''television viewing skills.'' Rather, they should be learning to read and write, finding solutions to math problems and perform science experiments. While American schoolchildren lag behind the rest of the developed world in basic academic skills, our Federal education dollars are paying for our children to watch television effectively.

If my colleagues believe that Federal education dollars should be made available to kids in classrooms instead of funding studies like this one, I urge them to cosponsor the dollars to the Classroom Act, which will require 95 cents of every Federal dollar to be used in the classroom where learning basic skills occur.

LOIS CAPPS ELECTED TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a very important day. I suppose that gets said a lot of times here in the well. But yesterday, the American people, in the form of the California delegation, elected Lois Capps to the House of Representatives. It was a campaign filled with millions of dollars of advertisement about abortion and about term limits and about a lot of other irrelevant issues.

But the American people voted for a candidate who said she wanted to come back here and work on education, who wanted to come back here and work on a patients' bill of rights, who wanted to come back here and do the things that affect the American people.

People of her district listened to all these television ads. I mean, they cannot get away from it. The air was filled with it. She spent $1,600,000. And this House has never yet brought out on this floor for debate a campaign finance reform bill. The people said we want somebody who is going to work on our problems.

D.C. SCHOOL CHOICE

(Mrs. NORTHUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I know what it is like to worry every day about how your child is doing in school. It must be terrible if your child is trapped in a school that is unsafe and unworkable; your daughter's sleepless nights become your own sleepless nights.

Most parents with children in the D.C. public schools live under these intolerable conditions. D.C. Schools have received national attention. In spite of funding per student that ranks among one of the highest districts in the Nation, education in this district has reached crisis proportions. Decrepid school buildings are literally falling part.

Just this year, a high school student interned in my office because opening day was delayed 3 weeks. The local news here is filled with stories of fire code violations, violence in schools, and failing test scores.

The problem with D.C. schools is that the entire system is broken. It is not just a bad teacher or disorganized principal or leaking roof or unrestrained bully in fourth grade; it is all of these and more. Parents cannot just change their child's class or even their child's school. They simply cannot escape. And so, their children are trapped.

Hopefully, the District will begin the long process of improvement. But, in the meantime, we need to give children a choice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LOIS CAPPS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 22nd District of California have spoken. Congratulations, Lois Capps, newly elected Democrat to the United States Congress, someone who stood for education, patients' rights, the preservation of social security, understanding the needs of the people, and, yes, understanding the rights of women. Lois Capps will come and take her place. We salute her because this is a place where we need to stand by those who need us most.

I would like to encourage my colleagues this morning, as we proceed historically to support the first African trade bill that this United States Congress has ever debated, give Africa a chance and equal partnership, a chance to do trade, a chance to improve their economic standing, a chance to create jobs, a chance to work with Americans. We can do great things together. I know that Lois Capps will help us do it. Today let us pass the African trade bill.

TRIBUTE TO NEW HAMPSHIRE OLYMPIANS

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to several New Hampshire Olympians who skated their way into America's heart last month. Their dazzling talent and can-do spirit and proud patriotism gave the world a glimpse of what makes our Nation so special.

As an American, I can think of few prouder moments in our history than when the U.S. women's hockey team claimed the Gold Medal for our country. As a Nation, we felt the magic of this newest miracle on ice as our heroes collected their hard-earned prize and secured their place in Olympic history.

Like all great champions, Team USA gave us something greater than a victory; they inspired girls all over the world to dream new Olympic dreams and strive to achieve their goals with grace and class. As a father of such a little girl, I thank them for being such wonderful world models.

Today, as New Hampshire pays tribute to Team USA, I congratulate the New Hampshire natives and Dartmouth and UNH grads who represented our State so proudly: Tricia Dunn, Katie King, Tara Mounsey, Colleen Coyne, Sue Merze, Kayrn Bye, Gretchen Ulion, Sarah Tueting. May your spirits always shine as brightly as the gold that you have won.

SCHOOL CHOICE WORKS

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, school choice works. Consider the recent example of Albany, New York. Philanthropist Virginia Gilder identified one of the worst schools in the entire city and offered every student a scholarship of $2,000. One-sixth of the children at that school took her up on the offer and transferred to private schools.

What was the result? Here is what the Washington Post reports: ''It worked. The school board ousted the principal, brought in nine new teachers, added two assistant principals and invested in books, equipment and teacher training after years of neglect.''

Faced with the prospect of losing its students to the competition, Albany's school system reformed itself. Albany's example shows that school choice helps not only the students who receive scholarships, it also helps the children who remain in public schools.

Mr. Speaker, if it worked in Albany, it can work in Anacostia. Next month, the House will consider school choice legislation for the children of the District. I urge my colleagues to support it.

AFRICA GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 383 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 383

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1432) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations and one hour 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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, and shall not be subject to amendment. 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 fifteen 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. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 383 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1432, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill designed to usher in a new era in U.S. African relations by stimulating market incentives and increasing trade.

H. Res. 383 provides for 2 hours of general debate with 1 hour divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, and 1 hour divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule provides for the consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means' amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as modified by the amendments printed in Part I of the report of the Committee on Rules as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and considered as read.

H. Res. 383 also waives points of orders against the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, that is, the rule on germaneness.

The resolution also makes in order six amendments printed in Part II of the Committee on Rules' report. The amendments shall be considered only in the order specified in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated by the report, and shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided between a proponent and opponent, and the amendments are not subject to amendment.

This rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone recorded votes and reduce to 5 minutes the voting time after the first of the series of votes provided that the first vote is not less than 15 minutes. This provision will facilitate consideration of amendments.

House Resolution 338 also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to reinforce the positive developments taking place in the sub-Saharan African region by promoting a United States trade policy with those countries that are committed to market incentives, human rights reforms, and private sector growth.

The countries affected by this legislation are moving toward democracy and opening their economies. This legislation will help expand this move by encouraging sub-Saharan countries that are truly reform minded to expand their trade and investment ties with the United States.

I think it is important to note that this bill requires the President to identify those countries that are moving toward the establishment of a market-based economy and that there is a strong eligibility criteria to ensure human rights and penalize those caught engaging in illegal behavior.

These conditions will continue to be helpful in terms of reforms that might otherwise not be made because these nations view this as a partnership and an opportunity to improve relations with the United States.

The United States has proven adept at providing developmental aid and humanitarian relief to this region in the past. However, as we move into the 21st Century, this legislation is part of a new strategy designed to stimulate growth by promoting free trade and market economies. If we do not open these new markets, I fear that we will lose valuable economic activities and thwart job creation for American business and workers.

The Committee on International Relations informs us that trade between the United States and Africa can be greatly expanded with over 11 million United States jobs, including one in five manufacturing jobs being supported by our exports. The potential for job creation is high.

☐ 1045

Over the last 4 years alone U.S. exports have created 1.4 million new American jobs. However, if the United States continues to opt not to participate, we all know that other nations will move forward in our place, forge free trade agreements with those countries and leave us behind.

With regard to the consideration of amendments, the Committee on Rules has done its best to permit the consideration of amendments to this legislation that do not touch upon the Committee on Ways and Means' portions of H.R. 1432. In testimony yesterday, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, argued for the traditional protections for tax and trade provisions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In permitting only these amendments, the committee has followed precedent during the consideration of Ways and Means bills in an effort to preserve the integrity of the trade laws.

H.R. 1432 was ordered reported unanimously from both the Committee on International Relations' Subcommittee on Africa and the full Committee on International Relations. In addition, H.R. 1432 was ordered reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously with only a single amendment offered and considered.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of the amendments and the merits of this important bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the last month I have been very impressed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), my chairman, who has made in order open rule after open rule. Unfortunately, today, Mr. Speaker, it appears that that open rule streak has come to an end.

The rule we are considering today is a modified closed rule for a very, very important bill to which Members really have a lot of amendments. But this closed rule, Mr. Speaker, will prohibit all but a very few amendments. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

This African trade bill is designed to stimulate growth and reduce poverty in eligible sub-Saharan countries. It encourages investment in some African countries which are already turning out to be rich markets for American technologies and exports. It also enables African countries to have the kind of trade consideration that countries in Europe, Asia, Mexico and Canada have enjoyed for years. Mr. Speaker, that is to say, it is about time.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, unless we can make some major changes in this bill, any help this bill gives African countries will be at the expense of American workers, particularly American textile workers. Unless we change this bill, huge Asian textile corporations will be able to transship their products through Africa and will avoid an 18 percent import duty. Mr. Speaker, that does not help African workers and it sure does not help American workers.

They can make the clothes in Asia, in Chinese sweatshops if they want. They can ship them to Africa to be packaged and avoid all kinds of quotas, all kinds of tariffs. Meanwhile, slave trade in China continues to flourish, African workers do not get much of anything to do, and American workers are laid off left, right and center.

But since my Republican colleagues have closed the rule to keep us from improving this bill, we cannot require progress on workers' rights, on child labor. We cannot prevent transshipping, we cannot require African countries to open markets for American goods like clothing, footwear and yarn.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues thought NAFTA was bad for American workers' rights, if they thought NAFTA would cause irreparable environmental damage, wait until they get a load of this African trade bill. It looks like we have not learned anything from NAFTA's mistakes.

This bill helps powerful Asian manufacturers at the expense of both African workers and American workers. It turns a blind eye to child labor, to basic workers' rights, and it will hurt the American textile business.

