United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1999 No. 101

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At the beginning of this day we pause in the quiet of this place to offer our thanks and praise to You, O God, for the wonderful gifts of love that You have made available to us and to all people. We know that we were not created to be alone, but to share in the blessings that You have given, to care for one another in our sorrows and to celebrate together in our joys. Whatever our situation we are grateful, O God, that You are with us and will never depart from us. For these and all Your blessings, we offer these words of prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MOAKLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2035. An act to correct errors in the authorizations of certain programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 468. An act to improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements, and improve the delivery of services to the public.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1-minutes at the end of legislative business today.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 434, AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 250 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 250

Resolved, That, at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed ninety minutes, with forty-five minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations and forty-five minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on International Relations and Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2489. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 as read, shall be 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the distinguished ranking member of

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 250 is a structured rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa.

The rule provides for 45 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Additionally, the rule provides 45 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule also provides that it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of text of H.R. 2489, which represents the combined work product of the two committees with jurisdiction.

The rule provides for consideration of only the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

The rule further provides that the amendments will be considered only in the order specified in the report; may be offered only by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered as read; shall be 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 rule waives all points of order against the bill, against the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and against amendments printed in the report.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, House resolution 250 is a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 434, as is customary in the House for all trade legislation that comes out of the Committee on Ways and Means. Additionally, this fair rule makes in order four amendments, all of which are sponsored by Democratic Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the end of the Cold War has opened up sub-Saharan Africa to the world as never before. And only now are so many African nations able to start making the necessary reforms to become part of the global economy. We are witnessing the rebirth of Africa as these nations move towards democracy and seek a higher standard of living for their people.

Mr. Speaker, the new economic realities of sub-Sahara Africa must be met and encouraged by the United States. Indeed, improving the lives of the people in sub-Sahara Africa can best be accomplished by advancing the development of free market economies and representative democracies. H.R. 434 is the vehicle for that economic and social progression.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act will provide sub-Saharan countries with the tools needed to raise the standard of living in African nations, while simultaneously benefiting the United States by opening new trade and investment opportunities for U.S. firms and workers.

Mr. Speaker, under H.R. 434, the President would identify potential African nations that may qualify for free-trade status. The African nation would consult with the United States Government and, whenever applicable, the private sector, with the goal of promoting trade, investment and debt relief for the African country.

The bill outlines specific criteria the sub-Saharan country must meet and adhere to in order to be eligible for trade status. The potential nations must demonstrate progress towards establishing positive pro-trade reforms in those countries.

In addition, the sub-Saharan country must be dedicated to the eradication of poverty and the important role of women to economic growth and development.

There is no question that the creation of an investment-friendly environment in Africa will benefit both the United States and Africa by attracting the capital necessary to promote much-needed job creation and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also builds upon accomplishments of the 106th Congress. Earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 1143, the Microcredit for Self-Reliance Act of 1999, a bill establishing microcredit programs that reach the poorest of the poor in developing nations with small loans that help people work their way out of poverty.

The record of these programs has shown that women benefit significantly by starting small businesses and climbing out of poverty. The African Growth and Opportunity Act contains a core provision that will continue to improve economic opportunities for women by further advancing micro-enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental goal of the African Growth and Opportunity Act is to provide incentives for sub-Saharan African nations to move forward in their reform efforts; improve their economies and foster economic development.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON); along with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE); and the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule. Although no one would challenge the idea that our policy towards Africa needs to be improved, this rule presents the House with a very limited choice on how to change that policy. It will not even consider 25 of the 29 amendments, many of which would have made great improvements on the bill that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, this rule does nothing to stop the illegal transfer of goods from China to the United States by way of Africa. This rule does nothing to protect the American workers from being mistreated. This rule does nothing to protect the American garment workers who are at risk of losing their jobs to underpaid workers in countries like China. This rule does nothing to protect the environment in Africa, which has already suffered irreversible degradations. Also, Mr. Speaker, this rule does nothing to implement serious debt relief for African countries, debt relief that so many other countries enjoy.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule will not even let the House debate the bill of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), which is supported by dozens of relief organizations and workers' groups. Under this rule, multinational countries can set up shop in Africa and exploit the very people that this bill is supposed to help.

My Democratic colleagues and I tried to convince the Committee on Rules to make amendments in order that would have addressed these issues, amendments like that of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) to help abolish slavery once and for all; like that of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) to provide some debt relief to sub-Saharan Africa; and like that of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and the amendment of the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) to prevent illegally shipped textiles from entering the country.

Mr. Speaker, there are 54 countries in Africa. The people in some of these countries are the poorest in the world. The very least we can do is implement a decent policy towards them, a policy that protects the environment as well as African and American workers. And, unfortunately, this rule will prevent us

from doing so. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

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

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

I want to point out, because of the comments made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), that if we look at the Jackson amendments, there were seven individual amendments, not a substitute amendment, that was offered before the Committee on Rules.

Also, as I stated in my opening remarks and I will restate now, trade legislation, including as recently as last year, is dealt with by the Committee on Rules and, more importantly by this House, in a structured rule, and this rule is very, very similar to the rule that was introduced and passed by this House last year.

□ 0915

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and this fair rule.

Yesterday, in the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and others who testified somberly described the many problems plaguing Africa. I think we are all too familiar with the images of hungry African women and children living in poverty and war-ravaged nations. For too long, the people of sub-Saharan Africa have suffered from the rampant spread of disease, environmental degradation, and political corruption. Our hearts go out to these victims of human suffering.

But there is hope. Since the beginning of this decade, 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa have moved toward democracy and market-based economies.

