Vitter	Weiner	Wilson
Walden	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Walsh	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Wamp	Weller	Young (FL)
Watkins	Wexler	
Watts (OK)	Wicker	

NAYS—141

Aderholt	Frank (MA)	Pallone
Allen	Goode	Pascrell
Andrews	Graham	Pelosi
Bachus	Green (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Phelps
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Pickering
Barcia	Hayes	Pickett
Barrett (WI)	Hill (IN)	Price (NC)
Berkley	Hinchey	Rahall
Berry	Hinojosa	Riley
Bishop	Hoeffel	Rivers
Blagojevich	Holden	Rodriguez
Bonior	Holt	Rogers
Boswell	Hooley	Roybal-Allard
Boyd	Hunter	Rush
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Sanchez
Brown (OH)	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Jackson (IL)	Sandlin
Capps	Jones (NC)	Sanford
Capuano	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Carson	Kennedy	Sherman
Chambliss	Kildee	Shows
Clayton	Kleczka	Sisisky
Clement	Klink	Smith (TX)
Clyburn	Kucinich	Spratt
Collins	LaFalce	Stabenow
Condit	Lantos	Stenholm
Conyers	Largent	Strickland
Costello	Lee	Stupak
Cramer	Lipinski	Tanner
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Danner	Mascara	Taylor (NC)
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Deal	McGovern	Tierney
DeFazio	McIntyre	Traficant
DeGette	McKinney	Turner
Delahunt	Menendez	Velazquez
DeMint	Miller, George	Vento
Dicks	Minge	Visclosky
Dingell	Mink	Waters
Doggett	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Doyle	Mollohan	Waxman
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Weygand
Etheridge	Myrick	Wise
Evans	Nadler	Woolsey
Everett	Norwood	
Farr	Obey	
Filner	Owens	

NOT VOTING—31

Baldwin	Gordon	Rothman
Brown (CA)	Hansen	Serrano
Burton	Hastings (FL)	Stark
Chenoweth	Hefley	Tauzin
Coble	John	Thurman
Cooksey	Latham	Udall (NM)
Engel	Luther	Whitfield
Forbes	McDermott	Wu
Frost	McNulty	Young (AK)
Ganske	Peterson (PA)	
Gephardt	Porter	

□ 1043

Mr. TURNER and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 306 on H. Res. 250, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1074, REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, a ''Dear Colleague'' letter will go out today announcing that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of July 18 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999.

The Committee on Government Reform ordered H.R. 1074 reported on May 19 and filed its committee report on June 7.

The Committee on Rules may meet on Wednesday, July 21 to grant a rule which may require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this case, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table by the close of legislative business next Wednesday.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as reported on Committee on Government Reform. Members should also use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

□ 1045

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolution 250 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 434.

□ 1046

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa, with Mr. EWING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 22½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, does the rule provide for those in opposition to this bill an opportunity to speak against the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that half the time allotted for debate on this bill be given to those who are in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain that request. Time must be yielded by the Members who control the time under the special order adopted by the House, the ranking members and the chairmen of the appropriate committees.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Members that do oppose this bill on certain grounds, and I believe they should be afforded an opportunity that the Chair could, in fact, make accommodations for, and I urge the House to do that.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. The gentleman asked for time and the gentleman was given time. What does the gentleman want the Chair to do?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I think there should be a reasonable amount of time presented for the opportunity for those who oppose this bill to be able to speak on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) will suspend.

The rule provides that the time will be yielded by the chairmen and the ranking members of the two appropriate committees, and that is the way the Committee of the whole will proceed under the rule approved by the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

This bill is the product of years of bipartisan congressional efforts to promote increased trade and investment between our Nation and sub-Saharan Africa. This measure authorizes a new trade and investment policy toward the countries of sub-Saharan Africa and expresses the willingness of our Nation to assist the eligible countries of that region with a reduction of trade barriers, the creation of an economic cooperation forum, the promotion of a free trade area, and a variety of other trade and related mechanisms.

This bill, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, has broad support in the Committee on International Relations and was ordered to be reported in February of this year.

Yesterday, in the meeting of the Committee on Rules, one of our distinguished colleagues, one who has demonstrated a long and passionate commitment to humanitarian issues, expressed concerns that this bill does not do enough for the people of Africa. Mr. Chairman, although this is indeed a modest bill, it would be a grave mistake to underestimate its strength. Both its power and its modesty, Mr. Chairman, come from the fact that this bill does not attempt to do anything for the people of Africa but rather it proposes to encourage beneficial trade with the countries and peoples of Africa.

This act recognizes a universal and independent desire of individuals everywhere to improve their lives and those of their families. Adam Smith recognized this power back in 1776 when he wrote, ''The desire of a man to better himself comes to him in the womb of his mother.'' A fundamental belief in individual aspiration is reflected in nearly all of the domestic legislation that we consider in this body, from tax laws, to education subsidies, to natural resource management. That principle must not be ignored in our policies toward other nations.

The entrepreneurial spirit is alive and well in Africa, but much economic activity there goes unrecorded and underreported. Ghanaian women with little formal education grow their crops and sell them in cooperative rural markets every week, season after season. Senegalese merchants travel to cities all across the globe selling their wares and remitting the bulk of their profits. Somalis, working together throughout the Middle East, spend their salaries on products which are in high demand back home and ship them to family members. In turn, they trade them for profit in the markets of Hargeisa and Mogadishu. It may come as a surprise to some of our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that on any given day a visitor to Hargeisa can stand on a street corner and exchange Deutschemarks, francs, pounds and dollars at international exchange rates.

These activities, and countless others like them, are happening and they are happening right now, as we speak, all over the African continent. They are not driven by any giant multinational corporations nor by international banks. They are not supervised by the Agency for International Development or by the IMF. This work occurs because people have discovered that it puts food on the table and clothes on the backs of their children.

Make no mistake, my colleagues, I strongly support U.S. foreign aid to Africa, and my record of that support is clear. In recent years, I have been supportive of the Development Fund for Africa, the Seeds of Hope Act, the International Financial Institutions, debt relief and the work of the United Nations. But foreign aid cannot serve as a backbone of any modern economy. At best, it can jump-start independently sustainable economic activity and help individuals gain a foothold.

As I have said, H.R. 434 is a modest bill. One can think of many problems confronting the people and the countries of Africa that this bill does not specifically address, and we have heard some of them already in the debate on the rule. But it would be a mistake to reject this bill for what it is not without recognizing the significant benefits that it represents.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recognize the extraordinary group of Members who have come together and worked extremely hard in support of this effort before us. Both Democrat and Republican, black and white, conservatives and liberals have found much common ground in the pages of H.R. 434.

I would like to pay particular tribute to the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); to the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE); to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE); and the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means, the dean of our New York delegation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. Chairman, even the often contentious counties of sub-Saharan Africa have come together united in support for this bill. I commend my colleagues for their efforts and their commitments, and I urge favorable consideration of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), be permitted to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It will open a new era in U.S. relations with sub-Saharan Africa. This bipartisan bill was reported with little opposition on a bipartisan basis from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, sub-Saharan Africa today is very different from what it was just a few short years ago. In the 1990s, more than two dozen of the 48 countries in the region have held democratic elections and 30 have undertaken specific economic reforms.

□ 1100

Increasing numbers of Africans have embraced the principles of democracy and free markets, which enable people and nations to improve the course of their futures.

Last year I traveled to Gabon. I believe President Omar Bongo and his country are an example of the changes under way across the African continent. President Bongo has set out on a plan to energize his country. He has brought a high level of prosperity to his country and actually developed an empowered middle class. And to ensure economic opportunity for the Gabonese people, the president is also directing the country's efforts in infrastructure building and privatization of state-owned industries.

Gabon is a good example of what is happening in Africa today. And here, in this body, we are laying the legislative groundwork that will help support the steps Gabon and other nations are taking in Africa.

Today, we adapt U.S. policy in response to the African renaissance. Specifically, this legislation will add a trade component to U.S. policy toward the region to mutually improve the standard of living of Americans and the African people.

It is unfortunate that the tremendous potential of sub-Saharan Africa has not been reflected in U.S. trade policy to date. But this bill fills that gap. I commend many members of the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides of the aisle for bringing us to where we are today on the floor in developing this legislation.

In developing this legislation, I particularly compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE); and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, who are the lead sponsors of this bill. They have done great work.

In addition, I must mention the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) particularly who have expended enormous effort in bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time may be managed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and that he may be able to yield and assign the time as he chooses.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement I may yield the time controlled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Democratic side to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, let me first take one moment to remind our colleagues where this legislation began.

The genesis was with one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT). I have yet to see a bill with as strong bipartisan support with people on both sides of the aisle supporting it, particularly the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and so many of my friends, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others on the Republican side.

There are many of us who would like to do more today. Africa is a continent that we have often ignored. The United States, with its often European and Middle Eastern-focused policies it is attempting to engage, the economic stage of Africa has been left behind. A continent with the poorest people on this planet, devastated by illness, famine, and economic hardship, America's foreign assistance has given the least to this continent that needs it the most.

There is more that we should be doing. We should be doing more in almost every category, from assistance to health, education, and in trade.

For my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, this is not an easy vote. Some of our core constituencies are divided. Concern for labor protection, the concern for the environment, things that we cherish, are not as significant and powerful as they should be.

I am among those who believe we should be doing more in every trade bill to include labor and environmental rights. We need to make sure that when we work to lift these other nations that we lift all of their citizens and not just a few.

The provisions of this bill are as good as we can get in this compromise. I can assure my colleagues, if this was a different Congress, we would have more protection for labor, we would have more committed to the poorest of the poor, and we would do more for the environment.

But our choice is not that today. We do not decide the composition of this House. What we have to do is do the best we can for these people who have suffered so much, with the legislature that the American people have given us.

GSP is a good program. It forces countries to address the ILO standard. And when we take a look at its history, almost a dozen countries have lost GSP preference because they did not follow those rules. In another number of cases, countries that had failed to follow the ILO standard when challenged and threatened with the removal of GSP ended up accepting the better standard for labor.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stretch politically today. There are tough questions here. There are concerns that we all have about why we are not doing more for Africa in aid, in health care, in education, in trade and assistance. But the choice before us is this bill or nothing.

Will Africans be better off if we kill this bill today? I think not. I think, if we can move this bill forward today, we will be able to build on its strength in the future.

Lastly, for my friends who have had a bad experience with NAFTA, this bill is not about NAFTA. This bill does not take away tariffs in a permanent manner, irrespective of countries' actions. The countries that deal with us under this bill will have to make improvements on how they treat their working men and women. They will have to address these issues that so many on our side care about. This is a bill that begins an engagement that we should have undertaken long ago.

I again commend all those involved, but particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for their great efforts.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have never really enjoyed any bipartisan effort as much as I have with this piece of legislation. Because truly, emotionally and politically, I am totally involved and committed.

Many, many years ago I was involved in the civil rights struggle, and I marched from Selma to Montgomery, and I cussed every step of the way, not having the slightest idea that I was a part of history. I feel, for most of us today, that we are on the brink of history.

It is hard for us to imagine that a country as big, as populous, as rich, as historic as Africa has been ignored by a great Republic like we have. It is hard to imagine that we have so many millions of African-Americans in this country but, unlike other Americans, have no village, no town, no country, not even a name that identifies us with any other country except our great United States of America.

As small as this step is, it brings us now in a family of trade. And for those that love Africa so much and believe that we have not really done enough, let me laud them for their efforts to attempt to improve this bill; but of course, after looking and working with the heads of these African countries and recognizing that they know that if everything they wanted and everything we wanted was on the bill we would not have bipartisan support, we would not have a bill, and we would not be able to take this one giant step.

But look at the people, Nelson Mandella, whose commitment is not to just Southern Africa, not just to Africa, but his commitment to humankind, supports the bill as well as all of the heads of state.

I know we have Members that know better than most people, but why do we not give the African people just a chance? They are not in the major leagues but, my God, they will be in the ball game. We have so many organizations, white and black, Jew and gentile, Muslim organizations, saying that we can work together with a better cultural understanding and a better commercial understanding of the things that we are doing.

For those that fear the loss of their jobs, visit Africa, please. Go to the towns and villages, and please do not come back saying that these countries are a threat to our textile industry. Do not say that they are going to take our jobs away from us.

Let us hope that what we are talking about is that we can get a decent standard of living for our friends in Africa, that they will be able to enjoy some of the comforts of the world, that we will continue to have our industrial commercial leadership, and that they will continue, as all of the countries we trade with, to take advantage of our technology and our consumer appetite.

So, for those who were opposed to the rule because it did not go far enough, stay with us as we open the door asking our colleagues to come in to work to improve the conditions that we want to improve, to improve the bill which we want to improve, but to be able to say that before we went into that next century, where every country we have had some agreement with, with this European country through the European Union, that we understood them. We understand our friends in Canada, in Mexico, Central and South America, in the Middle East with Israel, every continent except Africa.

Now we can rest assured when this becomes law that, on our watch, we started. Let us hope that our youngsters and our children's children will be able to say one day that no nation is denied the opportunity to enjoy the freedom and the friendship and the trade with our great Republic.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Over the last several years, many Members of this body have been working hard to improve America's relationship with Africa. We have done this because what happens in Africa matters. It matters to Africans, and it matters to our country.

The United States has real interests in seeing that Africa begins to reach its considerable potential. Such an Africa would offer limitless cultural and economic opportunity to Americans.

Already our exports to Africa are some $6.5 billion. This is greater than our exports to the former Soviet Union. It is greater than our exports to all of Eastern Europe. And the volume is growing. U.S. exports to Africa are growing by more than 8 percent per year. This is 130-some thousand American jobs.

As this map shows, businesses in my home State of California have been part of this. California is one of the top States in the country when it comes to exports to Africa, as is Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas. We can see the result of the growing exports here to Africa.

On the other hand, if Africa fails to meet its potential with the United States of America, then the United States will not escape the negative economic political and security implications. There would be lost economic opportunities, yes, but there would be more.

The reality is that terrorism and environmental degradation know no bounds. Simply put, this legislation, which has broad bipartisan support, is critical to the United States' relationship with Africa.

The Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs recently said, ''No other U.S.-Africa issue can be taken seriously until the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act is passed.''

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, I second that. But so do all the African ambassadors here in Washington, everyone who has unanimously supported this legislation. The African ambassadors understand the importance of this legislation, and they have rejected in no uncertain terms the efforts of critics to speak authoritatively for Africans.

So I say to my colleagues, if they care about the future of the continent, if they care about the future of 700 million people, support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I first of all would like to pay tribute to colleagues on the other side of the aisle, starting out with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who I hope is in everyone's prayers. He had heart bypass surgery, and I understand he is doing well.

He spoke to me about the possibility of figuring out how we would expand our trade relations with the underdeveloped portions of Africa where we were virtually nonexistent and was there something we could do. I talked to him about it awhile, and then the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) joined in that effort.

We had meetings, and we decided to come up with a bill that would advance the concept of free trade and establish a free-trade agreement with sub-Saharan Africa.

□ 1115

That is how the bill has finally reached this point. It is a culmination, really, of 4 years of bipartisan work to develop a U.S. trade and investment policy toward the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. I pay tribute to all who have been involved in this effort and who have given of their time and their energies so graciously.

This legislation comes at a time of great hope and opportunity in Africa. Already, the majority of countries in the region have held democratic elections. Earlier this month, peace agreements were signed in Sierra Leone and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In May, Nigeria, the most populous nation in the region with 107 million people, inaugurated its first democratically elected President in nearly two decades.

As Africans embark on this new course for their future, they said that they would like to be partners with us in the global economy. H.R. 434 responds to the change under way in Africa and proposes a framework for United States-African trade relations.

In particular, H.R. 434 promotes mutually beneficial trade partnerships with countries in the region committed to economic and political reform. The bill creates a U.S.-Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum, similar to the successful APEC model and the Asia-Pacific region, to facilitate regular trade and investment policy discussions.

It provides enhanced export opportunities for nonimport sensitive African products in the U.S. market through a 10-year extension of the Generalized System of Preferences and removal of statutory exclusions.

It requires the President to formulate a plan to enter into free trade agreements with countries meeting the bill's economic criteria.

H.R. 434 clearly puts our European and Asian competitors on notice that the United States will no longer cede market share to them in Africa. At present, our European competitors, who have capitalized on their historic relationship with the region and will reap the benefits of the proposed EU-South African free trade agreement, enjoy a 30 percent market share in Africa. Most recently, our Asian competitors have doubled their share of Africa's markets to 28 percent. Meanwhile, the U.S. market share in Africa has fallen to 6 percent.

The trade benefits in H.R. 434 are important because they will support and strengthen the democratic institutions emerging in sub-Saharan Africa. A stronger, more stable and prosperous Africa will be a better partner for security and peace in the region and a better ally in the fight against narcotics trafficking, international crime, terrorism, the spread of disease and environmental degradation.

A strong and stable sub-Saharan Africa constitutes a combined market for U.S. goods and services of 700 million people, more than all of Japan and the ASEAN nations combined. Already, U.S. exports to the region are 45 percent greater than our exports to all of the former Soviet Union. Yet our exports, which were valued at $6.7 billion in 1998, have just begun to tap into the rapidly growing markets of the region, some of which have posted double-digit growth for the past several years.

As the sponsor of H.R. 434, I believe that its enactment will establish sub-Saharan Africa as a priority in U.S. trade policy and will encourage countries in the region to redouble their economic and political reforms. H.R. 434 is also important to the advancement of a wide range of U.S. policy and security interests in the region and to codify many significant initiatives already under way in the administration.

I would remind my colleagues, also, that our legislation does nothing to impair any U.S. aid programs. That is totally separate and detached from what our bill attempts to do. We do not impair the continuation of U.S. aid where it is needed.

I would urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 434 today.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). He has borne what I consider to be some unfair slings and arrows in the course of advocating this most important bill. I also want to compliment my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with us to promote the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

I am supporting this bill for one simple reason. The countries in Africa want it. I think it would be the height of arrogance and extremely patronizing for those of us here to impose our will or to suggest that we know better for Africa than Africans do. If people are concerned about whether the trade will be fair, if people are concerned about whether the working conditions will be fair, I think it is reasonable to say, let the African countries and their leadership determine those issues, worker protection and the like.

It seems to me that this is a good bill for Africa that gives us an opportunity to trade with an area that we have unfortunately neglected. Make no mistake, however. This is not charity. This is not altruism. This bill is good for America. It opens up the potential for tremendous new markets in Africa. But it is fundamentally good for Africa. It will enable African countries to build on the reforms that are already taking place. It encourages those reforms. It will enable Africa to be more competitive in the new era, in 2005 when the WTO opens up duty-free zones. It will enable them to be competitive and productive.

Some will tell us that this is a threat to U.S. textile workers. That is not true. The fact of the matter is that the African component of textile manufacturing is extremely small, less than 1 percent of the U.S. market. We also have protections in this bill to ensure that import sensitive items are not brought in under the provisions of this legislation. For those who believe we will be hurting our textile markets, I think if we look at the bill, we find that that is not true.

There are some who say, ''Well, this bill will hurt African workers.'' Again not true. We have provisions to protect African workers. Let us not raise a higher standard for those workers than we do with other countries.

The bottom line is this bill is good for Africa. I urge its adoption.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as evolving nations move into the global economy and a major purpose of this bill is to help Africa do that, we have to look upon them as potential consumers but also as potential competitors. We have to look at the impact potentially on American jobs and businesses. We have to look at what are the rules of competition.

The main trade provision here spreads GSP to African nations, including textiles, and that is the most sensitive issue. So what are the rules of competition here? First of all, as has been mentioned, there is a provision that the President must certify that any product that is going to come in under GSP, including textiles, not be import sensitive. Secondly, there must be, I deeply believe this, labor market worker rights provisions in trade agreements. There is such in the GSP. The President has to consider in granting eligibility whether a Nation has taken steps or is taking steps to afford core worker rights, including the right to bargain collectively. Private parties can petition if GSP labor provisions are being abused, and 11 nations have had GSP treatment withdrawn from them because of that. Where competition is keener than would be true here, where labor markets are more developed than is true in sub-Saharan Africa, there should be a different standard applied, and I will fight for that.

I urge support. In this case it is a first step, a modest step, but it looks at the rules of competition as well as Africa as a potential consumer. We should support this bill and remember as we go on to other issues, we should keep in mind the rules of competition, including core worker rights.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) who serves on the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I note his superb leadership in this area. I note the superb leadership of the ranking Democrat on our subcommittee as well the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

There are two arguments against this bill, the first that it is really bad for Africa. The gentleman from Maryland was quite eloquent in making the case how wrong it is to apply such an assumption that the representatives of each African nation are selling their people short, that they do not care about worker exploitation, that somehow they do not care about environment. These are the assumptions one must be making if one says that the support of this legislation by every government in the African continent is somehow to be discounted.

As to the second argument that it hurts the United States, the gentleman from Maryland's argument was also quite persuasive. On what assumption do we base the fear that African nations are not reliable? On what assumption do we base the prejudice that an African nation will not be able to comply with its obligations under the trade agreements not to have massive transshipments? In our trading arrangements with other nations around the world, we assume that they honor their obligations, including the prohibitions against mislabeling and transshipments. Why do we throw this assumption out when we are dealing with Africa? It seems to me that the assumption is fair in this case, even if there were a much larger percentage of textiles than there is.

Lastly, let me conclude by pointing out that we give less in direct aid to Africa per capita than any other part of the globe with the possible exception of India depending how it is measured. This is not an aid bill. This is a bill to open up a reciprocal relationship of trade and respect. Other countries we give more than $30 per capita. To the people of sub-Saharan Africa, we give less than 17 cents per capita. Is that right? Is that fair?

If you wish to change it but you have constraints with the budget, at least open up trade, open up hope. That is what this bill does. I am proud to support it.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade for yielding me this time. It is a privilege for me to rise in support of this legislation.

America has an enormous stake in our long-term relationship with Africa, a relationship which can and must be mutually beneficial. Many will note that our experience in Africa since the colonial period in some respects has been disappointing. Despite our well-intentioned efforts in sending billions in foreign aid to this continent, poverty had over many years increased and economies had stagnated. Yet Africa has recently seen a modest but promising return to economic growth and a growing embrace of economic reforms and market capitalism. We need to encourage this.

By opening our markets and looking to Africa as a market for our goods, we can do more to lift Africa out of poverty and help build its economic self-sufficiency while at the same time increasing our exports and creating jobs right here in America. By passing this bill, we can buttress the economic reforms now being embraced by sub-Saharan Africa and stimulate much needed economic growth and investment.

The notion of Africa as an export market for America's products is not an exotic one. In the period between 1993 and 1997 in my own congressional district, the city of Erie benefited from $49 million in exports to Africa and the State of Pennsylvania currently ranks in the top 10 States in exports to the region.

Our investment in sub-Saharan Africa is a win-win situation that will promote stability in the region, increase economic prosperity and encourage development and growth. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this legislation which I believe is critical in shaping our long-term relationship with Africa.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, progress for African trade and growth can never take place unless there is first a recognition that Africa has as much promise as any other region in respect to long-term trade and commerce possibilities. Developing economies in Africa are natural markets for U.S. products and services. Recognition of Africa as a significant part of the global economy is long overdue. One of the principles advocated by the great radical organizer Saul Alinsky was that an aggrieved, neglected or oppressed group or nation must first command recognition before hope for progress can be ignited.

☐ 1130

For the 17 years that I have been in Congress, there has been no significant attention focused on African trade. Like many of my colleagues, I am the cosponsor of several additional measures related to Africa. Unfortunately, other than the foreign aid appropriations, this bill is probably the only African relevant bill that will reach the floor of the House in the 106th Congress.

Let me note the fact that some have charged that this legislation is as devastating as NAFTA. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I urge the full support for this landmark piece of legislation.

Progress for African trade and growth can never take place unless there is first recognition that Africa has as much promise as any other region with respect to long-term trade and commerce possibilities. Developing economies in Africa are natural markets for U.S. products and services. Recognition of Africa as a significant part of the global economy is long overdue. One of the principles advocated by the great radical organizer, Saul

Alinsky, was that an aggrieved, neglected, or oppressed group or nation must first command recognition before the hope for progress can be ignited.

For the seventeen years that I have been in Congress there has been no significant attention focused on African trade. This long overdue bill stands alone—and despite its imperfections and incompleteness, this legislation deserves our full support. Hope for Africa begins with today's recognition of Africa as a deserving trade partner.

Like many of my colleagues I am the cosponsor of several additional measures related to Africa. Unfortunately, other than the foreign aid appropriations, this bill is probably the only Africa relevant bill that will reach the floor of the House in the 106th Congress.

Let me also note the fact that some have charged that this legislation is as devastating as NAFTA. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the much highlighted textile industry the Sub-Saharan African countries have less than one percent. On the other hand, China has almost 10 percent of the U.S. textile market. In the seventeen years that I have served on the Education and Labor Committee no union has yet complained to me about losing textile industry jobs to China.

Just transfer one percent of the textile trade from China to Africa and you will do nothing to hurt American jobs—you merely maintain the status quo. Why are the same people who are yelling about trade with the infant economies of Africa so wimpish or silent on trade with China.

In the final analysis we have a problem here similar to the one faced by King Solomon when two women claiming to be the mother of one baby came before him. There are some who are proclaiming that, never mind the pleas of the African leaders, it would be better to vote this bill down and do nothing for Africa. Following the wisdom of King Solomon, it is clear that these negative opponents do not understand what is best for Africa. I urge a yes vote on this landmark legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding this time to me, for his hard work and commitment to Africa and to America.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 434. This is one of the most difficult no votes which I again will cast today, but I have attempted to dig beneath the surface of this legislation and analyze what its true impact will be.

I was compelled to vote against this bill when it was examined in the House Committee on International Relations. As one who has historically encouraged and worked for a comprehensive trade and development policy for Africa, this is not a vote which I cast lightly. In opposing this legislation I part company with the President I strongly support and a number of congressional colleagues for whom I have the utmost respect.

Now very troubling to me, the African Growth and Opportunity Act fails to respect African sovereignty. It threatens the rights of African nations to determine for themselves the economic priorities that are in the best interests of their people. H.R. 434 continues to carry harsh eligibility requirements. To obtain trade benefits, countries must reorder their spending priorities to suit the preferences of foreign investors and the International Monetary Fund.

Now, considering the mystery and the destructive nature of many of the IMF structural adjustment programs in Africa, this eligibility requirement is one which I cannot in good conscience support.

Other provisions in this legislation require countries to reduce taxes for corporations while at the same time cut domestic spending which will inevitably lead to further reductions in vital health care and education programs which are already starved for funds.

Africa has been neglected for too long, and as I listened to this debate, the supporters of this bill say that it is a modest first step. Well, it should be a major first step. It should not be symbolic, as many are saying. Africa deserves better.

In our enthusiasm to promote American business opportunities and forge new relationships with countries in Africa, we must remain focused on the paramount need at hand to support a free and fair trade policy which benefits Africa and America.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), vice chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As a cosponsor, I believe that the expanding trade and foreign investment in Africa is going to be a highly effective way to promote sustainable economic development on the continent. By providing African nations incentives and opportunities to compete in the global economy and by reinforcing African nations' own efforts to institute market-oriented economic reforms, this bill will help African countries provide jobs, opportunities and a future for their citizens.

Only through dramatically improved levels of trade and investment will Africans fully develop the skills, institutions, and infrastructure to successfully participate in the global marketplace and significantly raise their standard of living.

It is true that trade liberalization cannot remedy all of Africa's woes; however, that is why our overall strategy for sub-Saharan Africa is a combination of trade and aid working together. To those who criticize H.R. 434, charging it does not provide sufficient immediate aid to Africa's poor or for protecting Africa's environment, this Member would remind his colleagues that just 8 months ago the Congress enacted and the President signed into law the Africa Seeds of Hope legislation.

This food security initiative, which this Member sponsored, refocuses U.S. resources on African agriculture and rural development and is aimed at helping the 76 percent of the sub-Saharan people who are small farmers. This law, along with other current U.S. aid programs such as the Development Fund for Africa are the aid components of our African development strategy. With the passage of this legislation, we will have a balanced trade and aid program.

Frankly, I am mystified by some of the arguments against this legislation. I refer my colleagues who are opposed to reexamine the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) during the debate on the rule and to listen to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) who spoke just a few moments ago. The gentleman from Maryland reminded us that all of the Africa nations really are supportive of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time to complete this strategy and approve this desperately needed complementary trade component. This is the crucial missing component. I urge my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentelman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

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

This is a very important bill. For too long Africa has been treated as still colonies of many of our European allies. For too long their resources have been exploited by some Asians who have very little regard for the natural resources, including the magnificent rain forests and the creatures that are now endangered that walk this earth in Africa.

With the investment, American investment, we will be exporting one of our most valuable commodities, democracy, human rights, our appreciation for the environment. This is what will be exported into Africa, and with the importation in Africa and reaching out to Africa, their economies will grow; and with their economies, the democracies will also be more firmly put in place and their appreciation for their free-market system that has served this country so well.

These are the values that I believe we will bring to Africa, and African exports and the rich resources of Africa will be of great benefit to our country.

I traveled to Gabon with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means just last year and was very much impressed with the progress that Gabon has made, President Bongo, with his reelection. We had observers on the scene during the reelection. Members of their Parliament are visiting the United States at this time and I believe are with us this morning.

So I would urge a yes vote on this most important piece of legislation. Let us not continue to turn our back on Africa.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), an author of the bill and member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. JEFFERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to this chart. Those who say they want to help African workers and who want to deny the entry of African textiles to the American market cannot have it both ways. This shows how little Africa is involved now in importations to our country: just four-tenths of 1 percent, this big blue area and this little sliver of red. This little sliver of red is African imports to this country.

While it does not do anything in our market, makes us a slight dent here, one we can almost not notice, in Africa it is going to mean a lot to African workers. It is going to mean thousands of jobs there on the continent of Africa. It is the one place where Africa now has existing industrial capacity. The industrial revolution passed over Africa, or it was passed over Africa, if my colleagues will, and this is a way now to build in Africa the industrial base there around the textile industry.

If this is not done for Africa now, this bill will not mean very much in the shot term for African workers or for people that are off to the continent. So, for those who want to help African workers, let us make sure we do something about letting textiles in this country. We can do something to help the entry-level worker in Africa get a job and build the industrial base in that country.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in this Chamber just a few months ago, the President of the United States stood right here; and he said in his State of the Union address that ''trade has divided us and divided Americans outside this Chamber for too long. Somehow we have to find common ground on which business and workers and environmentalists and farmers and government can stand together.''

President Clinton continued: ''We must ensure that ordinary citizens in all countries actually benefit from trade, and we applaud it, a trade that promotes,'' he said, ''the dignity of work and the rights of workers and protects the environment. We have got to put a human face on the global economy, and then we proposed the old face on the global economy.''

I would love for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) or the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) or any of the sponsors of the bill to show me specifically in H.R. 434 where that common ground is. Show me where multinationals from the United States that locate in sub-Saharan Africa and take advantage of these trade provisions, that they have to hire African workers. Show me how we have provisions in this bill to keep the Chinese from taking advantage of African workers by importing Chinese workers into sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 12, 1999]

A 'GROTESQUE' GAP BETWEEN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY'S WINNERS AND LOSERS

(By R.C. Longworth)

As the global economy grows, rich nations are getting richer than ever, and poor ones are stuck in shantytowns on the outskirts of the global village.

''Global inequalities in income and living standards have reached grotesque proportions,'' the UN Development Program said in its annual global overview, the Human Development Report.

For instance:

The richest countries, such as the United States, have 20 percent of the world's people but 86 percent of its income, 91 percent of its Internet users, 82 percent of its exports and 74 percent of its telephone lines. The 20 percent living in the poorest countries, such as Ethiopia and Laos, have about 1 percent of each.

The three riches officers of Microsoft—Bill Gates, Paul Allen and Steve Ballmer—have more assets, nearly $140 billion, than the combined gross national product of the 43 least-developed countries and their 600 million people.

The United States, meanwhile, has more computers than the rest of the world combined. Lesser-developed countries are not likely to catch up any time soon: the same computer that costs a month's wages for the average American takes eight year's income from the average resident of Bangladesh.

The 200 richest people in the world more than doubled their net worth between 1994 and 1998. But in nearly half the world's countries, per capita incomes are lower than they were 10 or 20 years ago. Some of these are oil-producing nations hit by the long slump in oil prices, but many are in sub-Saharan Africa, where per capita income has fallen to $518 from $661 in 1980.

In 1960, the richest fifth of the world's people had 30 times as much income as the poorest fifth. By 1997, that proportion had more than doubled, to 7–1.

The key to a solution to these problems, the UNDP said, is not to stamp out the global economy but to embrace it with the rules and institutions that will ensure it serves people and communities, not just markets and their manipulators.

''Competitive markets may be the best guarantee of efficiency but not necessarily of equity,'' it said. ''Markets are neither the first nor the last word in human development.

''Many activities and goods that are critical to human development are provided outside the market, but these are being squeezed by the pressures of global competition.

''When the market goes too far in dominating social and political outcomes, the opportunities and rewards of globalization spread unequally and inequitably—concentrating power and wealth in a select group of people, nations and corporations, marginalizing the others.

''The challenge,'' the report said, ''is not to stop the expansion of global markets. The challenge is to find the rules and institutions for stronger governance . . . to preserve the advantage of global markets and competition but also to provide enough space for human, community and environmental resources to ensure that globalization works for people, not just for profits.''

The gap between people, like the one between nations, also is growing in the global economy, the UNDP report said. Inequality is growing both in industrialized nations—especially in the United States, Britain and Sweden, it said—and in newly industrializing countries, such as China and the formerly communist countries of Eastern Europe.

One result of globalization, it said, is that the road to wealth—the control of production, patents and technology—is increasingly dominated by a few technology—is increasingly dominated by a few countries and companies.

Of all the countries in the world, only 10, including the United States, account for 84 percent of global research-and-development spending. Businesses and institutions in the same 10 control 95 percent of all patents issued by the U.S. government over the past 20 years, it said.

Among corporations, the top 10 controlled 86 percent of the telecommunications market, 85 percent of pesticides, 70 percent of computers and 60 percent of veterinary medical products, it said.

The major countries and the global corporations may have earned their dominance, but, the report said, this monopoly of power is cutting poorer nations off from a share of the economic pie and, often, from decent health care and education.

''The privatization and concentration of technology are going too far,'' the report said. ''Corporations define research agendas. . . . Money talks, not need. Cosmetic drugs and slow-ripening tomatoes come higher on the priority list than drought-resistant crops or a vaccine against malaria.''

Many new technologies, ''from new drugs to better seeds,'' are priced too high for poor nations, it said. Global patent laws, intended to protect intellectual property, are blocking the ability of developing countries to develop their own products.

Even within the Third World, inequality is sharp. Thailand has more cellular phones and Bulgaria more Internet users than all of Africa except South Africa, the report said.

The report was not all gloom and doom. Even as gaps between nations grow and some countries slide backward, the quality of life for many of the world's poor is improving, it said.

Between 1975 and 1997, life expectancy in Third World countries rose to 62 years from 53, adult literacy rates climbed to 76 percent from 48 percent, child mortality rates to 85 per 1,000 live births from 149, and some countries—Costa Rica, Fiji, Jordan, Uruguay and others—''have overcome severe levels of human poverty.''

The UNDP report said uneven and unequal development around the world is not sustainable and risks sinking the global economy in a backlash of public resentment.

Without global governance that incorporates a ''common core of values, standards and attitudes, a widely felt sense of responsibility and obligations,'' the major nations and corporations face trade wars and uncontrolled financial volatility, it said, with the Asian financial crisis of the past two years only the first of many upheavals.

