REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2031, WORKPLACE PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-280) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to require the Secretary of Labor to wait for completion of a National Academy of Sciences study before promulgating a standard or guideline on ergonomics, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2031, TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-281) on the resolution (H. Res. 272) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2031) to provide for injunctive relief in Federal district court to enforce State laws relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 417, CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, a “Dear Colleague” letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 417, the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1999.

The Committee on House Administration ordered H.R. 417 reported this evening and is expected to file its committee report on Wednesday, August 4. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment committed to conference: Messrs. ARCHER, ARMLEY, CRANE, THOMAS, RANGEL, and STARK.

As additional conferees for consideration of sections 313, 315-316, 318, 325, 323, 328, 341-42, 344-45, 351, 362-63, 365, 369, 371, 381, 1261, 1305, and 1406 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, BOEHNER, and CLAY.

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2906.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2906) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), I understand, is reserving the right to object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), I understand, is reserving the right to object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SUNDBERG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows: Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ANDREWS: Page 116, after line 5, insert the following: PROHIBITION ON FUNDS FOR NEW OPIC PROJECTS SEC. 585. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any new Guarantee, insurance, reinsurance, or financial assistance by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, after the enactment of this Act, for the issuance of any new guarantee, insurance, reinsurance, or financial assistance, or for initiating any other activity which the Corporation is otherwise authorized to undertake.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to control the time in opposition? Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my time be halved with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and that she be given the authority to yield the time for her 7½ minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. Chairman, in 1996, this House voted to end welfare as we know it for single men, and for people struggling to raise families in America. The amendment says that it is time for us to end corporate welfare as we know it.

The amendment says that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC, will be precluded from initiating new deals, new transactions, with the money that is in this underlying bill. It says that DuPont and General Electric, and McDonald’s, and some of the largest corporations in the world, ought to risk their capital in risky international investments, not the capital of the American taxpayers.

Now, I have had the opportunity to outline my views previously on Thursday night, but I want to quickly summarize them before yielding to support of any amendment.

We will no doubt hear that this will cause chaos at OPIC. It will not. This amendment does not interfere with the ongoing operation and the wind-down of the entity. It simply says that funds should not be used to effectuate that wind-down rather than to initiate new deals.

We will hear that this will have a devastating effect on U.S. investment overseas. Frankly, the huge majority, the immense majority of private investments by U.S. corporations overseas have nothing to do with OPIC.

They have to do with the judgments of entrepreneurs and investors in the global market every day.

We will hear that somehow or another this is unilateral disarmament in the war on trade. It is nothing of the sort. It is the recognition that the real engine of international growth for the U.S. economy is not the taxpayers’ pockets, but the entrepreneurs taking a risk.

This is one of the few amendments I have ever seen that is supported by Ralph Nader and Milton Friedman. And that is probably all people need to know about why they should support it.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the 7½ minutes that has been yielded to me to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) will control the 7½ minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It really puts a damper on American entrepreneurship as we try to transfer technology to the least developed countries that we have in the world.

Recently, this House passed the African Growth and Opportunity Bill. It was not just out of compassion that we did it, but we wanted to make certain that we have people that are able to be productive. It we have disposable income, to have jobs, to have dignity, and not to be looking for welfare and to be looking for foreign assistance.

What OPIC does is encourage private investment to have partnerships so that we are able to say that all over the world, especially in developing nations, that our great Republic will be able to have meaningful commercial trade relations.

I have been to Africa. I have been there with Eximbank. I have been there with OPIC. I have been there with the State Department. Believe me, OPIC really encourages foreign investment, and we need it now more than ever.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. While the amendment might make for catchy so-called cost-cutting sound bites, in reality it would significantly hurt U.S. foreign policy, result in a revenue loss for the Federal Government, and cost American jobs and American export opportunities. This amendment has only costs, in my judgment, and no benefits.

First, contrary to some things that have been said, OPIC has contributed $3.3 billion to deficit reduction and the Function 1050 account. In fiscal year 2000, OPIC will contribute approximately $200 million to deficit reduction. OPIC is self-sustaining and generates an annual increase in funding. If OPIC were eliminated, the budget would lose revenues rather than achieve savings. In fact, this amendment would put the Federal Government $200 million in the red for just the next year.

Since OPIC’s operating costs are covered by user fees, eliminating OPIC does not mean these resources are available for other programs or can be considered as cut spending. There are no millions of dollars in savings as claimed by the amendment’s supporters, just lost jobs and export opportunities without any offsetting gain.

OPIC supports new, high-paying, export-oriented jobs in the United States. More than 237,000 jobs have been created as a result of OPIC-supported projects. In 1998 alone, nearly 7,000 U.S. jobs were created by OPIC projects. Without OPIC, it is estimated that 70,000 job opportunities could be lost in the next 4 years.

Those who express concern about OPIC supported investment abroad luring jobs away from America to foreign countries, this Member recommends they examine closely what investments OPIC is supporting and what kind of so-called foreign jobs are being created. The United States cannot supply raw electric power to Egypt. We can supply American-made power generating equipment and services. How is selling power generating equipment and years of spare parts and services taking jobs away from Americans? How do we sell the Egyptians these power plants, the Europeans, Japanese, Canadians, or other foreigners will.

The United States does not grow tea. Therefore, how does investing in a tea plantation in Rwanda steal American jobs? Indeed, it supports U.S. jobs insofar as that tea operation needs tools, machines, trucks and other services—and these are products and services made by American labor.

The United States is not home to the great Adventures. Most of our developing nations, zebras, and baboons are not native wildlife. Therefore, how does supporting the eco-tourism industry in Botswana by investing in new hotels and tour operations take away American jobs? On the contrary, this development requires all kinds of infrastructure—construction materials, hotels, tour operations—these goods and services Americans produce and sell.

OPIC-backed projects around the world are U.S. small businesses. Over the next 4 years it is estimated that OPIC projects will generate $23 billion more in America exports. $6 billion of those exports are to be from over 150 American small businesses.

OPIC has proven itself to be a successful supporter of American foreign policy. OPIC mobilizes private sector investment in support of U.S. foreign policy at no cost to the American taxpayer. The Andrews amendment would mean no support for U.S. investment in high priority foreign policy areas. It would eliminate an estimated $9 billion in increased American goods and services—America’s exports, $4 billion in Central America and the Caribbean, and $8 billion for development of Caspian Sea energy resources.

Since 1971, OPIC supported projects which have resulted in the export of $58 billion of American products. More than $2.8 billion in American exports were generated by OPIC supported projects in 1998 alone.

With respect to the Andrews-Sanders-Sanford amendment, I would have to say that it hurts American competitiveness and benefits our foreign competitors. Most of our developing nations, like France, Germany and Japan, offer a comprehensive array of export and overseas investment support. They clearly understand the importance of such programs in supporting jobs and economic growth at home. The U.S. spends less per capita, as a percentage of GDP, and in dollar terms on supporting private sector investment in developing countries than any other major competitor country.

Mr. Chairman, the support OPIC provides is not corporate welfare and has not eliminated American jobs as the “Dear Colleague” letter circulated recently complained. Caterpillar was
Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), one of the co-authors of this amendment and a person who has been very diligent about cutting costs for the American public.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I support this amendment and am, indeed, a cosponsor on this amendment because it makes sense to the United States taxpayer.

This amendment is not about the inefficiency of OPIC. As government organizations go, it is quite efficient. It is not about the management. It has a good track record. I have met with George Munoz, who is head of OPIC. The issue that this amendment gets to is not is OPIC able to handle the mandate that it has been given, but rather is that mandate in the best interest of the United States taxpayer. And I think if we look under the hood on this, we would come to the conclusion that no is the answer.

First, Mr. Chairman, there is a financial risk to the U.S. taxpayer with OPIC. OPIC was given a billion dollars of seed money in 1971 when OPIC was begun, and yet if we look, since 1971, there has been, for instance, a world war. These loans or guarantees are backed with the full faith and credit of the United States Government. If there was a war, we would see the cost to those guarantees. There has not been a global depression since 1971. If there was a severe economic downturn, we would see the cost to those guarantees.

In fact, if we look in Brazil, where there is $1.9 billion of taxpayer exposure, OPIC itself has said that fully half of their portfolio could be affected by the crisis there. The same could be said, for instance, in Russia. So, one, there is a contingent liability that goes back to the United States taxpayer.

With the money that was originally provided, interest is earned on that money. And if we look at the income statement of last year, $139 million was the net income and $193 million came in as a result of these interest payments. That leaves a loss of $54 million.

Admittedly, $54 million is not a lot of money in Washington, but back home that is a lot of money. In fact, I did a back-of-the-envelope calculation, and it would take 13,500 taxpayers, average taxpayers, working and paying taxes for a full year, to send Washington $54 million.

This consideration is that it does cost American jobs. And that is not my opinion or the opinion of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). That is the opinion of Time magazine. They did a three-part series on corporate welfare. What was found, for instance, a $29 million loan guarantee for Levi Strauss and Company to build a manufacturing plant in Turkey, while, at the same time, the Labor Department was handing out unemployment and training benefits for 6,400 American workers who had been laid off in 11 American plants with Levi Strauss and Company. The point of that article was saying that the two were directly correlated.

Finally, I yield just to make mention of the fact that changes markets. If we change a market, we change where an investment can be made. And so what we are doing is subsidizing development off our coast. And as well, that we are doing is preventing a marketplace from developing with other insurers.

This is a need that needs to take place, and it could be easily handled by the Lloyds of London, who are not in this business right now because OPIC is.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2¼ minutes.

First, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member of the committee, for yielding me this time.

I join my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) in saying that I am against corporate welfare, but this, the subject of his amendment, is not about corporate welfare. It is hard to understand how anyone can object to a program that returns money to the U.S. Treasury while at the same time furthering our foreign policy goals and helping to increase foreign investments and exports overseas.

Last year, OPIC earned a profit of $139 million. And in fiscal year 2000, OPIC will contribute an estimated $204 million in net negative budget authority. In fact, OPIC has had a positive net income for every year of operation with reserves now totaling $3.3 billion.

All that we do through the appropriation process is to allow OPIC to spend money that it has already earned to support corporate welfare.

With the grants that we have provided, we are saving money for the taxpayers by cutting OPIC’s appropriations. In fact, quite to the contrary. By supporting this amendment, we will forgo an estimated over $300 million in net budget authority for the next fiscal year. We do not save money for the taxpayers by cutting OPIC’s appropriations. In fact, quite to the contrary. By supporting this amendment, we will forgo an estimated over $300 million in net budget authority for the next fiscal year.

At a time when Congress is trying to adhere to the constraints of a balanced budget, OPIC stands apart as a revenue-earning program. And at a time that we are facing record high trade deficits, we need to be looking at ways to expand our export promotion programs, not contract them.

More American exports mean more American jobs. More than 375,000 American jobs have been lost as a result of OPIC’s supported projects. In our home State of New Jersey, OPIC has provided over $1 billion in financing and insurance, generating $3 billion in U.S. exports and creating over 10,000 jobs.

We should not be so shortsighted. We live in a global economy and only those who can compete will succeed. This is not corporate welfare. OPIC is one of the ways that we ensure that American companies and American jobs thrive in the next century. We cannot afford to be so naive as to believe that American companies, large and small, can compete without this type of support when their competitors have the full economic and diplomatic support of their governments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Andrews amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, we have heard OPIC being privatized as a private sector that can fill that gap. Lloyd’s of London, nobody could come in and fill that gap.

In fact, OPIC has been partnering with Lloyd’s of London on being able to come up to a relationship whereby part of this type of insurance can be privatized. The reason we need OPIC is so that we can be on an even keel with our exporting partners around the world.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), one of the coauthors of the amendment with a leading voice for progressive issues in America.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment, which would strike a good blow against the $125 billion a year we are currently spending on corporate welfare.

My, this is a strange debate. I am hearing conservative Republicans tell
us they believe in government insurance. This is what it is.

Now, it is interesting, however. This is not government insurance for middle-class homeowners. This is not government insurance for those homeowners who are paying outrageous premiums for automobile insurance. No, no, no. We do not get government insurance for that.

But if they are J.P. Morgan, they can get government insurance for a $200 million investment in an oil field in Angola. If they are Texaco, they get government insurance for $139 million for investment of a power generating project in the Philippines. If they are the Chase Manhattan Bank, they get socialized insurance.

Here we have conservative Republicans, corporate Democrats telling us government insurance, government helps our friends. I find that strange.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should note that in Indonesia right now OPIC officials are in that country, and this is the country because the government there is suggesting that an American-backed company may not be able to make as much money as they wanted; and if that in fact takes place, it is going to be the American taxpayer through OPIC that bails out that particular company that invested in Suharto’s dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, another disturbing aspect of this situation is that the United States Government is providing financial incentives to the largest corporations in this country to invest abroad.

Now, some of us think that it would be a very good idea for these corporations that are investing tens of billions of dollars abroad to maybe bring that investment back to the State of Vermont and other States around this country to put our people to work at decent paying jobs.

I hear our friend say that OPIC makes money. OPIC makes money. Well, if OPIC makes money, then maybe we better think about government insurance for the automobile people who need automobile insurance.

Are they in favor of that, Mr. Chairman? No. I ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Only government insurance for the large multinational corporations. Let us stop corporate welfare. Let us support the Andrews amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguishedgentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJJDENS0N), ranking Democrat of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would join my friend from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) in having universal health coverage, but that is not the debate today. The debate today is whether some of these billions, not welfare, but shares to these corporations giving us profits in every year that OPIC has operated in, $20 million in 1970, in excess of $200 million in 1997, and even during the Asian financial crisis $138 million, and anticipated back over to $200 million next year.

What this does is help American jobs, helps us export manufacturing, helps America’s international national foreign policy get executed. It is cheaper and an anti-Marshall Plan and it helps American jobs.

The gentlemen who are opposing this amendment have good intentions, but they are dead wrong.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey prohibiting OPIC from supporting any new investment projects.

This amendment would not only close down any future OPIC investments in Africa, but it would eliminate billions of dollars of OPIC-related hurricane assistance for Central America and the Caribbean. The adoption of this amendment would mean billions of dollars of future U.S. exports from ever taking place. Thousands of jobs now held by American workers would be lost, and millions of dollars in tax revenue would be unavailable to our States and local communities.

