

their part as individuals, that no parent allows a child to go into a home without inquiring as to whether or not there is a gun there, if it is locked, if it is loaded.

If Americans can somehow cut in half the rate of automobile deaths in the last 30 years, I know that we can do our part to protect our families. There is no single magic solution, but together we can find hundreds of ways everyday to make America safer, to make our communities more livable, because the most important face is going to be the face that does not appear on a poster like this, a picture that does not appear of one of our loved ones whose life was not lost to gun violence.

IMPORTANCE OF SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GRANGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, yesterday, Governor Bush came out with some general parameters on saving Social Security and the importance of saving Social Security. There has been a lot of discussion of whether there should be any privately-owned investment owned by the American worker as opposed to continuing to keep on going with a system that is insolvent. What it boils down to is that because of the demographics, because people are living longer, because the birth rate has been going down, there are fewer workers paying their taxes into a system to support and finance existing senior citizens benefits.

It is important that everybody understands that it is a pay-as-you-go program. It is a program where taxes come in one week, and by the end of the week, they are paid out in benefits. If you are an average worker today, then you are going to get an estimated 1.7 percent real return on the money you and your employer put into the system.

If you are a young worker, because we are going to run out of enough money eventually, there is not going to be adequate tax money, coming in to pay benefits, then you are going to get even a smaller return. There are two ways to fix Social Security; you either increase the revenue coming in, or you reduce the benefits going out.

None of us want to reduce benefits. Everybody, including Governor Bush, has committed that we are not going to reduce benefits for current retirees or near-term retirees. So then the question is, is there merit in having privately-owned accounts, and if we get a larger real return than 1.7 percent, then, absolutely, it brings more revenue into the system. In fact, if my Social Security bill had been passed, the first one that I introduced 5 years ago, the 25 year old when they retire would have \$150,000 more than what they are

going to receive under the current Social Security system.

There are safe investments even through the worst parts of the history of this country, on dips in Social Security. We saw that there was no 12-year period where there was not at least a positive gain on Social Security.

There are companies now that will guarantee you a gain, and if you are going to do a reasonable investment, and I would say reasonable for people over 45 is maybe 40 percent in bonds and 60 percent in safe stocks, in most all the proposals, Democrats and Republicans have all agreed that there needs to be privately-owned investment accounts, I mean Senator KERREY, Senator MOYNIHAN respected in this regard, Democrats in the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has been working on this for years, and he comes to the conclusion that there needs to be some privately-owned accounts, that are put into safe investments, low-risk investments, because it is an absolute certainty: If you leave those investments in more than 12 years, it is going to recover more than the 1.7 percent average that Social Security is going to pay people.

Now, the other part of the problem is that Social Security is running out of money, so we need to do something. We cannot just pretend that the problem is not there. On this chart, Social Security the bottom piece of pie now represents 20 percent of all government spending. This is a graphic impression of what is happening in Social Security. The blue at the top left is this short period of time where there is more tax money coming in than is needed to pay benefits, but over time, for the next 75 years, we are short \$120 trillion.

Tax revenues are short \$120 trillion of what is needed to pay what is promised in benefits today. Another way to say that is that the unfunded liability is short, \$9 trillion today. You would have to put \$9 trillion into an interest bearing account today to come up with the \$120 trillion that is needed over the next 75 years. We have got to do something.

Madam Speaker, suggesting, like the Vice President has, that simply if we pay down the debt, and you are doing that by borrowing the excess money from Social Security and using that money to pay down the debt held by the public, it is like using one credit card to pay off the debt of another credit card; to pretend that is going to somehow solve this red deficit problem is unrealistic.

It cannot be scored by the actuaries over at the Social Security Administration. So I plead with the Vice President, I pled with the President of the United States do not demagog suggestions of how we move ahead to fix Social Security. It is too important a program.

