

when they had a problem. I could recount hundreds—if not thousands—of cases where Herb got personally involved. One that always comes to mind involved a woman from Williamsburg whose husband had died and was buried in Arlington Cemetery. The woman's husband had been an Air Force pilot and she asked that he be buried in the section in Arlington where you could have different types of tombstones. Soon after his funeral she went about designing a tombstone that she thought would be a fitting tribute. The cemetery approved the design and she had the stone carved. When the stone arrived at the cemetery several weeks later, cemetery officials did a complete 180 and told her she couldn't use the stone. Somehow, a columnist at the Washington Post caught wind of the situation and a story appeared in the paper. Herb saw it and asked me what I knew about it. After a few quick calls, it was evident the woman hadn't contacted us. But to Herb, that didn't matter. Within a matter of minutes, Herb, me and another staffer were in a car headed over to Arlington. We drove through the cemetery to where the woman's husband was buried, got out, looked at some of the other tombstones then headed back across the river. Upon returning to the office, Herb immediately called the Superintendent at Arlington and presto, the issue was resolved. When I called the woman to tell her the cemetery officials had relented, I asked why she didn't call us. She said she didn't want to burden the Congressman with her problem.

To Herb, it wasn't a bother; it was a pleasure. It was all about helping the people he represented. The Congress has lost more than an outstanding Member, it has lost a warm, caring individual who served his nation with great honor and distinction. God bless Herb, his family, and America's First District.

Mr. GOODE. Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to TOM BLILEY, OWEN PICKETT and the late Herb Bateman for their service to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the entire nation. It has been a great pleasure to know and serve with these gentlemen in the House of Representatives. These men have served not only the people of their districts and the Commonwealth of Virginia, but the entire nation as well. Each has provided invaluable leadership, experience, and statesmanship to the people of their districts, state, and nation. I will miss their friendship and guidance and their districts, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation will miss their service, wisdom and experience.

TOM BLILEY's 20 years of service and his tenure as Chairman of the House Commerce Committee has benefitted his district, state, and country. TOM has led a life of public service and prior to his election and 20 years in the House of Representatives he was an outstanding mayor and leader for the City of Richmond.

OWEN PICKETT has always put the people, especially our military personnel, above partisanship. His many years of work and experience on the House Armed Services Committee and as Ranking Member of the Military Research and Development Subcommittee will be sorely missed by the 2nd District, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation.

The late Herb Bateman was a fine representative and a fine man. I appreciate his friendship as well as his service. We will miss his 18 years of service in the House and his experience on the Armed Services Committee and Chairmanship of the Military Readiness Subcommittee, but more than that we will miss Herb.

PNTR AGREEMENT WITH CHINA NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

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. Madam Speaker, today they are going to have a ceremony to celebrate the signing of the PNTR agreement with China downtown at the White House. It would be better if they held a wake to mourn the loss of U.S. jobs and complete capitulation of U.S. interests to the dictators in Beijing.

The 1999 trade deficit with China was \$68.7 billion. It is headed toward \$80 billion this year. The trade deficit with China currently reflects a 6 to 1 ratio of imports to exports, but they only talk about the few goods we export, not about the flood of imports and the value of those imports and the lost jobs from China.

The United States International Trade Commission acknowledges that with the adoption of PNTR, and if China joins the WTO, which is becoming very unlikely, they still estimate an increase in the trade deficit with China. Using their model, the Economic Policy Institute estimates the deficits will continue to grow for the next 50 years, reaching a peak of \$649 billion in 2048. Our trade deficit with China would not fall below the current level until 2060, 60 years from now, when every currently employed American worker is retired or dead.

Even if the trends predicted by EPI only persisted for a decade, our deficit with China would reach \$131 billion in 2010. The growth in exports would generate 325,000 jobs, but, unfortunately, the growth in imports would lose 1.14 million jobs. That is a net loss of 817,000 jobs, and those job losses would be reflected across the United States.

Let us not kid ourselves: PNTR with China was never about expanding U.S. exports to the Chinese, which would improve our global trade balance; it was about access by large multinational corporations to a low wage, brutalized labor force of 1.3 billion people, in a country with lax environmental standards.

The day after the vote, the day after the vote in the House of Representatives, the Wall Street Journal admitted this in a headline: "This deal is about investment, not exports. U.S. foreign investment is about to overtake U.S. exports as the primary means by which U.S. companies deliver goods to China."