Since its inception in 1971, OPIC generated over $5 billion in U.S. exports, created more than 237,000 jobs. It operates on a self-sustaining basis and actually provides funding authority to pay for the humanitarian development aid programs contained in the legislation we are now debating.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Andrews amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just make one thing very clear about OPIC making money. OPIC holds government bonds. The Department of the Treasury of the United States then pays interest on the government bonds.

So when we talk OPIC making profit, the profit is being paid for by taxpayers to an organization that holds government bonds. It has nothing to do with making money or having a profit.

So let us just be clear about the fact that we use this terminology carefully. We know this is a very tough fight here because it is right at the heart of subsidies to the most powerful; and we understand that it is hard to win that. But I think it is very important that when we have this debate that we be clear about it.

I am not suggesting for a second that anybody is trying to distort the truth. We have just got to get the facts about what profits are all about. It is not about any government operation making money in the marketplace. It has to do with taxpayers giving them $52 billion in extra money, which some call profits. That is in error. So we ought to be clear about what this organization actually does.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, claiming my time, I would say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, I would join the chairman in his assessment on the profit it makes.

Now, we have heard that OPIC helps American workers, and we have heard that it hurts American workers. I want to focus on that one claim.

Let us look at one of these transactions. In 1997, OPIC financed the building for Levi Strauss of a garment-making factory in Turkey, a $29-million guarantee, because they did not want to finance it themselves and private insurers would not do it.

Well, what happened when Levi Strauss built that factory? They laid off 6,400 workers at U.S. garment-making factories in 11 locations in the United States.

Now, do my colleagues think that those 6,400 employees, if any of them are listening today, that they will buy this argument that we are creating jobs? We lost those jobs. And not only did we lose those jobs, but the Labor Department had to go in, and let me tell my colleagues what they had to do.

They had to provide unemployment assistance, and they also had to provide trade adjustment assistance because of the Lerner-Massett program, which had been built in Turkey, financed by OPIC.

I strongly urge support of this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and others have talked about, we are in a global economy...
OPIC does open markets. OPIC has helped create jobs in this country. And OPIC charges premiums. OPIC charges premiums.

One of the big criticisms of OPIC is that the premiums are too high and that is why they have $3.3 billion in reserves. Now, if the premiums are too high and the private sector would be interested in going into these areas, why is it not there?

OPIC fills a void that the private sector will not go into if OPIC is eliminated. They will go into troubled countries. They go into countries that insurance companies of a private nature will not go into. These premiums have generated $3.39 million last year. They are expected to generate $200 million this year.

OPIC’s claims because of the way OPIC and they did become a priority whenever these troubled countries try to re-establish relationships with the United States.

No private company would have that great advantage in settling claims. That is what OPIC does not lose money. That is why OPIC does encourage trade. That is why OPIC works. That is why the private sector will not replace it if it is eliminated.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for this amendment. If it were true that this agency is profitable, we would not be here. They would be making profit, and OPIC would not need to come to us every year.

They are asking for $55 million. Where does the profit come from? It was stated earlier very clearly; from the interest they earn. They have a portfolio of $3 billion of U.S. securities.

But these did not reduce the national debt. That is part of the national debt. We pay interest on that $3 billion. And this agency gets $394 million from it.

They said, four times the amount of the requested appropriation.

No wonder on paper it looks profitable. And they say, well, the private companies will not insure some of these projects. That means it is probably risky. Why should the taxpayer assume the risk? Why should these corporations be protected with this corporate welfare?

This is the reason why jobs are exported to a cost to the American taxpayer. It is bad economics. And it is a tax on us, the taxpayers. It is bad economics. And it is a tax on us, the taxpayers. It is a tax on us, the taxpayers. OPIC is funded become a priority when OPIC fills a void that the private sector will not go into if OPIC is eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has the right to close.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSSEN).

Mr. BENTSSEN. Mr. Chairman, the reason why we have this insurance program is the same reason why we have the HUD insurance program for homeowners in this country, low-income homeowners, because the marketplace does not provide for it, just as my colleague from Missouri just said.

The other reason we have this program is because our trading partners around the world do this and do it a lot more. So if we are to pass this amendment and unilaterally withdraw from being a competitive trading Nation, we will only drive up the imports in this country, drive down the exports from this country, and cost Americans jobs.

By passing this amendment, we will not do nothing to bring capital back into this country. OPIC is used in my district where we have companies that are looking for new markets to get into.

The Stewart & Stevenson Company builds turbine engines and then sells them throughout the world. And when they sell more engines, they hire more Americans to build them in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I yield today on behalf of small business owners and workers in my home State of Oregon and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). This amendment to abolish OPIC would damage the efforts of Oregon’s small businesses in emerging markets overseas. In Oregon, OPIC has financed and insured projects worth $27 million. These efforts have generated over $33 million in Oregon exports. Many new jobs come through businesses that supply goods and services to projects insured or financed by OPIC, businesses like Hyster Sales Company in Tigard, Oregon, and Interwrap Industries in Portland, Oregon.

OPIC helps level the playing field for American businesses of all sizes which compete for overseas projects. OPIC offers American businesses essential risk insurance for their investments in high-risk emerging markets. It provides temporary financing for investments when private sector support is lacking.

But OPIC does all of this in a fiscally sound manner. Customers which benefit from OPIC repay the full principal amount.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the Andrews amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), a very articulate freshman Member.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andrews amendment. I am not debating whether or not it is corporate welfare, but I want to talk about how OPIC must get its own house in order first as I lack confidence in this program.

I am going to tell my colleagues a story about a company in my district, Mid-American Energy, who has been working with OPIC, had used OPIC to build a power plant in Indonesia.

What next? OPIC said, “That’s not good enough. We need you to do it again. We want you to go somewhere else for another arbitration.”

When OPIC loses this time, will they change the rules again? Will they require this company to go three out of five arbitrations?

Mr. Chairman, Mid-American has followed OPIC guidelines. Now it must fulfill its obligations. I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of small business owners and workers in my home State of Oregon and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).
fat cats. But I am not opposed to stimulating business growth and development in sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region of the world. I am not opposed to saying that in order to facilitate the development of opportunity in areas that unless there was some private investment, nothing would happen. And so while generally I would be on the other side of an issue like this one, but because of the need in areas of the world for business development, I find myself in opposition to this amendment because I want to see Africa have an opportunity to grow and develop, and I support investment in countries like sub-Saharan Africa. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment to prohibit any funds for new projects by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. OPIC's budget will hurt our nation's 22 million small businesses who export directly or by contract to other countries. Specifically, cutting funds would cut what little business assistance sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region of the world receives. During this decade OPIC has increased its effectiveness in helping Africa. For instance, OPIC has currently four privately managed investment funds available to support investment in Africa. These programs focus on mining, manufacturing, broadcasting, information technology and I hope to see soon healthcare.

The point I am trying to make here is that if we cut OPIC's budget we would hurt small business, decrease our nation's exports, and cut jobs. For the past three years, OPIC's budget has been effectively frozen. We already have this organization working on a shoestring budget.

OPIC is not a giveaway program, it is not a subsidy and it is not general assistance. It is not corporate welfare. This is an investment and a investment that is paying off. OPIC projects have generated $58 billion in U.S. exports and created more than 237,000 U.S. jobs.

I must confess that I am at a loss to understand how or why we would want to cut funding for an effort that is producing results, and effectively carrying out its mission. Why would you cut the budget on an agency whose budget is funded from user fees? Why prevent new investments? Why eliminate $9 billion in trade and investment in sub Saharan Africa? Why eliminate $4 billion in hurricane rebuilding resources in Central America and the Caribbean? Why undercut private sector rebuilding initiatives for the war torn Balkans? There is no reason to, and there is no reason to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been told, if it isn't broke, don't fix it! OPIC is not broke, let's not try to fix it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I appreciate the opportunity to summarize our point of view in the debate. I share a friend from Illinois a real desire to develop Africa and other less developed areas. I just think we should do it openly and directly and not through the Trojan horse of corporate welfare which I believe is what OPIC is.

Here is what OPIC really says. If someone wants to build a plant or a factory in New Jersey or Oregon or Texas, they are on their own, they have to go to a bank and take a risk and borrow the money themselves. But if they want to build the plant in a foreign country, another continent, then the United States taxpayers, if they are big enough and powerful enough, will have to reach into our pockets and subsidize it. The idea of us subsidizing these operations is wrong.

Let us end corporate welfare as we know it and support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I know the gentleman from New Jersey is well-intended in his beliefs, but I do believe him to be absolutely wrong.

He mentioned the fact that plants have already spent their own money in his home State without government assistance. Well, but the plants that are already there, like AT&T, like Berger International, like Schick, like Johnson & Johnson, Nabisco, Squibb and Ingersoll-Rand are all using OPIC, and I am sure that the abundant benefits of this agency and are benefiting from the fact that they are exporting the products could probably convince their fellow New Jerseyan that he was making a mistake.

The same with the gentleman from Alabama who stood up and talked about it. Yet in his hometown of Birmingham, Alabama, Mr. Chairman, they utilize OPIC more than any other city in the entire State. But the good thing about that is they ship those products through the port of Mobile and enhance the ability of the people in my district to benefit from exporting these products.

They say OPIC is not really making any money and how the books say that, but OPIC is making $200 million a year, period. That is the fact. They are not losing money. It is true that when our countries go now into a foreign country, they are on a leveled playing field with all of the other industrialized nations. But the other nations have similar programs. These are insurance programs that for the most part insure that if the government expropriates all of the properties there, that OPIC, the United States of America, will guarantee payment to the bank from which most of this money comes from for their guarantees.

This is not corporate welfare. This is a sensible export program that is vital to American industry. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Andrews amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, is it the Chair's understanding that after this vote, there will be no more votes tonight, that the rest of the amendments that we debate tonight will be carried over until tomorrow so that this would be the last vote of the night?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Under the rule the Chair has the authority to postpone votes on amendment and intends to do so after the vote on the Andrews amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this last amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Andrews amendment and in support of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or OPIC.

Let me tell you what OPIC has meant to companies, large and small, in my state of New Jersey. With the help of risk insurance provided by OPIC since the program began, New Jersey companies have generated $3 billion in exports which supported 10,000 jobs. I hope my colleague from New Jersey will take note of the companies from New Jersey who needed OPIC insurance in order to sell their products abroad and thus support jobs here at home in our state of New Jersey.

Many New Jersey companies have benefited from OPIC financing and insurance. They include, among others, Copelco Capital of Mahwah, Croll Reynolds Co. of Westfield; Engelhard Pollution Control of Iselin; Guest Supply Inc. of Monmouth Junction; H.W. Baker Linen Co. of Mahwah; Ingersoll-Dresser Pump Co. of Liberty Corner; Ingersoll-Rand of Woodcliff Lake, ITT of Midland Park; Maersk Inc. of Madison; Regal International of Closter. And what have these companies been able to do with OPIC Insurance? Let's just talk about some of the small New Jersey companies that have benefited. Misco America from Holmdel supplied products for a project in Ethiopia; Casale Industries from Garwood was involved in an electrical service project in Turkey; G.R. International from Red Bank was a supplier for the privatization of a copper mine in Peru.

So, again, I hope my colleague from New Jersey takes note of the importance of OPIC to New Jersey companies, large and small, and their employees.

OPIC is a key component in our efforts to open up markets all over the globe to U.S. products and services.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support OPIC.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

There being a recorded vote.

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

An recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were — ayes 103, noes 315, not voting 15, as follows:
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AYES—103

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. EVERETT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, on rolcall No. 359 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the chairman indicated, we have a serious problem in this country with regard to individuals who are noncitizens who have been arrested for serious felonies and have been ordered deported.

They are then in the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service pending the acceptance by their country of their citizenship. Unfortunately, we have many countries, well over 100 countries now, who have either refused to accept their citizens back or are unduly delaying the process of accepting them back, over 3,300 people, and we are adding approximately 60 every month to this list. These are individuals who are having to be detained in our Federal detention facilities at a cost of about $67 a day, and the cost on an annual basis is somewhere of about $380 million.

My amendment would have addressed that by simply saying to those nations, many of whom do receive assistance under this particular bill, that they would not be able to receive that assistance unless they cooperated, which is the responsibility of the country of nations to accept your citizens back once they have been ordered deported from another country, and that that would be a condition for their receiving assistance under this bill.

As the chairman has indicated, unfortunately, we did not receive the waiver from the Committee on Rules, but it is a serious problem, not only in my district, but in many other parts of the country. We cannot criticize the INS for not issuing deportation orders when we run into the problems of these over 100 countries who refuse to cooperate with that deportation process. I want to thank the chairman for his cooperation in making the matter a matter before the House tonight. I appreciate his cooperation and look forward to working with the gentleman as we approach the Commerce, Justice and State appropriation, as hopefully we can find wording that will address the issue there. I also appreciate his willingness that if we are not successful there, to continue to work with us to find a solution.

I think the American people expect when we order a person deported, that all others. I thought that we could enter into this colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) so that he brought to the attention of the committee. When we went to the Committee on Rules, we found that probably it would be better suited in the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) which is to come up later on this week.

In any event, the seriousness of the problem in the gentleman from Georgia actually impacts...
their country will accept them back, and, if they do not, that they should not expect to receive foreign aid at the same time. I am costing the American taxpayers over $80 million a year. Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also say I believe this is the law of the land anyway. It is my understanding we are just not adhering to it, enforcing it; that the State Department and the Justice Department have the authority already to enforce this, and yet they are failing to do so. It is an issue that needs to be addressed by this Congress, and I am very appreciative of the gentleman from Georgia for bringing it to our attention.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following: Sec. 1304. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act in title II under the heading “DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE”, not more than $33,500,000 may be made available for the development of educational assistance in India.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and a Member opposed each will control 25 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment and claim all time in opposition to the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) will control 25 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of the time allocated to me to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and that she be allowed to control said time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), and that he be allowed to control said time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, our foreign policy in our country has been concerned about human rights violations around the world for a long time. However, Mr. Chairman, we have been concerned about human rights around the world on a very selective basis in this country.

Recently we were in Yugoslavia, in Kosovo, trying to help the people who were being persecuted on both sides, and there were about 10,000 deaths in Kosovo. In Haiti, we sent in our troops a few years ago, and there were only a few hundred people killed, and it cost us probably several hundred million dollars to have our troops down there, but we thought it was a good cause in this country. Yet in places like the Sudan, where 2 million people have been killed, 2 million, in the struggle for freedom, we have not done a thing. Our role is almost nonexistent.

