

says that China has gained our trust and approval, and I would be saying that I believe this trade deal is the best thing for the people of my district.

I will not do that, because this is a bad deal for our workers.

The numbers do not lie. If PNTR is granted, New Jersey will see 22,276 jobs lost over the next ten years. The United States as a whole will suffer a net job loss of 872,000 jobs over the same ten years.

Proponents like to talk about job creation, but they do not like publicizing the job loss on our side.

The real job creation will be in China, where U.S. businesses will flock with their factories.

They will go there to pay thirty-three, thirteen, even three-cents per hour in sweatshops that are basically workshops from a maximum-security penitentiary.

Big business in America wants to exploit a labor force that cannot go on strike for higher wages, or for better conditions. It wants to take advantage of a labor force that is oppressed by its government. In fact, China has prison labor camps listed among its manufacturing companies!

Why is this year any different? Why is this trade deal any different? What has China done to gain our trust, besides stealing of our nuclear secrets?

China is not all of a sudden going to play by the rules. They will not limit their imports. China will not be a good trading partner, because there is no enforcement or reason to be.

With permanent NTR, we will have thrown in our last chip on keeping China in check.

This deal is bad for my district, New Jersey, and the country. I stand with environmentalists, veterans, human rights activists, and most importantly, working families, to oppose this legislation.

The timing is wrong, and the deal is wrong.

Now is not the time we should not vote to rubber-stamp a failed trading arrangement into infinity.

Trade rights should be a privilege to be earned, not a right merely handed out!

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this week there will be a lot of talk on the House floor about international trade. One side will talk about pseudo free trade, the other about fair trade. Unfortunately, true free trade will not be discussed.

Both sides generally agree to subsidies and international management of trade. The pseudo free trader will not challenge the WTO's authority to force us to change our tax, labor, and environmental laws to conform to WTO rules, nor will they object to the WTO authorizing economic sanctions on us if we are slow in following WTO's directives.

What is permitted is a low-level continuous trade war, not free trade. The current debate over Chinese trade status totally ignores a much bigger trade

problem the world faces, an ocean of fluctuating fiat currencies.

For the past decade, with sharp adjustments in currency values such as occurred during the Asian financial crisis, the dollar and the U.S. consumers benefitted. But these benefits will prove short-lived, since the unprecedented prosperity and consumption has been achieved with money that we borrow from abroad.

Our trade imbalances and our skyrocketing current account deficit once again hit a new record in March. Our distinction as the world's greatest debtor remains unchallenged. But that will all end when foreign holders of dollars become disenchanted with financing our grand prosperity at their expense. One day, foreign holders of our dollars will realize that our chief export has been our inflation.

The Federal Reserve believes that prosperity causes high prices and rising wages, thus causing it to declare war on a symptom of its own inflationary policy, deliberately forcing an economic slowdown, a sad and silly policy, indeed. The Fed also hopes that higher interest rates will curtail the burgeoning trade deficit and prevent the serious currency crisis that usually results from currency-induced trade imbalances. And of course, the Fed hopes to do all this without a recession or depression.

That is a dream. Not only is the dollar due for a downturn, the Chinese currency is, as well. When these adjustments occur and recession sets in, with rising prices in consumer and producer goods, there will be those who will argue that it happened because of, or the lack thereof, of low tariffs and free trade with China.

But instead, I suggest we look more carefully for the cause of the coming currency crisis. We should study the nature of all the world currencies and the mischief that fiat money causes, and resist the temptation to rely on the WTO, the IMF, the World Bank, pseudo free trade, to solve the problems that only serious currency reform can address.

TRADE WITH CHINA BUT NOT WITH CUBA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the House will not consider the agriculture appropriations bill because the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle so vehemently opposes one tiny provision of that bill. That is the provision that would allow the sale of food, food, to Cuba.

Cuba is such a threat to the United States of America that the sale of food could jeopardize our national security. Sell them eggs? They might throw them back at us.