They went on in the article to quote the chief representative of Rockwell International. "In China, that is the direction we are going. We are looking for predictability, reliability. With that, Rockwell expects to set up more factories in China."

The list goes on. GM expects to go from 40 percent Chinese parts to 80 percent Chinese parts. Procter & Gamble,

Motorola, Eastman Kodak, Compaq, Coca Cola, a who's who of American businesses are saying this was about them building plants in China with U.S. capital, not about exporting U.S. manufactured goods to China.

They talk about all the concessions China made to join the WTO. But China has, as we pointed out during the debate, violated every major trade agreement for the last two decades on trade; all the nonproliferation agreements that they have had; the memorandum of understanding in 1992 on prison labor; in 1996, the bilateral agreement on intellectual property; the bilateral agreement on textiles; and the 1992 memorandum of understanding on market access. Why do we believe them this time?

In fact, they are already backtracking. Just after the negotiations, their chief negotiator said that these were only theoretical opportunities for U.S. exports, explaining the incongruity by saying, "During diplomatic negotiations, it is imperative to use beautiful words."

China says they still intend to protect machine, electronic, chemical, medical, military, telecommunications, energy, transportation, automobile and agriculture industries, even if they get in the WTO, and now they are saying they will not join the WTO because we are actually asking them to make some changes in their exclusionary practices, to actually begin to allow foreign goods into their country.

No, this is a sad day, and not a day to celebrate. A few large multinational corporations based in the U.S. have tilted U.S. policy in a way that is to the detriment of our workers, our national security, the global environment and the people of China and their workers and their rights and any improvement in human rights and labor rights in China. This should not be celebrated; it should be mourned.

KEEPING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT

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. Madam Speaker, a lot of problems face this country and certainly face our administration. One of those problems is keeping Social Security solvent. This affects everybody, not only existing retirees, but the young, middle age and future generations. What is going to be their future in terms of working and paying taxes and, maybe or maybe not, getting Social Security benefits when they retire?

Social Security probably is one of this country's most successful programs in terms of helping people retire with some security. When we started Social Security in 1935, when Franklin Roosevelt decided we should have a

program to force savings and pay for some disability insurance while you are working, rather than risk the poor house.

At that time, there were something like 52 workers for each Social Security retiree. Remember, it is a pay-as-you-go program; existing current workers, pay in their Social Security tax and that tax immediately goes out to pay benefits for existing retirees. By the time we got to 1940, there were 38 people working paying in their taxes for every one retiree. This year we have three people working, three people working, paying in their taxes to cover each retiree's benefits.

A couple of things have happened. Politicians in this chamber, the Senate and the presidents decided to increase benefits over the years because it was popular. When there was not enough money, they increased taxes and borrowing. By 2025, over on the far right-hand side of this chart, you see there are only going to be two workers paying in their taxes for each retiree.

We started out back in 1940 having a 3 percent tax on the first \$1,500 of wages. Today we have increased that to 12.4 percent on the first almost \$76,000 of wages.

So I hope we all agree one of our challenges is not to increase taxes yet again. Demographics of longer life span and lower birth rates have also greatly affected solvency.

The diminishing return on our Social Security investment should concern us all. The real return of Social Security is less than 2 percent for the average worker in the United States.

Again, not counting the amount of the Social Security tax that pays for the disability insurance portion workers get a real return of less than 2 percent on the taxes paid in.

For some, there is zero return on their Social Security. They are never going to live long enough to get back what they and their employer put into it. But, still, 1.9 percent is the average.

Minorities do not get back what they pay in. A young black male, for example, is going live on the average 62 years. That means they pay in all of their life, but do not get benefits. But the average real return for the market, is over 7 percent. Part of the solution for Social Security has got to be a better return on the investment.

This chart shows the number of years you are going to have to live after retirement to get back the money that you and your employer paid in, just to break even. If you were lucky enough to retire in 1940, it took 2 months. If you retired 5 years ago, in 1995, you are going to have to live 16 years after retirement to break even. On average if you retire in 2005, 2015 or 2025, it is unlikely you are going to ever get back what you put into this system.

