Americans and non-Hispanic white fourth graders ranked first on this test in math in 1996. Texas Hispanic fourth graders ranked fifth. The study confirms earlier reports that Texas is one of two States that has made the greatest overall academic gains in recent years.

The report went on to say one reason why Texas has been so successful, according to the Rand study, has been the higher percentage of teachers who are satisfied with their teaching resources. Governor Bush provided those resources. He wants to do the same thing through initiatives such as Reading First, at the Federal level, which would offer training and a curriculum for teaching reading to K-through-12 teachers.

Governor Bush thinks reading is fundamental. I think his mother is the one who started that when she started the Reading First Program for America. He believes if a child can read, that child is going to be able to take the next steps in public education. That is why Governor Bush put the resources there in Texas. That is why the real Rand study that was comprehensive showed the great improvement in Texas. That is why his education plans for America will work because we want no child to be left behind in Texas or any other State.

I hope the campaign rhetoric doesn't hit the Senate floor again. I am not going to stand here and I am not going to sit in my office and listen to anyone else use Texas as a whipping boy, A, because Texas is a great State; B, we have a great Governor; C, the things that are being said are misrepresentations; and D, in Texas, where we have been behind in the past, Governor Bush has said we are going to get ahead.

We are tackling our problems. Every State has problems. I am proud of the leadership in Texas of our Speaker, Pete Laney and our Lieutenant Governor, Rick Perry, and our Governor, George Bush, who have worked together in a bipartisan way to make sure the resources are going into public education and into our children's health insurance program. It was our legislative leaders working with Governor Bush who said our entire State tobacco settlement would go to fund the children's health insurance program, and they took a huge part of our State tobacco settlement and put it in a trust fund in which every county in Texas will participate in perpetuity for the treatment of our indigent health care patients all over Texas. That was the leadership of our State legislature, and our Governor. Because they do want quality health care for all our Texas residents.

Maybe I am a little biased, but I think I come from a very great State. I think the statistics prove it. I do not want to hear anyone else say that Texas is not meeting its responsibilities in education, in health insurance, in patients' rights—because we are a leader. We are a leader and we want everyone in America to have the quality of public education that we are building to get in Texas. We want every child in America to reach his or her full potential. We want every child to have health insurance coverage. We want every person in Texas to have quality health care. That is why all of our tobacco settlement is going for health care or education programs to educate young people on the hazards of smoking. That is it, that is the entire use of our tobacco money: to educate young people on the hazards of smoking and health care for every citizen of Texas who needs it.

I am very proud of our record. I am proud of our Governor and I think he is the person who can bring these qualities to the United States.

I yield the floor.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate on the bill H.R. 4811, ''Making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes,'' having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The report was printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 24, 2000.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report on the foreign operations bill.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the Senate is a half billion dollars below last year's appropriation—the fiscal year 2000 bill was $15.4 billion—this year we are presenting a $14.9 billion bill. This includes $14.5 billion in fiscal year 2000 funds plus an additional $466 million in supplemental funding for debt relief, Southern Africa, and the Balkans.

Although we are below last year's level, we have managed to substantially increase key priorities, including providing $865 million for Ex-Im, a nearly $100 million increase over last year, $1.3 billion for development assistance, again a $100 million increase, within child survival we surpassed the request for AIDS funding and provided $315 million. Overall child survival funding was also increased to $963 million. In addition to over $1 billion in supplemental funds for Colombia, the Narcotics and Law enforcement account was increased by $20 million over the request to $325 million. For the first time in years, we managed to increase security assistance. This account is of real concern to our friends and allies in Central and Eastern Europe. We exceeded the request and provided $3.545 billion. To respond to crises from Chechnya to Sierra Leone, we substantially increased funding both over last year's level and this year's request for refugees to $700 million. In this account we were able to work out a compromise that will improve management and oversight of UNHCR while affording the administration flexibility to respond rapidly to any real emergency.

Finally, we provided funds for the fiscal year 2001 and the supplemental request for debt relief. In addition to language on IMF reforms recommended by Senator GRAMM, we have included a number of HIPC conditions worked out between Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH, representing the authorizing committees. There are a number of policy provisions which are also important to mention. Within the $675 million account for Eastern Europe, we have provided up to $100 million for Serbia. Senator LEAHY and I agree that we will never be able to withdraw troops and help stabilize the Balkans as long as Milosevic and other criminals responsible for outrageous atrocities across the Balkans are allowed to go free. No government in the region will have confidence in Belgrade if the rule of law is not upheld.

The administration lobbied heavily against our arguments that U.S. support for the new government should come with specific conditions attached. We thought aid should flow only if the Serb government met three specific conditions: First, they need to cooperate with the War Crimes Tribunal. Second, they must take steps to end support for organizations in the Republic of Srpska which prevent effective integration of Bosnia Hercegovina. Finally, given Belgrade's vicious track record, we thought it was important to seek assurances that the new government will implement policies which respect the rights and aspirations of minorities and the rule of law. Each of these conditions was designed to serve our interests in stabilizing the region so that an exit strategy for U.S. troops can be safely and effectively executed. The bill modifies this approach and includes an agreement which will give this administration and the new government in Belgrade a 5-month window in which assistance can move forward. After that period, only humanitarian aid and support to local mayors will be allowed if Belgrade refuses to meet the conditions which I have outlined.

I must confess my reservations about this approach. I listened to the arguments for flexibility, but I have little confidence in the administration's past record of support for the Tribunal and

standing up to Belgrade. I believe that there is no problem in Serbia that will be made easier by Milosevic's predatory presence. No regional government will have confidence in Belgrade as long as he is allowed to go free. It is in their interest and ours to see him turned over for trial. In the end I agreed to this compromise because funds for Serbia are made available subject to the committee's notification. If there is no sign of cooperation or progress on our conditions during the next five months, the administration should understand that I will put a hold on funding. This compromise is not a free pass to spend for five months—Senator LEAHY and I will be expecting concrete progress. The second area of tremendous concern addressed in the bill is Russia's action in Chechnya. Since launching this war, Moscow has blocked all humanitarian relief operations or international human rights investigations from proceeding in Chechnya. While we cannot always change the views in Moscow, I was extremely disappointed by the administration refusal to support the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights call for an international investigation. Instead Secretary Albright testified the administration preferred to allow Moscow to conduct its own internal investigation. The State Department has also rejected support for non-government groups providing relief and preferred instead to work through the Russian government.

To address these problems, we have earmarked $10 million for the more than 400,000 displaced families in Chechnya and Ingushetia which can only be provided through NGOs. Aid to the Russian government is also made contingent upon cooperation with international investigations in Chechnya. We have also made aid to the Russian Government contingent upon a certification that Moscow has terminated support for the nuclear program in Iran. In the past we have withheld 50 percent of the Russian government funds until this certification is made—this year we have increased the withholding to 60 percent. Putin has said Russia must build a dictatorship of law—what remains unclear is whether his personal emphasis will be on dictatorship or law. I think our aid should be leverage to secure a result which serves American interests and nuclear armed Iran certainly is not in U.S. interests.

Finally, let me mention debt relief. Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH reported out bills which conditioned U.S. support to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative managed by the IMF and the World Bank. The Foreign Relations Committee bill requires the Secretary of Treasury to certify that it is World Bank policy to—(1) suspend funding if loans are diverted or misused, (2) not displace private sector funding, and (3) disburse funds based on the implementation of reforms by the recipient country including the promotion of open markets and liberalization of trade practices, the promotion of projects which enhance economic growth and the establishment of benchmarks to measure progress toward graduation from assistance. Similar conditions are required of the IMF. In addition to including language supported by Senator HELMS and Congressman LEACH, we have included House language limiting resources to countries engaged in a pattern of human rights abuses. I supported stronger language which would have required that the Secretary of Treasury certify that the IMF and Bank actually were implementing new policy conditions before Treasury was allowed to disburse funds—this approach was recommended by Senator GRAMM, the chairman of the Banking Committee. That was my view of how it should have been handled. Instead, my colleagues on the conference supported Helms-Leach language which releases the funds and then requires reporting on performance over the course of the next year.

While I completely agreed with Senator GRAMM, I also shared the problem he has with his committee—there simply were not the votes to sustain this position. I think we have made progress on conditioning debt relief, but the Treasury Department should understand that I will continue to consult with Senator GRAMM when we receive notifications on intended debt relief recipients. Performance benchmarks are essential if we are to avoid seeing the same groups of countries and banks back in 5 years seeking the same relief all over again. Separate from the HIPC relief, we did include binding requirements that the Treasury Department withhold 10 percent of our contribution to any multilateral bank until specific conditions are met on procurement and management reforms. Not only will the banks have to improve internal management practices through audits, they will have to improve recipient country procurement management and financial practices. This is an important step in our battle against fraud and corruption. Once again, I think we have produced a balanced bill which funds U.S. priorities within sound budget principles and I urge its favorable consideration.

Finally, I repeat, this bill is below the amount spent for foreign operations last year. That makes it somewhat unique among the appropriations bills we have been in the process of passing, and I am proud to say we were able to bring this bill in under last year's total.

Mr. President, are we under some time agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under a 1-hour time limit.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum and further suggest the time during the quorum call be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senator BENNETT is here and wishes to speak in morning business. It seems to me he ought to speak on the bill time so we do not have to move the vote any later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The ranking member is here. Maybe Senator BENNETT can comment after the ranking member addresses the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad we are here. I commend Senator MCCONNELL and also our counterparts in the House, Chairman CALLAHAN and Mrs. PELOSI. The chairman, Senator MCCONNELL, and I have worked closely together on this bill. In the same way I tried to accommodate those concerns of his side of the aisle, he has tried to do the same on our side. As a result, we have a good bipartisan bill.