This bill purports to help Africans, which it may not, and it does so at the expense of African Americans who make up one-third to one-half of all textile and apparel workers here in the United States.

In the past few years, there has been a remarkable economic and political transformation in sub-Saharan Africa. President Clinton is going to Africa in less than 2 weeks. He would like to open up more trade. But right now, Mr. Speaker, he can do that only at a very high price to American taxpayers and to American workers.

So in the interest of all working people, I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule. We can send the bill back to the Committee on Rules, we can make these improving amendments in order, and this would vastly improve the bill. Mr. Speaker, I think we should.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to hear the words coming out of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the former chairman of the Committee on Rules, criticizing this rule as a closed rule. I just have to remind the membership, Mr. Speaker, that I labored for 6 years under the tutelage and the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), and time after time after time he took to this floor and said we must not, under any circumstances, open up a Ways and Means section of any bill to amendment, because the Tax Code in this country is so complicated that we must make sure that hearings have been held before we ever, ever allow amendments on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I have simply followed the leadership of my chairman, which means so much.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the gentleman has watched too closely. But also he may remember the most-favored-nation status China trade bill that I opened the rule because there were some very-much-needed amendments, and it is very reminiscent of what we are doing today.

Mr. SOLOMON. I do not recall that, and I will discuss it with the gentleman later. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that this is a controversial bill. I have a lot of concerns about it myself. I am concerned with the people that used to work in the trade, of making the shirts that we are wearing on our backs today. I was in several department stores and several discount stores like Kmart and Wal-Mart not too long ago, looking at all the shirts, the dress shirts like these that they had on display, and there were nine different countries that have brought these shirts into this country. I could not find one American shirt being manufactured here.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) used to represent a lot of those people in New York City, I represented them in the Hudson Valley. There are practically none left.

But notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. What we have done is to make every amendment in order, every single amendment coming out of the Committee on International Relations, the committee of jurisdiction. We have made amendments for the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) we made 3 amendments in order, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), all Democrats. Every single amendment that was filed with the Committee on Rules was made in order except those that would interfere with the U.S. Tax Code.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), sitting over there, had several amendments that were good amendments and that I would support, but we just cannot bring those amendments to the floor under these circumstances because it would open up the U.S. Tax Code. Therefore, I would ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), I know she is chairman of the Black Caucus, I would ask her when she comes over here to urge support of this rule because it is a fair rule.

We need to at least debate this issue on the floor and then let the chips fall where they may. But please come over and support the rule. It is a very fair rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), 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, I rise in support of the rule.

One of the reasons why certain amendments were not allowed under the rule is because it would preclude the African people from exporting their goods to the United States. It would seem to me that if we are going to have a trade bill, then certainly removing the ability of people that are really trying to build up some industry in these poor, impoverished countries, that we should not deny them the opportunity to develop their own fabrics, sew them together and send them to the United States.

Under the amendment that was not accepted by the Committee on Rules, the African workers in these countries would not be able to manufacture their own goods. They would have to accept American-manufactured goods, cut in America, sent across the Atlantic, sewed together and sent back over. They say, ''Well, it's been done in Mexico.''

There is a big difference between the line on the map between Mexico and the United States and the Atlantic Ocean, and it is just not feasible. The amendment would have precluded all of the GSP provisions in the trade bill. And so let us not hear that if we had had a better rule, we would have voted for the African trade bill. What would be better to say is that if you want to kill the African Growth and Economic Opportunity bill, if you want to deny the people in this part of the world participation in world trade, then you deny us the opportunity to bring it on the floor. And if you do not want the bill on the floor, then you have to vote against the rule.

The rule gives us an opportunity to vote up or down. It denies us the opportunity to take a lot of amendments and to change what the bill was.

And about transshipment. Transshipment is an international problem.

Let me make it abundantly clear that transshipment is a problem for the United States and that is the reason why special consideration was given in this bill where the offending countries are not only penalized, but it is governed by the International Trade Commission, the World Trade Organization, and if these countries in the sub-Saharan can manage to export and reimport the type of goods that the supporters of the amendments are talking about, we would know it in a hurry. Believe me, these countries are in such despair economically that they are only trying to participate.

I ask Members to support the rule, give these African countries a chance. We promised it to them. Let us not deny it through a parliamentary procedure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule on H.R. 1432, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. Unfortunately, the rule does not permit a perfecting amendment which would require that apparel receiving duty-free and quota-free treatment be constructed of U.S.-manufactured yarn and fabric, as is the law today on imports from the Caribbean basin, another group of impoverished people.

In its current form, H.R. 1432 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, particularly China that has avoided quotas in the past. In actuality, the bill could throw thousands of U.S. workers out of their jobs.

Over my years in Congress, I have supported many trade agreements that have produced positive results. However, I believe trade agreements should give American workers a fair shake, not hurt them. As it stands, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act will only produce negative results.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1100

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This restrictive rule prevents most Members of Congress from offering any amendments to perfect this bill and to ensure that it is the people of Africa who will benefit from this legislation.

This rule makes it impossible to require that the benefits provided by the United States under this legislation be granted only if the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa employ African workers in the production of goods granted preferential market access to the United States.

I favor the goals of this bill to provide a foundation for strong democracy and a sustainable social and economic development in Africa. However, I cannot sanction legislation that, in its current form, promotes these goals at the expense of African workers, the very sector of society upon which future economic development relies. At the very least, we must promote an economic foundation for Africa which has as its cornerstone the provision of the ample employment opportunities for the indigenous citizens and permanent residents.

Were this a fair rule, I would have been allowed to offer a simple but vital amendment. My amendment would have required that the benefits provided in this legislation, including duty-free and quota-free access to U.S. markets, only be afforded to those African countries if the goods produced were created by a work force that is composed of at least 80 percent permanent resident workers. In addition, my amendment would have required that these countries avoid the use of indentured, bonded, forced, convict or exploited child labor in the manufacture of these goods.

My colleagues say that this is not going to happen, that this is not possible, that the ocean is too far. Well, let me explain to my colleagues that the Chinese garment makers send to the northern Mariana Islands goods woven in China, cut in China, and assembled in the northern Marianas by the Chinese workers, a totally controlled work force that is indentured, that is bonded, where the young people are forced into forced abortions and into prostitution. It is a simple matter for the Chinese to do the same thing in Africa, because it is very clear why they are there. They can get there under the U.S. quota.

This is just legalizing transshipment, and what happens is that those workers can be imported from China, from India, from Bangladesh, as they are in the Northern Marianas, and they will be there to do the work, to create the goods that my colleague held up here; they will not be created by African workers because those workers will work for far less than any of the wages that are offered to them in Africa.

This is a fact of life. We deal with it now. Almost a billion and a half dollars worth of garments comes in quota-free, duty-free from the Marianas. We should not set up a parallel system. We should not set up a parallel system in Africa.

This legislation should bestow the benefits of this bill on the African people, not on the corporations that will set up in these zones and then import their workers, workers who will have paid large amounts of money, who in fact become indentured and work for pennies a day in violation of all, all working conditions that we would consider acceptable. This bill should be sent back to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. This is actually a very great day for this institution. I believe that the American people would be very proud of the process that went into fashioning this measure. It is clearly bipartisan; it crosses ideological lines. We have some of the most conservative Members of this institution strongly supportive of the measure, and some of the most liberal.

On the Committee on Ways and Means we have the leadership, including the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) who is here on the floor, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and others who have played a role in looking at this issue.

And quite frankly, while we hear about this question of whether or not we are allowing for the free flow of ideas here on the floor, the opportunity existed there in the Committee on Ways and Means. And frankly, as this measure moved, there was very little debate, but opportunity for it, and we also saw that there were no amendments when this measure moved out on a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that there is a complete open process with every germane amendment that is considered under the international relations portion, and I should praise my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, who has also worked long and hard on this.

So what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is I believe a measure which is really based on goals that we as Americans and as Democrats and Republicans share. Every one of us clearly wants to help the poorest and most disadvantaged among us. Every one of us wants to encourage individuals to help themselves, and so this measure is really based on the proverb, ''Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach him to fish and he will eat for a lifetime.''

As we look at the problems that my friend Mr. RANGEL mentioned of Sub-Saharan Africa, it is a very tragic history that I am very pleased to say is beginning to turn around. Sub-Saharan Africa is the only place on the face of the Earth where actually the children are doing worse than their grandparents.

As we look at the last 2 decades, what has existed in the United States? We have continued to funnel more and more U.S. taxpayer assistance to Africa. We, in fact, have followed the policy of aid, not trade. Well, with this measure we are by 180 degrees, I am happy to say, reversing that pattern, and we know that it is going to create the kind of opportunity that is necessary there, not only for people who are recognizing free markets and political pluralism in Sub-Saharan Africa, but also for the people of the United States of America who are going to also be beneficiaries.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), was also right as he in the Committee on Rules yesterday talked about how we have spent years focusing on Asia and Latin America, and unfortunately, we have not put enough attention on that very, very important and most impoverished spot on the face of the Earth, Sub-Saharan Africa.

