mining of gold, silver, and other valuable minerals on public lands without payments of royalties to the Treasury.

The 1997 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisors points out that between May 1994 and September 1996, the Interior Department was forced, by this 1872 mining law, to give away over $15.3 billion worth of minerals in return for which the taxpayers received only $19,190. This is probably the most egregious example of a government subsidy. Imagine, $15.3 billion in revenue lost, and we received only $19,190.

I could go on with some of the other subsidies, but there are a number of natural resources subsidies that are just totally unjustified and need to be reformed and should be addressed as part of this environmental challenge.

The last Democratic challenge to our Republican colleagues is, some may say that is not very significant, but I think it is, because one of the things that is so important is that Congress set an example and apply the laws that it passes to itself.

We actually have a rule or provision that was passed in the last Congress that says that you have to do that. But it is, nonetheless not always followed in practice, even if it is theoretically the law.

So our fifth challenge refers to the House of Representatives recycling program. We are calling upon the Republicans to repair the House of Representatives recycling program. We know millions of kids carefully recycle their glass bottles and paper but not the Congress. If you talk to your children or your grandchildren, you know that most of them are very concerned about recycling. It is the way for an individual to interact and get involved in environmental protection. So all the kids around the country or certainly a good portion of them are out there recycling their glass bottles and paper but not the Congress. SAM GEJDENSON, a Democratic Congressman from Connecticut, has introduced a resolution that will ensure that Congress plays by the same rules that our kids do with regard to recycling.

Specifically, he has introduced a resolution that provides for a mandatory recycling program in the House of Representatives. And we challenge the Republican Congress to adopt this resolution over the next few months and get the House back on the right track on recycling.

Just to give you some example of how recycling has declined under the Gingrich Congress, I think it is very important that we set an example. Under the leadership of the Speaker, it has declined.

I just want to give you some statistics, because I really think it is interesting. Since the Republicans took over, the percentage of House offices participating in recycling programs has declined, dropped from 90 percent in the 103d Congress to about 50 to 60 percent in the 105th Congress.

With regard to bottles, since the Republicans took over, the tonnage of bottles that are recycled has fallen by 83 percent. Specifically, the tonnage of recycled bottles has fallen from 109.76 tons in 1994 to 18.15 tons in 1996.

Let me give you some statistics with regard to recycled cans. Since the Republicans took over, the tonnage of recycled cans has fallen by 74 percent. Specifically, the tonnage of recycled cans has fallen from 10.76 tons in 1994, to 2.83 tons in 1996.

Now, specifically, what Congressman GEJDENSON's resolution does is mandatory implementation. It provides in the resolution that each Member and each employing authority of the House of Representatives shall participate in the office waste recycling program. The Architect of the Capitol has to ensure that all employees of the House of Representatives whose responsibilities include custodial duties are adequately trained in the implementation of the office waste recycling program. The Architect of the Capitol shall require any contractor under a contract with the House of Representatives for carrying out the office waste recycling program has to ensure that all personnel are adequately trained in the implementation of the program. And finally the architect has to submit semiannually to the Committee on House Oversight a progress report on compliance with the office waste recycling program.

Again, I think this is important. Democrats are calling upon the Republicans to adopt this resolution and work with us to turn the House into a model for recycling for the country, rather than an embarrassment, which I think in many cases we have become with regard to this recycling program.

Again, before I conclude, I just want to say that I think that we need to all join together on this anniversary of Earth Day. And I am pleased with the fact that at least on the floor so far this session, we have not seen any overt efforts to turn back the clock on environmental protection, but I believe very strongly that there is certainly momentum out there on the Republican side with the Republican leadership to start moving towards some of the same measures last year with regard to the Clean Water Act, with regard to the Superfund program, with regard to the Endangered Species Act that would seek to bring up legislation that would weaken some of these very important environmental provisions. And rather than even have the status quo, I think we need to move forward on progressive legislation such as some of the things that I mentioned as part of this Democratic 5 point challenge.

The bottom line is that although the environment has been significantly cleaned up, there is still a lot that needs to be done. The health and safety of our children and our grandchildren depend upon our taking action in a positive way towards cleaning up the environment and setting an example, if you will, for the House of Representatives in that regard.

I wanted to talk a little bit more, if I could, about the brownfields program, because I think that that is something that right now we could move on a bipartisan basis and that there is essentially a consensus to get it accomplished.