At the moment, new rules and regulations are being written in talks at the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund and other powerful global bodies. But these talks are ''too narrow,'' the report said, because they focus on financial stability while ''neglecting broader human concerns such as persistent global poverty, growing inequality between and within countries, exclusion of poor people and countries, and persisting human-rights abuses.''

They are also ''too geographically unbalanced,'' with an unhealthy domination by the U.S. and its allies.''

The UNDP report called instead for a ''global architecture'' that would include:

A global central bank to act as a lender of last resort to strapped countries and to help regulate finance markets.

A global investment trust to moderate flows of foreign capital in and out of Third World countries and to raise development funds by taxing global pollution or short-term investments.

New rules for the World Trade Organization, including anti-monopoly powers to enable it to keep global corporations from dominating industries.

New rules on global patents that would keep the patent system from blocking the access of Third World countries to development, knowledge or health care.

New talks on a global investment treaty that, unlike talks that failed last year, would include development countries and respect local laws.

More flexible monetary rules that would enable developing countries to impose capital controls to protect their economies.

A global code of conduct for multinational corporation, to encourage them to follow the kind of labor and environmental laws that exist in their home countries. The report praised voluntary codes adopted in Asia by Disney World and Mattel, the toy company.

The leading industrial nations already are considering new global rules on investment, banking and trade. The UNDP report, in effect, endorsed these efforts but urged that they be broadened to include the needs of poorer nations.

INTRODUCING H.R. 772, ''HOPE FOR AFRICA''

(By Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr.)

To overcome a nearly 400 year legacy of unregulated business, investment and trade that gave us slavery, colonialism and widespread human and economic exploitation, today we introduce H.R. 772, ''The HOPE for Africa Act of 1999,'' based on Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment as the basis for a new respectful and mutually beneficial human and economic relationship.

Unregulated business and investment, structural adjustment programs built on debt service, is the status quo or worse. This status quo formula has given Africa: wealth in the hands of a few; followed inevitably by civil wars (both ethnic and tribal) over food and economic security; undemocratic regimes; and economic and political instability.

We support bilateral, multilateral and international trade. We are not economic isolationists or economic protectionists. By introducing this legislation today, we seek to establish a new principle that should underlie every trade bill in the United States—that the benefits of trade must be shared widely by the majority of the common working people in every participating society, not just benefit the business and financial interests of an elite few.

We support business and investment in Africa. Indeed, our business development and trade provisions are more expansive than the provisions in Rep. Phil Crane's African Growth and Opportunity Act. HOPE for Africa insures that the average African worker will be paid a minimum wage; has the right to organize for their own protection and economic security; has the right to work in safe and healthy working conditions; can produce goods and protect the environment at the same time so business development and economic growth can be sustained indefinitely; and so the common people of Africa might be able to work their way out of their poverty and underdeveloped condition with dignity.

The HOPE for Africa legislation provides trade remedies that can be embraced by both working Americans and working Africans because it raises the living standards of both. It does not raise some African living standards at the expense of lowering some American living standards. It is also good for long-term business development and economic investment because average workers on both continents will be able to buy the goods and services that they produce and, in the process, build a fairer and more perfect economic world.

First, H.R. 772 affirms each African nation's right to economic self-determination. The HOPE for Africa legislation is built on the principles and goals developed by African finance ministers in cooperation with the Organization or African Unity, and with input by African workers' organizations such as COSATU in South Africa.

Second, H.R. 772 offers a solution to Sub-Saharan Africa's crushing $230 billion debt—unconditional, comprehensive debt forgiveness. Excluding South Africa, with upwards of 20 percent of sub-Saharan nations' export earnings going to debt service, few resources are left to devote to development and urgent local needs.

Third, H.R. 772 addresses the AIDS crisis by replenishing and targeting assistance from the Development Fund for Africa for AIDS education and treatment programs; making it U.S. policy to assist Sub-Saharan African countries in efforts to make needed pharmaceuticals and medical technologies widely available; and prohibiting the use of U.S. funds to undermine African intellectual property and competition policies that are designed to increase the availability of medications. Since the beginning of the AIDS epidemic, 83 percent of AIDS deaths have occurred in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Fourth, H.R. 772 restores Africa's budget line item for foreign aid with a set guaranteed amount, not to decline below 1994 levels. This would restore parity for Africa with U.S. foreign aid treatment of other vital regions. Currently, Africa is the only region not a line item in the budget.

Finally, President Clinton says we must put a new and human face on trade—and I agree. But the new face must be based on a new foundation. The policies regarding Africa that the Congress sets now will deeply affect the economic future of the continent and, thus, the future of the African people for decades to come. With such high stakes, it is vital that we get the initial policy right. With this in mind, I submit H.R. 772, which has the broad-based support of African and U.S. development, trade and economic experts and also organizations in Africa and the U.S., representing the interests of the majority of the people who will be affected.

A HUMAN FACE ON THE GLOBAL ECONOMY—THE HOPE FOR AFRICA ACT OF 1999

(By Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.)

President Clinton in his State of the Union Address said: ''. . . trade has divided us, and divided Americans outside this chamber, for too long. Somehow we have to find a common ground on which business and workers and environmentalists and farmers and government can stand together . . . . We must ensure that ordinary citizens in all countries actually benefit from trade—(applause)—a trade that promotes the dignity of work, and the rights of workers, and protects the environment . . . . We have got to put a human face on the global economy. (Applause.)''

I agree completely. However, the only piece of legislation mentioned in the President's Address, and the first trade bill being pushed by the administration, is the Republican-sponsored African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), H.R. 434—which is a continuation of the old face of trade.

The new face of trade must be based on a new foundation. That is why I introduced a Democratic alternative, H.R. 772 ''The Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment (HOPE) for Africa Act of 1999.''

The old face of the AGOA has been dubbed ''NAFTA for Africa'' by the trade press, and represents the failed status quo trade policy that has lost the support of the American people and was rejected last fall by Congress. Like Fast Track, the AGOA's chief sponsor is conservative corporate-oriented Rep. Phil Crane (R–IL).

When this legislation was introduced last year, I called it the ''Africa Recolonization Act'' and joined 185 of my colleagues in opposing it. Opposition to the AGOA is widespread in Africa. The Congress of South African Trade Unions declared this bill worse than no bill at all. Indeed, South African President Nelson Mandela declared the bill ''not acceptable to us'' in a joint news conference with President Clinton.

This bill is not the first time that developed countries have sought to do business with Africa. Slavery and colonialization were long-standing international commercial policy with Africa, and the results are the desperate poverty, environmental devastation and civil unrest plaguing Africa today. There is a long history of U.S.-Africa economic relations that must be overcome.

My HOPE for Africa bill promotes sustainable, equitable development in Africa, and fair and mutually beneficial trade between our two regions. Specifically, HOPE represents the new approach to international commercial policy that the President says he is seeking: access for African countries to U.S. markets; broad benefits to ordinary Africans; corporate adherence to labor, human rights and environmental standards; employment of African workers; promotion of African capital accumulation and investment partnership; emphasis on establishing small and medium-sized businesses in Africa; and partnerships between Africans and Americans.

HOPE provides for mutually beneficial trade by taking a holistic approach to interlocking trade, investment, business facilitation, debt relief and aid elements that are vital to any successful economic relationship between sub-Saharan Africa and the U.S. Indeed, the bill is based on the principles of the Lagos Plan on economic development created by the African finance ministers and the Organization of African Unity.

Moreover, HOPE includes the purchase, at the significantly discounted market rate, and cancellation of African debt which has a face value of $230 billion and annual debt service that devours over 20% of all African export earnings. Cancellation of this debt would provide a clean slate—and working domestic credit markets and resources for education, infrastructure and health—for African countries facing the challenges of the global economy. HOPE also targets U.S. foreign aid toward uses with broad public benefits, such as the prevention and treatment of the AIDS epidemic ravaging Africa. The AGOA does not even mention AIDS.

The AGOA extends short-lived trade ''benefits'' for the nations of sub-Saharan Africa. In exchange for these crumbs from globalization's table, the African nations must pay a huge price: adherence to economic policies that serve the interests of foreign creditors, multinational corporations and financial speculators at the expense of the majority of Africans.

Specifically, the AGOA requires sub-Saharan Africa to adopt a range of policies straight out of the International Monetary Fund's discredited play book. These policies include cuts in spending on health care and education, orienting food production away from meeting domestic needs and toward exports, and divesting natural resources and precious public assets to foreign investors. No other region's right to economic self-determination is dismissed so cavalierly by U.S. policy makers.

AGOA provides no relief from Africa's crushing debt burden, and does nothing to ensure that African workers and businesses, as opposed to foreign corporations, will enjoy the benefits of expanded trade.

Whose interests will the AGOA advance? Look at the coalition promoting it—a corporate who's who of oil giants, banking and insurance interests, as well as apparel firms seeking one more place to locate their low-paying sweatshops. Some of these corporations are already infamous in Africa for their disregard for the environment and human rights.

Africa is a region of tremendous human creativity, vast natural and cultural wealth, and enormous economic potential. More than 750 million people live in sub-Saharan Africa, compared to 250 million in the United States. The standard of living for most of Africa's people has been falling. The region's per capita income is less than $500 annually—versus $752 in 1980 when the IMF first began to work its will on African economic policy.

How shall we overcome our exploitative history with Africa? By the AGOA or by HOPE? It should be clear. AGOA ignores the needs of nations it is ostensibly designed to assist. HOPE embodies the priorities African nations themselves have identified. HOPE represents the new approach which places the needs of people ahead of narrow corporate interests and the dictates of economic dogma. HOPE is the human face on the global economy that President Clinton says he seeks.

THE TRADE DEBATE AND HOPE FOR AFRICA

(By Robert L. Borosage)

In 1999, the historic debate about US trade policy and the global economy will once again be joined. Economic collapse abroad and political opposition at home have shattered the Washington trade consensus. In his State of the Union address, President Clinton admitted as much, suggesting the need for a new dialogue on trade.

The first round of that debate will take place in African trade policy. The HOPE for Africa Bill, introduced by Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr. and co-sponsored by an ever-growing number of House members, contains the principles of a new direction for US trade policy generally. It contrasts starkly with the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, which is essentially a NAFTA for Africa. The following outlines the political context and stakes of that argument.

I. THE WASHINGTON CONSENSUS IS NO MORE

As President Clinton has warned, the world is gripped with the worst financial crisis since the 1930s. 40% of the world economy is in recession. Millions of Asians have been thrust into poverty. Russia has gone belly up. The contagion now engulfs Brazil, and threatens Latin America's economies. With West Germany in decline, Europe also now experiences declining growth that could lead into a recession.

Even in the United States, an island of prosperity in a sea of trouble, the effects are being felt. Manufacturing industries were in recession for much of last year. Exports declined; the trade deficit has hit new and unsustainable height. The most efficient steel plants in the world have been forced to lay off thousands of steelworkers. Layoff announcements last year were the worst of the 1990s. Even Federal Reserve Chair Alan Greenspan has warned of the dangers posed by the soaring trade deficits and the global crisis.

While the international policy elite struggles to contain the crisis and worries about its effects on globalization, it is apparent that globalization is the source, not the victim of the contagion. For over two decades, global corporations and banks have forged a global economy. They wrote the rules. Workers, consumers, and environmentalists were not invited to the table. They systematically pushed to dismantle controls over corporations, capital and currencies. The short term pain was worth it, they argued, for we would all reap the benefits of faster growth and global markets.

Now the returns are in. The world is plagued, as Joseph Stiglitz, chief economist for the World Bank has reported, with financial crises of increasing severity and frequency. Moreover, as a series of authoritative studies have documented, the defensive measures adopted by countries to avoid the crisis have produced far slower growth and greater inequality.

In the wake of the global crisis, this policy cannot be sustained. Across Asia, countries are scrambling to protect their people, to limit the brutal impact of speculative tides.

And in the United States, even at the height of the recovery, most Americans remain skeptical about the benefits of trade. The failure of the NAFTA accord reinforces those attitudes. Over the last two years, a coalition of unions, consumers, and environmentalists joined with isolationists on the right to block fast track trade authority. As AFL–CIO President John Sweeney has said, ''the Washington consensus isn't even a consensus in Washington anymore.'' It is time for a new direction.

II. THE CURRENT DEFAULT

This reality is increasingly recognized in the rhetoric of global leaders. Last summer, President Clinton warned the World Trade Organization that the global economy had to work for working families or it could not be sustained. He called for a new effort to build core labor standards and environmental protections into the global trading rules. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin has called for a ''new architecture'' for global finance. British Prime Minister Tony Blair has gone further, suggesting the need for a new Bretton Woods, presumably a systemic attempt to bring capital and currency speculation under greater control. Billionaire financier George Soros has demanded action to stave off what he calls ''the capitalist threat.''

Yet the bold rhetoric has not yet been reflected in policy. The contrast between changing rhetoric and static policy grows wider as the crisis continues to spread.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act expresses this inertia. Modeled on the NAFTA Accord, encompassing the harsh preconditions that the IMF enforced on Asian countries (and later admitted were excessive), it represents the failed policies of the past, not the new direction for the future.

III. THE EMERGING ALTERNATIVE: HOPE FOR AFRICA

The HOPE for Africa legislation, based upon extensive discussions with worker, scholars and activists in the African community, offers a small ''d'' democratic, internationalist alternative to the NAFTA model. It provides the beginnings of a new direction for US trade policy, and responds to the president's call for a new dialogue on the rules that should guide the global economy. Core elements include;

Debt relief to enable nations to pursue independent paths to growth and development. In contrast, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act offers no relief from the crippling debt burdens that force countries to open their economies, dismantle controls on capital, sacrifice food crops for export crops, and lock themselves in a constricting development straight jacket. Yet the record shows that countries do far better if they increase investment and sustain democratic freedoms while pursuing their own course to development.

Secure access to aid targeted on human needs. Poor nations need investment in education, health care, and other core human needs. By providing a floor underneath aid levels and by targeting human needs, HOPE for Africa provides nations with a basis upon which to plan. This contrasts sharply with the ''NAFTA for Africa'' model, which guarantees nothing and will end up providing aid that will go to repay foreign creditors.

Preferential access to the US market, but only if the countries choose to meet core human rights and environmental standards. Countries that decide to adhere to their own international commitments—to core international labor rights, to environmental protections, respect for other human rights—can gain preferred access to the US market. This contrast sharply with the NAFTA–WTO model that protects property rights but not labor rights, protects speculators but not the environment. One would lift standards up; the other would drive them down.

Preferred access limited to companies that actually serve to add employment, business opportunity and production within Africa, as opposed to multinationals content to use Africa as a transshipment point for goods made elsewhere.

The contrast with current policy is apparent. Today the US offers preferential access to its markets to countries routinely, whatever their record on labor rights or environmental protections. The ''NAFTA for Africa'' bill sustains such preferences on the condition that nations enforce IMF-like austerity and privatization dictates.

IV. THE COMING POLITICAL DEBATE: NO MORE BUSINESS AS USUAL

With the first signs that the Asian nations may be emerging from the global crisis and the hope that the Europe and US will escape much of its impact, the temptation is to return to business as usual. Already the Business Roundtable has announced a public relations campaign to educate Americans on the benefits of trade and the need for fast track trade authority. The administration is pushing for a new round in global trade talks, and possibly for China's accession to the World Trade Organization. With the support of much of the Wall Street-multinational corporate lobby and the administration in hand, Republican leaders began this year assuming that they could pass the ''NAFTA for Africa bill quickly with bipartisan'' support.

But as the growing support for the HOPE for Africa alternatives shows, the old consensus cannot be put back together again. Attempts to impose it will meet ever-greater opposition at home and abroad. And if the US economy slows and unemployment rises, the failure to define a new course that works for working people may generate a harsh xenophobic and nationalist reaction.

HOPE for Africa points the way to a new direction, one grounded in respecting independent national paths to development and growth, while protecting core human values. If frames a debate that is vital to working people a home and abroad. It deserves more than a hearing. It deserves support and passage.

PACE,
Fairfax, VA, March 15, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 330,000 members of PACE, the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, I am writing to urge you to support the HOPE for Africa Act, H.R. 772. This is the first time in our collective memories that the House has considered a bill that tries to ensure that any wealth generated by increased trade is shared by workers in all affected countries. The bill does so in part by including strong workers' rights provisions. The HOPE for Africa Act contrasts sharply with the African Growth and Opportunity Act, H.R. 434, which is almost identical to H.R. 1432, which passed the House last year.

The HOPE for Africa Act would expand trade between the U.S. and the countries of sub-Saharan Africa more than the Growth and Opportunity Act, but without damaging the U.S. economy. It would do so by increasing market access for Lome Treaty products, for which the U.S. is not a competing supplier. HOPE would also shift apparel quota from China to Africa, rather than adding additional imports to an already glutted U.S. clothing market to the detriment of workers here. Most importantly, HOPE includes strong language against transshipment of goods and use of guest workers, both aimed at seeing that its benefits accrue to African workers, rather than to Asian producers.

H.R. 772 does all of this without imposing the counterproductive conditionalities of H.R. 434. Instead of requiring African countries to reshape their economies to serve U.S. investors, HOPE recognizes the right of African countries to shape their own economic development plans.

Finally, HOPE for Africa provides the financial assistance that African nations will need to be able to participate in the world economy. It restores the budget line item for African aid. The failure of African Growth and Opportunity to do this leaves Africa as the only region of the world with no guaranteed annual level of American aid. HOPE also provides relief from Africa's crushing $230 billion burden of foreign debt. No debt relief is contained in the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

The House has a unique opportunity to forge a new consensus on trade policy, one that serves workers as well as employers. We urge you to become a cosponsor of the HOPE for Africa Act, H.R. 772, and to work to enact it into law.

Thank you for consideration of our views on this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

PAULA R. LITTLES,
Director, Citizenship-Legislative Department.

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 30, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I write to share with you a letter written by the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) on behalf of H.R. 772, the ''HOPE for Africa Act.'' As you may know textile manufacturing jobs are often transplanted to overseas markets with lax worker protections and wage rates. Consequently, many working men and women in America find themselves down-sized, outsourced and left behind. Yet instead of taking a protectionist position on international trade issues in Africa, UNITE has chosen to support the ''HOPE for Africa Act'' because ''for the first time in [their] collective memories,'' there is a trade bill being offered that ''tries to ensure that any wealth generated by increased trade is shared by workers in all affected countries.'' If you would like more information about the ''HOPE for Africa'' act, please contact me or have staff contact my Legislative Director, George Seymore, at 5–0773 or george@jackson.house.gov.

Sincerely,

JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

UNITE!
March 1, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 250,000 members of UNITE, the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees, we are writing to urge you to support the HOPE for Africa Act, H.R. 772. This is the first time in our collective memories that the House has considered a bill that tries to ensure that any wealth generated by increased trade is shared by workers in all affected countries. The bill does so in part by including strong workers rights provisions. The HOPE for Africa Act contrasts sharply with the African Growth and Opportunity Act, H.R. 434, which is almost identical to H.R. 1432, which passed the House last year.

The HOPE for Africa Act would expand trade between the U.S. and the countries of sub-Saharan Africa more than the Growth and Opportunity Act, but without damaging the U.S. economy. It would do so by increasing market access for Lome Treaty products, for which the U.S. is not a competing supplier. HOPE would also shift apparel quota from China to Africa, rather than adding additional imports to an already glutted U.S. clothing market to the detriment of workers here. Most important, HOPE includes strong language against transshipment of goods and use of guest workers, both aimed at seeing that its benefits accrue to African workers, rather than to Asian producers.

H.R. 772 does all of this without imposing the counterproductive conditionalities of H.R. 434. Instead of requiring African countries to reshape their economies to serve U.S. investors, HOPE recognizes the right of African countries to shape their own economic development plans.

Finally, HOPE for Africa provides the financial assistance that African nations will need to be able to participate in the world economy. It restores the budget line item for African aid. The failure of African Growth and Opportunity to do this leaves Africa as the only region of the world with no guaranteed annual level of American aid. HOPE also provides relief from Africa's crushing $230 billion burden of foreign debt. No debt relief is contained in Growth and Opportunity.

The House has a unique opportunity to forge a new consensus on trade policy, one that serves workers as well as employers. We urge you to become a cosponsor of the HOPE for Africa Act, H.R. 772, and to work to enact it into law.

Sincerely,

ANN HOFFMAN,
Legislative Director.

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA

NIGERIA: OIL IN TROUBLED WATERS—WITH A WEEK TO GO BEFORE NIGERIA'S ELECTION, ROBERT CORZINE AND WILLIAM WALLIS VISIT THE TURBULENT OIL DELTA

If only that were true. In recent weeks, dozens of young men from the Ijaw tribe have been killed by Nigerian army bullets as they demonstrated for a bigger share of the oil wealth produced by foreign companies in the delta.

Four years after the execution of the writer Ken Saro-Wiwa, who campaigned for the rights of the delta's Ogoni people, the region is again teetering on the edge of open rebellion against the federal government in faraway Abuja.

The conflict also threatens to divide the communities of the delta, as young activists challenge the authority of more cautious traditional leaders. Foreign oil companies such as Royal Dutch/Shell, which operate on behalf of the Nigerian state, are already in the line of fire. Militant groups have orchestrated kidnappings and closed oil installations in the state of Bayelsa.

Saro-Wiwa's militant message has been embraced by many of the region's minority tribes. The Ijaw—Nigeria's fourth largest tribe—have even resurrected Egbesu, their ancient god of war, to support their cause. ''Egbesu Boys'' recently marched into Yenagoa, the capital of Bayelsa, wearing only black shorts and holding white candles in a peaceful protest. But clubs can easily replace candles, and it was armed Egbesu Boys who died in the fighting with soldiers in Yenagoa.

Oil wealth is at the root of the tensions in the delta. Nowhere in the world do so many of the world's poorest people rub shoulders with some of its richest multinationals.

In their reed huts and tiny canoes, the Ijaws are dwarfed and encircled by towering gas flares and the pipelines that criss-cross the meandering creeks and rivers of the delta.

Canoes carved from local trees and designed for the placid waters of the mangrove swamps are regularly tipped over in the wake of orange speedboats ferrying oil workers to and from installations.

''When you see Shell workers and the installations they live in, and our swamp where the people are wallowing, you cannot be happy,'' a youth leader says.

Dragging his hand in the water from the side of a boat, he collects a rainbow film of oil on his dark skin. He says it is from an untreated spill. He is one of many young men in the delta who believe that oil leaks from ageing pipes—and not over-fishing—have choked the life from the once-fish-filled waters.

In one incident, he recalls, a loose bolt in a connecting pipe sent a 30-foot jet of oil over a village at the Santa Barbara crossing. For 24 hours, it spewed out a thick layer of oil, covering huts, fishing nets, cooking utensils and the small periwinkle snails that substitute for fish if the catch is poor.

''The only fish we can find here now are small and bony. We call them 'broke-marriage' because their flesh melts into the soup and husbands accuse their wives of feeding it to another man,'' says an old woman.

Local resentment against oil companies has made large parts of the delta no-go areas for foreign oil men, who risk being kidnapped or attacked by angry villagers.

''Arresting oil company boats is one of the few ways the Ijaw can gain the federal government's attention,'' says Antony Ikonibo, paramount ruler of the Akassa clan, a collection of 50 fishing villages and settlements near the mouth of the Nunn River.

In Khongo, the main village in Akassa, the signs of neglect are everywhere.

The jungle has reclaimed the high school, built by a civilian government in the 1970s. Goats sleep in one of the few classrooms still in use. In the evening, villagers gather around a muddy pool that serves as the main water supply. There is no electricity. Concrete slabs intended to protect the village from floods lie abandoned on the riverbank, the contractor having pocketed the money and abandoned the project.

Although the residents of the delta are united in the demands for a long-awaited share of the oil wealth, the emergence of militant groups and their increasingly aggressive tactics have divided communities.

''If we're not careful, soon the traditional leaders will be the target as it happened in Ogoniland,'' says Chief Ikonibo.

''There they were appealing for calm but the youths thought they were taking money [from oil companies] and so they butchered them.''

Many residents say it would be a tragedy if a struggle directed against a remote and distant government claimed many of its victims from within the neglected communities themselves.

But as one young man in Khongo noted: ''If a man from the Delta is on the wrong side, he'll die like a fly.''

TRANSAFRICA,
Washington, DC, February 15, 1999.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing in strong support of the Human Rights Opportunity Partnership and Empowerment for Africa Act of 1999 (''HOPE for Africa Act''), soon to be introduced by Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr. This bill would promote sustainable economic development and democratic governance in Africa as a means of securing for that continent maximum socioeconomic benefits from its myriad economic relationships with the United States public and private sectors.

The Hope Act was developed over several months of meetings with a variety of grassroots organizations, both African and American. The Act, among other things: describes the status of Africa at the dawn of the new millennium; cancels Africa's official U.S. debt; addresses the role of sovereignty in the conduct of mutually beneficial relations between nations; re-establishes a line-item for aid to Africa in the U.S. Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, and strongly encourages Export-Import Bank and OPIC involvement with small, female and minority-owned businesses.

Thus far, members who have announced their intention to co-sponsor the HOPE Act are:

House Minority Whip, David Bonior (D–MI); Congressional Black Caucus Chair, Jim Clyburn (D–SC); Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney (D–GA); Congresswoman Barbara Lee (D–CA); Congressman William Delahunt (D–MA); Congressman Elijah Cummings (D–MD); Congressman Dennis Kucinich (D–OH); Congresswoman Carolyn Kilpatrick (D–MI); Congresswoman Sheila Jackson-Lee (D–TX); Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky (D–IL); Congressman Sherrod Brown (D–OH); Congressman Lane Evans (D–IL); Congressman John Conyers (D–MI); Congressman George Miller (D–CA).

On March 11, 1998, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill designed to authorize new trade and investment policies towards sub-Saharan Africa. The Senate failed to pass companion bill S. 778.

H.R. 1432 would have imposed on Africa the most harmful conditionalities of the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The Act, like many structural adjustment programs, would have bankrupted local African enterprises, increased Africa's dependency on food imports, gutted vitally needed social services, reduced government expenditures on health and education, and widened the gap between rich and poor. Even President Nelson Mandela, standing next to President Clinton at an internationally televised press conference during President Clinton's March 1998 visit to Africa, said the following regarding H.R. 1432 in general, and its conditionalities in particular:

''These matters are the subject of discussions and they are very sensitive matters . . . This is a matter over which we have serious reservations. This legislation to us, is not acceptable.''

Efforts to remove these harmful provisions from H.R. 1432 were rejected by the House Leadership.

On February 2, 1999, Congressman Philip Crane (R–IL) introduced H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, in substantially the same form as H.R. 1432. However, H.R. 434 eroded H.R. 1432 in that language pertaining to development assistance and human rights was deleted.

By introducing the HOPE for Africa Act, Congressman Jackson seeks not only to remove the damaging provisions of the Crane bill, but more importantly to ensure maximum social, economic, and political benefits for the nations of Africa as they rightfully expand extant economic relations with the U.S. public and private sectors.

In the United States as in Africa, an educated and healthy populace is vital to competitiveness in an increasingly complex global marketplace. And, in Africa as in America, labor and environmental standards should form part of responsible public/private undertakings. The Jackson bill recognizes this.

The U.S. process of policy formulation—whether domestic or foreign in focus—has never limited debate and discussion to a ''single track.'' During our Congressional battle against apartheid, for example, and later during the Congress's efforts to restore democracy to Haiti, there were a plethora of ideas and approaches, reflected in a number of different legislative initiatives, as to how best to achieve these important goals.

The creation of a new and comprehensive economic policy package towards Africa should be no different.

U.S. criticism of the Soviet Union during the Cold War was that forced adherence to the established ''party-line''—no variation, no debate, no offering of alternate ideas—resulted in policies that ran counter to the long-term interests of the then-Soviet people. If we do indeed wish the people of Africa to benefit from the vast wealth and potential of that continent, and from the ever-expanding opportunities for US/Africa cooperation, we must—unlike the Soviets—allow open and constructive debate on the best means of doing so.

I seek your leadership to ensure the passage of the HOPE for Africa Act. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, I would welcome your call at (202) 797–2301.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RANDALL ROBINSON,
President.

WOMEN'S EDGE,
February 11, 1999.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Women's EDGE, a coalition of international development organizations, domestic women's groups, and individuals, is writing to express our concern about the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act II (H.R. 434). We oppose this bill, as currently written. Women's EDGE works to give women and families around the world an economic edge. Women's EDGE believes that H.R. 434 will harm, rather than help, the majority of African citizens. We support the HOPE (Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership, & Empowerment) for Africa Act, sponsored by Representative Jesse Jackson, Jr. (D-Illinois) as that best opportunity to achieve sustainable development in the Sub Saharan African (SSA) region.

H.R. 434 aims to improve the livelihoods of African citizens by pursuing an export-promotion strategy to the exclusion of other methods. We are deeply disturbed that H.R. 434 contains no provisions for development assistance to Africa. Women's EDGE believes that trade and aid are both important policy tools for the U.S. to use to achieve its diplomatic and economic aims. Furthermore, in order to truly benefit African citizens, the U.S. needs to support basic development needs such as basic education, education and access to technology, and capacity-building efforts. By laying the foundation for strong human capital development, the U.S. will be aiding African citizens today and tomorrow. In contrast to H.R. 434, the HOPE for Africa Act supports restoration of annual aid to Africa at the 1994 level ($802 million) under the Development Fund for Africa and prioritizes funding for basic human needs.

Women must be central to any discussion of sustainable economic development. A recent World Bank paper (No. 428) stated that ''if Sub-Saharan Africa is to achieve equitable growth and sustainable development, one necessary step is to reduce gender inequality in access to and control of a diverse range of productive, human, and social capital assets. . . . Reducing gender inequality—a development objective in its own right—increases growth, efficiency, and welfare''.

Trade policies must take women's social and work roles into account and design policies that improve women's lives, rather than increase their burden. Numerous studies have shown that trade provisions affect women differently because of the social roles that women play in most societies, as well as the wage discrimination, job segmentation, and cultural barriers women often face. While we commend the authors of H.R. 434, for recognizing the importance of women to economic development (Sec. 3), we are dismayed that there are no provisions within the bill to facilitate women's access to education, credit, capital, or technology in order to increase their ability to become economically self-sufficient. Instead, many of the export-driven strategies within H.R. 434 will serve to undermine women's businesses and health.

Some examples include:

Micro-credit programs, which have gained strong support in the U.S. Congress, are an avenue through which women have been able to parlay small loans into thriving businesses throughout SSA. However, in Zimbabwe, as trade was liberalized, women micro-entrepreneurs were unable to compete with the flood of cheap goods entering their country (AWEPON/DGAP, 1996).

Susan Joekes' research has shown that in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), a switch to export-promotion crops (non-traditional agricultural promotion) has often diverted resources from domestic consumption. Men have controlled the extra cash earned from this strategy and the nutritional status of women and children has declined. Falls in girls' school enrollment has also been observed, reflecting the need to use additional labor to meet domestic and export production.

Women's EDGE has grave reservations about the impact of the eligibility requirements on the poor in SSA, particularly poor women. The eligibility criteria outlined in H.R. 434 calls for the restructuring of African economies. Past experience has demonstrated that this sort of restructuring has led to deep cuts in government health, nutrition, and education programs. As a result, professional women who work in the government (and are disproportionately concentrated in these sectors) are displaced, and poor women see an increase in the cost of health care, food, and education. Any eligibility criteria should allow nations the necessary latitude to ensure food security, adequate health care, and access to basic education for its citizens.

The HOPE for Africa Act, rather than using the ''cookie-cutter approach'' outlined in H.R. 434 to determine eligibility, recognizes the need for self-determination for African nations. The HOPE for Africa Act enables African nations to pursue policies in the best interests of their citizens and recognizes the different capacities, natural resource base, and economic, social, and political needs of each nation.

Women's EDGE shares the concerns that other organizations have articulated about the preoccupation of expanding the textile industry in SSA, given that global trade rules will end textile and apparel quotas in 2005. With China competing for the textile market once the quotas are lifted, nascent industries will be overwhelmed and it is likely that China will become one of the sole suppliers of textiles for the global economy. This strategy seems to be shortsighted as a long-term development model for the region. The HOPE for Africa expands the market access for African goods, while protecting workers rights and the environment. Women's EDGE also supports the HOPE for Africa contention that debt relief must be an integral part of any policies aimed at improving the livelihoods of African citizens.

Women's EDGE urges you to oppose H.R. 434 and instead, support the HOPE for Africa Act that includes development aid and debt relief, and respects the sovereignty of African nations.

Sincerely,

RITU R. SHARMA,
Executive Director, Women's EDGE.

SIERRA CLUB,
Washington, DC, February 10, 1999.

DON'T TRADE AWAY AFRICA'S ENVIRONMENT—OPPOSE THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT (''NAFTA FOR AFRICA'') SUPPORT THE HOPE FOR AFRICA ACT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Sierra Club's more than half-million members, I urge you to oppose the African Growth and Opportunity Act (''NAFTA for Africa'') and to support the HOPE for Africa Act instead. Last fall Congress defeated fast track legislation as the first step toward forging a new, progressive trade policy that would guarantee protections for working families and the environment alongside any new trading privileges for business. The NAFTA for Africa represents the failed status quo trade policy that has lost the support of the American people and was rejected last fall with the defeat of fast track. The HOPE for Africa Act represents the first, bold step toward creating a new, progressive trade policy for the twenty-first century.

The NAFTA for Africa would pressure African countries into handing over their minerals, oil, and timber to transnational corporations by threatening to withdraw the low tariffs now granted for African exports to the United States under the US Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). Without strong environmental and labor standards, increased foreign investment by transnational oil, mining, and logging companies would destroy the natural resources—the farmland, pure water, and forests—that the vast majority of Africans depend on for sustainable development.

The NAFTA for Africa would:

encourage the kind of irresponsible and unaccountable investment represented by Royal Dutch Shell's oil operations in Nigeria's Ogonilnad. Shell has polluted the land and water, destroying Ogoni farmland and spreading disease, while propping up the country's military dictatorship with oil revenues. The NAFTA for Africa would spur investment by foreign mining and oil companies that have already displaced thousands from their homes without recourse to law, ignored Africa's weak environmental laws, and polluted the air, soil, and water with mine wastes, mercury, and cyanide.

increase tropical deforestation by foreign logging companies in Central Africa, where deforestation rates already exceed those of Brazil. In addition to destroying forests that help to curb global warming and provide clean water to Africa's farms and cities, industrial logging could expose the African people to terrible disease risks. According to The New York Times, the deadly Ebola virus was recently unleashed in Zaire and Gabon after foreign logging companies cut their way into untouched, primary forests, exposing humans to the forest animals that harbor the disease.

harm Africa's ability to benefit from new foreign investment by requiring cuts in corporate taxes and government spending. With few options for taxes to support needed public services, such essentials as public health and education would almost certainly be slashed.

In contrast, the HOPE for Africa Act would offer Africa a partnership for equitable and sustainable development that could serve as a model for a new, progressive American trade policy. In place of the NAFTA for Africa's meager trade benefits, HOPE for Africa would open the US market to the wide variety of goods listed under the Lome Treaty in which the US is not a competitor, would grant new access for African textiles and apparel while protecting the rights of workers and the environment, and would not set onerous, new conditions for continued GSP preferences.