So this measure, Mr. Speaker, is going to be beneficial. We are not going to be seeing countries using Sub-Saharan Africa as a launching pad to export into the United States, because again, as Mr. RANGEL said, we clearly will be able to differentiate between those goods that are coming from Sub-Saharan Africa and those that might come from other parts of the world, and we know that there is a 35 percent value-added content that is required, so we will have U.S. customs and, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) said, the World Trade Organization and other entities very closely monitoring that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good measure. I am very pleased that it has come out under Republican leadership here in the House of Representatives, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the measure as we move forward.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, every Member in this body wants to help Africa and African workers. So do I. But I do not want to help Africa and African workers at the expense of America and American workers.

Now, I support the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), his philosophy and ideology all the way through, and I believe him when he says that we will minimize that transshipment opportunity that exists in the bill. But quite frankly, I believe the gentleman, but the law says something else.

I say to my colleagues, this is not the African Growth and Opportunity Act, this is the Chinese-Japanese Growth and Opportunity Act for the following reason. I would like to explain it.

The bill defines an African product as one that contains at least 35 percent local value, African local value. Now, that is the standard minimum for the GSP program, which is the Generalized System of Preference. And understand that this bill does not specifically address that, but by God, we should, with record trade deficits year in and year out. And the silence is deafening.

I have not opposed the rule because quite frankly, I think the Republicans have had some fair and generous open rules, and Mr. LINDER and Mr. SOLOMON have done a great job, but let me tell my colleagues something. I believe this rule should be defeated because I believe we open up a window of opportunity for Japan and China and other competitors who have great access, who deny American access, and they will use that window of opportunity to continue to penetrate our markets.

How many more record trade deficits will we experience? How many more jobs do we send overseas? Our biggest export is American jobs. In addition, this bill authorizes the program for 10 years. I believe Congress should limit that so that we can actually find out, not guesstimate, what the impact will be on our jobs and our economy, and then we could have revisited this in Congress with statistics. But I understand the program, and this is a political good one because everybody does want to help Africa, and Africa deserves our help.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this to my colleagues on the Democrat side. We have been talking about trade for years. We have done nothing about trade, except open up our markets and allow us to get the shaft. If Congress embraces and challenges any stupid policy, it will be our trade policy, and we are failing to do that. So I cannot support this rule.

I will support Chairman MOAKLEY, and I will say this. I would like to see it go back to the Committee on Rules so we could put these protections in, and mine says it shall be at least 50 percent local value. That will help Africa, that will help African workers, and that will protect the American economy and American workers. We do not have to kill the bill. Send it back for another rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of hearing my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and rarely do they wind up on the same side. My hope would have been that they wound up on the same side that was right. Unfortunately, I believe they wound up on the side that was wrong, because when we analyze this legislation, it will do none of what they claim, quite frankly.

Just as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), indicated that we want to exchange aid for trade, it makes sense to do it with Sub-Saharan Africa, it makes sense to do it with Israel. We created a free trade agreement with Israel which allowed them to earn rather than to receive the aid that we provided. There should be no one who would fear a textile import flood from Sub-Saharan Africa. It just is not going to happen. The two countries that do have a bit of a textile production, Mauritius and Kenya, are less than 1 percent of United States imports.

The thing I think everyone has to realize is that because the United States signed the World Trade Organization, quotas will be phased out beginning in 2005. All this does is give those Sub-Saharan African nations a few years' head start before we phase out the quotas. That is entirely appropriate and fair to allow them to begin to earn their way instead of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, if my colleagues are concerned about point of origin or transshipment, and we certainly are, there are many parts of the world that utilize their locations as a drop stop, repackage and send-on. That is not what we intend and that this bill does not allow. The country of origin rules are as stringent as we have in place anywhere for any country.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) was concerned about the 35 percent domestic content. It requires a 35 percent domestic content and substantial transformation. That is, one has to do things to the product. One cannot just pass it through.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, placed an amendment in the bill denying the opportunity to be involved in this trade for 2 years if one is found guilty of transshipment, a very rigid penalty that had not been included before. I think it is appropriate. We need to make sure that people do not violate the rules.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues need to understand that all of the other trade rules that we have in place are not suspended. The arguments that were made for the textile concerns in the Caribbean I think carried great weight. Given the proximity of the Caribbean, given the ability to move product through the Caribbean, there was some concern.

No one can present a credible economic argument for the utilization of Sub-Saharan Africa the way that the Caribbean could have been used because it is simply not economic, dealing with textiles, to make the same argument. One cannot pencil out a cost-effective argument the way one could this in the Caribbean.

Besides all of that, the Generalized System of Preference, which protects sensitive industries in the United States, is completely available to that textile industry or any other industry if they have import-sensitive products and make their point. The full weight of the Federal Government in denying the importation of products is available under the Generalized System of Preferences.

So this bill is not, unfortunately, all that its strongest proponents claim it to be; it is a modest, modest, long overdue, self-help structure. And it is nowhere near its strongest proponents' arguments because it simply is not going to open the flood gates the way my colleagues have intimated.

☐ 1115

It is a well-crafted bill. The thing I could say most about it is that it is probably long overdue. It is entirely appropriate.

The United States has nothing to fear from sub-Sahara Africa, and if we do, we have in place a number of protections that are automatic and they trigger severe penalties. This is a reasonable rule. More importantly, it is a modest and reasonable proposal. We should vote yes on the rule; we should vote yes on this long overdue opportunity to allow people to earn their own way with a free trade zone between the United States and sub-Sahara Africa.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge very strong support of the rule. A vote against this rule will really be a vote against this bill. This bill will not come back up if this rule fails today. If in fact we lose this rule, we are not going to be able to bring this bill because the whole essence of this bill is the whole issue of trade and textiles.

I will tell the Members, there is a lot of misleading information that has been passed around over the last few months. This bill will not do any damage to the U.S. textile industry. The fact of the matter is that right now, Africa gives about two-thirds of 1 percent of all U.S. textiles to the United States. In 10 years under this legislation, it will only go up to about 1½ percent. That is not going to do any damage.

In fact the reality is it probably will not result in any more textiles coming to the United States than currently, mainly because we will see a displacement. Other countries in Asia will probably have less shipments of textiles as a result of this. This will only create, according to the International Trade Commission, which has done an objective study, about 600 jobs lost in the United States.

The job gain will be phenomenal over the next 10 or 20 years. Africa has 680 million people. There are 48 nations in this region that we are talking about. Thirty of them right now are moving to a market system of government and a market system of the economy, just like the United States. Twenty-five of them have fledgling democracies. Are we going to turn our backs on this great region of the world that over the next 20, 30, 50 years will be one of the regions of which all of us are going to want to be part?

Because for national security purposes, for obvious purposes of making sure that the Asian nations remain stable and the Middle East remains stable, Africa will be essential to the security of the free world and certainly of the United States.

A vote against this bill will break up the partnership between the United States and the African nations. The fact is that the President, in the next 3 weeks, will be going to Africa. If we turn this bill down, it will be a disgrace to this country.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I find it unfortunate that those of us who are not members of the Committee on Ways and Means are unable to offer amendments to this bill. As someone who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, we have 13 bills a year. Each one is brought here under an open rule. So we have open opportunity in our bills for people to offer amendments, and it is unfortunate we are not allowed to on this bill.

I went to the Committee on Rules yesterday with an amendment that I thought was a very fair amendment, that was going to be good to help improve the bill, which was basically to take unused sugar quota and give it to the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. It was going to help those countries. But just because of a blanket opposition to all amendments, it was unfortunate, but it was turned down.

What my amendment was proposing was to take these unused quotas. We have this program called the Sugar Program, one of the last of its type in this country, thank goodness. It is a command and control type system where we control the supply of sugar in America, and force the price of sugar at twice the world price in this country, so we pay twice the world price. When we buy sugar from around the world, and we have to buy sugar because we cannot grow enough in this country, we pay places like Australia twice the world price. Some countries cannot fill their quotas.

All we want to do is say if you cannot fill your quota, let us give it to the 10 countries of sub-Saharan Africa that need to have this economic growth. They would love to sell us more sugar because we will pay them twice as much as anywhere else around the world.

We have this crazy program that makes no economic sense. It costs jobs already in this country. It is bad for the environment, it is bad for the economy, it is just big government at its worst. All we are saying is let this program exist. We have these quotas, but some of them are not filled. Why not give them to the 10 countries of sub-Sahara Africa, rather than leave them unused and no one else can use them?

I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules has a blanket opposition to all amendments without considering the merits. I rise in opposition to the rule and urge its defeat.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill embodies a very, very important ideal, which I have long supported; namely, that the countries of sub-Saharan Africa should improve their economic lot through development and trade. This bill would begin the process of leading these countries from our traditional direct aid relationship.

However, Mr. Speaker, charity begins at home. I and other bipartisan Members with legitimate concerns for the health of the already suffering textile and apparel industries that we represent feel that we have not been allowed an adequate voice in this process. For this reason, my colleagues and I proposed a bipartisan substitute that we hoped that the Committee on Rules would have ruled in order.

I firmly believe that our substitute, if it were ruled in order, would result in a healthier U.S. textile and cotton industry, and sorely needed economic development and employment for the peoples of sub-Saharan Africa. The sponsors of this substitute only ask for the chance to vote for a good bill on the floor.

