

professors and speakers, especially at very liberal schools like Antioch, Oberlin, the University of Colorado, and some of the Ivy League schools.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that colleges and universities around this Nation will strive for full diversity and true academic freedom by allowing at least a few token conservatives onto their faculties, or at least as graduation speakers.

#### IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO LATINO COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of Social Security and how it impacts the Latino population throughout this country.

We must remember that the initial intent and purpose of the Social Security retirement system was to help alleviate the poverty among our elderly Americans and to meet the retirement needs of all workers. We must not forget the severe poverty that our seniors suffered prior to Social Security. Social Security has become the single most effective Federal anti-poverty program in our history, lifting more than 11 million seniors out of poverty.

Latinos are critically affected by any proposed changes in the Social Security System. A significant segment of the workforce, Latinos, and especially Latinas, women, represent a disproportionate percentage of those who lack employer pension coverage. We, as Hispanics, tend to work in small companies, small businesses, which do not have pensions. We are underrepresented in government jobs and for that reason do not have a lot of the pensions that others do. More than other segments of the population, Latinos depend heavily on Social Security to live their senior years in dignity.

The Latino population is growing rapidly. Currently, Latinos constitute 8 percent of the total U.S. workforce, and by 2010 Latinos are projected to account for 13.2 percent of all the workers. From 1997 to the year 2020, the number of Latinos that are aged 65 will double.

Unfortunately, despite the gains in education and other areas, Latinos still remain concentrated in low-wage jobs that provide few benefits. While more than 51 percent of Anglos workers have employer pension coverage, the same is true for only one-third of the Latino workers. Accordingly, Latino retirees are more than twice as likely as Anglo retirees to rely solely on Social Security benefits as a means of economic support.

In addition, Latinos are less likely than Anglos to receive incomes from interest on savings and investments. For example, in 1998, of all the persons reporting interest income, only 5.3 percent went to Latinos.

I would like to also applaud the efforts of some groups that are looking at the impact that any changes in Social Security will have on women. While reforming the Social Security System, we have serious implications for women, and especially Latinas. The women in our community, Latinas, may be the most severely impacted of all populations. The Latinas are more likely than other women to work inside the home and are less likely than other women to have retirement savings accounts.

Moreover, Latinas are less likely than other workers to have access to private pension coverage, and they tend to receive the lowest wages of any group in the work force. Relying heavily on Social Security benefits, changes in marital status or the loss of a principal wage earner places Latinas in a particularly vulnerable situations.

Given the paramount importance of Social Security to Hispanic men and women, we must approach so-called reform efforts with caution, weighing the impact on this key, fast-growing population. I am concerned that the plans to privatize Social Security would drain needed resources from the Social Security Trust Fund and jeopardize benefit payments to retirees, the blind, disabled workers and survivors.

The leading plan proposed by the administration's hand-picked Social Security commission would drain \$1.5 trillion from the trust fund in just the next 10 years, money that is already being used for other purposes. Privatization of Social Security would require cuts in guaranteeing Social Security benefits. The President's Social Security commission recommended a privatization plan that cuts benefits for future retirees by up to 46 percent. Everyone would be subject to these cuts, not just workers who choose to have individual accounts, and Latinos would be hit the hardest.

Social Security privatization would expose individual workers and their families to greater financial risks. Under privatization, benefit levels would be determined by the volatile stock market, by the worker's luck in making investments, and by the timing on his or her decisions to retire. In light of the Enron disaster, we know the risks.

Latinos, who are, more than other groups, dependent on Social Security as a guaranteed income stream in retirement, would lose under privatization.

Other proposals, while well-meaning, would not help us reach our goal of ensuring future solvency. I ask that, as we look at Social Security, we make sure we look at its impact on special populations as well as the baby boomers and what we consider the baby echos, those kids of those baby boomers.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH STANDS TALL FOR DOMESTIC STEEL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a moment to applaud President Bush for standing tall in favor of our domestic steel industry. He has, at a very critical moment, stood up for steel. If we have a domestic steel industry in coming decades, I believe it will be because of this courageous action and an administration that was willing to listen to steelworkers, listen to steel producers, and also listen to all other interested parties in order to craft a creative policy. He clearly listened to those who were calling for substantial relief for an industry in crisis. It has been running the risk of being hollowed out by unfair trade practices.

It is obvious that the President carefully weighed the issue. His judicious decision will provide breathing space to the domestic steelworkers and the industry. Enacting tariffs of up to 30 percent for most steel products provides help for those hardest hit by unfavorable conditions in the steel market. This administration has stepped up to the plate for the American steel industry and its workers, something that previous administrations, regrettably, had been unwilling to do.

Without the concrete actions taken by this President, the industry was facing a meltdown. The President recognized that the American steel industry and its workers have done their part in recent years. This is something that critics do not really willingly acknowledge, but the fact is our steel producers have taken dramatic steps to reduce inefficient capacity and modernize operations to become among the most productive steel producers in the world, with as few as one-and-a-half man hours needed per ton of steel produced.

□ 1515

That is an extraordinary transformation of an industry that was very inefficient a few decades ago.

To achieve these advances in productivity, the U.S. steel industry reduced capacity by more than 23 million tons, closed numerous inefficient mills, and significantly cut jobs. The workers have endured their fair share of pain and suffering as the workforce was reduced by hundreds of thousands of workers in an effort to become the most efficient producers of steel. But we all know that when competing with the unfair trading practices of some of our competitors, it was simply not enough.

Let us understand, Mr. Speaker, what the President did was WTO compatible. It was based on remedies approved by the International Trade Commission, and it utilized our 201 process, which the WTO contemplated. While opponents of this 201 action are crying foul, saying the cost will be prohibitive, Mr.