In other parts of Africa, Rwanda, Burundi, they killed 800,000 people in a few months and thousands of thousands of thousands of thousands of people have been killed, we have not done a thing. We do not even talk about it.

In a place called Kashmir, where there are half a million Indian troops occupying that area, women are being gang raped and men are being tortured and killed. Amnesty International calls the policy of the Indian government an “official policy sanctioning extrajudicial killings,” and we do not even talk about it.

In Punjab, since 1984, the last 14 to 15 years, a quarter of a million, 250,000 Sikhs, have been killed, not to mention those who have been tortured and maimed. In Kashmir, since 1988, a mere 10 years ago, 60,000 Muslims have been killed. Thousands of so-called untouchables, Dalits, the blacks in India, have been killed.

As result of some of these problems, there is a wave of attacks against Christians. The Wave Watch says, “Despite government denials that normalcy has returned to Kashmir, Indian troops in the state continue to carry out summary executions, disappearances, rape and torture.” This report was written in July of 1999, this year.

Methods of torture include severe beatings with truncheons, rolling a heavy log on the legs, hanging the detainee upside down, and the use of electric shocks. Indian security forces have raped women in Kashmir during search operations.

I can go on and on. Amnesty International, another human rights group says, “Torture, including rape and ill-treatment continue to be endemic throughout the country.” This is their annual report, 1999. “Disappearances continue to be reported during the year, predominantly in Punjab and Kashmir.” 1999. “Hundreds of extrajudicial killings and executions were reported in many states, including Kashmir and Punjab,” 1999.

I talk about this year after year after year. My colleagues who defend India’s government policies keep coming down saying, “Oh, well, it is a big country, the second biggest in the world. We have to keep those economic doors open. We have got to make sure that we do business with them.”

Well, okay, let us do business with them, but let us at least send them a signal, send a little-bitty signal to them that these kinds of atrocities cannot be tolerated, should not be tolerated. $11 million cut from our foreign aid to India is a drop in the bucket. They are getting foreign aid from all over the world. So if we cut them by a mere $11 million, one-fourth of the developmental aid we are going to give them, to send a little signal that they should stop these human rights abuses, is that wrong? I think not.
Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to Members and to the author of the amendment that the intent of his amendment is unclear. The amendment places a ceiling of $33.5 million on the amount of development assistance aid available to the government of India. However, the President’s fiscal year 2000 budget request for all development assistance to India, including both aid to the government and aid directly to nongovernmental organizations, is only $28.7 million. In fact, about 85 percent of all aid funding to India goes through NGOs, not the government.

Therefore, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) would actually allow considerably more funding to the government of India than the President, the Secretary of State, USAID, and the committee is recommending. I do not think it was the intent of the gentleman from Indiana to increase funding for India, but based upon the reading of his amendment, it appears to me that it raises the level of assistance to India and he may want to table it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMANN).

Mr. BERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment.

Cutting development assistance for India at this time would be totally counterproductive because it would undermine U.S.-India relations just when we’re starting to make some real progress.

India showed great restraint in the recent Kashmir crisis, and the Indian government has made a strong commitment to resuming bilateral dialogues and making progress. The Indian Supreme Court is conducting a human rights investigation into the recent Punjab atrocities and it should be continued.

Mr. Chairman, human rights abuses should be taken seriously wherever they occur, India, like most countries in the world, doesn’t have a perfect record.

But according to the latest State Department report on human rights practices, India is making real progress. The Indian Supreme Court has acknowledged and condemned earlier human rights abuses in Punjab, and the independent National Human Rights Commission is conducting an investigation.

The best way to improve human rights in India is to continue an open and frank dialogue, not to cut programs that limit the spread of AIDS, improve access to reproductive health services, and provide basic health care for mothers and children.

With some 500 million Indians living below the poverty line, the modest amount of assistance we provide barely scratches the surface when compared to the overall need.

But it’s an important symbol of the relationship between the world’s two largest democracies and it should be continued.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment. We have heard a variety of arguments as to why we should abandon ties with India, and frankly none of them make sense. The fact is that India, the world’s largest democracy, is becoming more closely aligned with the United States and is increasingly important to us as a trading partner and a strategic partner.

Over a quarter of a million people are expected to vote in India’s fall elections, free and fair elections open to every citizen of every religion of every region of every race. Think about that. A nation of 1 billion people with a free and open press practicing democracy.

This amendment sends the wrong message to the billions of people around the world who yearn for a secular stable political system, a political system in this country that our Founding Fathers believed should be based on universal freedoms. It sends the wrong message to the best allies that the United States will ever have, the world’s fledging democracies, whether they are the people of India, the people of Taiwan, or the people of Mali.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for opposition to the Burton amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the committee, just said that our amendment only addresses developmental assistance. The President knows full well that this amendment has been proposed in years past when developmental assistance and child survival and disease assistance was lumped into one category. Today he is trying to say that if our amendment passes, that we are actually increasing money to India, when I think they are trying to come up with a straw issue here to defeat the amendment and it is very disheartening.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds in which to respond.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for yielding me this time and for his great leadership on this issue and so many others.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment which would cut aid to India. A similar resolution or amendment was defeated in 1997, and we should do so again tonight.

The last two State Department Human Rights reports praised India for the progress the country has made in the area of human rights. And in the wake of the recent Pakistan-backed incursion across the line of control into Kashmir, India has been praised by the international community for the restraint it demonstrated and for the steps it took to ensure that the situation did not escalate out of control.

The momentum gained in U.S.-India relations in recent years needs to be sustained and strengthened. It is the world’s largest democracy and the world’s largest economic power. A relationship in this area should be supporting our friend and ally. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the intent of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) to send a message to India. I really actually truthfully believe India is a very large country that was created in a period of turmoil after the decline and the dissolution of the British Empire, and India has managed over the years, with great hardship, to have some fundamentally democratic institutions; and we should all recognize that they have elections there and have struggled to have independent courts and free elections and some kind of freedom of speech.

There have been ups and downs. In fact, I believe that the American business community has made a tragic error in focussing on Communist China as being that country which would be the recipient of aid and the recipient of investment over the years, when India was there and ready and willing to be a country that could increase the standard of living of its people by industrializing and making itself more prosperous.

However, let us recognize that with that India has made some major errors and some of them are based totally on ego. And when it comes to the Kashmir and the Punjab and Jammu, the Indian Government has not been far along, especially in Kashmir, to determine their own destiny through a plebiscite that was required of them by the United Nations.

The Indian Government today has, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) pointed out, hundreds of thousands of troops in Kashmir; and many of these troops have engaged in, as troops do when they are in hostile territory, engaged in major human rights abuses that have been documented time and again by Amnesty International. There is really no doubt.

Our own government’s Human Rights department here and the State Department have documented these human rights abuses. And take a look at what is being said. The type of grotesque human rights abuses against the people of Kashmir is the very same things we saw Saddam Hussein committing and also Milosevic down there in Kosovo and against the Bosnians. These things require us to act and to treat India in a certain way to get them to change their behavior.

First of all, and again let me go back, India is a democratic government. I would hope people would invest in India, and I hope that the United States has closer ties to India in the future. Nothing would make that more likely than for them to seek peace in Kashmir by permitting the people there to have a vote of plebiscite which India, because of ego, continues to say no, no, no. And as long as that happens, India will be spending tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions of dollars on weapons.

Mr. Chairman, think of this. Today we are only talking about decreasing the foreign aid to India by $11 million, when the Indians themselves are spending hundreds of millions on conventional weapons and at least tens of millions, probably hundreds of millions, on nuclear weapons as well. That makes no sense at all for us to be subsidizing the weapons program of India. Instead, we should be sending this message to India to do that the way that we want to get them to change their behavior.

Mr. Chairman, think of this. Today we are only talking about decreasing the foreign aid to India by $11 million, when the Indians themselves are spending hundreds of millions on conventional weapons and at least tens of millions, probably hundreds of millions, on nuclear weapons as well. That makes no sense at all for us to be subsidizing the weapons program of India. Instead, we should be sending this message to India to do that the way that we want to get them to change their behavior.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote against the Burton amendment which would unilaterally impose the wrong approach at the wrong time. The gentleman from Alabama has mentioned the NGO situation. That is aside from some of the things that I want to say. It is important, obviously, but I want to say this amendment will have the inappropriate and ill-considered effect of estracizing India at a critical point in the ongoing conflict over Kashmir.

Mr. Chairman, instead of risking further tension in the region, the United States should be actively engaged in promoting peace in the subcontinent of Asia. While the eventual resolution of the Kashmir conflict must be resolved bilaterally between India and Pakistan, the United States has an interest in facilitating meaningful negotiations between the parties. In fact, I believe so strongly in bringing peace to this region, that I have encouraged the administration to appoint a special envoy to serve as an honest broker to the conflict.

But in order to help bring a framework for peace, the U.S. must come to the table with clean hands. Supporting the Burton amendment would put the recent progress in relations between India and America at risk. Over the past year, we have seen increased dialogue on nuclear nonproliferation, a better understanding of India’s security concerns, and an increase in U.S.-India trade and investment. This improvement in U.S.-India relations should be sustained and strengthened, not put at risk.

In order to address concerns we may have about India, it is important to focus on fostering a positive and constructive relationship. Instead, we should be focusing on building a positive relationship, not putting at risk.

In order to address concerns we may have about India, it is important to focus on fostering a positive and constructive relationship. Instead, we should be focusing on building a positive relationship, not putting at risk.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).
More than 650 million citizens are expected to vote in India's elections later this year. There is a push in every nation that can boast of voter participation by far many citizens, and few that can match India's voter turnout which ranges around two-thirds of its voters.

And, there is no other nation that can boast of its economic ties to the United States in comparison to India. U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of nearly 50 percent a year since 1991, from $500 million then, to more than $12 billion now, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

Some one hundred of America's Fortune 500 companies have invested in India, opened offices and plants there. With so many large American companies that have now invested in India and opened operations there, it would be foolish to break those ties, ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble.

It is false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend. I would remind my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that our Government and the Government of India have negotiated on very sensitive matters of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Serious efforts have been made by our two countries to find common ground on these important security issues. Any action by the United States to stigmatize India on inaccurate human rights allegations will likely complicate our efforts to create a lasting and meaningful friendship in a very dangerous part of the World.

It should also be noted that the aid we provide to India goes for very important projects. The aid we provide to India goes to the control of AIDS, to population control, disease control and rural development.

These are important and worthy causes, causes that not only benefit India, they benefit us also.

In 1997, we overwhelmingly defeated this amendment by a vote of 342 to 82. We took the right position then, and we should take the right position now.

Mr. Chairman, let us as Members of Congress not view the Government of India as being callous to alleged human rights violations. India has made great strides in their battle to bring together diverse states within its Region.

Vote NO! on the Burton Amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Burton amendment. This amendment, whether it freezes, cuts, or caps foreign assistance to India, is a step in the wrong direction.

India's Government is moving in the right direction, at a rapid pace to strengthen its ties with the United States and the world.

The economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy, and India, the world's largest democracy, would receive a harmful blow with successful passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of India has been on a constant pace of change since 1991. Indeed, the most recent State Department human rights reports praised India for the substantial progress it has made.

India has established a process to receive and resolve complaints of human rights violations.

Those complaints are investigated. And when officials and members of security forces are found to have violated human rights, India has taken swift and sure action. Indeed, the human rights violations that Mr. Burton alleges, no longer exist.

India is a strong and vibrant democracy, with an independent judiciary, a free press and an active voting population.
The amendment, according to the intent of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), would cut one-quarter of the development assistance aid to India. This would affect, of course, not only American national interests, but some of the neediest people in the world in South Asia.

Make no mistake about it, the purpose of the gentleman’s amendment is punitive. It is designed to show our displeasure and our disapproval of the government of India. But India, a nation of a billion people, is too important to American interests to threaten or to punish in order to send a message or to show a pro-Pakistan tilt. Regrettably, despite his intent to the contrary, I have to submit that the gentleman’s amendment does not serve our national interests, neither with regard to arms control nor in relationship to human rights.

It cuts off all aid except Public Law 480 Title II when it comes to humanitarian aid. Some of the most important things that we are trying to do to assist the poorest people in the world and those specifically in India in this instance would be cut off. We are talking about immunizations against communicable diseases, basic education, nutrition programs, programs relating to HIV/AIDS. It would cut off all aid except the provision of Public Law 480 Title II when it comes to humanitarian aid. All foreign assistance except humanitarian assistance has been terminated.

While this Amendment does not affect the $81 million Title II food aid provided by the United States, it does directly affect other kinds of humanitarian aid. Utilizing the waiver process, the remaining U.S. development aid program responds other non-food humanitarian aid which supports to two key U.S. national interests: (1) The global issues of population growth, infectious diseases and environmental conservation; and (2) the humanitarian concerns of alleviating poverty and supporting child survival.

This Amendment would directly affect these poverty alleviation and basis development programs. It would cut HIV/AIDS containment and cut immunizations against such communicable diseases as polio and tuberculosis. It would cut basic education and nutrition programs. The recipients of this aid, mostly poor Indian women and children, have absolutely nothing to do with their government’s nuclear proliferation, human rights or foreign trade policies. Their lives should not be further jeopardized for the sake of making a symbolic political statement.

Our national interests in South Asia go beyond poverty alleviation. With India’s and Pakistan’s successful testing of nuclear weapons, it is in our own short term and long term national security interests to bring both South Asian countries into the regime of international arms control agreements. The chances for and consequences of nuclear warfare in this very volatile region are too great to belittle. The United States has submitted an amendment that un-justly singles out India, and hopefully, the fifth year that we decide to vote it down.

Mr. BURTON’s alleged claims of India’s human rights violations completely ignore the last two State Department human rights reports that praise India for its considerable progress in this area. The Burton amendment would substantially cut cricial U.S. humanitarian aid to India and would send the wrong message from the world’s first democracy to the world’s largest.

With the recent Pakistani incursion across the Line of Control into Jammu and Kashmir, India was praised by both the Administration and the International Community for the extraordinary restraint it displayed in confining its response to terrorist occupied territory. Mr. BURTON’s amendment has a peculiar way of showing our support.

The government of India has worked hard to address human rights issues. India has arrested and prosecuted more than 100 individuals associated with the recent string of religious attacks that occurred earlier this year and has passed laws to take action against those officials that have committed human rights violations. Truly, Mr. BURTON’s allegations continue to be based on outdated and inaccurate information.