We tried to meet everyone's concerns without putting in unnecessary earmarks or taking away the appropriate flexibility the President should have. We funded the President's important priorities, and I note that both sides of the aisle supported those.

I am disappointed, of course, as I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is, with the amount of time it took to get here. Finally, we are here. Had it been left to the two of us, we could have finished this bill before the August recess, but while we were told to make sure the cars in the train would follow, we were not allowed in the engineer's seat to get it down the track. It is here now, and it is a good result.

I am glad that we found an acceptable compromise on family planning that does not restrict what private organizations can do with their own private funds. That is only wise. After all, we have heard speeches forever from people here about how the government should get off the backs of individuals. We have finally agreed to do that. It was not easy. I give very high praise to Congresswoman PELOSI for her work on this.

I am also pleased that we include $425 million, the Senate funding level for family planning. This is not money for abortions. No funds in this bill can be used for abortions. This is money for family planning. So many countries I have visited are among the poorest of the poor, and they tell me that reducing the rate of population growth is one of their highest priorities but they lack the money to do so. They also say that when they have money for family planning, the number of abortions in their country goes down.

We provide adequate authority and funding for debt forgiveness. That had overwhelming support at the meeting the President had with Republicans and Democrats, members of the clergy across the ideological spectrum, representing all faiths and persuasions. I felt honored to be in that meeting.

One of our Senate guest Chaplains that week, Father Claude Pomerleau of the University of Portland, accompanied me there. I thank him for his advice and help on this. I should also say that Father Pomerleau is my wife's brother, my brother-in-law. Even the President said that it was probably Father Pomerleau's recommendation that got me into the White House, rather than my position that got him in.

In seriousness, on the issue of debt forgiveness, we want to help the world's poorest countries get out of debt. We also want to be sure they make the necessary economic reforms so they can stay out of debt in the future. It is not enough to say, look, we are going to pay your bills so you can get out of debt. It does nothing if then within a few years they are back in debt.

We provided aid to Serbia, subject to important conditions relating to Serbia's cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal. Chairman MCCONNELL, myself, as well as Senator BIDEN and others, strongly support these conditions.

The conditions do not take effect until March 31, 2001, and we do not intend the aid spigot to be opened wide before then. We expect the administration—this administration and the next one—to proceed cautiously. We will be watching, as appropriators, just how cautious they are. After all, administrations come and go, but the Appropriations Committee stays here, and we will be here to watch what is done next year.

We want to support the new Serbian Government, but only if it is truly democratic and respects the rights of its neighbors and also the rights of minorities. We expect the administration to treat the apprehension and prosecution of war criminals as a priority.

I am pleased with the amount of funds for HIV/AIDS. It is a $100 million increase above last year's level. We provided up to $50 million for child immunization, and substantial increases for programs to combat TB, malaria, and other infectious diseases.

There are a lot of other provisions I could mention, from restrictions on assistance for Peru—we did that because of the recent efforts to subvert democracy there. We hear the President of Peru make promises, but then take actions that belie what he has said. We put in additional funding for refugees. Unfortunately, we know that the reality throughout the world today is that there are more and more refugees. However, I strongly object to one House provision that was included. And I told the conferees that I objected. It is a $5.2 million earmark for AmeriCares. This is a private organization that does work in Latin America and other places. I cannot recall a single instance—certainly not since 1989, when I became chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee; nor in the 5 years I have been ranking member, and the Senator from Kentucky has been chairman—when we have earmarked funds for a private organization such as this.

It was done here, as I understand it, because a 6-year, $5.2 million proposal of AmeriCares was rejected by AID. According to AID, the proposal was too high-tech to be sustainable in the country in question, and because some of the work was already being done by others. I suspect it was a proposal which would buy a lot of expensive equipment from some manufacturer somewhere but might not be something appropriate for that country.

Although AID suggested to AmeriCares that they submit a revised proposal, AmeriCares opted instead to seek a congressional earmark, ignoring the usual practice, and basically saying: Just give us the money. We will decide what to do with it.

I have no opinion on the merits of their proposal. But if you are going to be applying for Federal funds, you ought to follow the same rules everybody else does.

There are literally hundreds of PVOs that submit requests to AID, and many are rejected—some because they do not make sense, and others because there is not the money to fund them. Are we now going to give those other dissatisfied PVOs their own earmarks? It is a terrible precedent. It does not belong in this bill.

I will give you an example. I have fought to ban landmines all over the world. We have the Leahy War Victims Fund that spends millions of dollars every year for landmine victims. I wrote the legislation that was the first piece of legislation ever in any country to ban the export of landmines.

There are many NGOs and PVOs—that is, nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations—that have come in and worked to get rid of landmines and care for landmine victims. Some are funded through the foreign aid bill or the defense appropriations bill. Some are funded through private donations that they raise. Many contact me because of my identification with this and say: Could I get Federal funding?

One of the nice things is that a lot of these—they are screened just before the money goes out. But can you imagine how it would be if we simply gave them the money just because it was requested by a Senator who wants to eradicate landmines?

It has always been my view we should let the experts judge the merits of these proposals, rather than just hand over the money to whichever organizations have the most political clout.

Some have complained—and I heard this morning—that this is a Republican bill. Others have said it is a Democratic bill. They are both wrong. Neither side got everything they wanted. There were significant compromises on funding and on policy by both sides. That is as it should be, especially for a bill that deals with foreign policy. And that is why I am proud to be here with the Senator from Kentucky, because we should not have a Republican foreign policy or a Democratic foreign policy. We should have a foreign policy that represents the interests of the United States.

We have had somewhat of an uneven record since the time when Senator Vandenberg spoke about ''politics ending at the water's edge.'' But on this bill, at least, Republicans and Democrats have come together.

It is interesting, too, because the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Appropriations Committee has probably the smallest staff of any committee around here—on the Republican side, with Robin Cleveland, and Tim Rieser on our side, aided by just a couple of people whom I will mention later—to put this together. We don't have huge armies of people to help us, but maybe that is just as well because as a result, in the end, Senators talk to Senators. That is the best way to do things around here.

I see the Senator from Utah is on the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE RAND STUDY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his courtesy. I was more than happy to give him whatever leeway he wanted, but I appreciate the opportunity to make a comment. Given the nature of the session in which we find ourselves, we have to take every opportunity as it comes along. As the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Kentucky, indicated, the time will be taken off the bill.

I rise to take the opportunity to respond to the comments that were made earlier by the Senator from Massachusetts in his scathing attack on the education system in Texas. The Senator from Massachusetts, as well as Senator HARKIN yesterday, referred to a Rand Corporation study on the State of Texas schools. They would have us believe that based on that study, the Texas schools are terrible and, further, that those of us who are saying nice things about Texas schools are deliberately misleading the public.

I want to make it clear that the people who are missing this story are the people who sit in the gallery above the Chair. The press has missed the story here because they have bought the line laid down by the Senator from Massachusetts and others in his party that somehow the Rand Corporation has denounced Texas schools as being terribly inferior. The Rand Corporation has done no such thing. Democrats

have used the recent Rand study to try to tell everybody that the Rand Corporation has done that. If I may, too many journalists have taken the press release as it has come out of the Democratic headquarters and not read the record for themselves.

I took a class in journalism. The first thing they said was, check the facts yourself. I didn't follow that career, but I have tried to remember that advice. So I have checked the facts myself. The place I went to begin with, with the help of my staff, was the Rand Corporation. Let us go back to the Rand Corporation and see what they have to say about Texas schools. I will leave aside the argument as to whether or not they are right. There is always the possibility that even these so-called experts could be wrong in their analysis. Let us set that aside for just a minute and ask ourselves, what does the Rand Corporation have to say about Texas schools?

This is what the Rand Corporation has to say about Texas schools. I am reading from a news release issued by the Rand Corporation itself. I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. The Rand Corporation says:

> The education reforms of the 1980s and 1990s seem to be working, according to a new RAND report, but some states are doing far better than others in making achievement gains and in elevating their students' performance compared with students of similar racial and socioeconomic background in other states. Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

I will repeat that last sentence:

> Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

This is not a Republican speaking. This is not the Bush campaign speaking. This is the Rand Corporation speaking. Texas, a high performer.

It goes on:

> Math scores are rising across the country at a national average rate of about one percentile point per year, a pace outstripping that of the previous two decades and suggesting that public education reforms are taking hold. Progress is far from uniform, however. One group of states—led by North Carolina and Texas and including Michigan, Indiana and Maryland—boasts gains about twice as great as the national average.

This is the Rand Corporation, Mr. President, saying Texas is boasting rates of improvement twice the national average.

Back to the report:

> Even more dramatic contrasts emerge in the study's pathbreaking, cross-state comparison of achievement by students from similar families. Texas heads the class in this ranking with California dead last.

Interesting. They go on to say:

> Although the two states are close demographic cousins, Texas students, on average, scored 11 percentile points higher on NAEP math and reading tests than their California counterparts. In fact, Texans performed well with respect to most states. On the 4th-grade NAEP math tests in 1996, Texas non-Hispanic white students and black students ranked first compared to their counterparts in other states, while Hispanic students ranked fifth. On the same test, California non-Hispanic white students ranked third from the bottom, black students last, and Hispanic students fourth from the bottom among states.

