

Tibet covers an area the size of Western Europe and is the world's highest plateaus. The Culture is magnificent and unique. Until 1950, Tibet had retained that ancient culture.

My amendment would offer additional hope to the Tibetan people that the international community, particularly the United States is supportive of their independence and that we are providing resources for improved systems and enhancement of aid programs.

The United States Army School of the Americas will have \$4 million of its appropriations transferred to a true democratic cause. Our efforts to provide international military training and education to the armed forces in Latin America has at best led to questionable practices by its graduates. We want democracy. We want to see our funds used to support the development of democracies. The Tibetans want democracy. Some graduates of the School of the Americas have not demonstrated such a commitment.

Graduates of the United States Army School of the Americas include some of the worst human rights abusers in the Western Hemisphere, including 19 Salvadoran soldiers linked to the 1989 murder of six Jesuit priests and their housekeeper and her daughter. Two of the three officers cited by the Guatemalan archbishop's office are suspected of the killing of anthropologist Myrna Mack in 1992, as well as three top leaders of the notorious Guatemalan military intelligence unit D-2 were graduates of the School of the Americas.

One-half of the 247 Colombian army officers cited in the definitive work on Colombian human rights abuses, *El Terrorismo de Estado en Colombia*, in 1992 were graduates of this School.

Ten of the 30 Chilean officers against whom a Spanish judge in 1998 requested indictments for crimes of terrorism, torture and disappearance as well as the El Salvador death squad leader Roberto D'Aubuisson graduated from the School of the Americas.

Two of the three killers of Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador and 10 of the 12 officers responsible for the murder of 900 civilians in the El Salvadoran village El Mozote are graduates.

And the most notorious for us, three of the five officers involved in the 1980 rape and murder of four United States churchwomen in El Salvador graduated from the School of the Americas.

Reducing funding for this School does not prevent the United States from providing appropriate training for military personnel of Latin American armed forces. It is conceivable that by our actions a better military training and education program can be developed. With a most improved screening process for potential students.

I urge you to support my amendment for democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has done an outstanding job of focussing attention on the violations by the People's Republic of China with regard to the Tibetan people. We cannot give enough attention to the occupation of the People's Republic of China in Tibet and we welcome the gentlewoman's remarks.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that on page 39 of the committee report, we recommend that \$250,000 be made available for democracy training and education activities for Tibetans. In addition, on page 55 of the report, we recommend \$2 million for continued humanitarian assistance for the Tibetan refugees.

So the committee has already addressed the concerns of the gentlewoman from Texas. We do not earmark, as she well knows, in our bill. This amendment would earmark and, therefore, I must continue to, number one, reserve my point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) I commend for bringing the plight of Tibet to the attention once again of our colleagues. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our distinguished chairman, has been most cooperative on this issue of Tibet. It is a priority for many of us on the committee. And, of course, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the authorizing committee, has been a champion on the Tibet issue for a long time.

But as the gentleman from Alabama said, the funds are in the bill already because this is a priority. The plight of the people of Tibet challenges the conscience of the world and by and large the world ignores their plight. Our bill does not, and the more attention we can call, the better.

Mr. Chairman, even though this may not be able to be received by the full House this evening, nonetheless, the bright light that the gentlewoman focuses on Tibet once again is appreciated and will contribute to freedom there one day.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by simply thanking both the ranking member and the chairman for the efforts that have been made in the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, as well as that of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations. My effort tonight was to provide more resources because of the horrific situation in Tibet. The abuse of human rights and the exile of the Dalai Lama.

I would like to continue to work with all of the committees and as well the

chairman, ranking member of the subcommittee and the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations as we try to bring peace and dignity to the Tibetan people.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:  
LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES, OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION, AND THE TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SEC. . None of the funds made available pursuant to this Act for the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or the Trade and Development Agency, may be used to enter into any new obligation, guarantee, or agreement on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 29, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that no funds for new obligations, guarantees, or agreements can be issued under the Export-Import Bank under OPIC or under the Trade Development Agency. This again is an attempt to try to slow up the amount of dollars that flow into corporations and for their benefit specifically as well as our foreign competitors.

China, for instance, receives the largest amount of money from the Export-Import Bank. Outstanding liabilities for the Export-Import Bank is now \$55 billion. There is \$5.9 billion that have been granted to the Chinese.

Last week we had a very important vote on trade. It was hotly debated over human rights issues. I voted to trade with China because I believe it is proper to trade with people. We are less likely to fight with them. And in this institution, too often we use our terms carelessly and we talk about free trade as being something which is managed trade. Free trade here generally means that we will have the NAFTA people managing trade, the World Trade Organization managing trade, and we will subsidize our businesses.

Just this past week we had the World Trade Organization rule against us saying that we grant \$2 billion worth of

tax benefits to our own corporations and they ruled that that was illegal. This is all done in the name of free trade.

I say that we should have free trade. We should trade with our friends and with anybody who would trade that we are not at war with. We should really, really be careful about issuing sanctions. But here we are, last week we had the great debate and a lot of people could not stand the idea of trading with Red China because of their human rights record and I understand that, although I did not accept that position. But this is the time to do something about it.