In addition, HOPE for Africa would:

provide comprehensive relief of Africa's crushing burden of $230 billion in foreign debt. Debt relief would allow Africa to re-direct its own resources toward priority development, health, education, and environmental needs. And debt relief would reduce the enormous pressure to recklessly exploit and export the region's rapidly shrinking natural resources.

provide adequate foreign assistance through the Development Fund for Africa and through the US Agency for International Development. Hope for Africa requires that such assistance be spent in consultation with the intended beneficiaries, the African people, and would be directed toward education, micro-credit, health, environmental protection, and other priority goals.

ensure that foreign corporations operating in Africa adhere to internationally recognized labor rights and to developed country environmental standards. Hope for Africa would give US citizens access to US courts to enforce these obligations.

The Hope for Africa Act offers the opportunity to launch a new, progressive trade policy in partnership with the African people that promotes equitable and sustainable development for all. The NAFTA for Africa offers only more of the same, failed policies of the past. We urge you to support the Hope for Africa Act and to reject the NAFTA for Africa.

Sincerely,

CARL POPE,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN LANDS ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1999.

AMERICAN LANDS, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES CENTER AND SIERRA CLUB URGE CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE HOPE FOR AFRICA ACT

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Yesterday, Representative Jesse Jackson, Jr. and thirty other Members of Congress introduced legislation that will help protect Africa's threatened native forests.

The HOPE (Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment) for Africa Act of 1999 (H.R. 772) is one of the first international trade and investment bills that forest activists can stand behind and endorse.

Unique among trade legislation, the HOPE for Africa Act includes strong environmental safeguards to ensure that corporations operating in Africa and accessing the bill's benefits act responsibly with respect to the local environment. Specifically, the bill would:

1. Deny U.S. market access to products that are produced in a manner inconsistent with the environmental standards that apply to similar operations in developed countries;

2. Empower U.S. citizens to enforce provisions of the Act in U.S. courts; and

3. Provide adequate foreign assistance to Africa while requiring that the assistance be spent in consultation with the African people and be directed toward environmental protection and other goals.

On the other hand, The ''NAFTA for Africa'' bill, or the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (H.R. 434), provides a myriad of new rights to foreign corporations operating in Africa while remaining completely silent on environmental protections.

The NAFTA for Africa bill would encourage the continuation of logging practices that have led to the near deforestation of Africa's frontier forests. According to the World Resources Institute, in West Africa, nearly 90 percent of the original moist forest is gone, and what remains is heavily fragmented and degraded. In Central Africa, over 90 percent of all logging occurs in primary forest, one of the highest ratios of any region in the world. In Zaire, which contains more than half Central Africa's remaining forests, many tropical forests remain intact, in part because of the nation's poor transportation system. The NAFTA for Africa bill would mean open season on these endangered forests while the HOPE for Africa Act would encourage forest protection.

The HOPE for Africa Act would provide forests activists with the opportunity to protect Africa's endangered forests with support for environmental protection policies, financial assistance and local input on sustainable practices while the NAFTA for Africa bill would provide new rights to foreign logging corporations without any consideration for forest protection.

We hope that you will listen to voices of forest activists from across the country and protect Africa's remaining native forests by supporting the HOPE for Africa Act and opposing the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sincerely,

ANTONIA JUHASZ,
Director, International Trade and Forests Program, American Lands.
on behalf of:
BRENNAN VAN DYKE,
Director, Trade and Environment Program, Center for International Environmental Law.

WILLIAM SNAPE,
Legal Director, Defenders of Wildlife.
MARK VALLIANATOS,
International Policy Analyst, Friends of the Earth.
DOUG NORLEN,
Policy Director, Pacific Environment and Resources Center.
DANIEL A. SILIGMAN,
Director, Responsible Trade Campaign, Sierra Club.

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1998]

AT WHAT COST?

(By Bob Herbert)

It has a nice name, the ''African Growth and Opportunity Act,'' and a clever slogan, ''trade not aid,'' but a bill now before Congress is in fact an enormous benefits package for thriving multinational corporations and a threat to the very sovereignty of the sub-Saharan nations that sponsors of the bill say they want to help.

The bill narrowly passed the House in March, where it was introduced and pushed hard by Representative Philip Crane, an Illinois Republican who has referred to some developing African countries and their leaders as ''retards.'' (A spokeswoman told me on Friday that the Congressman had not intended to offend anyone.)

The sponsor in the Senate, which has yet to vote on the measure, is Richard Lugar, an Indiana Republican. The bill has the strong backing of the Clinton Administration, as well as such giant corporations as Texaco, Coca-Cola and Kmart.

The aim of the bill is to liberalize trade between the United States and Africa. It would, among other things, allow duty-free and quota-free exports to the U.S. for 10 years, support the creation of a U.S.-sub-Sahara free-trade agreement and encourage the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to set up funds to stimulate private development in Africa.

But the bill also makes some demands. In essence, participating countries would have to adhere to the harsh and often inhumane requirements of the International Monetary Fund. Thus, these underdeveloped and often very poor countries would have to undergo a radical economic restructuring that would include cuts in corporate taxes, reductions in government spending and privatization of some of their most valuable assets—mines, forests, harbors, oil wells and the like—with the multinationals and other wealthy foreign investors ready to snap them up at fire-sale prices.

''What does this mean to the people on the ground in these countries?'' asked Randall Robinson, the president of TransAfrica and an opponent of the Crane-Lugar bill.

He noted that I.M.F. structural adjustment programs are already under way in some African countries and studies of those programs have shown disturbing effects. Ghana is one example. It is cited as an I.M.F. success story. And yet, as Mr. Robinson pointed out, public spending on education, health and agriculture—in accordance with I.M.F. dictates to limit spending—has been falling. Health care for the poor has taken a particularly heavy hit, even though children are dying in staggering numbers.

Half of all deaths in Ghana in recent years have been of children under 5, though that age group makes up just one-fifth of the country's population.

In Senegal, under the guidance of the I.M.F., spending on education has been cut. One might ask what sense this makes in a country in which more than 65 percent of adults and 77 percent of all women are illiterate.

From the point of view of the I.M.F. and the multinationals, it makes economic sense.

The trade bill also requires participating countries to join the World Trade Organization, even though many African countries have chosen not to join. The Organization for Economic Development, a supporter of the W.T.O., has reported that sub-Saharan Africa would be a loser under W.T.O. rules because countries that import more food than they export would inevitably be hurt by requirements to cut domestic agriculture subsidies.

This is not a small matter. Four in 10 Africans suffer in some degree from hunger or malnutrition. Agricultural subsidies can be a matter of life and death in such populations.

But the trade bill fashioned in Washington says simply: you will join the W.T.O.

Attempts to amend the bill—to modify the most onerous requirements—have been beaten back. President Nelson Mandela of South Africa has characterized the bill as ''not acceptable.'' But most sub-Saharan leaders, faced with desperately poor populations and desperately high unemployment, have signed on. They appear to hope that in some way, somehow, a trade agreement with the big boys, with the United States and its great corporations, will alleviate their economic suffering.

It's a situation ripe for wholesale exploitation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

The choice between the major provisions of two proposed pieces of legislation with respect to U.S./Africa economic policy—HOPE for Africa and African Growth and Opportunity—are contrasted below. This legislation will define U.S. economic policy towards Africa for the foreseeable future. HOPE stands for Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment.

ECONOMIC POLICY: SELF-DETERMINATION OR PATERNALISM?

African Growth and Opportunity rejects African nations' right to self-determination by coercing them to adopt the IMF economic development model which has already had devastating consequences in the region.

HOPE for Africa is based on the recognition that African nations have the right to determine their own approach to economic development.

TRADE BENEFITS FOR AFRICA

African Growth and Opportunity's meager trade ''benefits'' (the only benefits for Africa in the entire bill) are either short-lived, illusory or redundant.

HOPE for Africa offers broad market access for African goods.

BENEFITS FOR AFRICAN BUSINESSES, COMMUNITIES AND WORKERS

African Growth and Opportunity contains no conditions that African citizens or businesses benefit from the market access provisions.

HOPE for Africa aims to raise living standards and foster capital accumulation in Africa.

DEBT RELIEF

African Growth and Opportunity provides no binding debt relief whatsoever—despite the fact that Africa's crushing $230 billion debt burden is a massive obstacle to economic and social progress.

HOPE for Africa provides for comprehensive debt cancellation. Excluding South Africa, with upwards of 20 percent of Sub-Saharan nations' export earnings going to debt service, few resources are devoted to development and urgent local needs.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

African Growth and Opportunity fails to even restore the budget line item for Africa aid eliminated in 1996—even though U.S. assistance is at a historical low of .02 percent of the U.S. GNP and Sub-Saharan Africa is now the only region of the world with no guaranteed annual level of American aid. The bill provides no safeguards to ensure that funds that are allocated will be used to benefit African nations and African economic development instead of U.S. corporations, for instance seeking subsidies or government backing of investment they were planning to undertake anyway.

HOPE for Africa restores aid to Africa and ensures it is used for Africa's benefit.

THE AIDS CRISIS

African Growth and Opportunity ignores the AIDS crisis, and fails to even mention the word AIDS, much less allocate any U.S. aid funding to combat the AIDS epidemic currently enveloping the continent.

HOPE for Africa addresses the AIDS crisis by replenishing and targeting assistance from the Development Fund for Africa for AIDS education and treatment programs; making it U.S. policy to assist Sub-Saharan African countries in efforts to make needed pharmaceuticals and medical technologies widely available; and prohibiting the use of U.S. funds to undermine African intellectual property and competition policies that are designed to increase the availability of medications.

LABOR RIGHTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

African Growth and Opportunity is silent on these issues.

HOPE for Africa includes strong safeguards to ensure that corporations operating in Africa and accessing the bill's benefits act responsibly with respect to their employees and the local environment.

SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON: HOPE FOR AFRICA (H.R. 772) AND AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT (H.R. 434)

The Human Rights, Opportunity, Partnership and Empowerment for Africa Act (''HOPE for Africa Act'') H.R. 772 was conceived and drafted by African and U.S. civil society groups, economists, trade specialists and legislators to address the real needs and concerns of sub-Saharan African nations (hereafter SSA). It includes mutually beneficial U.S.-Africa trade and investment opportunities—meaning that African businesses and workers, not just U.S. corporations, will enjoy the Act's broad trade benefits. It adopts a holistic approach to the elements essential to ensuring a mutually successful U.S.-sub-Sahara Africa economic policy, including business facilitation, debt relief, aid and AIDS prevention and treatment. The legislation enjoys broad support of African labor, environmental and development organizations, as well as their U.S. counterparts. It is being promoted by a coalition of African-American clergy, community organizations and leaders.

In contrast, the ''African Growth and Opportunity'' Act adopts the NAFTA formula for Africa: giving foreign corporations broad new rights that will increase their capacity to profit from control of African resources, while doing nothing to ensure that benefits actually accrue to African nations and people. This NAFTA for Africa legislation also contains harsh eligibility rules that will force African nations to alter their economic and social policies and laws to suit the needs of foreign investors and the dictates of the

International Monetary Fund—despite the IMF's dismal record in the region. NAFTA for Africa is supported by the multinational corporate lobby and harshly criticized by African and African-American community, church and development groups. Nelson Mandela called the bill ''not acceptable.''

The choice between the two bills, whose major provisions are contrasted below, will define U.S. economic policy towards Africa for the forseeable future.

ECONOMIC POLICY: SELF-DETERMINATION OR PATERNALISM?

H.R. 434 rejects SSA nations' right to self-determination by coercing them to adopt the IMF economic development model which has already had devastating consequences in the region. In order to qualify for the bill's narrow trade benefits SSA countries must be annually certified by the U.S. President as meeting a long list of U.S.-imposed, IMF-style conditions:

Cutting government spending, such as further depriving vital health and education services of desperately needed funding; Cutting corporate taxes; Privatizing public assets through divestiture and opening up most areas of their economies to ownership and control by foreign multinationals, such as mines, agricultural land and telecommunciations; Abandoning economic development policies that nurture local industry and enable it to compete globally; Joining the WTO, where the OECD has said African nations will be the big losers; and Adopting policies, like the abolition of price controls, that will jeopardizing food security.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa is based on the recognition that African nations have the right to determine their own approach to economic development.

Rather than being conditioned on SSA nations' adopting a one-size-fits-all economic model, the substantial benefits provided (market access for a wide range of African products, business facilitation, debt relief, development assistance), are instead designed to provide SSA nations with the resources and the freedom of maneuver necessary to pursue the policies that are in the best interest of the majority of their citizens, and

The HOPE for Africa Act is modeled on the policy priorities established in the Lagos Plan of Action drawn up by African Finance Ministers in cooperation with the Organization for African Unity.

TRADE BENEFITS FOR AFRICA

H.R. 434's trade ''benefits'' (the only benefits for Africa in the entire bill) are either short-lived, illusory or redundant, and are conditioned on the discredited IMF-style policies.

Lifts existing quotas for Kenya and Mauritius and locks in quota-free treatment for the rest of SSA for textiles and apparel. This benefit is illusory, however, given that global trade rules will end textile and apparel quotas in 2005, at which point all countries who have invested in this industry will be overwhelmed by the dominant producer: China

In the interim, there are no meaningful safeguards to ensure that ''African'' textiles and apparel exported to the U.S. will actually be African in origin; weak transshipment rules mean they may be shipped through Africa from third countries such as China.

The Generalized System of Preferences program for SSA countries will be extended until 2009.

All SSA countries are granted ''least developed country'' benefits of the GSP program. It turns out that all but a handful of the most economically developed African countries already have been designated as qualifying for this treatment.

H.R. 772. HOPE for Africa offers expansive market access benefits to African countries, including new benefits for countries that enforce internationally recognized human rights and labor standards.

For the next five years before termination of the apparel and textile quota system, HOPE for Africa lifts the quotas now existing for Kenya and Mauritius and locks in quota-free treatment for the other SSA countries, but ensures that such goods will be produced Africa, by African workers, under conditions that protect workers' rights.

African countries will be granted quota-free, duty-free U.S. market access for the broad range of goods listed under the Lome Treaty in which the U.S. is not a competing producer. Lome covers goods like bananas, certain minerals, processed foods, and tropical products in which African countries have an advantage.

HOPE provides strong, enforceable protections against transshipment.

The Generalized System of Preferences program for SSA countries will be extended until 2005.

LABOR RIGHTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

H.R. 434 denies trade benefits to countries engaging in ''gross'' violations of human rights, but does not contain meaningful, enforceable language on labor rights and is silent on environmental issues.

It denies benefits to countries engaging in ''gross'' violations of human rights.

It contains weak and unenforceable language with respect to labor rights protections that major labor unions have declared ineffective.

It provides expansive rights and benefits to multinational corporations operating in SSA, but requires nothing of them with respect to the protection of the environment.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa contains strong, enforceable provisions denying benefits to human rights violators, as well as strong, enforceable safeguards to ensure that corporations operating in Africa benefiting from the bill act responsibly with respect to their employees and the local environment.

It denies benefits to countries engaging in ''significant'' violations of human rights.

It denies U.S. market access to products that are produced under conditions that violate internationally recognized labor standards.

It provides additional trade benefits for products of joint ventures using the environmental standards the use in their developed country facilities.

It empowers U.S. citizens to enforce the labor, environmental and other protections of the Act in U.S. courts.

BENEFITS FOR AFRICAN BUSINESSES, COMMUNITIES AND WORKERS

H.R. 434 contains no conditions that African citizens or businesses benefit from the market access provisions:

It doesn't require companies to employ citizens of sub-Saharan nations. Already, Asian workers are being imported into several African countries—where significant unemployment already exists among Africans—to work at Asian-owned factories.

It doesn't require investment or creation of jobs in sub-Sahara Africa. Rather, the weak transshipment rules allow goods to be shipped through Africa.

It applies a mere 20% value-added requirement for the GSP program to SSA—lower than any other eligible region. This reduces the likelihood of significant employment gains under the bill.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa aims to raise living standards and foster capital accumulation in Africa. To this end, the bill provides and requires:

Additional trade benefits for companies with 51% African equity participation.

60% African value-added for goods to obtain the duty-free, quota-free market access guaranteed by the bill.

Companies benefiting from the trade preferences employ 90% African workers.

DEBT RELIEF

H.R. 434 provides no debt relief whatsoever—despite the fact that Africa's crushing $230 billion debt burden is a massive obstacle to economic and social progress.

HOPE for Africa provides for comprehensive debt cancellation. With upwards of 20% of sub-Saharan nations' GDP going to debt service, few resources are devoted to economic development and urgent local needs.

African debts have been repaid many times over, but the vicious cycle of taking out new loans to pay the excessive compound interest on the old loans ensures that its debt will never be ''officially'' satisfied.

HOPE for Africa calls for full cancellation of African foreign debt, starting with the relatively small debt owed to the U.S. government and covering IMF, World Bank and private sector loans. By eliminating the principle—whose market value is less than a single year's interest payments—HOPE will remove the burden of servicing the debt.

During the period of debt cancellation, HOPE for Africa caps debt payments so that no African country is forced to pay an amount exceeding 5 percent of its annual export earnings toward the servicing of foreign loans (the same percentage countries paid under the Marshall Plan).

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

H.R. 434 fails to even restore the budget line item for Africa aid eliminated in 1996—even though U.S. assistance is at a historical low of .02% of U.S. GNP and sub-Sahara Africa is now the only region of the world with no guaranteed American aid.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa restores aid to Africa and ensures it is used to benefit the majority of SSA people.

Restores annual aid guarantee at the 1994 level ($802 million) under the Development Fund for Africa.

Requires that assistance be dispensed in consultation with African civil society, that it be directed to such vital areas as women's programs, education, healthcare, HIV/AIDS education and treatment, micro-credit, sustainable agriculture.

BUSINESS FACILITATION

H.R. 434's business facilitation measures are not actually targeted to SSA businesses.

Targets $500 million in existing OPIC funds for projects in sub-Sahara Africa, but does not target African businesses as beneficiaries, nor does it require that such funds be dispensed in consultation with African civil society.

Provides no safeguards to ensure that any financing will be used to benefit African nations and African economic development instead of U.S. corporations, that for instance, are seeking government backing of investment they were planning to undertake anyway.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa, targets investment financing for desperately needed infrastructure projects to small, women- and minority-owned businesses with majority African ownership, ensuring that the projects are undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner.

It targets $500 million in OPIC funds for infrastructure projects in SSA, including schools, hospitals, sanitation, potable water and accessible transportation.

It allocates 70% of the OPIC funding to small, women- and minority-owned businesses with at least 60% African ownership and $1 million or less in assets.

It targets 50% of OPIC funds used for energy projects to renewable or alternative energy.

It requires environmental impact assessments to be conducted and made public wherever relevant.

It creates advisory boards to oversee new OPIC funds (section 501) and Ex-Im Bank financing in SSA (section 502). These boards will have private sector experts in human rights, labor rights, the environment and development. Board meetings will be public.

THE AIDS CRISIS

H.R. 434 ignores the AIDS Crisis. NAFTA for Africa fails to even mention the word AIDS, much less provide any programs or funding to combat the AIDS epidemic currently enveloping the Continent.

H.R. 772, HOPE for Africa addresses the AIDS crisis by:

replenishing aid and newly targeting assistance from the Development Fund for Africa, specifically to AIDS education, prevention and treatment programs.

making it U.S. policy to help sub-Saharan African countries make needed pharmaceuticals widely available.

prohibiting the use of U.S. funds to undermine WTO TRIPS-legal African intellectual property and competition policies designed to increase the availability of medications.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 434, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Page 69, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 18 on page 70 and insert the following:

SEC. 11. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA EQUITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS.

(a) INITIATION OF FUNDS.—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall, not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, exercise the authorities it has to initiate 1 or more equity funds in support of projects in the countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in addition to any existing equity fund for sub-Saharan Africa established by the Corporation before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STRUCTURE AND TYPES OF FUNDS.—

(1) STRUCTURE.—Each fund initiated under subsection (a) shall be structured as a partnership managed by professional private sector fund managers and monitored on a continuing basis by the Corporation.

(2) CAPITALIZATION.—Each fund shall be capitalized with a combination of private equity capital, which is not guaranteed by the Corporation, and debt for which the Corporation provides guaranties.

(3) TYPES OF FUNDS.—One or more of the funds, with combined assets of up to $500,000,000, shall be used in support of infrastructure projects in countries of sub-Saharan Africa, including basic health services (including AIDS prevention and treatment), including hospitals, potable water, sanitation, schools, electrification of rural areas, and publicly-accessible transportation in sub-Saharan African countries.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Corporation shall ensure that—

(1) not less than 70 percent of trade financing and investment insurance provided through the equity funds established under subsection (a), and through any existing equity fund for sub-Saharan Africa established by the Corporation before the date of the enactment of this Act, are allocated to small, women- and minority-owned businesses—

(A) of which not less than 60 percent of the ownership is comprised of citizens of sub-Saharan African countries and 40 percent of the ownership is comprised of citizens of the United States; and

(B) that have assets of not more than $1,000,000; and

(2) not less than 50 percent of the funds allocated to energy projects are used for renewal or alternative energy projects.

Page 70, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 20 on page 73 and insert the following:

SEC. 12. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INITIATIVES.

(a) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—Section 233 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Board shall establish and work with an advisory committee to assist the Board in developing and implementing policies, programs, and financial instruments with respect to sub-Saharan Africa, including with respect to equity and infrastructure funds established under section 11 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

"(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory committee established under paragraph (1) shall consist of 15 members, of which 7 members shall be employees of the United States Government and 8 members shall be representatives of the private sector.

"(B) APPOINTMENT.—The members of the advisory committee shall be appointed as follows:

"(i) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall each appoint 2 members who are representatives of the private sector and 1 member who is an employee of the United States Government.

"(ii) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall jointly appoint the remaining 3 members who are employees of the United States Government.

"(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Of the 8 members of advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector—

"(i) at least 4 members shall be representatives of not-for-profit public interest organizations;

"(ii) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in development issues;

"(iii) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in human rights issues;

"(iv) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in environmental issues; and

"(v) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in international labor rights.

"(D) TERMS.—Each member of the advisory committee shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

"(3) MEETINGS.—

"(A) OPEN TO PUBLIC.—Meetings of the advisory committee shall be open to the public.

"(B) ADVANCE NOTICE.—The advisory committee shall provide advance notice in the Federal Register of any meeting of the committee, shall provide notice of all proposals or projects to be considered by the committee at the meeting, and shall solicit written comments from the public relating to such proposals or projects.

"(C) DECISIONS.—Any decision of the advisory committee relating to a proposal or project shall be published in the Federal Register with an explanation of the extent to which the committee considered public comments received with respect to the proposal or project, if any.

"(4) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS.—The Corporation shall carry out environmental impact assessments with respect to any proposal or project not later than 120 days before the advisory committee, or the Board, considers such proposal or project, whichever occurs earlier.".

(b) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INITIATIVE.—Section 2(b)(9) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)) is amended to read as follows:

"(9) For purposes of the funds allocated by the Bank for projects in countries in sub-Saharan Africa (as defined in section 17 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act):

"(A) The Bank shall establish an advisory committee to work with and assist the Board in developing and implementing policies, programs, and financial instruments with respect to such countries.

"(B) The members of the advisory committee shall be appointed as follows:

"(i) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall each appoint 2 members who are representatives of the private sector and 1 member who is an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

"(ii) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall jointly appoint the remaining 3 members who are officers or employees of the Federal Government.

"(C)(i) At least half of the members of the advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector shall be representatives of not-for-profit public interest organizations.

"(ii) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in development issues.

"(iii) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in human rights.

"(iv) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in environmental issues.

"(v) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall have expertise in international labor rights.

"(D) Each member of the advisory committee shall serve for a term of 2 years.

"(E)(i) Members of the advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector shall not receive compensation by reason of their service on the advisory committee.

"(ii) Members of the advisory committee who are officers or employees of the Federal Government may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the advisory committee.

"(F) Meetings of the advisory committee shall be open to the public.

"(G) The advisory committee shall give timely advance notice of each meeting of the advisory committee, including a description of any matters to be considered at the meeting, shall establish a public docket, shall solicit written comments in advance on each proposal, and shall make each decision in writing with an explanation of disposition of the public comments.

"(H) The Bank shall complete and release to the public an environmental impact assessment with respect to a proposal or project with potential environmental effects, not later than 120 days before the advisory committee, or the Board, considers the proposal or project, whichever occurs earlier.

"(I) Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the advisory committee.".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2415

OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Page 84, after line 16, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VIII—INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR COMPETITION LAW RELATING TO PHARMACEUTICALS OR OTHER MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

SEC. 801. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR COMPETITION LAW RELATING TO PHARMACEUTICALS OR OTHER MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of State may be used to seek, through negotiation or otherwise, the revocation or revision of any intellectual property or competition law or policy of a sub-Saharan African country that is designed to promote access to pharmaceuticals or other medical technologies if such law or policy, as the case may be, complies with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)).

——

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 434, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Page 92, after line 17, add the following:

SEC. 20. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 497 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2294) is amended by inserting before the first sentence the following: ‘‘There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter for fiscal year 2000 and each subsequent year an amount not less than the amount appropriated to carry out this chapter for fiscal year 1994.’’.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Amounts appropriated under the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act pursuant to the authorization of appropriations established under the first sentence of section 497 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2294), as added by subsection (a), shall be appropriated to a separate account under the heading ‘‘Development Fund for Africa’’ and not to the account under the heading ‘‘Development Assistance’’.

——

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 434, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Page 41, after line 16, insert the following:

TITLE I—TRADE AND INVESTMENT PROVISIONS

Page 41, line 17, strike ‘‘**SEC. 2**’’ and insert ‘‘**SEC. 101**’’ (and redesignate each subsequent section accordingly and make all appropriate technical and conforming changes).

Page 92, after line 17, add the following:

TITLE II—CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

SEC. 201. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

The Congress makes the following declarations:

(1)(A) For the majority of people in sub-Saharan Africa to be able to benefit from new trade, investment, and other economic opportunities provided by this Act, and amendments made by this Act, the pre-existing burden of external debt of sub-Saharan African countries must be eliminated.

(B) This fresh start will allow operation of local credit markets and eliminate distortions currently hindering development in sub-Saharan Africa.

(2) The cancellation of debt provisions contained in this title, and amendments made by this title, shall serve to help establish a more level playing field on which sub-Saharan African countries may move forward under the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 202. CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘PART VI—CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO THE UNITED STATES BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

‘‘SEC. 901. CANCELLATION OF DEBT.

‘‘(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall cancel all amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by sub-Saharan African countries defined in section 17 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a result of—

‘‘(1) concessional loans made or credits extended under any provision of law, including the provisions of law described in subsection (b)(1); and

‘‘(2) nonconcessional loans made, guarantees issued, or credits extended under any of provisions of law, including the provisions of law described in subsection (b)(2).

‘‘(b) PROVISIONS OF LAW.—

‘‘(1) CONCESSIONAL PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of law described in this paragraph are the following:

‘‘(A) Part I of this Act, chapter 4 of part II of this Act, or predecessor foreign economic assistance legislation.

‘‘(B) Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

‘‘(2) NONCONCESSIONAL PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of law described in this paragraph are the following:

‘‘(A) Sections 221 and 222 of this Act.

‘‘(B) The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

‘‘(C) Section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

‘‘(D)(i) Section 201 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5621).

‘‘(ii) Section 202 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 5622).

‘‘(E) The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.).

‘‘(c) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to cancel debt under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2002.

‘‘SEC. 902. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

‘‘(a) REDUCTION OF DEBT NOT CONSIDERED TO BE ASSISTANCE.—A reduction of debt under section 901 shall not be considered to be assistance for purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country.

‘‘(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO REDUCTION OF DEBT.—The authority to provide for reduction of debt under section 901 may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of this Act.

‘‘SEC. 903. REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.

‘‘(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 1999, and December 31 of each of the next 3 years, the President shall prepare and transmit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report concerning the cancellation of debt under section 901 for the prior fiscal year.

‘‘(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

‘‘(1) the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives; and

‘‘(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

‘‘SEC. 904. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

‘‘For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) for the cancellation of debt under section 901, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2002.’’.

SEC. 203. ADVOCACY OF CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) ADVOCACY OF CANCELLATION OF DEBT.—The Secretary of State shall provide written notification to each foreign government that has provided loans, guarantees, or credits to the government of a sub-Saharan African country (and such loans, guarantees, or credits are outstanding) that it is the policy of the United States to fully and unconditionally cancel all debts owed by each such sub-Saharan African country to the United States. In addition, the Secretary shall urge in writing each such foreign government to follow the example of the United States and fully and unconditionally cancel all debts owed by sub-Saharan African countries to each such foreign government.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing—

(1) a description of each written notification provided to foreign governments under the first sentence of subsection (a);

(2) a description of the response of each such foreign government to such notification; and

(3) a description of the amount (if any) owed to the United States by any foreign government opposing the United States policy advocated pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 204. ADVOCACY OF CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

Title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262c–262p–5) is amended by redesignating section 1622 as section 1623 and by inserting after section 1621 the following:

‘‘SEC. 1622. ADVOCACY OF CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

‘‘(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to advocate that their respective institutions—

‘‘(1) fully and unconditionally cancel all debts owed by any country in sub-Saharan Africa (as defined in section 17 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act) to such institution; and

‘‘(2) encourage each country benefiting from such debt cancellation to allocate 20 percent of the national budget of the country, including savings from such debt cancellation, to basic services, as the country has committed to do under the United Nations 20/20 Initiative, with appropriate input from civil society in developing basic service plans.

‘‘(b) ADVOCACY OF POLICY TO PREVENT SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES FROM PAYING MORE THAN 5 PERCENT OF ANNUAL EXPORT EARNINGS FOR DEBT SERVICE ON IMF OR WORLD BANK LOANS.—The Secretary of Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, until their respective institutions have fully and unconditionally canceled all debts owed to such institutions by any country in sub-Saharan Africa (within the meaning of subsection (a)(1)) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to advocate that their respective institutions not be party to, and that no future loan from their respective institutions be used to finance in whole or part the implementation of, any agreement which requires the government of any such country, during any 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section or any anniversary of such date, to pay an amount exceeding 5 percent of the annual export earnings of the country during the year toward the servicing of foreign loans.

''(c) ADVOCACY METHODS.—The Secretary of Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to carry out such instructions by all appropriate means, including by letter to the country representative members governing bodies of their respective institutions, and by requesting formal votes on these matters.

''(d) REPORT.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committees on International Relations and on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that contains—

''(1) a description of the response by foreign governments to the policies advocated pursuant to this section;

''(2) the result of any votes taken pursuant to requests made under subsection (c);

''(3) the amount (if any) owed to the United States by any country opposing any such policy; and

''(4) a copy of the letter referred to in subsection (c).''.

SEC. 205. CANCELLATION OF DEBT OWED TO UNITED STATES LENDERS BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of debt owed to any United States person by any country in sub-Saharan Africa. The report shall specify the amount owed to each such person by each such country, the face value and market value of the debt, and the amount of interest paid to date on the debt.

(b) ACQUISITION OF THE DEBT BY THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than September 1, 2000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall acquire each debt obligation owed to any United States person by any country in sub-Saharan Africa. It is the sense of the Congress that the price at which such an obligation is acquired should be the market value of the debt obligation as of January 1, 1999.

(c) DEBT CANCELLATION.—On the acquisition of a debt obligation pursuant to this section, the debt obligation is hereby canceled.

SEC. 206. STUDY ON REPAYMENT OF DEBT IN LOCAL CURRENCIES BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

Section 603 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(d) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) the viability and desirability of having each indebted country in sub-Saharan Africa (as defined in section 17 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act) repay foreign loans made to the country (whether made bilaterally, multilaterally, or privately) in the currency of the indebted country; and''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The matters described in subsection (e)(4).''.

SEC. 207. ALLOCATION OF PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL BUDGETS OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES FOR BASIC SERVICES.

The Secretary of State shall encourage the government of each sub-Saharan African country to allocate 20 percent of its national budget, including the savings from the cancellation of debt owed by the country to the United States (pursuant to part VI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by section 202 of this Act), to other foreign countries (as called for in section 203 of this Act), to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (as called for in section 1622 of the International Financial Institutions Act, as added by section 204 of this Act), and to United States persons (as called for in section 205 of this Act), for the provision of basic services to individuals in each such country, as provided for in the United Nations 20/20 Initiative. In providing such basic services, each such government should seek input from appropriate nongovernmental organizations.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO LEVEL OF INTERIM DEBT PAYMENTS PRIOR TO FULL DEBT CANCELLATION BY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

It is the sense of the Congress that, prior to the full and unconditional cancellation of all debts owed by sub-Saharan African countries to the United States (pursuant to part VI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by section 202 of this Act), to other foreign countries (as called for in section 203 of this Act), and to United States persons (as called for in section 205 of this Act), each sub-Saharan African country should not, in making debt payments described in the prior provisions of law, pay in any calendar year an aggregate amount greater than an amount equal to 5 percent of the export earnings of the country for the prior calendar year.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 434, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Page 43, line 22, strike ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''.

Page 44, line 2, strike ''gross'' and insert ''significant''.

Page 44, beginning on line 3, strike ''and has'' and all that follows through line 22 on page 48 and insert a period.

Page 58, line 5, strike ''to the United States—'' and all that follows through line 18 and insert the following: ''to the United States from Kenya and Mauritius, respectively, not later than 30 days after the country demonstrates the following:

''(A) The country has adopted an efficient visa system to guard against unlawful transshipment of textile and apparel goods and the use of counterfeit documents in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Customs Service shall provide the necessary technical assistance to Kenya and Mauritius in the development and implementation of the visa system described in the preceding sentence.

''(B) Not less than 90 percent of employees in business enterprises producing the textile and apparel goods are citizens of that country, or any 2 or more sub-Saharan African countries.

''(C) The cost or value of the textile or apparel product produced in the country, or any 2 or more sub-Saharan African countries, plus the direct costs of processing operations performed in the country or such countries, is not less than 60 percent of the appraised value of the product at the time it is entered into the customs territory of the United States.''.

Page 58, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 5 on page 59 and insert the following:

(2) OTHER SUB-SAHARAN COUNTRIES.—The President shall continue the existing no quota policy for each other country in sub-Saharan Africa if the country is in compliance with the requirements applicable to Kenya and Mauritius under subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1).

Page 61, after line 10, insert the following:

(e) TREATMENT OF TARIFFS.—The President shall provide an additional benefit of a 50 percent tariff reduction for any textile and apparel product of a sub-Saharan African country that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) and that is imported directly into the United States from such sub-Saharan African country if the business enterprise, or a subcontractor of the enterprise, producing the product is owned by citizens of 1 or more sub-Saharan African countries who control not less than 51 percent of such business enterprise.

Page 61, after line 10, insert the following:

(f) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—A citizen of the United States shall have a cause of action in the United States district court in the district in which he or she lives or in any other appropriate district to seek compliance with the standards set forth under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1) with respect to any sub-Saharan African country, including a cause of action in an appropriate United States district court for other appropriate equitable relief. In addition to any other relief sought in such an action, a citizen may seek three times the value of any damages caused by the failure of a country or company to comply. The amount of damages described in the preceding sentence shall be paid by the business enterprise (or business enterprises) the operations or conduct of which is responsible for the failure to meet the standards set forth under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1).

Page 61, line 11, strike ''(e)'' and insert ''(g)''.

Page 62, strike line 1, and all that follows through line 18 and insert the following:

''(C) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—(i) The President may provide duty-free treatment for any article described in clause (ii) that is imported directly into the United States from a sub-Saharan African country.

