the supplemental appropriations conference report, and there be 30 minutes for debate on the bill, to be equally divided, and no amendments or motions in order.

I further ask consent that immediately following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, without any intervening action or debate.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we are proceeding under a reservation of the right to object. Senator ENZI was explaining his reservation, and he is asking to be recognized to offer a bill that would call for an across-the-board cut in the appropriations process in order to pay for the additional funding here. Is that the gist of the Senator's reservation of the right to object?

Mr. ENZI. Yes. There are a few questions we want to ask in regard to reserving this.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I want to note my support for what Senator ENZI is stating, and that I am concerned that what we have in the underlying bill is not paid for and we ought to have appropriate offsets to this supplemental. It is an important supplemental bill, but I am reserving the right to object and I am saying that we should pay for this. It should be offset with other cuts in nondefense discretionary and domestic spending.

We have a $15 billion supplemental appropriations bill. We are asking in the nondefense areas that there be offsets to that. This is not a major thing for us to do. I think it is fully appropriate that we move forward and have offsets taking place in this supplemental bill. There is important spending taking place in the supplemental that I think is appropriate. There is some for my home State and the disaster we had. But let's pay for it. That is why I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, also reserving the right to object, I share Senator ENZI's concern and making this UC request to introduce a bill that would allow us to have offsets. We have an appropriations bill, as so often is the case with these emergency spending bills that come before us, traveling like a freight train. The ''freight train'' has little stowaways hidden all through it. So in the very short period of time that I began to look at some of the little stowaways hidden on this ''freight train,'' I found $1.8 million for safety renovations of the O'Neill House Office Building, $1.9 million for the Northeast Multi-Species Fishery, $250,000 for the L.A. Civic Center, $1.5 million for the University of DC, and $3.76 million for the House page dormitory. These may all be good things, but they are certainly not going through the right process.

There is $100 million for aid to Jordan; $77 million to the Census Bureau, Postal Service, USTR, et cetera. The Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians gets $22 million. I don't see how that can be termed an emergency coming before us. There is $8 million dollars for an access road to Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. On and on go these little stowaways. There is a high school, White River High School, which receives $239,000.

The point is, Mr. President, we have a process that is being perverted, a process that is being circumvented.

Mr. DORGAN. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for.

Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. GRAMS. Reserving the right to object, I also rise in strong support of Mr. ENZI——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no right to reserve the right to object when the regular order has been called for. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. In light of the objection, I renew my request for time agreements on the supplemental conference report, as stated earlier in my remarks, with 15 minutes of the Democrats' time under Senator DORGAN and 10 minutes of the Republican time under Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, what we have now—if I could explain it to the Senate—we have set aside the juvenile justice bill for now. We are going to do the supplemental appropriations bill. We have a 3-hour time agreement with some specific time set up for individual Senators. We also have a waiver of a point of order, with 30 minutes of time equally divided on that.

So there will be a vote on that point of order and, I presume, the vote on final passage. At that point, it is our intention to go back to the juvenile justice bill.

I say to the Senators who reserved their right to object, I certainly understand why they are doing it. I appreciate it and I want to support their effort. There is no question that more of this bill should have been offset. I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is probably in the vicinity, does not agree with that. But I have indicated all along I thought there should be more offsets. To Senators ENZI and BROWNBACK, HUTCHINSON, GRAMS, and perhaps SESSIONS—and I am not quite sure if Senator MCCAIN is here to raise that concern also—I certainly am sympathetic, but there was objection heard from Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. I want to observe that the unanimous consent proposal offered by the Senator from Wyoming had not been cleared on our side. We were constrained to object. I also observe, if we are going to establish an order for legislation to be brought to the floor following disposition of the supplemental, for example, we may want to bring to the floor the proposed amendment that died in conference committee by a 14–14 vote dealing with the agricultural fund.

Our point was that there are other priorities as well. But the unanimous consent request had not been served on our side. That is why we were constrained to object.

Mr. LOTT. I wonder if other Senators want me to yield.

I yield the floor.

## 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1141), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report. (The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of May 14, 1999.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is the conference report accompanying H.R. 1141 before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. That conference report is not amendable? There are no amendments in disagreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I first want to start off by commending the chairman of the House committee, Congressman BILL YOUNG, for his leadership in the conference on this bill. He was the chairman of this conference, and through his efforts we have achieved passage not only by the House but we achieved the result of getting a bill out of committee. Chairman YOUNG and I have worked very closely in the past. He chaired the defense subcommittee before becoming chairman of the full committee. I look forward to continuing that partnership during his tenure as chairman of the House committee.

We face a difficult task in reconciling the funds needed to respond to hurricane damage in Central America, the

Federal Emergency Management Agency and agriculture disasters—those FEMA disasters are national disasters declared by the President—and continued military operations in Kosovo, in Bosnia, in Iraq, and in the high state of alert in South Korea.

This is not an easy period to be chairman of this committee. We have what amounts to four major crises going on at one time. We are trying to maintain our defense capabilities to preserve our interests worldwide. This is very difficult, apparently, for some Members to understand. It is a difficult process, at best, to handle a supplemental and an emergency bill together, but it does take consideration of the Members of the Senate to understand which versions in these bills are emergency and which are just a normal supplemental.

They have been joined together. The President has sent us two bills and the House has passed two bills. They address the needs and the formal requests of the President. The Senate passed one bill, the Central American agriculture bill, in late March, prior to the Easter recess. At that time, before the recess, I urged that we have a chance to come to the floor and pass that supplemental. We knew there was going to be a second supplemental, but we could not get the time on the floor and the Senate did not act on the separate Kosovo package.

Due to the emergency nature of the funding for military operations and the availability of the first bill, it was our intention to merge the two bills into a second single bill in conference, which we have done. That is consistent with rules of the Senate and the House. These were matters which were emergency in nature, and we have added them as emergencies.

Now, as I think Senators are aware, there are many ideas in how we can address other needs in this bill. Supplemental bills have routinely been amended by both the House and the Senate. Questions have been raised about some of the matters in these bills—assuming that we have no right to add any amendments to emergency bills.

Now, this is both a supplemental and an emergency appropriations bill before the Senate. I hope Senators will keep that in mind. As most of the Senators are aware, these matters are brought up by individual Members of the Senate or the House and are considered and adopted by majority vote. I am not that happy about some of the provisions of this bill but, again, I have the duty to carry to the Senate floor those amendments that were included by action of the conferees. I hope Senators will keep that in mind as we proceed.

The conferees decided that some of these matters that are before the Senate and were presented to us should be reserved in the fiscal year 2000 bill, which the Appropriations Committees will start marking up next week. We cannot get to the regular appropriations bills until we conclude the action of the Congress on the supplemental and emergency matters in the bill before the Senate now.

Again, I know there are objections to this bill; there are objections to the process we are following. Many of those objections are brought forward because we do not have a point of order against legislation on appropriations bills.

That is not my doing. I have sought to restore that point of order and I continue to support the concept of that point of order. But we have several matters included in the Senate-passed version of the bill that were deleted by the conference.

One of them was a matter that was very close to my heart, and that is the Glacier Bay provision which was offered by my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI.

What I am saying is there are matters before the Senate some people object to. There are matters not in the bill that people object to, and one of them is that Alaska provision of my colleague. Obviously, a conference report is always a compromise. That is why we go to conference. We have disagreements with what the House has done, the House has disagreements with what we have done, and we meet in conference and try to resolve the problems.

This bill, for instance, contains more money for defense needs than were proposed by the Senate. After we went to conference with the House, we concluded they were right in seeking additional moneys for our defense readiness. There is no question it also contains more funding for refugees and for agricultural relief than was proposed by the House. The House has come towards the position of the Senate on both refugees and agriculture relief. Again, I think that is the process of compromise that should take place in a conference. This conference report needs to be passed today. The men and women of the Armed Forces must understand we support them, regardless of our points of view on the war that is going on in Kosovo.

Refugees ousted from their homes and their country by Serbian atrocities need our help also. I was honored to be able to go with other Members of the Senate to visit Albania. We saw the camps in Macedonia. We visited with the President of Macedonia and the Prime Minister of Albania. We went to see our forces in Aviano—that is our air base in Italy—and we visited with the NATO people in Bosnia.

Many Senators here have also visited the region since that trip I took with my colleagues and Members of the House. There were 21 of us on the first trip. All the Senators who went there know what needs to be done; there is no question in our minds. It is unfortunate we cannot take more people over there to let them see it, because I think uniformly the people who saw the troubles over there are supportive of this bill. We have provided additional funds in this bill for the Kosovo operation and for the victims of the war there in Kosovo. They are sort of an insurance policy.

We have faced this in the past. We went into Bosnia. We were supposed to be there 9 months and be out by Christmas. That is 5 years ago this Christmas. We have had to add money every year, take money from various portions of our appropriations process and pay for the cost of Bosnia.

We also have increased the level of our activity in the Iraq area. Even during the period of the Kosovo operation, there continue to be retaliatory strikes on Iraq because of the their failure to abide by the cease-fire agreement.

In South Korea, the North Koreans are continuing to rattle the cage, as far as we are concerned, and we are on a high level of alert in that area.

What I am telling the Senate again is this bill reflects those pressures on our defense forces. We want those people who are defending this country to know we support them when they are out there in the field representing our interests. The funds provided in excess of the President's request are contingency emergency appropriations for agriculture, for defense, for FEMA and for the refugees. The amounts added by the House and the Senate can only be submitted if the President declares an emergency requirement exists. We are going to get into that question of the emergency requirement here when the Senator from Texas raises his point of order. But we worked in conference very hard to assure adequate resources will be available through the remainder of this fiscal year to meet the needs in the areas we visited, in the Kosovo area, and to meet the needs of the military worldwide. Some of our systems are being taken from the areas I have described before—from South Korea, even from Bosnia and from Iraq—to move them into the area of the conduct of the hostilities in and around Kosovo and Serbia. Those funds that are needed on a global basis are in this bill. Some of them, as we know, the President did not request.

We believe we have taken action. Hopefully we will not have to see another emergency supplemental with regard to the conduct of the Kosovo operation during the period of time we will be working on the regular appropriations bills for the year 2000. In effect, we have reached across and gone in—probably this bill should be able to carry us, at the very least to the end of this current calendar year. The initial requests of the President took us to the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

I am happy to inform the Senate I am told today the President will sign this bill as soon as it reaches his desk. He has specifically asked us to complete our work and pass the bill today. I understand he has a trip planned and it would be to everyone's advantage if we get this bill down to him today and

have it signed. Therefore, I am pleased we do have the unanimous consent which does allow us to vote on this bill. I take it that will be sometime around 3:20 we will vote on the bill.

I do earnestly urge every Member of the Senate to vote for this conference report. To not vote for this conference report because of some difference, because of the process, would send the wrong message to the young men and women who represent this country in uniform. One of the things that impressed me when I was on the trips, both to Bosnia and into the Kosovo area, was if you go into the tents where these young people are living when they are deployed, do you know what you find? You find computers. They are on the Internet.

Right now, some of them out there will be picking up just the words I am saying. We are not back in the period, like when I served in World War II in China, when we did not hear from home but maybe once or twice a month at the most. We had to really just search to find news of what was going on at home and we were starved for news from home. These people are force fed news from home and many times what they see are rumors that come across the Internet. We don't need any more rumors going out to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces overseas. In this bill is the pay raise. We are committed that the money is there for the pay raise. We have initiated the concept of reforming the retirement system, which was one of the gripes we heard last year both in Bosnia and Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

This is a bill the men and women of the armed services are watching. They are going to watch how you vote on this bill. And they should. It is not time for petty differences over process or committee jurisdiction. This is a time to act and give the people in the Armed Forces the money they need so they know they will have the systems and they will have the protections they need when they go in harm's way at the request of the Commander in Chief.

I urge we not only vote to pass this bill, but Senators listen carefully to this point of order the Senator from Texas will raise, as it is raised against specific provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind, as we look at this bill, it is a different bill. When I woke up this morning, I looked in Roll Call and I was interested to see the statistics on supplemental appropriations, 1976 through 1996. We had no supplementals in 1995. We had one supplemental in 1996. I will get that number for 1997. People who are saying we are having too many supplementals—they are just wrong. We have not had too many supplementals. We go through a process of predicting how much money we will need. The departments of the Government start the process of sending their requests to the President through their agencies. They come up in the department, they go to the Office of Management and Budget, the President finally gets them sometime in September of the year before. In January or February, the beginning of the year, the President submits his budget which will be made available the following September, following October, going through the September of the next year.

In other words, what I am saying is this is the process. The money we are spending now on a routine basis started through the agencies in the fall of 1997, came into the departments in the spring of 1998, went through the President's process and got to OMB and were presented to us, in terms of a process, to have a bill for the year 2000 presented to us and considered in 1999.

This appropriations process is a long process. I hope I have not shortened it. But it is a very long process. In the process of trying to estimate the needs, things are overlooked, concepts are developed and, particularly in the defense field, new involvements of our military erupt. Kosovo is a good example. We had no knowledge we would have that kind of operation, an immense operation now, probably the largest engagement we have had, in terms of this type of crisis, since the Persian Gulf war. Actually, I think before we are over, it may be more expensive than the Persian Gulf war was to the United States.

I recognize the comments that are coming, particularly from my side of the aisle, about greater consistency in our appropriations process. I want people to look at the record. We have not had an excess of supplementals. We had an omnibus bill last fall, and most of the comments made on this floor are about the two omnibus bills that ended up the fiscal year—the one my predecessor, Senator Hatfield, was involved with and the one last year with which I was involved.

In both instances, if the Senators look carefully, they will find the appropriations process reached a stalemate, and the stalemate had to be resolved on the leadership level with the President. That was not the two committees that added that money. It was a negotiation with the President, in both instances, by the leadership of the House and Senate, and I commend them for it. We had to get out of that impasse or we would have had another impasse like we had previously when there was an attempt to shut down the Government.

When this Government is at war, it is not going to be shut down on my watch. I want everyone to know that. We are not going to shut down the Government when there is a war going on. We are not even going to suggest it. Anybody who does suggest it better understand he or she will not be here for long. The American people will not stand for that. Their sons and daughters are out fighting, and we ought to fight to get them the support they need.

I am going to fight—I am going to fight as hard as I can —to get bills such as this through and keep funding the Department of Defense at the level it should be funded to assure their safety—not just normal safety—but every single system we can adopt that will save the lives of the men and women in the armed services ought to be approved. This is what this does. It gives them the money they need to carry through the remainder of this year.

This year is going to be a very tough year. Any one of those other crises which are going on in Iraq, in Bosnia, in South Korea, or other places could erupt. I was told yesterday that we have people in the uniform of the United States in 93 different places throughout the globe now—93 different places—and any one of those places could erupt again while this Kosovo conflict is ongoing.

I do not want to hear anyone tell me that we have provided too much money. We have not provided too much money. If the money is not needed, I can guarantee you that this Secretary of Defense and this Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is not going to spend it. We have given them under this bill an enormous amount of discretion to spend the money. We have not earmarked this money. We have suggested things in the report that we hope they will consider, but this is the money to meet the needs of protecting our men and women in the armed services abroad, and it has to be viewed on that basis.

I urge every Member of the Senate to vote for it and to forget petty differences.

I am delighted to yield now to my good friend from West Virginia, a partner in this process of trying to get this supplemental and emergency bill to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the senior Senator, Mr. TED STEVENS, the manager of the bill and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is my longtime friend. I have served many, many years in the Senate and on the Appropriations Committee and on various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee with Senator STEVENS.

He was fair and he was dedicated to the positions of the Senate throughout the discussions on the supplemental appropriations bill when it was in conference with the other body. He stood up for the Senate's positions, and he was remarkably effective. I am proud to associate myself with him. First of all, he is a gentleman. His word is his bond. His handshake is his bond. I like that.

He is not so partisan that partisanship overrides everything else. We are all partisan here to an extent, but to some of us party is not everything, party is not even the top thing. Party is important, but there are other things even more important.

Mr. President, I intend to support this emergency supplemental conference report accompanying H.R. 1141. It is the result of a long and difficult conference with the House of Representatives. There are a number of matters in this agreement that I do not support, and there is one provision which is not included in the agreement but which I believe was as deserving as any emergency contained in the conference agreement.

That provision is the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program. Senators will recall that the Senate substitute to H.R. 1141 included the amendment that I offered to establish a 2-year $1 billion loan guarantee program to assist the more than 10,000 U.S. steelworkers who have already lost their jobs as a result of a huge influx of cheap and illegally dumped steel during 1998, last year.

This matter had strong support by the Senate conferees during the House-Senate conference. After a thorough discussion of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program, the House conferees voted to accept this Senate provision. Not all of the House conferees. All the House Democratic conferees and three of the Republican conferees voted to accept this provision. However, that vote was subsequently overturned the next day, and the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program remained a matter of contention until the very end of the conference.

In order to expedite the completion of this very important emergency bill, not everything which I support in the Senate, but I am going to support the bill, and because of the need to get it to the President as quickly as possible, I agreed to drop the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program in return for a commitment from the House and Senate congressional leadership that this loan guarantee provision would be brought up as a freestanding emergency appropriations bill in the very near future.

Pursuant to that agreement, I hope and expect that such an appropriations bill will be brought up in the Senate prior to the upcoming Memorial Day recess. I hope, because it is vitally important, that we act expeditiously, this being a real emergency.

The plight of many of the steel companies in this country is serious. The Speaker of the House has agreed to permit a motion to go to conference within 1 week of receiving the Senate-passed bill and has agreed to allow normal appropriations conferees to be appointed and to permit the resulting conference report to be brought up before the Houses.

Subsequent to Senate adoption of the substitute on H.R. 1141, the House Appropriations Committee marked up a second emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide emergency funding principally to support the military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo and for military operations in Southwest Asia for fiscal year 1999.

