

occurred mainly before 1940, in no way supports the results of computer models that predict a drastic future warming.

The pre-1940 warming is likely a natural recovery from a previous natural cooling. Most important though is the fact that weather observations have shown no global warming trend in the past 20 years whatsoever.

The discrepancy between calculated predictions of warming and the actual observations of no warming has produced a crisis for these scientists. Those who want to believe in global warming keep hoping that proof is just around the corner. In the meantime, unfortunately, it is the American taxpayers who will bear the burden of this uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, let us be careful not to over regulate.

---

#### NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in North Carolina we are pausing this week to draw attention to the need to focus greater efforts on the problem of domestic violence, and this is National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Just as we are confronted with the blight of hunger in America, we are faced with the blight of domestic violence, a public and personal health problem. Imagine the incidence of domestic violence in the world if indeed that is the situation that we face in America, that in America some 4 million women are battered every year, every year, one woman every 13 seconds.

It is for that reason the United Nations 4th Conference on Women held in Beijing, China, in September 1995, directly addressed this issue. Violence against women is an obstacle to equality, development, and peace. That was one of the conclusions of the conference.

Another conclusion, violence against women violates both their human rights and their fundamental freedom. Among several other actions to be taken, the conference urged that we condemn violence against women and refrain from invoking any custom, tradition, or religious consideration to avoid our obligation with respect to its elimination.

Being passive in this vital effort is not enough. Merely making the statement that one does not commit domestic violence does not go far enough in solving the problem. We must be proactive. If I may borrow from a well-worn phrase from several decades ago, if you are not part of the solution, you are said to be part of the problem.

Violence against women occurs in nearly every daily area of our lives.

Women are assaulted on the street, at workplaces, in schools and campuses. But it has been the hidden violence in the home at times in our Nation that is particularly difficult. It is the hushed tone, it is not acceptable, it is not talked about. But it is now gaining serious and sensible community-wide attention, as it should be.

Today most States now enact some form of domestic violence legislation and the public has now come to understand that it is a problem. As part of the crime bill, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act. The President created within the Department of Justice the Violence Against Women Office. Significant funding has been directed toward this problem under the Violence Against Women Act.

Still attitudes are slow to change, and much more needs to be done. Victims of domestic violence continue to face an unacceptable gap in legal representation when required to make appearances in key proceedings affecting their personal safety and the safety of their families.

Domestic violence remains a strong risk factor for female homicide. More women are murdered by their husband or their boyfriends than half of them murdered by strangers. Poor women are still far more likely to be victims of domestic violence than other women, and domestic violence endures as the leading cause of injury to women. More women are indeed harmed by domestic violence than all combined, street accidents, automobile accidents, or assault by strangers. More of their friends harm them and their loved ones than strangers do.

The problem of domestic violence also affects rural areas as well as urban areas. Women of all races, social, religious, ethnic, economic groups, all ages are affected by domestic violence.

Once domestic violence occurs, it re-occurs, and often times it escalates. This week and this month will only have meaning if each of us makes a new commitment to take a firm stand and to understand to do something, no matter how small, to help bring an end to the spread of domestic violence.

Changes begin with awareness, but it happens with action. Condemn violence against women and refrain from invoking any custom, tradition, or religious consideration to avoid our obligation with respect to its elimination. On this issue, each of us can be a part of the solution.

---

#### CURE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to sort of give an hour lecture on Social Security, and I am going to try to do that in 4 minutes.

With these charts, the first chart represents what is going to be happening in Social Security when we have less money coming in in taxes than are required to payout benefits. Since it is a pay-as-you-go system where current taxes immediately go to pay current benefits, and there is no savings or very little savings, it is becoming a bigger and bigger problem.

Look at this chart. A short-term surplus only lasts until 2011, and then the benefits for payouts to retirees are much larger than the taxes coming in. The red on this chart represents what happens to the deficits, how much more money we are going to add to the taxes coming in on Social Security in order to meet the benefit obligations.

You see it goes all the way to \$400 billion a year. There has been a lot of talk about if we just would keep the cotton-picking hands of Congress away from the trust fund, away from the surpluses, but these surpluses now amount today to \$600 billion. Six-hundred billion dollars is not enough to cover benefit payments on Social Security for 2 years. So that is not a long-term solution.

This chart shows what is happening to Americans that are living longer. When we started Social Security in 1935, the average age of death was 61 years old, so most people never even reached the 65-year-old age that entitled them for any benefits. So they died earlier, most people, and Social Security funding was not as big a problem.

As you see on this chart, life expectancy has gone from 61 when we started Social Security, and today it is 74 years old. So people are living longer. That is good, but it makes a problem with keeping the system solvent.

I have introduced a bill, and I will be introducing my next bill in the next few weeks. That has been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. The population growth of seniors is going up at the rate of 73 percent. The population rate of workers is increasing at 14 percent. That means that there is fewer workers paying in their taxes to cover the benefits. So the question is, What do we do?

In 1950, we had 17 people working paying in their taxes for each Social Security recipient. Today there are only three people working. By 2029, there is going to be two people working. We cannot continue to raise taxes on workers in America. We have increased taxes 36 times since 1971. So today most of the American workers pay more in the Social Security tax than they pay in the payroll tax; 78 percent of American workers now pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax.