''(ii) An article described in this clause is an article set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (b), or an article set forth in the product list of the Lome Treaty, that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a sub-Saharan African country that is a beneficiary developing country, if, after receiving the advice of the International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e), the President determines that such article is not import-sensitive. This subparagraph shall not affect the designation of eligible articles under subparagraph (B).''.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the rule and the bill—H.R. 434. Three-hundred-and-eighty years ago our nation's first trade policy landed 19 Africans in Jamestown, VA. Since then our nation has struggled with that painful and profound legacy. Undoubtedly, the effects of trade are far reaching and long lasting. In many ways my presence here today and that of 33 million other Americans is the result of this nation's first African trade policy.

As I told a delegation from Gabon that came to visit me in my office yesterday, the blood that unites us runs deeper than the water that divides us. So as Congress considers a new trade policy with Africa for a new millennium, for many of us this issue is charged with strong emotions and deep convictions. There are people of good will and intentions on both sides. It's rare—almost never—that I stand in opposition to a bill sponsored by Mr. RANGEL, a man who I've known and looked up to virtually all of my life and for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration. We both want what's best for Africa.

Today the weight and eyes of history are upon us. After centuries of getting it wrong—through slavery, exploitation, as pawns in a Cold War and neglect—it is incumbent upon us to get this new policy right.

Why am I opposed to the rule and opposed to AGOA?

Indeed, a dozen of my Democratic colleagues offered some 20 amendments—all of which were rejected except for four, only one of which is not a non-binding sense of the Congress resolution.

These amendments—which this restrictive rule would keep us from considering—did two things that are vital:

Cutting out the AGOA terms that would cause damage—make things worse—for the majority of people in Africa and/or the U.S. If the AGOA were simply not good enough—because some important aspect was missing for instance, that would be one thing—but it is AGOA's ability to undermine the already harsh status quo of food security, access to health and education, control of natural resources and economic sovereignty in Africa—that has moved me to action.

These are the provisions—mainly contained in AGOA's section 4—that led a broad array of African labor, religious, anti-hunger and other civic groups to reach out to me to develop an alternative to AGOA. We're talking about groups like COSATU—South African's mighty labor federation representing one in five South Africans. These are the provisions that have led to the formation of a coalition of African American bishops and ministers against AGOA—and led the community, labor, church, pro-Africa and other U.S. groups from TransAfrica and Organization US to the AFL–CIO, Teamsters and Sierra Club to make a vote against AGOA a high priority.

AGOA's section 4 would impose conditions—unlike any we impose on any other trade partners—requiring African countries to make major changes in their domestic economic and social policies as a condition for qualifying for AGOA's ''benefits.'' And, we are not talking about NAFTA telling Mexico to enforce intellectual property rights because that is a trade issue. We are talking about legislation that has the U.S. President annually certifying each sub-Saharan African countries' compliance with a long list of U.S.-imposed conditions: like requiring cuts in domestic corporate taxes and domestic health and education spending, we are talking about forced privitization through divestiture of African nation's mineral and oil wealth and of its other public assets, we are talking about changes in domestic pharmaceutical policy that are in compliance with African countries' obligations in the GATT–WTO.

There simply is nothing like that dealing with any other region of the world. And worse, the U.S. government has said to Africa's Ambassadors: it is this or nothing. Yet, the ''this'' is simply an intensification of the IMF–NAFTA policies that have been a disaster for African countries—because many of the provisions in AGOA are beefed up version of the ''structural adjustment'' policies imposed on Africa by the IMF in the past decades that have led to growing infant mortality, lowering of real incomes, devastating cuts in basic health and education services. Now we have the World Bank and IMF admitting that this policy has failed in sub-Saharan Africa and then the U.S. would impose it unilaterally through AGOA?

And that does not get to the damage to the U.S.: which is that AGOA's rules against transshipment through Africa from third countries like China are so weak that the 1.3 million U.S. workers in the textile and apparel sector would face major job losses even as African workers obtain no benefits. No doubt that there would be a limited impact of the trade provisions of AGOA if what we were talking about was just African imports—but AGOA's transshipment rules—opposed by the U.S. and African textile and apparel unions and by the U.S. industry—are the same ones that failed in the island of Hong Kong with its small size and well-funded enforcement capacity. It is unacceptible that U.S. textile and apparel workers—70% of whom are women and people of color—should lose their jobs while no new jobs are created in Africa because Chinese made goods are using the AGOA's trade benefits.

The second thing the amendments this rule would keep out would do is add the vital missing elements to AGOA:

You all know the list: AGOA simply fails to deal with the most basic issues that could make for a mutually beneficial U.S.-Africa policy:

There's nothing binding HIV–AIDs, one of Africa greatest economic and social challenges.

There is nothing binding to deal with the crushing $230 billion debt burden on the SSA countries.

There are no basic labor, human rights, African-employment, environmental rules for corporations to meet in order to enjoy the special trade benefits—not even the pathetic NAFTA agreements.

What is in AGOA and what is missing guarantees that passing this legislation on Africa is a worse outcome for most people in Africa than doing no U.S. legislation on Africa at this time. We all want to do something for Africa—but I doubt any of us want to do something bad to Africa.

Make no mistake: what we do with this Africa legislation will be the U.S.-Africa policy for decades to come, there's not going to be some piecemeal approach where industry—satisfied by the new rights it has obtained over Africa's resources and economies—suddenly decide to independently push for debt relief, aid, AIDS–HIV policy. Come on folks, get real. We either do the right thing now, or we are responsible for inflicting damage in Africa to benefit some narrow special interests in the U.S. business world.

We need to reject this rule and massive change AGOA. Absent that we need to defeat it. On behalf of the 72 Democrats cosponsoring the alternative approach to U.S.-Africa trade policy—the Human Rights Opportunity Partnership and Empowerment (HOPE) for Africa Act, I urge you to defeat this rule and keep hope alive.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, today Congress has before it legislation that will take a first step. Some would like it to be a giant step. Some say it is a baby step, but it is still a first step to a long standing inequality of U.S. trade policy with reference to Africa.

The passage of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, will codify the first-ever trade policy with the nations of sub-Saharan Africa. It is a first step for sub-Saharan African nations who need a financial boost to their economies in order to improve the socioeconomic status of their citizens. It is a first step to trade with the most powerful economy in the world.

It is a first step of American investment in Africa that will bring the same benefits it has brought to other developing nations, jobs, skill, training, and a degree of local sourcing and a transfer of technology and best practices that will benefit African business development.

It is a shame that it has taken this long for a first step, but it is indeed a first step for the U.S. Trade policy toward other developing nations in Europe, Asia, and South America utilizing similar framework has led to significant economic development in those nations to the point where the GDP growth rate exceeded that of the U.S.

To aid the development of Israel, the United States granted duty- and quota-free access for its textiles and apparel. It was the right thing to do for Israel; it is the right thing to do for Africa.

In order to ensure that the African people are the major recipients of the benefits of this trade, this legislation contains the strongest anti-illegal transshipment language of any U.S. trade policy. The ambassadors from the African nations and the Organization of African Unity have endorsed this legislation.

It is not for us to decide that they do not know what trade policy is best for their nations, just as we in America would not appreciate a foreign nation deciding what international policies are best for America.

The sub-Saharan African nations that can participate in this trade policy need to be given the same opportunity and assistance to develop their economies that the U.S. has given to developing countries in Asia, Europe, and South America.

Remember, we cannot have a second step without a first step.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is safe to say that everybody here wants to help Africa. Why is there a difference? It is because some do not want to do it on the backs of American workers, plain and simple. How could this be a good bill? Well, we could assure that there are no Asian transshipments. Can we accomplish that without U.S. Customs? Not with the track record currently.

We could assure that the products were made in Africa. The agreement calls for 35 percent. Rule of origin. Can my colleagues imagine if we allowed Made in America, I say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), that say only 35 percent needs to be made here for them to have the label?

□ 1145

Clearly, we should look to increase our export opportunities to the African countries, but under this agreement, not a single item is required to have their tariffs lowered.

I would challenge the Members, this is a trade bill, we will all agree. I think the name is the transshipment trade bill, but we have a trade bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my home State of Texas leads 15 other U.S. States in exporting goods to Africa, with an economic benefit totaling over $1 billion. So I rise in support of H.R. 434, hoping that many of my colleagues will answer the call from African leaders, and specifically women.

Women are very eager to possess the means to fully engage the global economy and become economically self-reliant. This bill helps the economic standing of women in Africa, as well as the U.S. Businesswomen in the Nigerian American community in my district are encouraging me to remind this body that H.R. 434 will help women in Africa to receive more entrepreneurial opportunities that are central to the eradication of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. This is why the African Association of Women Entrepreneurs supports this bill.

Currently, women in Africa head about 40 percent of African households, and supply a significant percentage of the African work force. This is a great first step. They do not want a handout, they want trade. Vote for 434.

Mr. Chairman, some opponents to H.R. 434 would have you believe that Democrats cannot think in terms of self-reliance or free-market opportunities in the context of helping individuals create a better way of life for themselves, domestically or abroad.

However, I rise in support of H.R. 434, hoping that many of my colleagues will answer the call from African leaders, and specifically women who are eager to possess the means to fully engage the global economy, becoming economically self-reliant.

This bill helps the economic standing of women in Africa and well as in the U.S.

My home State of Texas leads 15 other U.S. states in exporting goods to Africa, with economic benefits totaling over $1 billion.

Many of the women benefiting from this relationship between Texas and Africa are members of the large Nigerian-American community that I represent. They are committed to strengthening trading ties with their fellow sisters in Africa. Both sides want the passage of AGOA.

Businesswoman in the Nigerian-American community in my district are encouraging me to remind this body that H.R. 434 will help women in Africa to receive more entrepreneurial opportunities that are central to the eradication of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa.

This is why the African Association of Women Entrepreneurs supports this bill.

Currently, women in Africa head about 40% of African households and supply a significant percentage of the African workforce in the following industries: food processing, agricultural workforce, marketing and domestic food shortage.

This shows that they are already proving their ability to work to take advantage of the benefits that would be provided by the passage of H.R. 434.

Economic growth provided under AGOA also benefits women by generating increased resources for critical health care and educational needs.

Therefore, as a nurse and businesswoman, I am acutely aware of the economic and health-related benefits that AGOA will create for women in Africa.

I ask that my colleagues in this body not to deny women in Africa true empowerment, health access and economic rights. A vote against AGOA would do just that.

During the debate on the 1964 civil rights bill in the Senate, a member of the body said of that legislation, "There is nothing so profound as an idea whose time has come."

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 434 is laden with great possibilities and is profound because it is an idea whose time has finally come. Women in Africa are waiting for us to turn this profound idea into law and give them the means to take control over their lives and livelihood.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill. Everyone in this room supports Africa and we want to do what is right for Africa, but by God, we do not have to do it at the expense of Uncle Sam.

One of the previous speakers said this bill defines an African-made product as having 35 percent content. Look at our own laws on requirements for American-made products. I had an amendment before the Committee on Rules that said, make it 50 percent, in compliance with the Buy American Act of 1933, number 1; and number 2, require that those workers in Africa be African citizens.

This is a blueprint for transshipment, quota-free, duty-free, 35 percent content. For all of the Members who say that that is a smoke screen, the U.S. Customs Service has already cited six African nations for such transgressions.

Here is the bottom line, Mr. Chairman. I represent the United States of America. We have a record trade deficit approaching a quarter of a trillion dollars a year. I am opposed to the bill because yes, it is good for Africa, it is bad for America. It is good for African industry, it is bad for American industry. It is good for African workers, it is bad for American workers. It is good for China, Asia, and the world, and it is bad for our Cotton Belt, it is bad for our Midwest, it is bad for our farmers, it is bad for our industry. It is bad for America.

Let me say this, Congress will never help Africa, no matter how well-intended, by ultimately hurting the United States of America. Mr. Chairman, I was elected to represent the interests of Uncle Sam. I believe Africa needs all the help we can give them, and we should, but we should not make it easy to continue to put our people in unemployment lines.

The Democrat party had better look at the trade situation. They had better look at the trade situation, and they had better look at American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I support the intent of our efforts, but I oppose the substance and the mechanics of this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say at the outset, I am glad we are having this debate. We need to have more debates on this floor and in this Congress.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from New York, for his concern and diligence on behalf of providing opportunities and jobs in an area that we have neglected for such a long time, and my friend, as well, from the State of New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Having said that, let me just say that I oppose this bill. If I could just address for a second why I oppose the bill, I want to talk about the workers in Africa. This bill I think in my heart patterns the mistakes that we made in Mexico.

We were told when we did the North American Free Trade Agreement that not only would American workers benefit, but the Mexican worker would benefit. If we look at Mexico, the reality is that the wages since we passed that back in 1993 have gone down, from $1 an hour for the workers who belong to the maquilladora to 70 cents an hour.

The reason that has happened, the reason the environment has been despoiled, the reason wages have gone down, the reason they have no rights to organize, work collectively, come together and bargain for their sweat and labor, is because the trade agreement did not ensure that. The trade agreement there ensured that we were protecting our intellectual property, we were protecting the corporate rights, but it did not protect the worker.

I fear the same pattern here. I fear the same pattern here. Until we embody in these agreements the basic rights of working men and women, the same patterns will repeat themselves.

We should be addressing that. We should be addressing the questions of medical emergency assistance on AIDS. We should be addressing the debt question, which would take an enormous burden, which would be dealing with Jubilee 2000. We should be reaching out and expressing our hope in that way.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for bringing these issues up, bringing them to the floor, making us look at where we have been, where we are going, and what we are transplanting in terms of policy, and facing up to the reality that it is not just the corporations and the diplomats and the elite corps in these countries we ought to be concerned about, it is the working men and women who make the products who need to have the gains so their economies can flourish.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and I urge, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I must oppose this bill. I oppose this bill because I am not simply talking about Africa as a business opportunity. I love Africa. I have spent 20 years of my life working on behalf of Africa. We cannot see this as a business opportunity, and one more way of sophisticatedly exploiting Africa.

For those who love Africa as I do, help me stop Savimbi in Angola from running over dos Santos. They created Savimbi, the right wing did, along with Mobutu. They were the ones that supported de Klerk when we were trying to do something about getting rid of apartheid in South Africa.

I am sitting, as the ranking member in the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, trying to do something about the IMF. Some of the same language from IMF and the World Bank on structural adjustment is in this bill, not wanting Africa to own its own infrastructure, wanting them to reduce its corporate taxes, wanting them basically not to be able to be in control of their railroads and their airports, because we want to have the ability to own it all when we come in on this trade bill.

Yes, I am concerned about Africa. If Members love Africa as I do, help me make it a line item in the budget for foreign aid. Ensure that trade is not going to replace foreign aid. Do for Africa what we do for Israel. Do for Africa what we do for Russia. Give it most-favored-nation status, the way we do China.

I will tell Members how much they love Africa, they love it enough to want to give it to the corporations and allow them to do whatever they want to do. I know the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) loves Africa as I do, and he wants a good trade bill, but he has to amend it and make it right, I say to the gentleman from New York. This is not right.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and I appreciate the leadership the gentleman has shown in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation. There is very little doubt that the Africa that we see today is vastly different from the Africa we knew of yesterday. It is truly remarkable that a continent that was once racked by the insidious evils of apartheid, of civil strife, of dependence and economic stagnation, is today on the eve and in the making of an economic renaissance.

The engineers of this renaissance are not the Americans, they are not their former European colonial masters nor the Japanese. The engineers of this renaissance are the African themselves.

Today there is a generation of leadership in sub-Saharan Africa, leadership dedicated not to the failed status development models of the past, but to market-based reforms and private sector growth. This new generation does not ask America for help, but for hope. They do not ask America for food, but for the tools to make their crops grow. They do not ask America for roads or schools or dams, but for the capital incentives to build their own.

That is precisely what this bill would do. Through their actions, the African people have asked us to hear their call for hope, for opportunity, self-sufficiency, and sustainable economic growth. That is precisely what this bill would do. I urge my colleagues to heed this vote, to heed this call, and to vote yes on H.R. 434.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, because although it is well-intended, although it sounds good, it looks good, but in reality who does it really help? It really helps the multinational corporations that will slide into sub-Saharan Africa, pick up all of the goodies, put it in their pockets, in their wallets, and then move back. It has no protection for workers.

I see nothing in this bill that says that companies must hire, train, upgrade citizens who are indigenous to the community. I commend all of those who worked on it, and I admit that it sounds good. I, too, love Africa. I am of African descent.

But I can tell the Members, I do not want to help multinational corporations at the expense of the people in my district who have lost more than 130,000 jobs in the last 20 years, people who want to work, good people, but people who cannot find work because the jobs are gone.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

Let us talk about who is helped and who is hurt. Let me give some numbers consistent with what the gentleman just spoke of. He said 130,000 jobs in 20 years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that the apparel and textile industries lost 134,000 jobs in 1 year, 30,000 jobs in South Carolina in 12 months.

This will be a national holiday in China when Members pass this bill. The Chinese are going to send through Africa material made in China, apparel goods made in China that we would not let exist 20 seconds over here with the work conditions.

☐ 1200

There is going to be a stamp, ''Made in Africa'' but the slave labor comes from China, and it is going to put people from my district and the districts of my colleagues out of work. Sixty percent of the people in the textile industry and apparel industry are women, 35 percent are minorities, mostly African Americans. Where are they going to go to work?

We are going to give China an opportunity to destroy our textile industry. The trade policies of both parties are absolutely abysmal. We are played for a fool. I would not let either parties trade my car.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, really, there are two themes here. One is the economic and one is the human. And sometimes we get confused with sort of the opinions on the economics and the facts on the economics.

I am not going to get into the details because I disagree totally with some of the assumptions that have been made, that transshipments are going to deluge this country, it is going to open the doors to China. I do not think that is going to happen, but that is an opinion. We have the mechanisms to stop that.

I think that regarding the question about textile jobs, if I were representing a textile State, I would probably be concerned, also. But when we take a look at the actual numbers and the impact this is going to have, it is not a big worry.

I think as far as the human side, Sheila Sisulu, the Ambassador from South Africa, said this: If the first 5 years after apartheid were about ''nation-building, now it is about making hope a reality,'' and that is in terms of helping them economically.

Frankly, if we cannot help Africa in this tiny little impact on this Nation, who can we help? I love Africa, but if everybody else loved Africa, why can they not support this bill?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a bill about China. Transshipments are illegal. This is a bill about trying to inject a measure of investment and opportunity into one of the most catastrophically depressed regions of the world.

What are we afraid of? Are we afraid that our corporations, our workers cannot compete with this region? Clearly, that is a false assumption.

This is a win for Africa, but it is also an important win for the United States. This is a region of 700 million people. U.S. agriculture exports into this area are a tiny fraction of that compared just to Europe alone. And the growth opportunity is extremely significant if we begin building the kinds of relationships that will flow from the trade that is established from this act.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership in advancing a bill that is going to offer a real measure of hope to a region of the world that so desperately needs it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bad deal for Africans and Americans. It extends NAFTA. What can we expect if H.R. 434, ''NAFTA for Africa'', passes? We can expect even lower wages. If the experience of Africa is like that of Mexico, wages will fall. That is precisely what happened in Mexico where wages fell about 20 percent when NAFTA was enacted.

We can expect even more powerful multinational corporations. Africa knows this well already. One oil company ferries troops to fire upon civilians who exercise their democratic rights to protest for a cleaner environment and higher wages.

We can expect ever-higher trade deficits. Before NAFTA, the U.S. had a trade surplus with Mexico. After NAFTA, the U.S. had a trade deficit with Mexico. Why? Because NAFTA gave incentives to American companies to close their plants in America and reopen them in Mexico, then export from Mexico to the U.S. the goods they used to make in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and in my State, Ohio.

Some say it is not for us to decide. Well, it is only the Congress who can decide. If this is a first step, it is a first step in the wrong direction.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I have met with many of the presidents of Africa. I spoke with African ambassadors and diplomats, and all of them support the bill. I have not talked to one African representative that has been elected that did not support the bill and had a deep desire to increase foreign trade and investment.

In addition, as an African American woman, I strongly endorse H.R. 434 and believe that it is time that we pay attention to Africa and it is time that the United States and the world become color-blind to the continent and engage in trade with the Africans, just as we do with Asia and Latin America.

Let us not forget that the Africans who were brought to this country unwillingly made a great contribution to the infrastructure of our country without a penny of reimbursements. We owe it to the African continent at least to have them as trading partners. It is about time we made a sea change in our perception of the African continent and do everything within our power as Members of Congress to promote a success for African people whose forefathers have given so much to this great country.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), a Member who is new to the Subcommittee on Africa and has shown a great interest in the continent.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for yielding me this time. American workers are not impoverished by African nations that are impoverished themselves. American workers are not protected by having an impoverished African continent. American workers are not employed nor are their wages increased by businesses which are prevented from trading with Africa.

There are those who apparently want to see the African continent and most of the nations hobbled by a socialistic enterprise that has really impeded their progress for many years. They want to see countries continue in this failed program of a government-controlled economy. This will not work. It has not worked. It will only lead to greater degradation of both the environment and the economic situation in Africa.

There is another aspect of this, not just the economic consequences which I believe are positive for both American workers and African workers. With the end of the Cold War almost a decade ago, we are now faced with confronting a new war: a war on international terrorism. Likewise, Africa is a continent which can be welcomed by the United States or left alone, as some would have us do, and fall into the arms of terrorism, as we have seen these examples before in the past with the bombings of American embassies.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that with the passage of this bill we will eliminate the possibility of terrorist activities emanating out of Africa, but I am suggesting that it is a step in that direction. Because with the expansion of American exports in the way of trade and economies we are also exporting ideas. This is an extremely important point I think for our colleagues here to recognize.

We are not only bolstering monetary gains for those involved, but we are helping to build up and strengthen the stability of a region in a world that is rampant with conflict and turmoil. It is time to take a stand, and I welcome the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa as trading partners.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my good friend.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), my good friend, for yielding me this time.

I think it might be appropriate at this time to remind the gentleman of his promises that he made during the NAFTA debate that NAFTA would take this $3 billion trade surplus that we then enjoyed over Mexico and expand it. It has been expanded, but the wrong way. It has now gone into a $10 billion annual trade loss with Mexico, and all of those workers who were going to make enough money to go above that $1,000 per capita annual income to the point where they could order up American Kenmore washing machines and American-made Cadillacs, well, that has not come to fruition. In fact, their wages have gone down.

Mr. Chairman, that is the point here. These free trade deals manifest a situation clearly in which the best of intentions end up with very bad results.

I am impressed with the candor of the Chinese. It has been said on the floor that there are not going to be transshipments. Everybody seems to agree with that except the Chinese. This is a press release out of the Chinese Trade Ministry. I quote: ''Setting up assembly plants in Africa with Chinese equipment, technology, and personnel could not only greatly increase sales in African countries but also circumvent'' and here is the Chinese Trade Ministry saying this, ''will allow us to circumvent the quotas imposed on commodities of Chinese origin by European and American companies.''

The Chinese are already laying out their blueprint for expanding their $40 billion trade surplus over the United States at the expense of American workers.

Mr. Chairman, for those folks who think that African workers are going to partake in that, notice that they are not in this press release. They are not involved. This is going to be Chinese transshipment. It is going to accrue to the detriment of our trade balance.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the committee.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) for their work on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 434. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act offers us an opportunity to move forward our relationship with Africa.

Right now, the African market is small, but it is destined to grow. We can lay the groundwork today for a stronger relationship in the future which will mean a stronger partnership in the future, especially when it comes to the issue of trade, when Africa becomes a vibrant and strong player in that market.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill. I would prefer to see stronger provisions on the environment and on labor. But it needs to move forward. Partnership and progress are important elements in the U.S.-Africa relationship. 435 voting Members cannot in this House individually dictate the path and pace we will take to build that partnership and progress, especially as it relates to trade with Africa. But collectively we can send a message that we understand that in the future Africa will be an important trading partner with this country and move this measure forward and hope that in the future, when we have established that we are partners and friends with the African countries, that we deserve their trade and we deserve their business.

I urge support for H.R. 434.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, Africa has long suffered from neglect and needs our help. But when it comes to trade in textiles and apparel, I am not at all convinced that this bill will help Africa, and neither are the sponsors. They insist that its impact on the textile and apparel industry in this country will be small, minimal. But it may hurt textiles and apparel workers in these industries in America without helping textile and apparel workers in Africa.

Mr. Chairman, that is because by giving sub-Saharan countries duty-free, quota-free access to our markets, this bill will invite textile and apparel manufacturers in Asia to make their goods in Asia but transship them through Africa and gain access to our markets duty-free, quota-free, no restrictions whatsoever.

Is this improbable? Not when we consider the volume of transshipment today. Customs estimates it is in the range of $6 billion to $12 billion in textiles and apparel alone, and not when we consider the advantages. So if my colleagues want to help Africa but also help American workers, vote for the Bishop motion to recommit which will give Africa liberal treatment for access, but also protect our workers.

The bill before us today may be well-intentioned, but it is deeply flawed. I urge you to consider some important facts before you vote.

U.S. workers in the textile and apparel industry have lost their jobs faster than workers in any other industry over the past three years, and AGOA can only worsen the problem.

These jobs have been lost faster, and in greater numbers, than jobs in the steel industry, which has been the beneficiary of strong bipartisan support in this session. Almost 700,000 jobs have been lost in the textile and apparel industry since 1981; 118,000 have been lost in the past 12 months. The steel industry has lost 16,700 jobs over the same period.

If H.R. 434 becomes law, the U.S. textile and apparel industry—staggering under a trade deficit that topped $65 billion last year—will be hit even harder by imports coming in duty-free and quota-free from Africa. Neither Mexico under NAFTA, nor the Caribbean countries under CBI enjoy such access to our apparel markets. Even worse, these imports will not be made in Africa. They will be made in Asia and shipped through Africa and re-labeled to evade quotas and tariffs. Who will bear the brunt of these imports? 70% of U.S. apparel workers are women, and more than half are minorities, mostly African-American.

Why have the jobs disappeared? A primary driver has been low-wage imports—in both fabrics and apparel—manufactured and assembled in nations where worker compensation and working conditions are deplorable. This fact, not blind protectionism, is the reason we continue to impose quotas and levy tariffs on imported textiles and apparel. This fact also drives our decision to keep tariffs in place even after quotas are phased out in 2005. H.R. 434, in contrast to this reasoned policy, would create half a continent's worth of cheap imports. It would also open up Africa as a massive platform for transshipment, because textile/apparel goods supposedly originating there could come to the U.S. duty-free and quota-free. In short, AGOA will speed the already alarming textile and apparel job losses here in the U.S.

H.R. 434 will establish Sub-Saharan Africa as a massive platform for transshipment, accelerating these job losses.

Eight countries in Africa have already been identified by the U.S. Customs Service as transit points for illegal shipments of Chinese textile and apparel goods. This abuse, known as transshipment, is taken to evade China's quotas. China exports $10 billion legally to the U.S., and Customs believes that China exports as much as $6 billion more to the U.S. illegally.

H.R. 434 raised the reward for quota evasion by eliminating tariffs. Profits from transshipment will increase by the amount of tariffs evaded, which average 18% and run as high as 30%. The result: an explosion of transshipment through Africa, which will be all but impossible for Customs to police. Another result: rampant transshipment will take away the incentive for investment in African apparel production.

Supporters of the Bishop-Myrick amendment are not asking that a wish list of legislative language be added to H.R. 434, as some today have suggested. We are asking, instead, that we take steps simply to keep the pace of these job losses to a level reasonably commensurate with the rate of new job creation. The language we have sought to add, would address this problem, and its absence makes this bill poison to hundreds of thousands of hard working Americans.

I urge members to oppose H.R. 434.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1215

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I am honored to say that, today, the vast majority of American civic, religious, and business leaders strongly support this bill. More importantly, all 43 nations of sub-Saharan Africa have voiced unanimous support for this bold step towards stronger economic ties between the United States and Africa.

We have also recognized that Africa's fragile democracies cannot sustain themselves without economic prosperity. We have turned our attention towards strengthening Africa economically through U.S.-Africa trade. The globalization of the economy marked by the integration of markets through the world has made Africa the new economic frontier for economic growth. Western Europe and Japan are aggressively pursuing new trade relations with African countries.

This vast continent, with its enormous resources and human capacity, may become the world's economic engine well into the 21st Century.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, the African Growth and Opportunity Act provides the United States with the mechanism to leverage stronger U.S.-African public and private partnerships while promoting African and American long-term economic interests.

H.R. 434 is bipartisan. It provides a viable framework for modernizing Africa's trade infrastructure, strengthens relationships between the African and American private sectors, promotes African economic reform, and lays a foundation for future cooperation. H.R. 434 is the beginning of an ongoing relationship between the United States and Africa.

Much now has been said about the need for debt relief for Africa. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) has forcefully brought this point home to all of us. This bill does call for a deep debt relief for poor countries. We should, however, keep alive a discussion on this serious matter and seek to appropriately address the debt burden in an appropriate manner.

However, today, we begin to build strong trade relations between the United States and Africa, as it is a critical part of Africa's economic recovery. And for that, I urge all of my colleagues for the passage of H.R. 434. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This bipartisan legislation is intended to fundamentally shift U.S. trade and investment policy toward sub-Saharan Africa, establishing as U.S. policy the creation of a transition path from development assistance to economic self-reliance for those countries in Africa truly committed to economic and political reform, market incentives, and private sector growth.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act helps not only those Nations in sub-Saharan Africa who have sought to improve their economies by adopting political and market reforms, it helps the United States, which will greatly benefit from expanded trade. Tearing down trade barriers and creating new markets for American products in Africa translates into more American jobs and opportunities right here at home.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa and an original cosponsor of this legislation, I want to commend all those who have worked so hard to bring the African Growth and Opportunity Act to the floor today. It is a well-crafted bill that deserves our overwhelming support. I urge an aye vote on this legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have reflected on the debate that we have had this morning; and like many of my colleagues, I am gratified that the Halls of this Congress now raise their voices in a debate about Africa, acknowledging the fact that there is abject poverty in Africa but, as well, that there are energetic and active and enthusiastic business owners and women and those seeking employment who demand equality in the international trade world.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act, with the leadership of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), and now our guiding leader the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) combined together with Members recognizing that we must stand equal to the continent, or we will stand second to Europe.

It is interesting to note that U.S. exports of sub-Saharan Africa are greater than Russia and the NIS and Eastern Europe, $6.7 billion. But the exports going that direction cannot be enhanced without the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

As well, we cannot enhance the opportunity for businesses in Africa to trade with us. We then are treating them in a second-class manner.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is well knowledgeable that, as we ended World War II, it is very clear that the trade and investment helped rebuild Europe after World War II.

Yes, I started traveling to Africa and visiting with Africans in the late 1960s and 1970s. There is abject poverty. But Africans today do not want us to define them with abject poverty.

I want a debt relief. I want this Congress to have a debt relief vehicle. I am on a debt relief bill. But at the same time, we in America, acknowledging the fact that the cities of Greenville and Spartanburg and Anderson, South Carolina, exported $49 million to Africa, we in America cannot ignore $700 million.

Therefore, it is important to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act as, not only an opportunity for Africans, but an opportunity for us in America to be able to join and encourage small businesses, women, entrepreneurs, to develop capital infrastructure and provide the nexus of the engine of more jobs in America, in our urban and rural communities.

There is something about doing business with people. In Africa, people want to do business. They want to be educated. They want to have good health care. They want to make sure they have good housing. Let us get them going and work with them in partnership. Let them tell China how to handle their business.

I rise to support the passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. The time has come for this historic piece of legislation and the opportunities it presents, to become reality. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is good for America and good for Africa. For the first time, we will have a framework for using trade and investment as an economic development tool throughout Africa. Through this Act the United States seeks to facilitate market-led economics and as a consequence stimulate significant social and economic development within the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. The Governments of Africa have articulated their eagerness to become fully integrated into the global marketplace, as a means to self-sufficiency and progression as the world moves into the next millennium.

The Bill changes how America does business with Africa. It seeks to enhance U.S.-Africa policy to increased trade, investment, self-help and serious engagement. It seeks to move away from the paternalism which in the past characterized American's dealing with Africa. This bill encourages strategies to improve economic performance and requires high-level talks betwen the U.S. and African governments on trade and investment issues.

The passage of this bill will begin a new era where Africans and Americans work together in a relationship of mutual respect as business partners providing for Africa a platform to integrate more fully into the global economy. The bill is not a substitute for our foreign aid. But it will allow our aid to Africa to be even more effective because it will be balanced with good fair trade policies and the positive results of foreign investments.

Although this is the first such bill to specifically target the sub-Saharan Africa, the market access provisions of this bill are not new to foreign policy. Developing countries around the world have traditionally relied on trade and investment centered development to stimulate growth and diversification of a competitive economic base.

It is an approach that has been tested and proven by time. Trade and investment helped rebuild Europe after World War II. By opening U.S. market and encouraging receptive conditions for U.S. investments and exporters abroad, we were able to assist Asia in diversifying their export bases and by doing so become prosperous consumers of American products. It is time to apply these same incentives to the African marketplace.

Why now? There are thousands of reasons Africa and the U.S. should work together for the 21st century. Obviously, Africa matters to 30 million Americans who trace their roots there. But, Africa matters to all Americans. In volume terms, nearly 14 percent of U.S. crude oil imports come from Africa as compared to 17 percent from the Middle East. Despite areas of instability, Africa's economic trends generally remain positive. Africa has thus far weathered the global financial crisis, unlike many other developing economies.

More than two-thirds of African nations continue to implement far reaching macroeconomic reforms, including liberalizing trade and investment regimes, reducing tariffs, rationalizing exchange rates ending subsidies, and stabilizing their currencies.

U.S. exports of Sub-Saharan Africa rose 8.4% in 1998 to $6.7 billion. These exports support 133,000 U.S. jobs (based on the Department of Commerce estimates). U.S. exports to Africa are concentrated in high-wage industries, such as aircraft and parts, construction machinery and equipment, computers, motor vehicles, and telecommunications equipment.

Africa is an important market for U.S. farmers. In 1998, wheat and wheat flour was the 5th largest U.S. export product to sub-Saharan Africa with a value of $262 million.

And with an estimated 700 million people, each a potential consumer, the African market is vast and ready for our products and services. Sub-Saharan Africa does matter, both economically and politically. We are part of a global community and Africa is certainly a member. It is time to allow Africa full membership!

We must afford the same opportunities to Africa that we have already offered to other regions of the world. Africa has been a cooperative partner in addressing our concerns in combating such transnational security threats as crime, narcotics, terrorism and arms proliferation. The world can not find global solutions to the many issues without including Africa. We need a strong, economically stable continent that is our partner!

Democratic countries that are at peace and enjoying prosperity make good partners. They abide by international law. They help respond to crisis. They protect their populations. They care about their environment.

It is now, and always has been in our best interest to have our world made up of such countries. Some have stated that the Africa Growth and Opportunity act will undermine the sovereignty of African nations by imposing strict eligibility requirements on participating countries.

In a press conference on July 9th, the African Diplomatic Corps took umbrage with this claim. Ambassador Edith Ssempala, ambassador from Uganda pointed out that ''it is poverty, not African Growth and Opportunity, which ''recolonizes'' Africa.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity act does not undermine the sovereignty of any country because participation by Sub-Saharan countries in the Africa a trade initiative is entirely voluntary. A country can choose not to participate in the initiative if it believes compliance with the eligibly criteria is not in its interests. The ability of countries to make such decision is, in fact, a classic example of the exercise of sovereignty.

Some cite labor rights abuses. There is a misconception that the bill fails to include strong labor preconditions for countries to gain eligibility for expanded trade benefits. The bill stipulates that eligible countries must also observe the existing statutory criterion on internationally recognized worker rights as a condition for eligibility for duty free benefits under the General System of Preferences (GSP) program.