And, in just the past week, a ceasefire in the Congo and a peace agreement ending the war in Sierra Leone were signed.

Today the opportunity is ripe in the United States to give momentum to these positive trends by engaging Africa through trade, investment, and cooperation.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act does just that. This legislation not only begins to break down barriers to trade but also provides needed debt relief and facilitates $650 million in investment in sub-Saharan Africa.

Does this bill solve every problem facing the African people? No. But through this legislation, we are strengthening the foundation on which a stronger, more stable, more prosperous Africa will stand, an Africa that will be in a better position to address its problems with a strong ally found in the United States.

American companies and workers stand to benefit along with the African people. This legislation opens the door to a market of nearly 700 million people who will have the opportunity to buy American-made goods. Exports are the economic key to growth, competitiveness, and job creation here at home, and the U.S. must continue to look for new markets to penetrate.

Mr. Speaker, there is another bonus found in this legislation, which is the broad support it has garnered. I am proud to join with the Speaker, the Republican leadership, the President, and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including one of the bill's lead sponsors, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), in my support of this legislation.

Passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act will provide one more example of Republicans and Democrats, Congress and the White House, working together to do something positive for American workers and businesses, while reaching out to improve the lives of millions of Africans who are much less fortunate.

I urge support of the rule and the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) the author of the bill, the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the majority of the members of the Committee on Rules for what is a fair rule.

I think the members of the Committee on Rules know that many of the amendments that were received were received too late. I spoke with many of the Members that had these amendments, since I intended to have supported them, and they acknowledged that they were too late.

I do not think it is unusual for the Committee on Rules to have a closed rule on those issues which the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Ways and Means believes is necessary to craft a well-balanced piece of legislation and that it is not to be drafted on the floor.

I think trade is one of those issues. But I am reminded, as I ask my colleagues to support this rule, of the struggle that many of us had in the area of civil rights and to remember those who said that our legislation just did not go far enough, or we had so many friends that wanted to improve our lot but the Voting Rights Act did not take care of housing, the Voting Rights Act did not take care of jobs, the Voting Rights Act did not take care of equality. And certainly, if we included all of those things, most of the people who objected would not have voted for the Voting Rights Act anyway.

It is interesting to see how people would want this bill, the African Growth and Opportunity Bill, to improve all of the things that we have historically ignored. But really what is truly amazing is how, when we got to Africa, that they raised the bar.

How could we get to a continent that, when we look on TV, all we see is some little black baby with a swollen stomach, with flies around his or her mouth, stories of famine, stories of droughts, stories of poverty, stories of people begging for us to send a dollar, adopt a kid, and now we are asking for the first time that this great republic open up its trade doors and allow Africa to compete?

Does the bill ask for any special treatment in Africa? Does it ask for anything that we have asked for from our friends in the Middle East and Israel? Are the labor standards here lower than our trade in Ireland or any European country? Are we asking the Africans to do more than we ask our friends in North and South America?

When did we think that we had to demand so much more in a trade agreement to wipe out a country's debts even though it is not owed to us? We love the Africans so much that no matter who they owe, where they owe it, we should wipe it out.

We want environmental and work conditions over there that we do not demand in my Congressional district, and they certainly do not demand it from other countries. But now comes the time for us to show our love for all the people that are in Africa, and we love them so much that we want to put so much in this bill that will never get off the ground.

Well, I tell my colleagues this: I know that Americans know best for all the people in the world. And if they do not like our policy, we will bomb them until they understand it. I mean, that is what democracy is all about. But there comes a time that we ought to listen to the people who love their country, who are elected in their country, and who represent their country here.

Now, if we are concerned about the sub-Saharan countries and want some type of equality in trade, every ambassador, every President, every head of State ask us to do one thing: leave the bill alone. Vote for the bill, and vote for the rule.

Of course, if my colleagues know better what the African people want, if they know better what they deserve, then join with me and so many others after this bill becomes law and let us try to improve upon what we have done. But do not think that the whole world is not watching that, if we close the door this time, we will not have an opportunity next year to improve the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, Mr. Speaker, and the rule under which this bill will be considered is so

important because it would fundamentally alter U.S. relations with many nations of Africa.

Africa should and deserves to be treated as a trade partner, not a perpetual-aid partner. This bill treats Africa as a trade partner. That is why this bill had such strong bipartisan support in the Subcommittee on Africa and our full Committee on International Relations, strong bipartisan support, as a matter of fact unanimous support, in the Committee on Ways and Means of this House.

What this bill does is to identify those African nations that are committed to reform and it identifies these as the countries the United States will develop a special economic relationship with. These countries, countries that are giving themselves the best chance to develop through a partnership with American businesses, will take part in annual trade forums with the United States, just as we hold with nations of Asia.

They will also have greater opportunities to sell their goods to American consumers, who will also benefit. These are real benefits that should be incentives to African countries to continue their reform path allowing their citizens to reach their potential.

In debating this legislation, we should appreciate that this is a critical juncture for Africa. There has been real political and economic progress on the continent over the last several years.

Nigeria, the most populous nation in Africa, long suffering from military dictatorships, recently held Democratic elections, which I and other Members of this body had the privilege to observe. And, hopefully, Nigeria is turning itself around with its new reforms, with its new democracy.

Other African nations are making similar progress. Mozambique, recently war torn, is moving toward democracy; and with it they have had a set of economic reforms, the very reforms encouraged by this legislation. As a result, what has happened in Mozambique? They have seen their economy grow at better than 12 percent a year over the last few years.

Yet we need to be realistic. 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.