Supporting the Burton amendment would not only weaken our dialogue with India but would also undermine the strong economic relationship that both of our countries have achieved. The United States is India’s largest trading partner and largest investor. U.S. investment has grown from $500 million per year in 1991 to more than $12 billion in 1999. Many large American companies have seen the economic opportunities in India and have invested heavily there.

We clearly need to sustain and further strengthen the momentum that has been gained in U.S.-Indo relations. Instead of proposing legislation that merely alienates an important ally, I suggest the esteemed member of the gentleman from Indiana continue its progress in spreading the ideals of democracy by voting no to the Burton amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has submitted an amendment that unjustly singles out India, and hopefully, the fifth year that we decide to vote it down.

Mr. BURTON’s alleged claims of India’s human rights violations completely ignore the last two State Department human rights reports that praise India for its considerable progress in this area. The Burton amendment would substantially cut cricial U.S. humanitarian aid to India and would send the wrong message from the world’s first democracy to the world’s largest.

With the recent Pakistani incursion across the Line of Control into Jammu and Kashmir, India was praised by both the Administration and the International Community for the extraordinary restraint it displayed in confining its response to terrorist occupied territory. Mr. BURTON’s amendment has a peculiar way of showing our support.

The government of India has worked hard to address human rights issues. India has arrested and prosecuted more than 100 individuals associated with the recent string of religious attacks that occurred earlier this year, and has passed laws to take action against those officials that have committed human rights violations. Truly, Mr. BURTON’s allegations continue to be based on outdated and inaccurate information.

Supporting the Burton amendment would not only weaken our dialogue with India but would also undermine the strong economic relationship that both of our countries have achieved. The United States is India’s largest trading partner and largest investor. U.S. investment has grown from $500 million per year in 1991 to more than $12 billion in 1999. Many large American companies have seen the economic opportunities in India and have invested heavily there.

We clearly need to sustain and further strengthen the momentum that has been gained in U.S.-Indo relations. Instead of proposing legislation that merely alienates an important ally, I suggest the esteemed member from Indiana first take the time to travel to India and see its progress first-hand. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to help India continue its progress in spreading the ideals of democracy by voting no to the Burton amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that there are seven multilateral and 13 bilateral donors that provide assistance to India.

The United States is the seventh largest donor after the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the European Union, Japan, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

So there is a lot of people that are giving money to India. But nobody is sending any kind of a message to them that they ought to clean up their act as far as the human rights tragedies that are going on.

Christians are dying in Nagaland. Dalits, the blacks in India, are being
The Indian ambassador came to me and did not want me to introduce this amendment because of what is going on over there right now. But somebody said to me a little while ago, what about the signal this is sending because of the technology today? Pakistan on up on the border between Kashmir and Pakistan or India and Pakistan?

But what about the signal that was sent when they were going to give $25 million to Iraq just the other day? When the Indian ambassador was in my office, they were planning to give $25 million to Iraq in violation of the U.N. embargo. Does not anybody care about that?

Do we want them to support and work with Saddam Hussein? They said they are planning to work with him in developing oil fields in southern Iraq. Saddam Hussein has not changed. He is a terror to that entire region. He is a blot on the world. India says they want to help them, and we are not going to send a signal? Let alone the human rights violations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), cutting development assistance to India.

Democratic India is in a tough neighborhood. China occupies Tibet to India’s north. China sells nuclear and ballistic missiles to Pakistan on India’s west, and China has sold over $1 billion worth of arms to the drug-running Burmese military junta to India east. Our Nation should be strongly supporting India, the only truly democratic nation of the subcontinent.

Passage of the Burton amendment would undercut our strategic goals of supporting peace and stability through the promotion of democratic governments in the region.

In opposition to the point of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that India will enter into a commercial arrangement with Iraq, I received information from the State Department that the Indian ministry of external affairs has issued a statement that India will only enter into contracts approved by the U.N. sanctions committee on Iraq.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. India is the world’s largest democracy, and I agree that she is not a perfect nation. But I really do not know any perfect nations.

India is a young democracy, much younger than our very own. We still have problems with human rights in America. But India is moving, moving positively and progressively to try and overcome some of the difficulties of a country that has been colonized, a country steeped in poverty, a country that is seeking, working, struggling to overcome. Let us not take them back. Let us help them.

There is an old African proverb that says “When elephants fight, the grass gets hurt.” Well, India will be hurt, 950 million of them. Let us help them, not hurt them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of India and against the Burton amendment.

Today, India is the world’s largest democracy with 950 million people. For half a century India has struggled to overcome colonialism, religious and ethnic conflicts and all of the problems of underdevelopment.

India has made tremendous progress in trying to address its human rights problems. India has instituted a process to receive complaints, initiate investigations of all claims, and passed laws to take action against those officials and members of security forces that have committed human rights offenses. The Burton amendment would eliminate U.S. assistance to help sustain these achievements.

Mr. Chairman, I know that India is not a perfect country. However, and perhaps unfortunately, there are none, or at the very least, none that I am aware of. Even in our own country, one whose democracy is much older, one that is more technologically advanced, we are still trying to form a more perfect union and so is India.

So why, why reduce or cut funding to the world’s largest democracy? Why cut funds to a nation that is working hard and struggling to pull itself out of the depths of poverty and despair? Why cut back and or cut out the progress that is being made? W.E.B. Dubois is reported to have once said, when asked about the lack of progress being made by African Americans towards becoming a part of mainstream America, Dubois is reported to have said that “a people so deprived should not be expected to race with the wind,” perhaps one could say that a young democracy like India should not be expected to progress at a much faster pace.

They are making progress in the human rights arena, but have not quite gotten there yet. They are moving in the right direction and I say, let’s help and not hinder them, let us support and not oppose them, let us fund and not cut them.

Mr. Chairman, I have lived long enough to understand the African proverb that says when elephants fight it is the grass that suffers, in this case it is the people, 950 million of them. Today let us make a stand for the 950 million people who need our help.

Vote “No” on the Burton amendment and “Yes” for people of India.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Burton amendment this evening, as I have done several times over. A very similar amendment to make the same type of point was defeated in 1997 by a vote of 82 to 342 in this House, and I would hope that this amendment’s parameters would be defeated by a similarly wide margin.

The reason I feel this way and so strongly is because it is our national security interest for the United States to have a strong relationship with India.

We do not need to be showing the kind of vote that a vote for this amendment would do right now when we are having the best relationships we have ever had with India in the entire history of the two countries; at a time when India is sharing a common fight with us against terrorism, terrorism spawned by radical Islamists in that region of the world which do terrorist acts, not only in India, but all over the world, and particularly against our interests in many parts and maybe against us ourselves; at a time when China is a growing presence that we are not quite sure of and India provides a democratic ballast in that part of the world.

Therefore, I think we should refocus the debate away from the kind of vote that a vote for this amendment would do right now and vote instead for not only the Burton amendment but also the amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

I personally have spoken with the Indian ambassador within the past week, and I am very aware that the activity level involving the question of the aid to Iraq is fully within the United Nations’ parameters; it is improving, and it says so in its most current report.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There is no higher priority in U.S. foreign policy than checking the African proverb that says when elephants fight it is the grass that suffers, in this case it is the people, 950 million of them. Today let us make a stand for the 950 million people who need our help.

Vote “No” on the Burton amendment and “Yes” for people of India.
interest in checking that potential aggres-
sion than the promotion of a sta-
tish that we would not ever do it again.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chair-
man, I yield myself such time as I may
consume.
Mr. Chairman, the logic of some of the
arguments tonight kind of eludes me. One of my colleagues was talking
about India being such an essential in-
gredient in world peace and, for that
reason, we ought to do everything we
can to work with them.
The logic that we have used with
China is that China is so big, and they
are a nuclear power, we have to stay
engaged with them. We cannot criticize
them. We cannot do anything but ap-
pease them because it might lead to a
conflict down the road. As a result, we
accept things like espionage; we accept
things like illegal campaign contributions coming to the United
States.
Attitudes of appeasement usually do
not lead to a solution. They lead to a
conflict. We saw that in World War II
when Lord Chamberlain went to Mu-
ich.
All I can say is we are not talking about
destabilizing or causing a prob-
lem in India right now. What we are
talking about is sending a message to
them. We are talking about sending a
message to them that human rights
violations, that bang rapes by Indian
soldiers who are occupying, imposing
martial law on Kashmir and Punjab
will not be tolerated.
I am not saying sever relations with
India. I am not saying that we should
not do business with India, trade with
India. I am saying we should send them
a strong signal like we should send to
China. We do not want them stealing
our nuclear secrets in our nuclear labs.
We do not want them trying to influ-
ence our elections, like we do not try
to influence theirs. We do not want
India to violate human rights, or
China.
So we should send signals to those
countries around the world where that
occurs. We are supposedly the super-
power. We are supposedly the moral
compass in this world. If we are the
moral compass, then at least send a
signal to them.
If we cut off just $11 million, and we
did vote for that one year. We did pass
that one year not too long ago, because
I do remember debating Steven Solarz
on this subject. I think sending that
signal was the reason that India un-
leashed all of its resources that they
possibly could to lobby this body so
that we would not ever do it again.
They evidently have been fairly suc-
cessful.
But the feeling I have is that is so
strong and the reason I bring this up
year after year is because I cannot go
to sleep at night when I know that
there are gang rapes taking place, peo-
ple being tortured, people being put in
jail for no good reason other than they
I do not like what is going on when we
are supposed to be the people who real-
ly believe in freedom, democracy, and
human rights.
Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he
may consume to the gentleman from
New York (Mr. OWENS).
Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I have
listened to the debate for the last 10
minutes, and I am appalled by the fact
that the debate is taking place without
any real examination of the question of
Kashmir.

I have heard the various reasons that
the gentleman has given for sending a
signal to India, but the reason that all
of us should be concerned about send-
ing a signal to India is that the Kash-
miri feel that we have been in for al-
most 50 years is caused by the fact that
India refuses to accept the simple route
of Democratic self-determination for
Kashmir.

Kashmir is a large body of people
who ought to have the right to vote as
to what they want to do, whether they
want to be independent or join Paki-
stan, or maybe we will even let India
cross that off and do not have annex-
ation to Pakistan on the agenda. Let
them vote either to join India or to be-
come an independent state. They will
not even agree to that.
If Kashmir were located in Europe or
in Yugoslavia, we would all be con-
cerned about the denial of self-deter-
mation to the people of Kashmir. It
has gone on for decades now and no-
body seems to care about the fact that
the world's largest democracy, and
India likes to call itself the world's
largest democracy, and I applaud de-
mocracy in India, but it has great limi-
tations and it is totally blind when it
comes to democracy for Kashmir.
Kashmir is not permitted to exercise
the simple right to vote.
Now we have a situation where the
situation has escalated because these
two powers, which dispute about a
number of things but mainly about
Kashmir, are now nuclear powers. They
are nuclear powers. And I hate to say,
but as new nuclear powers or amateur
nuclear powers, they may rush into
something and cause havoc in that part
of the world. And of course, once we
start using nuclear weapons, we have a
problem with the atmosphere, we have
a problem with the ashes being blown
and radioactivity, all kinds of things
can be set off by the presence of nuclear
Kashmir between Pakistan and India.
I think that if we remove Kashmir as
a point of contention between India
and Pakistan, we would take a giant
step toward promoting peace in that
part of the world and toward avoiding
a catastrophe which would pull in many
other nations.
Now, I was all in favor of doing what
we did in Kosovo, because I thought it
was important to establish a new
moral order and to send a message to
predators like Slobodan Milosevic. But
India does not have any evil person we
can personify in the case of Kashmir.
But they have a long-term policy, a
long-term policy of just denying the
right to self-determination to the peo-
ple of Kashmir. Who can justify that?
And why not send a signal to India?
Why not do something?
I do not hear the United Nations de-
bating it. I do not hear anybody pro-
sing a sense of the Congress resolu-
tion. Why are we ignoring the problem
of Kashmir? Why do we let it go on and
on for decades? Are we waiting for an
explosion? Are we waiting for some-
thing more serious that we will be
drawn into? Are we waiting when we
will have to take sides because of geo-
politics, that China may be on one side,
therefore we have to get on the other
side? Why do we not proceed with a
simple nonviolent solution.
People have said we should not have
gone into Kosovo with bombs; we
should not have gone into Kosovo with
NATO; we should have had a non-
violent solution. Here is an opportu-
nity for a nonviolent solution. And
India, as a nation, has always been in
favor of nonviolence in many in-
stances. Gandhi was the founder of the
whole nonviolent movement. Why do
we not send a signal to India that we
would like to see them change their
ways and let Kashmir have a vote on
self-determination. Any signal would
be a very good signal.
I certainly will support the gentle-
man's amendment, because nothing
else is being done.
Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I
yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman
from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise
to oppose the amendment of my good
friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr.
BURTON).
Without question, the U.S. relationship with
India has been undergoing tremendous im-
provements in the last decade. With the rising
influence of Communist China over Asia, it is
in the vital national security interest of the
United States to solidify our friendship and co-
operation with India.
Not only is India directly threatened by the
belligerent government in China, Pakistan
gave military assistance to a band of terrorists
who crossed into Indian territory of Kashmir
and began a military assault.
The Indian military responded with equal
toughness to maintain its territorial integ-
ity. India was praised for demonstrating re-
straint and confined its military activities to re-
capturing its territory that was occupied by
Pakistani-backed military forces. By adopting a

August 2, 1999
The Burton Amendment would substantially cut critical U.S. humanitarian aid to India. Examples of humanitarian aid projects include: AIDS control, population and disease control, and rural development.

In regard to trade, the U.S. is India's largest trading partner and largest investor. U.S. investment has grown from $500 million per year in 1991 to $12 billion in 1998. Despite the collapse of various economies in Southeast Asia over the last two years, the Indian economy continued to grow at a rate of 6% in 1998.

India has been criticized in the past for human rights violations. The last two reports on human rights from the State Department praised India for the substantial progress the country has made in the area of human rights and, of course, as mentioned the creation of the independent National Human Rights Commission.

As many of my colleagues know, this is the world's largest democracy. Elections have been held in this country in a fair manner and they have made tremendous strides towards their democracy. In 1997, in the State of Punjab open and democratic elections were held and there was a 67 percent turnout. Elections in India are regular. They are contested by numerous parties and scrutinized by a free press.