Now, here is the bottom line: If you are over 50 years old, you are going to have to live about 26 years after you retire just to break even on the taxes that you and your employer paid into Social Security. That is why private

investment has got to be part of the solution.

If you are a lucky enough individual to break even, and that is even if Congress does not face up to the problem, then I think it is very important that Congress wakes up to the fact that the longer we delay a solution for Social Security, the more drastic that solution is going to have to be.

So what my proposal says is let us start private investment, where part of that Social Security tax can go into a personal retirement investment fund that is the property of the worker, and if they are lucky enough to meet the average of the last 80 years it will increase at the rate of 8.5 percent per year, and through the magic of compound interest it will result in greater benefits and save Social Security.

#### SUPPORT PUBLIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW] is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about one of the most critical issues facing our country, and that is support for public education and developing and expanding a skilled work force that is able to compete in the world in the 21st Century.

We are going to be discussing this week on this floor issues related to public education. We are going to be talking about the D.C. schools and the fact that there are leaky roofs, roofs falling in, and what the solution should be.

We are going to hear from the majority that the solution to leaky roofs is vouchers. We on the minority side are going to say that the solution to leaky roofs is to fix the roof, it is to then go on and make sure we have quality teachers teaching basic skills with technology in their classrooms, safe classrooms, children coming into kindergarten prepared to learn, and that we make a national commitment to our public education system all across this country.

Our democracy is founded on the belief that we have to provide a quality public education to every child in every neighborhood if we are to remain strong and independent as a country.

There are wonderful examples of supporting public schools in my district in Michigan. I attended on Sunday a celebration of a restoration of the Mason public schools, where in their elementary schools and their high school they have been investing in increasing their science labs and putting more technology into the buildings, a new field house, renovating their auditorium for the arts.

That community has made a strong public commitment and said to the young people of that community, "We believe in you, we will invest in you, and we want your public schools to be the best they can be."

All across my district now we are involved in a private sector effort called Net Day, where the business community has come together investing dollars, the labor community, through the leadership of IBEW and our electricians, are donating their personal time on Saturdays to come into the schools, working with our educators, working with every part of the community to wire our schools for the textbook of the future called the Internet, whether it is the Lansing public schools where we are wiring, in fact have wired 29 schools and are now moving on to bring volunteers to work with young people on basic reading skills, whether it is Pinckney elementary school that was wired, Lake Fenton a week ago, or the Fenton public schools on November 1.

We have a strong commitment in Michigan to bringing together all parts of the community to make the public school system the best that it can be. Do we need variety? Yes. Do we need choices? Of course. But if we pull dollars away from our public school system to put into private schools and thereby undermine the ability of every child to get a quality education, we do not do well for the future of this country.

There is a fundamental debate going on in this Chamber, a fundamental debate that each of us will be participating in through our votes. I strongly encourage my colleagues to step up and support a continuing strong public school system for the future.

Our children are moving into a world that is very different, that involves competing with people all over the world. They need skills that will allow them to be prepared to be successful in that world. It starts with a strong public school system.

#### LOW-INCOME CHILDREN DESERVE BEST SHOT AT GOOD EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I agree, we got to keep the public schools going, but why does the President continue to deny low income students a chance to excel academically? Why does he insist that children attend unsafe and often drug-infested schools?

Well, to be honest, I am still trying to find the answer to these questions. I find it ironic that both the President and Vice President send their children not to the District's struggling public schools, but to safe and challenging private schools. They understand and they want their children to get the best education, get it in a safe and friendly environment. They do not want their children to walk through metal detectors and have police roaming the walks and the halls or witness

a drug buy or a shooting, and I do not blame them.

But I believe that every child, black, white, rich or poor, should have the same choice. They should be able to get a first rate education, one that fosters growth and learning, not hopelessness and despair.

For all the President's talk of equality and opportunity for all, he is now the obstacle to those parents who want only the same privileges he has, to give their kids the best education possible.

He seems to be more interested in bureaucrats, unions and Federal control than in the well-being of our children. Our President does not believe that you parents are smart enough to do what is best by your kids, by denying you the freedom of choice that he and the First Lady exercise, he is denying your children their best shot at the American dream.

What is wrong with letting parents make their own decision, use their own money, that their children would be better served in a private school or a public school on the other side of town? What is wrong with this? What is the President trying to save? Clearly it is not our children's future.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple; it is school choice. The answer is simple; it is parental control. The answer is freedom to choose how and where your child gets an education. The President must not prevent our children from succeeding. The future of America depends on it.

#### EDUCATION, A TOP PRIORITY WITH DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have made education a top priority this Congress and our emphasis has been on improving public schools, including raising educational standards and addressing infrastructure needs. I listened to the previous speaker, and my concern is that the Republican leadership, after trying to make the deepest education cuts in history last year, is now emphasizing vouchers to pay for private schools as the way to reform our education system.

I listened to the previous speaker, and he talked about how the President and Mrs. Clinton send their kids to private school. But what he neglected to say is that they are paying for that out of their own pocket. The problem with the voucher system that the Republican leadership is talking about is that this is public dollars, tax dollars, that they want to take that to be used to improve the public schools and take those tax dollars and give it to private schools.