Let us compare and contrast their attitude about Cuba to their attitude about China. Tomorrow those same Republican leaders are pushing as hard as they can to have a truncated 3-hour debate on the issue of so-called permanent normal trade relations for China.

They want to sell them anything and everything: aerospace technology. They have already stolen the warhead technology. Missile technology. We are helping them improve their missiles. That little flurry we had about preventing that last year? Well, that died in the conference committee. We are selling them missile technology. They have targeted us with 19 missiles, but they are not very accurate. We want to help them with their accuracy, anything they might want to buy.

They are not a threat, somehow. We are going to engage them. But Cuba, Cuba is such a threat that food, we cannot sell food to Cuba. Do not worry, they might throw those eggs back at us.

A leader on the other side said, it is very easy to see the distinction between the two cases. If we cannot see it, I do not know, maybe we are just blind to it.

Let us just look at the distinctions in the State Department report. I have blanked out the countries. See if Members can guess which is an authoritarian state.

The blank is an authoritarian state in the blank Communist party is the paramount source of power. Citizens lack both the freedom to peacefully express opposition to the party-led political system and the right to change their national leaders or form of government. Prison conditions at most facilities remain harsh.

That is one of these countries. Here is the other. The blank is a totalitarian state controlled by blank who is chief of state, head of government, first Secretary of the Communist party, and Commander in Chief of its armed forces. Citizens do not have the right to change their government peacefully. Prison conditions remain harsh.

One of those countries the United States will trade anything and everything with, and the other one we will not even sell them food, but they kind of sound identical, do they not? They oppress their people, they have harsh prison conditions, political prisoners, religious prisoners, prisoners of conscience.

One of them presents a threat to the United States of America so grave they cannot buy food. The other, a country of 1 billion people that is selling sensitive nuclear technology to terrorist nations, that has violated every trade agreement it has entered into with the United States of America, that horribly oppresses its people, that crushes students with tanks, well, they are okay. We want to engage them, and we will sell them anything and everything they want.

We will be allowed 3 puny hours to debate this issue tomorrow because the

Republicans have a big dinner. The biggest trade issue before the United States Congress this year, and 3 hours of debate. It sounds like the deal is cut on that side of the aisle, and it is cut for one thing, campaign contributions from the big business that is pushing this stuff through this body.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, social security, as we see on this chart, now is the largest expenditure of the Federal Government. It uses 20 percent of all Federal Government funds. Medicare is 11 percent, but within the next 35 years Medicare, the way it is growing, will actually grow faster and be a larger percentage of the budget than social security.

Over the last 6 years I have introduced three social security bills, each one scored by the social security actuaries, to keep social security solvent for the next 75 years. I am very concerned what is happening in this presidential campaign.

The Wall Street Journal reports that the chairman of the Democrat House campaign committee has sent a memo urging Democrat candidates to bash and criticize Governor Bush for proposing social security reforms. These election year tactics I think are very dangerous because it will discourage fact-centered dialogue about what the real problem is: How we are going to keep social security solvent to pay benefits for future retirees. Instead, they use fear-based rhetoric to reduce this important issue to demagoguery for political gain. I think American workers deserve better.

Many will have payroll taxes taken from their paychecks for 40, maybe even up to 50 years. When it is time for them to retire, the promises made by candidates who demagogued during the 2000 elections will not produce the money to pay benefits at the levels that current retirees receive. Only real reform is going to do that.

As we see by this chart, this is the predicament of social security. Social security in 2016 is going to run out of funds, a cash flow problem, so there is less money coming in from social security taxes than is needed to pay benefits. So somehow we have to come up with money in those future years to pay for the benefits that have been promised.

There are only three or four ways to do that: We either cut existing programs, and probably that is not going to happen in this Chamber; we can increase taxes, and I think that is a very bad idea, because 72 percent of American workers today pay more in social security tax than they do in income taxes. Every time we have been in

trouble in the past, we have just said, well, we are going to raise the tax on American workers. So the problem is, how do we do it without raising taxes? Increase borrowing? Probably!