Later this year, India will conduct the largest exercised democracy in the world. More than 250 million people are expected to vote. More than 100 national and regional political parties will be participating in the elections. India maintains an independent judiciary, a free press, and diverse political parties. The India press corps actively investigates and reports on human rights abuses on a regular basis.

So I understand my colleague. Every year he comes to the House floor and offers this amendment. But in this case, I think his differences with the government of India should not harm the Indian people, especially those who are in need of the aid.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt) has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Burton) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

As in the past, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Burton) has cited human rights abuses in India as the reason for his legislative initiative. While human rights abuses have been uncovered in India, it is important to note the significant progress that India has made in addressing human rights problems.

As noted in the State Department’s human rights report on India, India is addressing its human rights problems because it is a democracy, as noted, the world’s largest. Although the country has confronted many challenges since gaining independence in 1947, it has stayed true to its founding principles.

For 50 years, India has been striving to build a civil society, to institutionalize democratic values of free expression and religion, and to find strength in the diversity of its land and its people, despite such things as outside insurgence in Kashmir.

I do not see why we would want to jeopardize this humanitarian aid. With the Indian army in an action of aggression as Kashmir and just as importantly, China, one of the world’s emerging powers, occupies a small part of India’s territory.

We have heard talk of the Iraqi potential loan, and yet it is subject to attack by the Pakistani army in an action of aggression as Kashmir. And just as importantly, China, one of the world’s emerging powers, occupies a small part of India’s territory.

We have had talk of the Iraqi potential loan, and yet that loan would go through only with the approval of the United States which means that India will do nothing without the consent of the United States which has a veto on that committee.

We are told that India should just allow Kashmir to secede, but there have already been elections in Kashmir. The chief minister is a Muslim.

And we should hesitate a minute before we announce that every country should allow any province at any time to hold a referendum on secession, because when South Carolina wanted to hold a referendum on secession, and the United States intervened.

The Burton amendment is the wrong approach at the wrong time. In the wake of the recent Pakistani incursion across the line of control, the U.S. and India have a new opportunity to build a broad-based relationship. Instead of applauding India for the admirable restraint shown in the recent Kashmir crisis, this amendment would punish India by cutting crucial humanitarian assistance.

The Burton amendment would substantially cut critical U.S. humanitarian aid to India. These programs limit the spread of HIV/AIDS, improve access to reproductive health services, and provide supplemental feeding and basic health services to mothers and children. A similar amendment was defeated in 1997 by a vote of 342–82. No similar amendment was offered in 1998.
relations between the U.S. and India. During the past year, U.S.-India relations have been marked by the broadened dialog on nuclear issues, proliferation, a better understanding of India’s security concerns, and an increase in U.S.-India trade and investment. India and the United States worked very closely to repel the Pakistani regulars and Pakistani-backed terrorists from the Line of Control.

The momentum gained in U.S.-India relations needs to be sustained and strengthened. A vote for the Burton amendment would send the wrong signal to the people of India. Proponents of the Burton Amendment will make repeated reports that India has offered Iraq a $25 million line of credit. India has said that it will only do this in the context of UN guidelines on the Iraqi sanctions. That means they will need unanimous approval by the Sancctions Committee, which is essentially the Security Council, before they will go forward with the loan. The US can stop it and India will abide by the decision of the UN.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chair-
man, I yield myself the balance of my
time, which will make just a couple of points and then I will with-
draw the amendment, because I have been convinced that since 2 years ago they changed the way the develop-
mental assistance was provided and that there has been a misrepresenting or a miswritting of the amendment, which I truly regret, but I do not think I will get unanimous consent to change it, so I will not even ask.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker talked about India’s minister of oil and gas, and he said that India was only going to allow that loan if the U.N. said that it was all right. The fact of the matter is India’s minister of oil and gas, and I am quoting him now, acknowledged that they would not violate U.N. sanctions but said his country would never allow a friend like Iran to suffer. So the intent of India was very clear. They were going to violate the embargo that they were going to violate the U.N. sanctions.

Let me just end by saying that the reason I come down here year after year is not because I like to argue with my colleagues, because I know the other side outnumbers me. And though I really liked Cyrano de Bergerac, where he fought hundreds of people by himself and emerged victorious, I come down here with no false illusions. I know when I come down, my colleagues will beat me into the ground. But I think it is important that we bring this issue up, because human rights are being violated in Kashmir and Punjab; because U.N. agreements have been violated, going back to 1948 and the plebiscite agreed to.

All I can say to my colleagues is that someday I hope that we will see fit to send some kind of signal to India that will bring about some positive change.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous con-
sent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?
observation is India is the largest democracy in the world, and there are 300 million people who live in poverty in that largest democracy. And 85 percent of the monies that we appropriate in this bill goes to private, volunteer organizations who spend it on making things better for the poorest stricken people of India.

There are other monies that go to India indirectly through this committee. For example, we fund UNICEF, and we also fund indirectly the Rotary International, which is in the process today of immunizing every child in India so there will not be a polio epidemic there and we will help to eradicate it.

So I do not question the fact that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is concerned. I do not question his motives at all. None of us agree with any atrocities that are committed.

If we look at the situation that the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) mentioned in Kosovo, the KLA is murdering people in Kosovo. Yet, within the next few months, we are going to appropriate some more money for Kosovo for humanitarian efforts.

We have already appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars already, and yet we still see the KLA now slaughtering the Serbs as they try to exit Kosovo and back into Serbia.

So it is not an indication of tolerance. It is an indication of no concern. It is an indication of we are doing the right thing, in my opinion, by appropriating this small amount of money, of which only probably less than $3 million goes to the Government of India and it is restricted in its use.

So, in my opinion, we are doing the right thing with the money we have agreed to give to the President in order that he can handle the international affairs as he sees fit, as the Constitution says.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just close by saying to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), that I am not in full retreat. Withdrawing the amendment was because of a technicality, and I think my good friend knows that. And we are good friends. We worked together on other issues.

But the thing that motivates me is 200,000 Christians that have died over the past 30, 40, 50 years in Nagaland; the 250,000 Sikhs that were killed in Punjab in the last 15 years; the 60,000 Muslims killed in Kashmir in the last 10 years; and the thousands of Dalits, who are lower cast people, the blacks, who are mistreated and killed in India.

Maybe we are justing windmills here. I do not know. But we have got to do what we think is right.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, we will be back another time to fight this battle. And I am sure I will have some formidable opponents like my colleagues over there, but we will do the best we can.

Just remember what Arnold Schwarzenegger said, "I'll be back."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to understand that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BURTON), under the unanimous consent request of last Friday I believe, has the right to offer an amendment, that this being withdrawn does not give the gentleman the right to offer a different amendment, and that is not his intent.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is withdrawn. There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hastings of Florida:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO COLOMBIAN FLOWER INDUSTRY

SEC. 4. FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The flower industry of Colombia has been recognized on several occasions by the Department of State, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the United States Customs Service for its substantive part in reducing drug-related and other criminal activities while working closely with United States law enforcers to establish extensive anti-smuggling programs.

(2) The flower industry of Colombia has been a leader as a major private industry in reducing corruption in the commercial sector, while working closely with the Colombian Government to bolster and advance its Democratic initiatives.

Programs being supported and funded by Growers of Flowers include corruption reduction in the commercial sector, the establishment of nursing care, day-care, subsidized food, nutrition, and educational programs, and a new program to eradicate domestic violence.

At this time there is scarce good news coming out of Colombia. On this past weekend, we read and saw further bombings taking place in Colombia.

The work that Growers of Flowers is voluntarily doing on the ground is, however, a bright little light. I am offering this amendment this evening to acknowledge the contributions of Growers of Flowers, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing to reserve my point of order on the amendment, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with concern over this amendment. The amendment expresses a sense of Congress. Colombia is in a very grave situation right now.
Its 40-year-old government guerilla struggle and the latter day antidrug struggle is over.

The Colombian flower growers have been one of its most successful enterprises in Latin America, but not without help from our country. Our country allowed Colombian flowers into this country duty free.

There is a downside to the Colombian success, the injury done to U.S. flower growers. We might note that since 1992, 50 percent of the U.S. carnation producers have left the business, 39 percent of the mini-carnation producers have left the business, 54 percent of the U.S. chrysanthemum producers have left the business, and 41 percent of the rose growers have left the business.


Well, I am here to congratulate those businesses in Colombia that are doing well. I think that the flower growers are a good business for Colombia.

Let us not forget or let us not do this praise without remembering that there is a downside, because all of those Colombian flowers get into the United States duty free.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing to reserve my point of order, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for being so generous in yielding.

I support both of the gentlemen. I think they are both right. I think that the Hastings amendment is one that is an important one, and the recognition that he seeks to present to the flower industry of Colombia is important.

But our colleague from California (Mr. FARR) is also right. I do not think that that recognition does damage to the flower industry in the U.S.; the free market does. But we must be sensitive to those needs because we have a wonderful flower industry in our country.

But that does not negate the facts that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) presents. I thank him for his leadership on this, especially at this sensitive time in Colombia's future.

My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), has been a champion on that score. He has been a friend of Colombia and is sensitive to the concerns that are there, too.

So, hopefully, we will be able to find a way to recognize and also recognize our own industries here, as well.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise not to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but to address the concerns many of us have about the impact that the Colombian flower industry is having on American flower growers. I won't disagree with the gentleman that the Colombian flower industry has made progress in Colombia. However, I ask Mr. Speaker, at what cost?

In 1991, Congress enacted the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA) which provided for duty-free treatment, or reduced duties, on many products, including fresh-cut flowers, imported from the Andean countries of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. This legislation was proposed to promote alternatives to coca cultivation and production by offering broader access to U.S. markets for legal products. Unfortunately, the act has not achieved these goals.

Since the enactment of ATPA, it is clear that Colombian fresh-cut flowers have been the greatest beneficiaries. In 1992, Colombia exported approximately 1.7 billion roses and carnations to the United States. Colombia now controls more than 50 percent of the United States market for roses and 80 percent of the carnation market. Overall, Colombian flowers account for about 65 percent of the United States fresh-cut flower market.

Meanwhile, the total number of U.S. fresh-cut flower growers has plummeted from 932 in 1992 to 706 in 1995, a decline of over 10 percent a year. Specifically, since the passage of the ATPA, more than 52.52 percent of U.S. Carnation Producers, 39.02 percent of the U.S. Carnation Producers, 53.95 percent of the U.S. Chrysanthemum Producers, 41.62 percent of the U.S. Pompon Chrysanthemum Producers, and 41.3 percent of the U.S. Rose Producers have left the business. This impact on the domestic-cut flower industry has been disproportionately placed upon California, home of 58 percent of the United States cut flower growers.

The ATPA provides the preferential treatment for Colombian fresh-cut flowers only— not for flowers from the Netherlands, or from any other country. This preferential treatment, however, is not serving its intended purposes of promoting legal drug production in the nation of Colombia.

In 1996, an International Trade Commission (ITC) report found that the "ATPA had little effect on drug crop eradication in the Andean region." This is a major understatement. In fact, since ATPA's enactment illegal drug crop cultivation has increased in Colombia. The number of hectares devoted to cocoa cultivation in Colombia increased from 37,500 in 1991 to more than 50,000 in 1995. The ITC report also found that "[the] ATPA had a small and indirect effect on crop substitution during 1995." Thus, we have not achieved the intended goal of reducing drug crop cultivation by providing market access for alternative crops.

We must do all we can to encourage Colombia to seek alternatives to drug production. However, the ATPA has not effectively reduced drug crop production in Colombia, nor has it improved the economic situation of cut flower growers in the United States. If we are going to fight drug production at its source in Colombia, Members and the American people should be informed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their indulgence.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is withdrawn.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Tanscred:

Amendment offered by Mr. Tanscred: Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 116. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided for the United Nations Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Program or the United Nations World Heritage Fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today cuts nothing from the total appropriations for the Foreign Operations Appropriations, but it does prohibit any use of funds for the Man and the Biosphere Program and the World Heritage Convention.

Currently, there are 47 Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States that in total make up a land area the size of my home State of Colorado. Creation of these reserves and sites has significant impact on non-Federal lands outside the designated areas and in several instances has caused major problems for private land owners.

In fact, several States have passed resolutions opposing U.S. Biosphere Programs.

Over the past several years in both the United States and Australia, the weight levied by World Heritage Sites has been brought to bear by private citizens carrying out the course of their industry.

In Yellowstone National Park, the environmental impact statement for the New World Mine was not even finished when the World Heritage Committee voted to place Yellowstone on the "In Danger" list for World Heritage Sites.
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Likewise, the Jabiluka Mine in Kakido National Forest in Australia...
came up against a similar threat by the World Heritage Committee, but this time the verdict was much more conclusive. What is ironic is that the decision was handed down in Paris.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the point of order.

Mr. TANCREDO. A decision affecting the land of private citizens in Australia was decided by bureaucrats in a country halfway around the world. These are decisions which should be handled by the government of the country in which the action in question takes place. It should in no way be given over to an international organization with foreign influence.

Mr. TANCREDO. Similar amendments to the one I have proposed have been passed in previous appropriations bills because these programs draw from funds of over 10 governmental agencies. This House has gotten in the habit of denying to these two particular organizations, and I believe that we must come together again to make sure more American taxpayer money is not used for programs which do not serve the American people.

I believe that there are certainly better places for this funding to be spent than in UNESCO, an organization from which the United States withdrew over a decade and a half ago.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I do seek to control the time, Mr. Chairman, but I also ask unanimous consent to give the time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and give her the authority to yield as she so deems necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the distinguished chairman for his generosity in yielding all the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the authorizing committee.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the World Heritage Convention is an international treaty conceived and spearheaded by the United States during the Nixon administration under which countries voluntarily identify culturally and environmentally significant areas within their own borders and promise to continue to protect them.

The program is totally voluntary. The land must be protected in order to be nominated. It is not protected after it is nominated. The only power that the World Heritage Committee has is if the program identifies protected areas which scientists can study entire ecosystems and then sets up a framework where those scientists can share their information internationally.

The framework documents which control the Man and the Biosphere program and the World Heritage Convention both contain language making clear that they in no way alter the ownership or control of these lands.

Since we were the first signatory of the World Heritage Convention in 1973, 152 other nations have followed suit. This convention was not only a promise to live up to our own standards for protecting these sites, it was an invitation to other countries around the world to follow suit.

