

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

SPEECH OF

HON. JEFF FORTENBERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

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

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

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

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

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

I believe that U.S. foreign assistance should not be used as a vehicle for imposing programs which potentially compromise the health of recipients, violate their consciences, or break laws of recipient nations which aim to affirm human dignity. On behalf of those we

strive to assist, I urge my colleagues in Congress, the Administration, and the United States Agency for International Development, as well as the constituents we serve, to work earnestly to uphold this purpose.

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

COMMUNICATIONS OPPORTUNITY, PROMOTION, AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

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

ANNUAL PEG SUPPORT FUNDING FROM CABLE COMPANIES

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

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

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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