Even a "C.D." or extra safe investments in the marketplace would give more to retirees. Governor Bush is suggesting limitations on any such investments; it can only be used for retirement purposes, it has to be limited to safe investments. We have companies now that will guarantee a return greater than Social Security without taking any risks. So, our challenge is we have to get people, this Congress, the President, to develop legislation to save Social Security.

It is easy to put off the fixing to the next generation or future congresses. Vice President Gore has suggested adding giant IOUs that demand increasing taxes later. The last president should have dealt with the problem. The next president should not put off solutions that will keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years.

Right now there is enough money coming in to pay benefits, up until an estimated 2015. We need to take action. We cannot keep putting it off.

EPA HINDERING SMALL COMPANIES

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, first let me give you a quick history of my company. I founded a company in Hickory North Carolina, in 1957 with a loan on my house. This company prints and converts polyethylene, polypropylene and cellophane for packaging for companies like Procter & Gamble and Johnson and Johnson for overwrap for cookies, baby diapers, the packages themselves. That is what the company does. It started off in 1957. At the present time we have 250 employees.

What I want to do is gripe. I would like to gripe about our government.

Several years ago, air pollution regulations went into effect. There was a whole list of various and sundry things that were polluting the air and doing horrible things to everybody's breathing and so forth. But at that time, my company, you have to print something on polyethylene that will evaporate and leave the ink there, so we were printing with methyl alcohol as a solvent and nylon as the coloring. You print the film, blow hot air at it, and evaporate the solvent. Well, what happened is the methyl alcohol at that time was going out the roof.

Along comes an outfit called EPA, and EPA, with this long list of pollutants, decided that methyl alcohol, this is 5 or 6 years after the whole thing started, 5 or 6 years later they decided that methyl alcohol was a positive solvent.

Well, I had seven printing presses in this plant of mine, and at that time we asked EPA, since they said we were polluting, what should we do? And they said, well, you have got to collect the solvent, the evaporating solvent, and destroy it. So we asked, could you give us some advice as to what to do? They said, well, we do not give advice, that is against the rules of the Federal government, but you have to do it.

Well, this thing right here that you see on my left is what is called a catalytic converter. What it does is it collects the printing inks above all the printing presses, all seven of them, and vents it through this unit right here. In the bottom here we have an oven that

is heated by natural gas, and it costs, by the way, \$50,000 a year in natural gas to run this. At the top comes out what is left over.

Well, \$50,000 a year to operate and \$600,000 a year to build it, and we were all set to go. We thought we were operating according to what the government wanted, and everything was fine, until a couple of years later they come back and they say, well, we have got a slight problem with your operation. There is pollution leaking out of your presses all through the building and so forth, so you have got to do something to stop that.

Well, again, they did not give us any information as to what we were going to do, so what we did is we built a wall all the way around this building and made it a separate room, and in this separate room we put forced air. The way we used the forced air was air conditioning. This is \$500,000 worth of air conditioning that we installed, and that costs \$50,000 a year to operate. What it did is it forced all the air to go through the system and go to the catalytic converter.

Well, this is great and wonderful. We have got the catalytic converter going, and the good old government comes up to us and says, I hate to say this to you, but you know those seven printing presses you have? Your catalytic converter is not big enough, it will only handle six printing presses. So they said, you have to shut down one of these printing presses. One of these printing presses costs about \$800,000. So we had to shut down a \$800,000 printing press at the request of our Federal Government to be able to handle this situation.

This all sounds like we were doing what I would consider the right thing as far as the ecology of the country is concerned, as far as what is expected of business people in this country, although in certain areas of the world I am quite sure this does not happen.

But what really bothered me was eventually I found out that a competitor of mine who had, roughly speaking, the same size plant that I had, went to EPA and discussed it with them, and they came up with a new conclusion. Their conclusion was to allow him to spend \$50,000 a year penalty for the right to pollute.

Now, here is a man that I am competing with. I have spent over \$1 million, that costs \$60,000 a year, that costs \$50,000 a year, I am spending \$110,000 a year to take care of pollution, and he is paying \$50,000 to do it on his own. This is what I consider the great and wonderful way that our Federal Government operates.

So with that kind of information I called up EPA and I said, what is going on here? This does not make a whole bunch of sense to me. And they said, well you have to realize we have inspectors all over the country, and everything is left up to the individual decision by each inspector. So the inspector came up with this brilliant idea