Just to give you a little more information about the brownfields program, essentially what it consists of, it is called the Community Revitalization and Brownfield Cleanup Act of 1997. And I think I mentioned before the specific amounts of money that are dedicated, both for inventory, doing an inventory of sites that would be potential cleanup sites for this program and also the amount of money that the Federal Government would provide.

But it also allows a State to request the EPA to make a determination that the State's program is a qualified program, if it provides, one, for response actions that are protective of human health and the environment; two, opportunities for technical assistance; three, meaningful opportunities for public participation. And let me stress that. One of the best aspects of the Superfund program now has been community involvement.

I know that in my own district in New Jersey, the sixth district of New Jersey that I represent, many of the local community organizations, citizens action organizations, if you will, have become directly involved in proposing cleanup and the way to go about cleaning up a Superfund site.

□ 1915

So we are asking that the same thing be done with the Brownfields Program, that basically the community be involved in the decisions about how to go about the cleanup.

That is really a very important part of any environmental initiative. Anything that we pass in Congress should contain a community involvement program, a citizen action program, because that basically gets the initiative from the grassroots and at the same time teaches local citizens, if you will, about how they can become involved in environmental protection.

I think that is a very important aspect of Earth Day, and part of the lesson of Earth Day is getting people involved on an individual basis as well as on a community basis. But ultimately we in Congress have to make the decisions, we have to move forward on a positive environmental agenda and hopefully this Earth Day next Tuesday will be our opportunity to launch that and to get our Republican colleagues involved as well in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CHILD LABOR AND THE CRUSADE OF IQBAL MASIH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for the

balance of the time as the designee of the minority leader.

EARTH DAY

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for raising these very important issues to recognize the importance of Earth Day.

It behooves the Congress to look back at history before there was an environmental sensitivity. We had a lake in Ohio that actually caught on fire. We had air that was not fit to breathe. We have created greenhouse gas emissions that have led to a global warming that one day will inundate several very populous islands. The Seychelles, for example, inevitably will go below sea level because of the greenhouse gas emissions that have resulted in the warming of our entire planet.

The ozone layer has been depleted because of chlorofluorocarbons carbons. We have an area the size of North America in the Antarctic, and while it may not concern people that penguins are not able to reproduce like they were, the fact is that it is a warning to all of us the effects of ignoring our environment.

In this country, we find that children's cancer is the second leading cause of death among children, and we know that 80 percent of the cause is environmentally related, 90 percent worldwide. It is because of pesticides in foods that children eat. It is because of the toxic chemicals that we put in our ground and on our grass that children play on and touch and get into their skin. It is because of the particles that they breathe. It is because of some of the water that they drink.

And so, as a result, we have despoiled this planet in many ways. And it certainly behooves us not to look back at what we have accomplished, but to look even more forward.

There are a lot of things that need to be done. For one thing, we ought to be measuring the toxicity level of environmental risks as they would effect children, not fully grown adults.

And so we have a lot to do, and I know that the gentleman from New Jersey will be in the lead in accomplishing those objectives. Hopefully, it will be sooner rather than later. Hopefully, not too late.

But Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise another equally compelling issue. It is an international issue, but it is one that has immediate effects upon our own population and our responsible role in the world. And so I would like to go down to the podium and address the House from there.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to speak about is child labor, the exploitation of children for profit. This week is the 2-year anniversary of the death of a real leader in the crusade against child labor. He was murdered because of that crusade. His name is Iqbal Masih.

Let me begin by telling you a little bit about the life of Iqbal Masih and how he became a crusader against child labor. Iqbal grew up Muritke, Pakistan. Iqbal's family lived in poverty, as do millions of other families in Pakistan.

Clearly it was very difficult for Iqbal's parents to scrape together enough to feed their children. By the time Iqbal was 4, his older brother was ready to marry. It should have been a time of great celebration.

Perhaps if by accident of birth Iqbal were born into a different family, one in the United States or a country as prosperous as ours, with the kind of employment opportunities that we afford, perhaps your family or mine, then Iqbal would have taken part in the ceremony and celebrated the marriage of his brother.

But Iqbal was not born into such a family. Iqbal did not get to take part in his brother's wedding. His family could not afford the wedding. They needed $12 to properly wed their son, and they did not have it.