We ask this, despite assurances from some of our colleagues, that the bill will be fixed in the Senate. But as I have reminded those Members, those of us who occupy the seats in this House only have a vote in this House, and trusting the Senate to fix what we do not do properly in the House is not a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule, send it back, allow us to adopt the substitute, which is a win-win for American textiles as well as for sub-Saharan Africa. Help us defeat this rule, vote no on the rule, and then let us put a good bill on the floor so we can help Africa and help American workers.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will talk slowly, because I want him to understand what I have to say. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked: What has been the most difficult vote for you to cast in Congress? The most difficult votes for me are those on trade issues.

I fully understand the importance of expanding trade legislation, and the American worker understands its importance, also. There is not an American worker who does not take pride in manufacturing a product and having it sold worldwide. But that same worker knows that while the U.S. has aggressively lowered or eliminated many of its barriers to foreign products, most countries are still closed to U.S. products. These workers believe that trade bills export jobs and not products. Time after time they have seen the trade agreements we have enacted result in a few hundred jobs lost here, a few hundred jobs lost there, and Mr. Speaker, those numbers add up.

More importantly, those numbers represent families in communities losing income and economic strength. Those are the same workers that used to walk in a store and see the ''Made in the U.S.A.'' label sewn in the garment. Today, that same worker sees the same label ''Made Anywhere But the U.S.A.'' That is salt in the wound to those who have seen their jobs exported and the products they used to make imported.

Yesterday, a Member of this body, as well as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, made a powerful statement before the Committee on Rules. He said, it is time that we give up on textile jobs. He added, we need to recognize, too, that it is too late to save these industries.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of a statement is exactly what the people of this country are angry about. They know that there are Members of Congress who have forgotten that the U.S. textile industry employs some 2 million people in this country, and most of those workers do not have the security of a higher education or the security of a trade or profession, as does a lawyer or a college professor.

Mr. Speaker, just this past week the Bibb Company textile mill located in Columbus, Georgia, announced that it would close its door March 20. That means that of thousands of textile jobs in Georgia, we lose some 250 more. Mr. Speaker, textile workers in this country deserve to know that legislators have not given up on their jobs.

The amendment I would have offered today, if the Committee on Rules had made it in order, would have provided that American workers receive some benefits from this trade bill. It would have guaranteed that the demand for U.S. products is as important to this body as creating jobs in Africa. Mr. Speaker, if the rules of origin and the GSP product exemptions were good enough to put in NAFTA, then they are good enough to put in this sub-Saharan Africa trade bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have tremendous respect for my colleagues in this Chamber, particularly the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, but Mr. Speaker, I must represent the people of the Third District of Georgia. I strongly urge defeat of this rule, defeat of this bill. I will not give up on American textile jobs, which represent the livelihoods of families in Georgia and the economic strength of communities all across this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not a textile bill. This is a bill that gives Africa the same opportunities to enter the world economy that Asia had. We gave it to them 35 or 40 years ago.

When I was in Africa in 1961 in Ghana, Ghana and Korea were exactly in the same place. Today, Korea has risen to the 11th largest economy in the world, and Ghana is down from where they were in 1961.

This bill has been endorsed by the President and Prime Minister of every Asian and African country. Andrew Young, a former United Nations Ambassador, C. Payne Lewis of Africare, the Urban Institute, the National Conference of Mayors, Mayor Dinkins of New York, and the Constituency for Africa, all these groups have looked at this and said this gives Africa an opportunity to play the game.

The amendment that was being discussed here could have been offered in the Committee on Ways and Means. It was not. We went out of there without that being discussed, because people knew that it was not, in the long run, a good amendment. It is not a textile amendment. It sets the bar so high that no one could start a textile industry in Africa.

If we say that every piece of cloth that is going to be worked in Africa has to be shipped from the United States, cut, and only can be sold in Africa, and then shipped back, it would not work fiscally, even. It is not a good amendment. I support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the President and Secretary of State to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), as well as an editorial from the Washington Post.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1998]

HOW TO HELP AFRICA

The House is scheduled to vote next week on an African trade bill. In the past, that would have been an oxymoron. The United States traded with Asia and Europe but sent aid to sub-Saharan Africa. This new approach, which treats African nations more as partners than as charities, is welcome—though not sufficient.

Many of the world's poorest people inhabit Africa, their economies in danger of being left behind altogether as trade and investment unite the rest of the world. But in recent years, the true picture has not been quite as gloomy as news reports on civil wars and coups d'etat might suggest. Many African countries have moved toward democracy and free-market reforms. Many are trying to spend more on basic health and primary education. Many want to help themselves and not depend forever on foreign aid.

This bill is aimed at those nations. It was put together by Republican Rep. Philip Crane and Democrats Charles Rangel, Jim McDermott and William Jefferson, and embraced by the Clinton administration. It would seek to encourage trade between Africa and the United States by removing quotas and many tariffs from the kinds of products these poor nations could most plausibly export: textiles, clothing, footwear. It would stimulate and insure private U.S. investment in Africa, and create forums for African and American businessmen to cooperate.

The legislation carries a tiny price tag, but some in the House and Senate oppose it for protectionist reasons. Yet African textiles now account for only two-thirds of one percent of total U.S. textile imports and are unlikely to rise above 2 percent even in the most optimistic (by African lights) scenarios. Africa's industry is not a threat to the U.S. economy.

A more serious objection—though not a disqualifying one—is that this bill will accomplish less than some rhetoric suggests. For countries as poor as those in sub-Saharan Africa, where average annual per capita income hovers below $500, trade and investment alone can't do the job. Aid remains essential, as the bill's authors acknowledge, and yet U.S. assistance to Africa declined by 25 percent during the past two years. This trade bill can help, but only in combination with effective aid and substantial debt relief.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

DEAR MR. RANGEL: The African Growth and Opportunity Act, H.R. 1432, is scheduled for a floor vote today. Passage of this landmark legislation is one of our highest legislative priorities. As you know, President Clinton made a strong statement in support of the bill during the State of the Union speech.

Passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act will send an important signal to Africa that we will help those countries which help themselves by pursuing sound economic and political reform policies. The Act will provide substantial trade and debt relief benefits to those African countries which are undertaking significant economic reforms. The African Growth and Opportunity Act will help African countries improve their own business climates so that U.S. companies can better compete in the important emerging markets of Africa.

We believe the legislation contains adequate provisions to prevent injury to U.S. industries and jobs. The impact on U.S. consumers, workers and industries must be assessed by the International Trade Commission (ITC) before the President is authorized to grant the additional duty-free preferential market access provided by the Bill. A recent ITC study of the textile provisions in the Act concluded that duty-free, quota-free entry of textile and apparel products from Africa would have a negligible impact on U.S. industries and workers.

This critical legislation will advance one of our most important foreign policy goals in Africa—integration of African countries into the global economy. The approximately 600 million consumers in Africa deserve a better future. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is an important first step in that direction, and I strongly urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1998.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHARLIE: I strongly support passage of H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which would provide enhanced trade benefits for sub-Saharan countries engaged in meaningful reform efforts.

The United States strongly supports a stable, prosperous Africa. Africa is a continent on the doorstep of a new era of democracy and prosperity, and many countries have adopted market-oriented economic and political reforms in the past seven years. A stronger, stable, prosperous Africa will be a better economic partner, a better partner for security and peace, and a better partner in the fight against drug trafficking, international crime, terrorism, the spread of disease and environmental degradation. Africa is already an important trading partner for the United States. Our exports to Africa are over $6 billion annually.

In addition, America has its own special reasons to contribute to Africa's economic development. Over thirty million Americans have ancestral origins in Africa. We should work to help African nations achieve greater prosperity and stronger democracies, which will improve the lives of the African people. This bill helps us do that.

This bill is supported by a bipartisan and diverse cross-section of Americans and concerned groups—including Jack Kemp, David Dinkins, Andrew Young, the United States Conference of Mayors and the National Urban League. They know this bill is good for both Africa and America.

We face a historic opportunity to assist the renaissance in Africa. Congress has the chance to help this transformation by enacting the African Growth and Opportunity Act. When it comes time to cast your vote, I urge you to support this legislation.

Sincerely,

BILL.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I must urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule. I do it, raising the question as to why this Congress ought to treat Africa any differently than it treats any other continent in the world.

Why would we say to the African nations that we must send all of our cloth to them and have them work on it, when we do not say it to other countries in the world? Why do we say to Africa, we cannot trust you to work with our customs people, with our government, on the transshipments issue, when we do not say it to every other country in the world?

Transshipment is not an issue, it is an issue as old as time. Every time we had to do a trading arrangement, we worried about transshipment, and every time we do that, we deal with the transshipment question as best we can. The African nations, to me, ought to be insulted by the way we are approaching this bill, because what we are saying is we trust them less than we trust the rest of the world to cooperate with us on transshipment questions. What is the basis for that?

We have the facts in front of us. The facts say that the entry of textiles in our marketplace will have little to no effect. We disregard that and argue, as I have heard some argue, that it is going to have a tremendously deleterious effect on the jobs in our country.

It is not true at all. What it will do is have almost no effect here and a huge effect there. We ought to treat Africa the way we treat the rest of the world. There is no reason to discriminate against that continent. I hope we vote for the rule.

☐ 1130

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN).

(Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me this time.

As one of the 30 million proud Americans of African descent, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill which would provide significant economic opportunities and incentives, fueling economic growth in that region of the continent of Africa known as sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1432 is a good bill for both Africa and the United States, for Africa because this bill, which was drafted with the full input of African governments, will position Africa to favorably compete with other countries that have well-established industries and global market shares.