In light of the House action in relation to the Kosovo supplemental, and in hopes of being able to move both the Central American emergency spending bill, H.R. 1141, as well as the emergency funding for Kosovo, it was determined by the joint leadership that the Kosovo funding should be taken up directly by the House-Senate conferees on H.R. 1141. As a consequence, the Senate Appropriations Committee never marked up the funding measure for Kosovo, nor did the Senate have an opportunity to debate that measure at all—no opportunity to amend it, no opportunity to debate it, no opportunity to vote it up or down. In other words, the first time the Kosovo funding has been before the Senate is today in the form of this conference agreement on H.R. 1141.

I generally do not support the handling of appropriations matters in a manner that does not allow the Senate to work its will on each of the issues in appropriations bills, but in this instance, I agreed to allow this procedure to be followed because of the importance of the matters contained in this particular conference report.

This conference agreement contains appropriations totaling some $15 billion, of which $10.9 billion is for the support of our men and women in uniform in Kosovo and Southwest Asia and $1.1 billion is for Kosovo-related humanitarian assistance. These amounts represent an increase of $6 billion—$6 billion—above the President's request for Kosovo-related appropriations. The $6 billion in emergency funding above the President's request contains a congressional emergency designation, but will only be available for obligation if the President agrees with that emergency designation, only if the President also requests these funds and declares them emergency spending.

In addition to the $12 billion for our Kosovo-related expenditures, both in military and humanitarian assistance, the pending measure also includes $574 million in emergency agriculture assistance programs, some $420 million higher than the administration's request. For the victims of Hurricane Mitch in Central America and the Caribbean, the conference agreement includes $983 million, of which $216 million is to replenish Department of Justice operation and maintenance accounts which were used to provide immediate relief to the hurricane victims. Finally, the agreement contains $900 million in emergency funding for FEMA in order to address the needs of the American people who suffered from the recent tornadoes in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Tennessee.

Mr. President, as I have stated, this was a very difficult conference that consumed many days and late nights to reach agreement. This was the first time that the present chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. BILL YOUNG of Florida, had an opportunity to serve as chairman of the conference. I must say that he performed his responsibilities very capably. During the many contentious debates that took place, he was always fair and evenhanded and respectful of all members of the conference, just like our own chairman, Senator STEVENS. Yet, at the same time, he displayed the necessary firmness in order to keep the conference moving toward completion. So, I compliment Chairman BILL YOUNG for his excellent work on this difficult conference.

Let me again compliment Senator STEVENS, but also I compliment the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. DAVID OBEY, whom one will never find asleep at the switch. He is always there. He is always alert, combative enough, to be sure, and loyal to his own body, the House of Representatives, and the Democrats whom he represented in the conference. His work is always effective and very capable.

In closing, let me again say that Chairman STEVENS stoutly defended the Senate position on all of the matters throughout the conference and also made certain that all Senate conferees were able to express their view on each of the issues.

I hope that the Senate will support the conference report. As I say, there are some things in it I do not like, some things that were left out of it that I very much wanted and believe in and believe constitute as much of an emergency as some of the other items that are designated as such in the conference report. But I want to support this. I urge all Senators to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of mine concerning the objectionable provisions contained in the bill be made part of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as a former Member of Congress once said, ''Every disaster is an opportunity.'' This bill proves that statement remains true today.

Scattered throughout this bill, which was supposed to be for emergencies only, is more than $1.2 billion in non-emergency, garden-variety, pork-barrel spending. When the Senate passed this bill just two months ago, I could find only $85 million in low-priority, unnecessary, or wasteful spending. By the time the conferees were done with it, the waste had grown by a factor of 14—14 times more pork-barrel spending was deemed worthy of inclusion in this conference bill.

Mr. President, I have compiled a list of the numerous add-ons earmarks, and special exemptions in this bill. Now, I know that some of these programs may well prove meritorious, but there is no

way for us to determine their merit because the process for doing so has been circumvented in this bill.

For example, the bill contains $1.5 million to purchase water to maintain sufficient water levels for fish and wildlife purposes at San Carlos Lake in Arizona, and an earmark of $750,000 for the Southwest Border anti-drug efforts. I know that these are important programs, but are they the most important programs in my state? The process by which these two earmarks were added in conference on this bill makes it impossible to assess the relative merit of these programs against all other priority needs in Arizona and across the nation.

The normal merit-based review process, which requires authorization and appropriation, was not followed, and these programs were simply added to this so-called ''emergency'' bill. The usual ''checks and balances'' were just thrown out the window.

Once again, I have to object to including programs in appropriations bills that have not been authorized. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Yet, without even seeking, much less obtaining authorization from the Commerce Committee, the appropriations put $38 million in this bill for the CPB to buy a new satellite. I have raised this issue before. There is a good reason for the two-tiered process that requires an authorization before appropriating any money for a program—to eliminate unnecessary or low-priority spending of taxpayer dollars. That process clearly was circumvented in this bill.

This bill contains the usual earmarks for specific amounts of money of special-interest projects, such as:

An emergency earmark of $26 million to compensate Dungeness crab fisherman, fish processors, fishing crew members, communities and others negatively affected by restrictions on fishing in Glacier Bay National Park in Alaska.

Emergency earmarks of $3.7 million for a House page dorm and $1.8 million for renovations in the O'Neill House Office Building, which were added in conference.

$3 million earmarked for water infrastructure needs at Grand Isle, Louisiana, again added in conference.

An emergency infusion of $70 million into the livestock assistance program, which is redefined to include reindeer.

Mr. President, I am sure that Santa Clause is happy today although even he would blush not only at the process but the amount of money that is included in this legislation.

Then there are the many objectionable provisions that have no direct monetary effect on the bill, but you can be sure there is a financial benefit to someone back home. For example:

Apparently, last year when we added millions of dollars to help maple producers replace taps damaged in ice storms in the Northeast, we added a bit too much money. This bill directs that leftover money be used for restoration of stream banks and maybe repairing fire damage in Nebraska.

The media has reported extensively on a provision (which was added in conference) allowing the Crown Jewel mine project in Washington State to deposit mining waste on more than the five acres surrounding the mine than is currently permitted. What hasn't been reported is that this language also reverses for several months any earlier permit denials for any other mining operations that were denied based on the five-acre millsite limit.

The bill contains language making permanent the prohibition on new fishing vessels participating in herring and mackerel fishing in the Atlantic—a protectionist policy that was slipped in last year's bill and is now, apparently, going to become permanent.

The bill contains another provision that provides a special, lifetime exemption from vessel length limitations for a fishing vessel that is currently operating in the Gulf of Mexico or along the south Atlantic Coast fishing for menhaden—an issue that should be dealt with by the authorizing committee, the Commerce Committee.

The report directs that three facilities be built to house non-returnable criminal aliens in the custody of the INS—facilities which are much-needed—but then the conferees decided to go one step further and direct that one facility had to be built in the mid-Atlantic region.

Last year's 1999 Transportation appropriations bill earmarked funding for a feasibility study for commuter rail service in the Cleveland-Akron-Canton area, and the conference report expands on the use of those funds to allow purchase of rights-of-way for a rail project before the feasibility of the project has even been determined.

There are many more low-priority, wasteful, and unnecessary projects on the 5-page list I have compiled, and is included in the RECORD.

Most of these add-ons are listed as ''emergencies'' in this bill. Do these programs really sound like emergencies to you?

A small number are offset by cuts in other spending, but that doesn't make it right to include them in a non-amendable bill that circumvents the appropriate merit-based selection process of selecting the highest priority projects.

Some of these programs, like the page dorm, were not even in the bills that passed the Senate and House. They were simply thrown into this bill in conference, at the last minute, in a bill that cannot be amended or modified in any way.

For the Coast Guard, this bill presented the opportunity to pick up another $200 million for operating expenses and readiness. This, too, was a last-minute add in conference of ''emergency'' funding—again, an issue for the Commerce Committee to consider.

I also want to note with interest the apparent prescience of the appropriators in including an additional $528 million in unrequested emergency funding, for ''any disaster events which occur in the remaining months of the fiscal year.'' Apparently, the appropriators have some inkling that bad things are going to happen in the next five months.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues understand that designating spending as an ''emergency'' doesn't make it free. It still has to be paid for. The fact is that most of the pork-barrel spending in this bill comes straight out of the Social Security Trust Fund. At a time when the American people are worried about the fiscal health of Social Security, worried about whether Social Security will be there when they retire, it defies logic that we are taking money out of the Trust Fund for these projects. The Trust Fund is estimated to be bankrupt by the year 2032, and taking another billion dollars out of it clearly accelerates that fiscal crisis. That is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing, which is taking the Trust Fund off-budget and putting more money into it to ensure benefits will be paid, as promised, to all Americans who have worked and paid into the Social Security system.

Mr. President, disasters should not be opportunities. It seems the Congress may still be suffering from ''surplus fever,'' a giddy lack of fiscal discipline because of projected budget surpluses into the foreseeable future. Last year, we spent $20 billion of the Social Security surplus for wasteful spending in the omnibus appropriations bill. I voted against the omnibus bill last year, and I will vote against this bill.

This bill is a betrayal of our responsibility to spend the taxpayers' dollars responsibly and enact laws and policies that reflect the best interests of all Americans, rather than the special interests of a few. I cannot support a bill that makes a mockery of the Congress' power of the purse and contributes to Americans' growing lack of faith in their Government.

Finally, I was very pleased to see the other Senators come to the floor. We cannot continue this practice of adding appropriations in conference. We cannot continue to circumvent the authorization process. I identified some 30 instances in last year's bill. It will stop, sooner or later. We promised the American people when we regained the majority we would not do this kind of thing, this kind of money, in this kind of unauthorized authorizations that circumvent the committee process.

I find it offensive as a committee chairman. Most of all, I find it offensive as an American citizen who also pays his taxes.

I assure Members and my friends on the Appropriations Committee, we intend to take additional measures in the appropriations process. If appropriations bills come to this floor without proper authorization of expenditures of

money or authorizations that are not agreed to by the committee chairmen who are authorizers, there are going to be a lot of problems around here.

Last fall, when we added $21 billion in unnecessary spending, some 30-odd reauthorizations, I said at that time in a letter to the distinguished chairman and my friend on the Appropriations Committee that I will not stand for it any further. I believe there are a whole lot of Senators on both sides of the aisle who are tired of this process.

I say that with all due respect for the dedication, the difficulties and the obstacles that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other appropriators have as they go through a very difficult process, but it must stop.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXHIBIT 1

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN H.R. 1141, THE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

*Bill language*

Bill language directing that funds made last year for maple producers be made available for stream bank restorations. Report language later states that the conferees are aware of a recent fire in Nebraska which these funds may be used. (Emergency)

Language directing the Secretary of the Interior to provide $26,000,000 to compensate Dungeness crab fishermen, and U.S. fish processors, fishing crew members, communities, and others negatively affected by restrictions on fishing in Glacier Bay National Park, in Alaska. (Emergency)

A $900,000,000 earmark for ''Disaster Relief'' for tornado-related damage in Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, and Tennessee. This earmark is a $528,000,000 increase over the Administration's request and is earmarked for ''any disaster events which occur in the remaining months of the fiscal year.'' (Emergency)

Report language providing FEMA with essentially unbridled flexibility to spend $230,000,000 in New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, to address damage resulting from the 1998 Northeast ice storm. Of this amount, there is report language acknowledging the damage, and the $66,000,000 for buy-outs, resuting from damage, caused by Hurricane George to Mississippi, and report language strongly urging FEMA to provide sufficient funds for an estimated $20,000,000 for buy-out assistance and appropriate compensation for home owners and businesses in Butler, Cowley, and Sedgwick counties in Kansas resulting from the 1998 Halloween flood. (Unrequested)

$1,500,000 to purchase water from the Central Arizona project to maintain an appropriate pool of stored water for fish and wildlife purposes at the San Carlos Lake in Arizona. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of an unspecified amount for Forest Service construction of a new forestry research facility at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $1,000,000 provided in FY 99 for construction of the Pike's Peak Summit House in Alaska be paid in a lump sum immediately. (Unrequested)

Language directing that the $2,000,000 provided in FY 99 for the Borough of Ketchikan to participate in a study of the feasibility and dynamics of manufacturing veneer products in Southeast Alaska be immediately paid in a lump sum. (Unrequested)

Language directing the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture to remove restrictions on the number or acreage of millsites with respect to the Crown Jewel Project, Okanogan County, Washington for any fiscal year. (Added in Conference)

Language which prohibits the Departments of Interior and Agriculture from denying mining patent applications or plans on the basis of using too much federal land to dispose of millings, or mine waste, based on restrictions outlined in the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior dated November 7, 1997. The limitation on the Solicitor's opinion is extended until September 30, 1999. (Added in Conference)

Specific bill language providing $239,000 to the White River School District #47–1, White River, South Dakota, to be used to repair damage caused by water infiltration at the White River High School. (Unrequested)

A $3,760,000 earmark for a House Page Dormitory. (Added in Conference)

A $1,800,000 earmark for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building. (Added in Conference)

An earmark of $25,000,000 to provide for the construction and renovation of family housing units at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico. (Unrequested)

Bill language, added by the conferees, directing that $2,300,000 be made available only for costs associated with rental of facilities in Calverton, NY, for the TWA 800 wreckage. (Added in Conference)

$750,000 to expand the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of New Mexico to include Rio Arriba County, Santa Fe County, and San Juan County. (Unrequested)

Bill language directing $750,000 to be used for the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area for the state of Arizona to fund the U.S. Border Patrol anti-drug assistance to border communities in Cochise County, AZ. (Added in Conference)

A $500,000 earmark for the Baltimore-Washington High Intensity Drug Trafficing Area to support the Cross-Border Initiative. (Added in Conference)

Earmarks $250,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Los Angeles Civic Center Public Partnership. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $100,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for the development of a child care center in the city of Huntington Park, California. (Unrequested)

Earmarks $1,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development for work associated with the building of Caritas House and for expansion of the St. Ann Adult Medical Day Care Center. (Added in Conference)

Bill language permitting the Township of North Union, Fayette County, Pennsylvania to retain any land disposition proceeds or urban renewal grant funds remaining from Industrial Park Number 1 Renewal Project. (Added in Conference)

$2,200,000 earmark from previously appropriated funds to meet sewer infrastructure needs associated with the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Wasatch County, UT, for both water and sewer. (Unrequested)

$3,045,000 earmarked for water infrastructure needs for Grand Isle, Louisiana. (Added in Conference)

The conference report language includes a provision which makes permanent the moratorium on the new entry of factory trawlers into the Atlantic herring and mackerel fishery until certain actions are taken by the appropriate fishery management councils. (Added in Conference)

Additional bill language indicating that the above-mentioned limitation on registered length shall not apply to a vessel used solely in any menhaden fishery which is located in the Gulf of Mexico or along the Atlantic coast south of the area under the authority of the New England Fishery Management Council for so long as such vessel is used in such fishery. (Added in Conference)

Bill language directing Administrator of General Services to utilize resources in the Federal Building Fund to purchase, at fair market value, not to exceed $700,000, the United States Post Office and Federal Courthouse Building located on Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota. (Added in Conference)

*Report language*

A $28,000,000 earmark in FY 99, and a $35,000,000 earmark in fiscal year 2000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. (Emergency)

The conference agreement provides $70,000,000 for the livestock assistance program as proposed by the Senate, and adds language providing that the definition of livestock shall include reindeer. (Emergency)

$12,612,000 for funds for emergency repairs associated with disasters in the Pacific Northwest and for the full cost of emergency replacement of generating equipment at Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge. (Emergency)

Report language acknowledging the damage caused by Hurricane George to Kansas. (Unrequested)

Report language urging FEMA to respond promptly to the appropriate disaster needs of the City of Kelso, Washington. (Unrequested)

Language where the Conferees support the use of the emergency supplemental funds to assist organizations such as the National Technology Alliance for on-site computer network development, hardware and software integration, and to assess the urgent on-site computer needs of organizations assisting refugees. (Unrequested)

$200,000,000 earmarked for the Coast Guard's ''Operating Expenses'' to address ongoing readiness requirements. (Emergency)

Report language detailing partial site and planning for three facilities, one which shall be located in the mid-Atlantic region, to house non-returnable criminal aliens being transferred from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark, for the cost of the World Trade Organization Ministerial Meeting to be held in Seattle, WA. (Added in Conference)

$1,000,000 earmarked for the management of lands and resources for the processing of permits in the Powder River Basin for coal-bed methane activities. (Unrequested)

$1,136,000 earmarked for spruce bark beetle control in Washington State. (Unrequested)

A $1,500,000 earmark to fund the University of the District of Columbia. (Added in Conference)

$6,400,000 earmarked for the Army National Guard, in Jackson, Tennessee, for storm related damage to facilities and family housing improvements. (Unrequested)

A $1,300,000 earmark of funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs in the State of Idaho. (Unrequested)

Report language clarifying that funds appropriated under P.L. 105–276 under the EPA's Programs and Management for Project SEARCH water and wastewater infrastructure needs for Grand Isle, Louisiana, may also be used for drinking water supply needs. (Added in Conference)

Report language which authorizes the use of funds received pursuant to housing claims for construction of an access road and for

real property maintenance projects at Ellsworth Air Force Base. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate directing a statutory reprogramming of $800,000 for preliminary work associated with a transfer of Federal lands to certain tribes and the State of South Dakota and for cultural resource protection activities. (Unrequested)

The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate that clarifies the scope of certain bus and bus facilities projects contained in the Federal Transit Administration's capital investment grants program in fiscal year 1999. The conferees direct that funds provided for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 shall be available for the purchase of rights-of-way in addition to conducting a major investment study to examine the feasibility of establishing commuter rail service. (Unrequested)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am surprised by some of the items listed in the Senator's statement. This bill is both a supplemental and an emergency appropriations bill.

A supplemental appropriations bill that was submitted by the President in March contained a request for $48 million to replace the National Public Radio satellite system. It is in this bill not as an emergency but as a supplemental appropriation. When we passed this bill in March, the Senate version of this bill contained $18 million for the satellite system. That was less than the President's request. The President made that request because the Public Radio system satellite failed and radio programs are currently being sent through an emergency backup satellite that will not be available until around the middle of September, early fall. The supplemental funding was requested by the President and approved by the Senate at the level of $18 million. The House insisted on the full $48 million. It is an item that is not designated as an emergency.