These two programs have established the United States as a world leader in environmental protection and scientific study and the sharing of that information. Killing these programs will not hurt these sites in the U.S. They are already protected and will remain so. Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks will still be national parks if we withdraw from the World Heritage Convention. The Everglades will still be protected if we stop our scientific study under the Man and the Biosphere program.

But this action will send a signal around the world that we no longer value the kind of environmental protection and scientific study that we as a Nation pioneered and asked the world community to join.

We have seen this amendment a number of times in the last several years and the House has rejected this amendment each and every time because in fact a majority of the House understands the nature of the scientific study, the importance of designating these sites as World Heritage areas, and they also understand that this is a voluntary program. The fact that the process takes place in Belgium or in Paris or somewhere else, this is an international body. This is an international body. So that should not be foreign to the Members of Congress and that is one of the reasons why it is in this legislation. This is an international organization to foster the protection of these huge, huge world class environmental assets. The size of these assets is immaterial. Some of them are there because nations decided that these landscapes, these huge areas should be protected as we did with the Everglades, as we did with Grand Canyon, as we did with Yellowstone. That is the purpose of this program. The international scientific study is there so scientists in one country can help other scientists learn about the kind of protections, about the kinds of programs we've used to protect these environmental assets.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong, strong opposition to this amendment.

This amendment is a late-night, backdoor attempt to kill two programs that critics of these programs have been unable to kill in the light of day. Legislation to abolish the Man and the Biosphere and World Heritage Programs failed in 1996 and 1997 and looks like it may fail again this year. So we are here tonight to short circuit the process with a little amendment buried in a huge appropriations bill.

The World Heritage Convention is an international treaty, conceived and spearheaded by the United States during the Nixon administration, under which countries voluntarily identify culturally and environmentally significant areas and then set up a framework where those scientists can share their information internationally.

The framework documents which control the Man and the Biosphere program and the World Heritage Convention both contain language making clear that they in no way alter the ownership or control of these lands.

1. The program is totally voluntary.
2. The land must already be protected in order to be nominated, it is not protected after its nominated.

Mr. TANCREDO. The power the World Heritage Committee has is, if the country who nominated the site goes back on its promise to protect that area, the Committee can drop the site from the list.

The Man and the Biosphere program identifies protected areas where scientists can study entire ecosystems and then set up a framework where those scientists can share their information internationally.

The framework documents which control the Man and the Biosphere program and the World Heritage Convention both contain language making clear that they in no way alter the ownership or control of these lands.

So if these programs are so innocuous, what's the big deal if we abandon them?

Well, since the United States was the first signatory of the World Heritage Convention in 1973, 152 other nations have followed suit. This convention was not only a promise to live up to our own standards for protecting these sites, it was an invitation to other countries around the world to follow suit.

These two programs have established the United States as a world leader in environmental protection and scientific study. Killing these programs won't hurt these sites in the United States. They are already protected and will remain so. Yellowstone and Glacier National Park will still be national parks if we withdraw from the World Heritage Convention. The Everglades will still be protected if we stop our scientific study under the Man and the Biosphere program.

But this action will send a signal around the world that we no longer value the kind of environmental protection and scientific study that we as a Nation pioneered and asked the world community to join.
This amendment is an attempt to short circuit the will of the Congress and it would send a terrible signal to the rest of the world. Oppose the TANCREDO Amendment.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The opponents of the amendment have suggested that in fact we have seen this many times before and it has been turned down by the House. In fact, the House has passed and the Congress has passed this amendment more than once on other programs, on other appropriations. I refer specifically to the State Department authorizations for fiscal year 1998 and 1999. I agreed to by recorded vote of 222–202. The Interior appropriations bill, fiscal year 1998, agreed to 222–203. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998, all of these.

For that reason Mr. Chairman, these two programs actually receive funding from a variety of different organizations and a variety of different departments, and so you have to go after them as you see them arise. That is why we said we will do this before. But each time, at least in the situations that I have identified, they have been passed by this House.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, I will defend the committee position in opposing reluctantly the distinguished gentleman from Colorado's amendment to our bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that the House Committee on Appropriations marks for the IOP&P account is $167 million, which is $25 million below the administration's request. An additional reduction of $2 million in the account would erode our ability to gain international cooperation in protecting the environment and natural resources.

A $2 million reduction to the IOP&P account exceeds our voluntary contribution to the Man and the Biosphere program, $355,000, and the World Heritage Fund, $450,000. As a result, this amendment would force reductions in other worthwhile scientific and educational activities, such as the Inter-governmental Oceanographic Commission and the National Council of Scientific Unions at a time when we look toward science to increase our understanding of global environmental problems.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for letting me interject here. The fact is that we have amended our own amendments. We do not strike any particular dollar amount, we just prevent funds from going for these two programs. It actually would go other places in the bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. We need to make those contributions to the Man and the Biosphere program. Everything else is fully funded.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment. I commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There have been a number of comments made with regard to the original treaty obligations of the United States, but concerning the Man and the Biosphere program, Congress has never gone on record either authorizing or supporting such a program to be carried out. Furthermore, many people have raised the issue as to the treaty obligation for the World Heritage Fund. This, however, is not true.

In article 16, paragraph 2 of the convention concerning the protection of world cultural and natural heritage, it states that each state may declare at the time of ratification that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 which deals with the payment of regular contributions to the World Heritage Fund. Likewise on October 26, 1973, the Senate concurred to the ratification of the convention subject to the declaration that the United States is not bound by provisions dealing with regular contributions to the World Heritage Fund. The Senate has the power to ratify, but this House has the responsibility of the public purse. We are not bound to contribute to the program with the hard-earned money of the American people. I strongly urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Kucinich:

SEC. 2. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for any category A Investment Fund project, as listed in Appendix E, Category A Projects, of the Corporation's Environmental Handbook of April 1999, as required pursuant to Executive Order 12114 and section 239(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2199(g)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I request a point of order.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment cuts funding to environmentally sensitive Overseas Private Investment Corporation fund projects, such as oil refineries, chemical plants, oil and gas pipelines, large scale logging projects near wetlands and projects on other protected areas. Current OPIC investment funds are not subject to any transparency requirements. Furthermore, no specific information on these projects is contained in OPIC's annual reports.

As a consequence, Congress, the public and the residents living near OPIC projects have no knowledge of the potential environmental and related financial and political risks. What is the taxpayer's interest in these projects?

Taxpayers are liable for OPIC investment overseas if they fail. I want to repeat that. Taxpayers are liable for OPIC investments overseas if they fail. Private corporations and investors make investments in OPIC investment funds. OPIC-supported funds, in turn, make direct equity and equity-related investments in new, expanding and privatizing companies in "emerging market" economies. While taxpayer money is not actually invested in these funds, taxpayers are liable for the investments should they fail. These funds have invested in more than 240 business projects in over 40 countries. Recent estimates show that the total amount in Investment Fund programs will soon reach $4 billion.

Since taxpayers are exposed to millions of dollars of potential liabilities, I believe OPIC has a responsibility to Congress and to the public to operate in an open and transparent manner. The lack of environmental transparency conceals environmentally destructive investment of these funds not only from Congress and the American public but also to locally affected people in the countries where OPIC projects are run.

For example, a 1996 Freedom of Information lawsuit focusing on OPIC activity in Russia revealed that an investment fund in a clear cutting of primary ancient forests in northwest Russia. Russian citizens, expecting democracy building assistance from the U.S. Government,
had not been provided with any environmental documentation. In fact, according to documents obtained in a lawsuit against OPIC, a consultant had falsely documented the Russian citizens' support for the harmful, irreversible logging of pristine forests.

OPIC investment funds have also been involved in a gold mine in the Cote d'Ivoire, on the site of a primary tropical forest which is opposed by local citizens. Reports of other troubling projects are also being circulated. Conservation groups have filed Freedom of Information requests to obtain the names, nature, location and environmental impact assessments for all OPIC investment fund projects. OPIC, however, continues to conceal the environmental consequences of these questionable investments from the public.

What little information has been uncovered about these funds reveals a checkered environmental record. With environmentally and socially sensitive projects being a main focus of the funds, public disclosure of environmental impact assessments is even more crucial.

Organizations such as the National Wildlife Federation, Friends of the Earth, Institute for Policy Studies, Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, Center for International Environmental Law and Pacific Environment and Resources Center have long advocated increased transparency in OPIC investment fund projects.

Representatives of these organizations met with the new OPIC President in February, where he agreed with their assertion that these funds should be transparent when it comes to the environment. OPIC recently launched a $350 million equity fund for investment in sub-Saharan Africa which will include transparency and public disclosure of data. But, Mr. Chairman, there are still 28 other funds which remain shrouded in secrecy. With almost $4 billion invested in these programs and OPIC's sketchy environmental record, it is even more important that OPIC be held accountable to the public regarding its investment in environmentally sensitive projects.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it is the intent of the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

That being the case, I will withdraw my reservation of objection and claim the opposition time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. So with almost $4 billion invested in these programs and OPIC's environmental record, it is even more important that OPIC be held accountable to the public regarding its investment in environmentally sensitive projects.

It is OPIC's policy, as outlined in the Environmental Handbook to conduct rigorous internal Environmental Impact Assessments on all environmentally sensitive projects. Environmental impact assessments are also required by law as found in Executive Order 12114 and Public Law 99–204. However, while the assessments for insurance and finance projects meet the rigorous requirements of the Investment Fund projects are not. Accountable government demands that these assessments be disclosed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is endorsed by Friends of the Earth, Environmental Defense Fund, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Center for International Environmental Law, Pacific Environment and Resources Center, Rainforest Action Network, Institute for Policy Studies and Amazon Watch.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as vice chairman of the International Relations Committee, this Member rises in strong opposition to the pending Amendment. As a result, the benefits that Africa so desperately needs will be lost. This includes environmental improvement projects in the areas of clean energy, forestry, water and agriculture which will bring jobs, economic development and conservation of natural resources. Indeed, if unable to access resources from the Africa Infrastructure Fund, African nations will be forced to run to other sources of investment including those that may not require the same standards of environmental responsibility as we do thereby resulting in further exploitation of and damage to Africa's fragile environment.

This Member would refer his colleagues back to all of the sound reasons detailed during the debate we just had on the Andrews amendment about why OPIC is an important and successful component of American foreign policy and trade promotion. While the approach of the Kucinich amendment may be somewhat different, the cost of it equals that of the Andrews amendment. Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment.

Any projects supported by OPIC in what is called Category A that subsequently change in nature from the description provided in applicable materials, and will thereby cause material impacts to the environment, shall be required to submit additional EA documents to OPIC that must be acceptable to OPIC in its sole discretion.
I. The Kucinich amendment is a bullet to the heart of OPIC’s $350-million New Africa Infrastructure Fund. This amendment would:

Stop the fund from investing in a majority of infrastructure projects (since many infrastructure projects are environmentally sensitive).

Prohibit most investments in clean water, sewage treatment, transportation, electric power and other projects that improve the lives of African people.

Undercut the fund’s ability to raise the private sector matching funds.

Make the fund uneconomic and less able to invest in women and microenterprises.

It would deny the benefits of the fund, including:

- 6,800 new jobs for Africans.
- Almost $50 million in annual revenues for the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.
- $2.5 billion in additional financing capital to Africa.
- $350 million in exports from the United States.

II. This amendment undercuts the environmental protections and new transparency built into the New Africa Infrastructure Fund. OPIC has world-class environmental standards that apply to all OPIC programs and funds:

- All environmentally sensitive projects must undergo a complete environmental impact assessment.
- The New Africa Infrastructure Fund projects will provide for public notice and public comment period in the host country.

All environmentally sensitive projects must meet OPIC requirements to mitigate potential environmental harm.

All environmentally sensitive projects are subject to OPIC environmental monitoring over the life of a project.

The New Africa Infrastructure Fund must have at all times an environmental management system and a full-time qualified environmental expert supervising the implementation of OPIC requirements.

III. The amendment would jeopardize investments by two other OPIC-supported Africa funds totaling $270 million.

These funds:

- Would be prohibited from investments in many manufacturing, agricultural, and processing projects as well as many basic services in sub-Saharan Africa.
- Will generate more than $300 million in US exports (estimated).
- Will create an estimated 5000 African jobs.
- IV. The amendment would harm, rather than help, the environment in Africa.

Because OPIC funds would be prohibited from any environmentally sensitive investments;

Some infrastructure projects will go forward with no obligation or requirement to meet OPIC’s world-class environmental standards.

Africa will lose the benefit of OPIC’s world-class standards being applied to a broad range of infrastructure, manufacturing and natural resource projects.

V. This amendment will undermine OPIC’s ability to fulfill its commitment to create another $150 million fund for Africa as called for in the House-passed Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

REPORT ON ATROCITIES AGAINST ETHNIC SERBIANS IN KOSOVO

SEC. ___. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act in title III under the heading “PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS” may be obligated or expended for peacekeeping operations in the Kosovo province of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) until the Secretary of State provides to and submits to Congress a report containing a detailed description of the atrocities that have been committed against ethnic Serbians in Kosovo, including a description of the incident in which 14 Serbian farmers were killed on or about July 25, 1999, and a description of actions taken by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces in Kosovo to prevent further atrocities.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts also reserves a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I come here tonight, Mr. Chairman, just to request a simple study. None of the funds that are appropriated under this act, under the title “peacekeeping operations,” they should not be obligated or expended for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, province of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, until the Secretary of State prepares and submits to this Congress a report containing a detailed description of the atrocities that have been committed in this case against the Serbians in Kosovo.

Thirty-four churches, Mr. Chairman, have been bombed since the Air Force, since NATO has stopped their bombing exercise and we declared that we won the war, and of course recently 14 Serbian farmers were massacred on or about July 25, 1999; and my point this evening is that we are going to appropriate more money for peacekeeping...
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operations, and I really think it is ap-
propriate that we get the State De-
partment under the NATO, State Department
work with NATO, to start to tell us
what actually occurred. Are Serbians
now seeing reverse cleansing at the ex-
pense of the Albanians?

Now there was a recent U.S. Today
article that raised so many questions
about the Clinton administration talk-
ing about their numbers, and they said,
"many of the figures used by the
administration and NATO to describe
the war-time plight of the Albanians in
Kosovo now appear greatly exaggerated as
armed forces took control of the
province. Instead of 100,000 ethnic Al-
banian men feared murdered by the
ramping Serbs the estimate now is
only 10,000."