How can this be, for the Rand Corporation to be saying such wonderful things about Texas and then having Democratic Senators come to the floor and quote the Rand Corporation as saying terrible things about Texas? If I were a conspiracy theorist, I would think the release of the latest Rand study might have something to do with the fact that there is an election in less than a week. But the president of the Rand Corporation has insisted that is not the case. He has insisted that the timing of the release of this second study, which is being used to trash Texas, was entirely coincidental and had nothing whatever to do with the election.

All right. Let's take him at his word and read his words to see how he reconciles the earlier Rand statement with the later one. I didn't tell you, but that first study I quoted from was released in July, before either of the conventions took place, before the question of Texas performance in education became a national priority or a national issue.

How does the president of Rand reconcile these two apparently irreconcilable positions, one where Rand says, in July, Texas is No. 1, Texas comes in first with California last, and the two States are demographically very similar—how do they reconcile that statement with the statements we are hearing on the floor today?

Read what he has to say, I say again to my journalist friends, who take the press release from the Democratic headquarters, put it in the headlines—top story in today's television—that the Rand Corporation has trashed the Texas record. I don't think any of them read what the president of Rand had to say because if they had, the story would have been different on this morning's news.

This is what he has to say:

> The July study ''Improving Student Achievement'' touched on the Texas schools and received widespread press play. Both efforts—

Talking about the July study and this last one—

> draw on NAEP scores. The new paper suggests a less positive picture of Texas education than the earlier effort, but I do not believe these efforts are in sharp conflict. Together, in fact, they provide a more comprehensive picture of key education issues.

So Rand is not backing away from their earlier statement that Texas is No. 1 in the areas that they quoted and covered in their first statement. They are not repudiating that.

They are not contradicting it. They are not backing away from it. Again, the president of Rand says:

> I do not believe that these efforts are in sharp conflict.

It is the politicians who have put them in sharp conflict, not the researchers. Let's examine the research and see what it says. Quoting again from the president of Rand:

> The July report differed in scope.

Then in parentheses he says:

> (It covered almost all States, not just Texas.)

Therein lies the answer to this dilemma. The July report that says Texas ranks No. 1 was a comparative study of Texas against other States. In that study, they said: In these areas we are checking, Texas is the best. The Rand Corporation said ''Texas is the best.''

Now, they came back to Texas to do a different study on an entirely different issue, and the issue they studied the second time was whether or not the Texas test system was a good one. They came to their own conclusion that the Texas system of testing needs to be improved. Their judgment, their opinion. Never at any time did they say that Texas was not getting better results than any other States, even with a system they claim needs to be improved.

I see the chairman of the subcommittee has returned. I will be happy to yield the floor now and get back to the foreign operations bill, which is before us. I could not pass the opportunity to straighten out the Record.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa have misled us because they have not read the fine print of the report they are quoting from, and they have not consulted the opinion of the president of the organization they are citing. At no time, in no place, in spite of what the political headline said, has the Rand Corporation backed away from its conviction that Texas is first in many, if not all, of the categories they examined on education. The Governor of Texas and the two Senators from Texas who spoke earlier are rightly entitled to be very proud of the progress that has taken place in education in their State.

EXHIBIT 1

RISING MATH SCORES SUGGEST EDUCATION REFORMS ARE WORKING

STATE ACHIEVEMENT DIFFERENCES TIED TO SPENDING, POLICIES TEXAS FIRST, CALIFORNIA LAST IN TEST SCORES OF SIMILAR STUDENTS

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 25—The education reforms of the 1980s and 1990s seem to be working, according to a new RAND report, but some states are doing far better than others in making achievement gains and in elevating their students' performance compared with students of similar racial and socioeconomic background in other states. Texas and Indiana are high performers on both these counts.

The study is based on an analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) tests given between 1990 and 1996. The authors rank the 44 participating states by raw achievement scores, by scores that compare students from similar families, and

by score improvements. They also analyze which policies and programs account for the substantial differences in achievement across states that can't be explained by demographics. Here are the key findings:

Math scores are rising across the country at a national average rate of about one percentile point per year, a pace outstripping that of the previous two decades and suggesting that public education reforms are taking hold. Progress is far from uniform, however. One group of states—led by North Carolina and Texas and including Michigan, Indiana and Maryland—boasts gains about twice as great as the national average. Another group—including Wyoming, Georgia, Delaware, and Utah—shows minuscule gains or none at all. Most states fall in between.

Even more dramatic contrasts emerge in the study's pathbreaking, cross-state comparison of achievement by students from similar families. Texas heads the class in this ranking with California dead last. Wisconsin, Montana, Iowa, Maine, North Dakota, Indiana and New Jersey cluster closely behind Texas. Louisiana, Mississippi, West Virginia, Alabama and Rhode Island perform almost as dismally as California.

Although the two states are close demographic cousins, Texas students, on average, scored 11 percentile points higher on NAEP math and reading tests that their California counterparts. In fact, the Texans performed well with respect to most states. On the 4th-grade NAEP math tests in 1996, Texas non-Hispanic white students and black students ranked first compared to their counterparts in other states, while Hispanic students ranked fifth. On the same test, California non-Hispanic white students ranked third from the bottom, black students last, and Hispanic students fourth from the bottom among states.

Differences in state scores for students with similar families can be explained, in part, by per pupil expenditures and how these funds are allocated. States at the top of the heap generally have lower pupil-teacher ratios in lower grades, higher participation in public prekindergarten programs and a higher percentage of teachers who are satisfied with the resources they are provided for teaching. These three factors account for about two-thirds of the Texas-California differential. Teacher turnover also has a statistically significant effect on achievement. (California is now implementing class-size reduction and other reforms but these steps began after the 1996 NAEP tests.)

Having a higher percentage of teachers with masters degrees and extensive teaching experience appears to have comparatively little effect on student achievement across states. Higher salaries also showed little effect, possibly reflecting the inefficiency of the current compensation system in which pay raises reward both high- and low-quality teachers. However, the report points out that salary differences may have more important achievements effects within states than between states. Also, they may have greater impact during periods when teachers are in shorter supply than during the 1990–1996 measurement period.

To raise achievement scores, the most efficient and effective use of education dollars is to target states with higher proportions of minority and disadvantaged students with funding for lower pupil-teacher ratios, more widespread prekindergarten efforts, and more adequate teaching resources. As for teacher salaries and education, the report adds, ''efforts to increase the quality of teachers in the long run are important, but . . . significant productivity gains can be obtained with the current teaching force if their working conditions are improved.''

The most plausible explanation for the remarkable rate of math gains by North Carolina and Texas is the integrated sets of policies involving standards, assessment and accountability that both states implemented in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The RAND study, led by David Grissmer, is based on NAEP tests given in 1990, 1992, 1994 and 1996 to representative samples of 2,500 students from the 44 voluntarily participating states. Five tests were given in mathematics and two in reading at either the 4th- or 8th-grade level. Not all of the states took all of the tests. And there were too few reading tests to permit a separate analysis of those results. Taken together, however, the tests provided the first set of data permitting statistically valid achievement comparisons across states. The researchers used data from the census and from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey to establish the student samples' family characteristics.

The 1998 NAEP reading and math scores became available too late to be incorporated in this analysis. ''We're examining those data now, however, and we find that the state rankings change little and our findings about which policies make the most difference aren't affected at all,'' Grissmer declares.

''Our results certainly challenge the traditional view of public education as 'unreformable','' he concludes. ''But the achievement of disadvantaged students is still substantially affected by inadequate resources. Stronger federal compensatory programs are required to address this inequity.''

Grissmer's coauthors include Ann Flanagan, Jennifer Kawata and Stephanie Williamson. Improving Student Achievement: What NAEP Test Scores Tell Us was supported by the ExxonMobil Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, the NAEP Secondary Analysis Program, the Center for Research on Education Diversity and Excellence and by RAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah has made an extraordinarily good point. If he would like to speak further, I can wait. I am going to propose a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BENNETT. I have probably exhausted my indignation on that subject, I say to the Senator from Kentucky. I will be available again if someone comes along to try to misinterpret and misquote these studies.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend for his very important contribution to what has become an issue across America.

Mr. President, with relation to the foreign operations bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote regarding the foreign operations conference report occur beginning at 4:30 p.m., and that there be 4 minutes for debate immediately following the vote for closing remarks with respect to the pending Feingold amendment and S. 2508, and that that vote immediately occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was told this had been cleared on both sides. We will propound the unanimous consent request later when it is cleared.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I had to leave the floor for a moment. Am I correct that the continuing resolution will not be here for a 4:30 vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, would it be his intention, once all time is finished or yielded back, to go to a rollcall vote on this bill?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am told that is fine with our side. We will be happy to finish up the debate and vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I know we are discussing the underlying bill. I ask unanimous consent to be yielded 7 minutes.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: It is my understanding that we have a vote scheduled at 4:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not correct; that has been changed.

Mr. REID. I don't understand how we are not having a vote at 4:30. How could it have been changed?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I propounded a unanimous consent agreement to which the Senator from Florida objected and that is how we found ourselves where we are.

Mr. REID. So what I stated earlier on the floor—that we had a vote at 4:30—was really not accurate, is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote was to occur at that time, but the measure on which the vote was to occur has not yet arrived from the House.