There are a series of other misunderstandings, I think, with regard to this bill, and I will be happy to discuss them with the Senator from Arizona later. I don't disagree with him about legislation on appropriations bills. The point of order under the rules that were previously in place against legislation on the appropriations bills was destroyed through a maneuver here on the floor of the Senate before my becoming chairman. We have had a tough time trying to get that put back into our system. I will be happy to help restore the point of order against legislation.

I don't look with favor on the omnibus process that occurred last fall and occurred once before I became chairman. But clearly, my job is to carry forward the bills as they come out of the Senate and out of the House and out of the conference by a majority vote. Under the current circumstances, there is not a point of order in the Senate on legislation against appropriations.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I rise to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if I might just confer.

How much time does the Senator from California wish?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. About 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and very able senior Senator from the State of California, which is larger than all the nations of the globe except, how many?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BYRD. Are there six nations that are larger than California?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Six nations that are larger than California. So the two California Senators really are here representing a State that is larger than all of the nations of the world except six. I thank the distinguished Senator and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member. I appreciate his comments about my State. I also compliment both the ranking member and the chairman of the committee for their drive, for their motivation, and for their staying power to get this conference report done.

Mr. President, the room was crowded. The hours were long. The views were sometimes cantankerous. But both the chairman and the ranking member, I think, were steadfast in the desire to produce a conference report which could, in fact, be approved by both bodies.

I also pay tribute to the chairman from the House, Mr. YOUNG. I had never seen him preside before. What I observed, which I think is well worth noting, was his fairness, his equanimity, and really his ability to move the process along which, without rankling, can be a very diverse membership. I say the same for Mr. OBEY, who really was steadfast in pursuing his own views.

I support this report. It contains the $12 billion for Kosovo. I am especially pleased to note that the supplemental contains funding for the documentation of war crimes, including rapes that appear to have been committed as part of Serbia's brutal campaign of ethnic cleansing. As the ranking member and the chairman have pointed out, it contains the much-needed disaster assistance and the $574 million in agricultural funding to provide a measure of assistance to very hard-pressed farmers throughout this great country.

I do want to speak about one small item. As we debate the conference report on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, I want to express my concerns about the inclusion of a ''hold harmless'' provision for what are called concentration grants authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In chapter 5, on page 91 of the conference report (Report 106–143), the conferees included $56.4 million for Title I concentration grants ''to direct the Department of Education to hold harmless all school districts that received Title I concentration grants in fiscal year 1998.* * *'' The report goes on to say, ''Neither the House nor the Senate bills contained these provisions.''

This provision is very disturbing for several reasons.

First, it was not included in either the House or Senate bills. Therefore, it has not been considered by the authorizing committees of either house. It has not been considered by the appropriations committees of either house. There have been no hearings. It has not gone through the normal deliberative process under which we hear from experts, weigh the pros and cons and cast votes. Quite frankly, this provision appeared ''in the dark of night.''

Second, the hold harmless provision contravenes an important provision of the law, known as the census update, a requirement in law that the U.S. Department of Education must allocate Title I funds based on the newest child poverty figures, figures that are updated every two years. Congress adopted the census update requirement in 1994 so that Title I funds—which the law says are to help disadvantaged children—truly follow the child, that dollars be determined generally by the number of children who are eligible. The holdharmless provision in this bill before us, guaranteeing that school districts that got funds in 1998 will get funds in 1999, even if their number of poor children has declined, violates the requirement that funds be allocated based on the most recent child poverty data available. The provision in this bill effectively rewards ''incumbents,'' despite their number of poor children, despite merit or need.

Third, this provision disregards Title I's eligibility requirements. Title I concentration grants are supposed to be especially targeted to concentrations of poor children, under the law. Districts that have poor children exceeding 6,500 or 15% of their total school-aged children are eligible for these grants, which are in addition to the ''regular,'' basic Title I grants. Guaranteeing funds to districts, no matter what the number or percent of poor children in those districts, spreads limited funds to districts that are not eligible because they do not have concentrations of poverty. It effectively takes away funds from districts that do have high concentrations of poor children. It overrides the eligibility requirements we have set and agreed on in law.

In my state, some school districts could benefit from this ''hold harmless'' provision because the number of poor children changed; it went below the eligibility threshold of the Title I concentration grants program. Like most Senators, I do not want any school district in my state to lose education funds.

But we either have rules or we don't. We have eligibility criteria or we don't.

If the current eligibility rules are wrong or are not working, we should change them in the authorizing process, a review which the Health and Education Committee is currently undertaking. We should not set up eligibility rules and then flagrantly ignore them, override them or ''freeze'' in place funds to districts that do not meet the requirements. We should not rewrite the rules in the ''dark of night'' outside the normal legislative process.

Fourth, this provision violates the principle that funds should follow the child. Title I was created for poor, disadvantaged children. That is its fundamental purpose and funding to states is determined largely by the number of poor children, children that all agree have great educational needs. This amendment sends funds to districts merely because they got funds in the previous year, not because the districts have needy children and not in proportion to the number of poor children they have.

Finally, this provision is very unfair to states like mine that have a very high growth rate in the number of poor children. In California, the number of poor children grew by 52 percent from 1990 to 1995. In Arizona, poor children grew 38 percent from 1990 to 1995. In Georgia, 35 percent. In Nevada, 56 percent. That is why Congress included a requirement for a child poverty update. This amendment is very unfair to those children. This amendment takes the funds away from the poor children for which the funds were intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I may have 30 seconds to wrap up.

Mr. BYRD. I yield an additional minute.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Even though it ''freezes in'' funding to districts—including some in my state—that got funds last year, even though they do not qualify, it makes a mockery of the basic purpose of the Title I program, its eligibility rules and the requirement to use recent poverty data. If Congress continues to override these basic rules of the authorizing law, we are effectively operating with no rules, or at least, constantly changing rules. Districts will not know whether they are eligible or what they can or cannot count on. This is just plain wrong. In my state, even though 39 districts would have their funding ''frozen in'' by this provision, next year, California will have 166 new school districts that will become eligible. If these ''hold harmlesses'' keep appearing in the dark of night, these eligible districts, with concentrations of poor children, could be deprived of funds to which they are entitled.

Because this is a conference report, under our procedures, I am not allowed to offer an amendment to delete this provision.

But let me put my colleagues on notice that I find this provision and this procedure very objectionable.

I hope my colleagues will join me in ending this practice so that our children can get the education Congress intended in creating the Title I program in the first place.

I thank the Chair, and I thank the ranking member.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am authorized to yield myself 5 minutes off of the time of Senator STEVENS.

Eleven billion dollars in this bill are earmarked to pay for the costs of the war in the Balkans and its consequences, direct and indirect. That war was begun in folly and has been conducted since with an almost incredible degree of incompetence. I have opposed the war from the beginning and will not support it now.

The conflict was begun because of Serbia's refusal to sign an agreement granting autonomy to the people of Kosovo and protecting its citizens. Other demands, including the free right of NATO troops to travel through any part of Yugoslavia, were impossible for any sovereign nation to agree to.

Our goals were worthy. But they were not of sufficient importance to vital American interests to warrant the use of our armed forces in combat. This proposition is perhaps best illustrated by the President's refusal to use all of the means necessary to attain his goals, choosing to cause death and destruction to the Serbs, and suffering, dislocation, and death to the very people we purport to protect, than to risk American lives in order to succeed. This is no way to wage a war.

But vital American interests have been seriously and adversely affected by the war itself. We have destabilized Macedonia and Montenegro, and perhaps other nations in the Balkans as well. We have damaged relations with Russia and may have pushed it along the road to reaction. We have put ourselves on the defensive with respect to China when we should have the high ground in many of our differences. We have fueled anti-American sentiment around the world.

If we win, we get to occupy Kosovo for a generation and to spend billions rebuilding it; if we lose, we are humiliated and NATO is weakened.

In addition, this war appropriation comes to the Senate in a form in which it cannot be amended. I, for one, am denied the opportunity to attempt to earmark a modest portion of this money to arm the Kosovo Albanian rebels. It is inconceivable that we should trigger this ethnic cleansing, refuse to intervene on the ground to defend the Kosovo Albanians, fail even to attack their persecutors effectively, and top it off by refusing to aid those who wish to fight for their own liberties.

Finally, of course, this entire emergency appropriation comes straight out of our Social Security surplus. I am not sure that the American people are at all aware of this fact. I cannot believe that they would support it. At my behest, the conference committee added managers' language calling for the restoration of this borrowing to the Social Security Trust Fund out of future general fund surpluses. But the language is not mandatory, and may well be ignored. We should not use Social Security to pay for a war in the Balkans.

For these reasons, and in spite of its many good and important provisions on other issues, I oppose this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the emergency appropriations bill because it is an emergency, it is necessary. I have been reading all of the press reports about the bill and criticisms of the bill because it is too large or perhaps too much money has been spent on one area or another. But the fact is, we have emergencies in our country that are not covered by the budget. We have had more emergencies in our agriculture area than we ever could have foreseen. You can't pick up the paper that you don't read about a terrible tragic tornado, and we are coming into hurricane season. So we are putting more money into FEMA. We have had floods in my home State. We must deal with these as they occur, and clearly on an emergency basis.

A good part of this bill is for agriculture. We are also helping our neighbors in Central America who were ravaged with a terrible hurricane and tornadoes. We are trying to do the things we have promised we would do. But since we started this emergency appropriation, we have also had a new emergency, and that is the situation in Kosovo. We are seeing, every day, what is happening there.

Mr. President, it is no secret that I have spoken out strongly against the way we got into this Kosovo operation. I have spoken out against going into an operation when we didn't have a good contingency plan. I have spoken out against so much of our policy in the Balkans. I just came back from the Balkans, just over the weekend, and I met with our soldiers on the airfield in Albania, the ones who are going to be supporting our humanitarian effort and, hopefully, be part of our defenses there, whatever we may do. I went to Aviano, Italy, and met with the troops who are doing so many of these air operations that we are seeing day after day after day. And, of course, there is no question that our troops are doing a great job. They don't make the policy; they just do the mission they are

given. Nobody can question their sincerity, their great attitude, and their commitment to our country. You will never meet a young man or woman in the military who isn't there because they love our country.

So when I think about this supplemental appropriation—and I know I have spoken against the mission itself, the way it has come about—and I remember looking into the eyes of the young men and women who are on the front line, I think, now, can I vote not to give the money to them to have the equipment they need to do the training they need, to have the incentives that they need to be doing a very tough job in a very tough neighborhood? Well, the answer is no, I can't vote against paying for their security, because they are the security for me and my family and for every one of us who is lucky enough to live in the greatest country on Earth.

So they have volunteered to give their lives so that we may live in freedom. Do you think for one minute I would vote not to give them the equipment they need to do that job? It would be unthinkable. So while we debate how we pay for it or who is responsible, in the end, I am going to vote for this bill, because I am going to support the troops who are in the field.

I am going to continue to argue with the administration that we need to learn the lessons about how this operation has been handled, and I think we will. I think there is a glimmer of hope that perhaps Mr. Milosevic has seen that we are going to win and prolonging it will only hurt his own people. So there is a glimmer of hope, and a glimmer of hope is better than total darkness. I think we need to seize on that glimmer of hope and try to come to the first agreement that we must have from Mr. Milosevic—that he will stop the atrocities against the people of Kosovo.

I just visited with the people of Kosovo. I visited with them in Macedonia. I visited with them in Albania. Those people have been through more than any one of us will ever know or understand. What I want now is the atrocities to stop for the ones who are still there. The ones we met with are in refugee camps. They are not comfortable, but they are safe. I want to try to help the people who are still in Kosovo, and the atrocities on them to stop so that we can then allow the people who have fled their country in terror to be able to go back in and rebuild their homes, rebuild their economy, so that they will be able to have a livelihood, so that they will be able to raise their children in their homeland without fear of a despot who would commit the atrocities that there is no question in my mind have been committed in the last 6 months and, indeed, for many years in this part of the world.

So, Mr. President, while we are debating policy, while we are debating from where the money is going to come all of which is legitimate debate, while we are talking to each other about our principles, which is our right to do, but at the end of the day, it is most important that we have the emergency appropriations which would give our kids who are on the front line and their commanders everything they need so as to know that we are not going to pull the rug out from under them, that they will have the equipment, they will have the airplanes, they will have the helicopters for their own security while they are protecting yours and mine.

So let's talk policy. Let's talk about never going into an operation like this again without a contingency plan. Let's talk about the treasure we have spent in this country to try to solve this problem. And let's not stop with Kosovo, because the money and the troops that we have put in harm's way cannot be lost for us to put a Band-Aid on Kosovo. Let's finish this job now.

But when we have stopped the atrocities and when the Serb troops have started leaving Kosovo, and when an international peacekeeping force moves in, let's take the opportunity, let's seize the moment to do something bigger than putting a Band-Aid on Kosovo. Let's look at the Balkans and do what we can to try to help them form areas of government that have to change so that those people will be able to have jobs, start farming their land, to live in security. That is what I want for the Balkans.

But continuing to say we can amalgamate the Balkans as if they were America is not going to have a long-term chance for success, because we don't understand what they have just been through in the last 5 years. We don't understand what it would be like to force people to live next door to each other when their mothers have been raped, when their fathers have been brutally murdered, when their families have had to flee in terror.

Let's start today by supporting our troops. Let's start today by keeping open the glimmer of hope for peace. And then let's take one step at a time to try to help these people become a contributing part of Europe so that they can do what every one of us wants to do; that is, live in peace and freedom, to have jobs, to support our families, and to give our kids a better chance than we have. That is what the Kosovar Albanians want. It is what the Serbs want. They are the good people of Serbia—not President Milosevic. That is what the Moslems in Bosnia want. That is what the Croats want. It is what the Albanians want. And they should be able to have it. That should be our goal.

I am going to support this bill. I am not going to say there are not legitimate differences about certain parts of it. Sure there are. That is why 100 of us are elected independently to represent the views we have—the views of our States. But we are required to come together. I hope the Senate will do the right thing and come together to do what is right for the farmers who are hurting, for the people in Central America who are hurting, for the people in the Balkans who are hurting, to help promote peace in the Middle East, and to continue to appreciate that we live in the greatest nation on Earth. We need to make sure we keep the security and the freedom of our country on our watch.

It is our responsibility to pass this bill and talk about the policy and talk about our differences, and our Constitution that provided that we do this.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask for 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized to speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I rise to offer some comments on the emergency spending bill we have before us. Many of us had hoped that the almost grotesque experience of last year's omnibus appropriations bill might have shamed Congress into refraining from the kind of fiscally irresponsible spending and catering to special interests that characterized that legislation. Apparently, it was a vain hope. We are back at the same disgraceful work barely seven months later.

Mr. President, few would argue the need for many of the core provisions of the legislation, especially the urgently needed humanitarian relief in Central America, our current military and humanitarian operations in the Balkans, and for victims of natural disasters here at home. Regrettably, those legitimate provisions are completely eclipsed by dozens of others that are at best highly questionable and at worst grossly irresponsible.

Mr. President, first and foremost among this latter group are the billions in additional funding for the military that was not requested by the administration.

Mr. President, to say there is a double standard when it comes to fiscal prudence in Congress is to say the ocean is damp. We saw it last year in the omnibus appropriations bill, we saw it again when this body took up and passed an unfunded military pay and retirement increase even before we had passed a budget resolution, we saw it still again during the budget resolution when military spending received a special exemption from the tough new emergency spending rules we adopted, and sadly, we see it now in this bill.

As has been noted by others, including my distinguished colleague from the other House, Wisconsin Representative DAVID OBEY, what we are probably witnessing is an effort to load as

much military spending into this bill under the pretext of an emergency in order to make room for special interest military spending provisions in the Defense appropriations bill later this summer.

Mr. President, put simply, this emergency supplemental measure uses Social Security Trust Fund revenues to help lard up an already corpulent defense budget.

Almost as troubling as this reckless use of Social Security revenues to pay for the military budget is that this technique isn't an exception. It has become the custom.

Mr. President, our budget caps have become a sham. We agree to those tough caps with great acclaim and fanfare, only to circumvent them casually on a regular basis with the emergency provisions of our budget rules.

Mr. President, as much as I oppose raising the budget caps, it would be far better if Congress and the White House were to raise those caps in an honest and open manner, than to continue the pretense that the caps have meaning only to circumvent them through the abuse—I say ''abuse''—of the emergency funding designation.

Mr. President, while the doubling of the military budget request is certainly the dominant flaw in this bill, there are other provisions that deserve notice as well. They represent what is most unseemly about the emergency appropriations process—special interest provisions that relate to no true emergency, but avoid the scrutiny of the normal legislative process and instead capitalize on human suffering or an international crisis, finding their way onto what we have come to call must-pass bills.

Mr. President, let me note that it may be that some of these extraneous provisions have merit. But they should be subject to the same fiscal scrutiny we ask of any proposal. They should be paid for. The standing committees should review and authorize these proposals, and the Appropriations Committee should propose a level of funding for each of them that makes sense in the context of the overall budget.

Mr. President, by circumventing this process, the advocates of these provisions reveal their distrust of Congress and possibly their own apprehension that their provisions may not be able to gain passage on their merits.

One such provision is the so-called Russian Leadership Program, a new program, Mr. President, newly authorized by this legislation which also provides it with $10 million in funding. I understand the program is intended to enable emerging political leaders of Russia to live here in the United States for a while to gain firsthand exposure to our country, our free market system, our democratic institutions, and other aspects of our government and day-to-day lives.

Mr. President, offhand, that doesn't sound like it is necessarily a bad idea. I might be able to support such a program, though I would certainly want to know something more about it before endorsing still another new democracy building effort. But, Mr. President, this proposal has not gone through the normal legislative process. It has not been held up to the scrutiny of a public review by the appropriate committees.

