

They take that computer and they use prison labor to upgrade that computer. If they do not serve so many hours in working on education or work, they do not get their privileges. So it brings a triple force right there. They then turn that computer down to the school, ready to plug in.

So that is what it takes as a Federal, a private, and a State partnership. But again, the focus should be on the teachers, the parents, the families and the community to make those decisions. But that is what we talk about as far as commitment, and making it happen and coming up with those kinds of solutions, which means less government.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are very near the end of the hour here and I would just kind of like to wrap this up. We talked about daring to dream. We talked about my personal life where we reached a point that we could not pay our bills, where we started a business and turned it into something.

We talked about starting the home building business and suffering through years where we lost money, and turning that company around and getting to the point where we were building 120 homes a year and providing 250 job opportunities. And daring to dream that in the United States of America, even if you have no political background, that in this great Nation that we live in, where if you want to run for office you can run for office, and we ran twice and lost, but we had a dream that it could still happen.

We got elected and came in here with a very specific dream. We came in here in 1995 and we dared to dream that we could balance our budget before the turn of the century and quit spending our kids' money. We dared to dream that we could make payments on the Federal debt and start paying this thing down, so instead of our kids getting a legacy of huge debts and interest payments, that we could actually start paying down the debt and maybe give our country to our children debt-free. We dared to dream that we could start putting the money away for Social Security so our senior citizens could once again rest assured that their Social Security was safe, and we dared to dream that we could reduce the tax burden on American workers.

Those things have all come about in less than 3 years. They have come about far faster than anyone even dared to dream that they could possibly happen.

Now we are here. It is time to look ahead and to look where we are going to. I would like to challenge my colleagues to dare to dream for the future of this country.

For our kids, let us give them a debt-free, drug-free America where education is once again number one in the entire world. For our workers, let us reduce the tax burden at all levels of government by at least a third, so that they are once again empowered to make decisions about how they will

spend their own hard-earned money. For our senior citizens, let us start putting the Social Security Trust Fund money aside in real dollars so that the Social Security Trust Fund is restored and safe for our senior citizens, and let us make sure that our Medicare system is solid and solvent so that our senior citizens are assured that their health care will be taken care of.

For all Americans, let us make sure that we provide a strong defense for this Nation and a clean environment as we look forward to the future. Let us dare to dream that we can restore this great Nation and once again have the greatest Nation in the world. Let us not be afraid to dare to dream.

BUDGETARY PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REDMOND). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about the most important subject we have to deal with here, and that is finances, budget and appropriations. I want to talk about it in the context of financing two societies and the way we deal with two different groups.

One society I would say is the international banking and investment community, which when they approach us for help it seems always to get an immediate response of billions of dollars to go into the International Monetary Fund or to bail out Mexico. Now we are talking about bailing out South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the immediate response of billions and billions of dollars.

In the other society I would lump all of us together and start with my most important concern, and that is schools, financing for schools, assistance for schools. School construction at the top of that list, but everything related to education.

There is a double standard with respect to the International Monetary Fund and the way it comes to the relief of the international investment community, versus the funding that we receive and the kinds of debate and deliberation that we have when we are funding education or when we are funding other vital domestic programs, or when we are funding certain African and Caribbean countries, Caribbean aid and Caribbean trade always have a second class status. They are in the same category as funding for domestic programs that help poor people.

We are committed, we say, both parties say that we are really concerned about using Federal resources to help people who are disadvantaged. Low-income people should be helped as opposed to special groups, affirmative action is condemned as helping special groups, and the justification for that is condemned.

I do not agree with that approach where affirmative action is tossed

aside as not being legitimate, but let us suspend that argument for a while and say that opportunity programs which help all poor people are certainly desirable, and if both parties, Democrats and Republicans, want to join in doing that, let us do that. But as we debate the process, let us understand that if we are going to help people who need help, the poorest people in our society, if we are going to help the children in inner cities' education systems, the schools that need repair most, the schools that need new classrooms, the schools that need to be wired for the Internet, if we are going to help them, it costs money.

So whenever we have a discussion of money, let us not retreat from the necessary resources to provide the opportunities for people who do not have opportunities. That is going to be our modus operandi. We are going to focus on providing opportunity versus providing corrections and adjustments for people who have been discriminated against. Then let us really provide the funding.

Let us deal with the funding for the schools in the inner city communities. Let us deal with the funding necessary for school construction, necessary for increasing classrooms, so that as we increase the number of teachers and we decrease the ratio of children to teachers, we have the space to do it. As we pursue those objectives that have been outlined by the President for education, let us deal with the funding the same way we deal with funding for the international investment community.

We have on the agenda in a few weeks a bill which will call for at least \$18 billion to be added to the International Monetary Fund. The American taxpayers are going to be called upon to add \$18 billion to the International Monetary Fund.

Now, there are some complications about one portion of it is \$3 billion and the other portion is \$15 billion; it is not really going to affect the budget, and it is not really an aid program, it is a loan program, and we only contribute to it and other nations contribute; there is a whole lot of malarkey which seems to hide the fact that it is money out of the Treasury, out of the coffers, which could be going to some other purpose, and it goes into the International Monetary Fund.

We are the biggest contributor there. Some people say we are approaching a point where almost 50 percent of the funds in the International Monetary Fund will be funds from the taxpayers of this country.

□ 2045

So we are going to have that bill on the floor. We have a bill tomorrow on the floor related to Africa, the African Growth and Opportunity bill, which I think is related to the discussion, too.

We are going to have, I hope, later on a bill related to the Caribbean Basin Initiative NAFTA Parity, how we deal with trade with the poor, sparsely populated countries of the Caribbean: These are all related.

I apologize if I do not proceed in a way where you have a simple topic, and I move from A to B, and it is an easy straight line, and you do not strain your brain to follow me. I think it is necessary for us to understand that this is a very complex world, and that a very complex process is undertaken when we spend your taxpayers' money.

I think it is also important to understand every voter, every American citizen has a stake in this process. Do not go to sleep. Do not let your eyes glaze over when I mention matters like the International Monetary Fund. It is your money.

