

United Nations AIDS program as one of the best in the world in both treatment and prevention. Working alongside nonprofit organizations, the government has aggressively fought the disease by offering universal antiretroviral treatment. Many of the first-line antiretroviral drugs used in Brazil are locally produced by generic companies, allowing the country to afford to treat tens of thousands of patients.

But other second-line antiretroviral drugs like the lopinavir/ritonavir combination, efavirenz, and tenofovir have been sold by their brand name producers at a high cost. These three drugs alone consume 70% of Brazil's AIDS budget. According to Brazilian Health Minister Humberto Costa, the Brazilian government pays more than \$2,600 annually per patient to purchase doses of lopinavir/ritonavir.

Some who oppose Brazil's action have claimed that it violates trade rules. In fact, the World Trade Organization's 1994 Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property specifically permits compulsory licensing. The 2001 Doha Declaration reaffirmed this option, stating, "Each member has the right to grant compulsory licenses and the freedom to determine the grounds upon which such licenses are granted."

As a signatory of the Doha Declaration, the United States should respect the rights of other nations to address important health problems.

MEETING BLAIR'S G-8 AFRICA GOALS—PROGRESS, BUT FAR FROM FINISHED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker I rise to discuss the ongoing progress towards meetings the objectives of Prime Minister Blair's G-8 objectives. The announcement of a tentative debt relief agreement for certain developing countries, mostly in Africa, is an extremely promising development for Africa that is long overdue. The recent agreement on 100 percent debt relief will initially benefit 14 nations in Africa, and is largely based on the Heavy Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Program, which already offers some debt relief to the world's poorest nations.

Several countries not included in the initial package are still technically eligible. An additional 9 African countries could qualify for full debt cancellation in the next 12 to 18 months, and a further 9 countries in Africa may potentially benefit from the agreement sometime in the future, if they continue to progress in meeting HIPC objectives, such as tackling corruption. But these additional countries are by no means guaranteed debt relief.

The current \$40 billion debt relief package must be commended. It is by far the most significant and comprehensive debt relief package ever given to Africa. However, a recent article entitled "Plan That Falls Far Short of Global Needs" in the publication *CaribNews* suggests that the plan must be closely scrutinized. One glaring issue is that the current package at most cancels only one-sixth of Africa's \$295 billion debt and leaves out several countries such as Nigeria and Kenya.

Nigeria, despite having a per capita GDP in line with HIPC eligible countries, and a staggering \$36 billion debt, is not currently included in the deal, though G-8 representatives say that some type of Nigeria specific arrangement is in the works. As a leader in West Africa, if not the entire continent, its fate is closely linked to that of the region. As such, the inclusion of Nigeria in a debt relief package is crucial.

In addition to debt relief, the issue of increased assistance must be addressed. This was reiterated in a recent Op-Ed release by Bernice Powell Jackson, Executive Minister of the Justice and Witness Ministries of the United Church of Christ, which calls on the U.S. to do more to help Africa. President Bush has so far rejected Blair's call to double aid to Africa, as well as establish the UN sanctioned benchmark which calls on developed countries to devote 0.7 percent of their gross national income to overseas development assistance by 2015. Of the G8 countries, France, Germany, Italy and Britain, have all pledged to hit the 0.7 percent target in the allotted period. The European Union also a collective body has also agreed to the benchmark.

In 2004, the United States, the largest economy in the world, was second to last among industrialized nations in the amount of development assistance it gave as a percentage of Gross National Income—it was dead last in 2003. In sheer volume the U.S. gives the largest total amount of foreign development aid, but as a proportion of national income only 0.16 percent goes to aid, far short of the 0.7 percent UN target.

While we claim to be the leader of the free world, small countries such as Norway and Denmark dwarf us in the percentage of their national income dedicated to development. Indeed, these countries have long exceeded the 0.7 percent aid target that the U.S. has yet to adopt. In addition, a recent report released by the Brookings Institute argues that the extent of U.S. assistance in recent years is not as large as the Administration has asserted.

Lastly, the issue of trade liberalization must be tackled if Africa is to experience real and sustainable development. Africa has a population of 860 million, accounting for 13.6 percent of the world's population, yet it only accounts for only two percent of global trade volume—down from 6 percent in the 1980's.

This is compounded by industrialized countries' usage of unfair trading mechanisms, such as subsidies, which have prevented African farmers and firms from competing on an equal footing with other nations. While industrialized nations battle with each other over increasing the \$50 billion they give in annual development assistance, they continue to spend over \$300 billion on domestic agricultural subsidies.

For its part, the U.S. gives billions of dollars annually in subsidies to a very small group of largescale agricultural producers—while compelling poor countries to further open up their markets. The World Bank has estimated that an end to Western agricultural subsidies would allow developing countries to earn hundreds of billions—on their own. Concessions on trade may prove to be the hardest sell in Blair's G-8 agenda, but his agenda is one the world cannot afford to ignore.