Mr. President, if one were asked where the new Russian Leadership Program were to be housed, one might reasonably guess somewhere in the State Department, perhaps in USAID. Those a bit more familiar with the array of duplicate programs we have might stroke their chin wisely and suggest that it would probably be included in the National Endowment for Democracy, a quasi-governmental agency that many of us believe duplicates services provided elsewhere in government.

But, Mr. President, if you guessed the State Department, or NED, you would be wrong. For the next year, this new Russian Leadership Program is to be housed in the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress, Mr. President.

Mr. President, as some may know, we already have numerous educational and other exchange programs with Russia. Agencies and Departments which have received funding from the Congress for exchange programs with Russia include, but are not limited to: the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Education, Justice, State, and Treasury; the Agency for International Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Federal Trade Commission, the Marine Mammal Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Commission, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for Democracy, the National Science Foundation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I appreciate the tremendous impact that educational cultural exchanges have had on our relationship with Russia. I have to wonder if we really need to create still another exchange program. Even if we determine that the program has great merit, I think serious questions can be raised about whether this ought to be administered by the Library of Congress.

It doesn't end there. According to the authorizing language in this legislation, the Librarian of Congress is given authority to waive any competitive bidding when entering into contracts to carry out this program. In other words, this program is effectively shielded from any expertise or efficiencies that might be brought to bear by existing firms or nongovernmental agencies with experience in this area.

There we have it: In this bill, a brand-new program that has completely avoided the review of the appropriate standing committees established in an agency, that is wholly inappropriate, with virtually no restrictions on its administration. This is a heck of a way to legislate.

Of course, this is just one example, one of dozens of extraneous provisions that have been slipped into this emergency supplemental bill. I am not talking about a lot of different bills; it is just what is going on in this bill.

As others have noted, these unrelated riders have become business as usual. This is especially true with respect to antienvironmental policy. This is not the first time I have expressed concerns regarding legislative riders in appropriations legislation that would have a negative impact on our Nation's environment. I am sorry to say with respect to one of these policies, the delaying of the implementation of new mining regulations, this is not even the first time such a rider has been inserted into an appropriations bill.

The merits of this policy, this very important policy relating to mining, should be debated at length on another occasion. I do want to note that the rules that safeguard our public lands with respect to mining badly need updating, if only to keep pace with the changing mining technology. One such technique, the use of sulfuric acid mining, caused grave concern 2 years ago in my own State when it was appropriated for use in private lands in the neighboring Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Regulations also need to take into account other land uses that would be displaced by mining, and they need to do more to require meaningful cleanup. Currently, there is no requirement to restore mine lands to premining conditions. This leaves taxpayers holding the bag for the mining industry's mistakes.

Obviously, this kind of a change requires a full, careful, and open debate. It just can't get the kind of attention it needs when it is quietly slipped into an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that we are only going to debate for 3 hours. Of course, that is precisely the reason the advocates of the rider have done it this way. They see their opportunity. They don't want a full and careful and open debate—special interests that push this policy know it will do them best and they will get it done best behind closed doors, away from the light of open debate.

In this connection, I think my colleagues should be aware that the PACs associated with the members of the National Mining Association and other mining-related PACs contributed more than $29 million to congressional campaigns from January 1993 to December 1998. Mining soft money contributions totaled $10.6 million during the same 6-year period. Mr. President, that is nearly $40 million in campaign contributions in recent years from an industry that stands to benefit from this rider that has been stuffed in this bill which we are only going to debate for 3 hours.

And so it is with too many of these provisions.

It should come as no surprise that a process characterized by secret negotiations and backroom deals should be

dominated by special interests and produce such questionable policy. These interests have succeeded in presenting Congress with a take-it-or-leave-it deal, and they are betting we will acquiesce for fear of delaying the true emergency assistance that I and everyone else have said is truly urgently needed.

Of course, I realize this measure is likely to pass. I hope it does not. But I cannot endorse this package or the process that brought it to the floor by voting for it. I ask my colleagues to consider calling the bluff of the interests that have succeeded in loading this bill up with extraneous matters that could never command a majority in Congress on their own.

If we can defeat this measure and insist on a clean, true emergency bill, we just might be able to shame those who have participated in crafting it and maybe even prevent this kind of abuse in the future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes to speak against this bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will not object.

Mr. President, Senator STEVENS has left the floor and I am here in his stead. Please enlighten the Senate as to the time situation pursuant to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator STEVENS has 39 minutes, Senator BYRD has 42 minutes, and Senator DORGAN has 15 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, obviously appropriating money is a very difficult task. I had the privilege for 7 years to serve on the Appropriations Committee. During that time I had the great privilege of serving as chairman of Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations. Probably more than most Members of the Senate who don't currently serve on Appropriations, I think I have some understanding of the difficulty our colleagues have in appropriating money. Let me also say that the funding issues are the most important and the most difficult issues we debate.

I will share with my colleagues and anybody who might be following the debate an experience I had in 1980. I was a second-year Member of the House and I had been an economist prior to coming to Congress. I kept noticing that on the issues that really mattered—the spending issues on amendments—we were consistently losing on virtually every one of those votes. I ran sort of a running total for about 6 months on those votes.

Here is what I concluded, as best I can remember. The average vote on spending that really mattered cost about $50 million. These were little add-on amendments that were voted on in 1980 in the House of Representatives. There were about 100 million taxpayers in 1980. So the average taxpayer was paying about 50 cents. The average appropriation amendment was costing about $50 million; there were 100 million taxpayers; so each taxpayer was having a cost imposed on them of about 50 cents.

As best I could figure, the average beneficiary was getting about $700.

Members don't have to have a degree in mathematics or any fundamental understanding of economics to understand that if you have 100 million people all losing 50 cents each, and then you have beneficiaries who are getting, on average, $700 each, it doesn't take a lot of imagination to understand why in 1980 we were losing on every spending amendment. The reason being, the average taxpayer could benefit only by 50 cents if the amendment were defeated. That wasn't enough to activate them to write a letter in opposition. The average beneficiary was getting about $700, as best I could figure, on these votes on amendments. For $700 they were willing to do quite a bit, especially through groups that represented them where they would have thousands of members, sometimes tens of thousands of members, who were getting $700 each.

So it very quickly became evident to me that we were fighting a losing battle on spending. That ultimately gave rise to our efforts to try to elevate this to a national issue where, rather than voting on all these little amendments that cost taxpayers 50 cents each, we could turn it into a big issue where we were talking fundamentally about the future of America, which is what budgets are about. And, in fact, in 1981 when Ronald Reagan became President, we were able to adopt a budget that dramatically reduced the growth in government spending, that reformed entitlements, and that cut taxes across-the-board by 25 percent. And I would argue, probably more than anything else, that and Ronald Reagan's opposition to regulations and the rolling back of burdensome regulations, and the monetary policy of the Fed, explained why we are in the happy condition we are in today with the current state of the economy.

But what I discovered in 1981 was the only way you can win on these issues is when you are debating the big issue instead of the individual spending program. The budget has become our way of trying to rein in spending. One of the vehicles we have in that budget process is spending caps, where we debate how much money we are going to spend on discretionary programs and we set it in law and then we judge spending based on that number that we have in fact set into law. In order to try to beef up our strength to try to hold the line on spending, we established budget points of order. In order to try to enforce them we established supermajority budget points of order, with 60 votes required in order to violate the budget.

I will, later today, raise a budget point of order against this appropriation bill. Why do I object to this appropriation? First of all, you cannot spend $14 billion beyond the spending caps in actual cash outlays, without doing a lot of things that almost everybody is going to be in favor of. But here is the basic problem. We set out, in 1990, in a budget agreement, a little loophole. I would have to say I was worried about it when it happened. But the loophole was allowing the President and Congress to get together and declare emergency spending, to designate spending as an emergency and therefore get around the binding constraints on spending that we had written into the budget. That provision went into effect in 1990. And in 1991 we declared $900 million of emergency spending. But in 1992, with the Presidential election, with the election of Bill Clinton, and with the fundamental change that occurred since then, here is what has happened to spending that we have annually designated as an emergency, and therefore outside the budget caps, and outside any binding constraint that we all solemnly voted for as part of the budget process. In fact, the spending levels that I will be trying to defend today with my point of order were adopted 98 to 2 on June 27 of 1997. Only two Members of the Senate voted against making the commitment to hold the line on spending. I am today going to be offering a point of order to try to hold the line on that commitment we made.

But here is what happened. Beginning in 1991 we had $900 million designated as an emergency in a government that was spending, in 1991, maybe $1.2 trillion. It was not very much money by comparison. In 1992, we declared $8.3 billion of spending to be such an emergency that it did not even count as part of the budget process; that it was exempt from the cap. By 1994 that number had grown to $12.2 billion that, in 1994, we designated as an emergency.

Because of our action at the end of last year in passing a $21 billion emergency funding bill, we have already violated the budget for fiscal year 1999 above the level that we committed to on June 27 of 1997. We have already violated that budget by $15 billion in budget authority, which is the portion of the $21 billion that the President has already released by concurring in the emergency designation. If we adopt this bill unchanged, as it is written and now is before the Senate, we will declare another $14.8 billion in budget authority as emergency, which will mean that in 1999 alone, we will bust the spending cap by $29.8 billion, all of which will be designated as an emergency, and all of which will be exempt from our budgetary process.

First of all, isn't it amazing that we have seen the level of emergency spending grow in 1991 from $0.9 billion, to $29.8 billion? What this really shows is we have lost control of the budget

process. This loophole is literally destroying our ability to control spending.

What are these items that are declared as emergencies, items that were so critical that we had to pass an emergency supplemental appropriation in order to fund them? Let me just give you some of the ones from last year that have already busted the budget by $15 billion. Then I will give you a few from this year. Army research into caffeinated chewing gum; the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine; grasshopper research; manure handling and disposal; onion research—those are the kind of items that were included in the emergency measure that we passed last year that has caused us to violate this year's budget already by $15 billion.

Let me go over some of the items that make up this supplemental appropriation bill. ''National Public Radio, $48 million to purchase satellite capacity; $1.3 million for the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle.'' Would anybody have us believe that we planned that meeting and we suddenly discovered, after years of planning, that we had to pay for it? Would anybody believe that this should suddenly be contained in an emergency bill? No. But what they would believe is we always knew we had to pay for it but we did not put it in the budget, knowing we would put it in an emergency bill and therefore we could get around spending constraints.

''Filling up San Carlos Lake; the purchase of a post office and a Federal court house in Minnesota; modernization at Washington International Airport.'' Modernizing an airport is God's work, but does it belong in an emergency bill? Don't we fund that out of a trust fund? What is it doing in an emergency supplemental bill? ''Renovating the U.S. House page dormitory?'' I do not doubt that is meritorious. If I did a survey among the pages they might think it is a wonderful idea. But is suddenly the world going to come to an end if we did it in this year's regular appropriation? My guess is we will not spend a penny of it until this year's appropriation bill is enacted anyway, so why is it in this emergency appropriation? It's in this emergency appropriation so we do not have to count it toward the spending caps next year. ''$1.5 million for the University of the District of Columbia.'' Then there is funding for the majority whip's office—that is in the House let me make clear—and the House minority leader's office, $333,000 each. Why isn't that in the appropriation bill for the legislative branch of Government? Why are we not funding that through the normal budget process? The answer again is we put these things in emergency funding measures in order, basically, to take them out of the process.

Why does it matter? Why does it matter that we are getting ready to bust our spending caps by $29.8 billion? Why it matters is that every penny of that money is coming out of Social Security. We do not have a surplus today except for the fact that Social Security is collecting more money than it is paying out. In fact, Social Security is collecting $127 billion this year more than it will spend. We have already spent $16 billion of that on something other than Social Security. We are getting ready to spend another $14.8 billion from this bill on something other than Social Security.

The point is, if we had not passed the emergency supplemental bill last year, which ended up taking $17 billion away from Social Security in this year, we would have had in this year the first time ever in American history where we actually had a Social Security surplus available to either lock up in a lockbox so it could not be spent or use it to save Social Security.

We do not have that ability now because of the emergency bill we passed last year, and now we are passing another bill that will take $14.8 billion.

The point I am making is this: We cannot have it both ways. We cannot say we want to lock this money up for Social Security and spend it at the same time. You can say you want to spend it and that this spending is critical and that it is absolutely essential we fill up these lakes and build these dormitories and that we fund reparation payments to Japanese South Americans from World War II, that we repair high schools, which I never knew was a function of the Federal Government.

You can say those are emergencies and they are important enough that we are willing to plunder Social Security in order to fund them. That is a legitimate position. It is not one with which I agree, but it is a legitimate position. What you cannot do is say we are going to lock this money away from Social Security or we are going to use it to save Social Security and then turn around and spend it. It is not legitimate to do both. What we are trying to do in this Congress is say we want to save the money for Social Security and we are trying to spend it at the same time.

I do not hold myself out as being more righteous than anybody else, but that is turning a little more sharply than I can turn. I still remember the press conferences where we stood up and said we want to lock this money away. Here we are today spending it.

What am I trying to do in my point of order and what will it do? First of all, there is not a point of order under the budget resolution against defense spending. There is a point of order against nondefense spending. The tragedy of this bill is that we could have offset all the nondefense spending in this bill. There was a point at which, before we started piling on more and more spending, we could have, with $441 million, offset all of the nondefense spending in this bill, in which case we would not have had an emergency designation to allow us to spend beyond the budget.

A decision was made by the Appropriations Committee not to do that. They could have done it. The level of reductions in other programs would have been minuscule. But the basic response from the Appropriations Committee, with all due respect, has been: We are not going to pay for these programs, we are not going to offset them and, basically, if you don't like it, do something about it.

That has basically been the message, and people have been up front and honest about it. The only thing I know to do about it is to oppose the bill and to use the budget which we adopted and of which I am proud—it is the best budget that has been written since I have been in Congress or certainly the best budget since the Reagan budget.

The problem is, I do not see any willingness on the part of our colleagues to enforce the budget. It is as if somehow writing a good budget was enough. Every day I read in the paper, often from members of the Appropriations Committee, that they do not have any intention of living within these numbers.

Some people are saying: OK, let this $14.8 billion go and then the next time we will resist. If you are going to resist this never-ending spending spree and this plundering of the Social Security trust fund, you have to begin to resist.

We are averaging over $10 billion a year of spending we are not even counting as part of the budget, and I believe that has to end.

I am going to make a point of order which simply makes the point that under the budget we wrote earlier this year, any Member of the Senate can raise a budget point of order identifying emergency designations in nondefense areas that are not offset, and that in order to overcome that point of order, those who want to spend that money, those who want to take that money out of Social Security, will have to get 60 votes to waive that point of order.

I do not deceive myself into thinking we are going to get enough votes to sustain this point of order. I realize how the system works. But I think it is important that we begin to raise questions about what is going on in the Senate. I do not know how we are going to save Social Security if we keep spending the Social Security surplus, nor do I see how we are ever going to give tax relief if we——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 20 minutes have expired.

Mr. GRAMM. I ask unanimous consent that I may take 7½ minutes off my 15 minutes on the point of order I will raise and use that 7½ minutes now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have great problems now. I understand the Senator wants to vote on this point of order,

and there are 30 minutes on that. We then have time left for the debate on the bill itself. This vote then, I take it, will occur sometime around 25 after 2, the way I look at it. I put the Senate on notice that I am going to ask that the Senate stand in recess or stand off this bill from the hour of 3:30 p.m. until 4:15 p.m. I have not done it yet, but I want everyone to know we have to go off this bill. Our committee cannot be on the floor during that period of time because of a very important meeting the committee has that we cannot cancel.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. GRAMM. I will be very happy to have this vote on waiving the point of order at any point that will convenience the Senator. There is nothing magic about doing it now. I had thought at the end of this 7½ minutes that I would raise the point of order, we could go ahead and have this vote and dispose of it, and therefore there will be no trouble being off the bill or potentially finishing the bill before the meeting. If the Senator wants to delay it, I will be happy to do that. The time is not of any importance to me. Whatever will convenience the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. That is 1 hour 6 minutes beyond that. I serve notice to the Senate, as manager, I cannot be here between the hour of 3:30 p.m. and 4:15 p.m. We will go ahead and have the vote when Senator GRAMM's time expires, but then I will ask the leader to give us consent to do something in that period of time so we can keep our meeting as scheduled. The Senator has another 7½ minutes now, as I understand.

Mr. GRAMM. On this. Why don't I go ahead and raise the point of order and take my 15 minutes and explain it, if that is OK with the chairman.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, what has the Senator been doing? I thought we gave him 20 minutes so he can do that.

Mr. GRAMM. The Senator gave me 20 minutes to speak against the bill. I have done that. I am ready to raise the point of order.

Mr. DOMENICI. And speak 15 more minutes?

Mr. GRAMM. I have a right to under the unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOMENICI. I misunderstood when I quickly gave the Senator 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. If the Senator wants me to yield the floor so he can speak now——

Mr. DOMENICI. No.

Mr. STEVENS. There are 30 minutes on his motion to waive.

Mr. GRAMM. I get half the time on the motion to waive since I am against waiving.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the conference report contains nondefense emergency designations in violation of section 206 of House Concurrent Resolution 68. I send a list of those designations to the desk. There are 29 nondefense emergency designations in this bill that are in violation and that are subject to a point of order, and I raise the point of order against each of these 29 designations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to section 206 of H. Con. Res. 68 and section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive all points of order against this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes equally divided.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me be sure to clarify: There are 29 provisions in the bill that are subject to a point of order because they are not funded.

Let me explain to my colleagues what this point of order does and what it does not do.

This point of order does not kill the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. This point of order does not strike any funding measure in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. What this point of order does, by striking the emergency designation for these 29 unfunded, nondefense provisions, is that it will trigger an across-the-board cut in all nondefense programs to fund these items.

That across-the-board cut will fund $3.4 billion of unfunded programs. It will do it, according to the Office of Management and Budget, with a 1.25-percent across-the-board cut in discretionary nondefense programs.

Obviously, our bill—if this point of order is sustained—will differ from the House bill. Under the procedures of our budget the bill would go back to the House, which could adopt the bill with this point of order made and therefore require the across-the-board cuts to offset this new spending, or the House could amend the bill to throw out the point of order, and the bill would come back and we would vote on the bill again and see if we could sustain it.