Do not make the mistake of thinking you have no stake here, and you also have no power to help make the decision. Every American voter has a great deal of power. As recent elections show, which have been very close, the election for the House of Representatives, the election for the other body, they are close enough to let you know that every vote counts, and what you think and how you vote, how you react to what we do here is very important. Your input matters a great deal.

Democracy plays itself out in a very complex way nowadays, and you ought to understand that. You ought to understand that, beyond your single vote at the poll, you have another role. Every citizen has a role in shaping public opinion, because public opinion drives the decision making in this House of Representatives.

Both parties have very elaborate, very well-structured processes for measuring public opinion. It leads to some amazing results because we do measure public opinion.

I never get tired of using the example of the 1996 turnaround on education, how the Republicans took over the House of Representatives. They had the majority, and they began to wage war on education, and the Federal involvement in matters related to education. There was a war which was almost like, you know, take no prisoners, you know, a scorched earth policy.

They called for the elimination of the Department of Education. They called for cuts in Head Start. They called for dramatic cuts across the board in education programs. At one point, the cuts that were being proposed added up to about \$4 billion.

Because we had a process whereby we came to the floor, the House of Representatives was meeting on a regular basis. In fact, in that first year, I think we made history in terms of the hours that were put in on this floor where the new majority pressed their Contract with America.

But the fact that they were pressing their Contract with America gave the minority an opportunity to answer. In the process of the minority answering, we got a message out to the people, our message on education.

We did not succeed on all matters. They did cut housing programs dramatically. They made \$22 billion in cuts across the board. So they got a

whole lot of their program of cuts in; some needed, and many not needed, many devastating.

But on education, our ability to bring the message to the floor, to talk to the American people about the proposed cuts in Head Start, the proposed cuts in the school lunch program, our ability to make our case, shape public opinion, and win the Republicans without the measure, the public opinion in their poll and in their focus groups, they found that the public definitely was not happy with their program to move the Federal Government out of its programs of aid to education.

Instead of a \$4 billion cut, which we resisted and avoided in 1995, in 1996, the same majority Republicans proposed a \$4 billion increase. I use this example because it is one example of the power of public opinion and how dramatically things can turn around, ideology notwithstanding, ceremony notwithstanding.

People have their agendas, and they want to cling to them, but because this is a democracy, and in the end, the people at the polls will determine who has power, the majority parties saw that their power was threatened if they continued on their policies and their dogma related to Federal aid to education. They turned around. They are out now trying to sell themselves, the majority Republicans, as a party for education.

We are in a situation where both parties have strong rhetoric programs about education. I say rhetoric, because I do not think either party is delivering as it should. But certainly, if we were to follow the leadership of President Clinton and the kind of program elaborated in the State of the Union address, the Democrats and the people who have good common sense would have a program for education that was far beyond rhetoric. It would be a reality. Certainly, in the area of construction, we need that reality.

So I am saying it pays for the people with the power. Every American out there who votes has power. It pays for you to understand what is going on here. I wish that you would join us in spreading the word so that other people will understand what is going on here. In order for you to do that, you need to go in some processes of circular reasoning, and not just follow the simple A to B to C to D approach.

We need to talk about the coming vote on IMF, which will pull out of the Treasury \$18 billion; the vote on the Africa Trade bill, which is a different kind of situation from what is going to happen with the bailouts; money that the IMF will give to Indonesia or to South Korea, or to some of the other more developed economies that have had tremendous investments made there.

What does it mean that we are willing to spend so much money in these highly developed societies when they go bankrupt as a result of corruption usually? Talking about school con-

struction over a 10-year period, we may spend 20 to \$21 billion. But we are going to rush to bail out these corrupt economies of Indonesia and South Korea, et cetera, and we are going to pay billions.

They are talking about \$50 billion in Indonesia, which means that about half of that will somehow come out of the American taxpayers' coffers. South Korea, there is about 40 or \$30 billion there. A majority of that is going to come out of the American taxpayers' coffers.

So what is it? Will Indonesia's corrupt or bankrupt system now get more benefits from the American taxpayers than the school children of America who need classroom space? They need safe schools. They need wiring for computers. They need computers.

What does it mean to have those kinds of amounts of money flowing out of the American Treasury to these countries?

I am not against IMF, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, United Nations. These are all international institutions which I support wholeheartedly. I am enthusiastically in favor of using these various international institutions to maintain peace and harmony and prosperity in the world as far as you can. We should support them.

But we should not allow them to be used as instruments for swindling the taxpayers of this country and for oppressing the people of the other nations like Indonesia, oppressing them through billions of dollars that are poured in by American banks and investors. Will Indonesia get better terms than we get?

We are talking about a school construction bill now that does not have any grant in it. Listen closely. There was a time when we were talking about school construction aid from the Federal Government which had grants. You give the money to the areas with the greatest need. You give some portion of it. Other portions were going to be loans.

Now we are talking about a school construction initiative which are strictly loans, strictly loans. There are no grants. Now we are going to have a program for school construction. It is being finalized now, the Rangel/Lowey bill, which is the President's bill, also. It is his initiative.

I am grateful for that initiative, because it is far better than anything else we have, but it is loans. It is forgiving the interest on bonds, I mean for giving a tax credit. Let me just go back. This is complicated. I am not sure I have it all straight. But you can follow up and investigate, because I think we need to begin to unravel some of these financing mechanisms and understand what is going on.

We are going to have money go to schools through their States and their localities as loans. The loans will come from the private sector. The private sector will be given a tax credit in lieu

of the interest. Instead of the schools, the local education agencies, the States, localities, instead of them having to pay the principal and the interest, they will only pay back the principal.

That is a pretty good deal; no interest loans. But the Federal Government will finance that by giving the lenders a tax credit, which would equal the amount of interest that they would have charged. That sounds like a good deal.

Over a long period of time, if the payment required of the localities, schools, school boards, if that repayment is spread over a long period of time, it is an even better deal. I do not know exactly how long a period of time it will be spread over.

