I comment Mr. Eric Buermann, chairman of the board of trustees, Mr. John Cotton, headmaster of Ransom Everglades, and his hard-working team for their efforts and all those individuals from within and outside the Ransom Everglades community for making the new Middle School Science Center a reality that present and future students will be able to enjoy and learn from.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. SCOTTY BAESLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues continue their efforts to limit or eliminate development assistance to India as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. I strongly oppose these efforts.

On August 15, India celebrated its 50th anniversary of democratic self-rule. Last year, India held the world's largest democratic elections. With nearly 300 million people going to the polls, the election was called epic by the New York Times, and extraordinary by the Washington Times. Any attempt to unfairly stigmatize India by placing limits on the small amounts of development assistance that the United States provides would have a devastating impact on United States-India relations.

The relationship between the United States and India continues to thrive and the United States is now India's largest overseas investor and its biggest trading partner. During the past 6 years, India's ambitious economic reform program has allowed United States business in India to grow dramatically. Exports from the United States were up 40 percent in 1996, and between 1991 and 1996 United States investment in India was 29.5 percent of all investment.

And throughout this economic boom, India's human rights record has steadily improved. India abolished the Terrorist and Disruptive (Prevention) Act which was the subject of objection by several human rights activists. An independent National Human Rights Commission has been established and is widely believed to be aggressively pursuing human rights. And the most recent United States State Department human rights report praised the commission's independence and noted that India has made substantial progress in the area of human rights.

Any effort to limit or eliminate development assistance should be opposed. As India continues to develop politically, economically, and socially, I believe it is important that the United States continue to send positive signals of support and understanding to the world's largest democracy.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2014, TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. VINCE SNOWBARGER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 1997

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly support this landmark tax relief bill. Today, we give American families their first significant tax cut in 16 years. Families with children will receive a $400 credit for each child in 1998 and $500 per child beginning in 1999. Investors, most of whom are hard-working middle-class citizens, will get a significant reduction in the capital gains tax. Millions of parents will be able to pass on the family business or farm to their children without worrying whether they can pay the estate taxes. Expanded IRA's will make home ownership and education possible for more families than before. And all of this is done within the context of the Republican commitment to the first balanced budget in three decades.

Along with most Americans, I wish this bill provided even more tax relief. In fact, I believe we should have cut tax rates across the board. And I regret that the President insisted on continuing to tax Americans on income that is solely the result of inflation. But with President Clinton in the White House, a more comprehensive tax relief plan simply was not possible.

This is not a perfect bill, but it is a reasonable compromise between Republican efforts to win tax relief for American families and President Clinton's insistence on more Government spending. We should consider how far we have come in the 4 short years since President Clinton and the Democrats raised taxes on every working—and nonworking—American. The American people rejected the big-government Democrats in 1994 and 1996 and elected Republicans to Congress to restrain the growth of Government and allow families to keep more of what they earn. Republicans heard that plea and today we are delivering.

Last week, when the President and many Members of Congress were considering bowing to the President's attempt to renege on the size of the tax relief we had pledged to the American people, I wrote the members of the conference committee, insisting they give us a bill that would allow us to keep our word. I am very pleased to say that since my letter was sent, the tax relief in this bill was restored to its full amount. I thank the conferees for responding to my concern.

American families can keep more of their money because we kept our word.

Now we should turn our attention toward simplifying the Tax Code and reforming the IRS. I will introduce legislation after the August recess to provide for a flat tax at the option of each individual taxpayer and I expect to be involved in congressional oversight of gross abuses at the IRS.

CAMPBELL AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2159

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1997

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Campbell-Payne amendment.

This amendment is very timely in that it seems fashionable today to cut the Africa accounts by any amount necessary. Last year the African Development Fund received $40 million—which is low compared to the previous years.

Today, the President allocated $50 million for the fund and it is now being cut by $25 million, which represents a 50 percent cut. The fund is the largest source of capital for the 39 poorest African countries outside the World Bank.

It uses a grassroots approach and it is unique within the development community in Africa. All of the fund's grants are made with indigenous, nongovernmental organizations, in response to African-defined problems and proposals.

It is also the largest co-financing partner for IDA in Africa and it reaches many levels of African society that other development banks do not, including IDA. Let me just say that it costs the fund a small amount to operate a country office in Africa. In fact, the fund's whole country operation costs less than half of what a single expatriate costs a bilateral or multilateral donor organization.

As I stated earlier, the administration requested $50 million for fiscal year 1998. $50 million is a small amount of money considering that we spent $2.2 billion on 20 B–2 bombers. For $1 billion it will ultimately cost for additional B–2 bombers, we could: immunize all children in developing countries, immunize children, support family planning, end malnutrition, illiteracy and help emerging democracies. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the use of ballistic weapons is no longer a viable solution to solve our foreign policy problems.

Yet we can do the minimal amount for the less developed countries of Africa. This year the fund will lend 4 times more than USAid which takes the strain out of this organization. It supports poverty reduction, agriculture sector production, basic education, health and economic reform.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa, let me just say that we should stop thrashing the African accounts. It is unfair and discriminates against the less fortunate.

In 1996, the fund increased its net income to $150 million and that same year, the fund's procurement resulted in $170 million in contracts for American business, a 100 percent increase over last year's figures. As you know, any reduction impacts heavily on the lives of millions of vulnerable Africans every day.

The tools of U.S. foreign assistance is needed to maintain our leadership around the world. Every President, Democrat or Republican, needs sufficient resources to carry out critical foreign policy objectives. These resources are even more essential today in the post-cold-war era as threats to U.S. interests are more closely linked to political and economic stability and regional conflicts.