So I am hoping to bring to light
through the study that I have in my
amendment that before we go any fur-
ther let us find out what has happened
in Kosovo and about these 34 churches
that have been bombed and the number
of people that have been killed and
talking about these 14 Serb farmers
who are massacred. Why not? Let us
hear the straight scoop now that we
are in control of Kosovo and find out
the real story.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to
the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise
in support of the Stearns amendment
that would call for a report on atroc-
ties against Serbs. A report by the
Secretary of State on the atrocities
against Serbs in Kosovo and the July 25
massacre is necessary because there
must be ongoing accountability for the
ongoing atrocities against Kosovo
Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo.

Securities are our top priority in the
Balkans. Peacekeeping operations are
supposed to keep the peace. But
there was no peace when 14 Serbian
farmers were killed on July 25, 1999, in
one of the worst massacres since the
end of the war. Who is accountable for
this? Who did it? How did these atroc-
ities happen amidst peacekeeping
troops? How can we prevent this from
ever happening again? We need an-
wswers.

A report describing these atrocities
will provide answers. More than 146
Kosovar Serbs and Albanians have been
killed since the end of the bombing
campaign on June 10. More than 150,000
Serbs have fled Kosovo since NATO ar-
rived on June 10. More than 20 Serbian
Orthodox churches have been damaged
or destroyed since June 10. Only yes-
terday a Serb Orthodox cathedral in
the province’s capital, Pristina, was
bombed.

These are not signs of peace. For true
peace to prevail, there must be ac-
countability of these actions. Peace-
keeping operations will amount to
nothing if they cannot prevent contin-
ued ethnic cleansing. Peacekeeping op-

The gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS), and I appreciate the gentle-
man’s sentiments.

ORGANIZED CRIME GANGS RULE KOSOVO
(By Laura Rozen)

Around 30 people a week are being killed in
Kosovo as organized gangs take advantage of
the U.N.’s failure to police the province.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, still
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with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pened to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.

I would like to enter into a colloquy
with the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
STEARNS) about his concerns in Kosovo
and the July 25 massacre. There are all concerns about what hap-
pended to the Kosovar Albanians. Let
justice be consistent, and let us also be
concerned about what is happening to
the Serbs.
Mr. CALLAHAN. Before, Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten I told the gentleman from Massachusetts that I would yield to him. Whatever time remaining I have on my point of order, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I also would like to associate myself with the comments that have been made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. There is no question that there is no shortage of hatred in Kosovo these days, and I would just point out that the first sizable delegations of Members of Congress was led by the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, of which I serve as the ranking member; and we saw the attempt on the part of American forces there, having detained some 10 or so Serbian Kosovars and some, almost 30, Albanian Kosovars for a variety of actions, but there are no courts in Kosovo to send those actions to, actions of looting and arson and, in fact, murder. In this instance, the 16 Serbian farmers, and one can surely not condone that kind of activity, already three people have been arrested for that. On the other hand, there have been no arrests and may well never be. In fact, the perpetrators out of the Yugoslavian armed forces are probably quite free and among the elite of the military in Belgrade at this time for the atrocities; and I could go into a list of them, one after another, the atrocities of 30 and 40 and 50 people who had been killed and burned, hacked apart by machete attack, small children, children as young as 2 years shot in the head, along with aged people thrown into a well along with cows and rocks and so forth as part of the atrocities that were perpetrated there. So there is no shortage of atrocities, but we cannot condone those activities, and I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas

(1) expresses its satisfaction with the decision of President Isais of the State of Eritrea and Prime Minister Meles of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia to agree to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) framework in settling the border dispute between Eritrea and Ethiopia as quickly as possible and encourages the two countries to renew hostilities.

(2) encourages the completion of the modalities for the resumption of talks between Eritrea and Ethiopia as quickly as possible and encourages the two countries to renew hostilities.

(3) appreciates the de facto cease-fire offered to the OAU; and

(4) appreciates the efforts of the Organization of African Unity and the Government of Algeria for aiding in the negotiations between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

(5) in order to more firmly move Eritrea and Ethiopia toward a resolution of the conflict between the two countries, expresses its intent to reconsider its position with respect to Eritrea and Ethiopia if there is a resumption of hostilities between the two countries.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I re- serve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed equal each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).
move forward and give their people peace and tranquility should be applauded. The Ethiopia-Eritrea conflict has substantially damaged the economic growth and development of the countries and has led to humanitarian suffering on both sides of the border. For 30 years, a problem dividing Ethiopia and Eritrea was Eritrea’s claim that its people have a right to self-determination. In 1991, this long and costly struggle ended through a coalition built to topple the Ethiopian dictatorship that was not acceptable to either country. For 7 years of peace, both neighbors pursued paths of economic and social development to give rise to the very idea of renaissance, establishing a path to economic growth and a better quality of life for the people.

The border dispute that ignited hostilities has smothered any confidence that things would be really better. The war has taken a vicious toll on the people in the countries. The number of casualties are almost surreal. We have seen reports of over 80,000 victims within 3 or 4 days of fighting. Individual border battles have involved over 90,000 soldiers fighting from various fronts. In Eritrea the army is estimated to be over 250,000 soldiers, men and women, a huge drain on a population of 3.5 people.

That is why I brought to the attention of this Congress my desire for a sense of Congress to acknowledge the movement, the progress, that has been made, the fact that the OAU agreement has been accepted or at least has been moved on and as well that there are efforts toward trying to resolve this.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentlewoman’s concerns that Ethiopia and Eritrea, two fine countries that have already suffered too many years of communist dictatorship, have spent 14 months at war with one another, and the loss has been tragic. We are hopeful now that there is a cease-fire, that they will implement the cease-fire and return to peace. I want to commend the gentlewoman for focusing attention on the cease-fire that is under way.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the distinguished chairmen of our committee will be at some point of order on this sense of the Congress motion, but I did want to take a half a moment to join her in commending our former colleague here, Mickey Leland. When the gentlewoman mentioned that it is 10 years, it seems impossible, but indeed it was 1989. I was with my family in Cairo watching the airlift news. We were all going to join Mickey in Nairobi when he left Ethiopia. Of course, he invited everyone to go to Ethiopia with him.

Fortunately for everyone else, he did not have a large enough plane for everyone. Maybe if he had a larger plane, he would still be with us. Every day I remember him, because his picture is on the wall of my office, holding a baby, that beautiful picture of Mickey Leland. He was there, not helping countries, but helping people.

I am particularly pleased that the gentlewoman at least has us focused on peace in that region because that is what we should be working toward. Once again, I commend the gentlewoman for calling the Congress’ attention to this important region of the world.

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

I share the gentlewoman’s concern about the war in Ethiopia and Eritrea, and I too am optimistic that the war between these two nations will soon be ending. I remind Members that bin Laden has long utilized Sudan as a terrorist training ground. In fact, Sudan served as a secure base for the bin Laden terrorists who blew up the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and in Kenya. But I sincerely hope that the gentlewoman would withdraw her amendment. I do not want to insist on my point of order, but I must insist if the gentlewoman does not choose to withdraw it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the chairman would allow me just to summarize, then I would like to ask unanimous consent upon my summary to withdraw this amendment.

I appreciate very much the chairman of the Committee, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and their ranking members for their kind words and agreement with me on the importance of this issue.

Let me close by simply saying that we have at least the makings of the potential of an opportunity for peace. The de facto cease-fire and the work of the government of Algeria in aiding the negotiations between Eritrea and Ethiopia should also be recognized, and hopefully the Congress will continue to monitor this circumstance to avoid the loss of life and certainly in tribute to my predecessor, Mickey Leland and his love for mankind, we can monitor the circumstances there.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentlewoman’s concerns that Ethiopia and Eritrea, two fine countries that have already suffered many years of communist dictatorship, have spent 14 months at war with one another. I am very hopeful that they will implement the ceasefire and return to peace.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. PAUL

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABDUCTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

Sec. 6. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

(1) population control or population planning programs;

(2) family planning activities; or

(3) abortion procedures.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will control the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), and that she may yield said time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is straightforward. It prohibits the use of any money for population control, family planning, or abortion of any funds authorized in this bill, appropriated in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the question really is this: Should the American taxpayer be required to pay for birth control pills, IUDs, Depo-Provera, Norplant, condom distribution, as well as abortion in foreign countries. Those who believe this is a proper and legitimate function will vote against the amendment. Those who believe that it is not a proper function for us to be doing these things around the world would vote for my amendment.
Mr. Chairman, I mention abortion because although this bill does not authorize funds directly for abortion, any birth control program that is involved in that receives funds from us and are involved with abortion, all they do is shift the funds. All funds are fungible, so any country that we give money to that is involved with abortion, for whatever reason, or especially in a family planning clinic, can very easily shift those funds and perform abortions. So this is very, very clear-cut.

I would like to spend a minute though on the authority that is cited for doing such a thing. Under the House rules, the committee is required to at least cite the constitutional authority for doing what we do on each of our bills. Of course, I was curious about this, because I was wondering whether this could be general welfare. This does not sound like the general welfare of the U.S. taxpayer, to be passing out condoms and birth control pills and forcing our will on other people, imposing our standards on them and forcing our taxpayers to pay. That does not seem to have anything to do whatsoever with the general welfare of this country.

Of course, the other clause that is generally used in our legislation is the interstate commerce clause. Well, it would be pretty tough, pretty tough, justifying passing out condoms in the various countries of the world under the interstate commerce clause.

So it was very interesting to read exactly what the justification is. The Committee on Appropriations, quoting from the committee report, the Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from clause 7, section 9 of Article I of the Constitution. "That is not a power. That was a proviso, a method of family planning. It was to keep us from spending our money without appropriation. If this amendment would be enacted, it would cause deaths and suffering for millions of children. I say that without any fear of contradiction.

Of course, we all want to reduce the number of abortions performed throughout the world, and the best way to do that is to promote family planning. It seems hard to believe that the gentleman would stand up and say he does not know why it is in our national interests that we improve the plight of children, poor children and families throughout the world by allowing them the opportunity to make decisions for themselves about the timing and the number of children that a family would have, or that the impact that this has on women, alleviating poverty, raising the living standards, giving more empowerment to women by having them control their own destinies.

The issue of population, certainly we understand that our world's resources are finite. I think that most would agree that it is in our interests as well as the interests of every person living on this Earth that we husband our resources very carefully, and that includes curbing uncontrolled population growth. I say that as one who does not support any forced measures in that end, but voluntary efforts to that end.

This amendment would close the most effective avenue to preventing abortions. The gentleman says that if we spent more money, then the organizations that use this money but also perform abortions have this underwriting, or the money is fungible, and, therefore, we are supporting abortions. I think this thumps full force, full well that no funds may be used for abortion procedures. That is the law of the land. We reiterate it every time we have a discussion on this subject. If you are going to apply fungibility, you would have to apply it to everything we do here. I do not know why all of a sudden when it comes to international family planning, fungibility becomes a principle, but when we are dealing with the defense bill or any other appropriations, we never say that giving money for this, or the other purpose helps that country underwrite some practices that we might not approve of.

The amendment would end a more than 30-year-old program recognized as one of the most successful components of U.S. foreign assistance. Tens of millions of couples, Mr. Chairman, in the developing world are using family planning as a direct result of this program, and the average number of children per family has declined more than one-third since the 1960's.

Three out of four Americans surveyed in 1995 wanted to increase or maintain spending on family planning for poor countries. I was, this year, in India and saw what happened in those states where there was effective family planning as opposed to what was the plight of the people in areas where the women did not have access to this family planning information.

So I believe that this amendment would be contrary to the interests and values of the vast majority of the people in the world, and certainly, speaking in our own terms, of the American people. In February 1997, both the House and the Senate showed their commitment to the USAID International Family Planning Program by voting for the early release of funds specifically for this program.
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We had to have a vote at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I see some of my colleagues on their feet, and I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). Population control, population planning is so important today. That is the next crisis that we are to be confronted with. The growth of populations around the world is going to lead to hunger in impoverished areas. And where we have hunger and poverty, we soon have war.

The best way to prevent that is to help with family planning and with population control. And I thank the gentlewoman for her arguments in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Alabama?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my duty in this House as chairman of this subcommittee to draft a bill. And in order to draft a bill, I have to depend upon a very able staff which really did the drafting of this 119 pages of law that hopefully will be passed tomorrow morning.

But upon my instruction, I would like to reiterate, and I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has already brought it out, but since I am responsible for writing this bill, the bill says that none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning.

So I just wanted to make perfectly clear my position as the author of this bill with respect to abortions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman's position is well known.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman makes the point that we should not use
the abortion issue to talk about fungibility and I believe that she is correct. I think it should apply to every-thing. This is the reason I do strongly oppose Export-Import Bank money going to Red China. Their violations of civil liberties and abortions are good reasons why we should not do it, and yet they are the greatest recipi-ent of our foreign aid from the Exim Bank. $5.9 billion they have received over the years.

So I would say, yes, the gentlewoman is correct. All of these programs are fungible. And I agree that the wording in the bill says that our funds cannot be used. But when we put our funds in with other funds, all of the sudden they are in a pool and they can shift them around and there is a real thing called fungibility.

So once we send money to a country for any reason, we endorse what they do. Therefore, we should be rather cau-tious. As a matter of fact, if we were cautious enough we would not be in the business of taking money at the point of a gun from our American taxpayer, doing things that they find abhorrent around the world and imposing our will and our standards on them.

Mr. Chairman, birth control methods are not perfectly safe. As a gynecologist, I have seen severe complica-tions from the use of IUDs and Depo-Provera and Norplant. Women can have strokes with birth control pill. These are not benign.

And my colleagues say we want to stop the killing and abortions, but every time that the abortion is done with fungible funds, it is killing a human being, an innocent human being. So for very real reasons, if we were serious about stopping this and protecting the American taxpayer, there is nothing wrong with some of these goals. I agree. As a gynecologist, I would agree with the goals, but they should not be done through coercion. They should be done through voluntary means through churches and charities. That is the way it should be done.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have the au-thority to coerce our people to work hard, pay their taxes, and then take the money into foreign countries and impose our will on them.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

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

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes ap-peared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentle-man from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will desig-nate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-lows:

The amendment offered by Ms. JACK-SON-LEE of Texas:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. ___.(a) Of the amounts made avail-able in title III under the account "INTER-NATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAIN-ING", $4,000,000 made available for the United States Army School of the Americas is transferred as follows:

(1) $2,000,000 is transferred to the account "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" in title II and made available for providing training and education of Tibetans in democracy activi-ties and for monitoring the human rights sit-uation in Tibet.