I do not know exactly how much of a tax credit the private sector will get in terms of the interest rate and what is going to be the going rate. You need to know that in order to compare the deal we are giving our children, our school systems to the deal that the IMF will give to Indonesia and Malaysia and these other countries. What kind of deal are they getting?

In the international marketplace, what kind of interest rates will be charged on the loans that they will be given in order to bail them out, and over what period of time? Will they really be getting a better deal? They may be getting a better deal automatically because their deal is going to move fast.

The schools are required and the education agencies and the State education departments are required to do a great deal of preparation and show that they have a plan to revamp their schools and to construct new schools, and that they are going to come forward with some contribution of their own.

There are a lot of things that are required. Some of the States would have the greatest needs; they have the greatest low-income population that is suffering; are least concerned about their low-income population.

So if they are required to make any match, any effort, they may reject it. If they are required to do this over a period of time, they may never get around to submitting the necessary paperwork. They may never get around to meeting the necessary conditions.

So we may have a far worse deal being offered by the Federal Government of the United States to our school children of America than we are offering to the corrupt bankers and manufacturers and politicians of Indonesia.

Let me just read for a moment what this school constructed initiative proposes to do and give you a better idea of how you should be talking to other people about the proposal.

The modernized schools for the 21st Century follows what you heard President Clinton propose in the State of the Union address. In order for students to learn and to compete in the

global economy, schools must be well-equipped, and they must be able to accommodate smaller class sizes.

To address these and other critical needs, the President's fiscal year 1999 budget will propose Federal tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. This is more than double the assistance proposed last year which covered half the interest of an estimated \$20 billion in bonds.

The new proposal provides tax credits in lieu of interest payments for investors in two types of bonds, school modernization bonds, and the expansion of the qualified zone academy bonds created last year.

These tax credits will cost the Treasury \$5 billion over 5 years and more than \$10 billion over 10 years. In other words, the tax credits that will be given to the private investors will amount to \$5 billion over 5 years and \$10 billion over 10 years.

Over a 10-year period, the private investors are going to loan the schools \$22 billion, according to this scheme, if it follows through in detail. They are going to make \$10 billion back on their money. They are going to receive \$10 billion of tax. It is going to cost the Treasury in tax credits. That is a pretty good deal for the private sector. How good a deal is it to the school system?

□ 2100

I am not sure. I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. I have been there for 16 years.

There was a time when I would not even undertake this kind of discussion because I trusted our colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations to deal with these issues. But the longer I stayed on Education, the more I realized that our problems, the way we deal with the funding for schools, the resources that schools need, the way we deal with opportunities to learn, you cannot complete the process, you cannot get what you need unless you focus on where the money is going from the Federal Treasury, unless you confront the people on the Committee on Appropriations who continually say there is not enough money, unless you confront the administration, unless you confront the leadership of the House. They insist there is not enough money.

So in order to deal with the basic concern that I have of improving education in America, funding education in America adequately, I have to challenge all of the assumptions that are being made about where the priorities are, where the money is going.

I think the American people, the voter out there, have to use his or her common sense in the same way. You have to look at the total picture so that when your Congressman tells you, we would like to fund schools and I am all in favor of education, but we do not

have the money for school construction, we want to use the surplus that we are about to get, use that for Social Security. We are going to use it for some other purpose.

We do not want to begin to go back into deficit financing; if you propose to build new schools or to renovate old schools, the problem is that you are going to get into big spending. Well, if you are going to give the International Monetary Fund \$18 billion over a short period of time, right away, then is that not big spending also? How can we do that big spending, investing in the bailout of corrupt enterprises across the ocean, when we cannot deal with a faster and a more thorough response to the financing of school construction.

Let us ask the question and let the experts answer it. At least we must be intelligent enough to keep asking the right question.

School modernization bonds, 19.4 billion and zero interest bonds, that is 9.7 billion in 1999 and 9.7 billion in the year 2000, are proposed for construction and renovation of public school facilities. The Department of the Treasury will allocate the rights to offer these special 15-year bonds.

I asked before, how long a period would they have to pay. Now we hear, they will be 15 years, 15-year bonds to States, territories and certain school districts that have submitted school construction plans to the Secretary of Education. I will not read all of this.

I will include this document entitled Modernized Schools for the 21st Century. It is just a one-page explanation of the school modernization program. I think it is a good summary. Instead of reading it, I would like to submit it.

School construction plans would not be accepted unless they meet certain requirements. In order to receive a bond allocation, States, territories and the eligible 100 school districts will be required to submit a plan to the Secretary of Education.

As I said before, there are two types of plans. One is for construction and one is for qualified zone academy bonds, a kind of bond that has been created for certain districts where you have high poverty rates.

I think the basic here is that you have 15 years to pay back the principal and the Federal Government will pay, will be responsible for the interest by giving tax credits to the private sector which issues those bonds to the States, territories and certain school districts.

It may be a better deal than Indonesia will get, but I am not sure. I suspect that because Indonesia will get their money so much faster and because they are in a situation where the private market has a higher interest rate, they will be placed at a great advantage. Those corrupt people who have now gone bankrupt will get money at a far lower interest rate than they would have, than they would get

if they had to deal in the private sector. It is rewarding corruption and incompetence and rewarding it quite rapidly, using American taxpayer money to do that.

My question is, why do we deal with that set of people with such generosity? What have they done to earn such generosity while we are so slow?

Here we are in the fourth year of our discussion of an initiative to aid school construction. It has been a no-no for so long. In the meantime, we have bailed out the savings and loan associations; \$500 billion it cost the taxpayers. And we bailed out Mexico; Mexico was nearly bankrupt. And we are now about to bail out certain Asian countries, including Indonesia.

I keep referring to Indonesia because it is a particularly difficult situation to swallow. It is hard to accept what is going on in Indonesia. Indonesia has an authoritarian regime headed by a man who used to be a general, General Suharto. Now President Suharto, who has been in office, I think he is going into his fifth term, five-year terms, like he has been there 25 years, he runs the country with an authoritarian hand. He is in the same category as Saddam Hussein.