This legislation is not a fix-all. Its rejection, though, would be a complete disregard of our interest in economically engaging with Africa at this critical time. To reject this legislation is to say we do not have any room on the economic map for Africa in this new century. I do not think we will go that way.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

This bill provides no debt relief for sub-Saharan African countries. It sets no requirements to use African labor. And it ignores the AIDS crisis in Africa.

It grants extensive rights and benefits to multinational corporations operating in Africa but requires nothing of them with respect to workers and protection of the environment.

Why should we support a rule that disallows dozens of amendments? Why should we support a rule that blocks amendments to strengthen labor protections? Why should we support a rule that stops amendments to protect against a flood of Chinese transhipped textiles? Why should we support a rule that blocks amendments to keep Americans working? Why should we support a rule that stops amendments to ensure that trade benefits accrue to African workers and African-owned businesses, not transplanted foreign workers and foreign-owned businesses?

We need a better bill for Africa, and we can get a better bill for Africa. But the only way we get a better bill for Africa is to vote against this rule.

NAFTA cost this country hundreds of thousands of jobs. It is too late right now to fix what happened when we passed NAFTA. It is too late to fix what happened when we passed GATT. We can fix this by sending this rule down.

□ 0930

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I testified before the Committee on Rules yesterday asking the committee to make in order an amendment that would be offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK). This amendment would have required that the apparel receiving duty-free and quota-free treatment must be manufactured from U.S.-manufactured yarn and fabric, fabric which is cut in the United States. This standard now applies in the Caribbean area. However, the Committee on Rules did not see fit to make this amendment in order. Therefore, I cannot vote for this rule.

Trade agreements should give American workers a fair shake, not hurt them. In its present form, H.R. 434, unlike NAFTA, does not do this. It poses a serious risk to our domestic textile industry and its employees. The bill does not prevent the illegal transshipment of apparel from other countries where countries now regularly exceed their quotas. This bill could throw thousands of U.S. workers out of jobs by allowing a huge flood of cheap Asian goods to move through Africa to the United States. It only requires that a mere 35 percent of the total value of textile and apparel products be added in the African countries in order to qualify for duty-free and quota-free treatment. Asian countries, particularly China, would be ready, willing and able to make up that remaining 65 percent.

By requiring U.S. yarn and fabric as the Bishop-Myrick amendment proposed, this bill would have ensured that U.S. textile workers, not Asian textile manufacturers, get to produce the fabric that African workers turn into clothes. In addition, Africa would still get a huge boost since all the sewing, labeling and packaging would be done in an African country in order to qualify. In other words, the Bishop-Myrick language is a win-win for American workers and the workers in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the rule and the bill. Three hundred eighty years ago, our Nation's first trade policy landed 19 Africans in Jamestown, Virginia. 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 our Nation's first African trade policy.

As I told a delegation from Gabon that came to visit 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 is very rare, almost never, that I stand in opposition to a bill sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a man whom I have known and looked up to virtually all of my life and for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration. We both want what is right and best for Africa.

However, with respect to this rule, a dozen of my Democratic colleagues offered 20 amendments, all of which were rejected except for four, only one of which is not a nonbinding sense of Congress resolution. These amendments, which this restrictive rule would keep us from considering, did two things that are vital:

Number one, cutting out of the African Growth and Opportunity Act terms that would cause damage, make things worse for, the majority of people in Africa, 750 million people whose per capita income is only $500 a year. 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 this action.

These are the provisions, mainly contained in AGOA's section 4, that led a

broad array of Africa labor, religious, anti-hunger and other civic groups to reach out to me to develop an alternative to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. Many amendments, from transshipment amendments, amendments with respect to eliminating debt, not senses of Congress but taking pressure, downward pressure off the sub-Saharan African wages so that they might be able to purchase what we produce here in America is a factor in an ongoing trading policy.

A labor policy. Certainly after 380 years, the center of any trading relationship with sub-Saharan Africa would take African labor and workers very seriously. These amendments were rejected by the Committee on Rules. Other amendments were offered by other Members of Congress to deal with the issue of AIDS. Substantive amendments to prohibit the United States Government from bringing World Trade Organization action against sub-Saharan African countries that are seeking to provide low-cost drugs where more than 85 percent of all AIDS-related deaths since the early 1980s have occurred.

These amendments to the African Growth and Opportunity Act were rejected. Instead, the Committee on Rules substituted nonbinding sense of Congress resolutions. There are no basic labor, no human rights, no African employment, no environmental rules for U.S. corporations planning to take advantage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Those of you who might be watching this on C-SPAN, go to your web site, www.USAfrica.org. There you will find United Meridian Corporation and Kmart and Amoco and Chevron and Tyco Submarine Systems, Mobil Corporation, the Gap, the Limited, National Retail Federation, a long list of corporations who plan to take advantage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This act is most appropriately titled U.S. Corporate and Foreign Investment in Africa Act of 1999, not growth for 750 million sub-Saharan Africans, many of whom my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York identified. This is the poorest region of the world, with the richest land and the richest resources.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude on this point. The Chicago Tribune wrote an article just yesterday where they said the top three officers of Microsoft Corporation, Bill Gates, a Mr. Ballmer, a Paul Allen, their top personal assets from Microsoft come close to $140 billion. Their personal assets are more than the combined gross national product of the 43 least developed countries and their 600 million people. So what does it mean for a gentleman with the kind of wealth of a Bill Gates to just buy an entire industry on an entire continent with that kind of wealth? If we do not have restrictions in our law so that American investment in sub-Saharan Africa is done right, if that is the only point that I make today, American investment in sub-Saharan Africa in light of our history and in light of the condition of those people must be done right. This rule falls short of our ability as Members of Congress to make this a better bill so that more Americans can benefit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair will remind Members that comments are to be made to the Chair and not to the viewing and listening audience.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the bill provides protections against human rights abuse. Any country engaging in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights is not eligible to receive benefits provided under the bill.