It is our duty and responsibility to see to it that Africa is not left behind. In addition and importantly, H.R. 1432 represents a shift from dependence on foreign assistance to a private sector and market incentives approach which will create a sustainable development strategy for the region.

This bill is important to us because it will strengthen an already important trading partner; a stronger, more stable Africa will be a better partner for us in the fight against drug trafficking, international crime, terrorism, the spread of disease and environmental degradation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1432 represents, I think, a fair compromise of all of the differing concerns that were raised about it. My colleagues and I intend to do all that we can to make sure that if this bill becomes law we continue to reinforce the positive developments taking place in Africa and see to it that it benefits, rather than harms, our American work force. I would vote for it if I could and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the passage of both the rule and the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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 am delighted to be able to follow my colleague, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN) for her very able remarks and simply to say that I disdain a closed rule. I believe in an open rule. But, frankly, if we vote against this rule, we defeat the bill.

I think it is extremely important that we get the basic facts. This is a real opportunity for the first time in the history of this Nation to promote opportunities between the United States business community, small and medium, and the continent of Africa, 48 sub-Saharan states.

I believe in the sensitivities and the needs of my friends in the textile industry. I believe in workers' rights. I believe in helping Africa cure its HIV problem. But I think that as we move toward trade and creating opportunities, we can work on these concerns, insist upon working and resolving these concerns, not only in conference committee but in the Senate.

If Members take the opportunity away to move this bill forward, they take the opportunity away for us to get legislation passed that does several things: $500 million in infrastructure that American businesses can engage with Africa and help them to produce the infrastructure system that they need, $150 million in joint venturing. When I had a conference in my district, many, many people came to that conference, small- and medium-sized businesses, the backbone of America, because they want a joint venture with Africans creating jobs in the respective districts and communities around this Nation.

We have a real opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to do something good to establish a relationship with a continent that has been colonized by our brothers and sisters in Europe. We have not had that kind of baggage. Americans can create the kind of economic security for its citizens by supporting this bill, supporting this rule, working with us in conference, working with us in the United States Senate and helping our friends in the textile community, as well as encouraging them to work in combination with Africa.

The transshipment question has been answered. Diplomats have told me, we are strengthening our Customs laws. Diplomats have told me, we will be watching for dumping and we have a monitoring system. This bill takes care of human rights. This bill allows these countries to move their economic standards up.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new day for Africa. This is not an exclusion of aid, for aid is needed. My personal commitment is to work on the question of HIV infection. But this does create a partnership for aid and trade and opportunities for Americans in inner city communities all over this country.

Vote for the rule and let us move to a new level with the continent of Africa.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair inform my colleague and me of the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. There has been a lot of discussion this morning about the merits or lack of merits of particular amendments. Unfortunately, a number of those amendments will never get to be debated on the floor, and that is why we should be opposing the rule.

If the Committee on Rules had made various amendments in order for debate, we could have debated and understood the pros and cons of those amendments and the body could have worked its will. That is what democracy is all about. We could have tried to improve this bill. And if the majority had voted against our improvements, then at least the opportunity would have been provided. That is what democracy is all about.

Instead, the Committee on Rules decided that it was going to enact its own fast track legislation. Basically what it said was, we are not going to give you an opportunity to allow democracy to work. We are going to bring this bill to the floor, not give you an opportunity to offer amendments, not give you an opportunity for debate, not give the body the opportunity to work its will on a majority basis. We are going to deprive you of your rights as Members of this body. That, in and of itself, regardless of the merits of the amendments, is enough to justify a vote against the rule.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, send it back, send out these amendments and let us debate them on the floor.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This is a modified closed rule and it does not permit the consideration of vital elements that are missing from H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which should indeed be an historical beginning. The act is well-meaning legislation, a purpose and concept which I support, and in fact I am an original cosponsor of this bill. If perfected by the proposed substitute, it could help facilitate the economic growth, opportunity and self-reliance in Africa that each of us supports.

First, while it intends to provide jobs for Africa in its current form, it will take jobs from America. It takes jobs from America because it allows yarn to be imported to Africa from other countries, countries whose labor standards are lower, and would give them an unfair advantage over American workers.

Second, the act proposes to encourage the building of a textile industry in Africa, but instead it discourages and destroys because only as little as 35 percent of the textile or apparel must be manufactured in Africa. Under the act in its current form, nations such as China and other Asian nations with cheaper labor could benefit, leaving Africa as a nation to benefit very little.

Third, the act makes a weak and feeble attempt at preventing the illegal shipping of apparel by an unintended beneficiary nation and would again leave Africa in a deficit position.

Finally, the act does not effectively address human and workers' rights and does not effectively address child labor restrictions.

For these and many other reasons, I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and make sure we have a historical, meaningful bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this closed rule. Several of us have tried in the Committee on Rules to offer amendments to attach labor, environmental, and human rights standards to this measure. We were denied that by the Committee on Rules and by the closed rule.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, so-called, is just like fast track. There are no environmental, there are no human rights, there are no labor rights safeguards. It is just like CBI, the Caribbean Basin Initiative. There are no labor standards, there are no environmental standards, there are no human rights standards. And it is just like the North American Free Trade Agreement. Again, there are no environmental standards, there are no worker safety standards.

There are no labor standards of any kind, or human rights standards, in this bill. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill is misnamed. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act should be known as the ''NAFTA Expansion to Africa Act.''

We should have learned something from the North American Free Trade Agreement. When we pass these trade agreements and we do not put environmental standards in, we do not put labor standards in, we do not protect workers in both, in all the countries involved, ours and theirs, we end up costing American jobs. We end up exploiting workers in those countries, whether it is Mexico, whether it is in the Caribbean, whether it is in Africa, whether it is in China, however we write these trade agreements.

And we ultimately hurt people in both countries. We hurt workers in the United States. We hurt workers in Africa. You lock in the exploitative conditions of those workers in those countries so their standards of living never improve.

Go to the Mexican border, go into homes in Mexico where two people, a home I visited, two people, both working for a major American auto company, do not make enough money, husband and wife, to have electricity in their home, to have running water in the home. That is what we are doing when we lock in these kinds of trade agreements without human rights, without worker safety standards, without labor rights, without environmental standards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for defeat of the closed rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, that last speaker has just energized my chairman, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have said enough on the bill and the rule itself, but I have to take exception with my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The gentleman appeared before the Committee on Rules. He had a very complex amendment. It dealt with both the Ways and Means aspects and the International Relations aspects. We explained to him that if he could remove the Ways and Means implication from his amendment, we would certainly make it in order. I know that he attempted to do that, but nevertheless the Parliamentarian still ruled that his amendment dealt with the Ways and Means implications and, therefore, could not be made in order.

The gentleman should not take the well and talk about a closed rule when it is not a closed rule. It is a modified open rule, and it would behoove him to state the explanation of the rule correctly, especially if he wants to come up to the Committee on Rules and have us treat him fairly, as we usually do.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my last speaker on this modified closed rule is the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear what this bill is about. This bill will allow 42 African countries to ship textile and apparel products, clothing, to this country free of any duties, that run as high as 30 percent and average 18 percent, and free of any quotas now and forever more.

How good a deal is this? This is a better deal than Mexico gets under NAFTA. It is a better deal than any of 26 Caribbean countries get under the Caribbean Basin Initiative. It is unprecedented. It is unilateral. We get nothing in return. There is no reciprocity for our textile and apparel products entering these 42 countries. It is wide-open access.

Let us be clear about this. When we open our ports wide open to exports from these 42 African countries, we will not see African goods coming through our ports. We are going to see goods made in Asia. They may make the labels in Africa, but they will be transshipped through Africa from countries like China and Hong Kong and Pakistan and Macao, who already are notorious for transshipping. The volumes run into the billions and the problems that are sweeping Asia now are only going to make them more prone to transshipment. And the prospect of Africa as a duty-free, quota-free transit point will be too much for them to resist and too much for our Customs Service to police.

☐ 1145

And who will bear the brunt of all these imports? Sixty percent of all apparel workers, 60 to 70 percent in this country, are women. More than half of them are minorities. Most of them are African-Americans.

This bill not only affects textiles and apparel, it also affects carbon and stainless steel, ferroalloys, footwear, leather products and wine. That is because these products now enjoy an exemption from the Generalized System of Preferences, GSP, and this bill removes that full or limited exemption.

Now, everybody knows where I am coming from. I have a constituency with a lot of good, hard-working textile workers who simply want the right to earn their way in our economy, nothing more. So my colleagues know what my interest in it is.

But do not take my word for it. Listen to what Randall Robinson said in a scathing critique of this bill. Everybody knows he is an eloquent, outspoken advocate for Africa, and has been for many years. He calls this bill, his words, ''an Africa de facto re-colonization act.'' At the end of his scathing analysis he says, ''Absent significant changes, this bill combines the worst of NAFTA and the harsh IMF structural adjustment program.''

Well, we have significant changes. We have an amendment offered by two Republicans and three Democrats, offered yesterday in the Committee on Rules, which would give Africa special access, give them basically the same kind of access that the Caribbean countries and Mexico enjoy today, gives them substantial privileges and, furthermore, imposes some realistic, tough transshipment remedies here, if indeed the transshipment problem does occur after these special access benefits kick in.

