EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JEFF FORTENBERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes:

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of United States foreign assistance is to strengthen the foundation for international stability by fostering civil society, supporting the development of free markets and institutions that foster self-determination, and helping the vulnerable by bringing healing, hope, and sustainable basic sustenance to those in need. As the leading provider of foreign assistance worldwide, the United States has made extraordinary strides toward alleviating suffering throughout the world. I would like to thank Chairman KOLBE for his hard work on this legislation to further this mission. He has shown great leadership and outstanding commitment to promoting our international initiatives.

I also wish to bring attention to the fact that this year's report on the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill confirms violations of the Tiahrt Amendment by an organization funded by the United States in Guatemala.

In passing the Tiahrt Amendment, which sets out clear criteria for voluntarism in family planning, the United States Congress worked to protect families throughout the world from the humiliation and indignity of coercion. I commend my colleague, Congressman TIAHRT, for his foresight in developing this amendment, which serves the important purpose of preventing the imposition of procedures under duress and without an explanation to participants of the potential risks involved.

Apparently the organization referenced in the report aggressively targeted women for sterilization, setting out numerical targets and offering financial incentives contrary to U.S. law. Although the system of financial incentives that occasioned the violations discovered in June 2005 has been terminated, we must work to ensure that this type of episode is not repeated and that investigations of such potential violations are vigorously thorough and unquestionably objective.

I believe that U.S. foreign assistance should not be used as a vehicle for imposing programs which potentially compromise the health of recipients, violate their consciences, or break laws of recipient nations which aim to affirm human dignity. On behalf of those we strive to assist, I urge my colleagues in Congress, the Administration, and the United States Agency for International Development, as well as the constituents we serve, to work earnestly to uphold this purpose.

And thank you again, Congressman KOLBE, for your leadership in international affairs, and for your selfless dedication to leveraging the gifts of our great country for the betterment of the international community.

COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit these charts for the RECORD during the debate on the Point of Order that I raised against H. Res. 850 providing for the consideration of H.R. 5252, the Communications Opportunity, Promotion, and Enhancement Act of 2006. The charts are compiled by the Alliance for Community Media detailing how 49 local franchising authorities in 13 States will lose huge percentages of their annual PEG funding under the COPE Act.

ANNUAL PEG SUPPORT FUNDING FROM CABLE COMPANIES

Franchise area	Current PEG annual funding [1] (excluding state law-mandated franchise fee of $1.20/sub/year to State and LFA)*	PEG annual funding under HR 5252 and SB 2686 (1% of gross revenues)	Potential PEG annual funding loss under HR 5252 and SB 2686
Massachusetts:			
Barnstable, Yarmouth, Chatham, Dennis, Harwich	$1,714,482 ($1,663,982 [4.5% of gross revenues] plus allocation of $505,000 in initial grants).	$369,774	$1,344,708 (78%)
Cambridge	$1,215,148 ($965,148 in 2005, plus $150,000/yr. grant, plus allocation of $1,000,000 capital grant).	193,030	1,022,118 (84%)
Newton	$974,502 ($833,502 [4% of gross revenues], plus $80,000/year in other grants, plus allocation of $610,000 in initial grants).	208,375	766,127 (79%)
Worcester	$985,000 ($900,000 [3% of gross revenues] plus allocation of $850,000 in initial grants).	300,000	685,000 (70%)
Billerica	$594,721 ($539,721 [5% of gross revenues] plus $55,000/year in capital grants)	107,944	486,777 (82%)
New Bedford	$591,098 (3% of gross revenues)	197,033	394,065 (67%)
Malden	$457,500 ($400,000 in 2005 plus allocation of $575,000 initial capital grant)	96,970	360,530 (79%)
Plymouth-Kingston	$443,050 ($410,000 [3% of gross revenues] plus allocation of $330,500 in initial grants).	136,667	306,383 (69%)
Norwood	$335,000 ($305,000 [5% of gross revenues] plus allocation of $300,000 in initial grants).	61,000	274,000 (82%)
Fall River	$385,000 (2% of gross revenues)	192,500	192,500 (50%)
Holliston	$131,998 ($106,998 [5% of gross revenues] plus $25,000/year in other grants)	21,400	110,598 (84%)
Carver	$82,300 ($74,000 [3% of gross revenues] plus allocation of $83,000 in initial grants.	24,667	57,633 (70%)