I called Saddam Hussein a sovereign predator. Saddam Hussein has all the power, all the authority, there is no democracy. There are no institutions free to criticize him or challenge him. He has all the power. There is no likelihood that anybody is ever going to be able to internally overthrow Saddam Hussein. He uses the power to create a military machine, manufacture massive numbers of military weapons and maintain a massive army which can be used only for destruction to keep the people under control within the country, and to also lead to promote ventures like the invasion of Kuwait. If he was not stopped, had not been stopped by the U.S., he would be probably invading Saudi Arabia and everybody around him who is weak enough to be swallowed up by the monster Iraq. So Saddam Hussein is a sovereign predator of a certain type.

General Suharto in Indonesia is not a military threat. He is a different kind of sovereign predator. He has all power, too, the military, everything under his control. But he is only interested in making money for his family and himself and his cronies, and he has used his power to enhance his money.

There was an article in the New York Times this past Sunday, March 8, in the Week in Review. It was called Indonesian face off, drawing blood without bombs. I was very impressed that the reporter, David Sanger, used the same comparison that I had begun to think of when I attended a meeting last week.

I sat in on a meeting of the Congressional Black Caucus leadership and the head of the IMF to discuss some of the same issues we are talking about here. Why is there a double standard? I am going to talk in a few minutes about

that double standard, how not only it applies to our own concerns domestically, but when the U.S. starts giving aid to countries in Africa or aid to countries in the Caribbean region, we do not behave the same way we behave with these big sovereign predators who have these big economies that require billions and billions of dollars.

I came out of that meeting thinking that, hey, Suharto is very much like Saddam Hussein. He is an economic sovereign predator. He sucks in investments from all over the world and uses them to enrich his family and his cronies and pours them into phony enterprises.

They have an aircraft manufacturing enterprise where, the whole world knows, they are never going to produce decent planes. Nobody is going to want to fly the kinds of planes they produce, if they ever get around to producing any at all.

They have an automobile concern headed by one of his sons which is supposed to manufacture the international automobile for Indonesia, and the automobile is really made in South Korea. They bring it out of the factory in Indonesia and they give it a subsidy. If you buy one of those automobiles, you do not have to pay the same taxes you pay if you buy other automobiles because that is supposed to be the national automobile made in that nation.

The owner of that factory is one of his Suharto's sons. So on and on it goes.

Let us just take a minute, do not let your eyes glaze over, look at the Asian bailout through the eyes of my good friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). He wrote an article for The Hill, which I think gives a very good summary of what we are dealing with here. I quote from the article that appeared in The Hill newspaper, Wednesday, January 28, 1998.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will ask that this article be entered in its entirety in the RECORD. I will not have to read it all. I think it is pertinent. It is short and to the point. I would like to have it in the RECORD.

Just quoting parts of the Sanders article, which is entitled "Asian Bailout Is Unfair," it is counterproductive, and he goes so far as to say it is illegal.

It is amazing to me that even as President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich tell us we have to cut back on Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' programs, affordable housing and children's needs, and perhaps even Social Security in the near future, that we can provide some \$15 to \$20 billion in loans to Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines and South Korea. This action will only increase public cynicism.

American workers have seen a substantial decline in their standard of living over the last 20 years even as they are working longer hours for lower wages. Twenty-two percent of the children in this country live in poverty. Millions of elderly people cannot afford prescription drugs. Forty million Americans lack health insurance. And there has recently been a significant increase in homelessness and hunger. For those people there is apparently no government assistance available, only the virtues of personal responsibility.

That is the name of the Welfare Reform Act that plunged so many people into a new level of desperation in our society.

But to continue quoting the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) from his article that appeared in The Hill on January 28:

But when foreign governments, some led by corrupt authoritarian billionaires, need assistance, the United States is there in rapid-response fashion to help them out. Where are the risks for the poorly managed governments which have run their economies into bankruptcy? Where is the self-regulation of the free enterprise system for the wealthy special interests of Asia that have borrowed more money than they can repay? Where is the magic of the marketplace for the reckless investors and speculators that have made huge profits by investing and lending money in Asia, but now want U.S. taxpayers to bail them out; or corrupt dictators, like President Suharto of Indonesia, whose family is worth \$30 to \$40 billion and who has invested much of his money abroad in foreign currencies?

Should the taxpayers of this country really be providing 19.3 billion as part of the bailout of these huge profitable banks and their overpaid executives? Is that really the way the system is supposed to work? I do not think so. That is socialism for the rich and the powerful and Darwinian capitalism for the middle class and the poor.

The International Monetary Fund bailout, as currently designed, is illegal and in violation of the Sanders-Frank amendment of 1994 which requires U.S. representatives to international financial institutions to urge borrowing countries to guarantee internationally recognized workers' rights and to include the status of such rights as an integral part of the institution's policy dialogue with each borrowing country. This has not been done.

In Indonesia, for example, Muchtar Pakpahan, the head of the Independent Indonesia Labor Welfare Union, is still in jail because of his belief that workers have the right to freely organize and join unions. No one believes that Indonesia guarantees international recognized workers' rights.

I will conclude my reading of sections from this article at this point.

The point is being made here that we have in Indonesia not only a corrupt, bankrupt system, but they are also violating the requirements that we have placed on our international monetary institutions. They are in violation of the principle that held us together, the majority of the Members of Congress, held us together against the free trade fast track.

We had the fast track process being proposed last fall, and in November of last year we defeated, we did not defeat it, we let it be known that there would not be enough votes for it on the floor. So fast track trade processes did not get okayed or approved by this Congress. It never got to first base in this House of Representatives. It was not put on the floor because they knew it would be defeated.

One reason we had solidarity there was that so many of us agreed that the effort that we had been waging to get standards placed into the international trade agreements, which require governments to recognize unions and to permit union organizing, were not

going to go forward, that we would not have a chance to do that on the fast track.

□ 2115

We also had concerns about environmental standards, and that is not going to be done. I hope that negotiation process is going on and that we will not have a replay of the fast track drama; that whatever new trade bills come back to this floor will have that requirement in them.

