that she offers her amendment with those noble intentions.

While I strongly agree with the intentions, I must oppose the means. Unless debt relief is de-linked from a requirement of countries to follow IMF economic policies, the main beneficiary of Congressional funding for debt relief is the IMF. That is because the IMF will receive control of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, while poor countries will have to follow IMF dictates about government spending, health and education policy, monetary policy, and privatization.

The IMF deserves much of the blame for the poverty, environmental degradation, and unemployment of heavily indebted poor countries, since it has been telling them what they could and could not do for decades. If the U.S. gives a real gift to the world's poorest countries, it should be freedom from the IMF's structural adjustment programs.

Indeed, that is what civic leaders from developing countries are asking for Lidy B. Nacpil of Jubilee South, a coalition of Jubilee 2000 campaigns from Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America, and the Caribbean sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee. In the letter, Congress was asked to ''oppose authorization of any funding mechanism that would empower the International Monetary Fund and World Bank to condition debt relief on adherence to macroeconomics and related structural adjustment programs. The effective imposition of these policies on our countries by the IMF, the World Bank and the other international financial institutions has had a devastating impact on large segments of our population, on our natural environments, as well as on our productive and reproductive capacities of our societies * * * It is the adjustment policies themselves, as the cause of our social, economic, and financial crises, which must be addressed.''

Appropriations for the IMF and World Bank should be conditional. The IMF and World Bank should no longer be able to impose structural adjustment programs over the economic choices and options of developing world countries. Otherwise, we are deceiving ourselves that our good intentions will lead to good results. Indeed, the only time Congress can promote reform at the IMF and World Bank is when those institutions have a request for funds before us. As multilateral institutions, they are not directly subject to wishes of Congress. Instead, the U.S. has a representative at each institution who works, according to Treasury, at developing consensus among the other nations' representatives. The only moment when the IMF and World Bank are susceptible to the unmediated wishes of Congress is when they come to Congress for funds. Then Congress is able to condition release of such funds on changes in IMF and World Bank practices.

Unfortunately, this amendment, however well-intended, places no new conditions on the IMF and World Bank. In fact, there is no requirement that the IMF and World Bank actually give any debt relief. Congress cannot take for granted that the funds we appropriate for debt relief will make a difference for the world's poorest citizens we hope to help. Congress has appropriated or authorized hundreds of millions of dollars to the IMF and World Bank in the past for debt relief, but almost none of it has been passed through to the poor countries as relief.

Again, Congress is being asked to give hundreds of millions of dollars to an IMF and World Bank administered account. That is the only certain thing Congress is being asked to do. For the amount, let us set aside the obvious question of the IMF's and World Bank's sincerity. If Congress sends the IMF and World Bank funds for the goal of relieving the foreign debt burden, we should ask what the IMF and World Bank require of poor countries to qualify for the debt relief.

According to the IMF and World Bank, it is not simply enough that a country be poor to qualify for debt relief. On the contrary, to qualify, countries must impose all sorts of harsh economic medicine to their countries. They must privatize national businesses. They must deregulate their banking industry; they must impose fees on social services—making the poor residents of poor countries pay for basic education and health services. They must be willing to allow the largest corporations in the world to take over ownership of their economies. They must open up their forests and minerals to large multinational corporations. They even sometimes have to oppose increases in their minimum wages. The IMF and World Bank then evaluate the countries' compliance with these painful prescriptions, and wait several years to see if the countries are repressive enough to make these policies stick.

If the IMF and World Bank wanted to relieve the debts of the world's poorest countries, they could do so immediately and without any additional funds from Congress. The General Accounting Office has simply reported to Congress about the adequacy of IMF accounts. The cause of debt cancellation does not require further Congressional funds. The IMF and World Bank clearly do not want to cancel the debt of poor countries.

Unlike the IMF and World Bank, I am in favor of immediate, 100 percent debt cancellation for the world's poor countries. If Congress is to make a real difference in the lives of the world's poorest, it must put a stop to IMF and World Bank structural adjustment programs when these institutions ask for funds from Congress.

DON'T FORCE A BAD DEAL AT CAMP DAVID

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, securing a just and enduring peace in the Middle East is a paramount goal of the United States and vital to our national interests. I sincerely hope that the day will come when the region is a stable, peaceful home of emerging democracies and U.S. allies.