Who yields time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I have requested time. I understand under a previous unanimous consent request, Senator GRAHAM of Florida was granted 30 minutes. He is yielding me a part of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield the time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know we have been discussing a variety of subjects in the last few hours. The matter before the Senate is the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

One of the difficulties all Members are having, is trying to get some accurate information about what is actually in these bills, as they come to us rather quickly. That is one of the things we have been talking about today. I think Senator LEAHY raised an excellent point. There are provisions in

foreign ops about which I also have some serious concerns. But right now, I just wanted to take a few minutes to discuss the Adoption Tax Credit.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

Mr. President, the adoption tax credit is broadly supported in this Chamber by Democrats and Republicans. It is one of the issues we seem to be able to come together on to say, yes, we believe in adoption. Adoption affirms life. It affirms families. It helps us to build families in very special ways. It provides an opportunity for children who don't have parents, and for parents who desperately want children, to get together.

Over the last couple of years, together, Democrats and Republicans, the White House, President Clinton and the First Lady, have been aggressive advocates of adoption. We have made great progress.

Just last week, under the tremendous leadership of Chairman HELMS, we passed the first ever International Treaty on Adoption. This treaty is going to reduce corruption, minimize the costs of international adoptions, and expedite this process so the children all around the world can find homes. We believe there are no unwanted children, just unfound families. We passed historic legislation a few years ago to help break down racial barriers to allow people of all different races to adopt children in need, in order to build families. We all know that love knows no color lines.

We are doing a wonderful job. I am on the floor today to encourage my colleagues to just try to do a little bit better. I am concerned that we are not going to expand this adoption tax credit and increase it in ways that are meaningful, in ways that will make a difference.

Just two months ago, many members of this body gathered in Philadelphia and vowed that under their leadership, no child would be left behind. This is a laudable goal, and one I think that every member of this body embraced. Here is our opportunity to prove it.

Let me briefly explain what I mean. Right now, as many people know—particularly those who have adopted children, or who have been touched in a positive way in their life through adoption, either as an adoptee, as a birth mother who is happy with the choice she made, or an adoptive couple—there is in place a $5,000 tax credit for adoption. We adopted this tax credit in 1996, in an effort to provide assistance to families wishing to adopt. It allows parents who adopt a child to receive a maximum of $5,000 in credit on their taxes. If that child is what we call a special needs child, the amount of the credit is raised by $1,000. In addition, reimbursements for adoption expenses from a private employer are also excluded from an adoptive parent's gross annual income.

The National Adoption Clearinghouse estimates that a private adoption costs anywhere from $4,000 to $30,000. International adoptions are reported at between $10,000 and $30,000. About six months ago, I was at a citizenship ceremony for newly adopted children. One mother came up to me and told me that, without the tax credit, she could not have even thought about adopting a second child.

So this is an important tax credit. It helps waiting children find homes. It helps working couples who want to be parents experience the sheer joy parenting brings. But it is not working for everyone. Unfortunately, the way the credit is currently structured, it is not helping all adoptive families, just some. Let me show you why.

As you can see, I have pictures of three children here, all of whom were adopted. The first Elena, a child from Guatemala, who was adopted when she was one year old. She has no known health conditions. This second child is Jack, a little boy from the United States, who was given up for adoption when he was born. Jack was immediately placed through a private adoption agency. Jack also has no known health conditions.

And this is Serina, a little girl, also from the United States who was also recently adopted. Serina was taken into foster care immediately upon her birth. She was born with prenatal cocaine addiction. She is small, in a wheelchair, and has difficulty seeing and hearing. She suffers from Cerebral Palsy, as well as multiple other problems.

As I mentioned, these two children, Elena and Jack, are relatively healthy. The third child, Serina, has multiple challenges. Under our current system, one would think all of these children and their families would deserve some help with adoption. But right now under our system, Elena and Jack have received help. Elena's parents received $9,786, while Jack's family claimed $5,890. Serina's parents, on the other hand, received nothing.

Under the current tax code, only expenses which are incurred in the act of adoption are eligible. Although adopting Serina meant that her adoptive parents had to renovate their car and make their home wheelchair accessible, such costs are not ''qualified adoption expenses.''

As I mentioned, the difficulty lies in the tax code. One can be reimbursed for expenses related to the adoption. But, as is widely known in the adoption community, when you adopt a special needs child, perhaps one who is not physically handicapped, or one who has emotional or mental difficulties or has been in foster care, there are little or no expenses related to the active adoption.

Serina is a special needs child, just like the 100,000 special needs children who are freed for adoption in the United States and yet are still waiting for a home. These are all children like Serina, waiting for a family to love and care for them. We want that adoption tax credit to work for these children, as well. The Department of Treasury estimates that, not including step parents, there were 77,000 adoptions in 1998, 31,000 of which were special needs. That is almost half.

Therefore, under our current system, the very children and families we are trying to help, encourage, and reward for opening up their homes and hearts to these children are actually being left out.

Here is a report to Congress from our own Department of Treasury, a report we received just in the last week. I brought this to the attention of our ranking member on the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN. This has also been transmitted to Chairman ROTH from Delaware, to help my colleagues understand that, according to this report, special needs children are being left out. I know that in the final days of the session, negotiators have been trying to reach a final agreement on a tax package. However, I am told that, while this package does include a provision to extend the non-special needs tax credit for two additional years, it does not include any relief for special needs children.

I know some people might say: Senator LANDRIEU is not right. She couldn't possibly be right. This can not be happening. We are not giving a tax credit for healthy kids and no tax credit for special needs kids.

That wasn't our intention. At least I believe it wasn't our intention.

Let me conclude by saying, when people stand up on this floor, or in Philadelphia, or in California, giving speeches all over America, and say they don't want to leave children behind, that ''no child will be left behind'', we are about to leave 100,000 children behind, because we will not take the time and the energy to fix this adoption tax credit. Children such as Serina, children in my State and a number of others, all of these beautiful children from different States—these are the kids who are about to be left behind.

If I have to come to this floor every day until we are finished—and Lord only knows how long we will be here—I will continue to do so, to speak for the children who are being left behind. We can fix the tax credit; it costs very little to fix it. If we are truly a body which vows to leave no child behind, then we must do something to help both special needs and non special needs children.

Mr. President, I will come to the floor every day if necessary to ensure that these children are not left behind.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time remains under my 30 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes 10 seconds.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as is necessary.

For the last several weeks, I have been raising concerns about the direction of our fiscal policy. Today, we reach a historic moment. Many were here in the 1980's and 1990's when the Federal Government, through annual deficits, acquired a record national debt of almost $5.5 trillion. In 1992, we reached the peak of this when we had a 1-year deficit of in excess of $290 billion.

In the 1990s, we took a number of steps to try to rectify this situation and to mitigate this constant increase in the national debt.

A key part of that process occurred in 1997. In 1997, we set spending limits for ourselves, including spending limits on the discretionary accounts of the Federal Government such as the account that we are dealing with today. We promised ourselves and the public that for every tax dollar cut there would be $1 less spent, and vice versa. That is the way in which a family would approach having to restrain its budget in order to come into line with its income. It would buy the holiday gifts that it could afford but not necessarily the ones that everyone in the family wants because for those family budgets there are some very real caps.

But, for Congress, the commitment to realistic budget and fiscal responsibility was a novel, even a radical idea. We had not even thought about it that much in the preceding 20 or 30 years. Apparently, it was so radical that it was too much to ask. It is almost as if this Halloween season we have all turned into Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. On the campaign trail we put on one costume; that is, the costume of our better selves where we boast about the courage and foresight it took to balance the budget. We talk about all the good things we are going to do, whether it is saving Social Security, providing a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, cutting taxes, or adding spending in other favorable programs. Then we return to Congress and we take off our mask. We begin grabbing for what we can get, a few billion here, a few billion there, regardless of the long-term consequences.

We have doled out treats to line our political pockets while we are playing a trick on the American public. That trick is that we are sleepwalking through the surplus. We are about to deny ourselves and future generations one of the greatest opportunities that we have had in American political and economic history: to use this enormous period of prosperity to deal with some of those long-term issues that will affect, not just ourselves, but future generations.

But as we vote to set the deficit monster free, we make the promise that this is only for this year. We are not really going to let him out of the cage; we are just going to open the door a bit and let him sniff some of the desirable consequences of profligate spending. This year we tell the American public this is our chance to celebrate this American prosperity. Next year we will cut the monster down to size, put him back in his cage, and no long-term harm will have been done. But the truth is for our children and our grandchildren this could be a very scary Halloween.

My friends, are we really so humble as to believe that what we do today will not resonate through future years? I personally find it hard to believe that this will be just a 1-year exception to a constancy of fiscal discipline.

In 1997, we planned for the future because we knew that what we did with the taxpayers' dollars would have real consequences. They are having real consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Washington Post article aptly entitled ''Binges Becoming Regular Budget Fare'' be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this story chronicles the crumbling of our wall of fiscal resolve in the face of a behemoth of appropriations bills. The bill we have before us, the foreign operations bill, carries a $14.9 billion price tag.

It has been stated that this bill is actually lower than the bill that we passed last year. If I am in error—and it is very difficult to respond since we have only in the last few hours gotten a copy of a multipage bill, but as I read through the bill, it is my analysis that in calculating last year's $15.5 billion expenditure, we have included an almost $2 billion item, the Wye Plantation commitments for the Middle Eastern peace, which are nonrecurring. So if you are comparing apples to apples, those things that we spent money on last year and those things we are going to spend money on this year, actually last year's comparable appropriation for foreign operations was closer to $13.5 billion. So instead of the $14.9 billion being a reduction, it actually represents approximately a 10-percent increase over the spending that we had on this same account last year, a 10-percent increase, while we are operating under the rule that we are only supposed to spend the rate of inflation, which is 3.5 percent, as an increase from 1 year's budget to the next.