So how did Iqbal's family pay for the wedding? Did Iqbal's father look for more work? Did they try to find a cheaper way to finance the wedding? No. Instead they took out a loan for the $12. But they did not have a house to put a second mortgage on. They did not have a pension plan to borrow against.

So they used their son Iqbal. They traded Iqbal to the moneylender as collateral on a $12 loan. The moneylender was not a banker merely looking for insurance on his loan. In fact, Iqbal's parents were never expected to pay the loan. Iqbal was expected to pay off the loan.

But how does a 4-year-old pay off his parents' debts? Well, he is forced to work. Iqbal had become a bonded laborer. Bonded labor is one step removed from child slavery.

The moneylender, now Iqbal's master, could trade or sell Iqbal to others. He exercised complete control over Iqbal. Because Iqbal's small fingers were nimble, he was forced to tie knots in handmade carpets.

Carpet manufacturers prefer to get children when they are young. As one manufacturer said, their hands are nimbler and their eyes are better, too. They are faster when they are small. They are also easier to control.

Because the carpet manufacturer controls what or even if these children eat, he can easily control them. Some manufacturers are not so subtle. Many of them chain the children to their looms. They must eat, work, and sleep tied to their loom.

At 4 years old, all these children know of the world is their village. They probably do not even know the name of their village. They are often taken hundreds of miles away. Even if they were lucky enough to escape, they would not know where to go. And even if they knew where to go, corrupt government officials merely return them to their masters.

So how do you escape from bonded labor? Iqbal was told he could escape if he raised enough money to pay off his parents' $12 loan. The carpet manufacturer said he would deduct Iqbal's salary from the amount Iqbal's parents owed.

The carpet manufacturer also added any of Iqbal's expenses to the amount his parents owed. These expenses included room and board. Iqbal had to pay for the privilege of sleeping chained to a loom and fines for any mistakes that 4-year-old boy made. The carpet manufacturer also charged interest on the loan.

Within a few years, Iqbal's $12 debt had increased 2,100 percent. Iqbal tied tiny knots for as much as 20 hours a day. He usually worked 6 days a week, and frequently all 7 days of the week he would work. He was beaten when he made any mistakes.

Iqbal worked for 6 years as a bonded laborer until he was freed with the help of the Bonded Labor Liberation Front, a human rights group. Iqbal was only 10 when he escaped. He then traveled around the world speaking out about the horrors that he and millions of other children experienced. His efforts focused international attention on the problem of child labor.

Because of his efforts on behalf of other child laborers, Iqbal won the Reebok Human Rights Award in 1994. Although a hero to other children, Iqbal made many enemies. Carpet manufacturers had to pay bigger bribes to continue business as usual. They were losing money.

Iqbal returned to his home village of Muritke, Pakistan in April 1995. On Easter Sunday, 2 years ago yesterday, Iqbal was riding his bicycle with two friends when he was shot and killed. Iqbal was 12 years old, 12 years old.

Mr. Speaker, the International Labor Organization estimates that worldwide there is as many as 200 million children working in Africa, one quarter of all the children are working; in Asia, 18 percent; Latin America, 7 percent. Child labor takes many forms. The worst is bonded labor and indentured servitude like Iqbal Masih endured.

Children also work in more traditional manufacturing centers, such as factories. Some children are minors. Some work on fishing rigs in the ocean. Some work on the streets shining shoes or selling their bodies. They work as glassblowers and as carpenters. They sort hazardous recyclables, like broken batteries soaked in acid and used hospital syringes dirty with blood.

Children have little resistance to adults that seek to exploit them. Unfortunately, almost invariably, children wind up at the bottom of all national agendas for political and social action.

I want people to focus on this picture. It is of a little girl at a shoe shine stand in Ecuador. She is less than 4 years old. She represents the millions of children who work on the streets of the world cities.

The cycle begins when a farm family moves to the city in search of work.

They soon find that the city is not what they expected. They lack the skills necessary for a good job and find city life far more expensive than they had planned on.

The family's mother may find work as a maid, but typically the father turns to alcohol or leaves the family. If children are surrounded by models of chronic inactivity and frustration at home, they may even be attracted to the excitement of the street.

Children are sent onto streets to work or beg. While seeking work, they are easy prey. They are given a job like this girl shining shoes. They must turn over all the money they receive to an older child who then gives them a small portion as salary.