Trading with Red China under true free trade is a benefit to both of us. It is a benefit to our consumers and it benefits both countries because we are talking with people and we are not fighting with them. But it gets to be a serious problem when we tax our people in order to benefit those who are receiving the goods overseas.

□ 2245

Now, if there is a worldwide downturn, this \$55 billion of liabilities out there could be very significant in how it is going to be paid back. The Chinese right now, their economy is not all that healthy. They are talking about a devaluation.

So this is a liability that the American taxpayers are exposed to. If we do have a concern about Red China and the Chinese, yes, let us work with them, let us trade with them, but let us not subsidize them.

This is what I am trying to do. I am trying to stop this type of subsidies. So my bill, my amendment would stop any new obligation. It does not close down Export-Import Bank. It allows all the old loans to operate and function, but no new obligations can be made, no new guaranties, and no agreement, with the idea that someday we may truly move to free trade, that we do not recognize free trade as being subsidized trade as well as internationally managed trade with organizations such as NAFTA and World Trade Organization.

Those institutions are not free trade institutions. They are managed trade institutions for the benefit of special interests. That is what this type of funding is for is for the benefit of special interests, whether it is our domestic corporation, which, indeed, I would recognize does receive some benefit.

Sixty-seven percent of all the funding of the Export-Import Bank goes to, not a large number of companies, to five companies. I will bet my colleagues, if they look at those five companies in this country that gets 67 percent of the benefit and look at their political action records, my colleagues might be enlightened. I mean, I bet my colleagues we would learn something about where that money goes, because they are big corporations and they benefit, and they will have their defenders here.

It is time we look carefully at these subsidies.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In doing so, I want to correct the record. Those of us who were asking for raising tariffs on products coming from China were not interested in cutting off trade with China. What we were doing is to say, let us have the same reciprocity between our two countries as we would expect from other countries.

But then to use that and say it is all right to give a \$70 billion trade surplus to the regime so they can strengthen their hold on the people of China but we should take out our concerns with China on the Ex-Im Bank I think is very inappropriate. That is why I oppose it.

The Ex-Im Bank does not subsidize the Chinese government. The Ex-Im Bank subsidizes U.S. manufacturers selling into countries, including China.

The Paul amendment would not allow the Export-Import Bank to assume any new business. This would mean that all of the Ex-Im's resources would be used to liquidate existing transactions. In other words, Ex-Im would slowly, gradually shut down.

I agree with the gentleman that we must subject the Ex-Im, OPIC, and all of these institutions to harsh scrutiny. Are they performing the task that is their established purpose, to promote U.S. exports? The Ex-Im Bank, I think, from the scrutiny we subjected to in our committee does that.

The gentleman's amendment is ill-advised. The same would apply to OPIC, which, by the way, does not operate in China.

So I urge our colleagues to oppose this amendment for many more reasons than I have time to go into.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed the impact of the closing down of OPIC earlier tonight, and my colleagues can see that the will of the House certainly agreed with those of us who think that we must have this competitive level playing field with the rest of the G-7 Nations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is absolutely right when it comes to basic sounding good things, a feel-good amendment, when he talks about Ex-Im Bank giving money to Red China. Ex-Im Bank does not give money to Red China. Ex-Im Bank loans money to American businesses to establish programs in Red China. There is no prohibition against Red China coming to the United States to invest with the support of a similar organization in China.

What we are saying is we want to be just like the rest of the world when it comes to global economy. This is a global economy. The only way our peo-

ple can participate in global economy is to have the same advantages as do Canada, as do Japan, as do Germany, as do France. We need this in order to work today in a global economy.

So we are not talking about losing money. That is not the question here. Ex-Im bank is not losing money. We are talking about whether or not we are going to have a financing capability that will enable American jobs to be exported to all of the countries that the gentleman from Texas mentioned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is the same debate that we had on OPIC except this one is twice as bad because, also, he closes down the Ex-Im Bank as well and cuts off the ability of American business people to do business in most any foreign country.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that it is truly a subsidy to a foreign corporation, a foreign government. For Red China, corporations and governments are essentially identical. They are not really quite in the free market yet.

But the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) points out that, no, that is not true. The money does not go to Red China and they buy things; we just give it directly. We do not even send it round trip. This is true.

We take taxpayers' money. We take taxpayers' guarantee. We give them to those huge five corporations that do 67 percent of the business. We give them the money. But where do the goods go? Do the goods go to the American taxpayers? No. They get all of the liabilities. The subsidies help the Chinese.

So, technically, yes, we do not send the money there. But who is going to pay it back? The Chinese pays the loan back. If they default, who pays the bill if the Chinese defaults? Who pays the bill if they default? It is obviously the taxpayers.

What I am pointing out is that \$5.9 billion that the Chinese now had borrowed from us, from the Export-Import Bank, is a significant obligation that, too, is on the backs of the American taxpayer.

So I urge support for the amendment because, if we are serious about free trade, just please do not call it free trade anymore. Call it managed trade. Call it subsidized trade. Call it special interest trade. But please do not call it free trade anymore, because it is not free trade.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the \$16 million, or whatever figure he is using that goes to China, goes in the form of things like airplane. Yes, a lot of it goes to Boeing,