I am particularly pleased as a Member from New York where we had the dean of our delegation the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) speak, we have the dean of the Republicans of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this structured rule regarding H.R. 434.

After careful consideration and consultation with our Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Ways and Means and the House leadership and all Members with an interest in this bill, the Committee on Rules has provided a thoughtful rule which will allow timely passage of this measure. I appreciate the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), on this matter as well as the leadership of the manager of the rule this morning, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS). Our committee appreciates the many courtesies extended toward our members and staff during consideration of this measure and other bills by the members and staff of the Committee on Rules.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act enjoys broad and bipartisan support. In the 105th Congress, we passed this bill by a wide margin. The administration has been extensively consulted and strongly supports this measure. African nations of sub-Saharan Africa are unanimous in their support, and African civic groups such as the National Council of Churches, the American Jewish Committee, the NAACP and Empower America have all expressed their strong support for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy passage of this rule followed by favorable consideration of the bill during the next few hours.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is so important because it would fundamentally alter U.S. relations with many nations of Africa. Africa should, and deserves to be treated as a trade partner, not a perpetual aid partner. That is what this legislation does.

H.S. 434 identifies those African countries that are committed to reform as the countries the United States will develop a special economic relationship with. These countries, countries that are giving themselves the best chance to develop through a partnership with American businesses, will take part in annual trade forums with the United States, just as we hold with the nations of Asia. They will also have greater opportunities to sell their goods to American consumers, who will also benefit. These are real benefits that should be incentives to African countries to continue their reform path, allowing their citizens to reach their potential.

In debating this legislation, we should appreciate that this is a critical juncture for Africa. There has been real political and economic progress on the continent over the last several years. Nigeria, the most populous nation in Africa, long suffering from military dictatorships, recently held democratic elections which I had the privilege to observe. Hopefully Nigeria is turning itself around. Other African nations are making similar progress. Mozambique, recently war-torn, is moving toward democracy and, with a set of economic reforms, the very reforms encouraged by this legislation, has seen its economy grow by over some 12 percent recently.

Yet we need to be realistic. 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. This legislation is not a fix all; its rejection though would be a complete disregard of our interest in economically engaging with Africa at this critical time. I don't think we'll go that way.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this rule.

I want an Africa trade bill, but I want a good Africa trade bill. I want to promote economic growth and the well-being of the people of sub-Saharan Africa. I know this goal is supported by the authors of this bill, and I applaud the Committee on Ways and Means and others who are pursuing this goal relentlessly.

I am not opposed to trade liberalization that is balanced, reciprocal, enforceable and beneficial to all parties. This rule will prevent that. I am disappointed that many Members of the House are not allowed to address the very real concerns that we have about the loss of over 400,000 jobs in the U.S. textile and apparel industries that has taken place across this country since 1995 and would be exacerbated by this bill.

Despite my attempts last year and this year in the Committee on Rules

and on the floor to make sure that the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act does not do more harm than good, the bill as reported is not beneficial to all parties concerned. The bill is flawed deeply without the amendment that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) and I proposed to the Committee on Rules.

The bill opens the door to illegal transshipments of goods from China, and it misses an opportunity to benefit American workers by requiring that imported goods from sub-Saharan Africa contain U.S. cut and formed fabric.

If the amendment that we proposed had been allowed, this body could have created a win-win for America and a win-win for the countries of Africa. The amendment we propose would have allowed the countries of Africa to access our strong and vast consumer economy in a fair way, but it would have also preserved our domestic textile and apparel jobs.

I regret that the Senate will be forced to fix this bill before it passes. This rule does not allow us to do our job here in the House. I ask that the House join me in opposing this unfair rule so that we can craft a truly good bill that will in fact be an Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

(Mr. BURR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Seldom, if ever, have I ever gotten up on the House floor and suggested a no vote against the rule. Seldom on the House floor have I ever seen so blatant an effort to eliminate U.S. jobs.

In fact, let me read to my colleagues a press release from the Chinese Trade Ministry, March 23, and 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 the quotas imposed on commodities of Chinese origin by European and American countries.

This is not an African growth and opportunity bill. It is not a U.S. growth and opportunity bill. This is an Asian growth and opportunity bill.

I am a member of the Committee on International Relations with my colleague, but we look at this differently. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility, all 435 of us as representatives of the American people, to put their interests first. The explanation we ought to have today is to the textile workers who we have disregarded their jobs. Clearly, there will be job loss. We are like ostriches with our head in the sand.

This body has never allowed bad legislation to move with the intention that it would get fixed somewhere in the process until this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule. If that passes, to vote against the bill, to move this back to committee and to do the work that we need to make a good bill and save U.S. jobs.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. H.R. 2489 is another trade bill that exploits the developing world for the benefit of multinational corporations and investors. Regardless of what this bill's supporters say, there is absolutely nothing in this bill to enforce worker protections and labor standards. We have been down this road before. When Congress passed NAFTA without putting labor and environmental protection standards at the core of the bill, we were told to put our faith in side agreements that would supposedly guarantee labor rights and environmental standards.