Director Crippen of the CBO pointed out in Thursday's Washington Post that finding the money to repay this trust fund debt means taxes will have to be raised, spending cut, or borrowing increased. As he said, reform proposals that do not change some of the program's basic principles are not going to solve the problem. Another alternative is getting a better return on some of those taxes paid in.

Right now, a young worker 20 years old going to work and paying social security can expect at the most a 1.2 percent inflation-adjusted return on what he or she and their employer pay in. So if that young worker can take some of their tax and get a better return than Social Security's 1.2 percent by investing in bonds, CDs maybe some of it in indexed stocks, they can have more retirement income. They now own that 2 or 3% of their wage plus the compounded earnings. It is part of their estate if they might die early.

We do not need Vice President GORE saying, we are just going to simply add giant IOUs to the Social Security Trust Fund and pretend somehow we are going to come up with the money in the future. It is our biggest, most important program in this country. Let us talk realistically, because the ultimate solution is going to require that Republicans and Democrats get together on a bipartisan basis to do this.

Demagoguing it, criticizing it, having memos go out that say, bash Governor Bush for any proposal he makes on social security, is not the way to move ahead on a bipartisan solution. I urge the President of the United States, I urge the Vice President, to stop it and to talk in a cooperative, factual manner about the real problem and how we might save Social Security and keep it solvent for our kids and grand-kids.

Mr. Speaker, Thursday's Wall Street Journal reports that the chairman of the Democrat's House Campaign committee has sent a memo urging Democrat candidates to bash Gov. Bush for proposing Social Security reforms. These election year tactics will discourage fact-centered dialogues about the reforms needed to keep Social Security strong for generations. Instead, they use fear-based rhetoric to reduce this important issue to demagoguery for political gain.

American workers deserve better than this. Many will have payroll taxes taken from their paychecks for forty and even fifty years. When it is their time to retire, the promises made by candidates who demagogued during the 2000 elections will not produce the money to pay benefits at the levels that current retirees receive. Only real reform that sets cash aside for the future will do this. Starting in 2016, Social Security starts to draw down its trust funds, and the Treasury must find the cash to meet these obligations. CBO Director Crippen pointed out in Thursday's Washington Post,

that finding the money to repay this trust fund debt means taxes will have to be raised, spending cut, or borrowing increased. As he said, reform proposals that do not change the program's obligations or take actions to promote growth in the economy are an empty gesture.

Governor Bush has shown true leadership by taking on this issue. He is not willing to accept the status quo, and we shouldn't be, either. The only way to get to real solutions is to discuss the facts and work together on a bipartisan basis to build a solution.

THE WHAT IF ORGANIZATION AND THE POSSIBILITY GENERATION

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today of hosting an organization of young people in from my district who call themselves "What If?"

What if young people knew how to create their future every day through the goals they set and the decisions they make?

What if today's youth were given opportunities to become team members, to solve problems and to resolve differences clearly and effectively?

What if the youth of today created an expectation for leadership and accountability, and in doing so, create a shift in the way they view themselves and the way they are viewed by others?

What if a generation, this generation, decided to empower itself by giving itself a meaningful name, the Possibility Generation?

What if the mass youth movement to spread that name around the globe taught participants in that movement to produce actions founded on choice, personal and social empowerment, integrity, and responsibility?

In a world where young people feel that the road ahead is so bleak as to require dramatic and violent means of self-expression, in a fast-paced world of uncertainty and change greater than any other time in history, we must empower youth to become visionaries, and to invite new choices for their future, to make responsible choices, and to take responsibility for the choices that they make.

In a world in which the mere sustainability of our planet cannot be taken for granted, we must encourage and produce socially, environmentally, politically, and commercially conscious youth leadership.

The What If Organization, founded to address these very issues, is an educational, training, and networking organization which provides unique emotional and intellectual development through innovative programs that train youth and young adults to become productive in the workplace, in their lives, and in their communities.

The skills acquired through What If interactive programs provide long-