(2) $2,000,000 is transferred to the account "UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MI-GRATION ASSISTANCE" in title II and made available for the Tibetan refugee pro-gram.

(b) Of the funds appropriated in this Act in title II under the account "ECONOMIC SUP-PORT FUND", not less than $2,250,000 shall be made available for providing training and education of Tibetans in democracy activi-ties and for monitoring the human rights sit-uation in Tibet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Ms. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I re-serve a point of order against the amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in actuality I wish I did not have to rise to the floor to offer this amendment. I wish that Tibet was living in peace and harmony. I wish the Dalai Lama who is in exile, who I had an opportunity to meet and discuss these issues with, was free to go back to Tibet.

My amendment offers to provide $4 million to the Economic Support Fund to provide training and education of Tibetans in democracy activities and for monitoring the human rights sit-uation in Tibet made worse by the activi-ties of China. In addition, we would offer additional funds to be of assistance to the Tibetan refugee program.

Mr. Chairman, there is a need for something to be done. As we recently remem-bered the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square tragedy, we con-tinue to acknowledge the human rights abuses imposed by the Chinese government. Whether on the mainland or other areas, the Chinese have shown themselves to be opposed to the basic human rights principles we all aspire to achieve.

The Chinese have tripled their mis-sile threat to Taiwan. China does not understand they cannot force a free and democratic Taiwan to unify and that they should accept its existence.
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continue to acknowledge the human rights abuses imposed upon the people by the Chi-
nese government. Whether on the mainland or in
in other countries or in their own land, we
have to be opposed to the basic human
rights principles we all aspire to.

The Chinese have tripled their missile threat
to Taiwan. China does not understand they
cannot force a free and democratic Taiwan to unite
and that they should accept Taiwan as a
friendly and independent neighbor and estab-
lish diplomatic ties.

And we all still watch as China continues its
occupation of Tibet. Since 1951, when the
People's Republic of China invaded Tibet hun-
dreds of thousands of Tibetans have been
killed outright or died as the result of aggres-
sion, torture or starvation. Over 6,000 mon-
asteries and temples have been destroyed.

The continued population transfer of Chi-
nese to Tibet threatens the existence of the
unique national, cultural and religious identity
of the Tibetan people.

The fragile Tibetan plateau is seriously
threatened by the exploitation of its environ-
mental resources by China.

The Tibetan people have demonstrated re-
peatedly for independence from China. Their
struggle is nonviolent and worthy of special at-
tention. Indeed, when in 1989, the Dalai
Lama, the leader of the Tibetan people, rec-
ceived the Nobel Peace Prize the international
community documented its commitment to a
free Tibet.

There are about 110,000 Tibetan refugees
living in 53 settlements in India, Nepal and
Bhutan. Over 1.2 million Tibetans have died in
a widespread program of imprisonment, tor-
ture and executions orchestrated by China.

Tibet's unique culture and Buddhist religion
have been systematically suppressed as
China has looted Tibet's enormous mineral
wealth, wealth, natural resources and priceless art
treasures, transporting them back to China to
fuel its own economic growth.

An apartheid system is in place, following
the mass migration of Chinese into Tibet.
These immigrants now dominate the economy
and hold all the best jobs. Employment pros-
pects for Tibetans are virtually nonexistent.

Coercive birth control policies, including en-
forced abortion and sterilization, are com-
pleting the policies of wiping out Tibet's iden-
tity forever. We watch China, the world's most
oppressive police state, control Tibet. There
are between a quarter and half a million Chi-
nese troops in Tibet. China permits no news
media in Tibet. Amnesty International and for-
eign diplomats are refused permission to visit.

Tibetans in Tibet are liable to interrogation,
imprisonment and torture for having unofficial
contact with foreigners.

Tibet covers an area the size of Western
Europe and is the world's highest plateaus.
The Culture is magnificent and unique. Until
1950, Tibet had retained that ancient culture.

My amendment would offer additional hope
to the Tibetan people that the international
community, particularly the United States is
supportive of their independence and that we
are providing resources for improved systems
and enhancement of aid programs.

The United States Army School of the
Americans will have $4 million of its appropria-
tions transferred to a true democratic cause.

Graduates of the United States Army
School of the Americas include some of the worst
human rights abusers in the Western Hem-
isphere, including 19 Salvadoran soldiers
linked to the 1989 murder of six Jesuit priests
and their housekeeper and her daughter. Two
of the three officers cited by the Guatemalan
bishop's office are suspected of the killing
of anthropologist Myrna Mack in 1992, as
well as the Salvadoran death squad leader
Roberto D'Aubuisson graduated from the School
of the Americas.

The Tibetan people have demonstrated re-
peatedly for independence from China. Their
struggle is nonviolent and worthy of special at-
tention. Indeed, when in 1989, the Dalai
Lama, the leader of the Tibetan people, rec-
ceived the Nobel Peace Prize the international
community documented its commitment to a
free Tibet.

The Chinese have tripled their missile threat
to Taiwan. China does not understand they
cannot force a free and democratic Taiwan to unite
and that they should accept Taiwan as a
friendly and independent neighbor and estab-
lish diplomatic ties.

And we all still watch as China continues its
occupation of Tibet. Since 1951, when the
People's Republic of China invaded Tibet hun-
dreds of thousands of Tibetans have been
killed outright or died as the result of aggres-
sion, torture or starvation. Over 6,000 mon-
asteries and temples have been destroyed.

As the gentleman from Alabama
(Mr. CALLAHAN), our distin-
guished chairman, has been most coop-
erative on this issue of Tibet. It is a
priority for many of us on the com-
mittee and the chairman for the ef-
forts that have been made in the Sub-
committee on Foreign Operations, Ex-
port Financing and Related Programs,
and the gentleman from New York (Mr. G ILMAN),
chairman of the Committee on Inter-
national Relations.

Chairman, I would like to conclude by
simply thanking both the ranking
member and the chairman for the ef-
forts that have been made in the Sub-
committee on Foreign Operations, Ex-
port Financing and Related Programs,
and the gentleman from New York (Mr. G ILMAN),
chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

My effort tonight was to provide more
resources because of the horrific situa-
tion in Tibet. The abuse of human
rights and the exile of the Dalai Lama.
I urge you to support my amendment for de-
mocracy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gen-
tleman from New York (Mr. G ILMAN),
chairman of the Committee on Inter-
national Relations.

Mr. G ILMAN, Mr. Chairman, the gen-
tlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-
LEE) has done an outstanding job of fo-
cussing attention on the violations by
the People’s Republic of China with re-
gard to the Tibetan people. We cannot
accept greater attention to the occupa-
tion of the People's Republic of China
in Tibet and we welcome the gentle-
woman’s remarks.

Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. Chairman, I
yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield
to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I
would point out that on page 39 of the
as we try to bring peace and dignity to the Tibetan people.

Mr. PAUL is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES, OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION, AND THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEC. 2245. None of the funds made available pursuant to this Act for the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or the Trade and Development Agency, may be used to enter into any new obligation, guarantee, or agreement on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that no funds for new obligations, guarantees, or agreements can be issued under the Export-Import Bank under OPIC or under the Trade Development Agency. This again is an attempt to try to slow up the amount of dollars we send to corporations and for their benefit specifically as well as our foreign competitors.

China, for instance, receives the largest amount of money from the Export-Import Bank. Outstanding liabilities for the Export-Import Bank is now $55 billion. There is $59 billion that have been granted to the Chinese.

Last week we had a very important vote on trade. It was hotly debated over human rights issues. I voted to trade with China because I believe it is proper to trade with people. We are less likely to fight with them. And in this institution, too often we use our terms carelessly and we talk about free trade as being something which is managed trade. Free trade here generally means that they have the NAFTA people managing trade, the World Trade Organization managing trade, and we will subsidize our businesses.

Just this past week we had the World Trade Organization rule against us saying that 2 billion worth of tax benefits to our own corporations and they ruled that that was illegal. This is all done in the name of free trade.

I say that we should have free trade. We should trade with our friends and with anybody who would trade that we would not, and if we would really, really be careful about issuing sanctions. But here we are, last week we had the great debate and a lot of people could not stand the idea of trading with Red China because of their human rights record and I understand that, although I did not accept that position. But this is the time to do something about it.

Trading with Red China under true free trade is a benefit to both of us. It is a benefit to our consumers and it benefits both countries because we are talking with people and we are not fighting with them. But it gets to be a serious problem when we tax our people in order to benefit those who are receiving the goods overseas.

Now, if there is a worldwide downturn, this $55 billion of liabilities out there could be very significant in how it is going to be paid back. The Chinese right now, their economy is not all that healthy. They are talking about a devaluation.

So this is a liability that the American taxpayers are exposed to. If we do have a concern about Red China and the Chinese, yes, let us work with them, let us trade with them, but let us not subsidize.

This is what I am trying to do. I am trying to stop this type of subsidies. So my bill, my amendment would stop any new obligation. It does not close down Export-Import Bank. It allows all the old loans to operate and function, but no new obligations can be made, no new guarantees, and no agreement, with the idea that someday we may truly move to free trade, that we do not recognize the use of subsidized trade as well as internationally managed trade with organizations such as NAFTA and World Trade Organization.

Those institutions are not free trade institutions. They are managed trade institutions for the benefit of special interests. That is what this type of funding is for is for the benefit of special interests, whether it is our domestic corporation, which, indeed, I would recognize does receive some benefit.

Sixty-seven percent of all the funding of the Export-Import Bank goes to, not a large number of companies, to five companies. I will bet my colleagues, if they look at those five companies in this country that gets 67 percent of the benefit and look at their political action records, my colleagues might be enlightened. I mean, I bet my colleagues would learn something about where that money goes, because they are big corporations and they benefit, and they will have their defenders here.

It is time we look carefully at these subsidies.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In doing so, I want to correct the record. Those of us who were asking for raising tariffs, on products coming from China, were not interested in cutting off trade with China. What we were doing is to say, let us have the same reciprocity between our two countries as we would expect from other countries.

But then to use that and say it is all right to give a $70 billion trade surplus to the regime so they can strengthen their hold on the people of China but we should take out our concerns with China on the Ex-Im Bank I think is very inappropriate. That is why I oppose it.

The Ex-Im Bank does not subsidize the Chinese government. The Ex-Im Bank subsidizes U.S. manufacturers selling into countries, including China. Mr. Paul amendment would not allow the Export-Import Bank to assume any new business. This would mean that all of the Ex-Im’s resources would be used to liquidate existing transactions. In other words, Ex-Im would slowly, gradually shut down.

I agree with the gentleman that we must subject the Ex-Im, OPIC, and all of these institutions to harsh scrutiny. Are they performing the task that is their established purpose, to promote U.S. exports? The Ex-Im Bank, I think, from the scrutiny we subjected to in our committee does that.

The gentleman’s amendment is ill-advised. The same would apply to OPIC, which, by the way, does not operate in China.

So I urge our colleagues to oppose this amendment for many more reasons than I have time to go into.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed the impact of the closing down of OPIC earlier tonight, and my colleagues can see that the will of the House certainly agreed with those of us who think that we must have this competitive level playing field with the rest of the G-7 Nations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is absolutely right when it comes to basic sounding good things, a feel-good amendment, when he talks about Ex-Im Bank giving money to Red China. Ex-Im Bank does not give money to Red China. Ex-Im Bank loans money to American businesses to establish programs in Red China. There is no prohibition against Red China coming to the United States to invest their money and lend their support of a similar organization in China.

What we are saying is we want to be just like the rest of the world when it comes to global economy. This is a
Mr. C. ALLAHAN) points out that, no, markets are essentially identical. He suggests that, if one were to consider a foreign corporation, a foreign government, we would find that such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that it is truly a subsidy to a foreign corporation, a foreign government. For Red China, corporations and governments are essentially identical. They are not really quite in the free market yet.

But the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. C. ALLAHAN) points out that, no, that is not true. The money does not go to Red China and they buy things; we just give it directly. We do not even send it round trip. This is true.

We take taxpayers’ money. We take taxpayers’ guarantee. We give them to those huge five corporations that do 67 percent of the business. We give them the money. But where do the goods go? Do the goods go to the American taxpayers? No. They get all of the liabilities. The subsidies help the Chinese.

Mr. Chairman, the UN World Food Program (WFP) last Tuesday expressed fears of a “worsening humanitarian crisis” in southern Sudan, resulting from the inability to transport food to those who need it. This ban has made most of the region inaccessible to relief agencies trying to deliver urgent humanitarian assistance to some 150,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, the funds appropriated by this amendment which is more than $4,000,000 will be used for rehabilitation and economic recovery in areas of Sudan which have endured many hardships due to their region’s political and economic problems.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the US Department of Agriculture, USAID, the Department of State, and Treasury have endorsed the Payne amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TANGREDI) be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am making friends with all of the members of the staff by taking 5 minutes at this hour, including the Speaker, but since I have stayed here this long, I will take 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that this is the week that the main business is going to, for this Congress, is the final passage of an $800 billion tax cut.

The Republican leadership says that their tax cut, at least that one which passed the House of Representatives, is for the middle class. But I would like to raise that question. The bill which passed the House of Representatives about 2 weeks ago had the following features: the 1.25 million taxpayers representing the 1 percent wealthiest, richest portion of the population each, on average, got $54,000 of tax reduction. The next 1 percent whose incomes is more than $300,000 per year.

At the other end of the scale, starting from the bottom, the lowest income person in this society issuing a tax return, if we took all 95 percent, starting from the lowest income and coming up to an income of $125,000 a year, all 95 percent of that population, all 120 million would have received 39 percent of the total tax cut; whereas, the 1.25 million, the wealthiest 1.25 million, or 1 percent, would have received 45 percent of that total tax reduction.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is more than $4,000,000 will be used for rehabilitation and economic recovery in areas of Sudan which have endured many hardships due to their region’s political and economic problems. The subsidies help the Chinese.

Mr. Chairman, if I may put that in a slightly different way, if those who may still be watching would consider 100 people, 100 people, the one among those 100 people who has income over $300,000 and consider that we might have $100 of tax reduction to be able to distribute among those 100 people, that the last person who is a little bit wealthier than $300,000 would get $45 of the total of $100 that is available for all tax reduction for all Americans.

Whereas 95 percent starting at the lowest income, up to the persons who might have $125,000 of income, that group of 95 people would find that they