This includes the right of association; the right to organize and bargain collectively; a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor; a minimum age for the employment of children and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work and occupational safety and health.

The African Growth and Opportunity act was developed in consultation with African leaders. It builds upon the economic reforms initiated by Africans for their countries.

As stated by Roble Olhaye as Dean of the African Diplomatic Corps, the African Growth and Opportunity Act is an innovative bipartisan legislation designed to stimulate and strengthen the U.S.-Africa economic partnership through ''incentives, trade liberalization, and [a] permanent forum for policy discussion and is of the utmost urgency''.

I agree, as must we all—the time is now. Let's pass this bill!

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that since 1995, over 375,000 American Textile and apparel workers have lost their jobs. Many of these workers have been from the State of Georgia—a number of them from the Third District, which I represent. June headlines in Third District newspapers read, ''Thomaston Mills Drops Bombshell: Textile Firm will Close Local Plant, Leaving 145 Jobless'' and ''Closing Will Affect All Taxpayers.'' In addition to closing its Third District facilities, Thomaston Mills simultaneously shut down factories and offices in a neighboring Georgia district and in Los Angeles and New York, costing another 555 Americans their jobs. Try to tell one of these 700 American citizens that it's a good idea to give more trade preferences to foreign textile producers without providing anything to American Producers in return. Thomaston Mills CEO Neil Hightower summarized the challenges textile mills are facing saying,

> We have been losing a lot of money on yarn and denim. The Asian crisis has seriously devalued currencies there, and they are being very aggressive in going after U.S. markets. There is still a lot of denim used, but all the growth is going to foreign suppliers.

The workers, families, and communities of the Third District of Georgia are not ready to accept another trade deal that benefits foreign manufacturers and provides nothing for American workers.

As textile manufacturers and many of my colleagues have argued for years, an African trade initiative that does not require beneficiaries to use U.S. yarn and cloth would seriously threaten domestic textiles producers by allowing massive transshipments of products through Africa from Asia. 807(a)-type ''yarn-forward'' and ''fabric-forward'' provisions would ensure first that U.S. textile workers and manufacturers would receive some benefit in exchange for trade advantages given to foreign producers. Additionally, such provisions ensure that African nations reap the benefits of increased trade, instead of trade predators such as China.

Last year, the Africa trade bill faced considerable opposition in House floor votes on the rule, on the motion to recommit, and on final passage, because transshipping provisions in the bill were inadequate to prevent massive Chinese transshipments through sub-Saharan Africa. 189 Members of the House (48 Republicans and 141 Democrats) opposed the rule last year. 192 Members (66 Republicans and 126 Democrats) supported the motion to recommit (which included 807(a)-type provisions). And, 185 Members (84 Republicans and 101 Democrats) opposed final passage of the bill. In spite of this broad opposition and in spite of the fact that this year's bill does not improve on the weak transshipping provisions from last year's effort, the Rules Committee chose not to allow floor consideration of an amendment that would have added yarn-forward and fabric-forward requirements to the bill.

Expanding trading is very important to the American worker, but most workers understand that while the United States has aggressively lowered or eliminated many of its barriers to foreign products, most countries are still closed to U.S. products. Time and again, these workers have seen trade agreements result in lost jobs. I strongly support enhanced trade and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa, but not at the cost of American jobs. In representing the people of the Third District of Georgia, I must urge Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), our ranking member, for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) for his leadership, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), and others who have worked diligently on this bill.

As an African-American woman living in America, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. Is it perfect? No, it is not. Is it a start? Yes, it is.

There are over 750 million Africans living in sub-Saharan Africa who want this bill. The leadership corps here in Africa, the Ambassador Corps who sits here in our Chamber want this bill. The African presidents who are represented by their ambassadors want this bill.

We have got a President for the first time in history of this country who has not only visited Africa but has put his support behind this bill.

I am a member of the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. For the first time in the history of this country, we will have an appropriation that begins to meet the needs of the African continent.

The land is fertile. The people are ready. Its leadership is in place.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, when one only has 2 minutes, one can only say so much.

But what I want to say here today, this is a first step. There has not been another before it. America is ripe for the building of Africa, and so are we as Africans in this country and Africans abroad.

Let us support this bill. Let us work with the African Ambassador Corps and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. Let me commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our chairman, for having the sensitivity to increase the appropriation so that we can rise up and build on the African continent.

I rise today in strong support of strengthening Africa's role in the international economic community. I rise today in strong support of the people of the second largest land mass on our planet. I rise today in strong support of the land of all of our biological origins. I rise today in strong support of economic self-sufficiency and sufficiency for Africa and her peoples. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 424, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It is, indeed, long overdue for Africa to take her place at the international table of economic opportunity.

On the pantheon of world history, Africa is a newborn. In the last decade, we saw the fall of one of the last old-line colonialist nations when apartheid ended in South Africa. The first African nation to gain a semblance of independence was the nation of Ghana in the mid 1950s under the late Kwame Nkrumah. Since then, many nations in sub-Saharan Africa have not struggled from outright colonialism, but the more surreptitious and sinister demon of neo-colonialism. What is neo-colonialism? While many sub-Saharan African nations gained political independence, their economic purse strings were controlled by their former colonizers. This is neo-colonialism, something that we must never repeat in Africa or throughout the world. It is one of my goals, as a Member of Congress, to ensure that Africa becomes economically self-sufficient.

I am proud and an original cosponsor of both AGOA and H.R. 772, the HOPE for Africa Act. It is my belief that these initiatives are not mutually exclusive, and I hope that some of the vital components of the HOPE for Africa are incorporated into AGOA to make it an even stronger bill.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act assists African nations in the often difficult transition from receiving developmental assistance to economic self-reliance through increased trade and investment opportunities. Economic development is promoted by establishing a new trade and investment partnership between the U.S. and the democracies of sub-Saharan Africa. There are many steps to promoting sustainable development. This initiative, which has strong bipartisan support, moves this process forward by promoting trade while supporting debt reduction and increased development aid for African countries.

Let me point out some of the important and salient points regarding the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA):

AGOA would increase U.S.-Africa high-level dialogue. AGOA creates a U.S.-Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum to facilitate such high-level discussion on trade arrangements. The bill also improves private sector and non-governmental dialogue by encouraging U.S. private sector and NGOs to host annual meetings with their respective sub-Saharan Africa counterparts.

AGOA supports debt relief by expressing the sense of Congress that the Administration should forgive concessional debt owed to the U.S. by the poorest sub-Saharan countries.

AGOA expresses the sense of Congress that the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), a corporation that I believe to be very effective in promoting exports, should initiate more equity funds in support of sub-Saharan African countries, as well as revising the composition of the OPIC board of directors to require at least one of the eight presidentially-appointed directors to have extensive sub-Saharan Africa private sector experience.

AGOA improves current workers rights. The trade benefits within this bill are extended under our Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), which contains workers protections. The GSP statute requires beneficiary countries to have taken or be taking steps to afford internationally recognized workers rights, defined as freedom of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, prohibition against forced or compulsory labor, a minimum age for the employment of children, and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work and occupational health and safety.

This bill expands trade opportunities by increasing access to the U.S. market for non-import sensitive goods and textiles. Of course, Africa must make continual progress toward achieving the bill's economic criteria, while maintaining the same requirements—as always—for existing trade and aid benefits to Africa.

I support trade and investment in Africa, and I hope you do too. I will be the first to acknowledge among my colleagues that while AGOA is not perfect, AGOA is a step in the right direction. For the first time in this century, Congress is taking real and positive steps toward ensuring that Africa is a fair trading partner with the United States. My colleague, Congressman JESSE JACKSON, JR., has a worthy bill, sections of which I hope can be incorporated within AGOA as it moves forward this Congress. I would personally like the canceling of even more African debt and requiring multinational companies in Africa to abide by U.S. environmental standards in Africa. I do believe, however, that AGOA is moving in the right direction by increasing the vital dialogue and interaction that is needed on all levels. This dialogue only helps the U.S. and sub-Saharan Africa to learn about each other and mutually beneficial business practices and opportunities. It is time for Africa to move along the path to effective economic self-sufficiency. H.R. 434 is a start on the path to true economic self-sufficiency for Africa that can only improve the lives of her people.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of H.R. 434. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is a win-win for African and American workers.

Africa is an untapped market of 700 million consumers for American goods and services. H.R. 434 will encourage African economic reforms, which will provide U.S. firms and workers with greater access to the growing economies of Africa.

The U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa rose 8.4 percent in 1998 to $6.7 billion. These exports support over 100,000 U.S. jobs, based on the Department of Commerce estimates.

Furthermore, U.S. exports to Africa are intensive in high-wage industries, such as aircraft and parts, construction machinery and equipment, computers, motor vehicles, and telecommunications equipment.

Africa is also an important agricultural market for the United States. In 1998, wheat and wheat flour was the fifth largest U.S. export product to sub-Saharan Africa with a value of $262 million.

This legislation requires the President to develop a plan to enter into free-trade agreements with sub-Saharan African countries and provides an opportunity for regular meetings with African officials to discuss trade liberalization.

H.R. 434 expresses support for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation's, OPIC's, creation of infrastructure and equity funds for projects in Africa.

But this legislation also benefits the Africans themselves. For example, H.R. 434 establishes the U.S. trade policy with Africa.

Again, I urge my colleagues' strong support for this legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. More so than ever before, we are seeing economic development in developing countries provide tremendous prosperity to folks for whom hope was once outside their grasp.

This bill today will provide a very important tool to sub-Saharan African countries to help empower men and women and their communities to begin to support themselves and their families, begin to develop their own businesses.

We spend a lot of time talking about how great our economy is, how good our ideas and values are, but we have got to go further. We have got to provide tools to countries so they can emulate our success. This bill is not just about a good idea. It is about a very important tool.

There has been concern expressed about abuse and exploitation of workers. Those are valid concerns. We constantly balance those concerns as we foster our economy here. There are unions in these countries that will work to protect workers. There are important provisions in these bills.

This bill will allow the President to decertify these preferences should there be abuses. This bill is balanced. We should support it. It will empower our friends in these very important countries.

☐ 1230

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of House Resolution 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am an original sponsor of this bill. I traveled throughout Africa with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and others, and I spoke privately and individually to the leaders of Africa. They want this piece of legislation.

We must realize there may be some other outside sources who may have some other benefits through the African Growth and Opportunity Act, but I say to my colleagues that there are not any that inherently have in them this investment in trade and arts, too, or any kind of development. The Rangel act has very sound policies in it, and there are things about it that will promote investment in Africa. Remember, this is the first time that this has been done. We have to take the first step.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is a critical step. After we take this critical step, we can do some other things. But I ask my colleagues to please support the Rangel bill and challenge any notion that it is going to be bad for people. It is not going to be bad. There is only a 4 percent impact in the event this bill does pass.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

As we approach this next century, it is appropriate for us to atone for the mistakes and our failed commitment to adequately engage Africa in this century. As we move forward in the next century, it is important that we move legislation such as this which will allow us to expand trade and economic opportunities for Africans and Americans alike.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act would provide a foundation for economic growth and employment in sub-Saharan Africa by encouraging this economic engagement in expanded trade and investment. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is win-win legislation. It is a win for African nations struggling to move forward and integrate into the global economy. It is a win for the African people, who will benefit from the new jobs and economic growth that this legislation is certain to bring to their region. And it is a win for U.S. businesses and workers alike, who will benefit from a growing African economy and its increased purchasing power.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this continent has a long history with the continent of Africa, and invariably it has been one of exploitation.

Generations ago, we used the African people, brought them to this country and enslaved them. And even after emancipation was granted, we continued to enslave them through a legal system that discriminated against them. We continued to exploit them to subsidize our agricultural economy. And then we used the African nations as surrogates in our Cold War with Russia.

Well, now, today, because of the initiative of indigenous leaders on the continent of Africa, we are finally saying, ‘‘Look, you are on an equal basis with us. We need you. You need us. Let us work together on a level playing field.’’ They have come into their own.

This should have happened generations ago, but we should not miss this opportunity today. This legislation is not patronizing. It is not exploitative. It is the right thing to do. Let us pass it unanimously.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a landmark piece of legislation that is long overdue.

I also want to applaud my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and all of the others who have worked so hard through several Congresses to bring us to this day.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has come to the aid of many countries, some of which have not made the strides in democracy we are seeing in many parts of the African continent. Today, with very little impact on jobs in the U.S., we can begin a process that has the potential to turn Sub-Saharan Africa into a model of economic progress. Through enacting this important piece of legislation, we will also see a win for this country in terms of increased trade and, thus, more jobs, not less, as the charts next to me support.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to strongly support amendments which will address what would be a major obstacle to the success we envision through H.R. 434, that of AIDS in Africa, a pandemic which is destroying families and decimating the populations of many of the countries we seek to help. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill and ask my colleagues to join us in the effort to bring affordable medication and health care to the people of Africa and the rest of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 1½ minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to thank publicly the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his out standing efforts in allowing us the opportunity to offer some critique to the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

I also want to make it very clear that many of my colleagues have stood here and said that this is a first step for Africa. Many of us have been trying to raise the bar in this Congress about what an appropriate first step would be. Not just a first step, we need to take ‘‘the step’’, the step that frees Africa and allows Africa to be an equal partner. We cannot do that if we use crushing debt as a basis for negotiating more favorable terms for U.S. corporations to grease the market for foreign investment in Sub-Saharan Africa without our standards and our values. Not just our money, we must also export our values in this particular instance.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will attempt to conclude this discussion by saying I really think this is one of the finest hours that we have had in the House.

We have had serious differences of opinion, but I think the overwhelming thought is that it has been too long that we not recognize the great potential of our great friends in the continent of Africa.

A lot has to be said about the leadership provided by the President of the United States, but of course we also have to recognize that the former Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, was one of the first to come before the Ways and Means, under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the subcommittee chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

And together, in working with the committees headed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the leadership that we have had on both sides, working with the representatives of the African countries to be affected, I do not really think that we have ever had a stronger coalition to begin this gigantic first step to bring some equity in the relationship that we would have with those that have been neglected morally and economically.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my friends and colleagues for their support.

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

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me also commend the leaders in this fight: the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE); the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL); the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON); the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for the work that they have done.

But I also wish to acknowledge, quickly again, the ambassadors from Africa who are here, and with this chart demonstrate what they have said what they want. The ambassador from Djibouti, who says we are sovereign and we would like to continue to have the support of this bill; and Mrs. Sisulu from South Africa, who said their country supports the bill, even under the late president of the country. Our good friend, Mr. Mandela, and Mrs. Ssempala from Uganda talked about Africa is interested in doing business. This is what they have said.

So what I am saying, as I last week went to the funeral of Joshua Nkomo, one of the freedom fighters in Zimbabwe, who fought against the white regime of Ian Smith; and while I was in Zimbabwe people were coming up and saying, we are glad finally to see this bill come. And I remember the freedom fighters of Jomo Kunyata, Patrice Lumumba and people who fought many years ago, Julius Nyere, those men who fought for independence of that great nation, of that great continent; and the new leaders today of Thabo Mbeki and Mr. Chissano in Mozambique; and we can move on and on through the continent.

As they were trying to get it moving forward, then came the Cold War, and our policies destroyed many countries in Africa. Our policies were based on U.S. policy towards Russia. So now, after 50 years of independence, let us give African leaders an opportunity. Let us remember W.E.B. DuBois, who was the first panAfricanist, and Dellums and Diggs, or Gray and Dellums, who fought against apartheid, and the late Congressman Diggs, the first chairman of the African committee; and let us remember our friend, Mickey Leland, who lost his life saying that we should feed the children.

So, finally, we are here. We have seen peace coming to Sierra Leon, and Nigeria electing a new president, Eritrea finally coming to some accord. We are seeing the fact that Africa now has the opportunity to move forward with growth and development and opportunity. Yes, there are many problems in the continent. We need clean water, we need to eradicate the guinea worm and deal with river blindness, we need to have inoculations, but we also need to have jobs for people.

This is the first step. And people criticize and ask why it is such a little step. Everyone knows that a trip of a thousand miles has to begin with the first step. Let us start that step; let us support the bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and let me open by expressing my appreciation to all that have been involved in the advancement of what to me is one of the more significant pieces of legislation that we have had before this body in quite some time.

I think, with regard to some of the arguments that we have heard on the negative side, that there are a couple of points that need to be stressed and perhaps put into a better perspective than we have heard today. And this especially has to do with the question of transshipment and the threat of transshipment. This bill has the strongest language ever that we have had in any trade legislation to protect against transshipment.

And I think it is important to recognize also that the U.S. Customs Service has not found Africa to be a significant source of any transshipment at all in all of our trade relations worldwide. And the International Trade Commission examined Sub-Saharan Africa textile and apparel production capacity and found that the elimination of tariffs and quotas, as provided in this bill, would have a negligible effect on the U.S. economy. Furthermore, the ITC estimated that African exports would not grow over the next 10 years to account for more than 3 percent of U.S. textile and apparel imports.

The World Trade Organization agreement on textiles and apparels will eliminate all textile quotas worldwide by the year 2005. The bill's textile provisions are intended to provide Africa with a necessary transition period to develop its textile and apparel sector and to prepare for global competition. Without these provisions, Africa will be left behind.

And Africa, in terms of our trade relations with that continent, has been left behind. This bill is designed to terminate that and to open up that door and that window and to create improved relations for not just the people in the African continent, it improves conditions for Americans, too. It is a win-win proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1245

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I rise in strong support of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 1999. This important legislation would encourage expanded trade and investment between American companies and manufacturers in sub-Saharan Africa, while also providing a strong foundation of economic growth and employment for some of the poorest countries in the world.

This bipartisan legislation would make significant progress in opening markets in key-sub-Saharan African countries. It will encourage greater U.S. investment in Africa, resulting in new jobs for African workers, and more jobs for U.S. workers and producers of goods and services. The U.S. will benefit by helping to build a consumer market for 700 million people. As African incomes increase, we will see a dramatic increase in U.S. exports. Today, more than 100,000 Americans are employed as a result of our trade with sub-Saharan Africa, and eight states have exported more than a billion dollars worth of products to sub-Saharan Africa over the last five years.

Enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act is important for U.S. businesses to compete with the already established European businesses in Africa. The U.S. has trade agreements with almost every country in the world—Asia, Europe, Israel and Mexico. Our European business competitors have long understood the importance of investment in sub-Saharan Africa. During the 1990's, British and French investments were 300 percent to 200 percent higher, respectively, than U.S. investment in Africa.

The United States has an important interest in a stable and prosperous Africa. This bill encourages African countries to continue fundamental reform in return for greater trade benefits, while providing protections for worker rights. As a result, this legislation will bolster African democracies, increase political stability and minimize the need for international humanitarian and disaster relief. By encouraging reform, supporting investments and increasing opportunity for trade, this legislation will stimulate the growth of the African private sector. One of the important provisions of this bill is the creation of OPIC-supported equity and investment funds to assist African entrepreneurs develop private sector enterprises. These funds will assist American companies seeking to establish a presence in the region, which will lead to long-term U.S. exports to the region.

This bill is clearly not enough to rescue Africa's poorest countries. We should go further by considering H.R. 1095, a bill which I have cosponsored to accelerate debt relief for highly indebted poor countries including those in sub-Saharan Africa. It is my hope the House will do so soon as a compliment to this free trade bill. In fact, few of these countries have the infrastructure to effectively compete in the global economy. But these countries need some hope of moving beyond aid dependency toward market-based economic development. This can best be achieved by expanding trade and investment opportunities for the nations in sub-Saharan Africa. This bill is a modest, but important first step toward achieving the goal of full African integration into the global economy, while assisting the U.S. to expand and diversify our exports, create new jobs and continue the longest, most stable growth period in our history.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by commending the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and all those who have spent so much time moving this historic legislation.

Let me also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and commend him for the fine job he has done in doing that.

Let me just try to answer some of the concerns. As trade has expanded, unemployment in the United States has gone down appreciably. We have the highest employment numbers we have had in decades, and part of this is because of the trade and engagement we have had. Our trade exports to Africa have been going up by 8 percent a year. And yet, the United States only has 4 percent of that market, only 4 percent of that market.

This gives us an opportunity for win-win. It creates new jobs in the United States, and it will create new jobs in sub-Saharan Africa. And at the same time, it gives us tough language to combat illegal transshipment, the strongest language that we have seen to date. If there are violators, that country can be pulled out of the program and those who do so are severely punished under this act, with severe penalties.

In terms of Africa's sovereignty, that issue has been raised. Let me reiterate that the African countries themselves, every one, supports this bill. This bill limits eligible countries to those who make progress with market-oriented economic reforms.

There is a human rights abuse screen that we have put in this bill, and we took care of some of the labor concerns with the amendment offered by the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Now, when it comes to China, if anything, this bill has the potential of harming the Chinese textile industry, not helping it. Early this year, Karen Fedorko executive vice president of MAST Industries, testified to the Committee on Ways and Means that the bottom line is that, under this bill, Africa would become significantly more competitive and producers we currently work with in East Asia would shift their orders away from Asian vendors and towards some of our new contacts in Africa. Frankly, Africa's gain is China's loss under this bill.

Let me reiterate. In many ways, Africa is in the balance. Without efforts today to bring Africa into the world economy, without efforts like the African Growth and Opportunity Act, Africa could become permanently marginalized, Africans would suffer, and the American people would not escape the consequences.

To reject this legislation is to say we do not have any room on the economic map for Africa in the new century. I do not think my colleagues want to go that way.

I ask for their support for this bipartisan legislation.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 434, the so-called African Growth and Opportunity Act.

AFRICA TRADE BILL

I support the goals of this bill—to provide a foundation for a strong democracy and to create economic development in Africa.

What cannot sanction, however, is legislation that promotes these goals at the expense of African workers, the very sector of society upon which future economic development rests.

At the very least, we must promote an economic foundation for Africa which has as its cornerstone the provision of ample employment opportunities for the indigenous citizens and permanent residents.

Unfortunately, this bill requires African countries to meet strict IMF-style austerity measures in order to receive limited trade benefits. Even after these conditions are met, there are few provisions to ensure that African citizens actually benefit from the duty-free, quota-free access to the U.S. market that the bill provides for garment manufacturers. Only 20 percent of a garment's value would need to be added in Africa.

Further, the bill would allow foreign contract workers to be exported to Africa to make the trade-preferenced products.

My colleagues say that the bill's provisions are stringent enough, that transshipment's not going to happen, that it is not possible, that the ocean is too far.

Well, let me explain to my colleagues about the over $1 billion garment industry in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands—a pacific island U.S. Territory that receives duty free, quota free access to the U.S. market.

Chinese garment makers send to the U.S. duty free goods woven in China cut in China, and assembled in the Northern Marianas by Chinese workers. We see in the Northern Marianas a workforce that is totally controlled, that is indentured, that is bonded, where the young women are forced into abortions and into prostitution.

It is a simple matter for the Chinese to do the same thing in Africa, because it is very clear why they would go there. In Africa, they can get there under the U.S. quota.

Today, in the Northern Marianas, 98 percent of the private sector jobs are held by foreign contract workers. Obviously, local workers in the Northern Marianas aren't the true beneficiaries of access to the U.S. market, just as the workers in Africa wouldn't benefit if this bill passes.

H.R. 434 represents the failed status quo model of trade that rewards multinational corporations but does little to protect workers or the environment.

The bill would further accelerate the global race to the bottom with corporations seeking locales where they can pollute at will and pay workers pennies an hour.

Forutnately, there is an alternative, that my colleagues, Rep. JESSE JACKSON, Jr., has introduced. It contains many of the worker-protection provisions I planned to offer—but was not allowed to offer—when this bill was debated last year.

Rep. JACKSON's bill, the HOPE for Africa Act, provides a new model for trade that combines expanded trade with protections for workers an the environment. HOPE for Africa aims to raise living standards, foster capital accumulation in Africa, and prevent the types of abuses that are rampant in the Northern Marianas.

In order to receive the bill's trade benefits, companies must employ 80% African workers, add 60% of a product's value in Africa, and be at least 51% owned by African citizens. Labor and environmental standards must be followed as well.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 434 as a failed model of the past and to support Representative JACKSON's vision for the future of trade.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, once again Congress demonstrates that it has no fundamental understanding of free trade or the best interests of the taxpayer. The Africa Growth & Opportunity Act is heavy-laden with the Development Assistance (foreign aid), debt forgiveness (so much for the balanced budget), OPIC expansion (thus putting the taxpayers further at risk), and of course a new international regulatory board to be funded with ''such sums as may be necessary.'' Additionally, the costs of this bill are paid by raising taxes on charity. Free trade, Washington style, is evidently not free for the taxpayer!

So what exactly is ''free trade'' and how far removed from this principle have those in Washington and the world drafted? Free trade, in its purest form, means voluntary exchange between individuals absent intervention by the coercive acts of government. When those individuals are citizens of different political jurisdictions, international trade is he term typically applied in textbook economics. For centuries, economists and philosophers have debated the extent to which governments should get in the way of such transactions in the name of protecting the national interest (or more likely some domestic industry). Obviously, both parties to exchange (free of intervention) expect to be better off or they would not freely engage in the transaction. It is the parties excluded (i.e. government and those out-competed) from the exchange who might have benefitted by being a party to it who can be relied upon to engage in some coercive activity to prevent the transaction in the hopes that their trading position will become more favorable by ''default.''

Because governments have for so long engaged in one variety of firm-or-industry-benefitting protectionism or another, my ''trade free of intervention'' definition of free trade is currently quite out of favor with beltway-dominant pundits. Such wrongheaded thinking is not limited to government. In academia, a widely-used undergraduate economics text, authorized by David C. Colander, describes a ''free trade association'' as a ''group of countries that allows free trade among its members and puts up common barriers against all other countries' goods''—thus here we have free trade associations putting up barriers. (An economic textbook only Orwell could love.)

An example of what now constitutes ''free trade'' Washington style can be found within the US ENGAGE Congressional Scorecard. It is insightful to consider what USA ENGAGE regards as pro-free trade against the backdrop of the non-interventionist notion of free trade outlined above.

China Most Favored Nation (MFN), while politically charged, is perhaps the cleanest genuine free trade vote chosen by USA ENGAGE. The question posed by this legislation is whether tariffs (taxes on U.S. citizens purchasing goods imported from China) should be lower or higher. In other words, when American and Chinese citizens engage in voluntary exchanges, should Americans be taxed. Clearly the free trade position here is not to raise taxes on Americans and interfere with trade.

The Vietnam Waiver vote classification as a pro-free trade position is particularly indicative, however, of what now constitutes free trade in the alleged minds of the beltway elite. When government forces through taxation, citizens to forego consumption of their own choosing (in other words forego voluntary exchanges) so that government can send money to foreign entities (i.e. trade promotion), this in the mind of Washington insiders constitutes ''free trade.'' In other words, when demand curves facing the corporate elite are less than those desired, government's help is then enlisted to shift the demand curve by forcing taxpayers to send money to various government and private entities whose spending patterns more favorably reflect those desired by those ''engineering'' such ''free trade'' policies in Washington. Much like tax cuts being a ''cost to government'' and ''free trade associations'' whose purpose it is to erect barriers, free trade has become government-coerced, taxpayer-financed foreign aid designed to result in specific private spending and private gains.

The Fast Track initiative highlighted in USA ENGAGE's Congressional scorecard has its own particular set of Constitutional problems, but the free-trade arguments are most relevant and illustrative here. The fast-track procedure bill sets general international economic policy objectives, re-authorizes ''Trade Adjustment Assistance'' welfare for workers who lose their jobs and for businesses which fail (a gentler, kinder ''welfarist'' form of protectionism), and creates a new permanent position of Chief Agriculture Negotiator within the office of the United States Trade Representative. Lastly, like today's legislative mishap, the bill ''pays'' the government's ''cost'' of free trade by increasing taxes on a set of taxpayers further removed from those corporatists who hope to gain by engineering favorable international trade agreements.

Constitutional questions aside, like today's H.R. 434, the fast track bill contained provisions which would likely continue our country down the ugly path of internationally-engineered, ''managed trade'' rather than that of free trade. As explained by the late economist Murray N. Rothbard, Ph.D.:

> [Genuine free trade doesn't require a treaty (or its deformed cousin, a 'trade agreement'; NAFTA is called an agreement so it can avoid the constitutional requirement of approval by two-thirds of the Senate). If the establishment truly wants free trade, all it has to do is to repeal our numerous tariff, import quotas, anti-dumping laws, and other American-imposed restrictions of free trade. No foreign policy or foreign maneuvering in necessary.

In truth, the bipartisan establishment's fanfare of ''free trade'' fosters the opposite of genuine freedom of exchange. Whereas genuine free traders examine free markets from the perspective of the consumer (each individual), the mercantilist examines trade from the perspective of the power elite; in other words, from the perspective of the big business in concert with big government. Genuine free traders consider exports a means of paying for imports, in the same way that goods in general are produced in order to be sold to consumers. The mercantilists want to privilege the government business elite at the expense of all consumers—be they domestic or foreign.

Fast track is merely a procedure under which the United States can more quickly integrate an cartelize government in order to entrench the interventionist mixed economy. In Europe, this process culminated in the Maastricht Treaty, the attempt to impose a single currency and central bank and force relatively free economies to ratchet up their regulatory and welfare states. In the United States, it has instead taken the form of transferring legislative and judicial authority from states and localities and to the executive branch of the federal government. Thus, agreements negotiated under fast track authority (like NAFTA) are, in essence, the same alluring means by which the socialistic Eurocrats have tried to get Europeans to surrender to the super-statism of the European Union. And just as Brussels has forced low-tax European countries to raise their taxes to the European average or to expand their respective welfare states in the name of ''fairness,'' a ''level playing field,'' and ''upward harmonization,'' so too will the international trade governors and commissions be empowered to ''upwardly harmonize,'' internationalize, and otherwise usurp laws of American state governments.

The harmonization language in the last Congress' Food and Drug Administration reform bill constitutes a perfect example. Harmonization language in this bill has the Health and Human Services Secretary negotiating multilateral and bilateral international agreements to unify regulations in this country with those of others. The bill removes from the state governments the right to exercise their police powers under the tenth amendment to the constitution and, at the same time, creates a corporatist power elite board of directors to review medical devices and drugs for approval. This board, of course, is to be made up of ''objective'' industry experts appointed by national governments. Instead of the ''national'' variety, known as the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 (enacted for the ''good reason'' of protecting railroad consumers from exploitative railroad freight rates, only to be staffed by railroad attorneys who then used their positions to line the pockets of their respective railroads), we now have the same sham imposed upon worldwide consumers on an international scale soon to be staffed by heads of multinational pharmaceutical corporations.

The late economist Ludwig von Mises argued there is a choice of only two economic systems—capitalism or socialism. Intervention, he would say, always begets more interventionism to address the negative consequences of the prior intervention: thus, necessarily leading to yet further intervention until complete socialism is the only possible outcome. This principle remains true even in the case of intervention and free trade.

To the extent America is non-competitive, it is not because of a lack of innovation, ingenuity, or work ethic. Rather, it is largely a function of the overburdening of business and industry with excessive taxation and regulation. Large corporations, of course, greatly favor such regulation because it disadvantages their smaller competitors who either are not in a position to maintain the regulatory compliance department due to their limited size or, equally important, unable to ''capture'' the federal regulatory agencies whose regulation will be written to favor the politically adept and disfavor the truly productive. The rub comes when other governments engage in more laissez faire approaches thus allowing firms operating within those jurisdictions to become more competitive. It will be the products of these less-taxed, less-regulated firms which will be the consumers' only hope to maintain their standard of living in a climate of domestic production burdened by regulation and taxation. The consumers' after-tax income becomes lower and lower while relative prices of domestic goods become higher and higher. Free trade which provides the poor consumer an escape hatch, of course, is not the particular brand of ''free trade'' espoused by the international trade organizations whose purpose it is to exclude the more efficient competitors internationally in the same way federal regulatory agencies have been created and captured to do the equivalent task domestically.

Until policy makers can learn enough about trade and voluntary exchange to distinguish them from taxpayer-funded aid to bolster corporate revenues, OPIC, Export-Import funding, Market Access Program, and other forms of market intervention (each of which are quite the opposite of genuine free trade), the free trade discussion will remain at worst, a delusional discussion, and, at best, a hollow one.

For these reasons and others, I oppose the so-called free-trade-enhancing Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment.

It has been a priority of mine and the rest of the Congressional Black Caucus to bring some of the many resources of this country and of the profits of our corporations to help fight the scourge of HIV/AIDS in Africa.

In this regard I applaud my colleagues, Mrs. JACKSON-LEE and also Mr. OLVER for their amendments. I would be remiss not to also recognize our former distinguished colleague, Mr. Dellums for his leadership in this arena.

Mr. Chairman, to date AIDS has killed more than 11 million people and continues to infect over 22 million of our brothers and sisters in sub-Saharan Africa. Millions of children are orphaned and countless families are destroyed.

In supporting this amendment, and asking for its passage, I take this opportunity to call on the administration, this Congress and our corporations to not only reach for our better selves, but into our very full pockets to help our fellow human beings who are in such great need.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by commending Mr. OLVER for initiating this important and timely amendment.

Africa is in crisis. The continent is home to one out of every ten people on the planet. Yet more than eight out of every ten deaths from AIDS have occurred in Africa. Health officials in Zimbabwe report over 3,000 AIDS deaths each week. This is a country that has a population roughly the size of the State of Ohio. In Kenya, 200,000 people will die from AIDS in 1999.

AIDS is destroying not only individual lives, but the social, political and economic fabric of the nations of Africa. In Zambia, more than half of the country's children have lost at least one parent to AIDS. How will these children survive? Africans between the ages of 15 and 40 have the highest AIDS infection rate. Who will remain to support Africa's families and grow Africa's economies? Right now, AIDS is reported to be rampant in the militaries of Zimbabwe and other Southern African countries. How will the political stability of Africa be secured?

This crisis demands the attention of the United States Congress. As we debate a bill that intends to strengthen our economic ties with the African continent, this is the right time and the right place for us to begin to think about the impact of AIDS on both the African people and our mutual long term interests.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act requires a lot of African countries. We need to hold up our end of the bargain. It is our responsibility to shine a spotlight on the issue of AIDS in Africa and to demonstrate our interest, not only in trade but in the long term stability of the nations of Africa and the health of her people.

By making it a Sense of Congress that addressing the AIDS crisis be a central component of our foreign policy in Africa; by recognizing the importance of AIDS prevention and treatment to our long term trade relationship with Africa; and by acknowledging that the African AIDS crisis merits expanded efforts by both public and private institutions as well as Congress to address the issue, this amendment represents an important step.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Olver-Pelosi-Foley Amendment to express the sense of Congress that addressing the AIDS crisis in sub-Sahara Africa must be a central component of U.S. foreign policy.

Throughout Africa, AIDS is destroying entire families and communities. It is tearing apart the social, and economic foundations of the continent.

In May, USA Today dedicated a series of articles focusing on the human face of this devastation—outcast children, dying infants, destroyed families. And the statistics alone are numbing. In all, 11.5 million people have died in sub-Saharan Africa since the disease emerged in the early 1980's and 22.5 million now living with the HIV virus are expected to die in the next ten years. By the end of 1997, at least 7.8 million children in this area of Africa alone were left orphans by the age of 14 due to AIDS.