The older child is equivalent to a pimp raking in profits by exploiting a small army of children. Frequently, though, the older child is in a similar relationship with even older children who may control large groups of these child pimps. Those that are beggars may be maimed to make them look more miserable and helpless than other beggars.

As the children grow older, they may realize they can make more money by theft or by exploiting children younger than themselves.

Street life cannot be easy for anyone, especially a 4-year-old girl. Tragically, when these children need to be thrown a life preserver, they often turn to drugs. The common drug for them today is glue. When they are hungry or very cold, they sniff glue to kill the pain. After sniffing glue the children stagger. They slur their speech, and their eyes swell and turn red. Soon they have irreversible brain damage.

While these tragic lives may sound parallel to life on our own city streets, there is an important distinction: The role of corrupt government officials.

In Brazil, one counselor said if a boy does not have enough money to give a cop, he may beat him. With the proper payoff a kid can keep out of the reform inventory or he can keep his place on the park bench for another night.

I would like to show the next picture, which is of a boy in Aligarth, India. It is a town in the Providence of Uttar Pradesh on the border of Nepal. This picture was presented to the Committee on International Relations last year by a constituent of mine Ms. Francoise Remington, director of a nonprofit group called Forgotten Children.

Uttar Pradesh is known for its production of brass and other metal products. This boy is making tiny padlocks. The average pay for children in the metal industry is $6 a month. The children work 60-hour work weeks. The children are recruited by middle men called dalals, who are paid by the thekedar, or contractor, who prefers children because they are so easy to control.

Although most metal factories claim to be family businesses to skirt India's scant child labor regulations, there are virtually no incidences of actual family metal shops in this part of India.

These children remove molten metal from molds near furnaces. These children work with furnaces at temperatures of 2,000 degrees. Burns are a constant danger. Children also work at electroplating, polishing, and applying chemicals to metal. This child is polishing padlocks on a small grindstone. Fumes and metal dust are constantly inhaled by these children, causing tuberculosis and respiratory illnesses.

Child labor in India is still the norm rather than the exception. There are about 250 million children in India. Estimates of the amount of children working in India ranges from 44 to 100 million. The Indian Government admits to at least 17 million.

□ 1930

The next picture is of Silgi. She is sewing soccer balls.

Nearby Pakistan, nearby to India, has similar problems with child labor.

Mr. Speaker, you may remember this picture from Life magazine last June. This is a picture of 3-year-old Silgi. She sits on a mud floor, in a filthy dress, stitching soccer balls bound for Los Angeles—Los Angeles, this country for which we pay large sums of money of which she gets a pittance. With needles longer than her fingers her stitching is adequate, but her hands are so small that she cannot handle scissors. She must get assistance from a fellow employee, her sister. Silgi lives in Sialkot, a city of 300,000 that produces 35 million soccer balls per year, 80 percent of the world's supply.

Mr. Speaker, children like Silgi can sew up to 80 hours each week, 80 hours a week in silence and near total darkness. Their foreman says darkness discourages photographers who may wish to expose their trade. They are punished if they fall asleep or if they waste materials or miscut patterns. They are also punished if they complain to their parents or speak to any strangers outside the factory. These children may be punished in a small room in the back of the factory. They may be hung upside-down by their knees or they may be contained. Frequently they are starved.

Let me show the last picture. This is of a girl bashing rocks. You could find pictures like any of these, scenes like any of these children that are pictured here today in any of these countries that we refer to.

Sometimes the entire family is working in bondage, perhaps to pay the debt of a diseased relative. Children are required to work alongside their parents to maximize production. They work up to 14 hours a day carrying rocks or breaking them into pieces. This young girl is doing just that. She lives in an area where gravel is scarce. In order to make cement, rocks must be broken down to small stones, and many rural areas' traditional class or caste systems perpetuate bonded labor.

Pledging one's labor and that of his children may be the only resource a family has and may be all they can pledge as security for a loan. Unfortunately, the same family may be uneducated and illiterate. It is easy prey to the money lender who may charge outrageous interest rates, and in those cases in which the labor of the family is pledged, debts are passed from parent to child often for generations upon generations.

Mr. Speaker, a surprising number of children are minors. The hazards they face are enormous. In the jungles of southeastern Peru, children work mining gold. In 1991, common graves of child workers—these are mass graves of child workers—were uncovered. The corpses reveal that these children died from disease and from work-related injuries.