The ongoing dialogue about the future relationship between Israel and its neighbors in this volatile region is essential if a true peace is ever to be realized. The current talks may be a meaningful step toward achieving our common goal.

However, I am concerned that the pressure to reach a deal—any deal—will outweigh that of securing a good one. A deal for deal's sake is not in the interest of Israel or the United States, nor is it in the interest of long-term peace and stability in the Middle East. In this volatile region, a flawed agreement that produces greater instability would be worse than the status quo.

Accordingly, American leaders must not abuse our unique relationship with Israel to force acceptance of destabilizing strategic concessions. True peace can only be obtained if both sides are confident that they are negotiating freely and in the interest of their people—free from outside pressures. I was quite alarmed to hear the Administration's spokesman stating that there is tension between the two sides due to the President's pressure on negotiators to come up with an agreement. Clearly, Israel should not be forced to negotiate away what's in its best interests to accommodate the political interest of any group.

Israel has been a longtime ally of the United States. The struggle of the Israeli people to maintain their sovereignty and security from hostile neighbors has been long and valiant. As Americans, we recognize their struggle is also our own—that beyond our strong ties of kinship, a strong and secure Israel is undoubtedly in America's best interest. An Israel with secure boundaries, free from threats or acts of war, is essential to long-term peace and stability in the region.

Over the last 50 years, Israel has shown its willingness to work with its neighbors to find peace, sometimes successfully—sometimes not—but in all cases the outcome was contingent on the determination of both sides to truly secure peace.

At this time, it is unclear to me that this is the case in these negotiations. In fact, the threat of the Palestinians to unilaterally declare statehood on September 13, regardless of the status of negotiations, call to question their commitment to peace and respect of Israel's autonomy and security. Any attempt by the Palestinians to unilaterally declare an independent state would have severe consequences to the relationship between the U.S. and the Palestinians. Make no mistake, this Congressman will not support such a unilateral declaration, particularly outside the confines of an agreement with Israel.

The U.S. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that any agreement the American people may be asked to embrace will truly protect Israeli and American interests, enjoys the support of the Israeli and Palestinian people alike, and brings a lasting and durable peace to the region. Accordingly, any final agreement must carry a real chance for meaningful peace before committing U.S. support.

No one should assume that the Congress will simply sign off on committing enormous American resources to a deal that contains compromises which would seriously undermine Israeli or U.S. security. Before a financial commitment is made by the U.S., the Israeli people must have their referendum, and we must have had an opportunity to examine the proposed agreement on its merits from an American perspective—both for the security of Israel and the security of the United States.

Finally, I remain gravely concerned that the Administration has yet to adequately consult the Congress on the status of the negotiations. The prospect that an agreement will contain an ongoing American commitment requires that the Administration work closely with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to build a broad consensus in support of the deal.

We must be certain that the final agreement carries a legitimate chance for an enduring peace before we commit the vast American resources routinely mentioned as part of a settlement. Any meaningful peace agreement must be attractive to both parties independent of financial incentives. Further the U.S. must not force an untenable deal that delivers today's headlines at the expense of lasting peace.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4811, the FY 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill. This bill is more than $300 million below current funding levels and almost $2 billion less than the Administration's request.

The allocation of resources in this bill will not enable our nation to carry out an effective foreign policy to meet our vital national security needs. The low levels of funding in key areas of this bill will hinder our ability to respond to and confront ongoing development around the world. Many countries around the world are undergoing rapid change; our nation now has an unique and unprecedented opportunity—and indeed, a responsibility—to provide global stability through the spread of democracy and the promise of economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to failing our vital foreign policy and national security objectives, this bill fails in responsibly allocating resources towards other critical priorities. While the overall request has been reduced by 10 percent, the amounts requested to address the problems of infectious disease, poverty alleviation, access to family planning, and debt relief in the world's poorest countries have been cut in a disproportionate manner:

The bill underfunds, by $390 million, our commitment to provide debt relief to the world's poorest countries. The Jubilee 2000 campaign for debt relief, which received bipartisan support throughout the United States and with a broad spectrum of religious leaders and organizations.