This amendment addresses the tragedy and the urgency of this crisis and affirms that addressing the HIV/AIDs epidemic must be a central part of our foreign policy now and in the next century. We cannot expect to make progress on economic development in Africa unless our policies sufficiently address the catastrophe of AIDS. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the Olver-Pelosi-Foley Amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, at this point, whether U.S. intervention in helping to rebuild the economy of the African continent is important is moot. Every thinking person recognizes the historic significance of rebuilding Europe and Japan after World War II. No one can or will dispute the prescience of the many plans currently on the table to rebuild war torn Yugoslavia. During the debate on NAFTA, member after member came down to the well of this body and sang the praises of strengthening the economies of our neighbors to our North and South.

The intentions behind H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act are altruistic and well within the spirit of fostering growth and development among our international neighbors in the emerging global economy. However, as is the case in many situations, the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and H.R. 434 is simply another cobblestone on that ill-fated pathway.

This legislation is fraught with missteps and although it is heralded as a new, innovative approach to bringing Africa, economically, onto a level playing field in the twentieth century, it clearly builds on many of the same blunders that have haunted U.S. trade policies in the past. This bill has been called the ''African Recolonization Act,'' ''NAFTA for Africa,'' and it is opposed by former South African President, Nelson Mandela. President Mandela even went so far as to say, that the bill is ''not acceptable to us.''

With all of these red flags waving around, how can Congress forge ahead full speed with this legislation and with blatant disregard for people of Africa and the additional Americans who will lose their jobs as a result of this legislation? Jobs in the textile and apparel industry have been hit especially hard by failed American trade policies. Since 1981, almost 700,000 jobs in the textile and apparel industry have been lost to foreign countries; 118,000 in the last 12 months alone.

The majority of these textile workers, who currently find themselves unemployed are women and minorities. With that in mind, another situation that confuses me about this debate is why so many women and minority members have come down to the floor in support of this legislation.

Africa is the cradle of human civilization—the birthplace for the entire world. For too long we have allowed this continent to be raped and plundered by the world's various interests, but finally the time has come to help our shared motherland stand on her own feet. The unfortunate truth about the time we have wasted debating this legislation today is that it will not do any of the things that need to be done in order to achieve the tasks so desperately needed to revitalize Africa.

I challenge the members of this body to bring substantive legislation to the floor that will seriously address the problems facing Africa and restore the nobility and dignity of this magnificent continent.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, once again I have to vote against this bill despite the fact that I support its premise. Just last year Congress made almost the same mistakes on this important legislation that we are making this year. The result of the mistakes the House of Representatives made resulted in stalemate and the loss of an opportunity to benefit the people of Africa.

I always prefer giving someone a hand up, rater than a hand-out. This is the point of this legislation. However, as this bill is written, I cannot vote for it. I will gladly vote for a motion to send it back to the committee of jurisdiction to amend it, because I know that there are simple ways for it to be improved.

It is important that we do what we can to help these desperately poor nations develop economically. By helping them create industry and develop into mature trading partners, we would like reduce the overall need for direct foreign aid. The authors of this bill have chosen to ignore the very real problem of transshipment of goods produced outside Africa. There is ample evidence that certain countries and companies around the world will exploit the ability to ship goods through the Africa continent to avoid duties and quotas that they would otherwise face. This is not fair, and I want to ensure that we address the issue in a way that protects our industries and workers. Not only is it unfair to our workers, it is unfair to the very countries this bill hopes to assist. Their domestic industries would not develop if other nations are using the provisions of this bill to circumvent internationally recognized rules of fair trade.

I hope that the Senate will generate a similar bill—but take the needed steps to safeguard the intent of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this Bill, because, I believe, we can help people abroad without hurting people at home.

This bill will hurt people at home.

I want to commend our colleagues who offer this legislation, for seeking to provide economic growth and development in Sub-Saharan Africa. I support that.

But, this Bill does not do that.

It is important to establish factories in Africa, to train its workers, to initiate production there.

But, this Bill does not do that.

It is equally important to save factories in America, to retrain our workers and to continue production here.

This Bill does not do that.

The economy in America is booming, but textile and apparel production is slumping.

No other industry is suffering like the textile and apparel industry.

Some 700,000 jobs have been lost since 1981; 118,000 have been lost in the past 12 months alone.

And, while this Bill could cause the further loss of jobs, it will not result in the gain of jobs to Africa.

What it will do is make it easier and cheaper for other nations to conduct illegal transshipments through Africa.

And, that will hurt Africa and hurt America.

Our colleague, Mr. BISHOP, proposed perfecting language to this Bill, but the Rule offered and passed does not permit its consideration.

Mr. Chairman, let's help workers in Africa.

But, in so doing, let's not hurt workers in America.

Oppose this Bill.

It has the right aim, but the wrong focus.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided bill and ask for my friends and colleagues to really consider what we are doing here. Once again I find myself having to protect my cotton farmers and textile workers against trade policies that have left many in my district with their heads spinning from the loss of jobs.

I do support fostering economic development in Africa and crating an economic partnership between those nations, but not at the expense of American cotton farmers and textile workers. The textile and apparel provisions of this bill will not promote jobs and economic growth in Africa; they will instead promote massive transshipments from China into this country. The bill will unnecessarily cost thousands of U.S. jobs in the cotton and textile industries while providing limited incentive for increased manufacturing capacity in the Sub-Saharan.

The bill, as is, opens the door for Asian textile and apparel manufacturers to use Africa merely as an export platform for sending their own textile and apparel products to the U.S. Incredibly, only 35 percent of the value must be added on the ground in Africa to qualify for quota free and duty free access. That doesn't sound like its going to benefit Africa, but China instead. When you remove tariffs on these imported products, you exponentially increase the incentive for both illegal and legal transshipment. Under this legislation, it would be totally legal for the Chinese to use their own yarn, fabric and possibly even imported Chinese labor to comply with 35 percent final value threshold. Once again, good for China, bad for American workers and Africa.

What makes me angry though is that we had a way of making this bill acceptable for those who want to promote Africa's growth, and for those of us who want to protect our textile workers and farmers, but that was denied by the Rules Committee. This legislation will create a trade policy that's going to hurt my cotton farmers and my textile workers so the Chinese can import more goods through Africa into the U.S. I urge all members to vote no on this misguided legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This measure is long overdue, and will help strengthen the economies of the world's poorest continent. This bill presents very little threat to American industries in the short run, and holds a huge upside potential for American jobs and profits to increase in the long run.

The most important part of this bill is that it will make a huge difference for the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa by giving them tariff reductions under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), as long as they are cooperating with international labor and transshipment standards.

At a time when military action is something to be avoided and there are real questions about what economic assistance we should provide around the world, this bill allows us to directly participate with and help strengthen other countries through global trade. I believe it will ultimately be the best long-term investment for the American taxpayer.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, this legislation will for the first time focus the attention of the U.S. government on a comprehensive trade strategy towards Africa. We have neglected this continent too long only to the benefit of their former European colonial powers. With the anemic growth in our exports because of the economic crisis affecting Asia, Russia, and Brazil, the U.S. needs to look at every possible market opportunity to improve trade relations.

Many may be surprised to learn that U.S. exports to Africa have been growing at a steady rate. Exports from Illinois to South Africa grew from $269 million in 1995 to $413 million in 1998—a 54 percent increase? Illinois exports more to South Africa than it does to Spain or India.

The specific African trade picture for Rockford is even better. Exports from Rockford to all of Africa more than doubled, going from $2.9 million in 1995 to $6.2 million in 1997. Some of these exports came from companies like Etnyree of Oregon, which sold asphalt making equipment to the Ivory Coast and Kenya; Newell's International Division in Rockford, which sold office and home products to Zimbabwe and South Africa; Wahl Clipper of Sterling, which sold barbershop hair clippers to South Africa and Nigeria; and Taylor of Rockton, which sold soft ice cream machines to South Africa and Nigeria.

African trade also extends to McHenry County—RITA Chemical of Woodstock sold industrial inorganic chemicals for the cosmetic industry in South Africa and Motorola of Harvard, a manufacturer of cellular phones that are used even in the remotest parts of Africa.

This represents the tip of the iceberg of what can happen if we build better trade relationships with the 48 countries of sub-Saharan Africa. All these companies agree that if there is a more active effort on the part of the U.S. government to help develop and open the markets in Africa, they would benefit through increased sales.

While this bill is not a cure-all for our trade deficit or for solving all of Africa's problems, it represents one beginning step in the right direction. It has the support of our exporting community. It has the support of all—I repeat—all of the sub-Saharan African countries. It's a win-win for all sides. I urge you to join them in supporting this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2489 as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule which, without objection, is considered read.

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2489

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''African Growth and Opportunity Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that it is in the mutual economic interest of the United States and sub-Saharan Africa to promote stable and sustainable economic growth and development in sub-Saharan Africa and that sustained economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa depends in large measure upon the development of a receptive environment for trade and investment. To that end, the United States seeks to facilitate market-led economic growth in, and thereby the social and economic development of, the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. In particular, the United States seeks to assist sub-Saharan African countries, and the private sector in those countries, to achieve economic self-reliance by—

(1) strengthening and expanding the private sector in sub-Saharan Africa, especially women-owned businesses;

(2) encouraging increased trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) reducing tariff and nontariff barriers and other trade obstacles;

(4) expanding United States assistance to sub-Saharan Africa's regional integration efforts;

(5) negotiating free trade areas;

(6) establishing a United States-Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Investment Partnership;

(7) focusing on countries committed to accountable government, economic reform, and the eradication of poverty;

(8) establishing a United States-Sub-Saharan Africa Economic Cooperation Forum; and

(9) continuing to support development assistance for those countries in sub-Saharan Africa attempting to build civil societies.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Congress supports economic self-reliance for sub-Saharan African countries, particularly those committed to—

(1) economic and political reform;

(2) market incentives and private sector growth;

(3) the eradication of poverty; and

(4) the importance of women to economic growth and development.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A sub-Saharan African country shall be eligible to participate in programs, projects, or activities, or receive assistance or other benefits under this Act if the President determines that the country does not engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights and has established, or is making continual progress toward establishing, a market-based economy, such as the establishment and enforcement of appropriate policies relating to—

(1) promoting free movement of goods and services between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and among countries in sub-Saharan Africa;

(2) promoting the expansion of the production base and the transformation of commodities and nontraditional products for exports through joint venture projects between African and foreign investors;

(3) trade issues, such as protection of intellectual property rights, improvements in standards, testing, labeling and certification, and government procurement;

(4) the protection of property rights, such as protection against expropriation and a functioning and fair judicial system;

(5) the protection of internationally recognized worker rights, including the right of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor, a minimum age for the employment of children, and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health;

(6) appropriate fiscal systems, such as reducing high import and corporate taxes, controlling government consumption, participation in bilateral investment treaties, and the harmonization of such treaties to avoid double taxation;

(7) foreign investment issues, such as the provision of national treatment for foreign investors, removing restrictions on investment, and other measures to create an environment conducive to domestic and foreign investment;

(8) supporting the growth of regional markets within a free trade area framework;

(9) governance issues, such as eliminating government corruption, minimizing government intervention in the market such as price controls and subsidies, and streamlining the business license process;

(10) supporting the growth of the private sector, in particular by promoting the emergence of a new generation of African entrepreneurs;

(11) encouraging the private ownership of government-controlled economic enterprises through divestiture programs; and

(12) observing the rule of law, including equal protection under the law and the right to due process and a fair trial.

(b) ADDITIONAL FACTORS.—In determining whether a sub-Saharan African country is eligible under subsection (a), the President shall take into account the following factors:

(1) An expression by such country of its desire to be an eligible country under subsection (a).

(2) The extent to which such country has made substantial progress toward—

(A) reducing tariff levels;

(B) binding its tariffs in the World Trade Organization and assuming meaningful binding obligations in other sectors of trade; and

(C) eliminating nontariff barriers to trade.

(3) Whether such country, if not already a member of the World Trade Organization, is actively pursuing membership in that Organization.

(4) The extent to which such country has a recognizable commitment to reducing poverty, increasing the availability of health care and educational opportunities, the expansion of physical infrastructure in a manner designed to maximize accessibility, increased access to market and credit facilities for small farmers and producers, and improved economic opportunities for women as entrepreneurs and employees, and promoting and enabling the formation of capital to support the establishment and operation of micro-enterprises.

(5) Whether or not such country engages in activities that undermine United States national security or foreign policy interests.

(c) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—

(1) MONITORING AND REVIEW OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The President shall monitor and review the progress of sub-Saharan African countries in order to determine their current or potential eligibility under subsection (a). Such determinations shall be based on quantitative factors to the fullest extent possible and shall be included in the annual report required by section 15.

(2) INELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—A sub-Saharan African country described in paragraph (1) that has not made continual

progress in meeting the requirements with which it is not in compliance shall be ineligible to participate in programs, projects, or activities, or receive assistance or other benefits, under this Act.

SEC. 5. UNITED STATES-SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA TRADE AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION FORUM.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—The President shall convene annual high-level meetings between appropriate officials of the United States Government and officials of the governments of sub-Saharan African countries in order to foster close economic ties between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, after consulting with Congress and the governments concerned, shall establish a United States-Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Forum'').

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In creating the Forum, the President shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The President shall direct the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the United States Trade Representative to host the first annual meeting with the counterparts of such Secretaries from the governments of sub-Saharan African countries eligible under section 4, the Secretary General of the Organization of African Unity, and government officials from other appropriate countries in Africa, to discuss expanding trade and investment relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and the implementation of this Act including encouraging joint ventures between small and large businesses.

(2)(A) The President, in consultation with the Congress, shall encourage United States nongovernmental organizations to host annual meetings with nongovernmental organizations from sub-Saharan Africa in conjunction with the annual meetings of the Forum for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1).

(B) The President, in consultation with the Congress, shall encourage United States representatives of the private sector to host annual meetings with representatives of the private sector from sub-Saharan Africa in conjunction with the annual meetings of the Forum for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1).

(3) The President shall, to the extent practicable, meet with the heads of governments of sub-Saharan African countries eligible under section 4 not less than once every two years for the purpose of discussing the issues described in paragraph (1). The first such meeting should take place not later than twelve months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION BY USIA.—In order to assist in carrying out the purposes of the Forum, the United States Information Agency shall disseminate regularly, through multiple media, economic information in support of the free market economic reforms described in this Act.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(f) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used to create or support any nongovernmental organization for the purpose of expanding or facilitating trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 6. UNITED STATES–SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA FREE TRADE AREA.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—The Congress declares that a United States–Sub-Saharan Africa Free Trade Area should be established, or free trade agreements should be entered into, in order to serve as the catalyst for increasing trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and increasing private sector development in sub-Saharan Africa.

(b) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, taking into account the provisions of the treaty establishing the African Economic Community and the willingness of the governments of sub-Saharan African countries to engage in negotiations to enter into free trade agreements, shall develop a plan for the purpose of entering into one or more trade agreements with sub-Saharan African countries eligible under section 4 in order to establish a United States–Sub-Saharan Africa Free Trade Area (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Free Trade Area'').

(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan shall include the following:

(A) The specific objectives of the United States with respect to the establishment of the Free Trade Area and a suggested timetable for achieving those objectives.

(B) The benefits to both the United States and sub-Saharan Africa with respect to the Free Trade Area.

(C) A mutually agreed-upon timetable for establishing the Free Trade Area.

(D) The implications for and the role of regional and sub-regional organizations in sub-Saharan Africa with respect to the Free Trade Area.

(E) Subject matter anticipated to be covered by the agreement for establishing the Free Trade Area and United States laws, programs, and policies, as well as the laws of participating eligible African countries and existing bilateral and multilateral and economic cooperation and trade agreements, that may be affected by the agreement or agreements.

(F) Procedures to ensure the following:

(i) Adequate consultation with the Congress and the private sector during the negotiation of the agreement or agreements for establishing the Free Trade Area.

(ii) Consultation with the Congress regarding all matters relating to implementation of the agreement or agreements.

(iii) Approval by the Congress of the agreement or agreements.

(iv) Adequate consultations with the relevant African governments and African regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations during the negotiations of the agreement or agreements.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report containing the plan developed pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 7. ELIMINATING TRADE BARRIERS AND ENCOURAGING EXPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The lack of competitiveness of sub-Saharan Africa in the global market, especially in the manufacturing sector, make it a limited threat to market disruption and no threat to United States jobs.

(2) Annual textile and apparel exports to the United States from sub-Saharan Africa represent less than 1 percent of all textile and apparel exports to the United States, which totaled $54,001,863,000 in 1997.

(3) Sub-Saharan Africa has limited textile manufacturing capacity. During 1999 and the succeeding 4 years, this limited capacity to manufacture textiles and apparel is projected to grow at a modest rate. Given this limited capacity to export textiles and apparel, it will be very difficult for these exports from sub-Saharan Africa, during 1999 and the succeeding 9 years, to exceed 3 percent annually of total imports of textile and apparel to the United States. If these exports from sub-Saharan Africa remain around 3 percent of total imports, they will not represent a threat to United States workers, consumers, or manufacturers.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) it would be to the mutual benefit of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa and the United States to ensure that the commitments of the World Trade Organization and associated agreements are faithfully implemented in each of the member countries, so as to lay the groundwork for sustained growth in textile and apparel exports and trade under agreed rules and disciplines;

(2) reform of trade policies in sub-Saharan Africa with the objective of removing structural impediments to trade, consistent with obligations under the World Trade Organization, can assist the countries of the region in achieving greater and greater diversification of textile and apparel export commodities and products and export markets; and

(3) the President should support textile and apparel trade reform in sub-Saharan Africa by, among other measures, providing technical assistance, sharing of information to expand basic knowledge of how to trade with the United States, and encouraging business-to-business contacts with the region.

(c) TREATMENT OF QUOTAS.—

(1) KENYA AND MAURITIUS.—Pursuant to the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, the United States shall eliminate the existing quotas on textile and apparel exports to the United States—

(A) from Kenya within 30 days after that country adopts an efficient visa system to guard against unlawful transshipment of textile and apparel goods and the use of counterfeit documents; and

(B) from Mauritius within 30 days after that country adopts such a visa system.

The Customs Service shall provide the necessary technical assistance to Kenya and Mauritius in the development and implementation of those visa systems.

(2) OTHER SUB-SAHARAN COUNTRIES.—The President shall continue the existing no quota policy for countries in sub-Saharan Africa. The President shall submit to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year, a report on the growth in textiles and apparel exports to the United States from countries in sub-Saharan Africa in order to protect United States consumers, workers, and textile manufacturers from economic injury on account of the no quota policy.

(d) CUSTOMS PROCEDURES AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) ACTIONS BY COUNTRIES AGAINST TRANSSHIPMENT AND CIRCUMVENTION.—The President should ensure that any country in sub-Saharan Africa that intends to export textile and apparel goods to the United States—

(A) has in place a functioning and effective visa system and domestic laws and enforcement procedures to guard against unlawful transshipment of textile and apparel goods and the use of counterfeit documents; and

(B) will cooperate fully with the United States to address and take action necessary to prevent circumvention, as provided in Article 5 of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

(2) PENALTIES AGAINST EXPORTERS.—If the President determines, based on sufficient evidence, that an exporter has willfully falsified information regarding the country of origin, manufacture, processing, or assembly of a textile or apparel article for which duty-free treatment under section 503(a)(1)(C) of the Trade Act of 1974 is claimed, then the President shall deny to such exporter, and

any successors of such exporter, for a period of 2 years, duty-free treatment under such section for textile and apparel articles.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF UNITED STATES LAWS AND PROCEDURES.—All provisions of the laws, regulations, and procedures of the United States relating to the denial of entry of articles or penalties against individuals or entities for engaging in illegal transshipment, fraud, or other violations of the customs laws shall apply to imports from Sub-Saharan countries.

(4) MONITORING AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Customs Service shall monitor and the Commissioner of Customs shall submit to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year, a report on the effectiveness of the visa systems described in subsection (c)(1) and paragraph (1) of this subsection and on measures taken by countries in Sub-Saharan Africa which export textiles or apparel to the United States to prevent circumvention as described in Article 5 of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Agreement on Textiles and Clothing'' means the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing referred to in section 101(d)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(4)).

SEC. 8. GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ARTICLES.—Section 503(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—The President may provide duty-free treatment for any article set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of an eligible country in sub-Saharan Africa that is a beneficiary developing country, if, after receiving the advice of the International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e), the President determines that such article is not import-sensitive in the context of imports from eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa. This subparagraph shall not affect the designation of eligible articles under subparagraph (B).''.

(b) RULES OF ORIGIN.—Section 503(a)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—For purposes of determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (A) in the case of an article of an eligible country in sub-Saharan Africa that is a beneficiary developing country—

''(i) if the cost or value of materials produced in the customs territory of the United States is included with respect to that article, an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered that is attributed to such United States cost or value may be applied toward determining the percentage referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) the cost or value of the materials included with respect to that article that are produced in any beneficiary developing country that is an eligible country in sub-Saharan Africa shall be applied in determining such percentage.''.

(c) WAIVER OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION.—Section 503(c)(2)(D) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(2)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

''(D) LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any least-developed beneficiary developing country or any eligible country in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(d) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 505. DATE OF TERMINATION.

''(a) COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—No duty-free treatment provided under this title shall remain in effect after June 30, 2009, with respect to beneficiary developing countries that are eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

''(b) OTHER COUNTRIES.—No duty-free treatment provided under this title shall remain in effect after June 30, 1999, with respect to beneficiary developing countries other than those provided for in subsection (a).''.

(e) DEFINITION.—Section 507 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) ELIGIBLE COUNTRY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—The terms 'eligible country in sub-Saharan Africa' and 'eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa' mean a country or countries that the President has determined to be eligible under section 4 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on July 1, 1999.

SEC. 9. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) BETTER MECHANISMS TO FURTHER GOALS FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the African Development Bank to use the voice and votes of the Executive Directors to encourage vigorously their respective institutions to develop enhanced mechanisms which further the following goals in eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa:

(1) Strengthening and expanding the private sector, especially among women-owned businesses.

(2) Reducing tariffs, nontariff barriers, and other trade obstacles, and increasing economic integration.

(3) Supporting countries committed to accountable government, economic reform, the eradication of poverty, and the building of civil societies.

(4) Supporting deep debt reduction at the earliest possible date with the greatest amount of relief for eligible poorest countries under the ''Heavily Indebted Poor Countries'' (HIPC) debt initiative.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that relief provided to countries in sub-Saharan Africa which qualify for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries debt initiative should primarily be made through grants rather than through extended-term debt, and that interim relief or interim financing should be provided for eligible countries that establish a strong record of macroeconomic reform.

SEC. 10. EXECUTIVE BRANCH INITIATIVES.

(a) STATEMENT OF CONGRESS.—The Congress recognizes that the stated policy of the executive branch in 1997, the ''Partnership for Growth and Opportunity in Africa'' initiative, is a step toward the establishment of a comprehensive trade and development policy for sub-Saharan Africa. It is the sense of the Congress that this Partnership is a companion to the policy goals set forth in this Act.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC REFORMS AND DEVELOPMENT.—In addition to continuing bilateral and multilateral economic and development assistance, the President shall target technical assistance toward—

(1) developing relationships between United States firms and firms in sub-Saharan Africa through a variety of business associations and networks;

(2) providing assistance to the governments of sub-Saharan African countries to—

(A) liberalize trade and promote exports;

(B) bring their legal regimes into compliance with the standards of the World Trade Organization in conjunction with membership in that Organization;

(C) make financial and fiscal reforms; and

(D) promote greater agribusiness linkages;

(3) addressing such critical agricultural policy issues as market liberalization, agricultural export development, and agribusiness investment in processing and transporting agricultural commodities;

(4) increasing the number of reverse trade missions to growth-oriented countries in sub-Saharan Africa;

(5) increasing trade in services; and

(6) encouraging greater sub-Saharan participation in future negotiations in the World Trade Organization on services and making further commitments in their schedules to the General Agreement on Trade in Services in order to encourage the removal of tariff and nontariff barriers.

SEC. 11. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

(a) INITIATION OF FUNDS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should exercise the authorities it has to initiate an equity fund or equity funds in support of projects in the countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in addition to the existing equity fund for sub-Saharan Africa created by the Corporation.

(b) STRUCTURE AND TYPES OF FUNDS.—

(1) STRUCTURE.—Each fund initiated under subsection (a) should be structured as a partnership managed by professional private sector fund managers and monitored on a continuing basis by the Corporation.

(2) CAPITALIZATION.—Each fund should be capitalized with a combination of private equity capital, which is not guaranteed by the Corporation, and debt for which the Corporation provides guaranties.

(3) INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.—One or more of the funds, with combined assets of up to $500,000,000, should be used in support of infrastructure projects in countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

(4) EMPHASIS.—The Corporation shall ensure that the funds are used to provide support in particular to women entrepreneurs and to innovative investments that expand opportunities for women and maximize employment opportunities for poor individuals.

SEC. 12. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INITIATIVES.

(a) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—

(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 233 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Board shall take prompt measures to increase the loan, guarantee, and insurance programs, and financial commitments, of the Corporation in sub-Saharan Africa, including through the use of an advisory committee to assist the Board in developing and implementing policies, programs, and financial instruments with respect to sub-Saharan Africa. In addition, the advisory committee shall make recommendations to the Board on how the Corporation can facilitate greater support by the United States for trade and investment with and in sub-Saharan Africa. The advisory committee shall terminate 4 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

(2) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for each of the 4 years thereafter, the Board of Directors of the

Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall submit to the Congress a report on the steps that the Board has taken to implement section 233(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by paragraph (1)) and any recommendations of the advisory board established pursuant to such section.

(b) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.—

(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

''(13)(A) The Board of Directors of the Bank shall take prompt measures, consistent with the credit standards otherwise required by law, to promote the expansion of the Bank's financial commitments in sub-Saharan Africa under the loan, guarantee, and insurance programs of the Bank.

''(B)(i) The Board of Directors shall establish and use an advisory committee to advise the Board of Directors on the development and implementation of policies and programs designed to support the expansion described in subparagraph (A).

''(ii) The advisory committee shall make recommendations to the Board of Directors on how the Bank can facilitate greater support by United States commercial banks for trade with sub-Saharan Africa.

''(iii) The advisory committee shall terminate 4 years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph.''.

(2) REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually for each of the 4 years thereafter, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on the steps that the Board has taken to implement section 2(b)(13)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (as added by paragraph (1)) and any recommendations of the advisory committee established pursuant to such section.

SEC. 13. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the position of Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs is integral to the United States commitment to increasing United States—sub-Saharan African trade and investment.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF POSITION.—The President shall maintain a position of Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs within the Office of the United States Trade Representative to direct and coordinate interagency activities on United States-Africa trade policy and investment matters and serve as—

(1) a primary point of contact in the executive branch for those persons engaged in trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa; and

(2) the chief advisor to the United States Trade Representative on issues of trade with Africa.

(c) FUNDING AND STAFF.—The President shall ensure that the Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs has adequate funding and staff to carry out the duties described in subsection (b), subject to the availability of appropriations.

SEC. 14. EXPANSION OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and Foreign Commercial Service (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Commercial Service'') plays an important role in helping United States businesses identify export opportunities and develop reliable sources of information on commercial prospects in foreign countries.

(2) During the 1980s, the presence of the Commercial Service in sub-Saharan Africa consisted of 14 professionals providing services in eight countries. By early 1997, that presence had been reduced by half to seven, in only four countries.

(3) Since 1997, the Department of Commerce has slowly begun to increase the presence of the Commercial Service in sub-Saharan Africa, adding five full-time officers to established posts.

(4) Although the Commercial Service Officers in these countries have regional responsibilities, this kind of coverage does not adequately service the needs of United States businesses attempting to do business in sub-Saharan Africa.

(5) The Congress has, on several occasions, encouraged the Commercial Service to focus its resources and efforts in countries or regions in Europe or Asia to promote greater United States export activity in those markets.

(6) Because market information is not widely available in many sub-Saharan African countries, the presence of additional Commercial Service Officers and resources can play a significant role in assisting United States businesses in markets in those countries.

(b) APPOINTMENTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, by not later than December 31, 2000, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, shall take steps to ensure that—

(1) at least 20 full-time Commercial Service employees are stationed in sub-Saharan Africa; and

(2) full-time Commercial Service employees are stationed in not less than ten different sub-Saharan African countries.

(c) COMMERCIAL SERVICE INITIATIVE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—In order to encourage the export of United States goods and services to sub-Saharan African countries, the Commercial Service shall make a special effort to—

(1) identify United States goods and services which are not being exported to sub-Saharan African countries but which are being exported to those countries by competitor nations;

(2) identify, where appropriate, trade barriers and noncompetitive actions, including violations of intellectual property rights, that are preventing or hindering sales of United States goods and services to, or the operation of United States companies in, sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) present, periodically, a list of the goods and services identified under paragraph (1), and any trade barriers or noncompetitive actions identified under paragraph (2), to appropriate authorities in sub-Saharan African countries with a view to securing increased market access for United States exporters of goods and services;

(4) facilitate the entrance by United States businesses into the markets identified under paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(5) monitor and evaluate the results of efforts to increase the sales of goods and services in such markets.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter for five years, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall report to the Congress on actions taken to carry out subsections (b) and (c). Each report shall specify—

(1) in what countries full-time Commercial Service Officers are stationed, and the number of such officers placed in each such country;

(2) the effectiveness of the presence of the additional Commercial Service Officers in increasing United States exports to sub-Saharan African countries; and

(3) the specific actions taken by Commercial Service Officers, both in sub-Saharan African countries and in the United States, to carry out subsection (c), including identifying a list of targeted export sectors and countries.

SEC. 15. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall submit to the Congress, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the end of each of the next 6 1-year periods thereafter, a comprehensive report on the trade and investment policy of the United States for sub-Saharan Africa, and on the implementation of this Act. The last report required by section 134(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3554(b)) shall be consolidated and submitted with the first report required by this section.

SEC. 16. DONATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT TO ELIGIBLE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to the extent appropriate, the United States Government should make every effort to donate to governments of sub-Saharan African countries (determined to be eligible under section 4 of this Act) air traffic control equipment that is no longer in use, including appropriate related reimbursable technical assistance.

SEC. 17. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES AND INCREASED FLEXIBILITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA.

(a) USE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT FURTHER ECONOMIC GROWTH.—It is the sense of the Congress that sustained economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa depends in large measure upon the development of a receptive environment for trade and investment, and that to achieve this objective the United States Agency for International Development should continue to support programs which help to create this environment. Investments in human resources, development, and implementation of free market policies, including policies to liberalize agricultural markets and improve food security, and the support for the rule of law and democratic governance should continue to be encouraged and enhanced on a bilateral and regional basis.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.—The Congress makes the following declarations:

(1) The Development Fund for Africa established under chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293 et seq.) has been an effective tool in providing development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa since 1988.

(2) The Development Fund for Africa will complement the other provisions of this Act and lay a foundation for increased trade and investment opportunities between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Assistance provided through the Development Fund for Africa will continue to support programs and activities that promote the long term economic development of sub-Saharan Africa, such as programs and activities relating to the following:

(A) Strengthening primary and vocational education systems, especially the acquisition of middle-level technical skills for operating modern private businesses and the introduction of college level business education, including the study of international business, finance, and stock exchanges.

(B) Strengthening health care systems.

(C) Supporting democratization, good governance and civil society and conflict resolution efforts.

(D) Increasing food security by promoting the expansion of agricultural and agriculture-based industrial production and productivity and increasing real incomes for poor individuals.

(E) Promoting an enabling environment for private sector-led growth through sustained economic reform, privatization programs, and market-led economic activities.

(F) Promoting decentralization and local participation in the development process, especially linking the rural production sectors and the industrial and market centers throughout Africa.

(G) Increasing the technical and managerial capacity of sub-Saharan African individuals to manage the economy of sub-Saharan Africa.

(H) Ensuring sustainable economic growth through environmental protection.

(4) The African Development Foundation has a unique congressional mandate to empower the poor to participate fully in development and to increase opportunities for gainful employment, poverty alleviation, and more equitable income distribution in sub-Saharan Africa. The African Development Foundation has worked successfully to enhance the role of women as agents of change, strengthen the informal sector with an emphasis on supporting micro and small sized enterprises, indigenous technologies, and mobilizing local financing. The African Development Foundation should develop and implement strategies for promoting participation in the socioeconomic development process of grassroots and informal sector groups such as nongovernmental organizations, cooperatives, artisans, and traders into the programs and initiatives established under this Act.

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 496(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293(h)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) DEMOCRATIZATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION CAPABILITIES.—Assistance under this section may also include program assistance—

''(A) to promote democratization, good governance, and strong civil societies in sub-Saharan Africa; and

''(B) to strengthen conflict resolution capabilities of governmental, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental entities in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 496(h)(4) of such Act, as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' in the first sentence and inserting ''paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)''.

SEC. 18. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the terms ''sub-Saharan Africa'', ''sub-Saharan African country'', ''country in sub-Saharan Africa'', and ''countries in sub-Saharan Africa'' refer to the following or any successor political entities:

Republic of Angola (Angola)
Republic of Botswana (Botswana)
Republic of Burundi (Burundi)
Republic of Cape Verde (Cape Verde)
Republic of Chad (Chad)
Democratic Republic of Congo
Republic of the Congo (Congo)
Republic of Djibouti (Djibouti)
State of Eritrea (Eritrea)
Gabonese Republic (Gabon)
Republic of Ghana (Ghana)
Republic of Guinea-Bissau (Guinea-Bissau)
Kingdom of Lesotho (Lesotho)
Republic of Madagascar (Madagascar)
Republic of Mali (Mali)
Republic of Mauritius (Mauritius)
Republic of Namibia (Namibia)
Federal Republic of Nigeria (Nigeria)
Democratic Republic of Sao Tomé and Principe (Sao Tomé and Principe)
Republic of Sierra Leone (Sierra Leone)
Somalia
Kingdom of Swaziland (Swaziland)
Republic of Togo (Togo)
Republic of Zimbabwe (Zimbabwe)
Republic of Benin (Benin)
Burkina Faso (Burkina)
Republic of Cameroon (Cameroon)
Central African Republic
Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros (Comoros)
Republic of Côte d'Ivoire (Côte d'Ivoire)
Republic of Equatorial Guinea (Equatorial Guinea)
Ethiopia
Republic of the Gambia (Gambia)
Republic of Guinea (Guinea)
Republic of Kenya (Kenya)
Republic of Liberia (Liberia)
Republic of Malawi (Malawi)
Islamic Republic of Mauritania (Mauritania)
Republic of Mozambique (Mozambique)
Republic of Niger (Niger)
Republic of Rwanda (Rwanda)
Republic of Senegal (Senegal)
Republic of Seychelles (Seychelles)
Republic of South Africa (South Africa)
Republic of Sudan (Sudan)
United Republic of Tanzania (Tanzania)
Republic of Uganda (Uganda)
Republic of Zambia (Zambia)

SEC. 19. LIMITATION ON USE OF NON-ACCRUAL EXPERIENCE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 448(d)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special rule for services) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''in fields described in paragraph (2)(A)'' after ''services by such person'', and

(2) by inserting ''CERTAIN PERSONAL'' before ''SERVICES'' in the heading.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendments made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account over a period (not greater than 4 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 20. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN VACCINES AGAINST STREPTOCOCCUS PNEUMONIAE TO LIST OF TAXABLE VACCINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4132(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining taxable vaccine) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(L) Any conjugate vaccine against streptococcus pneumoniae.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) SALES.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to vaccine sales beginning on the day after the date on which the Centers for Disease Control makes a final recommendation for routine administration to children of any conjugate vaccine against streptococcus pneumoniae.