Mr. Speaker, let me just speak briefly as to what the United States can do about this. First thing we need to know is that it exists, to spread the word so that we can become mobilized. There are many Members of Congress who have introduced legislation to combat these horrors, and just this week the Clinton administration announced a new voluntary code of conduct and labeling program. We need to gather it, this information, because in developing a solution to the problem of child labor we need to know the scope of the problem, the sources of the problem and what it is that we can do in the most cost-effective and efficient manner to change this situation.

Because many governments are in denial over the scope of child exploitation in their country, the international labor organization has made progress working with specific countries in human rights groups in conducting surveys. For example, until recently Pakistan had never conducted a survey to determine the scope of its problem. Pakistan and the International Labor Organization should be commended for undertaking this project. The study indicated that at least 8 percent of Pakistan's 40 million children were actively working and being exploited. More than half of the child laborers were located in the province of Punjab. So while the release of hard data and the scope of the child labor problem may hurt Pakistan in the short term, it now knows where resources are most urgently needed.

The United States compiles two sources of government information on child labor and human rights. The State Department's Annual Country Reports on Human Rights contains an overview of the human rights issues in every country. Unfortunately each report only contains a paragraph or two on child labor issues. Today I introduced legislation to add an additional section to the human rights reports that would detail the scope of child labor in every country. It would include an overview of the country's child labor laws and whether they are effectively enforced. It would include a

discussion of government corruption and bribery and their relation to the effectiveness of child labor laws. It would greatly enhance the information available to us today.

The other major source of government information are the reports published by the Bureau of International Labor Affairs under the direction of Under Secretary Andrew Samet. These reports are dedicated to specific aspects of the child labor problem. The first dealt with manufactured and mined imports, the second with forced and bonded child labor, and the third with goods imported into the United States. They have just undertaken their fourth report which I am sure will be as excellent as the last three.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are a contributing factor to the propagation of child labor. Few U.S. investors and even fewer U.S. consumers would knowingly buy products made from the sweat and toil of children. As consumers, we should ensure that when we spend $30 to $50 to buy a soccer ball for our children that the money does not go to companies that deny other children their childhoods by working them for pennies a day under inhumane conditions. As investors we should be sure our businesses are doing more than giving lip service to avoiding child labor.

On Monday the Clinton administration took the first step in addressing these concerns. They brought several members of the manufacturing sector together with labor leaders and public interest groups to craft a voluntary labeling program.

The first part of the President's program develops a ''Workplace Code of Conduct'' for apparel manufacturers. A code of conduct embodies a company's policy on a host of issues typically including ethical conduct which may differ from culture to culture. By firmly stating the company's policy on discrimination, forced labor, wages, benefits and other terms of employment, an American business can put its licensees and subcontractors on notice about the types of conditions it finds acceptable. By incorporating codes of conduct into contracts with licensees and subcontractors, a business can have greater control over how its goods are produced worldwide.

Many American firms have taken upon themselves to adopt strong codes of conduct prohibiting child labor, yet problems persist. One clear example was Nike's recent experience in Pakistan. Nike has a strong code of conduct prohibiting child labor among its subcontractors and anyone they do business with. Yet numerous reports documented children stitching soccer balls for Nike.

So why did they not know there was a problem producing soccer balls? Largely it was because when Nike's subcontractor in Pakistan became overworked, it subcontracted out some of its work, and in doing so did not impose the same code of conduct. This second level of subcontractors were unscrupulous profiteers who farmed out the work to whoever they could get to do it cheaply, the most cheaply, primarily children like Silgi.

Multiple levels of subcontracting are common in global manufacturing. Unfortunately they add levels of complexity to enforcing labor codes.

To ensure that the various levels of subcontractors and licensees are adhering to codes of conduct, businesses need to have reputable firms inspect their subcontractors periodically. Many small firms have been doing this successfully for years, and we are finally seeing the major accounting firms break into this market.

To a certain extent, adopting codes of conduct makes economic sense. The more a code of conduct is enforced, the less likely the controlling firm is subject to claims of worker exploitation and perhaps litigation.