□ 0945

Five years after its passage, Mexican workers are earning less than they did before NAFTA. American companies, and get this, American companies pay Mexican workers lower wages than Mexican companies pay Mexican workers, and yet here we are set to impose this same failed trade model on people of sub-Saharan Africa.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules rejected every single proposed amendment that would have actually given hope to the people of sub-Saharan Africa. Instead, we are set to give the world's largest corporations the freedom to exploit the world's poorest people without having to worry about labor laws, tough environmental standards or worrisome worker unions.

Vote no on the bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. It is not fair.

I reluctantly supported this bill last year. I attempted to amend this bill, and I was made to believe that my concerns would be addressed on the Senate side last time. They were not. Now this bill, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, is before us. It is no better now than it was last year. It still imposes unfair conditions on Africa.

Those of us with long histories working on behalf of Africa know the history of the rape of Africa. Many of the same corporations who fought us to the bitter end when we were trying to free South Africa are now lined up spending millions of dollars to pass this legislation led by the big oil companies, some of whom we are still trying to make good corporate citizens in places like Nigeria.

Let me just tell my colleagues what I tried to do. I tried to amend the bill. One amendment would have struck the most onerous conditions of the bill, these conditions that require African countries to cut corporate taxes, reduce government spending, and remove restrictions on foreign investments. We do not allow foreign countries to dictate our economic policies, nor should we attempt to dictate the economic policies of African countries.

My second amendment would have clarified that these conditions apply only to new programs and benefits established by the bill and not to existing foreign aid programs and trade benefits. This amendment is essential to ensure that countries that cannot meet these strict conditions can continue to trade with the United States as well as continue to receive foreign aid.

A third amendment would have allowed African countries to qualify for the programs and benefits in the bill even if they are unable to meet all of the bill's difficult conditions.

None of my amendments were made in order, and my amendments were timely, as were other amendments when we attempted before the Committee on Rules.

Let me just say we are not here simply because we want to oppose this bill. Again, we know the history of Africa, and we are not going to support the rape of Africa a second time in a more sophisticated way.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last year, when this same bill came to the floor, we attempted to offer an amendment which is the same amendment we attempt to offer now. It is not a poison pill; it is not an unfair provision. It would give African countries the same sort of trade treatment that we extend to Caribbean countries, Central American countries, and indeed to Mexico and to NAFTA. Basically it says if they buy our yarn and our cloth in their apparel when it is made from American-made source products, can come back into this country duty free and trade and tariff free.

It is fair; it is also a good way to police the imports coming into this country to make sure that they were indeed made in Africa, for our greatest fear about this bill is not some overwhelming surge of imports coming from Africa itself, but the fact that these sub-Saharan countries will become a massive platform for transshipment. As Asian countries hit their quotas, as they try to evade tariffs, there would be an enormous temptation to ship through Africa where the goods, apparel and textile goods, can come into this country duty free and tariff free.

Last year we were shut out also. This year we have been shut out again.

This should be, this well of the House, should be a free market of ideas. We should be able to come here and put forth our ideas if they are not relevant, if they are not off the wall, if they are good, sound, solid ideas and vie for votes on the House floor. But let

the competition be set, that the best bill can win right here in the House. Well, this bill today will not give us that kind of opportunity of that kind of vote.

Last year, this amendment was offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) on a motion to recommit. As everybody knows, that is a procedural motion, and for the most part Republicans do not vote for a Democratic motion to recommit. Even so, we got 193 votes for this amendment. I think 193 votes in last year's debate should buy us a ticket to this year's debate, should allow us to offer this amendment on the House floor and explain it, give us more than 5 minutes to explain it. If we win, fine; if we do not, fine as well. But give us the opportunity at least. Let this well be a free market of ideas.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and this legislation that we are about to take up today. This is a good bill, and it is a very important bill for Africa.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for the leadership that he has demonstrated on this legislation as well.

I have no great personal interest in this legislation. I have no constituent or I have no company that is pressing me to support this bill. I am not ideologically driven by these trade issues, and I am sensitive to the concerns of the textile industry, having watched what happened in Massachusetts over a 50-year period. But I am supporting this bill because I do not believe, as alleged, that this bill will make African nations take any action that they would not otherwise take.

I do not believe that imposing harsher than normal conditions on trade with the poorest countries of the world is fair or right, even if it is designed to create a precedent for other trade bills, and I do not believe that U.S. workers will be harmed by the minimal benefits of this legislation. What I do believe is that African countries want to expand their economies, put more of their citizens to work and be given the opportunity to sell their goods throughout the world, including the United States. This bill gives them an opportunity to help themselves.

This is the right bill at the right time, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule so that we can move forward on final passage.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation, and I rise to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership and his strong support for this legislation. I rise today to support the African Growth and Opportunity Act. A strong and open and fair trade investment relationship between the United States and the countries of sub-Saharan Africa could help reduce poverty and expand economic opportunity.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Commerce, exports to Africa already support 133,000 U.S. jobs. 133,000 U.S. jobs are supported now with this relationship. In fact, the United States exports to the sub-Saharan region exceed by 20 percent, already by 20 percent, those to all the States of the former Soviet Union combined. We are already starting to forge important relationships.

Now will this by itself serve as the panacea to help our relationship by itself with Africa? No. And I would encourage those people that rise today to try to help pass this rule and this legislation to come together to do some things to improve the number of loans under the micro-development loans for the poor program for Africa, to try to work with relief organizations and aid and assistance programs to further bolster our relationship between the United States and Africa, and also to try to direct assistance and aid through our foreign aid programs which sometimes are in greater ratios, directed at other countries and not so much at Africa.