I have met with the President maybe four times over the last 16 months, he ended up saying that he is not going to

come up with a plan because he is afraid it would be criticized. Let us move ahead, let us work together, let us, Republicans and Democrats, make sure that we fix this important program.

ENACT EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee will be marking up our appropriations bill for FY 2001. I am very concerned about the fact that the emergency supplemental has not been enacted yet by the other body. In fact, I have written a letter to the distinguished majority leader asking that they take up this emergency supplemental as quickly as possible.

We are now faced with an emergency situation in the area surrounding Los Alamos, New Mexico. We also have nine other wildfires, and I am told 67 forest fires raging nationally, many of them in the west, and the money for fighting these forest fires will run out, the emergency money will run out by the end of May, unless Congress enacts this supplemental.

What we are asking for is \$200 million for the Bureau of Land Management. The BLM does a great job of fighting the forest fires, along with the forest service; we are asking there for \$150 million, or a total of \$350 million.

This year 2000 will probably be one of the worst forest fire years since 1994, and also 1999 was a year where we had many devastating fires as well. I want to compliment the majority in the House for having enacted the supplemental, but now it is been languishing for several weeks, if not months, over in the other body.

Madam Speaker, this is a true emergency. I do not think we should be playing appropriations politics with this issue. We need to get this money out to the BLM so that they can run their emergency center out in Idaho, we need to get this money out to the Forest Service.

Secretary Babbitt has written back in early April a very impassioned plea to the majority leader in the other body urging that this emergency supplemental be taken up as quickly as possible, and there really is not any excuse.

Now, if they do not want to take up the entire emergency supplemental, one possible way to move forward would be to take out these two items. The money for the BLM, the \$200 million and the \$150 million for the forest service, and pass that immediately, and then we can pass it here in the House, get it down to the President and take care of this situation.

We cannot help but be sympathetic to see these people out in New Mexico,

some 260 of them, who have lost their homes. They are living in schools and other areas. They need to know that the Federal Government is going to do everything it can to make sure that we have the resources to fight these fires and to go in and restore the ground and the areas that have been damaged.

I think this is an emergency, a true emergency. I urge the leadership here in the House to meet with the leadership in the Senate and try to work out a way to get this money freed. I intend to offer these amendments as additions to the Interior Appropriations bill for 2001, hoping that maybe we can rush that bill through if it is the only way we can get action out of the other body. Again, I believe this an emergency. I think we need to act.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTIES ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, this morning I want to examine the environmental record of the Republican leadership and of the GOP Presidential candidate, Governor Bush. Last Thursday, Madam Speaker, the EPA released its Toxics Release Inventory which highlights the fact that Texas continues to have the largest amount of airborne toxic emissions in the Nation, as has been the case every year since 1995.

More than 300 million pounds of toxic chemicals were released into Texas' air, water and land according to this latest report. Yet, Governor Bush has pushed a strictly voluntary program for dirty power plants to reduce harmful emissions, even though Texas' deteriorating air quality has reached a crisis proportion.

Madam Speaker, of the air pollution produced by companies exempt from mandatory regulations in Texas, 75 percent, or 741,000 tons of toxic emissions, came from companies that contributed to and are close to Bush's gubernatorial races from 1994 to 1998. And only 3 of 36 plants who pledged to reduce emissions under this voluntary plan have actually done so and not even 1 percent of emissions from grandfathered plants have been reduced.

In fact, Texas has experienced significant increases in emissions. Specifically, Texas experienced an increase of 2 million pounds of cancer-causing and other toxic chemicals from 1997 to 1998.

Madam Speaker, although Texas ranks third worst in water pollution from chemical dumping, Governor Bush has done nothing to improve water quality and has subsequently underfunded Superfund cleanups. He also appointed industry representatives to State environmental agencies that had previously fought against environmental regulations.

Several environmental groups have called on Governor Bush to stop gutting the environment and act proactively. We know this will not happen. So we have to continue our efforts, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, and elect a President that will close the loophole for grandfathered power plants.