Franchise area	Current PEG annual funding (excluding franchise fees)*	PEG annual funding under HR 5252 and SB 2686 (1% of gross revenues)	PEG annual funding loss under HR 5252 and SB 2686
Minnesota:			
St. Paul	$1,437,000 ($761,000 for operations, $676,000 for equipment)	361,000	1,076,000 (75%)
Arden Hills, Falcon Heights, Lauderdale, Little Canada, Mounds View, New Brighton, North Oaks, Roseville, Shoreview, St. Anthony.	$1,046,023 ($951,629 operating grant, $94,394 equipment grant)	218,022	828,001 (79%)
Birchwood, Dellwood, Grant, Lake Elmo, Mahtomedi, Maplewood, North Saint Paul, Oakdale, Vadnais Heights, White Bear Lake, White Bear Township, Willernie.	$811,000 ($771,000 for operations, $40,000 for equipment)	222,000	589,000 (73%)
Blaine, Centerville, Circle Pines, Ham Lake, Lexington, Lino Lakes, Spring Lake Park.	$591,190 (for operations and equipment)	139,188	452,002 (76%)
Eagan, Burnsville	$647,982 (for operations and equipment)	225,237	422,745 (65%)
Andover, Anoka, Champlin, Ramsey	$357,000 ($311,000 for operations, $46,000 for equipment)	125,506	231,494 (65%)
Brooklyn Center, Brooklyn Park, Crystal, Golden Valley, Maple Grove, New Hope, Osseo, Plymouth, Robbinsdale.	$716,266 (for operations and equipment)	500,000	216,266 (30%)
Inver Grove Heights, Lilydale, Mendota, Mendota Heights, South St. Paul, Sunfish Lake, West St. Paul.	$293,000 ($235,000 for operations, $58,000 for equipment)	135,000	158,000 (54%)
Cities of Stillwater, Oak Park Heights, Bayport, and the Townships of Baytown and Stillwater.	$109,000 (for operations and equipment)	38,300	70,700 (65%)
Maryland:			
Montgomery County	$3,703,519 ($2,013,993 for PEG operations plus $236,100 for PEG capital plus $1,453,426 for I–Net operations).	1,787,200	1,916,319 (52%)

Franchise area	Current PEG annual funding (excluding franchise fees)*	PEG annual funding under HR 5252 and SB 2686 (1% of gross revenues)	PEG annual funding loss under HR 5252 and SB 2686
Washington, DC:			
Washington, DC	$2,160,000	1,080,000	1,080,000 (50%)
Oregon:			
Portland	$3,000,000 (3% of gross revenues)	1,000,000	2,000,000 (67%)
Multnomah County	$561,000 (3% of gross revenues)	187,000	374,000 (67%)
Salem	$400,000 (1.5% of gross revenues)	265,000	135,000 (34%)
McMinnville	$73,297 ($1.00 per subscriber per month)	43,215	30,082 (41%)
Virginia:			
Fairfax County	$4,500,000 (3% of gross revenues)	1,500,000	3,000,000 (67%)
Arlington County	$1,439,000 ($855,000/year; plus $584,000 in 2005—1% of gross revenues)	591,500	847,500 (59%)
Arizona:			
Tucson	$1,500,000 ($1.35 per subscriber per month)	700,000	800,000 (53%)
Michigan:			
Bloomfield Township	$313,243 (3% of gross revenues plus $33,500 annual grant)	97,910	215,333 (69%)
California:			
Santa Maria & Lompoc	$464,000 ($395,000 in 2005; plus allocation of $69,000/year, from $828,000 initial grant).	142,200	321,800 (69%)
Glendale	$613,333 ($600,000 in 2005; plus allocation of $13,333/year, from $200,000 initial grant).	300,000	313,333 (51%)
Ventura	$350,292 ($263,625 in 2005; plus allocation of $86,667/year from $1,040,000 in Yrs. 1–3 grants).	146,050	204,242 (58%)
Gilroy, Hollister, San Juan Bautista	$259,471 ($189,471 in 2005; plus allocation of $70,000/year, from $700,000 initial grant).	63,157	196,314 (76%)
Monterey	$231,622 ($151,622 in 2005; plus allocation of $80,000/year, from $800,000 initial grant).	68,571	163,051 (70%)
Palo Alto, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Atherton	$304,295 (88 cents per subscriber per month)	163,902	140,393 (46%)
Humboldt County, Eureka, Arcata, Fortuna, Ferndale, Blue Lake, Rio Dell	$293,750 ($200,000/year; plus allocation of $93,750/year, from $750,000 in Yrs. 1–2 grants).	180,000	113,750 (39%)
Oceanside	$487,333 ($214,000 in 2005; plus allocation of $273,333/year from $4,100,000 in Yrs. 1–3 grants).	389,538	97,795 (20%)
Santa Rosa	$316,667 ($150,000/year; plus allocation of $166,667/year, from $2,500,000 in other grants during franchise term).	260,000	56,667 (18%)
Monrovia	$83,000 ($46,000 plus 1% of gross revenues)	37,000	46,000 (55%)
Lawndale	$60,000 (2% of gross revenues)	30,000	30,000 (50%)
Ohio:			
Cincinnati	$756,000 ($0.96 per subscriber per month)	497,956	258,044 (34%)
Forest Park, Greenhills, Springfield Township	$161,665 ($1.06 per subscriber per month)	118,682	42,983 (27%)
Wisconsin:			
West Allis	$200,000 (annual grant)	104,400	95,600 (48%)
River Falls	$44,500 ($1.32 per subscriber per month)	15,790	28,710 (65%)
Madison	$388,000 ($0.60 per subscriber per month)	360,000	28,000 (7%)
Illinois:			
Urbana	$162,536 (2% of gross revenues)	81,268	81,268 (50%)
Kansas:			
Salina	$135,000 (70 cents per subscriber per month)	95,549	39,451 (29%)

