

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, at the end of 20th century, the world community came together under the leadership of several of the world's most influential churches and created the Jubilee 2000 movement, a worldwide movement to cancel the debts of the world's poorest countries. The Jubilee 2000 movement included the Catholic Church, the Episcopalian Church, the World Council of Churches, Bread for the World, many other Christian, Jewish and other faith-based organizations. Student groups, HIV/AIDS activists, development specialists, business leaders and labor unions also joined this diverse movement.

In 1999, Jubilee 2000 convinced the G-8 group of industrialized countries to develop the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, known as HIPC, a program to significantly reduce poor country's debt. In 2000, Jubilee 2000 convinced the United States Government as well as the governments of other G-8 countries to authorize this debt relief program and appropriate the funds to carry it out.

Unfortunately, the Enhanced HIPC Initiative has failed to provide a lasting solution to poor country debts. At least 18 heavy indebted poor countries are still spending more money on debt payments than they are on health care.

The goal of Jubilee 2000 was to completely cancel the debts of the world's poorest countries. We must do more to accomplish this goal. We must do more to proclaim Jubilee for the poorest of the poor.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 643, the Debt Cancellation for the New Millennium Act. This bill would urge the President to negotiate with the IMF and the World Bank to completely cancel 100 percent of the debts of the world's most impoverished countries who owe these institutions and give these countries a fresh start in the new millennium. This bill has 45 cosponsors.

H.R. 1298, the Global AIDS bill, included a debt relief provision, Title V, urging the administration to advocate deeper debt relief within the Enhanced HIPC Initiative. Title V states that the Secretary of the Treasury should immediately commence efforts with the IMF, the World Bank and other creditor countries to modify the Enhanced HIPC Initiative to reduce poor countries' debts to ensure that poor countries are not required to spend more than 10 percent of their annual current revenues on debt payments. For poor countries facing a public health crisis as a result of HIV/AIDS, the limit would be 5 percent. The Global AIDS bill was signed into law by the President on May 27, 2003, and is now Public Law 108-025.

Title V of the Global AIDS bill, which was added in the Senate by amendment and subsequently approved by the House, reflected provisions in H.R. 1376, a bipartisan debt relief bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman

from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. MALONEY). H.R. 1376 would have required the Secretary of the Treasury to submit reports to Congress describing the efforts and progress made in negotiating improvements to the Enhanced HIPC Initiative. Unfortunately, Title V of the Global AIDS bill does not require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress on the administration's effort.

My amendment would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress on the progress made in modifying the Enhanced HIPC Initiative as called for in Title V. This simple reporting requirement would enable Congress to monitor the administration's effort to achieve deeper debt relief for poor countries. A reporting requirement also could provide an incentive for multilateral development institutions and other creditor countries to support proposals for deeper debt relief.

Deeper debt relief for the world's heavily indebted poor countries will remove a major obstacle to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, poverty reduction and economic growth. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment. It is sorely needed. I could not think of a more noble project than to assist Buddhist countries with huge debts with debt relief. This is a measure that deserves bipartisan support. I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for it.

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment points to an important subject, the need for prompt implementation of the Act, and we certainly think that the Committee on International Relations and other relevant committees ought to receive periodic reports and hold hearings and briefings, if necessary.

The reporting provisions in the legislation require the Secretary of Treasury to inform the Congress of his progress in implementing the Act, but we have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman at this point. Unless we figure something differently, we are entirely supportive.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his words of support. I do not think there would be any other information which would lead to opposition to the amendment, and I thank the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his support and superb leadership on this committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman pro tempore 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. 1950) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 2004 and 2005, to authorize appropriations under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for security assistance for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the *Columbia* disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate

conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 2115, FLIGHT 100—CENTURY
OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION
ACT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2115 be instructed to insist upon a total level of funding of not less than \$59,000,000,000 for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 for programs authorized pursuant to sections 101 through 103 of the bill, including not less than—

- (1) \$14,800,000,000 for Federal Aviation Administration operations;
- (2) \$12,294,000,000 for air navigation facilities and equipment; and
- (3) \$31,276,000,000 for airport planning and development and noise compatibility planning and programs.

