

global economy. The only way our people can participate in global economy is to have the same advantages as do Canada, as do Japan, as do Germany, as do France. We need this in order to work today in a global economy.

So we are not talking about losing money. That is not the question here. Ex-Im bank is not losing money. We are talking about whether or not we are going to have a financing capability that will enable American jobs to be exported to all of the countries that the gentleman from Texas mentioned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is the same debate that we had on OPIC except this one is twice as bad because, also, he closes down the Ex-Im Bank as well and cuts off the ability of American business people to do business in most any foreign country.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve 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. CALLAHAN) 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.

So, technically, yes, we do not send the money there. But who is going to pay it back? The Chinese pays the loan back. If they default, who pays the bill if the Chinese defaults? Who pays the bill if they default? It is obviously the taxpayers.

What I am pointing out is that \$5.9 billion that the Chinese now had borrowed from us, from the Export-Import Bank, is a significant obligation that, too, is on the backs of the American taxpayer.

So I urge support for the amendment because, if we are serious about free trade, just please do not call it free trade anymore. Call it managed trade. Call it subsidized trade. Call it special interest trade. But please do not call it free trade anymore, because it is not free trade.

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

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

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the \$16 million, or

whatever figure he is using that goes to China, goes in the form of things like airplane. Yes, a lot of it goes to Boeing, which is a huge corporation. But the benefit that the American taxpayers receive are the thousands of jobs that Boeing provides in order to export this plane to China who pays for it. If indeed there was some problem, we can always go and get the airplanes back.

It is not like we are giving something away. We are creating jobs. I might tell my colleagues that many of those Boeing jobs are located in the State of Alabama.

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

The CHAIRMAN. 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 appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, further proceedings on 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 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 religious and political beliefs. These funds will help support education, crop growth and other needs necessary for the basic existence of these people.

Mr. Chairman, this is a humane, well thought out, gesture offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. CALLAHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-283) on

the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

\$800 BILLION TAX CUT, BUT NOT FOR THE MIDDLE OR LOWER CLASSES

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

Mr. OLVER. 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 the 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that this is the week that the main business is going to be, 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. Those are the 1 percent whose incomes is more than \$300,000 per year.

At the other end of the scale, starting from the bottom, from 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. The 1 percent richest of Americans got more than all 95 percent of our population whose income is beneath 125,000.

If I may put that in a slightly different way, if those who may still be watching would consider 100 people, 100 people, one of whom 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 that one person whose income is greater than \$300,000 would get \$45 of the total of \$100 that is available for all tax reduction for all Americans.

□ 2300

Whereas 95 people, 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