So that is basically what we are doing.

This point of order does not kill the supplemental appropriation, it simply pays for it. It simply says, in the $3.4 billion of programs that are not funded, that under the Budget Act you can make a point of order that they are not funded, and insist on that point of order so that 60 Members of the Senate would have to vote to say we do not want to fund these programs, we want to bust the budget, and we are willing to take the money out of the Social Security surplus in order to pay for it—which is what you will be saying if you vote to waive this Budget Act point of order. Have no doubt about that.

If we sustain this point of order, there will be a 1.25-percent across-the-board cut in the same accounts, same section of the budget, nondefense discretionary, to fund these programs. The Appropriations Committee will have a decision at that point as to whether they really want these programs if they have to fund them. My guess is for many of them, they will not. My guess is, if you have to fund these programs, you will decide you do not really want them all.

Why have I made this point of order? And why is it important? Why it is important is that our budget is so different from real budgets in the real world. Every time we want to bust our budget, we say we have an emergency. But American families have emergencies every day. They are not able to bust their budgets. What we basically do here would be equivalent to a family—they have written out their budget, and they decide to buy a new refrigerator this year or they are going to go on vacation this year or they are going to buy a new car this year; and Johnny falls down the steps, breaks his arm.

The way the Government does it, they say: Well, that is an emergency, so we are going to waive our budget. We just won't have to count that as part of what we are spending. But that is not the way families work. Families have to sit back down around their kitchen table, get out an envelope and a pencil, and they have to figure out that if they have spent $400 setting Johnny's arm, they are not going to be able to buy that refrigerator or they are not going to be able to go on that vacation. They do not like it, but that is what they have to do, because that is the real world.

All I am asking here is that on these $3.4 billion worth of programs, if they are so good and they are so important, let's pay for them. It is not as if we are going to do great violence to the budget of the United States if we are required to pay for it. We are talking about a 1.25-percent across the board reduction in order to pay for these programs.

My view is that if you really wanted these programs, you would be willing to pay for them. If you are not willing to pay for them, we ought not to be spending it.

So I want to reserve the remainder of my time and conclude by just saying this. If you meant it when you set those caps on spending, if you meant it when you said you want to lock away this money for Social Security or use it for Social Security reform, we have an opportunity today to save $3.4 billion that belongs to Social Security. It does not belong to general government. It does not belong to all of these projects we are funding here. It belongs to Social Security.

If you want to save that $3.4 billion for Social Security, if you want to lock it away or use it to save Social Security, vote to sustain this point of order. I hope my colleagues will vote to sustain this point of order, because I think it is important. I think if we do not stand up now, we will now be at $29.8 billion by which we have overspent the 1999 budget before we have ever passed a single regular appropriations bill—all in the name of emergencies.

So if we are ever going to stand up and stop this plundering of Social Security and stop this runaway spending train, we have to do it now. I urge my colleagues to vote with me if you want to protect Social Security and if you want to live up to the budget.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for just 2 minutes on this motion to waive. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for making that motion to waive.

My point in addressing the Senate now is to inform the Senators that, basically, this point of order deals with the moneys that are in the bill for PL–480 food aid, for refugee assistance, for farm aid, aid for the Wye River, aid to Jordan, for the Central America and Caribbean emergency due to Hurricane Keith, and for the FEMA disasters that have taken place throughout our country.

All of those are matters that could not have been contemplated in 1947. We controlled $1.8 trillion on a 2-year period. And the Senator from Texas is objecting to the fact that these events, that have taken place totally unexpectedly, are going to cost $29.6 billion.

He is talking about 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total spending that we control. In other words, estimates that were made have been exceeded now because of unforeseen circumstances in Central America, in farm aid, in terms of the assistance to Jordan, in terms of FEMA disasters, and national disasters declared by the President, and have consumed 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent more money than we estimated.

He is wrong in talking about the bill for the year 2000. We have not gotten to the year 2000. This does not have any impact on the year 2000 except in terms of defense. It aids us in defense trying to deal with defense matters.

These are things that the Budget Act rightfully said there is a time when you can have emergencies, when they are unexpected items that have happened.

There are a lot of things in this bill that are not emergencies; they are supplemental; they are supplemental items. We can argue about them, but they are not involved in what the Senator from Texas is doing. An opinion about lumping all those things in the bill is one thing, but to deal with this concept of knocking out the emergency clause is wrong. I hope the Senators will support the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, not too long ago Senator GRAMM and I stood on the floor shoulder to shoulder preparing a budget for the United States. Not too long ago, I came up with the idea of a lockbox for Social Security. Once my friend, Senator GRAMM, saw it, a few words of congratulations and a few thoughts on how to make it perhaps a little better, we stood shoulder to shoulder that we wanted to save the Social Security trust fund. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed.

The Senator from New Mexico is proud of the budget that is going to operate for the year 2000, the new millennium. It is going to be a tough budget, and we are going to try to live with it. But I do not believe we should leave the floor today with a lot of Americans, if they were listening, thinking that the budget of the United States is out of control.

Sometimes my good friend from Texas overstates the case. And by overstating the case, sometimes, instead of being as effective as he could be, he is a little less effective.

Nobody looking at the budget of the United States as it pertains to the accounts we are talking about, defense and appropriated domestic accounts, thinks it is out of control. As a matter of fact, the whole world looks at this budget, the one that the Senator from Texas is saying is out of control, and says, how do you do it? You are doing so well.

As a matter of fact, the defense spending which is in this budget—part of the budget that the Senator is talking about—is at the lowest level and under control, the lowest level since World War II, the end of World War II, in terms of the percent of our gross domestic product that goes to defense. Likewise, the domestic spending that he is alluding to, out of control, says he, well, let me tell you, it is the lowest in history in terms of the percent of GDP. We are doing a great job of controlling this part of the budget.

He and I may come to the floor and discuss another issue where we might agree, but it has nothing to do with this bill, nothing to do with these ideas that he is alluding to today about the budget. They have to do with entitlements and mandatory spending. So for those who think the budget has gotten kind of big, we have to face up to where it is that it is getting its pot belly. It is not getting it from these two accounts, defense and domestic discretionary spending. That is the truth.

The Senator referred to families and their budgets. I noticed some people were listening to him almost enraptured thinking about their own checkbooks. To compare a family checkbook with a great American country that has a war going on in Kosovo that we didn't know about 6 months ago and expect us not to have to spend some money for that is to compare an individual American family in their kitchen with their checkbook to a country that is at war and needs money to fight the war. That is what is principally behind this appropriations bill. The overwhelming percentage of this spending is for the defense of our Nation, if that is why we are in Kosovo, because we have something to defend. And whether you like the war or you don't like the war, it costs money. It isn't predicted in the family checkbook that in the middle of the month you are going to have a war, because families don't have wars. They don't go out and buy more tanks and more airplanes, when they have a disaster.

That is point No. 1—the budget is not out of control.

Point No. 2—the overwhelming percentage of this particular bill is for the defense of our Nation. Many of us are proud that we put more money in than the President had asked us for. We thought the President low-balled the request because he didn't want to be embarrassed about this war, and so he has far too little money. We put in $5 billion more in this bill. Take that to the American people and ask them: Would you do that, or would you not do that? Would you believe Senator GRAMM's reasoning for saying let's cut some other American programs to pay for that?

By the way, the sequester which he is speaking about, the across-the-board cut which will be done by the Office of Management and Budget, the President's people, it will not be 1.25 percent for all the rest of the accounts. Because the year is so far down, it will be almost 4 percent, 3.75 percent, or some $3 billion. Is that what we should do when we have emergencies, cut all of Government across the board 3.75 percent, not when the budget starts, but when the budget year is half over with or more than half over with, just say we are going to cut it? Families do not do that either, if you want to talk about families. They don't come along when they have all their children's bills paid for and everything else and say that we are going to cut 3.75 percent out of it and spend it for something else. They don't have that kind of problem. That is what we are going to be confronted with for American programs in education, in construction, in highways, in everything.

It is just not worth it, in this Senator's opinion. The longer you wait and delay this bill, the more the demands are going to be, not less. They will be more.

Let me just give you one more. If we are out of control, every country in Europe and every industrial democracy in the world has already gone out of this world. They are all spending more than we are as a percentage of their budgets. Their budgets are much higher than ours. And that is why we are doing so well—because our budgets are low, and our taxes must remain low.

To be sure on my comments about how low defense spending is and how low domestic spending is versus other years and other nations, I have that on two pieces of paper. I ask that those two documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Total government—Federal, State, local—spending as a percentage of GDP (1998)*

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| United States | 31 |
| England | 40 |
| France | 54 |
| Germany | 47 |
| Japan | 37 |
| Canada | 42 |

| | Percentage of GDP | |
|---|---|---|
| | Defense | Nondefense |
| 1980 | 5.0 | 5.2 |
| 1985 | 6.2 | 4.0 |
| 1990 | 5.3 | 3.5 |
| 1995 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| 1998 [1] | 3.2 | 3.4 |

[1] The lowest percentage since WWII, both defense and nondefense.

Mr. DOMENICI. The issue now is not whether you want to vote for this bill or not. The issue is whether you want to support a motion to waive the point of order, a very specific, new point of order; I helped draft it. It is a nice point of order. Whether you want to waive it or not, that is the issue. If you want to vote against the bill, you can still do that but, frankly, you should move to waive this so that when those people who want to vote for this bill vote for it, they are not confronted with having to cut Government 3.75 percent in order to accomplish the purposes suggested here by my good friend from Texas, Senator GRAMM.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes 4 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and friend from New Mexico for helping me see that in an effort to derail this point of order that we didn't do something that could undercut the whole budget. I am very grateful for his help on that.

I want to disagree with the points that have been made by my two colleagues and do it in such a way as to not be disagreeable.

First of all, our dear colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, says that the violating expenditures here that are not offset are only sixteen-hundredths of a percent of overall Government spending. Well, my point is, if it is that small an amount of money, why don't we pay for it? In a budget of $1.7 trillion, we are in essence saying that $3.4 billion of nondefense spending is so important we are willing to violate the budget in terms of spending beyond our cap. But it is not important enough that we are willing to cut somewhere else to fund it? It seems to me if it is that important, we ought to be willing to pay for it.

As to whether the budget is out of control relative to much of the world, our budget is not out of control. I agree with our colleagues. I am not making a statement trying to send the stock market down at 2, nor do I think any statement I could make would be capable of doing that. But I am not comparing America to Honduras. I am not comparing America to Japan. I am comparing what America is doing relative to what Congress promised the American people we would do.

I do say that when we are spending, in emergency spending in 1999, three times as much as we have ever spent before, that suggests to me that something is out of control. As we all know, we read every day in the paper where Members are saying there is no way we can live up to these spending caps, and that this is only the beginning of our violation of the budget. My view is this ought to be the beginning of the fight to preserve the budget numbers we adopted.

Let me tell you how the budget is out of control. It is not out of control the way we keep our books, even though we are beginning to lose control by designating all the spending as an emergency. But if we used accrual accounting, like American business has to, with Medicare and Social Security, we would be running huge deficits today.

I agree with our colleague from New Mexico. Many of our worst problems are in areas like Social Security and Medicare. But the point is, we have to have Presidential leadership, we have to put together a program to deal with those problems; and it takes a concerted effort to do that. But the one area that we can control by ourselves is discretionary spending. The point is, if we don't have the will to prevent $3.4 billion of new spending, how are we going to have the will to reform Social Security or Medicare?

In terms of comparing the checkbook of a family to a great nation and a great economy, I think it is a good comparison. In fact, Adam Smith once observed:

> What is wisdom in every household can hardly be folly in the economy of a great nation.

Where can we find a better blueprint for fiscal responsibility than looking at working American families sitting around the kitchen table? The fact that they are dealing with thousands of dollars and we are dealing with billions of dollars doesn't fundamentally change things. They have to set priorities. They have to say no. And they have to say no to their children, the people they love, and to real needs.

All I am saying is that we need to say no more often so that working families can say yes more often. I want to save Social Security so we don't have to double the payroll tax. I want to save Social Security so we don't have to cut benefits for the elderly. But we can't do that if we keep spending the Social Security surplus.

In terms of across-the-board cuts, if it is not worth cutting to pay for, then why is it worth spending? If it is not worth taking it from a lower priority, is Social Security the lowest priority? Is taking this money out of the Social Security surplus of lower significance than funding all the thousands of other programs we fund? I don't think so.

The final point. This is a point of order under the Budget Act against the nondefense portions of this bill. I would have raised a point of order against all the emergency designations in the bill had the point of order existed. I don't want people to think this is somehow nondefense versus defense. I believe in a strong defense. My dad was a sergeant in the Army for 28 years 7 months and 27 days. I have voted for defense. I have helped write budgets that rebuilt defense. But I want to pay for defense.

I think where the difference is, I am willing to cut other programs to fund defense. But I don't understand why we are not willing to take it away from something else to fund defense but we are willing to violate our spending caps to fund defense. And if this war is so vitally important—let me make it clear that I don't see the vital national interest here. I don't see this as a vote on the war. But let me make it very clear, if this war is so vital, we ought to be willing to cut other Government programs to fund it. The idea that we ought to take the money out of Social Security to fund this war, I think, is wrong.

So, again, this is a hard issue. I don't doubt the sincerity of our colleagues who are trying to do a difficult job in writing these appropriations. But there are two reasons I am here making this point of order. No. 1, we busted the budget by $21 billion on the last day of the last Congress. We are already at almost $30 billion of busting it now. We have to stop this from happening at some point. Let's do it now.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask that the Senator yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let's go back to what we are talking about. If a family had a $16,000-a-year income and had a 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent overage in their expenditures that year, they would have to borrow $20. We are talking about 16 one-hundredths of 1 percent in excess of the budget. And it is for items that are emergencies. What family would not borrow $20 to meet an emergency? Is it disaster relief emergency? Yes. Is the Central America-Caribbean expenditure an emergency? Yes. The Wye River accord for Jordan, was that an emergency? Yes. Is farm country in trouble? Is that an emergency? Yes. All we are saying is we are going to deal with that $20 out of $16,000. That is the comparison for an average family.

Mr. President, the thing that bothers me most about this is, we have to contemplate change. I will make one statement to you. If the New Madrid Fault that runs through the center of this country suffers an earthquake again—the last time it went off, the church bells rang in Boston because of an earthquake that took place going through the area west of the Mississippi. It changed the Mississippi River. It went backwards. It started a new channel which it has today. Can you imagine the amount of money we

would have to have? That is why the Budget Act provides money for emergencies. If the Senator is trying to say you have to have 60 votes to overcome that, now, that is wrong. I hope we have them today, Mr. President. This is an emergency, and this money is needed by the Department of Defense, and the agencies need it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator from Texas have any time remaining?

Mr. GRAMM. I don't think I have any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in conclusion, Senator GRAMM makes a lot of good points. I believe we make some good points, also. I don't believe we ought to, at this stage of the budget year, adopt a point of order that will send us back to all of the Government programs, some of which many of us don't like, some of which many of us love, most of which are halfway through a year. I don't believe we ought to go back and have them cut 3.7 percent across the board.

One thing about missing our budget targets—the so-called caps, Mr. President—the overwhelming percentage of supplemental appropriations have been for real emergencies, or emergencies that the President of the United States asked us for and in which we concurred. That is what the Budget Act says; caps are binding except for emergencies; emergency money is not subject to caps. That is what we have here.

I hope we pass this appropriations bill today and fund what our military desperately needs to replenish the Kosovo war and replenish the military equipment and the time that was spent in Central America for the disaster that killed 10,000 of our neighbors in Central America. Those are predominant items in this bill. There are a lot of small ones that are difficult to justify, but in a real sense they don't really amount to the essence of this bill, which is emergencies we cannot contemplate.

I yield back whatever time I have.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to offer my support to Senator GRAMM's point of order against the supplemental appropriations conference report. As I have said before, we must provide the offsets for the nonemergency portions of this conference report. There is currently $13.3 billion of nonemergency spending that has not been offset, in violation of the Budget Act. I believe that Congress must protect the Social Security surplus and ensure that the money is there for future generations, not spend it on items that are clearly nonemergency items.

We have been spending the last few years talking about fiscal discipline and the spending caps. Now that we have a surplus, Congress must resist the temptation to circumvent the regular appropriations process. Many of the items contained in the report should have been considered by the appropriations subcommittees and debated on the floor of the Senate. Congress must allow the regular process to take place and not sneak things into appropriations bills.

I tried to offer legislation that would provide those offsets, but an objection was raised. I want to ensure that Congress does the right thing and preserves the Social Security surplus. This is what the lock box legislation would prevent. This is what my legislation would prevent. I ask my colleagues not to waive the Budget Act.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I supported Senator GRAMM's point of order because, while some of the spending programs in this bill may have merit, they should not be funded by Social Security Trust Fund balances. The point of order would not prevent these programs from being funded, but would force Congress to find adequate offsetting spending cuts to pay for those programs, or those spending cuts would be imposed automatically at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote take place at 15 minutes after 2, in 7 minutes, and I yield that time until the vote to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER. The vote will take place at 2:15, in 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The vote will be at 2:15.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for yielding me the time.

I support the waiver on the point of order. The conference committee labored extensively and diligently to come up with the bill that is on the floor at the present time. It was a tough, contentious, argumentative conference. While not perfect, we conferees did the very best we could. At some points on Wednesday night of last week, it looked a little like ''Saturday Night Live,'' except it was Wednesday. C-SPAN was in the conference room recording and videocasting across the country to the few who might have been inclined to watch.

Having been a party to that conference and having struggled through the issues of the necessity for military spending and the emergency programs that are involved in Hurricane Mitch and the tragedies in Oklahoma and Kansas—Kansas being my native State—the conference committee did the very best it could.

This bill ought to be enacted in toto. Since that requires a waiver initially, that ought to be undertaken.

We are really looking at broader, complex issues as we face the appropriations process for fiscal year 2000.

