

would be using this opportunity to scare those most vulnerable in our society, and particularly those senior citizens who depend upon Social Security for their livelihood. So today I just wanted to take a few minutes to talk about Social Security.

The Social Security program began in 1936, and between 1936 and 1998, a period of 62 years, in about 47 of those 62 years there was a surplus in the Social Security account. In other words, there was more money coming in through the payroll tax than was being paid out to beneficiaries.

During those 47 years of surpluses, the Democratic leadership controlled the Congress for about 95 percent of that time, and during that time in excess of \$800 billion was spent by the government from that fund.

Now, the sad thing about it was not only was the Congress during that period of time spending all of the income tax, both personal and corporate, but they were also spending all of the Social Security surplus, and they still were creating deficits, annual deficits, in excess of \$200 billion a year in many of those years.

□ 1645

So I went back and I wanted to look at Vice President GORE's record while he was in Congress. Now, he served in the U.S. Congress and in the U.S. Senate from 1977 to 1992. During that time, Congress spent \$269 billion of the surplus of Social Security. At least from the research that I looked at, I did not see anywhere that Vice President GORE expressed any opposition to spending that surplus money. Then, during that period, from 1977 to 1992, the Federal debt increased by \$2.4 trillion. I did not find any record where Vice President GORE objected to that kind of addition to our Federal debt.

So I read this article about the Vice President using the politics of fear to scare senior citizens about the future of Social Security, and I said, what is the real issue here? When we have people come to Congress to lobby on Social Security, we obviously have senior citizens who depend upon it for their livelihood. But we also are having more and more young married couples with children coming, and they are paying frequently more in payroll tax than they are in income tax, many of them do not have any health insurance, they do not qualify for Medicaid, their employer does not provide health insurance, and they cannot afford it, and many of them do not believe that Social Security will even be there for their benefit when they retire. So Candidate Bush simply elevated for discussion the possibility which many of these young people want of allowing them the opportunity to direct up to 2 percent of their payroll tax into the equity markets.

Now, he did not say that he advocated that, he said that he wanted to explore it, because all of us know that by the year 2032, Social Security will

be bankrupt. There is a surplus now and there will be until the year 2013, but at that time, the Federal Government is going to have to start repaying some of the \$800 billion that it owes Social Security.

So Candidate Bush is looking for some long-term solutions for Social Security and its solvency. Of all of the articles that I have read about Vice President Gore, I do not see that he has ever advocated any solution, but he has been effective in advocating the politics of fear.

Now, we know from his record that this Vice President has no objection to the government spending every dime of the Social Security surplus. But, it appears from what he said yesterday and the day before that he does not want to even discuss giving young people just entering the workplace the opportunity to invest up to 2 percent of their payroll tax into the equity markets. We know that historically the Federal Government on the \$800 billion of the Social Security money that it has borrowed is paying on the average of 5 percent a year. That is about what it averages out to. We know that historically the equity markets have increased over that period of time by about 14 or 15 percent a year.

So I would simply say, it is time for us to stop using the politics of fear as advocated by the Vice President and start looking for real solutions and having real discussions about how can we solve the long-term solvency of Social Security so that not only will it be available for senior citizens today, but it will also be available for those young men and women just entering the workplace today.

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

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in order to accommodate the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) catching his airplane, that he could take the first 5 minutes, and then I could immediately follow with 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NO MORE I LOVE YOU'S

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to warn my colleagues and the

Nation of a computer virus that as we speak is really sweeping the world. This is a computer virus that is going to be shortly called the "I Love You" virus, and believe me, there is nothing romantic about it, because this may be one of the most insidiously destructive viruses we have seen in several years. It has already destroyed 600 files in my office, and I am afraid that in many, many other of my colleagues' offices this afternoon we will have incurred substantial damage. I wanted to alert anyone who may be listening to this of a couple of things about this virus.

First, anyone who receives an e-mail where the subject is "I Love You" should immediately delete the e-mail. That is the modus operandi of this e-mail, and no one should open up an e-mail with that subject matter now or perhaps forever, considering this virus. The reason is, there is a second aspect of this virus that is very damaging, and that is we have learned this afternoon that this particular virus will also damage common files that are on a shared server of anyone who opens up that e-mail. What has already happened this afternoon in my office is that we had someone open up that e-mail and it then destroyed other common files on our shared server system. In our system, it happened to destroy our graphic files under the JPEG type files and there may be others that are subject to damage. So I hope that everyone can spread the gospel with their friends not to open up any "I Love You" e-mail messages.

I have another message that is important for those who are responsible for this destructive act. That is, you will be hunted down; you will not be able to hide. There will be nowhere you can hide to escape the impact of your actions. You will be hunted down like dogs, and you will be prosecuted. The reason is, that these juvenile vandal efforts are enormously destructive, and I can assure the perpetrators of this: that the U.S. Congress, beginning next Tuesday, is going to do what we can to make sure that the investigatory authorities have the technological tools at their disposal to find those who are responsible for this and make sure that they are prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I think this points up an important point that we in Congress have to understand. In the West, when the technology of the stagecoach was invented, Congress responded by creating, if you will, a Marshals Service to respond to the stage coast heists. We now have to be additionally attentive to give our law enforcement officials the statutory authority and the resources and the technological resources that are necessary to track these folks down and make sure that they are prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to suffer significant damage nationally as a result of this. The person power hours that are going to be required to respond to this is going to be a major national problem. I think that we should

commit ourselves when we return to our offices next Tuesday or Monday to be very diligent in making sure that we adopt the technology necessary to respond to this new threat.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE
RELATIONS FOR CHINA

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in support of the United States Congress granting permanent normal trade relations to China. I rise as a Democrat, one who believes that this policy of economic engagement is in the best interest of the United States on a number of issues.