But that is not what is the true monster in this bill. The true monster in this bill is stuck into the appropriations language, which for us on the floor is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since we do not have a copy of the actual bill and conference report. It is specifically stuck on page H10776, nestled in between a provision that relates to gifts to the United States for reduction of the public debt—and I am glad to know that we get some gifts to reduce the public debt—and a provision that provides debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries. It may be appropriate that this language I am about to quote is inserted in between those two provisions.

In section 701(a), this language appears:

> Section 251 (c)(5) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 . . . is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:
>
> ''(A) for discretionary category: $637,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $612,695,000,000 in outlays;''.

That might seem fairly unexciting, but let me tell you what we are preparing to do. In that Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we provided a spending limit for discretionary accounts for each of the future years. For the fiscal year 2001, the year for which we are now appropriating, the spending limit was established at $542 billion. The legislation we are about to vote upon will increase that figure from $542 billion to $637 billion, a 17.5-percent increase in the allowable expenditure in this 1 year alone. That is the scale of the monster that we are about to let out of the cage by adopting this legislation.

This figure will put far more than a dent in the surplus that we promised. It will put a massive hole in our budget projections. The fact is, by the time we are done, Social Security is more likely to be floundering midstream without a life vest than to be in a secure lockbox on dry land. Instead of fiscal responsibility, we are now practicing fiscal myopia. We are honing in on the magic number, a $4.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. However, what we are forgetting to completely level with the American people about is that that $4.6 trillion is predicated on the assumption we are only going to spend $542 billion this year. We are about to authorize a number that is almost $100 billion larger.

The forecasters of the Congressional Budget Office do not have a crystal ball. They can only see the future the way we look at it and the degree of confidence they place in our actions. The CBO numbers, upon which the $4.6 trillion surplus is predicated, are based on those commitments made in 1997.

This appropriations bill demonstrates that we are not committed to those commitments of 1997. The surplus projections assume that discretionary spending increases each year would be restrained to the rate of inflation. We are about to completely abandon that facade.

What are we about to do as we go into this new reckless era? The best case scenario—and we can assume under that that we will, indeed, be able to increase discretionary spending for the future only by the rate of inflation, that this is just a 1-year aberration through which we are living; that Halloween is going to be repealed for future years—if we have that best case scenario, we can anticipate that our surplus will sink by about $100 billion over the next 10 years—$100 billion less than the projections.

I do not think that is a credible scenario. I do not believe there is any reason to believe that what we are doing today is exceptional. Rather, what we

are doing today is going to be precedential for the future. And assume that it is precedential. The discretionary spending each year increases by the same rate that we are increasing it this year; that is, approximately 9 percent, or 5.5 percent more than the rate of inflation.

If we act in each of the next 10 years with the same abandon that we do this year, we will spend the entire 10-year projected surplus on this increased spending. There will be no money to strengthen Social Security. There will be no money to finance a tax cut. There will be no money to provide for prescription drugs through Medicare. In fact, spending at this rate will not only eliminate all of those potentials, but Congress will be forced to dip into the Social Security surplus, that thing which it has committed it would never ever do, by $400 billion over 10 years.

So we are making some very serious decisions as we pass this appropriations bill with its enormous increase in the limitation on discretionary spending.

Save Social Security, indeed. Could it be that when we talked about saving Social Security, we really meant preserving it as a museum piece so we could talk to our grandchildren about what it used to be like? We will tell them that back when we were young, the Government actually sent you money when you grew older and deserved a rest. But if discretionary spending will dent the surplus, the direction we are taking on mandatory spending will virtually hollow it out.

Our lack of fiscal discipline is not only to be found in the appropriations bill but also in the creation of new entitlements. We have already passed the Defense Department authorization bill that changes the health benefits as a new entitlement and will reduce the surplus by $60 billion over the next 10 years.

We are poised to approve give-backs to Medicare providers that will cost another estimated $75 to $80 billion of our surplus over the next 10 years.

Another $260 billion disappears if we pass a tax bill, which it is rumored that it is about to be presented to us by our colleagues from across the hall in the House of Representatives.

So when you add up all of this laundry list, you will find that we have reduced our surplus to another return to deficits.

It is very easy to add up these numbers and simply say it is too much, but I am well aware that much of the spending is for worthy causes, many of which I myself support. But what these individual pieces of legislation do not add up to is a solid plan for the future. What they do not add up to is the requirement that we make choices, that we set priorities, that we decide which of all of these good things is most important, and that we have the discipline to stick to those priorities.

I ask again, whatever happened to ''Save Social Security first''?

Can we really say we have done anything to shore up the Medicare system which is desperately in need of an infusion if it is to remain viable for today's seniors, their children, and grandchildren?

Are we ever going to be able to pay down the debt?

Our colleagues in the House have suggested that 90 percent of the surplus for this year go to debt reduction. That proposal was for this year only, for fiscal year 2001, however, because they cannot do it over the next 10 years. Ten percent of the surplus would be $456 billion. Congress may very well enact legislation in the next few years that will exceed that amount by in excess of $100 billion.

We have already committed ourselves to more spending than the House of Representatives pledge would require using 90 percent of the surplus to pay down the national debt.

Mr. President, $100 billion is more money than most Americans can ever conceive of.

In a few short months, history will move forward again and we will gather together in the Chamber of the House of Representatives to greet a newly elected President to hear his first State of the Union Address.

By almost any measure, the state of our Union is strong. Our economy is the envy of the world. Incomes are up. Unemployment is down. Home ownership is up. Inflation is low. Mortgage rates remain modest.

As we await a new President, and the first State of the Union Address from that new President—the first new President elected in the 21st century—I am reminded of the historic State of the Union speech delivered by President Clinton at the beginning of 1998.

To provide context from that time, we, as a nation, were on the verge of shifting from annual deficits to a hope for a promised projected surplus. We were looking at a prospect we had not faced in years: What do we do with a possible surplus?

In his 1998 State of the Union Address, President Clinton answered that question. If I could quote from his eloquent words of that evening:

> For three decades, six Presidents have come before you to warn of the damage deficits pose to our nation. Tonight, I come before you to announce that the federal deficit—once so incomprehensibly large that it had eleven zeros—will be, simply, zero.
>
> If we balance the budget for the next year, it is projected that we'll then have a sizable surplus in the years that immediately follow. What should we do with this projected surplus?
>
> I have a simple, four-word answer: Save Social Security first.

Mr. President, that simple four-word answer, ''Save Social Security first,'' brought all of us to our feet in January of 1998. And, Mr. President at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, your greatest legacy will be the restoration of fiscal discipline here in Washington.

Mr. President, you are being challenged as to the fidelity and sustainability of that commitment to fiscal discipline. We should now resist the temptation to allow the deficit monster to escape from the cage again.

We should give to President Clinton the rightful recognition for reversing decades of rampant borrowing and, as a result of that courage, producing sustained national prosperity and the potential for even more prosperity.

But, Mr. President, at the end of your administration, we need you to remain true to the principles that have produced this legacy. If we in the Congress are unable to exercise fiscal discipline, we will have to turn to you to provide us with the necessary restraints.

We are talking here about our children and our grandchildren. Are we again going to return to the days when we expect them to pay our bills or are we going to accept the responsibility that virtually every generation of Americans—but for those who have lived in the last 30 years—were prepared to accept? And that is that we would—each generation, each year—pay our bills and not ask future generations to do so. That is the fundamental issue we face with this appropriations bill. Because I believe it fails to meet that test, I will vote no.

Thank you, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 2000]

BINGES BECOMING REGULAR BUDGET FARE

(By Eric Pianin)

Rules created more than two decades ago to impose fiscal restraint on Congress have broken down, helping fuel a year-end spending spree that is resulting in billions of extra dollars for highways and bridges, water projects, emergency farm aid, school construction and scores of other projects.

Many budget hawks have derided the binge as a typical election year ''porkfest.'' But key lawmakers and experts on federal budgeting say another less visible problem is that the law aimed at reining in such spending has been effectively gutted by the congressional leadership.

In particular, lawmakers are increasingly ignoring the annual congressional budge resolution, the document that is supposed to guide spending and tax decisions in the House and Senate every year. In years past, lawmakers might miss their budget targets by a few billion dollars, but now they are busting the budget by as much as $50 billion a year.

This year's budget resolution, for instance, called for about $600 billion in spending this fiscal year on defense, health, education and other non-entitlement programs. When Congress and the White House finally complete their negotiations, probably this week, the total will be $640 billion or more.

One reason, lawmakers say, is that the GOP congressional leadership has adopted—largely for political reasons—unrealistic budgets that understate the amount of spending members want. Another is that the emergence of big surpluses has made Congress much less vigilant bout living within its means—and more prone to make up the rules as it goes along.

''I think the budget process has been destroyed and I think, unfortunately, Republicans have been heavily numbered among the assassins,'' said Sen. PHIL GRAMM (R–Tex.), a veteran of budget skirmishes. ''I think we've made a mockery of the process and it will be very difficult to revive it.''

Stanley Collender, a prominent expert on federal spending, added: ''What we're seeing is budget decision-making by the seat of their pants.''

Collender and other experts say the increased spending being approved by Congress could begin to cut into projected surpluses, leaving less for the spending and tax cut initiatives proposed by Vice President Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush. Outside of the Social Security program, analysts have projected the federal government will run a $2.2 trillion surplus over the next decade. But the Concord Coalition, a bipartisan budget watchdog group, estimates that the forecast surpluses are likely to shrink by two-thirds, to about $172 billion, if congressional spending patterns persist.