(2) DELIVERIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), in the case of sales on or before the date described in such paragraph for which delivery is made after such date, the delivery date shall be considered the sale date.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on the operation of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund and on the adequacy of such Fund to meet future claims made under the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 106–236. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 106–236.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 3, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 3, line 8, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 3, after line 8, add the following:

(10) encouraging the establishment and development of small businesses in sub-Saharan Africa and encouraging trade between United States small businesses and these newly-established small businesses in sub-Saharan Africa.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 250, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of economic activity in Africa comes from small entrepreneurs. I just wanted to express my support for the thoughtful amendment offered by the gentlewoman because it recognizes that fact and encourages trade between small businesses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that small businesses are the backbone of America. As we hold up a map of the United States, I am very proud to say that we are noting that 15 States export at least $100 million or did export it in sub-Saharan Africa in 1998. But if we look at this colorful map, we will see that America does business with sub-Saharan Africa.

What I want to have happen today is a vote on an amendment that says small businesses will do business with sub-Saharan Africa and, as our amendment said, to encourage the creation and development of small businesses in sub-Saharan Africa for them to likewise do business with our business community. The language is an attempt to eliminate, or at least minimize, the intimidation that typically goes along with the business of international trade.

Succinctly, the bill helps gun-shy businesses make overseas ventures that will grow our economy well into the next millennium. This amendment will assist in our ensuring that all viable businesses may access the tremendous trade opportunity created by this bill. Specifically, it will target small businesses that up until now have little incentive to go abroad in their search for steady streams of income.

Mr. Chairman, what it says to all the advocates of this bill is that we have an extra responsibility with the larger corporate community to insist on the participation of the small businesses; we have the responsibility to promote in the Department of Commerce the Ron Brown Center in South Africa that works very hard to put American businesses together with African businesses. This amendment is to emphasize that importance.

For those unconvinced that small businesses drive our economy, I would like to share with them some statistics. Small businesses in the United States represent 99.7 percent of all employers, a truly dramatic number. Fifty-three percent of the private workforce in the United States is employed by small business.

For those unwilling to concede that small businesses must play a role in our trade overseas, please take note that small businesses represent fully 96 percent of all exporters.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand about 10 pages that show how many different cities do business with sub-Saharan Africa: Gary, Indiana; Green Bay, Wisconsin; Harrisburg, Lebanon, Carlysle, Pennsylvania; Hickory, Morgantown, North Carolina; Honolulu, Hawaii; Houston, Texas; Jackson, Mississippi; Kansas City, Missouri; Knoxville, Tennessee. Incorporated in all these cities, of course, are small businesses.

There are a great number of Africans that want to help themselves. I have met with them. I have met with the ambassador core. I have seen the small businesses in Africa. They are ready and waiting. I have seen the flour packing factory. I have seen the fish packing factory. These employees in Africa want to work, and more of them want to access capital to ensure that they can provide and have the opportunity to construct their businesses.

Small businesses in the United States are a principal source of our new domestic jobs. I want to see small businesses in sub-Saharan Africa being the principal source of jobs as well in sub-Saharan Africa.

Small firms hire a larger proportion of employees who are younger workers, older workers, women workers; and that is what we expect in sub-Saharan Africa with the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Let me also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, that OPIC is committed to helping small business. OPIC has indicated that 1999 is the year of small businesses at OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. This represents dollars for small businesses.

With that, Mr. Chairman, let me simply say I hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment. How can we turn our backs on small businesses when we are opening the opportunity and the doors for trade with Africa?

Mr. Chairman, today, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 1999. This amendment encourages and recognizes the need for U.S. and African small business opportunities and investments in Sub-Saharan Africa through the mechanisms provided by the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

H.R. 434 is embedded with clearly written language in an effort to restore stability and promote trade between the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa. That language is an attempt to eliminate, or at least minimize, the intimidation that typically goes along with the business of international trade. Succinctly said, the bill helps gun-shy businesses make overseas ventures that will grow our economy well into the next millennium.

This amendment will assist in our ensuring that all viable businesses may access the tremendous trade opportunities created by this bill. Specifically, it targets small businesses that up until now, have had little incentive to go abroad in their search for steady streams of income. As a result, the amendment ensures that the gains brought about by this bill are spread generously to all segments of our economy—and the economy of Sub-Saharan Africa as well.

For those unconvinced that small business drives our economy, I would like to share with you some statistics. Small businesses in the United States represent 99.7 percent of all employers—a truly dramatic number. Fifty-three (53) percent of the private work force in the U.S. is employed by small business. For those unwilling to concede that small businesses must play a role in our trade overseas, please take note that small businesses represent fully 96 percent of all U.S. exporters. Furthermore, I have little doubt that our encouragement of the development and enhancement of African small businesses can yield similar economic statistics within Sub-Sahara Africa. They need that growth, and frankly, so do we if we are to expand and diversify our economy.

There are a great number of Africans that want to help themselves, and we would be remiss if they would be locked-out of the benefits of increased trade with the United States. Countries like Botswana, Nigeria and South Africa have experienced a great deal of success fostering small businesses within their bounds, and they do so partly because it benefits their economy. In light of this fact, we must realize that the best way to assist these countries is to encourage them to continue with these successful practices.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act must make clear: our U.S. small businesses are welcomed and indeed encouraged to participate in trade with Africa—and specifically, in trade with South African small businesses.

Small businesses in the United States are our principal source of new domestic jobs. Because there are approximately 23 million small businesses in the U.S. they are able to provide virtually all of the new jobs added to the economy. In 1997, the U.S. economy created nearly 3 million new jobs. Six our of ten of the industries adding those new jobs were small business dominated industries. Being an integral part of the African trade relationship will ensure small businesses continue to play a vital role in the economics of the United States.

Small firms hire a larger proportion of employees who are younger workers, older workers, women or workers who prefer to work part time. They provide nearly 55 percent of the innovations that drive our economy. These businesses are an asset to our country, and we cannot leave them out of the fold with this bill!

It makes good business sense to ensure that our small businesses have no doubt that they are welcomed and encouraged to seek the opportunities created by the African Growth and Opportunity Act. They must take advantage of the provisions giving them access to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). They must know about lowered tariffs on goods. These are things to be taken advantage of for the betterment of our economy, let us make sure that everyone, therefore, can take advantage of them.

This amendment is but a start, I will admit. And we must follow up on this issue if we are to ensure that our goal will be achieved. We must ask the Department of Commerce to emphasize and utilize the newly opened Ron Brown Investment Center located in Johannesburg, South Africa.

We must ask trade associations that represent small businesses to establish and encourage foreign investment through use of this bill. Those associations should additionally assist and provide technical assistance for those small businesses that seek the aid of OPIC, the Department of Commerce, and the Small Business Administration so that they can enter into ventures overseas easily and successfully.

I truly believe that we will be making history today. Let us make sure that when that history is reviewed, that small businesses can be found in the main body of the text, and not in a footnote. I therefore respectfully urge you to vote aye on this amendment.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition to the amendment, although I support it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. It will encourage the development of small business in Africa. It reiterates what this bill is trying to accomplish by promoting trade and investment.

I have had the opportunity to travel to Africa with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). We together had the opportunity to see small businesses across the continent at work. Small businesses in Africa are thriving. And we are building partnerships with small businesses in the United States. And this bill, improved with this amendment, will advance these goals.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), a very distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed that some U.S. corporations trading in Africa have blood on their hands.

On May 27, a group of Nigerian citizens filed an action against Chevron in a U.S. District Court. They accuse Chevron of assisting Nigerian security forces to commit murder, injure protesters, and ransack and burn villages of the indigenous Nigerians. These protesters were objecting to the destruction of their environment and the plundering of their resources.

Unfortunately, evidence gathered by a number of highly respected international human rights and environmental groups support these claims.

These types of allegations are a part of a growing list of crimes being committed against the underprivileged peoples of the world.

The most serious offenders are the giant oil companies who are hungry to take advantage of the rich oil and mineral resources in Africa. Incredibly, these corporations now deny responsibility for their actions.

Our corporations should be required to conduct themselves according to a strict corporate code of conduct that ensures our U.S. corporations become good corporate citizens of the world.

I support this amendment because it encourages the development of small business opportunity in Africa and, therefore, protects Africa from the bad elements of corporate America.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Let me say that I think that small business, whether it is here or abroad, is really the wave of the future. In this Nation, small business comprises 85 percent of employment in this country.

Most of the new jobs created today are small business. Whether they are high-tech, whether they deal with intellectual properties, most of these are done with small businesses. And so, in order to move this Nation, this continent, forward in the area of entrepreneurship, small business is where it ought to be.

We also should support the micro-economics, some of the very, very small businesses that women in Africa are in charge of. Women are the main driving force in many villages, as they are the barterers and they are the deal makers. And so, it is keenly important that we not only connect small business people on the Continent of Africa but in this Nation of small business people, minority women, minority-owned businesses.

I think this is a great connection. I think that the Continent of Africa is looking for partnerships or looking for people to work as equals together.

I believe that the historic 12-day, 6-country tour that President Clinton made last year sent a message that the U.S. is ready to stand up, stand forward to create the climate that is necessary to see this continent finally in the new millennium take its rightful place in the world.

I am very encouraged by this amendment. I think we should all urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, on the small business amendment.

☐ 1300

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to publicly thank the gentlewoman from Texas for all of the work that she has done for the people on the continent of Africa as well as to improve the economy of those of us in the United States of America. She not only has worked hard in the committee and in the subcommittees to make certain that small businesses were the beneficiaries but she has actually gone around the world, especially on the continent, to get a better understanding of the problems and then be able to come forth with the solution to those problems. She has gained the support and the friendship of the people of both sides of the aisle. She is to be congratulated. I support the amendment.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to congratulate the outstanding leadership that the gentlewoman from Texas is providing for not only the women here in America but for the women of Africa. It is so important that we have the nexus between the businesses here and businesses in Africa. We recognize that women make up the majority of businesses, especially microenterprises in Africa, and it is indeed important that we begin to move the agenda for those women so that they can provide the type of support for their families.

I am excited to be here as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Empowerment of the Committee on Small Business to support this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First let me thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations for yielding me the time.

I want to remind those individuals who have listened to this debate, my colleagues, that we would not let this bill proceed without embracing the backbone of America. As I indicated, 99.7 percent of the new jobs and jobs created in America in this very good economy have been created by small businesses. I think it is important to note that there is not one State in the United States that does not have a coloration to indicate that they are not doing business in Africa. I think it is also important when we begin to analyze this bill that we see Africa in multicolors. It would almost be like taking a portrait that our very esteemed African-American artist John Biggers paints, he paints with a lot of colors, going in and looking at the painting and saying, ‘‘It looks like there is all blue.’’

We realize that there is poverty in Africa, that there is need for education, health care, running water and electricity. When we speak to the heads of government, they are prepared to engage internationally to secure those particular needs of their people. Why can we not as we recognize how much we do with Africa provide the forum and the vehicle for not only the large corporations but our small businesses? I hope that the large corporations, I hope that OPIC, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, are listening. Just for information, let me note that OPIC has a small business advocacy team, a small business hotline, a web page, how-to materials only for small businesses to do business in Africa.

I believe that if we really pay attention to what is going on, we will see the numbers of pages of the many cities throughout America that are reflected in this map that shows that there is not one country left out. Let us not take a second step to Europe. I would ask that we pass this amendment and support the idea of small businesses having a piece of the pie of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 106–236.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

Page 24, strike line 13 and all that follows through line 18 on page 25 and insert the following:

SEC. 11. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA EQUITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDS.

(a) INITIATION OF FUNDS.—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall, not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, exercise the authorities it has to initiate 1 or more equity funds in support of projects in the countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in addition to any existing equity fund for sub-Saharan Africa established by the Corporation before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STRUCTURE AND TYPES OF FUNDS.—

(1) STRUCTURE.—Each fund initiated under subsection (a) shall be structured as a partnership managed by professional private sector fund managers and monitored on a continuing basis by the Corporation.

(2) CAPITALIZATION.—Each fund shall be capitalized with a combination of private equity capital, which is not guaranteed by the Corporation, and debt for which the Corporation provides guaranties.

(3) TYPES OF FUNDS.—One or more of the funds, with combined assets of up to $500,000,000, shall be used in support of infrastructure projects in countries of sub-Saharan Africa, including basic health services (including AIDS prevention and treatment), including hospitals, potable water, sanitation, schools, electrification of rural areas, and publicly-accessible transportation in sub-Saharan African countries.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Corporation shall ensure that—

(1) not less than 70 percent of trade financing and investment insurance provided through the equity funds established under subsection (a), and through any existing equity fund for sub-Saharan Africa established by the Corporation before the date of the enactment of this Act, are allocated to small, women- and minority-owned businesses—

(A) of which not less than 60 percent of the ownership is comprised of citizens of sub-Saharan African countries and 40 percent of the ownership is comprised of citizens of the United States; and

(B) that have assets of not more than $1,000,000; and

(2) not less than 50 percent of the funds allocated to energy projects are used for renewal or alternative energy projects.

Page 25, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 6 on page 28 and insert the following:

SEC. 12. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INITIATIVES.

(a) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—Section 233 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Board shall establish and work with an advisory committee to assist the Board in developing and implementing policies, programs, and financial instruments with respect to sub-Saharan Africa, including with respect to equity and infrastructure funds established under section 11 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory committee established under paragraph (1) shall consist of 15 members, of which 7 members shall be employees of the United States Government and 8 members shall be representatives of the private sector.

''(B) APPOINTMENT.—The members of the advisory committee shall be appointed as follows:

''(i) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall each appoint 2 members who are representatives of the private sector and 1 member who is an employee of the United States Government.

''(ii) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall jointly appoint the remaining 3 members who are employees of the United States Government.

''(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Of the 8 members of advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector—

''(i) at least 4 members shall be representatives of not-for-profit public interest organizations;

''(ii) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in development issues;

''(iii) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in human rights issues;

''(iv) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in environmental issues; and

''(v) at least 1 member shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in international labor rights.

''(D) TERMS.—Each member of the advisory committee shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(3) MEETINGS.—

''(A) OPEN TO PUBLIC.—Meetings of the advisory committee shall be open to the public.

''(B) ADVANCE NOTICE.—The advisory committee shall provide advance notice in the Federal Register of any meeting of the committee, shall provide notice of all proposals or projects to be considered by the committee at the meeting, and shall solicit written comments from the public relating to such proposals or projects.

''(C) DECISIONS.—Any decision of the advisory committee relating to a proposal or project shall be published in the Federal Register with an explanation of the extent to which the committee considered public comments received with respect to the proposal or project, if any.

''(4) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS.—The Corporation shall carry out environmental impact assessments with respect to any proposal or project not later than 120 days before the advisory committee, or the Board, considers such proposal or project, whichever occurs earlier.''.

(b) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INITIATIVE.—Section 2(b)(9) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)) is amended to read as follows:

''(9) For purposes of the funds allocated by the Bank for projects in countries in sub-Saharan Africa (as defined in section 17 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act):

''(A) The Bank shall establish an advisory committee to work with and assist the Board in developing and implementing policies, programs, and financial instruments with respect to such countries.

''(B) The members of the advisory committee shall be appointed as follows:

''(i) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall each appoint 2 members who are representatives of the private sector and 1 member who is an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

''(ii) The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate shall jointly appoint the remaining 3 members who are officers or employees of the Federal Government.

''(C)(i) At least half of the members of the advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector shall be representatives of not-for-profit public interest organizations.

''(ii) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in development issues.

''(iii) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in human rights.

''(iv) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall be a representative of an organization with expertise in environmental issues.

''(v) At least 1 of such private sector representatives shall have expertise in international labor rights.

''(D) Each member of the advisory committee shall serve for a term of 2 years.

''(E)(i) Members of the advisory committee who are representatives of the private sector shall not receive compensation by reason of their service on the advisory committee.

''(ii) Members of the advisory committee who are officers or employees of the Federal Government may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the advisory committee.

''(F) Meetings of the advisory committee shall be open to the public.

''(G) The advisory committee shall give timely advance notice of each meeting of the advisory committee, including a description of any matters to be considered at the meeting, shall establish a public docket, shall solicit written comments in advance on each proposal, and shall make each decision in writing with an explanation of disposition of the public comments.

''(H) The Bank shall complete and release to the public an environmental impact assessment with respect to a proposal or project with potential environmental effects, not later than 120 days before the advisory committee, or the Board, considers the proposal or project, whichever occurs earlier.

''(I) Section 14(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the advisory committee.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 250, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, one of the primary barriers to investment in Africa is the lack of physical infrastructure; unnavigable roads, lack of electricity and no access to hospitals. These are just some of the examples of underdevelopment that make Africa less welcoming to investors. Support for investment projects in Africa must grapple with these fundamental barriers.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act includes Overseas Private Investment Corporation financing in the amount of $500 million for projects in sub-Saharan Africa. However, there is no guarantee that this money will be used for projects that improve the standard of living for Africans in ways such as increased access to education, health care facilities, potable water and sanitation services. There is also no guarantee that African firms themselves will benefit from the financing. The fact that the gentlewoman from Texas had to offer an amendment for small firms is a good indication of where the present emphasis of the bill is left out and who is not included.

I, therefore, offer this amendment to improve the OPIC provisions in the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It authorizes the same amount for OPIC funds, $500 million, but ensures that this financing benefits partnerships. The amendment would also target the financing and insurance to small firms. Multinational corporations do not need another handout. This amendment would make OPIC relevant to smaller firms in the U.S. and Africa that really need the investment support.

The amendment would also ensure that projects supported by OPIC respect the environment and the local community. In the past, foreign investment in Africa has often led to development projects that drive people off their land and destroy the environment and the livelihoods of local residents. The African Growth and Opportunity Act should shoot higher for Africa. Infrastructure should be targeted for existing initiatives aimed at increasing citizens' access to schools, hospitals, electricity and potable water. This amendment will thus change the structure of OPIC and Export-Import Bank advisory boards to make OPIC funding accountable to these goals. The advisory boards will include experts in human rights, the environment, labor rights and development issues. This oversight will increase the likelihood that U.S. support for investment overseas will contribute to overall development objectives, facilitate business development in Africa, be responsive to local communities and respect the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for his concern for enhancing the infrastructure for sub-Saharan Africa, but I do regret that I must oppose his amendment. It would impose unrealistic, unworkable requirements on the OPIC investment fund that would be the centerpiece of U.S. efforts to help the African private sector and would encourage free market economies.

This amendment imposes specific quotas for U.S.-led investment and restrictions on the types of investment. It would prevent African entrepreneurs from making their own decisions about how best to utilize the investment encouraged by H.R. 434.

In addition, the Jackson amendment imposes additional, burdensome requirements on the creation of new advisory panels to OPIC and to the Export-Import Bank. The Congress and our Committee on International Relations as well as other committees already have adequate tools for proper oversight of these institutions. The proposed additional requirements would ultimately reduce their proven effectiveness.

Although I do not question the good intentions of the gentleman from Illinois in presenting this amendment, I must vigorously oppose its passage and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson amendment which promotes small business development and protects affirmative action by providing that 70 percent of trade financing and investment insurance provided by OPIC be allocated to small women and minority-owned businesses having at least 60 percent African ownership. This amendment would ensure that, at the very least, a majority of our OPIC funds in Africa would be used for the benefit of the African people.

I commend the gentleman for this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Jackson amendment because it is unrealistic in the light of how OPIC funds work and in the light of what we are trying to do here with this $500 million infrastructure fund.

The expectation is that there will be large amounts of investments, perhaps $35 million each at a minimum, to invest in telecommunications, in banking, in transport infrastructure, in large infrastructure projects. There is no reason to tie the hands of these private fund managers as they try and bring Africa to the global economy in these areas which require huge investments. Frankly, the $500 million investment figure for this fund is fairly modest considering the investment needs of Africa and the lack of investment capital flowing into the country. So to say that this must be undertaken by small businesses only and undertaken by minority businesses only is to put Africa at a disadvantage in trying to develop its economy.

In so many cases the gentleman from Illinois has said that the bill is too modest and understates its promises to Africa. In this case his amendment is too modest. It takes into account things that cannot work in Africa because they are too small-minded to work under the situation where we are looking for capital investment in major investment projects, in infrastructure. It limits the Africans too much. I really think that he has not thought it through well enough. I therefore oppose the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, can he can respond to any provision in the bill that specifically facilitates with economic incentives small business investment or participation in partnerships in sub-Saharan Africa?

Mr. JEFFERSON. OPIC itself as the gentlewoman from Texas just talked about at some great length is focused on small business investment and development. It has not done that before. It is focused on it now to a great extent. The bill calls for women-owned businesses to be enhanced. In fact, that is where most of the empowerment provisions are. So I do not think that is a problem.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The gentleman is referring to sense of Congress provisions in the bill that have no binding implication.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this is really where the rubber hits the road. Whenever we talk about real dollars and real investment, everybody can find reasons why it cannot be done. A sense of Congress is not an amendment. It is not something that has any teeth. We tried on this bill before as we wished to have done in the Committee on Rules to have some substantive amendments that would ensure that there would be business opportunities not only for Africans but for those small businesspersons who want to couple with Africans as we move forward to trade.

Here as we look at this amendment and we talk about and direct ways by which we can help the infrastructure and AIDS, not a sense of Congress on AIDS but real money that could be used to deal with AIDS, again we find reasons why it cannot be done.

I want to tell my colleagues, no matter what happens with this bill, I want the same Members, particularly on that side of the aisle, to help me make aid for Africa a line item in the budget of the United States of America and increase the aid to Africa that they care so much about.

I rise in support of this amendment and I think everybody should support it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Jackson amendment propounded by my good friend from Illinois. The problem with the Jackson amendment is that it does not understand or address the true nature of what OPIC is. OPIC is not foreign aid. It is not government money. It is American money as to which there is a guarantee, and insurance premiums are paid for that guarantee. That is the very nature of it.

☐ 1315

Mr. Chairman, because it is private money, if we have all the strings that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) wants to attach to it, we will not have any investors, and therefore the very countries in Africa that Mr. JACKSON is trying to help, he will end up hindering.

Now what does it do on small businesses? In Illinois, for example, in the district I represent there is Ed Myers, there is Wall Clipper Sterling, there is Taylor of Rockton, Rita Chemicals of McHenry. These are all small to medium sized companies in Illinois that are being directly impacted by OPIC guarantees to Africa, and I would encourage the Members to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Jackson amendment. While well-intended, it imposes a quota system on OPIC projects in Africa.

Seventy percent of the investments made by OPIC's Africa fund must go to small, women- and minority-owned businesses. In addition, 60 percent of such investments must go to businesses owned by Africans. Finally, all such businesses must not have assets greater than $1 million.

In the opinion of OPIC, it is impossible to dictate ownership requirements on a privately managed fund. It would also be impossible to raise $500 million in capital for a fund that makes investments in companies with no more than $1 million in assets.

If the Jackson quota amendment is adopted, there will be no private sector interest in OPIC's Africa fund. Without private sector partnership, this amendment simply means: no new U.S. jobs, no new U.S. exports to Africa, no new African jobs and expose OPIC and the taxpayer to potential lawsuits.

Support the underlying bill that encourages the existing OPIC Africa development fund that will: create 1,000 U.S. jobs, increase U.S. exports to Africa by $500 million over five years, create 9,700 Africa jobs; and operate at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Defeat the Jackson amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 40 seconds.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the biggest criticism of the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is that overwhelmingly these loans, as well as the insurance that is provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation only goes to very large multi national conglomerates in the United States. The Jackson amendment specifically makes it possible for Ex-Im to lend money to small businesses under $1 million and ensures the minority part of a partnership with Overseas Private Investment Corporation funds in order of establishment of a partnership between sub-Saharan Africans and Americans might indeed be initiated, and so the use of Ex-Im and OPIC in this particular instance is appropriate.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, just to add that I did because I find it somewhat humorous that the many amendments that I offered, the only amendment that I offered to this was accepted was this particular amendment, and I received a letter early this morning as well as a phone call.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. May I have an additional 15 seconds? This is actually in support of the gentleman's point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for an additional 15 seconds on both sides.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter very early this morning from the Vice President of Congressional Affairs at the Export-Import Bank who indicated in her letter that Ex-Im Bank is officially opposed to the Jackson amendment, and I just take great umbrage with that particular letter because the Vice President of Congressional Affairs just happens to be my wife, Sandy, and so when I go home this evening as a result of the vote on this amendment, one Jackson is going to be extremely proud and one is going to be extremely sad.

So I want all of my colleagues to know they will not disappoint me one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) has expired, and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to comment on the amendment of my friend, and I much admire him, and I do not like to get in between him and his wife, but his wife, I think, is right on this one, and let me express why.

When I was in the foreign aid agency in the Carter years, an assistant administrator, we wrestled with this issue of how to make real these, not these, but the AID projects in Africa and other places and not have them simply go for a lot of infrastructure that was unrelated to the basic needs of the people in the country, and I think that is what the gentleman from Illinois is trying to say here. The problem is that the way OPIC is structured this would not work, and also I think, and we need to work on this, is restructure these amendments. We have to be sure that we are not taking away the prerogatives of the country in whose domain the project is.

Now a lot of these infrastructure projects that are insured through OPIC have to get the permits, the approvals, in one form or another from within the country, and I think the impact of the gentleman's amendment really is for us to dictate further than we want to what African nations think is something useful for themselves.

Also, these 40 percent, and I will not call them quotas; I think what the gentleman is trying to do is to get it down to the grass roots. I think it is a good purpose, but with these stringent numbers and percentages I think we are going to tie up investments the gentleman would not. So I think the better course is not to pass this amendment, but to work together to try to make sure OPIC funds go where they should.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 106–236.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 38, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 18. ASSISTANCE FROM UNITED STATES PRIVATE SECTOR TO PREVENT AND REDUCE HIV/AIDS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

It is the sense of the Congress that United States businesses should be encouraged to provide assistance to sub-Saharan African countries to prevent and reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. In providing such assistance, United States businesses should be encourage to consider the establishment of an HIV/AIDS Response Fund in order to provide for coordination among such businesses in the collection and distribution of the assistance to sub-Saharan African countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 250, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I started out in debate earlier this morning acknowledging how much I appreciated the fact that we are debating Africa on the floor of the House in the context of what Africa has to offer and what it has to offer its people, in particular, sub-Sahara Africa, and I might just draw the attention of my colleagues to the face of Africa, a young child, young and bright and energetic and ready to be educated, to have potable water, to have electricity, to be able to have access to capitol, to grow up and to be able to be part of a thriving economy in the 48 States, 48 nations, that comprise sub-Sahara Africa.

But juxtaposed against that face is a startling number, that by the start of 1998 8.2 million children had lost their mothers to AIDS, and many had lost their fathers as well, more than 9 out of 10 children often by AIDS or in sub-Sahara Africa where the burden of care is straining extended families and communities to breaking point in many places.

We must declare a war on HIV AIDS.

I am very delighted to have had the opportunity to join the esteemed Member from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and the esteemed Member/colleague from California (Ms. LEE) on a presidential mission solely dedicated to studying and determining what we could do about HIV AIDS in sub-Sahara Africa.

This amendment does as much as I believe in a trade bill we can stretch on the question of HIV AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, I have said I am a supporter of debt relief, the E–8 is a supporter of debt relief. We hope the IMF will come to its senses and be a supporter of debt relief because we cannot take the money that is being used to subsidize to bring down or to service debt and not be able to shift it to more important resources and needs.

But this amendment speaks to the African Growth and Opportunity Act for what it is, a trade bill with major multi nationals who will be engaged in trade in Africa, and it calls upon the establishment of a HIV response fund, the collaboration of resources with the multi nationals to be able to shift those particular resources over to the need for fighting AIDS. This is an HIV AIDS response which will allow moneys from creditors to be able to use along with the corporate community. In particular this is dealing with the corporate community to supplement or to be able to utilize for prevention and treatment and other desires of the sovereign nation as it relates to treating HIV AIDS.

It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that we can team up with already the leadership in sub-Sahara Africa on the question of HIV AIDS. We can team up with Uganda, team up with Zimbabwe, we can work with South Africa and Zambia, and now we know we can work even more because the New York Times has said we have found a $4 treatment for AIDS that can be given to the woman to prevent the transmission of such to the child.

We have a light at the end of the tunnel, and I would hope my colleagues would support this amendment for what it is. It is an acknowledgment and a recognition that we can do more than just talk about AIDS, but we can begin to put the structures in place to take private sector dollars to help us with a response fund that will fight fight fight and win the war against AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 1999. This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is a threat to the success of this trade bill and that there must be a concerted effort in order to properly and sufficiently address this threat.

My amendment encourages U.S. business to assist sub-Saharan Africa with the HIV/AIDS problem and consider the establishment of a HIV/AIDS Response Fund to coordinate and fund those assistance efforts.

HIV/AIDS is a global problem touching virtually every country and every family around the world. More than 95 percent of the people with HIV live in the developing world. It is estimated that by the year 2020, HIV/AIDS will be responsible for 37 percent of all adult deaths form infectious diseases in the developing world.

There are 33 million cases of HIV/AIDS infections worldwide. Of those, over 22 million of them or 66 percent, occur in sub-Saharan Africa. As we debate trade and economic development for Africa, we must acknowledge the fact that unless there are serious efforts to contain the AIDS epidemic, and to reduce the number of those newly infected in Africa, the development goals we seek for Sub-Saharan Africa will not and cannot become reality.

AIDS is wiping out decades of progress on a variety of development fronts in sub-Saharan Africa. In Tanzania, the World Bank predicts that its gross national product (GNP) will be 15 to 25 percent lower as a result of AIDS. South Africa alone estimates that AIDS will cost the country 1 percent of its GNP each year.

Professionals are being particularly hard hit in Sub-Saharan Africa as 34 percent of those with post-secondary education having been diagnosed as HIV positive. As a comparison, those holding elementary-level educations comprise but 18 percent of the HIV infected population.

Business entities, critical to a successful trade policy, also are witnesses to the devastation of HIV/AIDS. Uganda Railways has lost 5,600 employees to AIDS and has a labor turn over rate of 15 percent annually, simply due to AIDS. Barclay Bank is now hiring two employees for every one skilled job, assuming that one of those employees will die of AIDS.

Economic growth can not happen without human resources. The sub-Saharan workforce is being quietly eroded due to the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS and its crippling effects. In 1994, the Indeni Petroleum Refinery in Zambia spent more on AIDS-related costs than it declared in profits. A study in South Africa found that at current levels of benefits per employee, the total costs of benefits would rise from 7 percent of salaries in 1995 to 19 percent by 2005, once again, simply due to AIDS.

HIV/AIDS is now threatening development gains that local and donor governments, citizens, NGOs and international agencies have worked for decades to achieve. By the year 2010, life expectancy in some sub-Saharan countries could decrease by 30 years or more. True economic development can not survive such a statistic.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is a bill designed to quickly bring sub-Saharan Africa into the global marketplace. U.S. business will be primary benefactors of the rewards from this bill. However, HIV/AIDS, if not handled correctly, will be an unexpected barrier to growth and opportunity. U.S. business must be encouraged to recognize the problem and join us in addressing it.

We have federal agencies now addressing the HIV/AIDS issue internationally. The Department of State, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, the U.S. Peace Corps, the Department of Health and Human Services, the FDA, the Department of Commerce, and the Defense Department each has addressed a component of the HIV/AIDS problems of sub-Saharan Africa. But they cannot do it alone.

There are some corporate and international efforts to tackle this problem. They are good efforts. But we need our business community to also recognize this issue and join us as partner in the war on HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. They must realize that they cannot gain the full benefit of this bill unless Africa is strong.

We need those corporations who will benefit the most from the passage of this bill to ante up. Corporations like Chevron, Mobil, Bank of America, Oracle, SBC Communications, Eastman Kodak, Ford and Boeing—all of whom support the passage of this bill, to do something for the benefit of those upon whose shoulders they will find growth. I would, like my amendment denotes, encourage them, together, to establish a Reponse Fund. I would encourage them to work with African authorities to educate their workforce and their children about the dangers of HIV.

Simply said, the onus of the responsibility should be on those who will bear the fruit of this bill. Corporate America—I call you by-name. McDonalds, Motorola, Enron, General Electric—we need you to band together, to use your resources to cement Africa's greatest resource, it's people. Many corporate groups interested in this bill, like the Constituency for Africa and the Africa Trade Council, list HIV/AIDS as one of their top agenda items. That is encouraging, but we want more than a list. We want a response—a Response Fund.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a tremendous opportunity to work with the private sector to harvest immediate and substantial resources to aid those who are fighting HIV or AIDS. Let us not waste it. Let us pass this amendment. I ask you each for your support on this issue, and for your support in passing this Act.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following news article for printing in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1999]

NEW MEANS FOUND FOR REDUCING H.I.V. PASSED TO CHILD

(By Lawrence K. Altman)

In an advancement that promises to significantly reduce the incidence of AIDS in children in developing countries, American and Ugandan scientists have found a simple new way to prevent mother-to child transmission of the AIDS virus that also is less costly and markedly more effective than the standard therapy in the third world.

The more practical therapy comes from substituting one marketed drug, nevirapine, for the standard drug, AZT. The cost for the two doses of nevirapine was $4, compared with $268 for the AZT regimen now used in developing countries and $815 for the much longer and more complicated course used in the United States and other developed countries, Federal health officials said in releasing the finding yesterday.

The new treatment calls for both a mother and her infant to take nevirapine just one time—a mother takes a pill once during labor, and her baby is fed the drug as a syrup once during the first three days of life.

Nevirapine, a drug used in combination ''cocktail'' treatments, has been marketed since 1996 in the United States for treatment of H.I.V., the AIDS virus, and it was remarkably safe in the study that was conducted by American and Ugandan researchers. As babies reached 3 months of age, nevirapine had cut the risk of mother-to-child transmission of H.I.V. to 13 percent from the 25 percent for the standard course of AZT in developing countries, or a reduction of 47 percent, United States and Ugandan health officials said.

Monitoring will continue for 18 months to determine adverse effects that might show up later in infancy. The monitoring will also help to determine how many babies will still become infected through breast-feeding in the first months of life, when such transmission is highest.

H.I.V. can be transmitted during pregnancy or during delivery when bleeding occurs. Nevirapine is believed to be able to block transmission of H.I.V. during the delivery, and further studies will be needed to determine if transmission can be stopped during breast-feeding.

Nevirapine targets the same enzyme in H.I.V. as AZT, but it is a different class of drug.

The low cost of nevirapine makes it feasible or wide-scale use in many developing countries, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, who heads the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, predicted in an interview. His Federal Agency paid for the study.

Dr. Peter Piot, who heads the United Nations AIDS program in Geneva, said the nevirapine study was ''a major gain'' because it ''approaches ideal prevention therapy'' for developing countries, where 95 percent of the H.I.V.-infected people live.

But Dr. Piot said it was ''unrealistic to introduce it on a large scale in developing countries without first using pilot programs'' because drug therapy is only one part of a complex effort to prevent H.I.V. Such pilot studies will begin soon in developing countries, he said.

Most women in developing countries do not know that they are H.I.V.-infected because testing programs are scarce. ''It is still a logistical, economic and cultural challenge to develop programs to encourage H.I.V. testing, counseling and baby formula as a substitute for breast-feeding for infected mothers,'' Dr. Piot said in an interview.

American and Ugandan scientists plan another study to see if it would be more effective to give nevirapine to mother and infant for longer periods. Also, a continuing study in the United States and Europe aims to determine if adding nevirapine to standard regimens will further lower the transmission rate of H.I.V. from mother to child. Dr. Fauci said there was no need to change the United States recommendations until more studies are completed.