When we look at the history of Congress and all of the trade agreements that we have had to vote on, seldom, if ever, have we had the opportunity to gain increased access to a market and not have to have given anything in return.

This administration was able to negotiate an agreement that resulted in the United States not reducing their tariffs 1 percent, not reducing their quotas 1 percent, not giving up anything, and in return, we achieved significant across-the-board reductions in tariffs. We received increased market access into China. We received the opportunity to have direct investment to China to over the 50 percent-ownership level in most sectors of their industry.

This is an agreement that is good for American workers, it is an agreement that is good for American businesses, it is an agreement that is good for American farmers.

One has to understand what is going to be the repercussions of the United States Congress failing to support PNTR for China. If we fail to vote for this measure, we are going to ensure that there are U.S. workers that are not going to benefit from the significant reductions in tariffs.

Just to put this in kind of graphic terms, if my colleagues can really think if the United States is still facing the same tariff schedule with China as we are today, and maybe it is in the exportation of auto parts, and if we are in competition with Canadian factories and Canadian workers who have supported the China PNTR who could experience a significant reduction in tariffs, it is clearly going to give that Canadian company the ability to gain that contract that will result in those products flowing into that China market. It will be U.S. workers that are on the outside.

The other thing that is going to result in tremendous benefit to U.S. workers and businesses are the provisions of this agreement that provide for even added protection against import surges coming from China. This agreement will ensure that the United States even has greater protection

than it currently does today with import surges. So if we are faced with a situation as we were in years past with a significant increase in the exportation from China of apple juice concentrate, which had a significant impact in any Pacific Coast apple-producing States, or even if we were looking at the importation of large amounts of steel, we would now have the ability to take action specifically against China in order to deal with the import surges that might have resulted in having adverse economic consequences in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of my colleagues that have brought up an issue which is one that we have to address, and that is the issue of human rights and religious freedoms in China. All of us would like to see greater progress in China. But many of us I think agree that the best way to influence the internal affairs in China is by embracing this policy of economic engagement.

I was very honored and pleased to have the chance to visit with Martin Lee who is recognized internationally as one of the leading human rights activists in China, the leader of the Hong Kong Democracy Party. It was his commentary in terms of how we can make the greatest progress on human rights in China that I think resonated more effectively and with greater credibility than anybody I have heard address this issue. He is one who believes very strongly that if we do support this policy of economic engagement and supporting PNTR for China, that we will empower the reformers in China. We will empower the people that are trying to do away from the State-run enterprises. We will ensure that it is the people that are trying to carry out the reforms and bring China into a rule of law regime that their stature will be enhanced by our actions here.

He went on to further state that if the U.S. Congress failed to support PNTR, what we would in effect be doing would be undermining some of the progress that we have seen over the past decades in human rights and religious freedom, that in fact we would be empowering the hard-liners there, the people that want to maintain some of the centralized control of their economy and their society. He cautioned us and actually implored Congress not to take action that would result in China's stepping back and not moving forward.

Another gentleman from the Hong Kong Democratic Party also spoke, and he talked about what is happening with the introduction of the Internet into China. Just in the last year alone, we have seen Internet usage in China increase from 2 million people to 10 million people. It is expected that it is going to increase in this year alone to 20 million people. In the next 4 or 5 years, it is conceivable and quite likely that we will have 100 million people in China with access to the Internet. Why is this important?

I think it is important because I believe the Internet is probably greatest tool for the advancement of democracy that we have seen in the history of mankind. It will be this increased Internet usage in China that will result in more people getting access to information that is not controlled by the Chinese government. Support China PNTR.

□ 1700

DARYLE BLACK: A DEFENDER OF
THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today the City of Long Beach, California, mourns the loss of a fine young police officer who was brutally murdered last Saturday night in a gang attack that also wounded his partner. Officer Daryle Black was 33 years of age when he died in the sudden and unprovoked attack that also wounded his colleague, Officer Rick Delfin. The murder of Officer Black reminds all of us that law and order are not automatic.

Safe streets and peaceful neighborhoods are created by those willing to risk their own safety, even their lives, for our community.

Officer Black cared deeply about serving others, and he served with a quiet courage and a steady professionalism. His loss is one we will all feel for many years from now.

Officer Black was a former United States Marine, a 6-year veteran of the Long Beach Police Department. He was assigned to a special gang enforcement unit. Officer Black was a very soft spoken person. Some of his colleagues said he was a gentle giant whose love for police work gave him the drive to risk his life on the streets every day.

He will be remembered by his many friends and colleagues for his professional dedication and commitment to protecting his community.

At the time of the shooting, Officer Black and his partner had just finished part of a police sweep of a neighborhood where gangs and drugs have been a serious problem for the city. Officer Delfin was wounded in the assault and is now recovering from an attack that most of us could never imagine, let alone face on a daily basis.

Daryle Black and Rick Delfin could imagine such an attack. Like every other police officer in America; however, they regularly faced personal danger, frequent physical and verbal assaults, and a host of other uncertainties each day as an unavoidable part of their job.

Mr. Speaker, too often we take for granted the thousands of men and women who patrol our neighborhoods, walk our streets, and guard our lives and property. The death of Officer Black brings home to us the very real and very constant risks that others accept on our behalf. All of our Nation's