Congress is on track to boost non-defense discretionary spending by 5.2 percent above the rate of inflation during fiscal 2001—the sharpest spending increase of its type in 25 years—according to a new analysis by Democrats on the House Budget Committee.

The decision to ignore the budget resolution is only one sign of a general brreakdown of fiscal discipline on Capitol Hill, according to fiscal experts. Congress and the Clinton administration are also ignoring spending caps both agreed to as part of the 1997 legislation to balance the federal budget.

Congress's enthusiasm for real budget constraints began to wane almost as soon as deficits gave way to surpluses beginning three years ago. Until then, the specter of towering annual deficits of as much as $290 billion had fostered a series of hardnosed policies, including a 1990 budget deal that for the first time imposed caps on spending and required Congress to offset tax cuts by reducing spending or raising other revenue.

The emergence of surpluses has left it to lawmakers to produce budget plans that would impose spending discipline with an eye to the time when Medicare and Social Security will begin to run short of money. But that has not happened.

In the politically charged environment of Capitol Hill, the House and Senate budget committees in recent years produced plans that budget experts say were more GOP political manifestors than practical blueprints. The problem came to a head in 1998, when House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich (Ohio), then a Republican presidential aspirant, produced a House budget resolution so top-heavy with tax cuts and tough on domestic spending that he could not sell it to Senate Republicans or the White House.

For the first time in nearly 25 years, Congress completed that year without a budget. The following year Republicans managed to agree among themselves on a budget, but the document was largely ignored by GOP leaders when they negotiated a final spending agreement with the White House.

This year's plan was somewhat more pragmatic, but even so it called for $150 billion of tax cuts—about twice what Congress will finally settle for—and spending cuts in many areas that GOP members of the appropriations committees refused to accept.

Some of the additional funding this year will go for emergencies, such as restoration of western forest lands hit by fires last summer and security problems at the national nuclear laboratory at Los Alamos, NM. But much of the additional money will go to satisfy the election year demands of Clinton and special projects sought by GOP and Democratic lawmakers—ranging from $2 billion for extra highway and bridge projects to $5 million for an insect-rearing facility in Stoneville, Miss.

''The budget process can only do what the political will can support,'' said G. William Hoagland, the Republican staff director of the Senate Budget Committee. ''I would argue that, if anything, what this year shows is that you need a [tough] budget process even more in times of surpluses than in times of deficits.''

Another phenomenon in recent years has been a growing propensity on the part of congressional leaders to overrule key committees—even in promoting big policy changes. Last year, for example, Republican leaders waited until late in the year to unveil details of a plan to wall off the Social Security surplus from the rest of the budget. They returned from this year's August recess with a new idea for using nine-tenths of next year's surplus for debt reduction.

While both proposals, arguably, will help to impose some limitations on spending, they were presented without any meaningful debate or review by the committees with jurisdiction. House Majority Leader Richard K. Armey (R–Tex.) defended the practice, noting that ''the leadership can't have any idea that holds water unless the [GOP] conference holds it with them.''

BUSTING THE BUDGET

[Dollars in billions]

Fiscal year	Budget resolution	Actual spending	Excess spending
1997	$528	$538	$10
1998	531	533	2
1999	533	583	50
2000	540	587	47
2001	600	[1] 640	40

[1] Estimate.

Source: Senate Budget Committee.

THE CUBAN TRANSITION PROJECT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to engage Senator MCCONNELL, Chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding an important project addressed in both the Senate and House Committee Reports. This project is the Cuban Transition Project located in Miami, FL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would be pleased to engage in such a colloquy.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, my purpose for entering into this colloquy is to seek clarification from the Chairman regarding the Conferees' intent to support the Cuban Transition Project. The House Committee Report states that it supports $3.5 million be provided through USAID for this important initiative to provide policy makers, analysts and others with accurate information and practical policy recommendations that will be needed over a multi-year basis to assist this country in preparation for our next stage of interaction with the Cuban community and nation. The Senate Committee Report similarly supported this project, and it is my understanding that you support this project and intend that it receive support from USAID.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is correct. Support for the Cuban Transition Project was clearly stated in both the House and Senate Reports, and it is the Committee's intention that the project be supported by USAID as indicated. This project is envisioned as a critical component as we prepare ourselves for dealing with Cuban issues in the future. It is our intent that the Cuban Transition Project receive funding this year.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman for reiterating his support and clarifying the intent of the subcommittee. This project has the strong support of the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, and I know that this committee will also be expressing support to the agency. I would like to ask if you will be willing to further advise the Agency formally of your position on this matter.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the subcommittee will further clarify this matter with USAID and I would be happy to work further on any concerns that my colleague from Florida may have.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chairman for his comments.

POLIO ERADICATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with Senator LEAHY, ranking member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. It is my understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee report recommended $30 million for the global polio eradication campaign at USAID and the House recommended $25 million. It is also my understanding that the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund received a $248 million increase for Fiscal 2001 and that there are sufficient funds for the USAID to provide the $30 million for global polio eradication, am I correct?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, we have provided sufficient funds to fund polio eradication at the Senate level of $30 million.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator work with me to ensure that the current USAID Administrator and the Administrator in the new administration provides $30 million for global polio eradication for fiscal 2001?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, I would be happy to work for the Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. Thank you, Senator LEAHY for your commitment and leadership on this issue.

MICRONUTRIENT FUNDING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Senator LEAHY would engage in a brief colloquy about funding for USAID programs in micronutrients?

Mr. LEAHY. I would be delighted to do so with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MILKULSKI. It is my understanding that the conference report currently under consideration makes no reference to micronutrient programs funded through the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund. However, the Senate provided $30 million for this activity in its version of H.R. 4811, while the House provided $25 million. Given that the conference report before the Senate provides $963 million for child survival and disease prevention activities, an increase of almost $250 million that I strongly support, I was wondering if the Ranking

Member would join me in working to obtain the Senate level of $30 million for micronutrient programs.

Mr. LEAHY. I would be happy to. As the Senator has correctly pointed out, the conference report includes a significant increase for child survival activities at USAID. AID is strongly encouraged to dedicate more recourses to the micronutrient programs.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank my colleague.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the conference report on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

I reluctantly voted against that conference report, because it contained a provision dramatically increasing the budget caps, effectively throwing fiscal discipline to the wind.

But I want to go on record indicating that, if the amendment busting the budget caps had not been included in the bill, my vote would have been an enthusiastic yes. Substantively, this is a remarkably good bill, and I commend the managers, Chairman MCCONNELL and the ranking member, Senator LEAHY, as well as Chairman Callahan and Congresswoman PELOSI for their excellent work.

An unprecedented commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS abroad and full funding of the Administration's request for debt relief initiatives are among the many laudable provisions in the bill that complement this year's authorizing work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The conference report contains significant assistance for important family planning work, which can help to bring better health and economic development to families and especially to women around the world. Moreover, I am pleased to see that the bill does not contain restrictive, so-called ''Mexico City'' language designed to limit what private organizations can do with funds raised from non-U.S. government sources.

During the debate on the Senate's version of this bill earlier this year, I asked for, and received, the commitment of Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY to pursue full funding for flood recovery assistance in Mozambique and southern Africa, a region of the world utterly devastated by a series of cyclones earlier this year. This was especially tragic, because prior to the flooding, Mozambique had been making progress toward climbing out of poverty, enjoying economic growth rates of 10 percent per year. I want to thank both Senators for keeping their word. This conference report contains $135 million in flood recovery assistance for the region. This is the right thing to do.

I took a particular interest in the southern Africa issue, in part because I serve as the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on African Affairs. In that same capacity, I have joined with a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to insist that the Administration make accountability a top priority in the context of our policy towards Sierra Leone. I am gratified to note that the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report includes language urging the State Department to provide support for the Special War Crimes Court for Sierra Leone. The support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for this key Congressional priority in West Africa should not be overlooked.

In another area of interest, I note that the conference report retains language suspending certain types of military and security assistance to Indonesia until a set of conditions relating to the disarmament and disbanding of militia forces and accountability for gross human rights abuses have been met. At the same time, it maintains an appropriate level of assistance for the people of East Timor, who are seeking to rebuild their communities and to fully realize their independence each day.

Finally, the conference report provides strong support for the Peace Corps and for important development assistance accounts which, when responsibly administered and monitored, can serve U.S. interests in building a more stable, prosperous, and democratic world.

All of these sound provisions make it all the more unfortunate that the bill has been tainted with the budget-busting amendment, so that my vote would have been an accurate reflection of my support for this bill. Too often in the past, the Congress has failed to understand the critical link between U.S. engagement with the rest of the world and our national interests—our security, our health, our economic stability, and even our national values. This bill recognizes those links and moves in the right direction. It's a shame that a bill that makes such sensible policy choices, so casually busts the budget caps that we rely upon to ensure fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report for Foreign Operations Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001.

The bill before us includes much that is good; in fact, it includes much that is important for our national security. For example, with the Middle East experiencing a level of turmoil not witnessed since the 1973 Yom Kippur War, the assistance in this bill for Israel and for other friends and allies in the region constitutes an essential component of our policy there. Vital humanitarian assistance programs are funded, including debt relief for especially poor countries.

However, I cannot support this conference report because it raises fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending caps to $637 billion from the $600 billion that was provided for in the budget resolution passed in April. Assuming that will be the new total amount of spending allowed, that would be nearly $40 billion more than the budget resolution, $13 billion more than what the President requested, and $50 billion more than what was spent in fiscal year 2000.

