement is essential. And each day we drag our feet, we jeopardize Israel's security; we endanger the very security of Middle East peace; and we destroy our own credibility as a mediator in the Middle East peace process. Wye assistance has become a pawn in the majority's budget game, a dangerous game with very high stakes indeed.

And Wye is not the only problem with this bill. The International Development Association, the Peace Corps, debt relief, international organizations and programs are all underfunded. The bill remains $2 billion below the President's request and $1 billion below last year's level.

This is not the first and it is not the only example of a reckless decision on the part of the majority that shows utter disregard for maintaining the United States' global stature. Last week, the Senate majority brazenly defeated the comprehensive test ban treaty. The United States is currently the U.N.'s biggest deadbeat, owing over $1 billion in arrears.

Thanks to the President's decision to veto the foreign aid bill we sent him, we can now, working together, begin to restore the United States' diminished global leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. Stop the games, stop the gimmickry now, and let us go back to work and return with a bill that preserves our national security.

□ 1830

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in this century we have had the New Deal, starting with F.D.R. We have had the fair deal. We have had the square deal. But this could be called the ''misdeal'' because it is a raw deal for America's seniors. Congress ought to say ''no deal'' to the President.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity to visit with a farmer in Kimball, South Dakota. He has been a farmer for 37 years, and he is hoping some day to be able to cash rent his farm ground out, which is not worth a whole lot right now, and that, coupled with his Social Security payment, retire.

What the President has said is that we are going to take from this farmer's account the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for more foreign aid because $12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough, $12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough. The American people ought to be outraged.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of South Dakota seniors, I say ''no deal'' to the President's bad policy in this respect.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I rise in opposition to H.R. 2606, the conference report on foreign operations appropriations. This moves us in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, the conference report moves us into a dangerously low budget.

We have the conference agreement, which provides $12.6 billion. It is nearly $2 billion below the President's request and $1 billion less than last year's bill.

The low level of funding is untenable. It will be impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the world's 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.

The omission is particularly troubling, as it signals a lack of support for the recent strides made by countries in Africa. The development fund for Africa is being cut 40 percent from last year.

$175 million is cut from essential loans for the poorest countries. $155 million is cut from global environmental protection programs. $87 million is denied for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries in the world. $50 million is cut from African development loans. $200 million is cut from economic development and democratic building in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. $35 million is denied for the Peace Corps, where we just agreed to move our numbers up to 10,000 volunteers. Many Members from both sides of the aisle said it was great. So what do we do? We approve 10,000 and cut 35 million.

The gentleman talked about $12 billion, how outraged people from South Dakota were. I think I am in a time capsule where we are back 200 years ago. I never heard such an egregious, outrageous statement.

Here we are going to give $782 billion back to the wealthiest people in this country, and we are talking about cutting $2 billion back from the poorest people in the world and that people in this country are outraged.

I think we live in a society that some people are really very, very narrow visioned; and I believe that we must regain our position in the world. I think that the President is absolutely right. I stand a hundred percent behind his veto.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for yielding me the time. And I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). Because instead of categorizing this with a unique historical perspective that is revisionist, to say the least, let us engage in some recent history.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States came here about 10 months ago, and in his message to a joint session of Congress, in his State of the Union address, he said it was up to us to save Social Security first. But with his veto today, the President is telling all Americans, Mr. Speaker, that they should surrender a portion of their Social Security Trust Fund to go not for their retirement but to a scheme of bigger spending not on Americans but on other folks around the world.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I just got on the House floor. Is it correct that the President vetoed this bill because it takes Americans' hard-earned money and he wants to give billions away to other countries more?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is exactly the

case. The President is taking the hard-earned money of Americans and wanting to spend more and more and more and jeopardize the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has vetoed a foreign aid bill because it does not send enough American tax dollars overseas. Outrageous.

In order to satisfy the President's insatiable appetite for foreign aid, Congress would have to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. That would be unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, let us protect Social Security for those who receive benefits now and those who pay the taxes and those who want to receive benefits in the future. Let us stop the foreign aid raid.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has said no to the President's taking money from our farmers in North Carolina who have lost their homes, small businesses.

The President has said, no, our farmers do not matter. He does not mind, and they do not matter. That is what he said. But the committee of the gentleman has said, our farmers and our seniors matter. I thank the gentleman very much for saying yes to our people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the last two comments, the facts are they have already spent $23 billion of the Social Security surplus in bills that they have already passed in the House this year. That is the fact even if they do not want to admit it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 3½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, well, this year trick or treat for UNICEF will have a new meaning because the President just said no to a $9 million increase in UNICEF funding. So the children of America are going to have to work a little bit harder.

It is important because the President also said no to a $60 million increase in child survival programs. He also, to keep the streets just as dangerous as he could, said no to a $24 million increase in the international drug programs.

We keep hearing about our obligations overseas and our promises to the Middle East. I was in Israel. I spoke to Mr. Barak in a small group at a Congressional delegation in Israel and Jerusalem and also here in the Capitol. I also went to Jordan and spoke to King Abdallah. There was no discussion of you-all made this promise the Wye River is in the bag, we are spending the money. I did not hear that from the two top leaders of these countries.