Vice President Gore has called for a market-based approach to reducing power plants that addresses the four primary pollutants of concern, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon dioxide and mercury. I have a bill that establishes a trading program to reduce these four pollutants, and I urge my colleagues to enact this type of legislation as quickly as possible to improve the health of our citizens and our environment.

Madam Speaker, let me also point out that Vice President Gore has led the fight on many environmental efforts from preserving open space to protecting air and water quality. He also has led the brownfield development program. And I can tell my colleagues the importance of this program, because my hometown of Long Branch, New Jersey has received a \$200,000 grant from the EPA to help redevelop brownfields. The Republican leadership's ideas of Superfund reform is to gut water quality protections and put a cap and fence around a site and call it a day.

I have over 115 superfund sites in my district, and I can tell my colleagues that this is not environmental cleanup or protection.

Again, I just wanted to highlight this morning the major differences between the Republicans and the Democrats on environmental issues and, particularly, the differences between our Presidential candidates. We have our Presidential candidate, Vice President Gore, who has fought hard over the last 7 years and even before as a Member of Congress to protect the environment and improve the environment around our country.

TRADE WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, here in Congress, we say we stand together and in our commitment toward the spread of democratic ideals and improvement of the human rights. These last couple weeks I am not so sure.

During the weeks approaching the vote for Permanent Normal Trade Relations for the People's Republic of China, corporate CEOs flocked to the Hill to lobby for increase unrestricted trade with China.

They talk about access to 1.2 billion potential consumers in China. What they do not say is that their real interest is in 1.2 billion Chinese workers,

workers whom they pay wage on the level of slave labor.

These CEOs will tell us, increase trade with China will allow human rights to improve. Democracy will flourish with increased free trade as we engage with China. But as these CEOs speak, their companies systematically violate the most fundamental of human and worker rights.

In the new report "Made in China, The Role of U.S. Companies in Denying Human and Worker Rights," released by Charles Kernaghan and the National Labor Committee, we see evidence of American corporations exploiting the horrible conditions of human rights in the People's Republic of China.

Companies such as Huffy and Nike and Wal-Mart are contracting with Chinese sweatshops to export to the United States, often with the assistance of repressive and corrupt local government authorities. 1,800 Huffy bicycle workers have lost their jobs in Ohio as Huffy shut down its last three remaining U.S. plants over the last 17 months. In July of 1998, Huffy fired 850 workers from its Celina, Ohio plant where workers earned \$17 an hour. Huffy now outsources all of its production to developing nations, such as China, where laborers are forced to work 15 hours a day, 7 days a week and earn an average of 33 cents an hour, less than 2 percent of what Ohio Huffy bicycle workers earned.

Wal-Mart makes its line of Kathie Lee Gifford handbags in China. There are a thousand workers at the factory, where they put in 14-hour shifts, 7 days a week, 29 or 30 days a month, one off day per month. The average wage of the factory is 3 cents an hour.

Workers live in factory dormitories housed 16 in a room. Their ID documents have been confiscated; they are allowed to leave the factory only for one and a half hours a day. For half of all factory workers, rent for the dormitory exceeds their wages. Workers earn nothing at all and, in many cases, owe the company money. These people are indentured servants to Kathie Lee and to Wal-Mart. Some would simply call it slavery.

The findings in Charles Kernaghan's report illustrates why democratic countries in the developing world are losing ground to more authoritarian countries in the developing world. Democratic nations, such as India, are losing out to more totalitarian governments such as China. Democratic nations such as Taiwan are losing out to more authoritarian governments such as Indonesia where people are not free and workers do as their told.

The share of developing country exports to the U.S. from democratic nations fell from 53 percent 10 years ago to 35 percent today. Corporate America wants to do business with countries with docile workforces that earn below-poverty wages and are not allowed to organize to bargain collectively.