Mr. DEFAZIO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to instruct be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct would be to insist upon the House levels of funding for the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. There are a number of critical issues looming before us in the future of aviation. Some folks think today because the levels of travel are depressed that the concerns we had about modernization and airspace and a lot of other issues have gone away. They have not. We fully expect that with the new security measures we have put in place and they are continuing to put in place that people will be returning if the economy ever recovers, but that is

another issue for another debate over tax cuts versus investment. But if the economy does and when the economy recovers, we will find that the levels of air passenger traffic will increase greatly in the not-too-distant future. We cannot take a break from the investments that we need to make.

Our bill, Flight 100, would provide more than \$59 billion over the next 4 years; and we think 4 years is essential, because the Senate only wants to reauthorize for 3 years, perhaps to come back and tinker or whatever reason, but we need the certainty of the 4 years and we need the higher levels of investment. It provides substantial increases in the airport improvement program, again back to the capacity issue and the concerns that were driving us just a couple of years ago here in the House in terms of the lack of capacity.

Our bill would provide \$14.8 billion for airport improvement projects over 4 years. That is \$1.2 billion more than the FAA's request, and it would be \$300 million more than the Senate has requested, projects that would not only enhance capacity but actually put people to work, a meaningful investment in construction projects. It would provide \$12.3 billion for FAA facilities and equipment to maintain and modernize our air traffic control system. We have finally straightened out the problems in acquiring the new system and the technology. We need now to go ahead with the acquisition to put this equipment into place so that we can better utilize the airspace and we can better protect the safety of the traveling public. Again, the Senate has \$267 million less than the House bill.

We have a number of other areas where we believe that the House bill is superior, but these are the ones we wish to emphasize in our motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

I am pleased to rise this evening in support of the motion offered by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation. We are in concurrence with the other side of the aisle. This is a bipartisan effort to instruct conferees on the position of the House as opposed to the Senate.

I would say very briefly that the level of funding that the House proposes is in the best interests of our aviation community. There are a number of programs that have been spoken to, air traffic control modernization and other safety and security issues, that do need to be addressed at the level that is authorized by the House and that is the preferable position. Again, I am pleased to join my colleague. It would be sad if we stepped back, last year was the safest year in the record of safety in American aviation history, and not properly address the needs of one of the most viable parts of our economy and that is the

aviation industry. We support the position, we support this motion to instruct conferees, we support a 4-year as opposed to a 3-year reauthorization. I would strongly encourage the adoption of the motion to instruct conferees offered by my colleague.

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

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

I would just urge that my colleagues strongly stand behind the work of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House and support this motion to instruct and stand firm against the Senate so that we can have the best bill possible.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this motion would instruct the conferees to insist upon not less than the House-passed total of funding of \$59 billion for the next four years for the Federal Aviation Administration's airport improvement, facilities and equipment and operations programs.

The funding in the House bill, Flight 100, will ensure that we continue to invest in badly needed airport infrastructure and air traffic control modernization. This is imperative to the future of aviation. Although air passenger traffic has decreased significantly since September 11th, the FAA expects that by 2006 total passenger enplanements will reach the 2000 level of 696.3 million. The United States is the only nation that enplanes over 600 million passengers annually. No other nation comes anywhere close to FAA's responsibility for managing approximately 200,000 take-offs and landings each day of the year. FAA and its air traffic controller's achieve this great feat with the assistance of impressive technology, but technology that is nonetheless aging.

We must ensure that we have a robust aviation program to meet all of our future challenges, including accommodating larger aircraft; addressing airport access issues and terminal expansion; and dealing with environmental issues. Flight 100 provides more than \$59 billion over the next four years of system capacity enhancements, technology modernization and operation of the air traffic control system. The Senate passed bill authorizes \$43 billion for these purposes for the next 3 years.

Flight 100 provides substantial increases in Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding to meet anticipated capacity needs. In total, the House bill provides \$14.8 billion for AIP over four years, \$1.2 billion more than the FAA's request. The three-year AIP funding levels in the Senate bill are \$300 million less than funding provided by the House bill for the corresponding years.

Flight 100 provides \$12.3 billion for FAA facilities and equipment (F&E) to maintain and modernize our air traffic control system, which is more than the Administration's requested level of funding. Moreover, \$200 million is specifically designated for critical terminal automation system replacement, which has recently experienced deployment delays due to budget cuts. The three-year F&E funding levels in the Senate bill are \$267 million less than funding provided by the House bill for the corresponding years.

The bill also provides the Administration's requested level of \$31.3 billion for FAA operations.