We have recently seen the allocations in the House of Representatives. The allocations in the Senate are portending for very, very severe cuts.

I chair the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services. The President's budget is slightly in excess of $90 billion. The allocation preliminarily marked up for my subcommittee is $80 billion. If that is to happen, we are going to have some really drastic, drastic cuts, cuts which the American people are going to have to evaluate as they are making their wishes known in our representative democracy to the Members of the House and Senate.

We have budget caps. I would like to live within those budget caps. But to do that, we are going to be looking at these kinds of reductions in spending:

On Safe and Drug-Free Schools, there would be a cut of $66 million from the Drug and Violence Prevention Program.

Here we are today on a juvenile crime bill where we are trying to deal with the problems of juvenile crime, and at the same time we are looking at a budget which is going to cut funding of $66 million from the guts of that kind of a program—drug and violence prevention.

We are looking at cuts on the Job Corps of $150 million from a $1.3 billion program.

When we talk about the Job Corps, here again we are talking about dealing with juveniles who may have gone astray.

If you have a juvenile offender without a trade or a skill, a functional illiterate who leaves prison, that individual is going to go back to a life of crime, and is going to get the first gun he can put his hands on. And here we are talking about an enormous cut in the JOBS Program, which is designed specifically against that problem.

We have enormous cuts in child care—$131 million in our efforts to whip the welfare program and send welfare mothers to work. Child care is indispensable.

Special education—a favorite of all Senators—would be cut by $480 million.

The National Institutes of Health, the crown jewel of the Federal Government, perhaps the only jewel of the Federal Government—instead of having a $2 billion increase, which the Senate said we ought to have in the sense of the Senate, the National Institutes of Health would be reduced by $1.8 billion, which would result in approximately 6000 fewer grants at a time when medical research is on the verge of solving enormous problems of Parkinson's with the new stem cells estimated within the 5- to 10-year range.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Some of those who were called to order may be the ones who ought to be listening to what needs to happen in our appropriations process if we are to achieve the goals of our lofty rhetoric.

But interrupting, the juvenile violence bill on the culture of violence-

we have programs which are designed to deal with that. The way we are heading, we are going to be cutting the heart out of the precise programs intended to deal with that culture of violence.

These are issues which I hope the American people will understand so that their views may be felt in our representative democracy.

We would all like to stay within the caps. We would all like to economize. But when we take a look at a $10 billion cut which hits labor, safety programs, and health and education, those are matters which have to be decided by this body reflecting the views of our constituency.

I again thank the chairman for yielding the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 70, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—70

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akaka | Durbin | Mack |
| Baucus | Edwards | McConnell |
| Bayh | Feinstein | Mikulski |
| Bennett | Frist | Moynihan |
| Biden | Gorton | Murkowski |
| Bingaman | Grassley | Murray |
| Bond | Harkin | Reed |
| Boxer | Hatch | Reid |
| Breaux | Helms | Roberts |
| Bryan | Hollings | Rockefeller |
| Byrd | Inouye | Sarbanes |
| Campbell | Jeffords | Schumer |
| Chafee | Johnson | Shelby |
| Cleland | Kennedy | Smith (OR) |
| Cochran | Kerrey | Snowe |
| Collins | Kerry | Specter |
| Conrad | Kohl | Stevens |
| Coverdell | Landrieu | Thurmond |
| Craig | Lautenberg | Torricelli |
| Daschle | Leahy | Warner |
| DeWine | Levin | Wellstone |
| Dodd | Lieberman | Wyden |
| Domenici | Lincoln | |
| Dorgan | Lott | |

NAYS—30

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abraham | Graham | McCain |
| Allard | Gramm | Nickles |
| Ashcroft | Grams | Robb |
| Brownback | Gregg | Roth |
| Bunning | Hagel | Santorum |
| Burns | Hutchinson | Sessions |
| Crapo | Hutchison | Smith (NH) |
| Enzi | Inhofe | Thomas |
| Feingold | Kyl | Thompson |
| Fitzgerald | Lugar | Voinovich |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 70, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if we could, for the orderly presentation of the balance of the argument on this bill, I inquire, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 12 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia has 42 minutes. The Senator from North Dakota has 15 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask the Senator from West Virginia if we can make a list of who is going to be recognized, because almost all the time is allocated, as I understand it. I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. I reserve 7 minutes of the time. Can the Senator allocate his time?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Let me see how much time I have left. I have 45 minutes promised.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has 42 minutes, but I will give him 3 of my minutes.

Mr. BYRD. All right.

Mr. STEVENS. Please tell us what they are.

Mr. BYRD. Senator CONRAD, 5 minutes; Senator LANDRIEU, 5 minutes; Senator HARKIN, 8 minutes; Senator GRAHAM, 7½ minutes; Senator DODD, 5 minutes; Senator DURBIN, 5 minutes; Senator WELLSTONE, 5 minutes; Senator BOXER, 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Senator reserving some time for himself?

Mr. BYRD. Senator DORGAN has 15 minutes for himself outside this.

Mr. STEVENS. Does that allocate fully the Senator's 42 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). It does.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge the Senators to take their time starting now.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as I begin, I pay tribute to the Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS, and the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and other of my colleagues. I see the Senator from Mississippi on the floor, Mr. COCHRAN, and so many others who in that conference spent hour after hour, day after day hammering out a conference agreement. Especially the chairman and the ranking member. I recall one evening sitting there at 1 in the morning, and they were still there exhibiting the kind of patience that is quite extraordinary in order to resolve all of these many issues.

Much of the discussion was about the victims of Hurricane Mitch, the responsibility to respond to our neighbors in this hemisphere who have been hit with such a terrible disaster, the military needs with respect to the airstrikes in Kosovo, and the prosecution of that conflict, the needs for spring planting loans in farm country, and a range of other issues.

I support many of those areas, but I am not going to support the conference report because I believe, as I indicated in the conference committee, that if there are resources above that which was requested for the Defense Department for the prosecution of this conflict in Kosovo, if there were $2 billion or $3 billion or $5 billion or $6 billion more available, then I believe we should have a better debate on the priorities of the use of those funds. I, for one, believe we have an urgent, urgent need in rural America to provide a better safety net to give family farmers a chance to make it through this price depression. I believe that is the priority.

We had a vote in the conference on the Senate side, and we lost 14–14 on a proposal that would have added nearly $5.5 billion for some price supports to build a bridge across those price valleys during these troubled times in rural America. We lost 14–14. I wish we had won.

Nearly $5.5 billion to $6 billion was added to this package for defense spending that was not requested. It is not that the money is not available, it is that a different priority was attached to the spending of this money.

I will tell you why I feel so strongly about this. I come from rural America. I come from a small town. We raised some cattle and horses. Last Thursday, my brother called a florist in a little town called Mott, ND. Mott, ND, is 14 miles from my hometown of Regent. Regent has 300 people and Mott is a bigger town and always was, even when I was growing up. Mott is about 800 people.

My brother called the florist on the Main Street of Mott. There is one little florist shop. He said: My brother and I want to order flowers to be delivered to the cemetery at Regent for our mother and father for their graves on Memorial Day. We do that each year, and we also do so on Mother's Day and Father's Day.

My brother said he told the woman who runs and owns the floral shop: By the way, I forgot to call you this year on Mother's Day. I was going to have you deliver some flowers for Mother's Day.

Incidentally, this floral shop always apologizes when we call because she says: We have to charge you a $2 delivery fee. It is 28 miles.

My brother said: I forgot to call you this year to deliver flowers for our mother's grave on Mother's Day, but I would like you to deliver them on Memorial Day.

The woman who owns the flower shop said: That's all right, we delivered some on Mother's Day because we know you call every year and we thought you just forgot. Later on, we were going to send you a bill, and if you paid it, that was all right, and if you did not, that's all right, too.

That probably does not happen across America, but it happens in my part of the country, in rural America, where family farmers and Main Street merchants work together in a lifestyle that is really quite wonderful. People do things, people help each other, but there is no amount of help in farm country these days that can reach out

and say to family farmers who are struggling to make a living: We will help you with the price of your grain. We know you are trucking that grain to the elevator these days and are told there is no value; we will help you.

That is not what is happening. In fact, they are going to the elevators today to find out the grain market has collapsed and they are getting Depression-era prices, at the same time the current farm program, freedom to farm, is pulling the rug out from under these farmers with respect to the safety net. We need to help.

If we want family farmers in our future, we need to help. If we want to preserve this kind of lifestyle, yes, of family farms and Main Street of our small towns, we need to do something to help.

I want to read a few things from Ted Koppel's program ''Nightline'' on Tuesday, May 18. They did a program on the farm crisis. They pointed out—while all of the good news comes to the Washington Post and the New York Times, just open them up and read all the wonderful news, our economy is growing, unemployment is down, inflation is down, virtually everything else is up, a lot of good news—but the farm belt does not experience that good news. Family farmers are in desperate trouble and small towns are shrinking. The rural economy is in desperate trouble.

Ted Koppel on his program had farmers and others talking. I will share some of that with my colleagues:

> Here's what many farmers see happening, the prices they can sell their crops for falling and predicted to stay low. . . . wheat prices are down 42 percent.

Now, ask yourself, how would you feel or your family feel if you had a 42-percent cut in your income? Would you feel that the economy is doing real well?

> Corn prices are down 38 percent. Oats and barley down 32 percent.

In constant dollars, these are prices that we received in the family farm in the Great Depression.

At the start of the program, Ted Koppel interviewed a fellow. He talks about a guy who works with farm families, tries to help them. Willard Brunell said:

> I think the scariest one was back a few years when I got a phone call from a farm wife [who] said my husband just left with a gun and he's driving away. He said he's going to his tractor. [He said] I was there with him 20 minutes and it was quite a ways away. I got him out of his tractor. He sat in my little car and we spent two hours in that car trying to talk him down and he told me exactly how he was doing, going to do it. He had the gun with him. . . .

They get more than 50 calls a month in this fellow's church talking about that kind of desperation.

In Minnesota and North Dakota, where Ted Koppel's program was taped, is some of the richest farmland in the entire world. Last year, one in every three farmers grew a crop that cost more to produce than they could sell it for. For many, it was the fourth, fifth year that happened.

Lowell Nelson was interviewed on this program. He is one of those farmers.

> He was born, raised and had his own sons on this land, a fertile 400 acres he bought from his brothers 35 years ago after his dad died. But this spring [is the first spring] he's not planting anything.

He cannot. He is ruined. He said:

> Well, I had been putting it off [this decision] for quite [a long] time and I had gotten a lot of urging, you know, from my wife to make a decision and I had just been putting it off. It's a decision I didn't want to make.

His wife said:

> One night he was out in the field and all of a sudden called me on the [shortwave] radio and wanted me to come over just to ride with him [on the tractor] and I knew something was wrong and it was shortly thereafter that he decided he'd better get some medical help.

The interviewer asked Mr. Nelson:

> How badly did you scare yourself?

He said:

> Real bad.

The interviewer asked:

> What do you mean?

He said:

> Thinking that it may be better off not being here.

The reason I mention the ''Nightline'' program, they interviewed these folks. These are real people in desperate trouble—just in desperate trouble. We have a country whose economy is growing and thriving and rising—full of good news. The stock market hits record highs. Everybody says this is a terrific economy. Then you drive out down a country road, and talk to a family who has struggled for 20, 30, 50 years, and you see what is happening.

A big guy stood up at a meeting I had one day. He had a big beard, a tall fellow, a strong fellow. He said: You know, my granddad farmed my farm. My dad farmed it for 40 years. And I have farmed it for 23 years. Then his eyes teared up and his chin began to quiver, and he could not continue anymore. When he finally got the words out, he said: And I can't keep going anymore. I'm broke, so I have to sell the farm.

That may not matter to some, but it matters to me.

A woman wrote me a couple of weeks ago and said: We had our auction sale on our farm, and my 17-year-old son would not get out of bed to come downstairs. He refused to come down and help at the auction sale because he was so heartbroken. He knew he would never be able to do what his dad did. He knew he would never be able to farm that farm. She could not get him out of bed he was so heartbroken.

I tell you all of that because we pass a supplemental bill and we say: All right, on defense, the Defense Department needs $6.1 billion to prosecute this war in Kosovo. We must restore munitions and planes and do other things. And I am for all of that. I support all of that. I support our men and women in uniform and support this mission.

But then we also say there is another $5 or $6 billion we want to add to that. And I say, if there is $5 or $6 billion around that can be used in this discretionary way, then I want the priority to say: We want to continue to invest in America's family farmers.

You think this country is going to be a better, stronger place when we don't have family farmers left? When corporations farm America from California to Maine, you think food prices are not going to go up? And it is more than just farming. These folks contribute in every way to their community. They contribute to a way of life that we are losing in this country. Yet, somehow, when we talk about all of these fancy economic theories, nobody talks about the family as an economic unit—nobody.

The economic unit in this country is the large corporation. They are all getting married, as you know. There is all this corporate romance going on all over America. Every day you wake up and see a new couple of corporations have decided to get hitched and get bigger.

What about the economic unit that really matters in the center of this country in America's farm belt that grows America's food? That makes America's communities strong? That helps build America's churches? That puts life on main streets on Saturday night? What about those economic units? What about family farmers?

Last year, we passed an emergency bill. About half of that money is not yet in the hands of family farmers. It will be there in a matter of weeks, I guess, through the USDA, through this formula. But it is $1.5 billion short of what was promised. We should have at least added that to this piece of legislation. We should have at least added some additional support to say to family farmers, when prices collapse at Depression-level prices, we are going to reach out a helping hand, extend a helping hand to you to say you matter to this country.

We had an opportunity to do that and did not. A 14-to-14 vote, and how I regret losing that vote—but in this business, in this system, you win some and you lose some. My hope is that those who felt it not appropriate, those who felt it was not the time to respond to this need now will, a week from now or a month from now, decide that it is time to respond.

This is not Democrat and Republican. We have had bad farm programs under all kinds of administrations—Democratic administrations, Republican administrations. I want the farmers to get the price from the marketplace as well. That would be my fervent hope. But when the marketplace collapses, we must help.

Let me make a final point. I think it is fascinating that at a time when

somehow the economic unit of the family, with respect to agriculture, does not seem to matter, that which the family farm produces in this country is used by everybody else to make record profits—the railroads make record profits hauling it; the cereal manufacturers make record profits putting air in it and puffing it up and putting it on the grocery store shelves and calling it puffed wheat—the farmers go broke. The manufacturers get rich. Or they sell a steer for a pittance or sell a hog for $20, an entire hog. You can buy a hog for $20 at the bottom of the hog market, and then go to the store and buy a ham that cost you $30 or $40. Buy a small ham at twice the price you bought the entire hog for.

Something is fundamentally wrong, and farmers know it. So everybody who touches these products make record profits and are getting bigger and richer; and the folks who start the tractor and plow the ground and plant the seed, and then hope all summer it does not hail, the insects don't come, that it rains enough and doesn't rain too much, and that they, by the grace of God, might get a crop, wonder whether they will be able to sell it in the fall and make any kind of profit.

So I cannot vote for this conference report. But having said that, I deeply admire the work of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from West Virginia and others who participated in it. The priorities, in my judgment, needed to include the priorities I have just discussed with respect to helping family farmers, and they do not, regrettably.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I say to my good friend from North Dakota, I had oriented myself to one set of remarks, but I listened carefully to his, as I frequently do. He certainly speaks from the heart about his people. I remember the floods that his State experienced years ago. I feel as if I am on the farm, the family farm, with him. And you talked about that family.

So while we may be at odds on this bill, I want to take the same theme and talk about a family. I want to talk about a military family. This bill has in it provisions for a military family.

I want to talk about that wife here in the United States, or in other places of the world, with their children, whose husband is flying an aircraft right at this minute in harm's way. It could be the reverse, because women are flying aircraft in harm's way in this conflict over the Balkan region, over Iraq.

Mr. President, this country is at war. And for that wife at home, war is hell. For that individual in the cockpit, war is hell.

The purpose of this emergency legislation is to provide the dollars necessary to alleviate to some extent the strain on the families and those in the cockpits.

Every Member of the Senate has young men and women involved in the conflict in Kosovo or over the general Balkan region or over Iraq or standing guard, as they are, in other far, remote areas of the world to protect freedom. That is what this bill is all about.

Let me add one other feature, and then I will yield the floor, because many are anxious to speak.

Each year, the Department of Defense plans for the next year and the year following as to how many aviators, for example, they will train to keep the cockpits filled. Last year, the number of pilots we had to keep to maintain the flying status of sufficient men and women fell by 1,641. That number of young men and women trained as aviators decided they no longer could remain on active duty and would return to civilian opportunities. Many of those decisions were dictated by their concern for their families. But stop to think of what it costs every American taxpayer to replace that individual in that airplane, to train the number of new recruits to be pilots or navigators or to take to sea in those combat airplanes.

I ran that calculation. It costs roughly between $2 million to $6 million, depending on the type of aircraft, to train a man or a woman to become an aviator, $2 million to $6 million. If you multiply the average of that times 1,641, it is $9 billion just to replace the aviators. That same drain on trained manpower, womanpower in the military occurs in other branches of the service where perhaps their training is not as costly to the taxpayer but $9 billion just to close the gap for those flying aircraft.

Let us think about the families, as my good friend from North Dakota described, the farm community. Let us talk about the military, what those wives and their children, what those aviators are doing in harm's way today. They are carrying out the orders of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This Nation is but one of 19 nations locked together in the first combat operation in the 50-year history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This is a critical moment for families, be they farm families or military families.

Mr. President, as I said, support the emergency supplemental appropriations bill now before the Senate. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I join with my colleague and close working partner on defense matters, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to urge all our colleagues to support our military forces by voting for this bill.

I support this bill for one simple reason—we are at war. As we speak, we have military forces engaged in combat—going in harm's way—in the skies over the Balkans and Iraq. Whether or not there is agreement on how these risk-taking operations are being prosecuted is not now the question. We must support our military forces who are risking their lives daily to carry out the missions they have been assigned.