We need to work on this relationship more. This is a first start, and I encourage my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this rule, but not to the intent of the bill before us. For the second year in a row, the Committee on Ways and Means has told us there is nothing to worry about with regard to transshipment of Asian textiles through Africa. Those of us in agriculture know better. In the past 15 years we have dealt with this multibillion dollar problem in commodities, including garlic, peanuts, walnuts, pistachio nuts and coffee, tobacco; it goes on and on, and, of course, textiles.

Despite the tireless efforts of our Customs Service, our chief textile negotiator at USTR said recently that he felt the problem was getting worse. Indeed, the cleverness of exporters seeking illegal access to lucrative U.S. markets has forced Customs to result to complex testing for trace elements. Customs simply does not have the manpower to test every product entering the U.S., and the incentives to cheat the system have always managed to keep ahead of our ability to detect new methods of transshipment.

The Bishop-Myrick amendment rejected by the Committee on Rules was an honest attempt to address the problem. The refusal of the Committee on Ways and Means to effectively address transshipment and of the Committee on Rules to deny us a chance to even debate this issue sends the wrong message to the agriculture community at a time when farm prices are at a record low.

The adjusted world price for cotton is half of what it was a few short years ago, and mill use in the United States is down 8 percent from last year. Where are the new market opportunities for farmers that were promised by the leadership of this House when we passed the Freedom to Farm bill? They are in the Bishop amendment which was rejected by the Committee on Rules for the second year in a row.

I thank the gentleman for having yielded this time. I hope our colleague will send this rule back to the Committee on Rules, where we can get a fair rule, one that will address a win for Africa and a win for the textile and cotton industry in the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to put this whole matter in perspective.

First, how did this matter come before the Committee on Ways and Means and ultimately now to this Congress? It did not come because some corporate lobby brought it to our committee. It did not come because of somebody in some slick suit said, Look, let's go and take advantage of Africa.

It came up because those of us who were conscientious about the issue looked at what was happening in our 1994 GATT bill consideration and noticed that we were dealing with every country in the world, every continent in the world, trade relations, trade policies, but nothing for Africa on this subject at all. And so our committee decided that that was not right, that our country owed it to Africa and to the people of Africa and to the people of America to engage Africa as a trading and investment destination, as we had engaged the rest of the world.

□ 1000

That is how this whole policy started out. And I should tell the Members this, those who worry about conditionalities in the bill ought to really line up with what is happening in Africa today. This bill would not be possible, there would be no reason to talk about it, there would be no way we could even pass it today, if it were not for what is happening in Africa itself. This bill builds upon the initiative of African-Americans.

In Africa right now many countries have, through great pain, adopted reform that includes promoting the movement of goods and services

through their countries, maintaining a fair judicial system and promoting the rule of law, protecting property rights, providing national treatment for foreign investors, implementing measures to facilitate investment, developing regional markets and promoting regional integration, and striving to reduce poverty and increase access to education and health care, particularly for women. This is what Africa is itself doing for its own people. This bill simply builds on that foundation.

For those who worry about transshipments in Africa, I want to ask this question: Why do we consider something peculiar in the African experience, in the African culture, that raises these concerns beyond what we are concerned about them in other countries? Why is this such a big issue in Africa? It defies logic.

First, there is no history of transshipment issues with Africa. Africa is one of the continents in the world where there are less problems than any other place on transshipments.

Second, it is almost insulting to the Africans to suggest that they want to transship. When we were in Uganda with our President in 1998 with six African heads of State, each one of them stood up and took great umbrage at the suggestion that they would simply be transshipment arenas for China or for some other place.

They said, look, we want the jobs in our own countries. We want to empower our own people. We want to employ our own people. Why would we have all these years, having a chance to ship our goods to America and not put our own people to work? It is an absurdity. African-Americans need the jobs. They are going to employ their own people, and there is nothing inherent in the African experience that suggests there would be concern about transshipment.

I think this whole business about the issue of conditionalities, I think we have to look to the Africans on this question as well. There are many ways to talk about how to improve this bill, and I could think of a lot of ways to improve it, and everybody else out here could. But we have to now deal with what is possible to be done in the context in which we are working.

The African nations understand that this is an important first step, this is not the end all and be all, but it is an important first step in this whole process. Let us not, in this measure, attempt to be more wise than the Africans about what they need. Let us stand with Africa for a change, and change the policy that relates to our relationship with it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKs of New York. Mr. Speaker, the question that presents itself today is whether or not we should support this rule and this bill.

The question some have asked, is this a perfect rule or a perfect bill, I dare say in the year and a half that I have been a Member of this great House, I have yet to see a bill or a rule that I feel is perfect. So clearly this is not a perfect bill and not a perfect rule. But there is a goal at the end.

Unfortunately, what I hear, because of some of the past relationships or lack of relationships we have had with the African continent, some feel that everything must be in this bill. That is impossible. I think that this will not and cannot be the only bill which deals with Africa, but it is a first step, an historic step to making sure that we put Africa on the screen here in America.

So I say to the Chair of the Committee on Ways and Means and to the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), I thank them for bringing this bill to the forefront. I urge Members to vote for the rule and vote for the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, I properly rise to support this rule and congratulate the collaboration of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Ways and Means, and the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

But what I want to point out is that this is the face of African trade in America. All of these States in the United States are already doing business with Africa. Africa is standing as an equal trading partner.

I know, as we have said and my colleagues have acknowledged, this is not the only step. I associate my remarks with those of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). We wanted an open rule. We believe in debt relief. But this is the beginning. Are we going to tell Americans that we cannot go to the next step and do a greater trade or have a greater trade relationship with Africa?