President Clinton's recent initiative includes a code of conduct requiring no more than a 60-hour work week, a minimum age for employment of children, and compliance with local minimum wage laws. Even though an undeveloped country may not see enforcing its minimum wage laws as a priority, our codes of conduct will require that goods bound for the United States be made in compliance with these local laws.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire at this point how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today, short of spending many, many hours in a library, consumers have no way of knowing if the products they buy are produced by children, and in exchange for complying with the suggested codes of conduct manufacturers will be permitted to use a new ''No Sweat'' label on their goods. Consumers will find it easy to look for the No Sweat label. Quick and easy access to such information will empower consumers to show the manufacturing industry the importance of staying child-labor free. I would hope that every parent would look for this label and would understand but for the grace of God their child could be in a similar exploited condition.

Labeling programs do have critics. Some fear that labels will be easily forged. Some fear that labeling requirement will be increased over time and used as protectionist measures. These are valid concerns and only serve to underscore the importance of fighting the battle against child labor on many fronts.

One is trade sanctions. We could ban imports made by children. This is the approach taken by Senator HARKIN and Congressman FRANK and their legislation. This approach would keep track of specific products that were routinely made with child labor from certain countries. These products would be banned unless the importer could demonstrate that child labor was not used in the manufacture of the product.

Another approach is through utilization of the generalized system of preferences program. The GSP, which is the acronym for this program, is designed to provide preferential trade treatment to developing countries. If a country qualifies, certain products are given reduced tariff rates.

A condition of receiving these generalized system of preferences benefits for any particular product is that the export country ensure that basic worker rights are protected. If not, the United States can revoke GSP benefits to all products from the country, or the United States can revoke generalized system of preference benefits for specific products. Last year, Commerce Secretary Kantor suspended GSP benefits to Pakistan on surgical equipment, sporting goods and hand-knotted carpets for failing to effectively fight child labor in these industries.

Because the export country usually wants to restore GSP benefits quickly, it has an incentive active to cooperate with the United States. The executive branch has the authority to reinstate GSP benefits if it is satisfied that the export country is making a good faith effort to rectify the problem.

Unfortunately, all of these approaches only help solve the child labor problem to the extent it is connected with U.S. trade. But about 95 percent of all child labor does not involve products bound for the United States. Most involves domestic products or services and cannot be effected by U.S. trade policy.

For this reason I introduced the Working Children's Human Rights Act which would deny non-humanitarian U.S. assistance to countries that have not enacted or refuse to enforce their own child labor laws. U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to support rogue regimes that turn a blind eye to government corruption and inaction that perpetuates the exploitation of children. Withholding foreign aid has a limited effect, though, because only a small handful of countries receive any U.S. assistance today.

The United States does, however, have leverage through lending institutions such as the World Bank. The World Bank provides loans, technical assistance and policy guidelines to help its developing country members reduce poverty and improve living standards through sustainable economic growth. The bank does a tremendous job at financing necessary projects such as infrastructure improvement which is necessary to attract private sector investment. Because of the importance of assistance such as World Bank loans to developing countries, it is appropriate for the United States to condition its vote in favor of loans to a particular country on that country's compliance with major U.S. foreign policy goals.

□ 1945

Today, the United States votes against loans to countries which the President has certified as major illicit

drug-producing countries. The eradication of child exploitation ought to be as important to United States foreign policy as combating narcotics, which is terribly important. That is why my legislation would require the United States to vote against loans to countries who have not adopted or refused to enforce their own child labor laws.

There is a more immediate step the World Bank could take. Last year we heard testimony before the Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Rights, on which I sat, that hundreds of children worked on infrastructure improvements on one particular project in India. Who knows how many thousands of children like them work on such projects?

The World Bank and other such institutions should take a more active role in eradicating child labor by requiring that no children work on projects for which World Bank funds are used. Surely U.S. taxpayers do not want their contributions to the World Bank used for development projects that exploit children.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues some success stories in our battle to end exploitation of the children. The first is a project in Bangladesh that would not have been possible without the dedication of U.S. Ambassador David Merrill.

Bangladesh's garment sector began thriving in 1977 and currently exports over $750 million per year into the United States. The industry's main products include shirts, trousers, jackets, T-shirts, shorts, briefs, and sweatsuits.

By 1990, estimates of the number of working 10- to 14-year-old children in Bangladesh were between 5 and 15 million children. The vast majority of these children worked in the garment sector. Typically, garment factories in Bangladesh were dimly lit with poor ventilation. Hours were very long. Workers usually were forced to work without break; the doors are locked during the shift. Only occasionally is a guard with a key near the door. During time of high demand, workers are locked in until their work is finished, often overnight. They work 24 hours a day.