Mr. President, the conflict in Kosovo has been ongoing since March 24, when the NATO use of force began. Since that time our pilots and the pilots of our allies have flown thousands of combat missions against Milosevic's military machine. We have already spent billions of dollars—on both aircraft operations and munitions—in support of Operation Allied Force. These funds are now coming out of the readiness accounts of our military services. Without this supplemental, there would be further and unacceptable degradation of the readiness of our forces.

The conference agreement provides $10.9 billion for defense, including $2.2 billion above the President's request for aircraft flying hours, spare parts, depot maintenance and munitions, including sophisticated precision-guided missiles and bombs, which allow our pilots to be more effective at reduced risk—both to them and to innocent civilians on the ground.

Mr. President, I know that some of my colleagues have expressed concern regarding the funds provided in this bill for pay raises, pay table reform and retirement reform. I firmly believe that all my colleagues would agree that we have very serious problems of recruiting and retention in our military services. I believe the problems are of such magnitude—indeed, we have a hemorrhaging of skilled personnel leaving our military—that this situation qualifies as an emergency. As an example, both the Army and the Navy failed to meet their 1998 recruiting goals and the Army, Navy, and the Air Force project that they will not meet their recruiting goals for 1999.

Last year, 1641 more pilots left the service than the Department of Defense projected. It costs about $6 million to train a single pilot. The cost to replace these 1641 pilots is more than $9 billion. We must act to stop this hemmorhage of pilots and other skilled military personnel. We must send a signal now that we in the Congress intend to take care of our military personnel and their families.

I know that there are Senators who are concerned about this process, and there are Senators who disagree with some of the items in this emergency supplemental. I share some of these concerns. But, Mr. President, as I stated earlier, our Nation is at war. We can argue the process and our other concerns at another time.

I believe that now is the time for the Senate to show its support for our men and women in uniform who are, as we speak, carrying out their assigned missions under difficult and dangerous conditions. I will vote for this bill, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate his work on this very important measure for our country at this time.

I was here in the Chamber and got to hear the remarkable speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. He is absolutely correct. There is not enough money in this supplemental appropriations bill to address the devastation that we are experiencing throughout rural America. My State in particular has been hard hit because of weather-related disasters, the worst drought in over a century occurred last year.

It is my hope that in the months ahead we will all, on both sides of this aisle, Democrats and Republicans, be more mindful of the tremendous difficulty that rural America is experiencing and come up with additional and real ways of helping that lead us to a more market-oriented approach but recognize that there are some safety nets and some bridges that need to be put in place that are not there yet, and it is causing great pain throughout America.

However, I want to point out that in this supplemental, partly because of the fine work by the Senator from North Dakota and others, we have added a half billion dollars for much-needed farm relief. It is not enough, but it is better than nothing. Farmers in my State in Louisiana and in many States around the Nation are depending on us today to vote favorably toward this measure and to send them this help. Every day in my office the phone rings with farmers needing their emergency assistance that was promised to them last year but not forthcoming.

It is estimated from our agriculture commissioner that there are over 300 to 400 farmers that are just barely holding on, waiting for these checks and this assistance so that they can make future plans.

It is important. It is not enough money in this bill, but it is better than what it started out to be. Because of the leadership, a half billion dollars has been added. I am happy to say that a great deal of that money will go to help Louisiana and other States in our area.

This package includes much-needed emergency assistance to farmers in Louisiana and other agriculture States still reeling from last year's extreme weather conditions.

Mr. President, I will never forget the faces of farmers in my home State as they showed me acre after acre of scorched row crops, or how shocking it was to see the horrible cracks and craters in what was once fertile soil.

This package, Mr. President, includes additional assistance to replenish the fiscal year 1999 emergency loan account, which has been depleted due to the severity of this crisis.

Hundreds have received help but, right now more than 300 farm families in Louisiana are waiting for their emergency loan applications to come through. And although more assistance may still be needed, those loan payments are crucial to help our farmers stay in business.

Mr. President, hurricane victims in Central America are also waiting on this emergency package. In fact, they've been waiting for more than 6 months.

The winds and rains of Hurricane Mitch claimed the lives of more than 10,000 people, and left an estimated 1 million homeless. It completely wiped out hundreds of schoolhouses, bridges, roadways, and churches. But after visiting Honduras and Nicaragua, I can assure you the numbers fail to convey the full extent of the devastation.

Besides the obvious humanitarian reasons, helping our Central American neighbors recover serves the long-term interests not only of the United States but the entire Western Hemisphere.

Within the past few decades, we have seen Central America move from conflict to peace, from authoritarian governments to democracies, from closed to open economies. Now this progress is at risk.

In the past, the United States has played a strong role in encouraging economic development in Central America.

Nearly four decades ago, President Kennedy traveled to Costa Rica to announce his ''Alliance for Progress'' to promote the expansion of agriculture exports throughout the region.

Since then we have pursued a variety of other measures designed to help these countries diversify their economies and boost exports.

While these policies have not always been successful, the United States has always shown its willingness to help lift these economically depressed nations to a more prosperous standard of living.

The point is—the United States has a long history of helping our Central American friends move further down the path of development. Now—perhaps—that friendship is being tested by the devastation that has decimated their towns and villages and the commerce that flows through them.

But, as we all know, friendships become stronger when they are tested. And I am glad that the United States is responding like good friends should.

I am also particularly pleased that this supplemental package will be used in part to addresses the problem of permanent housing in Central America.

During a historic meeting—hosted by Senators LOTT and COVERDELL—held in the LBJ Room several months ago, four Central American Presidents made it clear that permanent housing is among the highest priorities for their recovery. The numbers say it best: Mitch destroyed 700,000 homes, severely damaged 50,000 and left 35,000 people in temporary housing—tents, schools, churches.

I will be working—along with other colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to see that we do all we can in the area of housing in Central America.

Helping Central America rebuild is of special concern in Louisiana. With one of the largest Honduran communities outside Honduras, New Orleans is sometimes referred to as ''the third largest Honduran city.''

Brought to our State through trade with the port, these enterprising people have been a source of strength to our community for many years now. So this package is of utmost importance to them and so many others back home.

Before yielding the floor, Mr. President, let me also express my support for the increase in military spending in this supplemental.

Over the last decade, we have seen a slow, steady decline in the recruitment and retention of our military men and women. We have allowed the disparities between military and private sector to grow so large that our service men and women are being lured away.

For instance, B–52 pilots at Barksdale Airforce Base in Shreveport, LA, can go right down the street to the Shreveport International Airport and sign on with a commercial airline with better salaries, pensions, and benefits.

It is imperative that we reverse this trend. Mr. President, my hope is that these military spending increases will mark a good step forward in helping us recruit and retain the best and the brightest.

In closing, let me say again how important this Emergency Supplemental Package is to farmers in Louisiana and other rural communities in America. And as we consider the interests of our Nation and this hemisphere—and the future of the fragile democracies in them—on the edge of this new century, let us make sure we honor our ties of friendship with the nations of Central America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from West Virginia and my leader on the Appropriations Committee, and my friend, Senator STEVENS from Alaska, who is not present on the floor; he is also the chairman of this important committee.

You can measure the values of a nation by the way it spends its money. If you take a look at this bill, you will see that the values of America are strong in many areas. We are prepared to spend $6 billion to make sure that the men and women in uniform in Kosovo have the very best. Were it my son or daughter, I would demand nothing less. I am sure we all feel the same.

We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for humanitarian relief. Isn't it typically American that no matter what our sacrifice, we are willing to help others, whether it is the refugees

in Kosovo or those suffering from the hurricane in Central America.

Many other good things are in this bill. I was happy to be part of an effort to provide financial assistance to those who have been in the pork production industry and have been hard hit during the last year. Senator BOND and I have worked for $145 million to try to help some of these farmers to face the toughest times in their lives. Net farm income in Illinois is down 78 percent. Farmland in Illinois is some of the best in the country, yet farmers have seen this dramatic decline in income. With all these good things in the bill, it would seem fairly obvious to vote for it without reservation. I wish I could. I plan on voting for it, but with serious reservations. Let me tell you what they relate to.

When this bill came from the White House, the President asked for $6 billion for military and humanitarian assistance, and then the House added $5 billion in military spending which the President didn't ask for. Among other things in this bill is $500 million for military construction around the world that is not authorized, not requested. It is put in here.

When I went to the conference with Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, the Senate side of the aisle said we are going to propose an amendment that I offered—$265 million for American schools. You have heard of all the things I have mentioned. There is not a penny in this bill for American schools—nothing. Are schools on our minds? You bet they are. Cities like Conyers, GA; Littleton, CO; Jonesboro, AR; West Paducah, KY; Pearl, MS; Springfield, OR. The sad roster of schools in America that have been hit by school violence continues to grow.

I produced an amendment for $265 million for two things—not radical new suggestions but tried and true things such as school counselors so that kids who are troubled and have a problem have somebody to turn to, and after-school programs so that kids are supervised in a positive, safe learning environment. The House conferees rejected that. Not a penny for schools, not $265 million. Not a penny for schools, but $5 billion more in military spending than this President requested.

Where are our values? Where are our priorities? If our priorities are not in the schoolrooms and classrooms of America, if they are not with our children, where are our values?

I salute what is in this bill. Much is good. But it pains me greatly to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that in a conference committee only a few days ago the idea of sending money to America's schools for America's schoolchildren was soundly rejected by the House conferees. That makes no sense whatsoever.

We will talk in the juvenile justice bill about how to reduce crime in America, how to reduce violence, and we should. We will talk about gun control, and I support it. But there is more to it. We have to be able to reach out to those kids who show up at school every day with a world of hurt, a world of problems, kids who probably see school as the only shelter, the only nurturing environment, in their lives. These kids need a helping hand, and with this helping hand they can be better students and better Americans.

We missed an opportunity in this bill by denying one penny for those schools. We missed that opportunity. I am sorry to say that this bill does not include it. But I promise you this. As long as I serve in the Senate, I will join with those in the Senate and, I hope, others in the House, who come to the realization that there is no greater priority than our children.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. Like our other colleagues, I commend him and the distinguished Senator from Alaska for their hard work on this particular proposal we will be voting on today.

I regret that I am not able to support this particular bill because there is so much in it that I do support. I clearly recognize the critical need for additional spending for our military. Indeed, we are not spending enough on our military today, even with the emergency spending that is legitimately included in this bill for the crisis in Kosovo. We are going to have to spend even more if we are going to meet our commitments around the world and provide the national security that we're expected to provide—and indeed that we profess to be able to provide. We are not spending enough money on ships, or planes, or ammunition, or on quality of life improvements for members of our Armed Services. We are going to have to address those needs, even beyond what is provided in this bill.

I am embarrassed by the fact that we're just now getting around to funding the emergencies that occurred as a result of Hurricane Mitch, and the needs of our farmers are acute and critical. There is simply no excuse for the delay in providing the emergency funding in these areas. The concern I have is with the process. We cannot continue to do business this way. If we determine that this is an emergency spending measure, we ought to make sure that what we are funding are true emergencies and take care of our other priorities through the normal authorization and appropriations process.

We have the promise of a surplus. We ought not to abandon the fiscal responsibility that brought us that promise and has given us the chance to make real progress on debt reduction. We should not use the fact that we have our men and women in harm's way overseas as an excuse to go on a spending binge here at home. Many of the projects in this bill have merit. If it is an emergency, it ought to be in this bill. And we ought to take out the nonemergency spending, pass a clean bill, and get the emergency spending where it is needed, especially to our military.

In short, Mr. President, providing substantial emergency funding for our troops in Kosovo is the right thing to do. Providing long-overdue emergency funding for the victims of Hurricane Mitch is the right thing to do. And providing desperately needed emergency funding for our nation's farmers is the right thing to do. But combining these legitimate emergency requests with billions of dollars of nonemergency spending—no matter how meritorious the individual project—is the wrong way to do it.

With that, I yield back any time I may have. With great regret, I announce that I am unable to support the bill, although I fully support many of the priorities the bill includes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 7½ minutes to Mr. GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that Colton Campbell be afforded floor privileges during the duration of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will reluctantly support this legislation because it contains important issues. It contains the funding for our troops in the Balkans. It contains the funds to meet our humanitarian responsibilities to our neighbors in Central America and the Caribbean. It also retains a provision—which I know the Presiding Officer has strongly supported—to clearly state that the funds the States secured through their tobacco settlements will be funds to be managed, administered, and prioritized at the State level.

Mr. President, I share many of the concerns of my colleague from Virginia. I share those concerns because what we are doing is to chip away at the financial security of 38 million Americans—38 million Americans who receive Social Security income. Forty percent of those 38 million Americans would have fallen below the poverty line but for Social Security.

Why is this relevant to this debate? It is relevant because we are on the verge of draining an additional $12 billion from the Social Security fund through this legislation. We had three choices when we started this debate. One choice was to do the tough thing, to reprioritize our spending, to say that if it is important that we spend money on our humanitarian needs in

Central America and the Caribbean, then let us reduce spending somewhere else.

I am pleased to say that for that account we in fact have done so.

We had another choice, which was to say let's raise revenue. If we can't find an area where we think it is appropriate to reduce spending, then let's be prepared to pay for this emergency.

Third, we could say let's use the accumulated surplus that we have, which today is a 100-percent surplus generated by the Social Security trust fund. As to the $12 billion in this legislation, we have elected the third course of action.

Mr. President, this is not the first time we have done so. In fact, it is not the first time in the last 8 months that we have done so.

Last October, in the waning hours of the budget negotiations, Congress passed a $532 billion omnibus appropriations bill.

Tucked into that bill was $21.4 billion in so-called emergency spending.

The effect of that designation then—as it is today—was to relieve Congress of the necessity of finding some other reprioritized spending to eliminate in order to pay for this emergency.

But because of the emergency designation, the $21.4 billion in October could be approved without offsets, and because of the emergency designation today, we will approve an additional $12 billion of expenditure without offsets.

Let's look at the numbers.

In 1998, Social Security was $99 billion. The first use of that money was to offset $27 billion in deficit in the rest of the Federal budget. An additional $3 billion was used to pay for emergency outlays, leaving us with a total surplus not of $99 billion but of $69 billion.

This year, 1999, we are projecting a $127 billion surplus.

Again, we have used $3 billion to offset deficits elsewhere in the budget, $13 billion for emergency outlays, and we are about to spend another $14.6 billion for emergencies, reducing our surplus from $127 billion down to $96 billion. And for the year 2000, we have already carried forward some of the emergency spending from 1999.

Again, we will be reducing the Social Security surplus by $10 billion. This is from where we are paying for these emergencies.

Mr. President, the repetitive misuse of the emergency process is continuing to erode the Social Security trust fund. This misuse is done in a manner that precludes most Members of Congress from any meaningful role in what has traditionally been accepted as emergencies. We have been denied the opportunity to participate in a determination as to whether the proposed emergency expenditure met the standards of being sudden, urgent and unforeseen needs, which is the standard that has traditionally been used for emergencies.

The same Congress that claimed to be saving the surplus for Social Security—committed to a ''lockbox'' for Social Security—is again actively participating in raids on the Social Security trust fund through the back door.

Willie Sutton once was asked, ''Why do you rob banks?'' His answer: ''That's where the money is.''

We may manufacture the strongest vault to protect the Social Security surplus from Willie Sutton. But if we let Jesse James continue to steal the money on the train before it gets to the bank, we will have the same result. The money will not be there for our and future generations of Social Security beneficiaries.

Social Security is a federally mandated program. We have a legal obligation to our children and grandchildren to secure the surplus for its intended purpose—Social Security. We must assure that the budget surplus is not squandered on questionable emergency items in the future.

Mr. President, with your support and that of Senator SNOWE of Maine, we have introduced legislation which has as its objective to establish permanent safeguards that will assure that nonemergency items are subject to careful scrutiny and not inserted into emergency spending bills to circumvent the normal legislative process.

I urge our colleagues' support for this legislation.

Mr. President, as we adjust to the welcome reality of budget surpluses—after decades of annual deficits and burgeoning additions to the national debt—we must never forget how easily this valuable asset can be squandered.

For too long, the Federal Government treated the budget like a credit card with an unlimited spending limit.

Private citizens are warned against falsely dialing 911. Congress should exercise the same restraint in using its emergency authority.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 10 minutes be authorized for debate on this measure, and that 8 of those minutes be under the control of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and 2 minutes be under the control of this Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, let me just say that being for or against this bill is basically a tossup, as far as I am concerned. It is one of those 51–49 types of propositions. So that is how I am going to come down on the 51-percent side, and vote for the conference report.

First of all, this is not a time to indicate anything less than full support for our troops in Kosovo and the surrounding areas.

There is also in this conference report some much-needed farm assistance and disaster assistance for the United States and Central America. However, I must say there are parts of the bill to which I register my stiff opposition.

First, this bill forfeits the opportunity to ensure that tobacco settlement money is used to fight smoking and to promote health—that is not in here. In fact, just the opposite.

Second, the bill provides only a fraction of critically and urgently needed farm assistance. Let me just talk for a moment about that subject.

This is an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. We take care of emergencies in Central America and other places. But one of the very biggest emergencies facing us today is the emergency in American agriculture. Export prospects are dismal. Exports for this year are projected to fall to $49 billion, which is a 19-percent decline from 1996. Asia still hasn't recovered. Net farm income for major commodities could drop to $17 billion compared to an average of $23 billion a year for the previous 5 years. Net farm income for major field crops will be 27 percent below what it was for the last 5 years.

It is true that there is some farm assistance in this package, and I was pleased to work with my colleagues to get it in the bill. But it is not enough, and it is too late.

The White House sent up the supplemental appropriations request for additional farm loan funds and Farm Service Agency funding on February 26. Now here we are just getting to it, nearly three months later.

This money was critically and urgently needed for the planting season. Now we are just getting around to it, even though the planting season is well over halfway past. The farm assistance that we have in the bill is good. Sure, an aspirin is good, if you have a major illness and you have some pain. But it doesn't get to the real root cause of it, and neither does the assistance in this bill. It falls far short of what is needed.