I am amazed that my colleagues would suggest that we have written a bill or supported a bill that has no concerns for the needs of the African people. In the bill, it says that one of the criteria elements will be reducing poverty, increasing the availability of health care, educational opportunities, maximizing credit to small farmers and women. It has in it a provision for a strong opposition to transshipment or dumping.

We are looking out for all of us. This is a good bill. This is a good bill because it provides language that indicates that there must be a good visa system, there must be domestic laws and enforcement procedures that void transshipment or dumping.

I believe that this bill will be the first start for beginning relationships with small businesses, relating to small businesses in Africa. Likewise, I think it is important to note that this bill specifically emphasizes women entrepreneurs.

I believe this will be an enormous, enormous boost to the economy of Africa, and yes, to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, which will govern our debate on the H.R. 434, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, and I rise in strong support of the over-arching bill, which I believe will usher in a new era of trade and prosperity for the people of Africa and the United States.

When we came back after the Christmas break, I considered it one of the highest priorities of this Congress to pass this particular piece of legislation. I have been to many meetings and met with countless individuals of whom all share a tremendous amount of excitement for this bill. Just a few short months ago in my home town of Houston, I spoke before the Corporate Council on Africa, who had gathered together delegates from virtually every area of Africa and the United States, and each of them expressed to me their tremendous anticipation of this bill, and of improved trade relations with Sub-Saharan Africa.

I have met with many African Ambassadors on this issue to discuss the impact of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act on their countries, and each of them was singularly positive. For many of the countries in Africa, this will be their first true opportunity to leverage their most precious resource—their people—in order to achieve robust capital investment. With that capital, it will be much easier for those countries to help themselves—to improve their telecommunications, electrical, and health infrastructures.

Having said that, there are several issues that I believe should be addressed by this bill, but which were left out of the version reported to Rules by the International Relations and Ways and Means Committees. One of these issues is the problem of AIDS in Africa.

As a Member of a Presidential Mission to Africa on HIV/AIDS just recently, I was a witness to the true devastation that has been caused to the African economy, and the African community. I toured special communities especially created to deal with families whose lives have been changed by HIV/AIDS. I have met the grandparents, who would be of retirement age here in the United States, but who must work to support their grandchildren—orphaned by AIDS.

As a result, I will be offering two amendments later in this debate to bring recognition to this important issue. The first amendment, which I am offering along with Congressmen OLVER, LEWIS, and HORN, and Congresswoman PELOSI, makes it clear that it is the ''Sense of Congress'' that AIDS must be dealt with if we are to have a healthy trade relationship with Africa.

I also will be offering an amendment that encourages corporate America, who will benefit greatly from the passage of this Act, to engage the problem of AIDS in Africa. I also states that corporate America should be ready to assist in Africa's prevention efforts through the use of some fiscal mechanism, like a HIV/

AIDS Response Fund. Many of these corporations engage in charitable gift-giving here in the United States, we ought to make sure that they are willing to do the same abroad as well.

Another area in which the bill could use some improving is in its lack of focus on small business. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, providing more than half of the private workforce in the United States. They also represent 96 percent of all U.S. exporters. Small businesses also make up the bulk of the African economy. We should encourage these two groups to work together—to bring about the positive change that all of us desire. The routes of trade should be filled with more than just multinational-conglomerates, because it will be small business that gives us stability, flexibility, and growth.

I am thankful that three of the amendments that I offered at the Rules Committee have been made in order under this rule and I would like to thank Chairman DREIER and Ranking Member MOAKLEY for their hard work. I urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support the bill, and to support my amendments. Thank you.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all commend the leadership of this House that have taken this very important legislation, the gentlemen from New York, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. REYNOLDS; the Committee on International Relations, with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for me, a person that in the middle sixties started going to Africa, working with the freedom movements in Kenya, with the Kenyu party back in the fifties, with SWAPO in Namibia, dealing with the racist regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia and talking about independence for Africa. So today is a great day.

It is a day that we have some conflict, there is no question about it. We have longtime leaders like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who have been fighting for Africa for many, many years, and we have our newer generation who are there, coming up to step up to the plate. So I think Africa is in good shape for the future.

I think that every area needs an opportunity. When we look at Asia after World War II and at Hong Kong, we had the lowest per capita income in Asia. Housing was poor, education was down, there were no jobs. If we go to Hong Kong today, we will see a bustling, vibrant economy. Why? Because in Hong Kong and in Asia they determined that there was a need to have some investment.

We needed to start with a program. We needed to start with something that could be done. Textiles started in that place. Now we have seen the development moving into more and more sophisticated types of industry.

Africa, a continent of 800,000 people in sub-Saharan Africa, a place that has all of the resources and riches, plus it has a very strong and vibrant people, because people who can exist on less than $5 a month by their own ingenuity and by their own creativity, by their own industry, are a group of people for whom the sky is only the limit if they had the opportunity.

They say that even a trip of a thousand miles must begin with the first step. I think that today the first step is being taken. No, this is not a bill that is all-encompassing. As a matter of fact, in the old mythology, in the Pandora's box, all of the evils came out in that myth, but the cap was put down and hope remained in it.

So I think that it is important that hope remains alive, but I think we have to take a first step. This is an important first step.

I think that it is insulting to tell the Diplomatic Corps from Africa that this is not good for them. I just returned from Africa this past week, and everyone there was saying, please have this bill pass, it means that much to us.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and pass the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, African textile and apparel exports to the United States last year were $570 million. This is .86 percent of the total U.S. textile and apparel imports, less than 1 percent. The U.S. International Trade Committee reports that this volume would increase maybe 25, 50 percent, to just over 1 percent if this bill passes. Is that any kind of threat to the most powerful economy in the history of the world? No, it is not.