We have a bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow, the Africa Growth and Trade Act, which has provisions in it to deal with the problem of the right of unions to organize. No nation like Nigeria in Africa would be allowed to participate in this Africa Growth and Trade bill since it does not have that kind of freedom for labor unions. We have written it into the bill.

So we have a situation here where the kind of violations and the kind of abuses that have been permitted in Indonesia and some other Asian countries while they enjoy the benefits of the International Monetary Fund, will not be allowed in this process of trying to help Africa.

Here again I want to talk about the double standard. Africa has not received any substantial aid from the United States. I think if you add all of the aid of all kinds that flow into Africa from the United States we have about a billion dollars. A billion dollars in aid the last year we have records for flowed from the United States to Africa. The huge continent of Africa got a billion dollars in aid. The Caribbean countries, the little islands, got far less than that. When we lump them all together they got far less than that.

So there is an issue of a standard of operation with these needy countries, disadvantaged countries, countries that are just getting started. And by the way, these are nations that will provide far greater markets for our products than our Asian corrupted partners. The balance of trade with some of these countries that we are going to be bailing out is already skewed so that we are importing far more from them than they are buying from us.

So we are not only helping corrupt investors and corrupt institutions in these Asian countries, certainly like in Indonesia, but we are also financing our competitors. American workers are being jeopardized and displaced by the cheap labor markets in the same countries we are now going to bail out.

The African nations are not among these competitors. We have a very tiny trade with Africa. And by the way, the trade with Africa is in surplus in the other direction: \$6 billion in the last period that is recorded. That is small compared to what we do with Japan and China and Indonesia, et cetera. Six billion dollars. But it is on our side. We sold them products worth \$6 billion. The amount of trade coming the other

way is minuscule, the amount that they have sold to us.

So the Africa Growth and Trade bill will be opening up a great new market. It will be establishing a dialogue, and mostly it is about dialogue. There is very little money in that bill that is going to be on the floor tomorrow, and it is important that people understand that. At a time when we are considering International Monetary Fund bailouts for these overheated developing economies in Asia, we should not mix it up and get confused and say we do not want any trade bills.

The Africa trade bill is an example of a great need that will benefit this country ultimately, because it opens and builds new markets. It is a great process of trade that has not gone forward which is to our advantage, and that will be opened up by the Africa Growth and Trade bill.

But I hear complaints. There is tiny amounts of money that may be involved there in terms of trade in textiles, so we have a lot of problems with people saying we do not want any more competition for our textile industry. And certainly I have friends in the labor movement I have worked with for years on this problem of competition with our industries, textile or otherwise. The amount of textiles imported from Africa at this point is .6 percent. Less than 1 percent. All of the countries of Africa combined, less than .6 percent.

I have a chart here that shows that on the other hand the amount that is exported from places like China, which by the way has no environmental standards and they do not allow free organization of labor unions, here is a chart called "Comparison of U.S. Textile Imports From Major Suppliers and from Sub-Saharan Africa." Total imports, \$19 billion.

And they give some of the break-out from the various countries that enjoy a percentage of that support. At the top, of course, is Mexico. Mexico has 11.5 percent of the imports of textiles. We import from Mexico, out of our total, and they get a big share, 11.5 percent. They are right across the border, and of course NAFTA has made it possible for them to enjoy great advantages. So they are the biggest importer.

Second to Mexico is the faraway country of China. The faraway country of China that does not allow its unions to organize, is not involved with environmental standards, and they get 8.6 percent, 8.6 percent of the total in our textile imports.

Taiwan, 6.3 percent. Hong Kong, 4.7 percent almost. India, South Korea, Thailand. The standard of living in countries like Hong Kong, Taiwan, and South Korea is quite high versus the standard of living in sub-Saharan Africa, where the per capita income is \$383 per year. I am sorry, the per capita income of Taiwan, for example, is \$12,000 a year. Per capita income in Hong Kong is \$21,000. Per capita income. That may be pretty close to our per

capita income here when we break it out in terms of wage earners. South Korea is \$8,000; Taiwan \$2,400. But Africa's per capita income, I said \$383. No, it is \$460.

So I am saying, again, two societies, two approaches. When we come to approaching Africa, we have been very mean, very stingy. We do not have any real trade going. Only .6 percent in textiles. And I assure my colleagues that overall imports from Africa are not much better, but we want to apply very stringent standards to Africa now. But we did not apply those to China. China is getting already a big share, and we did not apply those standards to China. We did not apply those standards to Mexico.

People have approached me and said, "I am concerned. If we let Africa have a greater percentage, and we import more textiles from Africa, will that not throw American workers out of jobs?" And my answer is I doubt it seriously. I think if there are any people thrown out of jobs, they will be in Hong Kong or China or Taiwan, because they have the lion's share. They got that way because they had cheaper labor and they could undercut the labor cost in the United States. They do not have cheaper labor than Africa.

So if we want the market processes to continue to work, Africa will take some of the textile business away from these countries that have now prospered. They have higher labor costs and they will be the ones who lose. We have already lost it. We have already lost these tremendous percentages to China, to Mexico, to Taiwan, to Hong Kong and to South Korea. They are doing very well. Now, if we allow international monetary forces to work without any interference, Africa would take some of the textile business away from these countries and not from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the RECORD at this point the chart labeled "Comparison of U.S. Textile Imports From Major Suppliers and From Sub-Saharan Africa."

COMPARISON OF U.S. TEXTILE IMPORTS FROM MAJOR SUPPLIERS AND FROM SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

	1996 MFA Fibers (in millions of square me- ters)	Percent of 1996 total imports	Total 1996 U.S. tex- tile im- ports (in millions)	1994 GNP per capita income
Total Imports	19,070.766	100.00	\$45,932	\$4,470
Mexico	2,207.063	11.57	4,232	4,180
China	1,644.861	8.63	4,892	530
Taiwan	1,203.465	6.31	2,733	12,100
Hong Kong	891.950	4.68	4,031	21,650
India	869.682	4.56	1,737	320
S. Korea	729.189	3.82	2,049	8,260
Thailand	631.137	3.31	1,402	2,410
Sub-Saharan Africa	127.413	0.67	383	460

Source: 1997 Major Shippers Report and World Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by making some comparisons here. A billion dollars is a lot of money, and we should never minimize the fact that a billion dollars from the taxpayers is to be treasured and a great value should be placed upon it. And when we talk about \$18 billion going into the International Monetary Fund, we already

have a lot of money going into the International Monetary Fund. We have been pouring a lot of money in.