Mr. Speaker, all we wanted was a chance to argue the merits of our amendment. It is a sad day in the House when we cannot come here and argue on behalf of our constituents. I urge a ''no'' vote against this rule so we can have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, ''The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act'' will allow textile and apparel imports to come from Africa to our country duty free and quota free Neither Mexico under NAFTA nor the Caribbean countries under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) enjoy such wide-open access to our markets. Most of the imports will not be made in Africa. They will be made in Asia and transshipped through Africa to avoid quotas and tariffs. Countries like China and Pakistan and Hong Kong are notorious for transshipping now; the financial problems sweeping Asia will make them only more prone to transship; and the prospect of Africa as a duty-free, quota-free transit will be too much to resist.

Who will bear the brunt of all these imports? 60% of all U.S. apparel workers are women, 35% are minorities, mostly African-American. U.S. apparel workers earn better wages than ever and many enjoy health benefits. The local apparel plant is often the anchor business in a small town or one of the few job sources in the inner city. These are the workers this bill will hurt.

Eight countries in Africa have been identified by the U.S. Customs Service as transit points for illegal shipments of Chinese textile and apparel goods. This transshipment is occurring now just to evade China's quotas. The Africa Free Trade Bill will increase the rewards of quota evasion by eliminating all tariffs. Profits from transshipment will increase by the amount of the tariffs evaded, which average 18% on apparel and run as high as 30%. The result will be an explosion of transshipment through Africa, which will be all but impossible for customs to police. Another result: rampant transshipment will remove the incentive for investment in African apparel production.

This bill not only affects textiles and apparel; it also affects carbon and stainless steel, ferroalloys, footwear, leather, and wine. These products now enjoy either an exemption from the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) or limited application of GSP. The Africa Free Trade bill removes all such exemptions, and subjects these products to competition with duty-free imports from sub-Saharan Africa. Included among these countries is South Africa, an industrially developed country which recently completed the world's largest, most modern steel plant.

Yesterday, Randall Robinson of TransAfrica blasted this bill as ''an Africa de facto re-colonization act.'' The bill adds a long list of mandates that Africa countries must meet to obtain GSP benefits which no countries anywhere else are required to satisfy. The receive aid and trade benefits under this bill, African countries are required to lower corporate taxes, to sell off government-owned industries, and to give national treatment to foreign capital (aka MAI). But they are not required to protect human rights or religious freedom or the environment.

Randall Robinson has written members of the House a letter saying, ''Under the cover of an appealing name and non-binding preamble, this bill contains numerous provisions aimed at benefiting large foreign private investors and multi-national corporations at the expense of true and equitable African development. The bill assaults the sovereignty of African countries in ways not present in our dealings with other countries . . . Absent significant changes, this bill combines the worse of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the harsh International Monetary Fund structural adjustment program.''

Our amendment proposes ''significant changes'' to the bill to protect African workers and American workers alike. Our amendment:

Protects U.S. textile workers by limiting duty-free, quota-free access to apparel that is made in Africa out of fabric made and cut in the United States. What we propose is very similar to the ''special access'' benefits enjoyed by Mexico in NAFTA and by Caribbean countries in CBI.

Protects U.S. cotton growers and synthetic fiber producers by requiring use of their yarn in apparel that is eligible for duty-free, quota-free access.

Protects other industries hurt by changes to GSP made in H.R. 1432, such as ferroalloys, footwear, stainless steel, and wine.

Adds accountability to the bill. Every African garment sold in the U.S. can be traced to U.S. fabric pieces shipped to Africa, which greatly reduces the opportunity for transshipment.

Adds tough enforcement measures to punish transshipment, including higher penalties for fraud and gross negligence. It limits the mitigation process, which allows Customs to forgive up to 100% of transshipment fines, and restores Customs' authority to seize transshipped goods.

Requires African countries to cooperate with U.S. Customs and allow full access in its investigations of transshipment.

De-links textile and apparel benefits from GSP benefits, maintaining the textile and apparel exemption from GSP.

In summary, our amendment raises the benefits of the bill to Africa by ensuring that apparel imports coming from Africa will be produced in Africa by Africans.

Some $43 billion in clothing and apparel were imported into this country last year. This industry has surrendered well over half the domestic market to developing countries. Before we decimate what is left of our domestic market with a new barrage of low-wage imports, or open the door to even more transshipment and evasion, let us have a chance to make the case for our amendment. It allows sub-Saharan Africa special access that is as good in most respects as NAFTA and CBI, and that in some respects is better because it levies no duties at all on eligible textiles and apparel. Our amendment is well conceived and carefully crafted; it deserves to be part of this debate; and members deserve the chance to vote on it. Since the rule denies us this chance, we should vote it down.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to urge everyone in the Chamber and everyone listening and watching to vote for this rule.

There is no question on the resolution that some of the amendments others had wished to be debated were not put in order and will not be debated, under a longstanding practice in this House of not opening up the Ways and Means jurisdictional areas with respect to taxes. Anyone can imagine the kinds of mischief that could be created on this floor if people could openly amend any portion of the Ways and Means jurisdiction in respect to taxes.

So to the extent it is a closed rule, it is a modified closed rule. There will be several amendments offered, longstanding opportunity for debate on this bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). 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 227, nays 190, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—227

Ackerman	Goodling	Packard
Allen	Goss	Pappas
Archer	Granger	Parker
Armey	Greenwood	Paul
Baker	Hall (OH)	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Hamilton	Payne
Bartlett	Hansen	Pease
Bass	Hastert	Peterson (PA)
Bateman	Hastings (FL)	Petri
Becerra	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Bentsen	Hayworth	Pombo
Bereuter	Hefley	Pomeroy
Berman	Herger	Porter
Bilbray	Hill	Portman
Bilirakis	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Bliley	Hoekstra	Quinn
Blumenauer	Horn	Radanovich
Blunt	Houghton	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hulshof	Rangel
Boehner	Hutchinson	Regula
Brown (FL)	Hyde	Roemer
Bryant	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rogan
Burr		Rohrabacher
Burton	Jefferson	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jenkins	Roukema
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ryun
Cannon	Kasich	Salmon
Cardin	Kelly	Sanchez
Castle	Kilpatrick	Saxton
Chabot	Kim	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Kind (WI)	Schaefer, Dan
Christensen	King (NY)	Schaffer, Bob
Cook	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Klug	Sessions
Coyne	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Crane	Kolbe	Shaw
Crapo	LaHood	Shays
Cubin	Largent	Shimkus
Davis (FL)	Latham	Shuster
Davis (VA)	LaTourette	Skaggs
DeGette	Lazio	Skeen
DeLay	Leach	Skelton
Diaz-Balart	Levin	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Linder	Smith (OR)
Doggett	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Dooley	Lofgren	Smith, Adam
Doolittle	Lowey	Smith, Linda
Dreier	Lucas	Snowbarger
Dunn	Manzullo	Solomon
Ehlers	Markey	Souder
Engel	Martinez	Stearns
English	Matsui	Stump
Ensign	McCarthy (NY)	Sununu
Eshoo	McCrery	Talent
Ewing	McDade	Tauscher
Farr	McDermott	Tauzin
Fawell	McHugh	Thomas
Fazio	McInnis	Thune
Foley	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Forbes	McKeon	Towns
Ford	McKinney	Upton
Fossella	McNulty	Vento
Fowler	Meek (FL)	Walsh
Fox	Meeks (NY)	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Menendez	Watkins
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Watts (OK)
Gallegly	Moran (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Morella	Weller
Gibbons	Nethercutt	White
Gilchrest	Neumann	Whitfield
Gillmor	Northup	Wolf
Gingrich	Nussle	Woolsey
Goodlatte	Oxley	Wynn

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Bishop	Callahan
Aderholt	Blagojevich	Canady
Andrews	Bonilla	Carson
Bachus	Bonior	Chambliss
Baesler	Borski	Clay
Baldacci	Boswell	Clayton
Ballenger	Boucher	Clement
Barcia	Boyd	Clyburn
Barr	Brown (CA)	Coble
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Coburn
Berry	Bunning	Collins
Combest	Jones	Pickering
Condit	Kanjorski	Pickett
Conyers	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cooksey	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Costello	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Cramer	Kennelly	Riley
Cummings	Kildee	Rivers
Cunningham	Kleczka	Rogers
Danner	Klink	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Deal	LaFalce	Sabo
DeFazio	Lampson	Sanders
Delahunt	Lantos	Sandlin
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sanford
Deutsch	Lewis (KY)	Sawyer
Dingell	Lipinski	Schumer
Dixon	LoBiondo	Scott
Doyle	Luther	Serrano
Duncan	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sisisky
Ehrlich	Manton	Slaughter
Emerson	Mascara	Snyder
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Spence
Evans	McCollum	Spratt
Everett	McGovern	Stabenow
Filner	McHale	Stark
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Stenholm
Frost	Meehan	Stokes
Gejdenson	Metcalf	Strickland
Gephardt	Millender-McDonald	Stupak
Gilman		Tanner
Goode	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Gordon	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Graham	Minge	Thompson
Green	Mink	Thornberry
Gutierrez	Moakley	Thurman
Gutknecht	Mollohan	Tierney
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Torres
Hefner	Murtha	Traficant
Hilleary	Myrick	Turner
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez
Hinchey	Neal	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Ney	Waters
Holden	Norwood	Watt (NC)
Hooley	Oberstar	Waxman
Hostettler	Obey	Wexler
Hoyer	Olver	Weygand
Hunter	Ortiz	Wicker
Inglis	Owens	Wise
Istook	Pallone	Yates
Jackson (IL)	Pastor	Young (AK)
John	Pelosi	Young (FL)
Johnson (WI)	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—14

Barton	Gonzalez	Riggs
Brady	Harman	Rodriguez
Fattah	Pascrell	Schiff
Furse	Poshard	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Redmond	

□ 1211

Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Messrs. NEY, YOUNG of Alaska, LAMPSON, CUNNINGHAM, WISE, HALL of Texas, RAHALL, DIXON, OWENS, SERRANO and SCHUMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT). Pursuant to House Resolution 383 and rule XXIII, 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. 1432.