[1] Massachusetts State law currently provides that any funding above the state mandated fees be spent on communications operations including PEG, I-Net and others. This chart anticipates state law changing to allow franchise fees to be used for other purposes.

* In addition to the annual PEG support funding described in this chart, other PEG and in-kind services resources are often provided by cable companies that serve these communities, including connections for program origination from multiple locations, free cable modem service, promotional assistance (e.g., ad avails, program listings on TV Guide channel, annual bill-stuffers), Institutional Networks, etc.

RECOGNIZING AARON SCOTT McRUER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Aaron Scott McRuer, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Aaron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Aaron has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Aaron Scott McRuer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

THE ROLE OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN GLOBAL ECONOMICS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of third world debt relief for the RECORD. In the article, Can Developing Countries Be Financial Saviors of Rich Nations?, published in Volume XXIV No. 1230 (May 24–30, 2006) issue of The New York CaribNews, Mr. Tony Best cites Dr. Jeremy Siegel, a professor of the Wharton School of Business. Addressing the possibility that the baby boomers' selling their savings stock and bonds would lead to a weakening of the assets of the rich nations, Dr. Siegel claims that the best solution is to allow investors from developing countries to buy up these excess stocks to maintain the market prices. Mr. Best asserts that some of "the highest growth rates in dollar terms in market capitalization was in the emerging markets" of Macedonia, West Bank and Gaza, Fiji, Nigeria, Jamaica, Botswana, Trinidad and Tobago, India, Kenya, Bermuda and Tanzania. As Mr. Best claims, if the global market is integrated so that "the selling of assets from the old in the rich world to the young in the developing world is no more difficult than today's sales of assets by elderly folks," America's trade deficits in the developing world would not be a cause for concern. The increasing investments in American from the growing markets would be balanced by the existing trade deficits and debts owed by the developing countries to the U.S.

[From the New York CaribNews, May 24–30, 2006]

CAN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BE FINANCIAL SAVIORS OF RICH NATIONS?

(By Tony Best)

It may not be a case of reverse Robin Hood, meaning stealing from the poor and giving it to the rich. But investors and stock markets in relatively poor nations of the Caribbean and Africa may in the long run be the next financial saviors of future prosperity in the world's wealthiest nations. Add Asia, Latin America and the Middle East to that list and the prospects would become clear, very clear.

So, while people in G–8 nations and their affluent neighbors may not steal from such developing and relatively poor nations as Jamaica, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados, Uzbekistan, Nigeria, Botswana, Pakistan, Swaziland, Bermuda, Jordan and at least 40 other emerging markets, some economists in the U.S., Britain and elsewhere in the developed world are offering a bit of advice: keep your eyes on these economies because they are poised to help make up the shortfall of buyers of assets in the rich world.

One such economist is Dr. Jeremy Siegel, a professor at the prestigious Wharton School of Business in the U.S. He believes that with many baby boomers in North America and Europe, persons born between 1946–64, getting ready or planning their retirement, they may sell off their stocks and bonds in large quantities to finance their retirement and that in turn can create a huge gap in the assets of rich nations.

"The sale of these assets will lead to a sharp fall in prices, because there are too few people in the smaller generations that followed the boomers to buy all of those assets at today's prices," stated The Economist as it explained Siegel's theory.

The upshot: unless the baby-boomers delay their retirement, they could "see their standard of living in retirement halved, relative to their final year of work," the Economist added. Siegel warns a huge sell-off of stocks and bonds by the baby-boomers can trigger a 40–50 percent fall in stock prices with a smaller pool of investors coming along in the rich countries to take up the financial slack. That's where the developing countries may come in, goes the argument. Some figures tell an interesting story.