In addition, there remains the usual plethora of parochially-driven spending directives. While the bill appears to avoid legally restrictive earmarks, the effect of numerous provisions intended to do precisely that: direct funds where Members of Congress want them to go, usually for parochial reasons. I will be submitting a list of such items for the RECORD.

The decision to vote against this bill, irrespective of the usual pork-barrel provisions, however, was difficult. I recognize the importance of aid to Israel during this crucial period in its history, and I agree with the imperative of relieving the poorest countries of the burden of their international debts. The fiscal irresponsibility of Section 701 of this bill adjusting the spending caps upward to accommodate greater levels of pork barrel spending is too much to ignore. I'm not ignoring it, Mr. President. I oppose passage of this bill because I abhor the continuing disregard for fiscal responsibility it represents. And I abhor the cynicism illuminated by a decision to attach such fiscally irresponsible language to a spending bill so important to our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD earmarks, Member-adds, and directive language.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—EARMARKS, MEMBER-ADDS, AND DIRECTIVE LANGUAGE

International Fertilizer Development Center: $4 million;

United States Telecommunications Training Institute: $500,000;

National Albanian American Council training program: $1.3 million;

Section 536 Impact on Jobs in the United States: restrictive language intended to curtail trade that adversely affects employment in the United States;

Section 545 Purchase of American-Made Equipment and Products: Requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress on efforts by heads of Federal agencies to ensure that directors of international financial institutions make full use of American commodities, products and services;

Kiwanis/UNICEF Iodine Deficiency Program: $5 million;

University of California, San Fransisco: $500,000 to develop detailed epidemiological HIV/AIDS profiles for priority countries;

Gorgas Memorial Institute, University of Alabama: AID is ''urged'' to work closely with the institute, drawing from the $60 million alloted to address global health threat from tuberculosis;

Notre Dame's Vector Biology Laboratory Tulane University's Department of Tropical Medicine: AID is ''urged'' to direct $2 million to these institutes to establish Centers of Excellence for malaria research;

Carelift International: AID is ''urged'' to direct $7 million to Carelift International;

University of Missouri-St. Louis International Laboratory for Tropical Agriculture

biotechnology program: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million;

University of California, Davis: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million for the university to train foreign scientists;

Tuskegee University, Alabama: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $1 million to establish a Center to Promote Biotechnology in International Agriculture at Tuskegee University;

Marquette University, Wisconsin: AID is urged to allocate a sum of money similar to that received under this bill as other universities to the Les Aspin Center for Government;

United States Telecommunications Training Institute: $500,000 ''should'' be made available for the institute;

Habitat for Humanity International: Department of State is urged to coordinate with AID to ensure the program receives $1.5 million;

Foundation for Environmental Security and Sustainability: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $2.5 million to support environmental threat assessments with interdisciplinary experts and academicians;

Alfalit International: earmarks $1.5 million to combat adult illiteracy;

University of San Fransisco: earmarks $1 million for the Center for Latin American Trade Expansion to assist in the development of trade promotion initiatives;

Patrick Leahy War Victims Fund: earmarks $12 million;

American Center for Oriental Research: DoS and AID are ''urged'' to allocate $2 million for the center, headquartered in Amman, Jordan, with operations in Boston, MA;

Dartmouth Medical School: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $750,000 for a joint program with the University of Pristina to help restore educational programs;

Florida State University: AID is ''urged'' to allocate $2 million for a distance learning program;

Synchrotron Light Source Particle Accelerator project (SESAME): ''the managers intend that $15 million of the funds made available for Armenia should support this or a comparable project.'' Berkeley, California, partnership;

University of South Alabama: $1 million to study the environmental causes of birth defects in Ukraine;

Ohio Center for Economic Initiatives National Telephone Cooperative Association, Arlington, VA: $3.2 million for industrial sector management tours;

University of Alaska/Alaska Pacific University/Alaska Native regional governments (North Slope Borough and Northwest Arctic Borough): $20 million for the activities of these institutions in the Russian Far East;

World Council of Hellenes/United States-Russia Investment Fund: allocates an unspecified sum to the World Council of Hellenes and the United States-Russia Investment Fund to support the Primary Healthcare Initiative in Ukraine, Georgia, and Russia;

Notre Dame University: The Department of State is directed to support the university's program of human rights, democracy, and conflict resolution training in Colombia;

Naval Post-Graduate School, Monterey, California: DoS and AID are ''urged'' to allocate $150,000 for development of a peacekeeping initiative at the school;

Jamestown Foundation: $1 million to disseminate information and support research about China.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, in June of this year I expressed my displeasure with the foreign operations appropriations bill when it came to the floor of the Senate. The overall funding level was too low, security assistant accounts were unfunded, burdensome conditions were placed on contributions to international organizations and an inadequate appropriation was made for debt relief.

I'm pleased to find that the conference report has corrected some of these problems in a very satisfactory way. Appropriators have done the right thing on debt relief, by fully funding the amounts requested. As the wealthiest nation in the world, there is no excuse for us ignoring the plight of the world's poorest countries which are laboring under an untenable debt burden.

I'm also relieved to see that the overall funding level of the bill comes far closer to the administration's request than the bill that the Senate passed in June. That bill, to my dismay, was $1.7 billion short of what was asked for. The conference report is a vast improvement. It is still some $200 million below what the executive branch has projected that it will need to undertake foreign operations. Obviously this is quite a large sum and there is a very serious need for Congress to reverse the trend of undercutting State Department and Agency for International Development programs. However the conference report brings the money requested and the money appropriated substantially closer.

The bill contains a provision for assistance to Serbia with which I am in agreement. To unilaterally lift sanctions, or to open up the aid spigot fully would be both premature and naive. The United States should adopt the more measured response reflected in this provision. The language in the conference report sends the right message that we must condition our aid to the new regime in Serbia until it has clearly demonstrated that it will cooperate with the Hague War Crimes Tribunal, respect the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina and not undermine the Dayton Accords, and that it will unequivocally renounce the use of force in Kosovo and take steps to implement policies that reflect a respect for minorities and rule of law.

Finally Mr. President, let me say that I am also relieved to see that the level of funding dedicated to the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, De-mining and Related Programs (NADR) has been increased substantially. The amount is almost $100 million more than the level in the Senate passed bill, and slightly higher than the President's request. Although I would like to see more resources dedicated to the International Science and Technology Centers program, I welcome the plus up in the larger account. These programs are a crucial element in our strategy to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, and combat terrorism.

One NADR account that received more than the amount requested was export control assistance, and I truly applaud that. The assistance that we give to other countries in developing export control laws, regulations, and enforcement is absolutely crucial from the non-proliferation standpoint, and it can also help combat international terrorism. As we plus up that program, however, we must remember to provide the personnel to implement it. Many of those personnel are in the Department of Commerce, and more are needed. Unless appropriators provide elsewhere the requested 7 additional personnel (which translates into 5 additional FTE in Fiscal Year 2001) for the Bureau of Export Administration, the additional funds that we make available in this bill simply will not be implemented as effectively as we would wish.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference report. It has taken some time to reach an agreement satisfactory to all interested parties, but I believe that the bill before us goes a long way toward advancing American interests abroad. Furthermore, this bill contains important provisions to help poor and vulnerable world citizens.

First of all, I am especially pleased that appropriators have agreed to fully fund the President's debt relief package for third world countries, and that language has been included to allow the International Monetary Fund to release $800 million from the sale of gold reserves so that the interest earned on the proceeds can be put to work providing debt forgiveness to heavily indebted poor nations in Africa and parts of Latin America. The burden of external debt has become a major impediment to economic development and poverty reduction in many of the world's poorest countries—a reality I have witnessed first-hand throughout my travels in Latin America. Until recently, the United States government and other creditors sought to address this problem by rescheduling loans, and in some cases, providing limited debt reduction. Despite such efforts, the cumulative debt of many of the poorest countries has continued to grow beyond their ability to repay, and thus, developing economies are struggling. And, even worse, it is the most vulnerable citizens in these fledgling democracies that are suffering from this debt. When already poor governments are investing vast amounts of their budgets in debt maintenance, little remains for social services for those most in need. As a result, women, children, and the poor end up suffering and living in want.

Throughout my tenure in the Senate, I have supported efforts to target assistance for programs designed to address the special needs and concerns of the poor, and I am grateful that we have had some success in this undertaking. United States assistance programs, together with other international aid efforts, have made basic human necessities available to many of those most in need. However, I believe that the debt reduction initiatives included in the Foreign Operations bill

today build upon that success, and hope that they will dramatically increase the quality of life for citizens in indebted countries. We still have a long way to go to ensure that all people live free of hunger and want, but I think that today we are taking a dramatic leap forward toward that end.

I am also pleased with the increase in funding for children's health programs included in this bill. This conference report provides $963 million for child survival and disease programs, $413 million more than the administration requested. Besides providing funding of $110 million for UNICEF, this money will be used for immunization programs, prenatal care, polio eradication, combating illegal trafficking in women and children, and the establishment of orphanages for displaced children. My colleagues know of my deep commitment to child welfare both at home and abroad. Indeed, too often children are overlooked because they do not vote and have no voice in our political system. I am extremely happy that children's welfare programs have been so generously funded in this bill, and hope that this represents a trend that will continue in the years to come.

Finally, I would like to comment on the family planning provisions in the bill. I believe the problem of overpopulation is an extremely important issue and population stabilization is crucial to the well-being of the planet. Overpopulation threatens to exert tremendous social, ecological, medical, and economic hardship on much of the world, and we must take strong action to limit it.