□ 1213

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. 1432) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, with Mr. SNOWBARGER 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 New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. CRANE), and the gentleman from New York, (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

□ 1215

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.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I have some reservations concerning the textile provisions in this bill, I do rise in strong support of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, H.R. 1432.

This legislation is a result of years of bipartisan congressional efforts to develop a comprehensive trade and development policy toward the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. On May 22 and June 25 of last year, the Subcommittee on Africa and the full Committee on International Relations held markups on this important legislation. On both dates, it was approved by voice with strong backing on both sides of the aisle.

This legislation promotes economic reform through free trade initiatives, creation of equity and infrastructure funds, the refocusing of development assistance, and the creation of special advisory committees on sub-Saharan Africa for the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Under its provisions, the President is directed to determine eligibility for benefits under this bill based on a sub-Saharan country's adherence to human rights norms and a demonstrated commitment to economic policy reforms.

Africa, as we all know, is comprised of some 48 nations. It includes over 500 million people and supplies many important natural resources to our Nation, from petroleum to uranium to timber. Trade between our Nation and Africa is greater than that between the United States and the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe combined. Yet there exist great possibilities for this trade to be expanded.

With the end of the Cold War and the demise of the apartheid regime in South Africa, sub-Saharan Africa is opening up to the world as never before. Many nations in that region are moving toward democracy, liberalizing their economies and seeking a better standard of living for their people. For the first time in almost a generation, most African countries are participating in a marked economic upturn. Often perceived as a continent of failed or declining states, Africa is now in the midst of an economic and political rebound with overall growth rates of nearly 5 percent.

As African entrepreneurs are working to convince their own governments to reduce state regulations and constraints on domestic and foreign investment, so too should we be providing the trade and investment opportunities for these emerging-market-oriented economies.

The bill before us today provides a framework and a structure to accomplish those goals. Up to the present, our development assistance programs have been at the center of our relationship with many of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. There is little doubt that these development programs, including the Development Fund for Africa, will continue to play an important role in bilateral relations with the countries of that continent. But for aid to achieve its real objectives, to be no longer necessary, it must be accompanied by the right trade and investment policies. Under this bill, we can help African governments strengthen their capacity to make good policy choices and to carry through on their effective implementation.

In 1996, trade between our Nation and sub-Saharan Africa grew at an impressive 18 percent rate. This growth rate shows no signs of declining as our trade with this emerging region continues to outpace the growth in United States global trade. Several African countries, including Senegal, Ghana, Ethiopia and Cote d'Ivoire are among the fastest growing economies in the world. The United States is the largest recipient of African exports, at nearly 20 percent, but we are only the fifth largest exporter to Africa. In short, we have ample opportunity to increase our export and investment opportunities in the region.

One of the provisions in this bill creating a U.S.-Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation will help to accomplish this objective. This forum will provide a focal point for Africa policy efforts in the U.S. Government in the same way that APEC annual meetings do for our overall economic policy toward Asia. It will also help promote the policy reform process in Africa, particularly in the trade and investment area.

Mr. Speaker, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, with its bipartisan backing from Speaker GINGRICH to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), support our interests in Africa and the aspirations of African entrepreneurs across the continent. The lowering of tariffs, the expansion of trade, the encouragement of free markets over the past decade has benefited American companies and workers alike and has served our overall foreign policy interests.

Now I urge my colleagues to let us include Africa in our trade policy for the next century. I urge adoption of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa, who has ably managed this important measure through the committee. We look forward to his continued strong leadership today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, control the balance of my time in general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the winds of change are blowing in Africa. From the end of apartheid in South Africa to the successful democratic transition of power in Botswana, tremendous economic growth in Uganda, infrastructure improvements in Ghana, the privatization of formerly state-owned industries in Mozambique, and growing stock markets in Zimbabwe and Ghana, African nations are taking the requisite steps to shed Africa's media image of poverty and conflict and recast Africa as a new frontier for investors. Today, a majority of sub-Saharan Africa's 48 countries have adopted market-oriented economic and political reforms, including open markets, privatizing industries, stabilizing their currencies, and simply making their countries more investor friendly.

As President Clinton noted, there really is a dynamic new Africa out there. African nations are looking to enhance trade, not aid, to foster their economic development and political stability. While trade cannot supplant aid entirely, at least not yet, trade is a missing link in the final leg of U.S. policy towards the continent.

The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act is America's response to positive changes in Africa, and it seeks to harness Africa's potential in a manner which benefits Africans and Americans.

Africa is already an important trading partner for the United States. Our exports to Africa have grown 14 percent over the last 2 years and are now more than $6 billion annually. Exports from my own home State of New Jersey to sub-Saharan Africa are more than $200 million. In fact, exports to Africa are 27 percent greater than our exports to all of the former Soviet Union combined. When former Secretary Ron Brown traveled to Africa, he pointed out that while investment in Africa was sometimes more difficult than your average foreign investment, it also yields a greater than average return on direct investment, about 25 percent, compared with 8.5 percent for direct investment worldwide.

In 1995, the World Bank estimates that sub-Saharan Africa's GDP grew by 4 percent. Thirty countries reported growth over 3 percent, and four countries, Uganda, Angola, Malawi and Lesotho, grew by more than 10 percent. Many countries have embraced political and economic reforms which are encouraging foreign investors to look at new investment in the continent.

This legislation provides opportunities both for Africans and for Americans. The bill is a comprehensive program. Not only will it facilitate trade and investment, but it is a landmark piece of legislation because it places new emphasis on the importance of Africa to America, and as a result, it will engage Americans and American businesses in Africa.

Before the 1990s, Africa was an ideological Cold War battleground where U.S. policy focused largely on promoting Cold War interests and responding to imminent humanitarian concerns. Africa's tremendous economic potential was ignored. This legislation says, no more. More economic opportunity means less poverty, less emergency humanitarian relief, more peace. Less likely to have U.S. troops deployed to end mass slaughters, we can save money and we can make money as trading partners; we can limit the risk to American lives and also, ultimately, we can encourage greater stability and peace within Africa itself. And that is good for Africans. That is a win-win situation.

We are ready for a new era in America's policy toward Africa. With the passage of this legislation, we will launch that era, an era where America wholeheartedly embraces Africa, its people and its enormous wealth of opportunity, an era in which we pursue policies that seek to improve the lives of Africans as part of our policy, not just as an afterthought.

I urge my colleagues to support this historic opportunity for America and Africa by supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is long overdue. This African Growth and Opportunity Act is long overdue. For too many years, we have thought of Africa in terms of aid only. All of our attempts to promote economic development in Africa have been a matter of sending aid and more aid. Yet many African countries are poorer today than they were at the time of their independence in the early 1960s.

There are many reasons for this. Some African countries have been crippled by civil wars, some which were fueled by the Cold War. Some African countries have been hit by natural disasters, including droughts. Downward changes in the world prices of some African commodities have hurt.

But our aid has been part of the problem, too, part of the problem because it has often sustained what have proven to be unsustainable economic policies in Africa. Like other areas of the world, Africa went the route of socialism in the 1960s and 1970s. It was fashionable then for African governments to nationalize industries, to close economies to imports, to try to manage commerce down to setting the price on a bag of corn and otherwise kill the entrepreneurial spirit in Africans that is common to people all over the world. Africa's poverty today has much to do with these disastrous policies.

Like other regions of the world, though, Africa has been changing. Over the last 10 years, many African countries have been reforming their economies, allowing everyday Africans to seize their own economic destinies. State-controlled companies have been sold, commerce-crippling red tape has been cut, and partnerships with foreign investors have been permitted. In short, African nations have begun to give themselves a chance to develop just like other countries in the world.

There have been impressive results. Many of my colleagues today will tell the story of what some are calling the African Renaissance. Many African countries are having real economic growth of up to 10 percent for the first time in years.

☐ 1230

One country, Uganda, probably the most aggressive economic reformer in Africa, has been growing at 10 percent for several years running. Uganda is now being called the African lion.

This growing economy means that the development, better health, nutrition, education, the things that everyone in this House wants to see for Africa, is beginning to happen. And it does not take too many years of 10 percent economic growth to make some real progress. That is why Americans are thinking about Africa in new terms. All this is a new beginning for Africa. Though we should not ignore the real challenges these countries face, more reforms are needed, and economic reform can be trying, but if African countries meet this challenge, then the Africa of the 21st century will be a far different Africa than the Africa of the recent past.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is all about helping these countries along with this reform plan. It does this by identifying those countries that are committed to reform as the countries the United States wants to develop a special economic relationship with. These countries, those that are giving themselves the best chance to develop, that are giving U.S. businesses the chance to take part in their development through American exports and investment, will take part in annual trade forums with the United States. They will also have greater opportunities to sell some of their goods to American consumers. These are real benefits, benefits that should be incentives to African countries to continue their reform path, allowing their citizens to reach their potential, and helping American businesses too.