Speaker, allow me to assure Members that their arguments are without substance.

According to a study by Professor Jerry Hausman, an economist at MIT, the assumptions from opponents such as the Consuming Industry's Trade Action Council were fundamentally flawed. Hausman's study, which unlike the CITAC study so often quoted in the media, accurately reflected the current steel market, showed the tariffs would cost the average consumer about \$2 a year and have no negative impact on the U.S. economy. This was a study of stronger remedies than were actually proposed by the International Trade Commission. Hausman's study showed that the section 201 remedies would provide a net benefit of \$9 billion a year to the U.S. economy. Steel constitutes only a small share of the total cost of most products that contain steel, so the cost to the consumer and the costs on a single consumer item would be minimal.

For a typical family car, the increase caused by the imposition of a 40 percent tariff would be about \$60, a 30 percent tariff in the tariff structure proposed by the President would be substantially less. For a refrigerator, the increase would be less than \$3.

Again, I have to congratulate the President for being engaged on these issues, looking past the cannot at the substance, and being concerned about many of the communities we have in places like western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia where people have built a living and built living wages around a steel industry that we need to have in this country for strategic reasons, and if we are going to maintain our industrial base.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has had the courage to take on this tough issue. We need to do more in Congress. We need to look at the issue of legacy costs. We need to look at ways potentially of participating in a global effort to rationalize the industry; but in the end, we can build on this 201 decision, we can build on the President's courage, and working with the administration, we have an opportunity to lay the groundwork for a strong, healthy competitive world-class American steel industry that is allowed to compete on a level playing field.

#### INTEGRITY ABOVE ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on Resources heard testimony from investigators and from the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife and others in regards to a scheme put forward by several Federal employees to alter a lynx study in the northwestern part of the Nation.

It is very important for us as government employees to maintain the integ-

rity of the process, and a part of that goes clear down to our field employees upon whom we depend very heavily to deliver a product that they are required by protocol to deliver. What do I mean by this? What happened is we had several biologists, Ray Scharpf, Mitch Wainright, Sarah LaMarr and Tim McCracken, Federal employees involved in a lynx study in the northwest part of this Nation. These are professional biologists or associated with professional biologists.

Their job was to go out and determine whether or not there was any evidence of lynx in a forest, to then determine whether or not further investigation was necessary. What these individuals did was go out and planted evidence. They planted evidence, just like a bad cop goes into a house and plants drugs. They planted lynx hair and submitted the lynx hair to the laboratory in hopes that the laboratory would assume that there were now lynx in this area that they had studied.

The average biologist that we have working for the Forest Service or for the Fish and Wildlife are people of high integrity. I cannot think of a biologist that I have met that I have not been fairly confident of the integrity and the standards that they rise to.

But in this case, these Federal employees brought a disgrace upon the United States Government and brought a disgrace upon these agencies by planting evidence and submitting false samples for a survey. Unfortunately, these employees are still employed by the Federal Government. Fortunately, we had a whistle blower. An employee on his last day called in the fact that false samples had been submitted to this survey.

My point in taking the floor today is that I appreciate the Members who attended the hearing today, and I especially appreciate the investigators who went out and came up with these conclusions. We know that these employees knew that what they were doing was wrong and outside their protocol, but they still carried out their actions.

Mr. Speaker, today we had a good hearing about it, and I think we will be able to install some fire walls that will prevent this type of scheme from happening again. In the meantime, it has unfortunately cast a small shadow upon the profession. What we need to do is assure that that profession has no shadow at all because their importance in our studies out there are absolutely critical. We depend on them very much, very much; and we have good reason to depend on them. They are the experts, but integrity comes first and above all.

#### STOP IMPENDING RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with several of my colleagues, to discuss the most pressing domestic issue of our time, that of Social Security.

Let me first begin by thanking my fellow freshman Democrat, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), for his leadership in organizing with me this Special Order about the impending raid of Social Security. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her leadership and assistance in organizing our colleagues here today.

Our Nation faces incredible challenges; this we all know as we stand united in a war on terrorism. All of our thoughts and prayers are with our men and women in uniform today. This afternoon I stand before this House to talk about one of the most pressing domestic issues of our time, an issue that cannot be ignored even as we fight a war abroad, and that is Social Security.

Around the world as populations of developed countries grow older, the cost of paying for pension and health benefits rise. In the United States, more than 44 million people collect benefits from our Social Security system. Social Security represents one of the most important and depended-upon programs in this Nation's history.

Social Security is a great American success story, having reduced the percentage of poverty among our Nation's retirees from over 50 percent to 11 percent since the program's inception in 1935. Moreover, Social Security is not simply a retirement program; it is also a program that provides disability and survivor's benefits to over 13 million workers and their families.

Last year this House and this country had a 10-year estimated \$5.6 trillion unified surplus, which included \$3 trillion in non-Social Security surplus. But how times can change. In less than a year, \$4 trillion of that surplus is now gone due to tax cuts, the downturn in our economy, and the war effort.

The greatest tragedy is not simply the diminution of the surplus, but also the fact that the proposed budget now before us in this House diverts \$1.4 trillion of the Social Security trust fund and \$556 billion from the Medicare trust fund to pay for spending and new tax cuts.

I have supported and continue to support tax cuts, specific tax cuts, but not tax cuts that undermine our ability to honor our promises and commitments. I support, as do so many Members of this House, a fiscally responsible plan for our Federal budget, a plan that recognizes the current health of the Social Security trust fund, while also recognizing the need in the future to protect it.

Because of the current strength of the trust fund, we have an opportunity before us as a Nation that we will not have too much longer to protect the reserves that will be vital in ensuring the