Opponents also miss the point that today all but two African countries have no textile quotas. That is 46 sub-Saharan countries.

So why have we not seen the transshipment problem we have heard about today in these 46 countries? This bill has safeguards against transshipment. One is that it provides for a review of its textile provisions by requiring the executive to report to us in Congress on the growth of textile and apparel imports from Africa, and if there is a transshipment problem discovered, and there is no reason to believe there would be one, today there is none, we checked with Customs, there is none, but if there is, we can simply pull that country out of the program and this bill establishes a way to do that.

Let me say that most everyone in this body, Democrat and Republican, have been working to promote U.S. trade and investment in Africa. Why? It increases the standard of living of Africans, it increases the standard of living of people in the United States. One hundred thirty-three thousand jobs right now are dependent upon exports to Africa that will increase under this bill.

This bill is bipartisan. It has been years in the making. We have held hearings on this bill. We have built this huge bipartisan support of Republicans and Democrats for this bill.

I have heard some comments about the environment. For us on the committee, we have been holding hearings on the environment in Africa. We have programs like the Campfire Program in Zimbabwe, like the Ndeki Forest Program in the Congo, that we are supporting. We will continue to do that.

But this bill need to be passed today, this Trade and Investment Opportunity Act for America and for Africa.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and the rule.

Last week I was in Africa and visited three very poor countries, Djibouti, Eritrea, and Ethiopia. Two of them are involved in a very, very violent war that has killed tens of thousands of people over the last year, but they still recognize that poverty is their number one enemy. And they also are noticing, Mr. Speaker, that we have spent billions of dollars in the Balkans, and are still bogged down over this bill.

Africa will notice. Today is the day to send this bill forward, even if it is not perfect. For those who are concerned that it is not a perfect bill, what is the protection? The protection is these countries do not have to participate. It is almost patronizing to say that somehow we have to put out this perfect bill and this they somehow cannot sort through all these conditions themselves.

□ 1015

They will do what is in their best interests. If they like these conditions, they will meet them and negotiate and work with the United States on trade.

This is good for Africa. It is good for the United States. I support the rule and the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Sometimes we have to make tough choices, and if I were put to a choice under this bill of choosing to keep jobs in North Carolina or send them to Africa, that would be a wonderful choice that I would have to

make. Unfortunately, because the Committee on Rules did not make in order the amendment authored by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the choice is not that, but the choice is whether I keep jobs in the textile and apparel industry in North Carolina or create a platform in Africa for Asian and Eastern markets.

So I think this rule is unfair. We should have been allowed to debate this issue on the floor. I encourage my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules and one of my mentors on free trade.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him for his superb management of the rule. And I compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the others who have spent a great deal of time, such as the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who have worked long and hard on this very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to talk simply about the issue itself, but I feel compelled to respond to the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), my friend, when he referred to the unfairness of this rule. Just a few hours ago, at 12:30, I referred to the fact that on the State Department authorization bill, the bill that is designed to deal with the problem that we have with embassy security around the world, we made in order a number of amendments, 41 in fact: 22 Democratic amendments, 12 Republican amendments, and 7 bipartisan amendments. On this bill, we make in order only Democratic amendments.

Now, I often have to fight the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend, in the Committee on Rules who is often trying to withdraw Democratic amendments that we have made in order on bills. I am happy to say that he did not do it on this one.

We have, in fact, made in order an amendment from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), my friend, an amendment from the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a bipartisan amendment, all amendments that have been offered by the Democrats. I am proud of this rule which will allow us to provide for a free and very, very open debate.

Let me take a couple of minutes to talk about this very important issue. I am proud to have worked with many of our colleagues on the issue of global trade and Africa. It is no secret, in fact, it was said by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) in our committee yesterday, the poorest continent on the face of the earth is the African continent. And this bill is designed to not only address the concerns that exist among those 48 Nations in Sub-Saharan Africa but also to address concerns that exist right here in the United States of America.

The Cold War is over. We are very proud of the legacy of Ronald Reagan and George Bush in bringing an end to the Soviet Union. I remember spending time in Angola and other spots when I traveled in the latter part of the last decade throughout Sub-Saharan Africa, and that has come to an end. Now what we have seen is a very fragile move towards political pluralism and democratization taking place in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 434 goes a long way towards encouraging even further moves towards free markets, further moves towards representative democracy, and we need to herald those things. But it is also important to note that this bill is not only designed to address the concerns that exist in that very important part of the world, Sub-Saharan Africa; it is designed to address the concerns that exist right here in the United States of America.

I agree with some critics. We should not spend all of our time simply thinking about other parts of the world. Our priority here is to deal with our national security interests. The best way for us to maintain, or one of the best ways for us to maintain our national security is to do everything that we can to have the highest standard of living possible.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) just referred to the fact that there will be 133,000 jobs created because of exports going from the United States to the 48 nations in sub-Saharan Africa. We also have to remember something else. What is it that gives us the highest standard of living the world? It is the fact that the world has access to our consumer markets.

So we are going to create a chance for that struggling single mother who is trying to make ends meet to have the chance. She is going to have the opportunity to have a higher standard of living by being able to buy clothes for her children, by being able to purchase other things that are very important. That is what free trade is all about. We have so often argued that trade is not a zero sum game. Trade is, in fact, an issue which is a win-win all the way around.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I encourage bipartisan support for this rule and enthusiastic support for what I think is a very, very important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 263, nays 141, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Archer
Armey
Baird
Baker
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Coburn
Combest
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Ewing
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Upton

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

NAYS—141

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

NOT VOTING—31

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

□ 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.