But I do see that, in this bill, the President said no to our increasing aid to Israel $30 million where he had cut it.

We keep talking about what this money is going to do. It is going to go to good causes overseas, but any increase will come straight out of Social Security. We should reject this veto.

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

Mr. Speaker, since my speaker has not returned to the floor, I will use his time and my time in closing. It affords me the luxury of commending my distinguished chairman for the work that we did together to bring this bill to the floor originally. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill but only with the idea that when we came back from conference, it could only be supported if there was a higher allocation to this foreign operations bill.

So it is not with a criticism of the process with which the distinguished chairman moved the bill through. We worked together on that. What it is a criticism of is the lack of funding in the bill for us to live up to our leadership role in the world.

The distinguished majority leader said that the percentage of funding for foreign aid is going down because other spending is going up, he said in reference to my remarks. I did not say that. I said that, in real dollars, our foreign aid spending is being reduced since Reagan's years by, what, one-quarter to one-half in real dollars, not in percentages.

This debate about Social Security that our colleagues have drummed up really does a disservice to the whole debate on the budget and the appropriations process. This debate that our colleagues have drummed up, this illusion that they have tried to convey on the floor today is an insult to the intelligence of the Social Security recipients, to the Social Security donors, and their families.

Yes, President Clinton said he was going to save Social Security first, and we all subscribed to that. That is not the only thing we do. Now, if the gentleman thinks that is the only thing we do, maybe we should have a zero foreign operations budget. Maybe we should spend no money on any trade assistance for the Ex-Im Bank for us to promote U.S. products abroad or the Trade Development Administration for the same purpose or OPIC, which enables our products to find markets abroad. Maybe we should do none of that.

Maybe we should abandon everything we do with the religious community to reach out to poor children throughout the world and to help them stave off disease and starvation.

What is in this bill, as I said earlier, is 6.3 percent of a percentage, less than 1 percent, of the Federal budget. With President Clinton's funds, it would be .8 percent. So it would be still less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, a small percentage and a small price to pay for what the President enumerated in his veto message about promoting democracies and free economies throughout the world, about promoting markets for our products, about honoring our commitments internationally, about living up to our leadership role in the world.

This century that we are coming to an end as we do fiscal year 2000 appropriations bills is a terrible century in many respects. Nazism, communism, authoritarianism were rampant throughout this century and they are coming to an end now.

One of the brightest stars of this century was the founding of the State of Israel. How sad it is that this body, representing the American people who have fully supported that brave, courageous state all these 51 years of its existence, that we, coming to the end of this century, will not take yes for an answer in the peace process by funding the Wye River agreement.

Leaders in that region gave their lives, their health, and all of their future for this peace agreement; and we in this body are rejecting all of that sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's veto when the time comes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and echo what she said. We have worked in a nonpartisan fashion trying to give the President the flexibility, trying to give the President the sufficient amount of money to have effective foreign policy.

The President, in my opinion, has just thrown this agreement out the door when he vetoed this bill. I am going to send him a bill now that will instruct him on what foreign policy problems can be if indeed he is so obnoxious in vetoing a bill such as this.

So let me tell the President, this next bill he is going to get, number one, is not going to be any more and, number 2, is going to give him a reason to veto it. Because we are going to go back to the old days when the Democrats were indeed telling Ronald Reagan and George Bush what they were going to do during their foreign policy.

□ 1845

So if the President wants to declare war, this is war. It is war that he is going to suffer, not me. The people of Alabama could care less if I pass a foreign aid bill or not. So I am not going to suffer. But millions of children are going to suffer because they do not have the child survival money that we put into the bill.

Let me just give Members one example of what the President said, and I wish everybody in America could get a copy of this message from the President of the United States and understand what he is saying. One thing he says in here is I need $900 million to forgive debt for poorer nations. That comes from his trip to Africa where he took 1,700 people with him and spent $47 million of the American taxpayers' money and goes over there and once again clinks his glass and then comes back and says, This is an entitlement. We want to forgive this debt that these foreign leaders have incurred during these corrupt regimes in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, if people could see this message, if they could understand exactly what the President is saying, they would be up here marching on this Capitol saying, ''SONNY, don't give in to that guy. He has this insatiable appetite to spend our money to give it to these foreign countries just because they walk in his front door.''

I might forewarn the President that Halloween is just around the corner and a lot of these people knocking on the White House gate for trick-or-treat might have on turbans, and I might tell them when they go knock on the door, ''Wear a turban and carry a bag and let me tell you, that President will fill it up. He'll give you an IOU from the Congress.''

But we are not going to give in to the President on this issue. We might be here till Christmas, we might be here till Easter, but we are not going to give in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal, de novo;

H.R. 2140, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2886, by the yeas and nays; and

House Concurrent Resolution 196, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of 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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 49, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—49

Baird
Borski
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
Dickey
English
Evans
Filner
Gibbons
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hutchinson
Kucinich
LoBiondo
Markey
McDermott
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Ramstad
Sabo
Schaffer
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Weller

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—26

Brady (PA)
Buyer
Camp
Carson
Collins
Cooksey
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klink
Knollenberg
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McIntosh
Menendez
Neal
Pallone
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanford
Scarborough
Towns

□ 1910

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.