The bill also reduces, by $42 million, funds to combat worldwide HIV/AIDS.

The bill hinders developing nations' ability to grow by drastically cutting funds for the International Development Association, the African Development Bank and Fund and the Asian Development Fund by 32 percent.

This bill also cuts nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, de-mining, and related programs by 32 percent.

Finally, this bill cuts, by $385 million, international family planning programs; and imposes restrictions on foreign organizations which are contrary to our long-held constitutional principles of free speech.

There are, however, provisions in this bill that I strongly support. This bill includes increases for the Child Survival and Disease account and the Peace Corps, for example. The most important priority that this bill funds well, however, is the maintenance of our commitment to the state of Israel and the peace process in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, foreign aid should not be immune from scrutiny and budget cuts; however, it should not be the victim of skewed priorities. Indeed, robust and well-directed foreign assistance programs are essential for our national security. The process of building stability around the globe my combating infectious disease and poverty, working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization,and fostering the conditions for economic growth ultimately benefits us all.

Unfortunately, the allocation of resources in this bill fails to recognize this fundamental fact, shortchanges our foreign policy goals, and undermines our national security. I will vote against this misguided bill today and urge my colleagues to do the same.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently was not present on the floor for a vote yesterday, July 17th, 2000.

If I had been present for rollcall No. 402 I would have voted ''yes,'' and I extend my congratulations to the Republic of Latvia on its 10th anniversary.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I am deeply dismayed at the lack of funding for such critical, life-saving programs as debt relief, HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, and international family planning.

At a time when many developing countries are consuming 30 to 40% of their annual budgets on debt repayment, they are simultaneously depleting monies that would be better spent on health care, education, and economic development. The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for FY 2000 established clear and specific crtieria which developing nations must meet in order to qualify for debt relief. These conditions include performing satisfactorily under an economic reform program, promoting civil society participation, implementing anti-corruption measures and transparent policy making, adopting strategies for poverty reduction, and strengthening private sector growth, trade, and investment. New governments in nations such as Bolivia and Mozambique are succeeding in their concentrated efforts to democratize and stablize their respective countries, and have met the qualifying standards for debt relief. It is unjust to continue to punish the poorest civilians for debts incurred and for promises unfulfilled by former dictators.

Nearly four decades of economic development, particularly on the continent of Africa, are currently unraveling before our eyes. The proposed funding level in H.R. 4811 of $202 million—$42 million less than the President's request—is simply not sufficient to effectively combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic at its current growth rate. The global AIDS crisis is a threat of unprecedented magnitude, and it has been unsparing in its attack on the world's children. UNAID reports that more than 3.8 million children under 15 have already perished as a result of AIDS. An additional 1700 children per day are newly infected with HIV and join the 1.3 million who are currently living with the disease. The U.S. Census estimates that the life expectancy in many Sub-Saharan African countries will fall to age 30 within the next 10 years.

This indiscriminate plague gravely affects even children fortunate enough not to have contracted the disease themselves, by rendering them orphans—13.2 million to date. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has estimated that by the year 2010, there will be 42 million AIDS-related orphans, many of whom will be susceptible to abuse or recruitment into gangs or militia.

In addition to the horrific and exponential increase in suffering and loss of human life, HIV/AIDS inevitably will have an enormous and devastating impact on future economic development, political stability, trade and commerce, and international security. Since effective medical research and counseling intervention have been proven to drastically reduce the mother-to-child transmission rate of HIV around the globe, from the United States to Thailand, there is absolutely no excuse not to help fund these vital programs.

As world experts meet this week in Durban, South Africa for the 13th International HIV/AIDS Conference, we must do our part in this country and in this bill to alleviate the unimaginable suffering that HIV/AIDS is causing in the developing world.

A crucial element of reducing the prevalence of HIV/AIDS is adequate access to family planning resources and information. Pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions claim the lives of 600,000 women annually, primarily due to early and frequent childbearing and poor access to health care and contraception. Family planning helps prevent high-risk and unwanted pregnancies and reduces the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and life-threatening infections such as HIV/AIDS. The Administration's request for a $169 million increase to USAID population assistance would likely result in 1.5 million fewer unintended births; 2.2 million fewer abortions;