In 1990, the Bangladesh garment manufacturers insisted that children were only in factories to accompany their working mothers who could not afford child care. Not true. Yet the Asian-American Free Labor Institute study showed children walking to factories with their time cards in hand. When that institute probed further, they learned that children really worked at the same factories with their relatives.

In the fall of 1993, Senator TOM HARKIN and Representative George Brown introduced legislation to ban imports made by child labor from entry into the United States. Fearing passage of this bill, the Bangladesh garment manufacturers abruptly fired 50,000 child workers.

Unfortunately, firing the children from the manufacturing centers meant they were forced to look for other work. Many went to work as brickmakers or fish processors, using more dangerous equipment that exposed them to even more risks. Through the hard work of Ambassador Merrill and human rights groups, an historical memorandum of understanding was signed by the Bangladesh garment manufacturers, the International Labor Organization and UNICEF on July 4, 1995.

As a result of this agreement, children are moving from factories to schools while they receive a monthly stipend. The Bangladesh garment manufacturers, UNICEF and the ILO, the International Labor Organization, all contribute to a fund to build schools and educate these children, and that is the solution. That is what we have to be doing. They pay the children one-half of what they would have made in the garment factories.

It is working. We can make progress. We need to be making that kind of progress in other countries. It is wrong to continue exploiting over 100 million children per year.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time. I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] having the patience to wait through this. I would urge my colleagues not only to cosponsor the legislation on human rights for children, but to get involved in this issue seeking a long-term solution.

CHINESE COMMUNIST COMPANY COSCO IS THREAT TO UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] just talked about human rights and he makes many, many good points, and I support the gentleman's assessments.

Let me say that I would ask the gentleman to support us, the attorney general from California and all of the police chiefs in the State of California, and I am sure there are other States that are affected. They brought some pretty gruesome pictures of children being imported from Mexico, we are talking 7-year-olds, 8-year-olds, 9-year-olds and teenagers, across the border to serve in methamphetamine labs across the United States.

One out of four of these exploded in fires, and they had grizzly pictures of these children burned. Not over a period of weeks or months or years, but these children are dying within minutes of breathing in the fumes and the chemicals of methamphetamines.

I will work with the gentleman. We do not have to look very far, and I understand that, yes, there are human rights violations like these, but even within our own borders. I think it is criminal, and we ought to do everything we can to stop it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I thank the gentleman for his concern, which I know is very sincere and his commitment to do something about it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me just say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman that spoke before, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] talked about the Republicans destroying the environment; and I would like to make just about 30 seconds' worth of comments.

The gentleman has a right to his opinion, only he states it as fact, and I would say that the gentleman is factually challenged. He has a right to his view, but those from the left that would take all the power in Washington, DC, and control that power, whether it be environmental, whether it be education, whether it be private property, whether it be religious beliefs, and control it within the walls of this body, I disagree with.

Let me give a classic example. The Superfund, which was created to clean up toxic wastesites, over 70 percent of the dollars that we allocate to clean it up go to trial lawyers in litigation. What we are saying is that over 85 percent of the cleanup of these Superfund sites is done by the State and the people within that State.

Now, it is up to your opinion, Mr. Speaker, whether having the money and having it wasted here in Washington, DC, over 70 percent are getting 90 percent of the dollars down to the State, who actually does the cleanup, and focusing the money on the problem instead of bureaucracy. There are two different views there.

The EPA, the dollars go to over 50 percent of the bureaucracy, and we believe on the Republican side, with many of our colleagues on the other side, that it is more important to get the dollars to clean up clean air, more important to get the dollars out of those that pollute the air, and support this country.

With those comments I would like to move on to the title subject tonight, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk about COSCO. Not Price Club, Mr. Chairman, as we know it, not Costco or Price Club, as many Americans know it, but the China Ocean Shipping Company owned and controlled by only one CEO, chief executive officer, and that chief executive officer is Communist China itself.

There is no board of directors, there are no bosses above COSCO or these other corporations set up by Communist China. They all answer and are directed, and if they do not, one can imagine the consequences.

What I want to speak to tonight is that recently, within the last couple of days, a judge, just the day before yesterday, agreed to examine the validity