So the big question to ask is: If it is not a giveaway, if it is not aid but loans, after it has existed for so long, why do we continually have to put money in? Why does the return of the principal and the return of interest on the principal not keep the fund at a point where we do not need to keep pouring money in? We have been pouring money into the International Monetary Fund in ever greater amendments.

A billion dollars. What does a billion dollars do? Let us take my concern about schools in New York City, my concerns about school construction there, and narrow it down to just one part of the school construction problem. We have 300 schools that burn coal in their furnaces in 1998, in America, in the big City of New York, which has all kinds of pollution problems.

And the Daily News, the second biggest newspaper in the city, has recently completed a series of articles on asthma and the high asthma rate in our city. We have the highest in the country. Asthma is the number one killer of children in our city, and yet we have 300 coal-burning furnaces. And these coal-burning furnaces, it is said to convert them would cost us \$1.3 million. Like everything in New York, I fear the cost is rather inflated. But to take one coal-burning furnace and change it into an oil-burning or gas-burning furnace they say will cost \$1.3 million.

Well, if we take \$1 billion out of the \$18 billion we are going to give away to Indonesia, what could we do with it in this situation? Simple arithmetic would say that we could take care of the problem of all the coal-burning furnaces, and that will cost us a little more than \$300 million, probably about \$330 million. For \$330 million we could take care of all the coal-burning furnaces in New York City, have the kids in a situation where they are not officially being victimized by their own city, by their own school system, where the asthma problem is not being aggravated by public negligence. Wipe it out. \$330 million will do it.

So we still have \$670 million left over from that billion. With that we could buy a large number of computers and we could wire schools, and we could go on to begin the process of building and repairing our schools.

A billion dollars is a great deal of money. When we look at the appropriations for the International Monetary Fund, we say, oh, it is no problem. Eighteen billion dollars more into the International Monetary Fund is no problem. But when we look at appropriations for our own domestic concerns, like coal-burning furnaces and school construction, it becomes a lot of money. Big spenders, we are called.

Right now we have a program called the empowerment zones. We have 10 empowerment zones that are going

now; six urban, three rural, and one Indian reservation; and 100 enterprise communities. I asked my staff to just check how much have we spent. These programs have been going now for 2 years. How much have we spent on all these enterprise zones and the empowerment zones? And the estimate is that in 2 years these zones that are spread across several cities and rural areas, and these enterprise communities, we have spent a billion dollars in social services grants from the Health and Human Services.

These programs are comprehensive, and all the departments of government contribute, so it is estimated that we have spent about a billion dollars in 2 years. A billion. And we have \$2.5 billion in anticipated tax expenditures of revenue to the Federal Government because of the tax breaks.

The other part of the enterprise zone and empowerment program is we give tax breaks to industries that invest in these communities. A combination of \$3.5 billion for our number one economic recovery program for cities and our rural areas.

□ 2130

\$3.5 billion over a 2-year period. And we are going to drop \$18 billion into the International Monetary Fund in one action. Just compare what a billion dollars is worth, and you will see that there are two sets of standards. When we are dealing with domestic concerns, like school construction, enterprise zones or any other activity of our Federal Government designed to help poor people, we are nickel and diming, relatively speaking, we are nickel and diming the process.

As I conclude on schools, the New York City report on the performance of the public schools in reading and math, the elementary schools, came out in the Sunday New York Times. And I want to congratulate the New York Times for not only in its Sunday paper giving a spread which included every school that was involved and every local school district, they had a big spread that covered two pages and is quite informative.

They went even further, and they put into this process a new calculation of their own, a new way of analyzing the statistics. They did something called reading performance, where they took the reading scores of the children in each school; and I will read what they did here.

Under the category called, "Reading Performance," they list the scores, they list the schools, they list the student-teacher ratio, and they list the income of that school. Income is measured in terms of the number of children who qualify for the Federal School Lunch Program. The percentage of children who qualify for the Federal School Lunch Program, well, they do it in terms of children who do not qualify. They get a figure based on the number of children who do not qualify.

If 6.6 percent of the children in the school do not qualify for the school

lunch program, they know that 93 percent do qualify. So the low-income population they can calculate by looking at the fact that the high-income, those who are above the level where they qualify for school lunch programs, are low. So they give the math score and they give the reading score, and they give the percent of changes in reading and they rank the whole city, and they give you the reading performance indication.

The reading performance is a measure calculated by the New York Times comparing schools to similar schools after taking into account student family income and English speaking ability as reported by the State. A score of 5 is the highest, and 1 is the lowest. And they show you that, and very informative things happen.

There are those of us who say that there is a relationship between the income of a family and the performance of students at school, and we have said that for years. But the New York Times reading performance index shows it quite clearly. We can just look and we will see clearly that there is a pattern where the incomes were lowest.

Where the incomes were lowest, we had the greatest problems in reading except for a few exceptions. And I think where there are exceptions, the chancellor of the school system, Rudy Crew, and of the other school authorities, as well as other school boards, everybody ought to take a look at the fact that are some low-income schools, a few, which perform very well. The income was not an indicator of their reading performance. You know, they read very well. Something is happening at that school which is unusual. But, by and large, 90 percent of the schools follow the pattern of the lowest incomes and the lowest scores. And in the overall districts, we have the same pattern.

Except, I think the people of Staten Island better take a hard look at their schools. Because it was very interesting that Staten Island, that section of New York City which has strived to secede from the city recently, they voted they wanted to get out of the city and secede, mostly middle-income homeowners' favorite place to live, their overall average in terms of income is very interesting. They are highest in the city. They have 58.9 percent of the children who do not qualify for school lunches. That is the highest in the city. And yet their reading level is nothing impressive.