Now, this bill will not cure all of Africa's ills, but it helps in a big way. It also puts Africa on the map for America, not as a place of famine and poverty and of endless aid spending, but as a place where growth is offering American businesses new opportunities. Africa is changing. It is time for U.S. policy to change too. This is what this bipartisan act is about. For the sake of a brighter future for Americans and a brighter future for Africans, let us pass this very significant legislation.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill which I am pleased to be a cosponsor of.

Now I realize this is not a perfect bill and that there are concerns, and I hope those concerns can be worked out, but let me emphasize today in dealing with the continent of Africa we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. In the past we have had a very limited trade relationship with Africa, based primarily on Cold War objectives. I am pleased to say that with this bill we are moving forward into the new millennium to develop and cultivate new trade relationships. I think that is good for America.

Currently, Europe has 30 percent of the African market. By comparison, we only have about 6 to 7 percent. It is in our national interests to support better trade relationships with Africa. It is in our interests to develop new markets. It is in our interests to avoid costly conflicts where trade replaces warfare. It is in our interests to address these global problems.

Africa does have unique problems and progress is fragile, but progress has been made. Numerous countries have moved to democratic systems and those countries are now prepared to receive our assistance in cultivating trade relationships.

It is important that we offer important reforms, such as eliminating trade barriers, such as encouraging improved fiscal policies, promoting private sector development, fostering good government and fighting corruption, debt forgiveness. All of these are objectives that can be accomplished if we pass this bill.

Let me hasten to point out, however, that this bill will not benefit countries that continue to engage in human rights violations. They will not be eligible for those benefits. But for those countries that are truly moving toward democracy, those countries that are truly eliminating human rights violations, those countries will be able to benefit.

But, more importantly, we in the United States will be able to benefit because a stronger Africa represents new markets for our goods, and to the extent that we can take advantage of these new markets, we can have a more prosperous economy here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support for this very excellent bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in very strong support for H.R. 1432, a bill to authorize new trade and investment policy for Sub-Saharan Africa.

First, let me commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and many distinguished, informed and thoughtful colleagues on both sides of the aisle for sponsoring this bipartisan initiative. This act is a much-welcome initiative for a continent in need of our focused attention, and I am very proud and pleased to be an original cosponsor.

We hear a lot of hyperbole and exaggeration around here, but I tell my colleagues, in my judgment, without fear of responsible contradiction, this is the most important foreign policy initiative of this Congress. Beyond that, this is the most important thing that we have done potentially for Africa in post-colonial times, and I believe that the potential will be shown to be a reality.

Why do I say that? Well, first of all, we know, of course, that the United States has been committed to Africa in terms of foreign assistance for many years now, but our commitment to Africa in terms of trade has been less steadfast. In fact, our trade policy at times discourages private sector enterprises in Africa. These trade barriers can negate the benefits of U.S. foreign assistance to some of the same African countries that we are trying to help.

Oftentimes, we hear from these countries, ''We want trade,'' and they even go on to say, ''We do not need aid if you give us adequate trade opportunities.'' This is a win/win situation for the United States and these African countries.

As a strong supporter of the aid to Africa through the Development Fund for africa, in fact, Mr. Wolpe I think was the original initiator, and other mechanisms, I believe this legislation finally coordinates and sufficiently focuses America's resources on both trade and aid in Africa, and there are a number of amendments made in order that will improve this legislation.

By requiring African countries to show their commitment to market reform, this bill lays the proper foundation for a very positive, cooperative relationship between the United States and these many countries of Africa. By proposing a framework for investment assistance, export promotion, free trade arrangements, and the abolition of trade barriers, this legislation creates a reward system that ensures those market reforms in Africa are more likely to continue.

Finally, by maintaining our foreign assistance program for sustainable development and humanitarian purposes, this legislation commits us not only to economic liberalization in Africa, but also to equitable and efficient development that does not overlook the poor or those most in need.

Mr. Chairman, I find it very hard to imagine how someone could oppose this legislation once they have examined it. This legislation has received widespread attention both inside the United States and outside this country from our allies and friends. Ask the African countries and their leaders and their people how they feel about it. If they know about it, they are in favor of it. It has been received well as a coordinated, thoughtful component to our foreign policy toward the individual countries of Africa.

I say to my colleagues who know about my involvement in Africa and foreign affairs issues for some time, I say to them, this legislation is a very positive contribution to Africa and to the United States. I strongly urge that my colleagues support the most important foreign policy initiative of this Congress, one that has bipartisan support.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), in recognition of the gentleman's strong concerns about this issue and that it is his birthday, even though he is going to speak in opposition.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) for this opportunity. I want to thank all of my colleagues for their participation in this discussion which I suspect will be a fruitful debate.

This is an historic day as this Congress discusses and debates U.S. trade with Africa on the House floor. As my colleague noted, I was born on March 11, 1965, and on December 12, 1995, I was elected to Congress as the 91st African-American to serve in this House. There have only been 102 African-Americans elected to Congress out of a total of 11,541 Americans. Ninety-eight have been in the House, 4 elected to the Senate and 2 this last century, including 2 this century, CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, the only African-American woman to ever serve in the Senate.

This occasion to debate a respectful and reciprocal trade relation with Africa is a test of fate for the 60 million Africans taken from their native shores and forced to make the transatlantic voyage. It is because of that history that we are compelled to strenuously critique and analyze this bill. So I am periodically, Mr. Speaker, going to raise questions of some of my colleagues on the other side and this side that I hope will be taken in the spirit within which we have engaged in this discourse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, Africa is a continent on the move and it is time we recognized that fact. We have neglected the people of Africa and ceded many export opportunities to their former European colonial powers.

This legislation will for the first time focus the attention of the U.S. Government on a comprehensive trade strategy towards Africa. This legislation reinforces the positive developments taking place in that continent. Since 1990, more than 25 African countries have held democratic elections and more than 30 countries have embarked on free-market economic reforms.

Let me give my colleagues a taste of what can happen. Last year I held a hearing before the Subcommittee on Small Business Exports, which I chair, on the subject of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC. A wonderful lady born in Africa and now residing in Massachusetts, Monique Maddy, testified how her small telecommunications firm was able to contribute both to economic development in Africa and increased U.S. exports to Africa.

She won a deal, thanks to a political risk insurance package from OPIC, to build wireless public telephones which operate on debit cards instead of coins for Tanzania. This contract resulted in the export of $4.5 million worth of goods and services from 8 supplier companies in 7 States: Texas, New Jersey, Washington, Georgia, Missouri, and North Carolina. In addition, 60 jobs were created in Tanzania.

Because the Africa Communications Group did so well with the Tanzania sale, Ms. Maddy subsequently won a larger sale to Ghana with OPIC's help. This will result in the export of approximately $65 million worth of goods and services from the United States and create 500 jobs in Ghana. Without OPIC, most likely these deals would have gone to our European competitors.

My home State of Illinois is another example of the phenomenal growth of exports to Africa. South Africa alone is Illinois's 20th largest export destination, totaling $389 million for 1996. The leading exports to South Africa are industries where Illinois excells: chemical, earth-moving equipment, agricultural machinery, and aviation parts.

From the Chicago-land area, exports to South Africa grew 148 percent between 1993 and 1996, starting at $74 million and increasing to $184 million. In Rockford, Illinois, exports to South Africa grew 29 percent, jumping from $2 million in 1994 to $2.6 million in 1995, the latest date for which we have export statistics.

South Africa is the locomotive that drives much of Sub-Saharan Africa, and it is critically important we help this big emerging market on the path of democratic and free-market reform.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

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

□ 1245

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in support of H.R. 1432, the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This bill will help sub-Saharan countries build economic self-sufficiency and reduce their isolation in an increasingly interdependent world. The bill supports U.S. aid programs that are vital in the near term, but focus on sustainable development as the only way to substantially boost living standards in some of the world's poorest countries. It promotes trade, foreign investment, debt relief, and private enterprise, including businesses run by women.

At the same time, the bill requires that beneficiary countries have or must be moving towards market-based economies. It requires they be committed to accountable government, the eradication of poverty, observance of human rights: these criteria offer the best chance for prosperity and stability in the region.

The debate today will go into great details on many of the provisions. There will be some amendments which make the bill even better, and others which will be designed to fundamentally gut the key provisions of this bill, but I urge support for the bill and opposition to those amendments, in the context of trying to help H.R. 1432.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of H.R. 1432 say that the United States should not help Sub-Saharan Africa by dropping quotas and tariffs on textiles and apparel, even though these are the goods countries in the region can most readily produce. Opponents argue that reducing trade barriers will make U.S. imports of such goods soar, threatening U.S. textile and apparel manufacturers and workers. They vastly overstate the case.

To address this concern, the Committee on Ways and Means asked the International Trade Commission to assess potential textile and apparel imports from Sub-Saharan Africa under the terms of the bill. The ITC estimated