For families living under the conditions that exist in many developing nations, family planning is critical. Without it, mothers have great difficulty spacing their births and limiting the number of children they bear and, as a result, they suffer the tremendous physical stress of repeated childbirth—often without the aid of physicians or midwives. Furthermore, women are not the only ones who suffer in these cases; their children suffer too. Children in large families find themselves competing for food with other siblings. As a result, they suffer from higher incidents of malnutrition and hunger.

Under the compromise included in the conference report, family planning groups abroad can finally use their own money to provide family planning services, although the restriction on federal funding of abortions continues. In addition, Congress has boosted the general funding available for international family planning from $370 million to $425 million which will be available for expenditure after February 15, 2001. By helping women avoid pregnancy before conception, this funding will help mothers in developing countries better plan their child rearing, and will reduce the number of abortions performed annually. Moreover, it will ensure that every child born is a wanted child and will reduce the number of children born to parents who do not have the resources to care for them.

I believe that this is a good bill. It helps those who need it most, and provides funding for our international priorities. It includes money to help end the devastation of AIDS in Africa, assists women, children, and the poor, and allows governments to finally get out of the shadow of crushing debt that both economic circumstance and mismanagement caused to be accrued. On balance, the programs funded in this appropriations bill advance America's foreign policy and national security interests. In short, it is good for the people of the world, and the people of America. When we invest pro-actively in global stability we encourage peace and commerce, and everybody wins. For these reasons, I will vote in favor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee to express my strong support for this conference report. I want to extend my congratulations to Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL as this is clearly one of the best Foreign Operations bills produced in recent years.

This is a good bill which will advance U.S. interests on many fronts. This is a good bill for my constituents who are engaged in global affairs in everything from international trade to humanitarian relief efforts. This is always a tough bill to finish because it address several very controversial issues. Unlike years past, however, this bill is being widely praised by both parties and by the Administration. Again, that is a tribute to the leaders of our subcommittee who worked so hard to bridge very difficult issues.

Perhaps the most significant agreement within this bill is the commitment to fulfill U.S. obligations on debt relief. By providing the requested $435 million for debt relief, this Congress is sending a powerful message to the poorest countries in the world. The U.S. and the international community, by following through on debt relief to the world's poorest citizens, can give new hope to millions of people. I am proud to have supported this effort. And I am so proud of my constituents who embraced campaigns like Jubilee 2000 which made debt relief an issue no one could ignore.

I want to single out one gentleman in particular who touched so many of us here on Capitol Hill with his work. The Reverend David Duncombe from White Salmon, Washington was a heroic champion for debt relief. On two occasions in the last year, Reverend Duncombe staged hunger strikes here in Washington, D.C. to demonstrate the effects of starvation on the human body. Reverend Duncombe visited my office almost every Wednesday morning when he was in Washington, D.C. He stood before us all, day after day, in solidarity with the millions of people affected by this issue. Passage of debt relief is a genuine tribute to people like David Duncombe who rallied Americans to the debt relief cause all across our country. I'm proud Americans came together to ensure our foreign aid dollars will make a difference for poor citizens around the world.

I am strongly in support of this bill's increased funding for international family planning. This bill also repeals the global ''Gag'' order which has crippled our international family planning efforts in previous bills. We know that more and more women in the developing world are starting businesses and contributing to the economic health of families. These women want access to family planning programs and information to build strong, sustainable families. It is time to take our domestic political debate out of the international family planning appropriations process once and for all. International family planning programs help save the lives of women throughout the world. International family planning in a health issue and should be treated that way.

This bill is also strong in the area of export promotion. This bill provides more than $900 million to the Export-Import Bank of the United States which facilitates job creating exports from throughout our country. Other trade promotion entities like OPIC and TDA will receive increased funding under this bill as well. These programs are tangible, real proof that our foreign aid program generates jobs and economic opportunity for Americans.

There's so much more in this bill which will benefit America's interests. We continue our strong program of microcredit lending. Our commitment to UNICEF and important organizations like the Peace Corps continues with this bill. And we are providing increased funding to confront AIDS, tuberculosis and other health threats to the developing world. I am particularly supportive of the bill's $50 million contribution to the Global Alliance for Vaccines & Immunizations. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee has devoted much energy to the GAVI effort, and I encourage the Senate to continue its involvement in this promising program.

Our efforts to assist Russia and the former Soviet states as they continue to struggle with reform are key parts of this bill. Washington state is particularly interested in the Russian Far East. This bill funds democracy-building initiatives, economic transition and other programs for most regions of the former Soviet Union. It's frustrating work, but I support this assistance because it is important to our national interest. In other parts of the world, this bill funds human rights work, environmental protection programs, and other important democracy-building initiatives. From Burma to Serbia to Latin America, this bill works to advance America's interests in so many areas.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this important conference report.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida still have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I yield back my 30 seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is there any other time remaining under the agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 5½ minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator LEAHY has 9 minutes. Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS have 5 minutes each remaining.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier I had mentioned Robin Cleveland and Tim Rieser. I also want to thank Jennifer Chartrand and Billy Piper on the Republican side, who are always very helpful and did a superb job. On the Democratic side, Mark Lippert, who recently joined my staff from the Democratic Policy Committee, is mastering the Appropriations Committee process. I saw Jay Kimmitt on the floor earlier of the committee staff. Not only is he a good friend but a repository of all knowledge and the one to whom we can all turn when we need to know just how to get out of whatever mess we have stumbled into.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank Tim Rieser and Mark Lippert, a representative of Senator LEAHY's staff, Jennifer Chartrand, and, of course, my longtime associate, Robin Cleveland, and Billy Piper as well, for their great work on this bill. I thank Senator LEAHY. It was good to work with him again this year.

Having said that, I understand there are 5 minutes that Senator STEVENS has reserved. I am told he is happy for me to yield that time back.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I also yield back the time of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me also thank Jay Kimmitt, majority appropriations staff, for his outstanding work as well. With that, I believe we are ready.

Mr. President, I will propound a unanimous consent request before we go to the vote. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the vote regarding the foreign operations conference report, to be followed by 4 minutes of debate with closing remarks with respect to the pending Feingold amendment to S. 2508 and that vote immediately occur following those closing remarks, to be followed by a vote in relation to the continuing resolution.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Therefore, Mr. President, there will be three back-to-back rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Abraham	Gregg	Murray
Baucus	Hagel	Nickles
Bennett	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Hatch	Reid
Bingaman	Hollings	Roberts
Bond	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hutchison	Roth
Brownback	Inhofe	Santorum
Bunning	Inouye	Sarbanes
Campbell	Jeffords	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Shelby
Cochran	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Collins	Lautenberg	Snowe
Crapo	Leahy	Specter
Daschle	Levin	Stevens
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dodd	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Torricelli
Dorgan	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Wellstone
Gorton	Moynihan	Wyden
Grassley	Murkowski	

NAYS—27

Allard	Enzi	Landrieu
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Breaux	Fitzgerald	McCain
Bryan	Graham	Miller
Byrd	Gramm	Robb
Cleland	Johnson	Sessions
Conrad	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Edwards	Kyl	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—8

Akaka	Feinstein	Helms
Ashcroft	Frist	Lieberman
Burns	Grams	

The conference report was agreed to.

COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2508.

Pending:

Campbell Amendment No. 4303, in the nature of a substitute.

Feingold Amendment No. 4326 (to Amendment No. 4303), to improve certain provisions of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD and I have 2 minutes to address the Senate before the vote on the motion to table Feingold amendment No. 4326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 4326

Mr. FEINGOLD. My amendment is supported by the administration because it improves the bill. It actually makes the bill comply with Federal reclamation and environmental laws. It makes it clear that only the features of the latest version of the Animas-La Plata Project will be constructed, and the result of that, my colleagues, will be a better return for the taxpayers than the underlying measure. This is important.

The Ute and Navajo tribes will have their claims settled and paid for, even under my substitute, 100 percent by the Federal Government, but the nontribal water recipients will have to repay their share of the construction, fish and wildlife mitigation, and recreation costs. That kind of repayment is only fair. It is what other water users and other projects such as the California central valley and central Utah have to pay.

If my colleagues will look at the fact, this is not unprecedented. This is actually the way other water projects are handled now. The water users have to pay these fair costs. This amendment not only does not kill the bill, it just makes sure there is a fair opportunity for court review. The bill does not undercut; the non-Native American users actually pay their fair share.

Most importantly, this greatly expanded project that has now been scaled down to a reasonable level does not somehow get put back into this large wasteful project. It is both strong in terms of environmental concern and very strong in terms of the taxpayers.

I hope by supporting this, my colleagues, the Senator from Colorado could have this water project that he has worked on for so long, but that it be done in a responsible way which the administration supports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am joined by Senator BINGAMAN, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator ALLARD in asking the Senate to support our version of the Animas-La Plata water project by voting to table the Feingold amendment. In 2 minutes they will not have time to speak, but I believe I am speaking for them.

Our version of S. 2508 is truly bipartisan. By the way, it is not an expanded project. This is a much more reduced project. The Republican Governor and the Democratic attorney general of Colorado strongly oppose the Feingold amendment. By voting to table the Feingold amendment, we will leave intact a bipartisan version of S. 2508, supported by the administration, the States of Colorado and New Mexico, the Ute tribes of Colorado, the Navajo nation, and rural and municipal water users of southwest Colorado and northwest New Mexico.

In doing so, we will be saving the taxpayers over $400 million by downsizing the currently planned Animas-La Plata water project. If the Feingold amendment is not tabled, most of those entities will withdraw their crucial support