HELPING THE LEAST OF THESE: CANCEL AFRICA'S DEBT AND SHARE THE WEALTH

(By Bernice Powell Jackson)

If you were only to read most of the newspaper headlines, you'd think that the U.S. government is being quite generous to the world's poorest continent, Africa, but it just ain't so. In fact, we're being awfully stingy and while President Bush is trying to put a happy face on his meetings with British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Mr. Blair must be pretty disappointed at how little he is coming away with for Africa.

The truth is that 34 of the world's 48 poorest nations are in Africa, which is also facing a rampant AIDS epidemic, where thousands die every day. Moreover, a number of African nations are still recovering from civil wars and/or enormous national debts, many of which were incurred by unscrupulous dictators and illegitimate governments who never used the funds for the hospitals and schools for which they were intended. The truth is that Africa is a continent whose natural resources of gold, diamonds, oil, chromium and other much-needed minerals have been ravaged by much of the rest of the world. Moreover, tens of millions of its most precious resource—human beings—died or were stolen in the African slave trade a century ago. I remember being on a World Council of Churches panel in 1998 in Zimbabwe, where an African leader reminded us that when you count the billions of dollars lost to Africa through these ways, "we don't owe Europe and America anything. You still owe us," he said.

The truth is that for many of the poorest nations, paying back these huge national debts is not only burdensome, it is impossible. For most, they will never be able to pay off the principle, while the interest costs continue to mount. But many of these nations are forced to make these interest payments, which means that they cannot put funds into health care and education, which are critical to their national survival.

Even the new World Bank President, Paul Wolfowitz, has said that a case can be made for more funds going to development in Africa. President Bush, however, doesn't seem to agree with his protégé, Mr. Wolfowitz. In his meetings with Prime Minister Blair, President Bush has expressed an openness to canceling debts, but he has refused to increase substantially U.S. foreign aid to Africa. Instead, he has agreed to use \$674 million already allocated by Congress for emergency famine relief to a few African countries.

The extra \$25 billion a year for Africa sought by Mr. Blair, are not budgeted President Bush replied. Nevermind that almost the entire \$220 billion allocated for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been unbudgeted by this same administration.

Many Americans believe that we spend about 25 percent of our Federal budget on foreign aid to poor nations when we actually spend about 1 percent. Many Americans believe the headlines when our government agrees to fund programs like the \$15 million announced for AIDS in Africa. The reality is that little of that money has been sent. Similarly, three years ago the U.S. signed onto the United Nation's Millennium Project. In it, the world's richest nations agreed to increase their aid to .7 percent by 2015 to the poorest nations. Two weeks ago the European Union agreed to double their aid by 2015. But, it seems the President Bush has told Mr. Blair that we won't be doing the same. It's the old story of the check is in the mail.

In a recent editorial, the *New York Times* pointed out that .7 percent of the American economy would equal about \$80 billion. That's roughly equivalent to the amount the

Senate approved for additional military spending in Iraq and a little more than half of the corporate tax cut last year.

Three hundred million Africans live on less than \$1 a day on a continent trapped in \$300 billion in foreign debt. If we're serious about fighting the war on terrorism and serious about living out the moral values we're so quick to talk about, then we must not only cancel the debt of Africa's poorest nations, but we must also substantially increase our foreign aid to Africa.

You can write or call President Bush and tell him so. You can write or call your Senator. You can ask others to join you—it's up to us, all of us.

PLAN THAT FALLS FAR SHORT OF GLOBAL NEEDS

Now that the euphoria of the G-8 debt deal to help poor Africa, Caribbean and Latin American states has died down the reality of the situation is hitting home.

And it is painfully obvious that what was initially sold as a dream scheme isn't what it was cracked up to be.

Promoted as a plan designed to ease the financial pain of high debt inflicted on some of the world's poorest countries by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in particular the \$40 billion debt write off scheme approved by many of the world's richest nations—the U.S., Britain, France, Japan, Germany, Italy, Russia and Canada—falls very short of what is really needed.

It's true that the deal is an important first step but it's far from the generous package, which countries and commentators would have us believe.

Some figures underscore the need for the industrialized world to give more money to the designated beneficiaries and also to expand the list of highly indebted nations, which are crying out for help.

It's important that we bear in mind that when the figures, which are being tossed around in a vain attempt to highlight the generosity of the developed states, are looked at carefully, the actual amount and how it is parceled out is a drop in the bucket of requirements.

In today's money, according to Gary Duncan, Economics Editor of the Times of London, the value of the recent write-off is "only about \$17 million for the 18 countries to enjoy immediately."