I offered an amendment in the conference committee to address the deepening crisis in the farm economy. The amendment addressed a range of farm income problems in the crop, livestock and dairy sectors, and it dealt with agriculture's economic crisis around our nation, not just in one or two regions. Regrettably, that amendment failed on a 14–14 tie vote of Senate conferees.

The amendment lacked just one vote. So we will be back again on whatever measures we can get up on the floor this year to provide critically and urgently needed economic assistance to our farm families and our rural communities.

All I can say is that when it came to the issue of Kosovo, we were willing to meet our obligations and respond to the emergency. In fact, the conferees had no trouble coming up with $5 billion more than what was asked for in

military spending. But we couldn't come up with the money needed to help our beleaguered farmers and the rural economy.

Finally, I also want to say a word about offsets for this bill. For the small portion of the bill that is offset, there was a beeline to go after programs that are vital to the most vulnerable in our society: food stamps and housing. Hunger and poverty remain persistent and pervasive problems in our society. Now we know these rescissions are not genuine offsets, since there are not outlay reductions associated with them. So perhaps there is no harm, but clearly these offsets should not lay the groundwork or create a precedent for future rescissions that actually reduce program benefits.

Again, on the whole, I will vote for the conference report.

I just want to register my objections to two major portions of the conference report, farm assistance and tobacco, which I consider to be totally inadequate.

I yield the floor and yield the remainder of my time.

NEEDED SUPPORT FOR THE PAN AM 103 FAMILIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a significant provision in the 1999 Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill will enable the Justice Department to pay for the travel expenses of the Pan Am 103 families who wish to attend the upcoming Lockerbie bombing trial in The Netherlands this summer. Existing law prevents the Department from using federal funds to pay for this travel.

Under this provision, the Justice Department's Office of Victims of Crime will be able to use an existing reserve fund to pay for the transportation costs, lodging, and food at government per diem rates for immediate family members of the Pan Am 103 victims. The Department also plans to establish an 800 number and a web site to keep family members informed during the trial. In addition, the Department plans to establish a compassion center, staffed with counselors, at the base in The Netherlands where the trial will be held, in order to help the families cope with the emotional strains of the trial.

The families of the victims of this terrorist atrocity have been waiting for more than ten years for justice. They have suffered the deep pain of losing their loved ones, and that pain has been compounded by the Libyan Government's refusal for many years to surrender the suspects accused of the bombing. Now the suspects are finally in custody and the trial will begin soon. We can never erase the pain of the loss that the families have suffered, but we can enable them to attend the trial and see that justice is finally done. I commend the House and Senate conferees for including this important provision to help these long-suffering families.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, in the past, American presidents have argued that a congressional appropriation for U.S. military action abroad constitutes a congressional authorization for the military action. I will not vote for an authorization of money that may be construed as authorizing, or encouraging the expansion of, the President's military operations in Kosovo. I will oppose the appropriation of almost $11 billion for a war I have consistently spoken out against.

On March 23, I voted against President Clinton's decision to launch the air campaign in Yugoslovia. On May 4, I voted against a resolution that would have given the President blanket authority to expand the operation. To date, I have not been convinced that this war is necessary to protect a vital national security interest, and I have opposed efforts to escalate the conflict.

I have a number of secondary considerations with respect to this legislation. I am concerned, for one, about plundering the Social Security trust funds to pay for a war that involves no vital national security interest. If I believed that vital national security interests were at stake, I would consider the argument to fund the war from the Social Security trust fund surplus. But in the absence of a vital national security interest, I do not believe the Congress should pay for the war out of the Social Security trust funds.

I am also concerned about some of the anti-environmental riders added to the emergency supplemental bill in conference. These provisions should have been fully debated, and should have gone through the normal legislative process, instead of being slipped into the bill in the dead of night.

I am disappointed that I can't support this bill, because it contains funding for farmers hit by low commodity prices. Some of this is funding that I've argued for and, in fact, voted for in earlier instances, including S. 544. But my opposition to funding the military action in Kosovo is firm. I can endorse neither the authorization for the war, nor the appropriations process that is its genesis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD.

Mr. DODD. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I rise to support the Conference Report of H.R. 1141—the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill before us today. I do so reluctantly, however, because of the many special interest riders that have been attached to this emergency legislation. In the final analysis I will support the conference report because it provides critically important funds to assist American farmers, to support ongoing action against Yugoslavia, to relieve the suffering of Kosovar refugees, and to help Central America recover from the devastating effects of Hurricane Mitch.

In light of all the other measures that have been added to this bill, many of dubious merit, I deeply regret, Mr. President, that the Speaker of the House refused to allow House conferees to accept a Senate amendment that would have freed up monies for payment of the United States debt to the United Nations. I find it somewhat puzzling that House Republicans are on record calling for a negotiated settlement of the Kosovo conflict, yet are not prepared to provide overdue payments to the organization that will likely play a central role in implementing any peace agreement. I would like to dwell on two major provisions of this bill which I support, namely the aid to help Central America recover from the damage caused by Hurricane Mitch and the funds to sustain our ongoing efforts in the Balkans.

The funds aimed at helping Central America recover from Hurricane Mitch stem from an emergency request the President made back in February. It is extremely embarrassing that it has taken until May for the Congress to finally get around to passing the necessary legislation to provide relief for a natural disaster that occurred last fall.

I cannot overstate the degree to which the storm ravaged Nicaragua, Honduras and other nearby nations. In less than a week, Hurricane Mitch claimed at least 10,000 lives—possibly as many as 20,000, left more than a million others without adequate food or shelter, and set the economies of Nicaragua and Honduras back as much as a generation. The need for long-term international assistance is great.

In late October and early November 1998, Mitch carved a slow, meandering and deadly path through the Caribbean. At the hurricane's apex, Mitch's storm clouds stretched from Florida to Panama and wind gusts topped 200 miles per hour. Meteorologists labeled Mitch a ''Category 5 Hurricane,'' the highest such designation.

Unlike other hurricanes, Mr. President, it was not Mitch's winds which proved so deadly. By the time the storm crossed the Honduran Coast on October 29, 1998, its winds had slowed to 60 miles per hour and the storm's movement to a mere crawl. The torrential rain, however, did not abate. The storm's slow speed allowed it to continually pound the same area day after day. By the time the skies cleared, Mitch had dropped five feet of rain onto Honduras and Nicaragua.

The massive flooding which followed claimed the lives of at least 10,000 Central Americans. That number, Mr. President, is certainly shocking. Yet, sadly, it is probably an understatement of the actual loss of life. As many as twelve thousand other people in the region are still missing and presumed dead. The Honduran government has declared 5,657 dead and 8,052 officially missing. In Nicaragua, at least 3,800 died. Smaller numbers perished in El Salvador, Guatemala and other countries in the region.

Mr. President, not since the Great Hurricane of 1780, nearly 220 years ago, has a storm claimed so many lives in the eastern Caribbean.

Mitch also destroyed or damaged 338 bridges, 170 in Honduras alone, leaving much of Honduras and Nicaragua accessible only by helicopter. The lack of helicopters in the region and their limited capacity left thousands without adequate food and water for weeks while some of the food provided by international aid organizations rotted at the airport.

Those who survived face the task of piecing the economy and mangled infrastructure back together. Meanwhile, more than a million people throughout the region, including one out of every five Hondurans, had to rebuild their homes and replace their personal possessions.

Honduran and Nicaraguan agriculture—a vital component of both economies—was decimated. Hurricane Mitch destroyed a quarter of Honduras's coffee plantations and 90 percent of the country's banana plants. The entire shrimp farming industry was destroyed. Damage to sugar and citrus crops was similarly heavy. The factories and farms of Honduras's Sula Valley, which normally contribute 60 percent of the country's GDP, were all flooded. While Nicaragua was not as badly damaged, the effects are still staggering: 20 percent of the nation's coffee plantations were destroyed. Newer crops such as citrus were completely annihilated.

The process of rebuilding the shattered lives, infrastructure and economies of Honduras and Nicaragua will be long and expensive. The World Bank and the United Nations Development Program estimate the total damage to the region at more than $5.3 billion. While these numbers are difficult to comprehend, they are even more daunting given that the GDP of Nicaragua is only $9.3 billion and that of Honduras only $12.7 billion.

I commend my colleagues for finding the resources to assist our neighbors to the south who have called upon the international community in their hour of need. It is not only in their interest, it is in our interest to assist them. It deserves our strong backing.

The original intent of the President's request for emergency appropriations from the Congress was to provide our men and women in uniform with the equipment and materiel they need to effectively strike the Yugoslav military. While I am heartened by recent reports of a possible diplomatic solution, we must remain prepared to continue our military efforts in the absence of an enforceable diplomatic solution which meets NATO's conditions.

Mr. President, we must never take the decision to send our service men and women into harm's way lightly. If a situation which is such an anathema to the United States that it calls for military action presents itself to us, however, we must vigorously support our soldiers, sailors and airmen through both word and deed.

As I just mentioned, the decision to send our military into battle is one of the most solemn that this body or this nation ever faces. And so, before I go on, let me reiterate why the situation in Kosovo justifies, in fact demands, American military involvement.

Slobodan Milosevic has carved a place for himself amongst history's most despicable tyrants. Serb forces have murdered least 5,000 ethnic-Albanian civilians and burned six hundred villages. To date, approximately 80 percent of Kosovar Albanians—more than 1.3 million innocent men, women and children—have fled their homes in a desperate attempt to outrun Serb military and police forces. Nearly 750,000 Kosovar Albanians have made it to the relative safety of neighboring countries and are now living under the most difficult of conditions.

These numbers, however horrific, tell only part of the story. They cannot express the pain of a family torn apart by blood-thirsty paramilitary policemen or the pain of a young woman gang-raped by Serb soldiers. They do not express the tears of a young child who spends each day wandering between the tents of a Macedonian refugee camp searching for his or her missing parents. They do not describe the pain, both physical and psychological, the victims of torture feel each day.

Many members of Congress, myself included, have traveled to the region and visited the refugee camps. We have seen the pain in the eyes of the refugees fortunate enough to have made it out of the killing fields of Kosovo. Mr. President, the look in the eyes of these refugees defies description.

The ongoing genocide in Kosovo is antithetical to the most basic principles on which the United States stands. By acting to preserve the fundamental rights of Kosovar Albanians, the United States is reaffirming our belief that all people are endowed with certain inalienable rights, including the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If, however, the United States chose to stand idly by in the face of such grotesque evil, we would draw into question our dedication to human rights and our resolve to oppose dictators around the globe.

Our military, however, cannot effectively combat this evil if we in the Congress fail to offer them our support. One month ago, President Clinton sent a request to Congress for $6 billion in order to fund our military operations through the end of the fiscal year. That money is included in this bill.

As we debate this issue, people far beyond the walls of this chamber are listening to our words and watching our actions. Our men and women in uniform throughout the region who are putting their lives on the line each day want to know whether we in the Congress will seize this opportunity to support them. They need and they deserve the very finest equipment our nation can muster—the type of equipment the President's original request will pay for.

In capitals across Europe, our allies are listening and looking to the United States for leadership. They want to know whether the United States will maintain its commitment to NATO and to this important operation.

In refugee camps in Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and elsewhere, hundreds of thousands of Milosevic's innocent victims are listening; hoping that we will reaffirm our commitment to them.

In the hills and forests of Kosovo, men, women and children who are hiding from soldiers and policemen are listening to American radio broadcasts on portable radios. They are looking to the United States for hope and support in their most desperate hour.

And finally, tyrants around the world, but especially in Belgrade, are judging our dedication to human rights and freedom.

Mr. President, we must send the same message to all: The United States will not back down in the face of unspeakable evil.

Just a moment ago, I mentioned that the President requested $6 billion for the ongoing operation in the Balkans. In just one month, however, that $6 billion bill has ballooned into a $14.9 billion monstrosity. The President's original request now represents well under half of the total bill.

Regretfully, the majority of the new spending is for non-emergency programs which fall far outside the original intention of the legislation. Such programs should rightfully be left to the regular appropriations process. The issues this bill was intended to address are simply too important to be embroiled in political spending. Thus, while I continue to support strongly the President's original request, I support the legislation before us with reluctance due to the expensive, non-emergency riders that were added during the House/Senate conference on this measure.

Mr. President, the provisions of this bill relating to Kosovo and Central America deserve our immediate attention and support. The victims of mother nature's fury in our own hemisphere and of Slobodan Milosevic's genocide in Europe, as well as the brave American men and women fighting under the American flag, need and deserve America's support. For that reason I intend to vote to support passage of this conference report despite its imperfections.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, has a very distinguished guest whom he wishes to present. I therefore yield for that purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that no time be charged to the remaining speakers because of that fact, and I ask unanimous consent following the introduction by Senator HELMS, there be a recess of 3 minutes so Senators may personally greet the distinguished guest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY KING ABDALLAH BIN HUSSEIN

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, as always, is gracious, and I thank him very much. As he indicated, we have today a distinguished son of a distinguished father who has visited many times. His Majesty, King Abdallah bin Hussein of Jordan.

He has been visiting with the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and I present him to the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:37 p.m., recessed until 3:42 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the very able and eloquent distinguished Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise for the first time since I have been in the Senate to oppose a supplemental appropriation. It hurts my heart because there is so much in this bill that is good. But I have to say there is a lot in this bill that does not belong in it, and there are some things left out of this bill, one or two things, that I thought were real emergencies that should have been in there.

What started out as requests to fund unexpected emergencies has turned into a flurry of spending and riders that simply do not belong in this bill. The one area that I particularly cared about, violence in our schools—which is an emergency by anybody's measure when parents are telling us, 75 percent of them, they are concerned about their children when they go off to school—a very modest proposal by the Senator from Illinois was turned down by the House members of the conference after it was approved by the Senate members of the conference. So all kinds of dollars were found for many things, but they could not find it in their hearts to do something about violence in the schools by providing some counselors, some afterschool money so desperately needed in our country today.

I am happy for the Senator from West Virginia, that he was able to get a commitment for a crisis he is facing in the steel industry in his State. I agreed with him, that particular piece of legislation and those funds should have been placed into this bill, and they were not. So I found this a very strange conference. I miss the Appropriations Committee. I was on it for two beautiful years. So I sat and watched at 1 in the morning as Senators and House Members debated. You may wonder, why would the Senator from California do that? Very simple: It is a very important bill that is before us.

I believe in what NATO is trying to accomplish. I agreed with the President that we needed to find about $6 billion for the military. It turns out it is almost double that, that winds up in this bill. The pay raise is taken care of. I wanted to do an even higher pay raise, but that pay raise—it is not an emergency, it is an obligation. We have to back the pay raise in the regular appropriations bills. This is just another way to push dollars around.

I do not think it is fair to say that is an emergency. I supported the funds in there for America's farmers, for Hurricane Mitch; those things were fine. But some of the riders in this bill really were wrong, not only wrong in substance but wrong to put in this bill. For example, the rider that deals with the tobacco funds from the tobacco lawsuit. It is not that I object that the Federal Government will not get a share of that—because I am willing to say it is fine, the Governors are the ones who put their names out there and they should get these funds. But to say to the Governors who are getting our part of the reimbursement: By the way, spend it any way you like—we are going to see Governors use that money to put a swimming pool in the Governor's mansion; we are going to see Governors use that to build a little street in the neighborhood where maybe some of their donors live.

I do not come from the school of thought that Governors are better than Senators. I think we run on a platform and most of us, most of us from both parties, believe we need to take care of the health care needs of our people. Comes along this bill, comes along a rider that says: Governors, you can spend that any way you want. Build a running track for your friends around the Governor's mansion? Fine, no problem, no strings. I have a problem with that. We should make sure our Governors are taking care of the health needs of their citizens since part of that money rightly comes from a recovery that included Federal programs—Medicaid, as an example.

Then there are three riders that deal with the environment in one way or the other. One has to do with oil royalties. This is about the third time that antienvironmental rider has been placed in this bill, because colleagues know they cannot get the votes here. It is stopping the Interior Department from collecting the rent payments or the royalty payments from oil companies who drill on Federal land, taxpayers' land. That money is being stolen from us. How do I know that? Because there have been lawsuits. And every time the Federal Government wins those lawsuits—I ask for 1 additional minute, if I might.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. So here we have a situation where the Interior Department could use the money to help with our parks and open space, and the oil companies get another special rider on this bill. It is the third time that has happened. Mr. President, I do not think that is the way to legislate.

Then we have an environmental rider placed in the bill by Senator GORTON who now, I understand, is not even going to vote for this bill which has his rider in it that does tremendous damage to the State of Washington by permitting a mine up there.

There are so many things in this bill that do not belong in it. So it is with a heavy heart I say to my friends, for whom I have great respect, I cannot vote for this. I do not think everything in there is truly an emergency. Yet I think those things that were emergencies were left out.

I look forward to working with my friends in the regular order so we can debate some of these important measures outside this so-called emergency designation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I will vote against the pending conference report because I believe it, and the policy and process behind it, represent a shameful failure on behalf of our American servicemen and women now in harm's way in the Balkans.

This legislation before the Senate today displays exactly what's wrong with Washington, including the United States Senate. There is much in the pending conference report on Supplemental Appropriations which is urgently needed and which I support. American farmers need and deserve the disaster assistance included in this legislation. The Kosovar refugees need and deserve massive resettlement and reconstruction assistance, of which the pending measure provides at least a down payment. Our servicemen and women need and deserve the pay raise it provides and above all, those who are on the front lines in the Balkans and elsewhere in the world need supplies and equipment.

However, in spite of these positive features, I will be voting ''no'' because of the bill's funding for an expanded, open-ended war against Yugoslavia, which in my opinion, has not been adequately and appropriately considered by the Congress, and also because this important legislation has been used for petty provincial interests. In effect, our servicemen and women are being held hostage while the bill has been loaded up with narrow amendments to assist special interests, such as a gold mine in Washington state, a dormitory for Congressional pages, and reindeer ranchers.

While I have certainly observed this same game of special interest influence on the legislative process all too often since I have been in the Senate, this current case is particularly egregious