And when you compare their reading levels with their income, they are the lowest in the State. The City of Staten Island is taking a hard look at the fact that they have a relatively prosperous population, people with decent incomes and yet they are not performing well at all. That is the only exception to the rule in terms of district.

Other districts follow the pattern. If the overall district had a very low income level, the percentage of students with low incomes, the district's reading levels were also quite low except

for a few exceptions here and there. And I say this in closing because I want to reemphasize the fact that opportunity programs that we have talked about in the poorest parts of our population deserving help from the government, our neglect of following our rhetoric with principle leads to situations where these concentrations of poor students are not getting the kind of help that they need.

In an area like District 23 in Brownsville, one of the lowest income levels on these charts, you have the highest number of teachers who are not certified teachers. It is a place where a great deal of effort is required to maintain certified teachers. It is a place where you will find other kinds of problems related to lack of resources that are needed. There is a correlation in that which should be taken into consideration, and it is not enough for the State to make tours of schools, do evaluations and ratings and decide to take low-performance schools and put them into special programs.

The problem is poverty, and the problem has to be addressed. We cannot address the problem of poverty if we are going to continue with this two-society system. One approach to any kind of activity which relates to international financing where bankers have invested money, we will jump in with billions of dollars to bail it out starting with the situation in this country, the Mexican bailout, and now the bailout of Asian countries. We rush with our resources and money to put it into situations which is going to make the investments of bankers good, people who have loaned money to these enterprises in these countries at high interest rates. They got high interest rates. That is why they made the loans.

So they profited from high interest rates, and now the taxpayers are going to bail out the country so they get their principal back also. So it is international socialism, giving away large amounts of money in situations which promote people who are rich already, and corrupt, and have created a situation in the free market that they ought to be allowed with free market resources.

On the other hand, we apply to Africa and to Caribbean nations a different standard, and we give them nickels and dimes and not much help. Just as we approach situations in our own domestic economy, and when we deal with vital domestic programs, we take a nickel-and-dime approach. This was an approach taken by a reporter I mentioned last week. The Eisenhower Foundation came out with a report which updated the current commission record, and they had in their report a list of investments that ought to be made by the Federal Government.

And I will leave my colleagues with this, investments in school reform should be \$15 billion a year. They said we should be investing \$15 billion a year just in school reform, not construction, just reform and other kinds

of activities in schools. We should be investing \$7 billion a year in Head Start. And they had many other programs that support poor communities, job training, economic development et cetera, and they come out with a figure of \$56 billion a year that they think we should be spending. That would be on the order of an operation bailout. We would be doing for ourselves the kind of things we are so readily willing to do in our own Nation if we would spend in our own economy and own schools, invest in our own institutions to the degree it is needed.

Modern, complicated societies require great investments in order to be able to survive and to be productive and for this Nation to continue to lead the world as it does. We are making a great mistake when we pour our resources into foreign enterprises blindly in order to bail out the private sector while we are not willing to make comparable investments in our own institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

[The Hill, Wednesday, January 28, 1998]

ASIAN BAILOUT IS UNFAIR,
COUNTERPRODUCTIVE AND ILLEGAL
(By Rep. Bernard Sanders)

President Clinton's proposal for the Asian bailout, which is supported by Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and a number of Republicans, is an insult to American taxpayers, counterproductive for movement toward a stable world economy, and illegal.

It is amazing to me that even as President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich tell us we have to cut back on Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' programs, affordable housing and children's needs—and perhaps even Social Security in the near future—that we can provide some \$15-to-\$20 billion in loans to Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines and South Korea. This action will only increase public cynicism.

American workers have seen a substantial decline in their standard of living over the last 20 years, even as they are working longer hours for lower wages. Twenty-two percent of the children in this country live in poverty, millions of elderly people cannot afford prescription drugs, 40 million Americans lack health insurance, and there has recently been a significant increase in homelessness and hunger. For these people, apparently, there is no government assistance available, only the virtues of "personal responsibility."

But when foreign governments, some led by corrupt authoritarian billionaires, need assistance, the United States is there in rapid response fashion to help them out. Where are the "risks" for the poorly managed governments which have run their economies into bankruptcy? Where is the "self-regulation" of the free enterprise system for the wealthy special-interests in Asia that have borrowed more money than they can repay?

And where is the "magic of the marketplace" for the reckless investors and speculators that have made huge profits by investing and lending money in Asia, but now want U.S. taxpayers to bail them out? Or the corrupt dictators like President Suharto of Indonesia, whose family is worth \$30-to-\$40 billion and who has invested much of his money abroad in foreign currencies?

Should the taxpayers of this country really be providing \$19.3 billion as part of the bailout to these huge, profitable banks and their

overpaid executives? Is that really the way the system is supposed to work? I don't think so. That's socialism for the rich and the powerful, and Darwinian capitalism for the middle-class and the poor.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) bailouts, as currently designed, are illegal and in violation of the Sanders-Frank Amendment of 1994, which requires U.S. representatives to international financial institutions to urge borrowing countries to guarantee internationally recognized workers' rights, and to include the status of such rights as an integral part of the institution's policy dialogue with each borrowing country.

This has not been done. In Indonesia, for example, Mughtar Pakpahan, the head of the independent Indonesia Labor Welfare Union, is still in jail because of his belief that workers have the right to freely organize and join unions. No one believes that Indonesia guarantees internationally recognized worker rights.

Will the IMF bailout improve the lives of people who are affected? Experts as diverse as former Republican Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz, Jim Sheehan of the conservative Competitive Enterprise Institute, Ralph Nader and the Friends of the Earth agree that it won't.

Finally, what does this bailout say about our position in the international economy? How does this crisis relate to our absurd trade policies which, this year, will run up a record-breaking \$200 billion trade deficit as American corporations continue to invest billions in low-wage Third World countries, while laying off workers here?