The United Nations AIDS group estimates that 1,800 babies are born H.I.V.-infected every day in developing countries where most women do not receive prenatal care. In some areas of Africa, up to 40 percent of pregnant women are H.I.V. infected, and from 25 percent to 35 percent of their infants will be born infected if therapy is not provided.

Wide-scale use of nevirapine in developing countries ''could potentially prevent 300,000 to 400,000 newborns each year from beginning life infected with H.I.V.,'' Dr. Fauci said.

AZT and other anti-H.I.V. drugs have drastically reduced mother-to-child transmission of the infection in the United States since 1994, when a federally sponsored study showed that AZT, taken for several weeks, could stop mother-to-child transmission of H.I.V. The American regimen calls for the pregnant woman to take AZT five times a day beginning as early as the 14th week of pregnancy and continuing until labor, when an intravenous injection of AZT is given. At birth, the baby takes AZT four times a day for six weeks.

Because the American regimen was impractical and too costly for third world countries, scientists sought a more affordable therapy.

Researchers initially intended to enroll 1,500 women in the study, conducted at Mulago Hospital and Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda, beginning in November 1997. One part of the study was dropped in February 1998 after another United States-financed study conducted in Thailand found that AZT used for a shorter period than in the United States was effective in preventing mother-to-child transmission of H.I.V.

The Ugandan study then involved 618 women in their ninth month of pregnancy who had not taken anti-H.I.V. drugs and their 631 infants. Of the 618 women, 308 took AZT and 310 took nevirapine. Enrollment stopped at the end of last April.

The women agreed to accept by random selection either of two drug regimens. One regimen was single dose nevirapine therapy for mother and infant. The other regimen involved taking two AZT pills at the onset of labor and then one pill every three hours until delivery. Infants born to mothers who took AZT were given AZT twice a day during the first week of life.

After two months, 59 infants born to mothers who took AZT and 35 infants born to mothers took nevirapine were infected. Statistical tests projected the 25 percent and 13 percent infection rates, respectively.

The three deaths that occurred among mothers who took AZT were due to AIDS and not the drug, the researchers said. No deaths occurred among the mothers who took nevirapine.

Infection was the most common cause of adverse effects and death among the infants whose mothers took the two drugs. The adverse effects and deaths were not deemed drug related.

Scientists learned the findings on Monday at a meeting of a committee that oversees the safety and effectiveness of such studies.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely important for us to understand what we do when we talk about a sense of Congress as opposed to actions that are actually taken that would create public policy or appropriate money. It is a good thing to be able to have language that says something nice, and we do that from time to time. But I want to make sure that everybody understands that this sense of Congress neither appropriates money nor does it create public policy. We cannot play around with this AIDS problem in Africa.

Since 1983, 85 percent of all of the debts in sub-Saharan Africa is related to AIDS. We have only seen 1 percent of the medicine that they need in this area. Seven out of 10 in sub-Saharan Africa, infected with HIV or AIDS.

So I think it is nice to at least mention it in this trade bill, but my colleagues have got to understand it means nothing to talk about trade. Where are the workers going to come from if we do not have the medicine, if we do not have the resources, if we do not have a real commitment by this country to deal with AIDS?

I know the pharmaceuticals, the companies are all up in arms because they do not want their patent stolen. They do not want people replicating without their permission. They do not want them purchasing. We see that fight going on now, and it is a fight that must go on.

But the fact of the matter is while colleagues are focused, while colleagues are focused and we are saying nice things, we are sitting over in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and I as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, we are trying to fashion AIDS as a factor in debt relief. We do debt relief. We are going to get some debt relief for Africa this year. It will not be done in anyplace else other than the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. We do not want to send a message that we are taking care of

AIDS in the trade bill and not get the opportunity to leverage what we are doing so that we can truly do something about AIDS; so, know it for what it is, and again, it is all right to say something nice and to try and encourage people, but when I come back to my colleagues with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and others on debt relief where we are factoring in AIDS in order to increase debt relief, and they are going to be those who will be opposed to it, I do not want them to forget and think, oh, we have already done something because my colleagues do nothing today when they support this sense of Congress.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of us are deceiving ourselves that we are dealing with the AIDS crisis in this legislation. I also think there is nothing wrong with reminding the corporate world they have got a responsibility.

☐ 1330

Bristol-Myers Squibb has committed $100 million to Africa. That is an important start. It is a significant action. Other companies ought to take the same kinds of action.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for bringing this amendment up. I think the more we talk about AIDS, whether it is here or in sub-Saharan Africa, is positive. I cannot believe that we would say that a sense of the Congress, saying that we need to do something about it, is not the first step.

Ten years ago we could not get a leader in Africa to admit that AIDS was a problem. I have met with presidents and they said no, we do not have that problem. I think we have to start with education. Just to mention the word AIDS in some of these circles is a step in the right direction. I compliment the gentlewoman and urge Members to support this resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is titled the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, but the single largest barrier to growth and opportunity on the continent of Africa is the overwhelming AIDS epidemic that the U.S. Surgeon General has compared to the plague of the 14th century.

Wherever Members are on the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, passing or not passing, and all of us have various positions with respect to this bill, including the process this bill has gone through for amendments, we had an amendment before the Committee on Rules that specifically prohibited the United States government from bringing action against sub-Saharan countries that are attempting to buy drugs cheaper or even produce generic drugs.

That amendment was rejected by the Committee on Rules, apparently overwhelmingly, but what was accepted was another AIDS amendment that gives a sense of the Congress that we want to do something about it; just a sense of the Congress, nothing binding, no appropriation, no money.

Certainly there is going to be a problem for any U.S. investment in sub-Saharan Africa that does not provide for relief in terms of pharmaceuticals and drugs for sub-Saharan people. Again, regardless of Members' position on the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, we need a commitment from the majority to advance the debt relief bills of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH). It helps towards the AIDS crisis.

We need a commitment on more appropriations to make more funding available to address the continent's most devastating disease. We need a commitment toward AIDS education on the continent. With more than 1,500 languages, it is difficult to explain to many different people in many different languages how devastating the disease is.

In Durbin, South Africa, Mr. Chairman, we just received a newspaper article about a horrible rumor, a horrible rumor that if you have sex with a virgin, that is the cure to AIDS. We have to fight this kind of ignorance on the continent, and that will only come from more money, more money and more appropriations.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for having the guts, really, to stand up today and claim opposition to this amendment.

[From CNN Interactive, May 19, 1999]

IN SOUTH AFRICA, DOCTORS, COURTS FIGHT BRUTAL AIDS ''CURE''

(By Charlayne Hunter-Gault)

DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA (CNN)—South Africa's northeastern province of Kwazulu-Natal is blessed with a lush landscape—and cursed with the country's highest AIDS rate.

The rolling hills and fertile valleys in the province of 8.5 million have spawned a myth of a terrible folk ''cure''—a story that says having sex with a virgin will rid sufferers of the disease. The widespread belief has left parents, children, doctors and the courts struggling with a wave of rapes, frequently of young girls.

Skhumbuza Mthembu, a 15-year-old peer counselor at a village primary school in Mpophomeni, says he has heard of the so-called cure from local men and boys. And he often hears firsthand about the results.

Those who have been victims tell horror stories about being raped by a teacher, or a brother, an uncle or even a father. They tell of being assaulted in restrooms, in the forest or the bush, or in bed while they were sleeping.

More and more stories like this are being told by younger and younger children across this province and elsewhere. But many, many more stories are not being told until it's too late.

Dr. Gillian Key treats sexually abused children at the Addington Children's Hospital in Durban, the harbor port of Kwazulu-Natal.

''Unless you see the children within an hour or one or two days, you're unlikely to find anything,'' Key said. ''It's a pitiful thing.''

Some of the children receive good news—that they test negative for HIV. For another family, the news wasn't good.

One such child key treated was raped when she was 2: She tested HIV-positive and now is developing full-blown AIDS.

''It's hard every day,'' said her mother, who asked that her family remain anonymous our of fear that her daughter would be stigmatized. ''It's hard not knowing that one day she might not grow up.''

In Durban, authorities have set up a special court to deal with child abuse cases. It's difficult to establish which rapes are connected to the cure myth, but prosecutors and other say the abuse of younger children since it began circulating has ''skyrocketed.''

Court officials try to ease the process for young victims who must testify. They provide separate rooms for them to testify on videotape so they don't have to face their abusers. But the fact that there are so many of them, coupled with their increasingly younger ages, makes it difficult to obtain convictions.

''The youngest we can put a child on the stand is three years and if we look for an actual trial date, it will be something like six months away,'' said Durban prosecutor Val Melis. ''You can't count on a child to remember details like that that far down the line.''

Meanwhile, back in Mpophomeni, teen counselor Mtembu holds another session to help youngsters cope with the trauma of rape—and to teach them ways they can protect themselves.

But when asked what about that, one young girl answered: ''We just have to cry loudly and hope someone will hear us.''

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Detroit, Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly stand here to support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). A sense of the Congress is just that, that we sense that we ought to take an action. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to report that our subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), recognizes this, and we are going to and have on the subcommittee the appropriations for HIV-AIDS in Africa.

It is a tremendous problem, but we are working on it. The sense of the Congress is the first step. The action to get it done is the next, and we are moving on that.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me clarify for a moment that this is a sense of Congress that brings about a rapid response fund that will be contributed to by corporations involved in the African Growth and Opportunity Act, private sector investment.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson-Lee amendment encouraging assistance of the American Business Community to deal with the HIV/AIDS problem in Sub-Saharan Africa and to consider the establishment of an HIV/AIDS response fund.

Anyone familiar with the HIV/AIDS problem knows of its tremendously negative impact on life in Sub-Saharan Africa and how it is rampaging throughout the area bringing death and destruction. Mr. Chairman, I've been told that those to whom much is given, much is expected in return. Therefore, many of our businesses and pharmaceutical companies are in a great position to provide help and resources to those with the greatest need in our world.

This is a great opportunity to give the greatest of all gifts, the gift of life.

I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for introducing this amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 106–236.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 106–236 offered by Mr. Olver:

Page 38, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO HIV/AIDS CRISIS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Sustained economic development in sub-Saharan Africa depends in large measure upon successful trade with and foreign assistance to the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

(2) The HIV/AIDS crisis has reached epidemic proportions in sub-Saharan Africa, where more than 21,000,000 men, women, and children are infected with HIV.

(3) 83 percent of the estimated 11,700,000 deaths from HIV/AIDS worldwide have been in sub-Saharan Africa.

(4) The HIV/AIDS crisis in sub-Saharan Africa is weakening the structure of families and societies.

(5)(A) The HIV/AIDS crisis threatens the future of the workforce in sub-Saharan Africa.

(B) Studies show that HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa most severely affects individuals between the ages of 15 and 49—the age group that provides the most support for the economies of sub-Saharan Africa countries.

(6) Clear evidence demonstrates that HIV/AIDS is destructive to the economies of sub-Saharan Africa countries.

(7) Sustained economic development is critical to creating the public and private sector resources in sub-Saharan Africa necessary to fight the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) addressing the HIV/AIDS crisis in sub-Saharan Africa should be a central component of United States foreign policy with respect to sub-Saharan Africa;

(2) significant progress needs to be made in preventing and treating HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa in order to sustain a mutually beneficial trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa countries; and

(3) the HIV/AIDS crisis in sub-Saharan Africa is a global threat that merits further attention through greatly expanded public, private, and joint public-private efforts, and through appropriate United States legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 250, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. Chairman, sustained economic growth is desperately needed throughout Africa. Expanded trade between African nations and the United States, which is the goal of the legislation before us today, must be a major part of sustained economic growth.

But sub-Saharan Africa is under siege from the HIV–AIDS epidemic. Twelve million people have already died, and 20-plus million are HIV–AIDS infected. I would just ask Members to look at this quickly, at these maps, and imagine first that in 1977 a map like this up here shows not a single case of AIDS identified in the continent of Africa.

In this map for 1987 we can see the growth of AIDS, and for 1997 we can see the further growth, with a group of countries in the very dark red where the average AIDS infection rate for people in the working force, between 15 and 49, is average 25 percent, and for all these dark orange countries it is in the range of 15 percent.

Mr. Chairman, if we think of that map, that is the very age group that is necessary to build any economy anywhere in this world. So the sense of Congress in our amendment simply states that solving the AIDS crisis should be central to our foreign policy in sub-Saharan Africa; number two, that this crisis is a global threat that warrants greatly expanded effort at all levels, government, private, private-public partnerships, including appropriate legislation by this Congress; and number 3, that progress must be made on prevention and treatment for HIV–AIDS if there is to be any real hope for sustained economic growth or any mutually beneficial trading relationship with the nations in sub-Saharan Africa.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, although I support the amendment, I will claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California will be recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would like to urge my colleagues to support the Olver-Foley-Pelosi-Horn-Lewis amendment to H.R. 434.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 434, and I appreciate the hard work of the bill's chief cosponsors, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). Both of my colleagues have worked diligently to create a balance on a very difficult issue, laying the groundwork for much needed trade policy with Africa.

This amendment is very relevant to the future success of our trade in the sub-Saharan Africa and to economic growth in that region.

Like many of my colleagues, I am concerned about HIV and AIDS in Africa. Twelve million Africans have perished from HIV–AIDS, and 22.5 million are currently living with HIV. At this rate, the HIV–AIDS epidemic will leave a path of destruction in sub-Saharan Africa, destroying families, societies, and economies.

Individuals between the ages of 15 and 40 are hit hardest by HIV and AIDS. That is the cross-section of the population responsible for supporting the economy. As a member of the International AIDS Task Force, I believe this epidemic is too powerful to ignore if we are serious about expanding economic opportunity in Africa.

This is a nonbinding sense of the Congress amendment. I think it is an essential part of the trade policy we are developing. I pledge my support for H.R. 434, and think we can make this an even better piece of legislation by passing this amendment to show the Congress recognizes the force of HIV and AIDS to Africa.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. AIDS is an affliction which has had a fundamental and far-reaching effect on the well-being of many nations, and I think this amendment signifies the importance of our strong national commitment in combatting this disease, not only for this Nation's benefit, but for the benefit of all humanity.

Though we continue to struggle in our efforts to understand AIDS and to cure it, it seems to me entirely consistent with this Nation's character, which teaches us to reach out to the weak and the sick, to engage in this dilemma in an active and direct manner.

This amendment is reflective of this sort of approach, and it is my hope that it will serve as a stepping stone for future congressional action.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a severe problem, as has been pointed out. This costs millions of lives. AIDS has cost millions of lives in Africa. It does threaten economic development of the continent. Members of the House, including the coauthors of this particular amendment, are working on this problem. I support this amendment. This amendment will bolster our efforts on AIDS in Africa.

Let me also point out that the underlying bill will support sub-Saharan nations' efforts to strengthen their economies, to promote their strong growth, to promote job creation, and improve the standards of living there. In these ways, the bill will strengthen the ability of sub-Saharan countries to fight AIDS.

Already growth and economic reforms have helped to generate resources for drug access programs. For example, Cote d'Ivoire has established a $1 million solidarity fund from corporate contributions and nonprofit insurance systems.

But this amendment will help us do more. I thank the authors for offering this amendment, which we will support.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and thank him for his leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor. I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to borrow his chart to show the tragedy of the spread of AIDS from 1987 to 1997. Much of this could have been prevented. We cannot talk about commerce and the economic situation in Africa without talking about HIV and AIDS.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for years I have urged the administration to address the issue of AIDS in the developing world.

I thank gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has worked on this issue from the perspective of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services to make the AIDS issue a top item on the G–7 and G–8 agenda. If they are dealing with the economies of the developing world, they must deal with the issue of AIDS.

There have been success stories in Africa. Uganda is one of them. So we must cooperate with Africa on the AIDS issue. We will do so in the spirit of this sense of the Congress. I wish this could be a stronger amendment and have the power of law. We must make it have the force of law. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to add my voice to those who are seeking to find a solution, those who are seeking to bring resources, seeking to bring progress to one of the greatest needs that exists on the face of this Earth.

□ 1345

We can give to Sub-Saharan Africa because we can give the greatest gift of all, and that is the gift of life. We can do it through sound trade policy, and we can do it through direct aid.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me say any U.S. policy toward Africa must recognize that not only is HIV and AIDS a health issue, but it is an epidemic of enormous social and economic dimensions. Not only are there humanitarian concerns which we must morally embrace, we must attack this disease on a global basis, just as we did with polio and smallpox. It is in our national interest to do so. Diseases know no boundaries. This sense of the Congress resolution is an excellent first start, but we must put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Olver amendment addressing the HIV/AIDS crisis. Addressing this crisis should be a central component of America's policy with respect to Sub-Saharan Africa, if we are going to have significant trade relations. This amendment speaks specifically to the needs of African women who are the epicenter of the worldwide AIDS epidemic. African women are the backbone of the vital informal and microenterprise sectors that make up so much of African economies.

Mr. Chairman, this epidemic is decimating the pool of skilled workers. I express my support to further bring attention to this crisis.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be granted 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will each control 1 additional minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for the work he has done on this amendment. It has taken a lot of hard work, and I rise in support of it.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment brought by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) which focuses on what poses the biggest threat to what we are trying to do through H.R. 434. HIV/AIDS has killed more than 11 million people and continues to infect more than 22 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Today, while we try to meet our obligation to help Africa economically, we must not lose sight of this pandemic which is killing and affecting individuals in the prime of their life. I urge passage of this amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Olver-Foley-Pelosi amendment. This amendment simply expresses the sense of the Congress that addressing HIV/AIDS should be a central component of our policy in sub-Saharan Africa.

There are approximately 750 million people in sub-Saharan Africa—almost 500 million more people than live in the United States. It is critical that the legislation we are considering, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act includes language dealing with HIV/AIDS which are now rampant throughout sub-Saharan Africa. Southern Africa is facing an unprecedented emergency as the numbers of people becoming infected with HIV continue to climb at alarming rates in many countries of the region. This year, 1.4 million people between the ages of 15 and 49 were infected in nine countries of southern Africa.

In the four worst-affected countries of the region—Botswana, Namibia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe—between 20% and 26% of adults in this age group are now estimated to be living with HIV or AIDS, and other countries are catching up fast. Zimbabwe is especially hard-hit. In 23 HIV surveillance sites out of a total of 25, between 25% and 50% of all pregnant women were found to be infected with HIV. At least a third are likely to pass the infection on to their babies.

Dr. Peter Piot, Executive Director of the Joint United National Programme on HIV/AIDS has said that "we now know that despite these already very high levels of HIV infection the worst is still to come in southern Africa. The region is facing human disaster on a scale it has never seen before.''

Mr. Chairman, the wealthiest of nations would be financially overwhelmed by the prospect of dealing with an AIDS crisis of this magnitude. For sub-Saharan African nations, many with per capita incomes of less than $500 per year and crushing debt service payments monopolizing their budgets, the likelihood that they will be able to provide adequate treatment to the exploding number of AIDS patients is bleak. Without international cooperation in providing overall AIDS education, prevention and treatment, future generations in sub-Saharan Africa will face short, often agonizing lives.

The impact on society of this type of epidemic is so obvious. How can we even think of passing legislation to increase trade and investment in Sub-Saharan Africa without including this sense of the Congress amendment that acknowledges the impact that HIV/AIDS has on establishing stable trade and true economic growth? This amendment should be an integral part of any equation when dealing with the overall economic policy of this region. This amendment takes the first step in acknowledging and expressing concern about the criticality of treating and preventing the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

I urge support for this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. Chairman, I rise to support our amendment to recognize the HIV/AIDS dilemma in Africa. This amendment does not interfere with the trade provisions of the bill. It is bipartisan and sensible. While this amendment is limited to non-binding ''sense of the Congress'' language, I think it is an essential part of the trade policy we are constructing in this bill.

It is time to develop a new trade relationship with Africa. For U.S. businesses and for the countries of sub-Saharan Africa, the passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act will provide the safeguards and incentives required for meaningful investments and partnerships. The bill is good for America and Africa. However, something is lacking in this legislation. Over 12 million Africans have died from AIDS and currently over 22 million in sub-Saharan Africa are living with HIV. Over 50% of the new HIV infections in Africa occur in women. Women also carry the main burden of care of family members with HIV/AIDS. Approximately 6 million women in sub-Saharan Africa are HIV positive. Our Growth and Opportunity trade bill seeks to uplift the women entrepreneurs and provide business and employment opportunities that will guarantee a better quality of life. HIV/AIDS is a barrier to our goals.

In 1998, sub-Saharan African experienced four million new HIV infections. AIDS death tolls are rapidly rising. Sub-Saharan Africa experiences an estimated 5,500 funerals per day.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic is leaving a path of destruction in sub-Saharan African that is impacting all aspects of life. This is why it is important as we consider the African Growth and Opportunity Act, we include our concern about the HIV/AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa. This region can not achieve economic prosperity or fully meet the objectives of our bill, if the population is dying. The workforce will not be available to staff the many new and developing businesses. The cost of employee benefits will off set corporate profits and make any economic growth less than stellar.

This amendment gives members the opportunity to voice their concerns about HIV/AIDS and it calls upon the House to consider future legislation addressing the HIV/AIDS crisis. I am pleased to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Mr. OLVER of Massachusetts, Mr. FOLEY of Florida, Ms. PELOSI of California, Mr. HORN of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

I know that the African Growth and Opportunity Act will be a better bill with inclusion of this amendment, because this amendment will help to ensure that the goals of the bill are achieved. The HIV/AIDS epidemic is too threatening to ignore if we are serious about expanding economic opportunity in Africa.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, 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. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for Sub-Saharan Africa, pursuant to House Resolution 250, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BISHOP. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BISHOP moves to recommit the bill H.R. 434 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 7. SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAM FOR APPAREL ARTICLES FROM ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.

(a) SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President, in consultation with representatives of the domestic textile and apparel industry and with representatives of countries in sub-Saharan Africa that are eligible under section 4 and after providing an opportunity for public comment, shall establish a special access program for imports of eligible apparel articles from such eligible countries in sub-Saharan Africa under which imports of such eligible apparel articles are not subject to duties or quotas.

(2) PROGRAM MODELED ON EXISTING PROGRAM.—The program under paragraph (1) should be modeled on the existing program providing for preferential tariff and quota treatment on apparel articles originating in Mexico, consistent with the international obligations of the United States under the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing and other trade agreements.

(b) ELIGIBLE GOODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Apparel articles are eligible for the special access program established under subsection (a) only if the articles are—

(A) apparel articles classified under chapter 61 or 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States that are assembled in an eligible sub-Saharan African country from fabrics wholly formed and cut in the United States, from yarns wholly formed in the United States, and sewn with thread formed in the United States, whether or not such articles were subjected to stone-washing, enzyme-washing, acid-washing, perma-pressing, oven-baking, bleaching, garment-dyeing, embroidery, or other similar processes; or

(B) handloomed, handmade, or folklore articles of an eligible sub-Saharan African country that are identified under paragraph (2) and are certified as such by the competent authority of that country.

(2) DETERMINATION OF HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, OR FOLKLORE GOODS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the President, after consultation with the eligible sub-Saharan African country concerned, shall determine which, if any, particular apparel goods of the country shall be treated as being handloomed, handmade, or folklore goods of a kind described in section 2.3(a), (b), or (c) or Appendix 3.1.B.11 of Annex 300–B of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

(3) ACTIONS BY PRESIDENT TO PREVENT MARKET DISRUPTION.—The President may impose the normal trade relations rates of duty, restrict the quantity of imports, or both, with respect to imports of eligible goods under this subsection from any eligible sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that such action is necessary to prevent market disruption or the threat thereof.

(c) REPORT.—The President shall include as part of the first annual report under section 16 a report on the establishment of the special access program under subsection (a) and shall report to the Congress annually thereafter on the implementation of the program and its effect on the textile and apparel industry in the United States.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Agreement on Textiles and Clothing'' means the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing referred to in section 101(d)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(4)).

SEC. 8. PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CUSTOMS LAWS INVOLVING APPAREL GOODS.

(a) PENALTIES.—Section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PENALTIES INVOLVING APPAREL GOODS.—

''(1) FRAUD.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the civil penalty for a fraudulent violation of subsection (a) based on a claim that apparel goods are eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa—

''(A) shall, subject to subparagraph (B), be double the amount that would otherwise apply under subsection (c)(1); and

''(B) shall be an amount not to exceed 300 percent of the declared value in the United States of the merchandise if the violation has the effect of circumventing any quota on apparel goods.

''(2) GROSS NEGLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the civil penalty for a grossly negligent violation of subsection (a) based on a claim that apparel goods are eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa—

''(A) shall, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), be double the amount that would otherwise apply under subsection (c)(2);

''(B) shall, if the violation has the effect of circumventing any quota of the United States on apparel goods, and subject to subparagraph (C), be 200 percent of the declared value of the merchandise; and

''(C) shall, if the violation is a third or subsequent offense occurring within 3 years, be the penalty for a fraudulent violation under paragraph (1) (A) or (B), whichever is applicable.

''(3) NEGLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the civil penalty for a negligent violation of subsection (a) based on a claim that apparel goods are eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa—

''(A) shall, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), be double the amount that would otherwise apply under subsection (a)(3);

''(B) shall, if the violation has the effect of circumventing any quota of the United States on apparel goods, and subject to subparagraph (C), be 100 percent of the declared value of the merchandise; and

''(C) shall, if the violation is a third or subsequent offense occurring within 3 years, be the penalty for a grossly negligent violation under paragraph (2) (A) or (B), whichever is applicable.''.

(b) MITIGATION.—Section 618 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1618) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Whenever'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) MITIGATION RULES RELATING TO APPAREL GOODS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury may remit or mitigate any fine or penalty imposed pursuant to section 592 based on a claim that apparel goods are eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa only if—

''(A) in the case of a first offense, the violation is due to either negligence or gross negligence; and

''(B) in the case of a second or subsequent offense, prior disclosure (as defined in section 592(c)(4)) is made within 180 days after the entry of the goods.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR PRIOR DISCLOSURES AFTER 180 DAYS.—In the case of a second or subsequent offense where prior disclosure (as defined in section 592(c)(4)) is made after 180 days after the entry of the goods, the Secretary of the Treasury may remit or mitigate not more than 50 percent of such fines or penalties.''.

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.—Section 596(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1595a(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) it consists of apparel goods that are claimed to be eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa introduced into the United States for entry, transit, or exportation, and

''(i) the merchandise or its container bears false or fraudulent markings with respect to the country of origin, unless the importer of the merchandise demonstrates that the markings were made in order to comply with the rules of origin of the country that is the final destination of the merchandise, or

''(ii) the merchandise or its container is introduced or attempted to be introduced into the United States by means of, or such introduction or attempt is aided or facilitated by means of, a material false statement, act, or omission with the intention or effect of—

''(I) circumventing any quota that applies to the merchandise, or

''(II) undervaluing the merchandise.''.

(d) CERTIFICATES OF ORIGIN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all importations of apparel goods that are claimed to be eligible products of countries in sub-Saharan Africa shall be accompanied by—

(1)(A) the name and address of the manufacturer or producer of the goods, and any other information with respect to the manufacturer or producer that the Customs Service may require; and

(B) if there is more than one manufacturer or producer, or there is a contractor or subcontractor of the manufacturer or producer with respect to the manufacture or production of the goods, the information required under subparagraph (A) with respect to each such manufacturer, producer, contractor, or subcontractor, including a description of the process performed by each such entity;

(2) a certification by the importer that the importer has exercised reasonable care to ascertain the true country of origin of the apparel goods and the accuracy of all other information provided on the documentation accompanying the imported goods, as well as a certification of the specific action taken by the importer to ensure reasonable care for purposes of this paragraph; and

(3) a certification by the importer that the goods being entered do not violate applicable trademark, copyright, or patent laws.

Information provided under this subsection shall be sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the United States rules of origin for textile and apparel goods.

Redesignate succeeding sections, and references thereto, accordingly.

Page 18, line 19, insert after ''(b)'' the following: ''(other than apparel articles described in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (b))''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit. I want this House to know that I would like to see us pass an Africa trade bill. I want everyone to know that we believe that we ought to pass an Africa trade bill, but it ought to be a good Africa trade bill, and it ought to promote economic growth and the well-being of the people of Sub-Saharan Africa, but not at expense of the people of America.

I am offering this motion to recommit so that we can send this bill back to the committee and perfect it and do in the House what we expect the Senate is going to do when it sees this bill. This bill will not offer labor protections, it will not protect us against transshipped textiles from China, it will not protect American jobs. Mr. Speaker, we ought to do for Africa what we did for Europe. We need an African Marshall Plan.

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

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, we are from Congress, we are here to help. That is great. Let us help the American textile worker and family for a change. Help Africa, of course, but not at the expense of American men and women who depend on textiles for their livelihood.

For those who believe that the Sub-Saharan trade bill represents free and fair trade, I invite them down to the 8th District of North Carolina. I invite them to meet the most decent and hard-working people in this great Nation. And I invite them to stand at the mill gate and explain to them how wonderful this legislation will make their lives. They have heard it before. They remember clearly the promises made to them during negotiations of NAFTA and GATT, and they now know these promises were hollow.

Mr. Speaker, we in rural, textile-rich America no longer have faith in trade agreements which so obviously disregard the health of our proud industry. We can fix this. All we have to do is vote to recommit and support the Bishop-Myrick amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as it is now written, without a textile provision, no one in Africa is helped by the massive transshipment industry created for the Chinese. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) read their press release, their game plan. Their plan is clear as a bell. Let the transshipments begin. The only person helped may be someone selling aviation fuel for the planes which will bring the foreign goods to bury our textile industry and the men and women who depend on it. My colleagues will complete the destruction of this industry, its jobs and especially its people by allowing this bill to pass without the Bishop-Myrick amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we saw fit to acknowledge the crisis in our steel industry. I supported this measure. I did not support it because I have a lot of steel manufacturers in my district, I supported it because it was the right thing to do.

While the plight of the steel industry is serious, the plight of the textile industry has been nothing short of tragic. While the steel industry lost 17,000 jobs, the textile industry has lost 180,000 during the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support American people, support a true American industry, vote to recommit and fix this bill which, in its present form, only serves to hurt African-Americans and others in the U.S.A., taking their jobs. Help Africa, but help America first.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that, since 1995, over 375,000 American textile and apparel workers have lost their jobs. Many of these workers have been from the State of Georgia, a number of them from the Third District of Georgia.

In June of 1999, headlines in the Third District newspapers read, and I quote: ''Thomaston Mills Drops Bombshell: Textile Firm will Close Local Plant, Leaving 145 Jobless.'' That may not seem like many jobs, but that is the second largest employer in this particular community, which was big to them.

And another headline: ''Closing will Affect All Taxpayers,'' meaning a loss to the property digest in this county which is a great loss. In addition to closing this plant, Thomaston Mills simultaneously shut down factories in other neighboring counties and also offices in Los Angeles and New York costing another 555 jobs.

Workers, their families, and the communities of the Third District of Georgia are not ready to accept another trade deal that exports jobs rather than goods, so I urge my colleagues, vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to close this out by simply saying that if we recommit, if we pass this motion to recommit, we will then be in a position to perfect this bill and to truly have a bill that would be beneficial for the people in Africa and for the people in America, workers in the United States.

If we fail to pass this motion to recommit, then we will have to depend upon the other body to do what we should have done ourselves here in this body. It will not pass on the other side without the provisions that we are trying to get in to protect both Africa and American workers.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), our distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. It does not say that the African countries cannot export any clothing to the United States. It does not say that. It merely says that the clothing has to be assembled only with United States of America fabric, only with United States of America yarn and only with United States of America thread.

I really think that this is repugnant to everything that we think of when we talk about trade. So manufacturers of clothes ship it across the Atlantic, let them stitch up our fabric and yarn and thread, and they will ship it back and try to sell it for a profit.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, transportation costs involved with shipping fabric from the U.S. to Africa are prohibitively high, and shippers rarely service African ports. Even if a U.S. fabric requirement were economically feasible, it would discourage investment in African fabric production which would prohibit Africa from ever being able to compete in that sector. A U.S. fabric requirement is a gutting proposal which will stifle African economic growth and discourage job creation in America, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 163, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—234

Ackerman
Allen
Archer
Armey
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Borski
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clement
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Neal
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauscher
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—163

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Bachus
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bonilla
Bonior
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Capuano
Carson
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Danner
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Emerson
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Filner
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Hilleary
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hunter
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Mascara
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, George
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Norwood
Obey
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Price (NC)
Rahall
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Thompson (CA)	Velazquez	Weldon (PA)
Thompson (MS)	Vento	Weygand
Thornberry	Visclosky	Wise
Tierney	Walden	Woolsey
Traficant	Wamp	Young (AK)
Udall (CO)	Waters	
Udall (NM)	Watt (NC)	

NOT VOTING—37

Baird	Frost	McNulty
Baker	Ganske	Miller (FL)
Baldwin	Gordon	Nethercutt
Bilirakis	Hansen	Ortiz
Blunt	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hefley	Shadegg
Boswell	Hobson	Stark
Boucher	Istook	Tauzin
Burton	John	Thurman
Chenoweth	Largent	Wicker
Coble	Latham	Young (FL)
Coburn	McDermott	
Cooksey	McInnis	

□ 1419

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No 307, I was unavoidably detained, by traffic. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 434, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INFORMING MEMBERSHIP OF THE PASSING OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Members that we have lost this morning our dear friend from California, GEORGE BROWN, who died in Washington, D.C.

Our prayers and our thoughts are with his family and his friends and neighbors and constituents. He has been a constant friend to all of us on both sides of the aisle. He has been a dedicated public servant and he gave a great, great deal of his life to this body and to his constituents.

I would like to ask us now to rise and have a moment of silence in his memory.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise as chair of the California Democratic delegation, and I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will also ask to be recognized as the Chair of the Republican delegation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I appreciate the words of our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), on behalf of GEORGE BROWN.

I wish to announce to the Members that in the days ahead we will be reserving an appropriate time for a memorial discussion on the floor recognizing the many, many years of service of our colleague GEORGE BROWN, and in turn we will be continuing to communicate closely with his family in order to get information to the Members regarding memorial services that are appropriate in California. Those notifications will come to Members very soon.

Further than that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we adjourn today in GEORGE BROWN's memory by way of the full membership of the House.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 252) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 252

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable George E. Brown, Jr., a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, maybe other Members of the California delegation would like to speak, but we will set a special time for that. I just want to thank the leadership, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate for already lowering the flags on the Hill on all of our Federal buildings out of respect for the memory of GEORGE BROWN. We will dearly miss him.

We will appoint at the appropriate time a memorial service here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this House now for 11 years, and I have to say that I have never met a man more principled and more honest and more open than GEORGE BROWN.

I loved GEORGE BROWN dearly, and I think I am talking for the rest of us, certainly on our side of the aisle, and I know many others will come up, but GEORGE BROWN was such a principled human being. And sometimes people who feel so strongly about their principles get caught up in bitterness and partisanship, but GEORGE BROWN had such a wonderful spirit and a happiness about him that he diffused tension with his principles and his spirit rather than creating tensions.

I just would like to add my words and to say that working under his leadership in the Committee on Science was a joy. And here we are at the 30th anniversary of our landing on the moon, and GEORGE BROWN certainly deserves such a great deal of credit for the leadership he provided over the years in this great achievement of our country.

GEORGE BROWN was an honest liberal, an honest man, a man with a dear heart, and we will miss him.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague indicated, we are going to schedule another time for a memorial service on the floor, rather than do that at this moment. I know Members want to think through all of their feelings about our colleague and I, frankly, want to make sure that Marta has an opportunity to share these moments with us. So we will work with the Speaker and the leadership to make sure an appropriate time is selected and go forward from there.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) regarding next week's schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.