Actually, as Duncan pointed out in well-reasoned analysis, the amount that Tanzania, Guyana, Honduras and the other 15 beneficiaries would save in debt payment, which can then be ploughed back into education, health, roads and infrastructural development, is chicken feed. The relatively small amount of \$1.5 billion in annual savings "is a fraction of the \$50 billion a year needed to double annual aid flows," which Britain's Prime Minister, Tony Blair, and his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, insist is needed to help Africa and other countries turn the corner by reducing poverty.

It is estimated that Britain's commitment under the deal calls for its taxpayers to provide \$100 million a year for up to a decade, a sum that the United Kingdom can meet without breaking a sweat. The annual charge to the U.S. treasury is close to \$175 million a year. That's not enough to pay for the public information system of the U.S. Justice Department. For Germany the bill would amount to about \$50 million a year for the first three years. The sums get even smaller when we look at France's annual commitment of about \$30 million.

It's obvious, then that we are not talking about large sums of money. Instead, the funds that don't even begin to scratch the

surface of need in Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America. It's also clear that advocates of debt relief for the world's poor were right when they called for a broader debt relief and aid package.

For instance, Romilly Greenhill of Action Aid, raised question marks about the scheme when he called the plan very good short term news for the 18 countries that will benefit but complained that overall "it will do little to immediately help millions in at least 40 countries that also need 100 per cent debt relief. What is disappointing is the lack of any substantial concrete commitment on aid."

You can say that again.

What has hit home is that at a time when the United Nations Millennium Goals are coming up for review, the United States, the wealthiest of the wealthy, is unwisely opposing the International Finance Facility which the British Chancellor is seeking to establish to offer a greater helping hand to the poor by using bonds to raise billions of dollars. Washington's opposition is undermining efforts to boost aid and in the end is likely to cause greater suffering.

To make matters worst, Germany has made it clear that it doesn't intend to out up any new money to pay for the debt write-off. Instead it will use existing aid funds to finance its share of the deal, something that makes the whole thing laughable. In essence, then, we shouldn't be expecting any significant changes unless and until there is a substantial change in attitude towards the poor.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) and Chairman REGULA that highlights the importance of restoring funding for the Community Service Block Grant Program.

Mr. Chairman, while I certainly understand the difficult work of the Appropriations Committee as it strives to keep the 2006 budget process under strict allocations, it is my hope that we can somehow find additional funding for the C-S-B-G Program. While the President sought to consolidate the program in his 2006 budget to the Congress, I was pleased to support language in the House-passed budget package, which states that:

Community Service Block Grants provides invaluable assistance to low-income families and communities. These funds are used to build healthy and stable communities. Due consideration should be given to this program before Congress implements any changes.

Mr. Chairman, thousands of community action agencies provide services that help low-income individuals: Train for gainful employ-

ment, obtain quality living environments and generally move toward self-sufficiency. One of those agencies is "Total Action Against Poverty," in my congressional district, which has provided much-needed services to the Roanoke Valley and southwest Virginia for nearly 30-years.

I believe a major reason for the effectiveness of organizations like "Total Action Against Poverty" are that they are locally controlled. Rather than seeking guidance from a know-it-all bureaucracy in Washington, DC, community action agencies can resolve community problems with community solutions. These organizations are grassroots-based, and are led by local boards and volunteers, with diverse memberships and strong roots in their communities. By nature, these groups are invested in their communities—and have the ability to leverage C-S-B-G funds with significant resources from private organizations including corporations and foundations with a stake in promoting the wellness of their neighborhoods, rather than pleasing constituencies in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that C-S-B-Gs are the kind of good-government programs that Congress should continue to support. I hope that conferees can support the C-S-B-G program.

SOUTHERN ALAMANCE WINS 3-A CROWN

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, as baseball fans across America anxiously wait to see who will win this year's World Series, the Sixth District of North Carolina waits no longer for one of its champions to be crowned. On June 4, 2005, the Southern Alamance Patriots captured the North Carolina Class 3-A state baseball championship by defeating Northwest Cabarrus two games to one at Doak Field on the campus of North Carolina State University. This year, Southern Alamance captured its first state title since 1988 and its third in school history.

With the series tied at one in the third game of the series, the Patriots scored an unprecedented eight runs in the first inning. This was an anomaly after the Patriots were held to only three hits in game two. The (Burlington) Times-News reported that the Patriots learned from their mistakes and took advice from their coach Jason Smith when he told them to not try to, "... lift and hit it out. In this big park it is not going to happen." The players kept the ball on the ground and prevailed in what proved to be an exhilarating game.

Northwest Cabarrus went into game three on a "high" after beating the Patriots in game two. The game winning "high" was soon replaced with a "low" after the Trojan's starting pitcher, Robbie Gurley, walked two people and gave up a single in the first inning. Gurley was pulled and replaced by Joe Hubbard. After Hubbard could not get the job done and was replaced by a third hurler, the Patriots were confident after gaining an eight-run lead in the first inning. Among those who scored in the first were Thomas Sappelt, Michael Parker, Roy Albright, Brent Haynes, Jonathan Shields,