The president and Congress must move to resolve this crisis and make certain that similar crises do not arise again. Let me suggest a few steps that should be taken as soon as possible:

We must not repeat the errors of the past, learning nothing from the savings and loan fiasco and the Mexican bailout. Instead, we must use this crisis to fully debate the proper role for the United States in the global economy, and all aspects of IMF policy;

Enforce the law and not support any IMF bailout which does not guarantee internationally recognized worker rights;

Make certain that the financial institutions responsible for the crisis pay for the bailout, and not the taxpayers of the United States or the workers of Asia;

Implement a tax in the U.S. on international transactions on capital that creates an insurance fund for bailouts; and

Make certain that the IMF does not implement a one-size-fits-all "austerity program," which further impoverishes the workers of Asia, and makes their exports into the United States even cheaper, potentially costing us millions of jobs.

Finally, we must pass legislation prohibiting the president from expending any more than \$250 million from the Exchange Stabilization Fund without the approval of Congress.

MODERNIZE SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

In order for students to learn and to compete in the global economy, schools must be well-equipped and they must be able to accommodate smaller class sizes. To address these and other critical needs, the President's FY 99 Budget will propose Federal tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. This is more than double the assistance proposed last year, which covered half the interest on an estimated \$20 billion in bonds. The new proposal provides tax credits in lieu of interest payments for investors in two types of bonds: School Modernization

Bonds (a new proposal), and expansion of the Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (created last year). These tax credits will cost the Treasury \$5 billion over 5 years, and more than \$10 billion over ten years.

SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BONDS

\$19.4 billion in zero-interest bonds (\$9.7 billion in 1999 and \$9.7 billion in 2000) is proposed for construction and renovation of public school facilities. The Department of the Treasury would allocate the rights to offer these special 15-year bonds to States, territories, and certain school districts that have submitted school construction plans to the Secretary of Education.

Half of the bond authority would be allocated to the 100 school districts with the largest number of low-income children, in proportion to the number of such children served (the Title I Basic Grant formula), to provide assistance in accordance with each school district's plan.

The other half would be allocated to States and territories to provide to school districts in need of assistance in accordance with each State's plan. The bond authority would be allocated according to the State's proportion of low-income children (Title I Basic Grant formula), except that children in the 100 school districts (above) would not be included in the count.

School Construction Plans: In order to receive a bond allocation, States, territories, and the eligible 100 school districts would be required to submit a plan to the Secretary of Education. The plans would (1) demonstrate that a comprehensive survey has been undertaken of the construction and renovation needs in the jurisdiction, including meeting requirements for access by persons with disabilities, and (2) describe how the jurisdiction will ensure that the bond funds are used for the purposes intended by this proposal, including the requirement that they will supplement, not supplant, amounts that would have been spent on construction and renovation in the absence of these bonds. State plans would also describe how they will ensure that localities with the greatest need—as demonstrated by inadequate facilities coupled with a low level of resources to meet the needs—would be served.

QUALIFIED ZONE ACADEMY BONDS

This program, created by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, provides a tax credit to pay interest on bonds for a variety of expenses (including building renovation) related to certain public school-business partnerships. The FY 99 Budget would expand these bonds to cover school construction and would increase and extend the bond authority by \$2.4 billion (an additional \$1 billion, to \$1.4 billion, in 1999, and \$1.4 billion in 2000). This bond authority is allocated to States on the basis of their respective populations of individuals with incomes below the poverty line.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1757, FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during special order of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ISTOOK) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen

relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-432)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1757), to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **DIVISIONS.**—*This Act is organized into three divisions as follows:*

(1) **DIVISION A.**—*Foreign Affairs Agencies Consolidation Act of 1998.*

(2) **DIVISION B.**—*Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999.*

(3) **DIVISION C.**—*United Nations Reform Act of 1998.*

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—*The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

SUBDIVISION A—CONSOLIDATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Purposes.

Sec. 103. Definitions.

Sec. 104. Report on budgetary cost savings resulting from reorganization.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Effective date.

CHAPTER 2—ABOLITION AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 211. Abolition of United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Sec. 212. Transfer of functions to Secretary of State.

Sec. 213. Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security.

CHAPTER 3—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 221. References.

Sec. 222. Repeals.

Sec. 223. Amendments to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

Sec. 224. Compensation of officers.

Sec. 225. Additional conforming amendments.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Effective date.

CHAPTER 2—ABOLITION AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 311. Abolition of United States Information Agency.

Sec. 312. Transfer of functions.

Sec. 313. Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Sec. 314. Abolition of Office of Inspector General of United States Information Agency and transfer of functions.

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

Sec. 321. Congressional findings and declaration of purpose.

Sec. 322. Continued existence of Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Sec. 323. Conforming amendments to the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994.

Sec. 324. Amendments to the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act.

Sec. 325. Amendments to the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act.

Sec. 326. Transfer of broadcasting related funds, property, and personnel.

Sec. 327. Savings provisions.

Sec. 328. Report on the privatization of RFE/RL, Incorporated.

CHAPTER 4—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 331. References.

Sec. 332. Amendments to title 5, United States Code.

Sec. 333. Application of certain laws.

Sec. 334. Abolition of United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

Sec. 335. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 336. Repeals.

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Effective date.

CHAPTER 2—ABOLITION AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 411. Abolition of United States International Development Cooperation Agency.

Sec. 412. Transfer of functions and authorities.

Sec. 413. Status of AID.

CHAPTER 3—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 421. References.

Sec. 422. Conforming amendments.

TITLE V—AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Effective date.

CHAPTER 2—REORGANIZATION AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Sec. 511. Reorganization of Agency for International Development.

CHAPTER 3—AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Sec. 521. Definition of United States assistance.

Sec. 522. Administrator of AID reporting to the Secretary of State.

Sec. 523. Assistance programs coordination and oversight.

TITLE VI—TRANSITION

CHAPTER 1—REORGANIZATION PLAN

Sec. 601. Reorganization plan and report.

CHAPTER 2—REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY

Sec. 611. Reorganization authority.

Sec. 612. Transfer and allocation of appropriations.

Sec. 613. Transfer, appointment, and assignment of personnel.

Sec. 614. Incidental transfers.

Sec. 615. Savings provisions.

Sec. 616. Authority of Secretary of State to facilitate transition.

Sec. 617. Final report.

DIVISION B—FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 1001. Short title.

Sec. 1002. Definition of appropriate congressional committees.