

operational budget, to keep government open, to keep it operating, is not going to go into effect, Mr. President, unless you send Congress a balanced budget.

Finally, the President did send Congress a balanced budget, and now we have moved ahead. We have reframed the debate in Washington, D.C. so both sides of the aisle are now saying, great, we need a balanced budget. Let us be more frugal in our spending.

We have come a long ways, but we have still got a long ways to go. We have got a long ways to go because we are still borrowing the money that is coming in surplus from the Social Security Trust Fund to use for other government spending, and that has got to stop.

Here is my proposal of how we stop it. I introduced the only Social Security bill that has been introduced in the last session of Congress three years ago and again this session that has been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent. So if we really want to put Social Security first, let us stop talking about it and start doing it.

Now that we are looking at a surplus in terms of the unified budget that is coming in this year, and the estimates are as high now as a \$40 to \$50 billion surplus. Let us start taking that surplus money and allowing workers in this country to have their own personal retirement savings account that will partially offset their fixed benefits and Social Security eventually when they are ready to retire.

But giving these workers some of this surplus money that is coming in, which is, after all, overtaxation, allowing them to see the creation of wealth, allowing them to see the magic of compounding interest where our money can double every 4 or 6, 8 years; and when we are ready for retirement at age 65, we are going to see much more money in those funds.

So with even a partial offset, in my bill that I call for using these surplus monies to beef up Social Security, to start down the road of solvency, I am suggesting that for each \$2 these people earn in the investment market of limited investments, of so-called safe investments, for every \$2 they earn there be a \$1 offset in their Social Security benefits, so there is really a safety net.

But what we have got to do is make sure that existing retirees continue to have the benefits that have been promised to them, but at the same time we make provisions that our kids and our grandkids and our kids' grandkids and great-grandkids can have an opportunity to have even more revenue returns in their retirement years.

Look, we have got a demographic situation where there are fewer workers paying in their FICA taxes to more and more retirees. When we started out in 1935 we had an average age life-span of 62 years old. That meant most people that paid into Social Security all their working life never received any benefits.

Now the average age of mortality, the life-span today at birth is 74 years old for a male, 76 years old for a female. But if we live to be 65 years old, then on the average we are going to live another 20 years. Let us get at it. Let us really put Social Security first.

TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS TO WORK DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Take Our Daughters to Work Day. The Capitol Hill activities for Take Our Daughters to Work Day have been rescheduled for next Thursday because of the D.C. schools having academic testing today.

Today many fathers and mothers took their daughters to work. Take Our Daughters to Work Day was created in 1993 to help maintain that essential feeling of self-worth and enhance their understanding of what is possible and what they can accomplish if they put forth the effort.

This is an important day for the millions of girls who are provided with the rare and much-needed opportunity to meet successful professional women and envision the immense possibilities that stand before them.

Numerous studies have shown how many girls exhibit a strong and distinct sense of self-confidence until they reach the age of 11. Then there is a sudden drop in self-esteem, a lowered sense of self-worth, and intense feelings of insecurity about their own judgments and emotions. Take Our Daughters to Work Day is an effective way of maintaining their self-esteem.

Last year, 48.3 million adults said that their company and their spouse's company participated in this special day. In addition, three in ten adults said that they or their spouse personally participated by taking a girl to their workplace, which equals 15.4 million people.

Clearly, this is a day not only for this Nation's daughters but for parents, employers, and people who understand the value of investing in and training the younger generation to become better, stronger, and more effective members of the labor force in the years ahead.

As we approach the new millennium, Take Our Daughters to Work Day and similar activities which promote reaching out to young girls and women will become even more essential. By the turn of the century, 8 out of every 10 women between the ages of 25 and 54 will be on the job because they want and, in most cases, need to work. For the first time in history, most new jobs will require education or training beyond high school.

I hope that Members will participate in the Take Our Daughters to Work

Day activities we have organized for our colleagues on Capitol Hill next week.

Our Nation's daughters need to know who they are and what they can be, which will exceed far beyond any societal limitations that were placed on their foremothers and to some degree continue to this day.

This knowledge and self-confidence help them develop more ambitious dreams, strive to take on more challenges, and become valuable leaders in America's future. We look forward to next week, Take Our Daughters to Work Day.

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS WEEK

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, this week is a special time in our country. It is designated as National Crime Victims Rights Week. It is an opportunity to try to begin to balance the scales of justice that are weighted so heavily in favor of the accused and so lightly weighted in favor of the victims of violent crime.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of a constitutional amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), Congressman and Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, that attempts to restore and provide really for the first time in this country solid, irreversible rights for victims of violent crime.

What this constitutional amendment does is that it provides that victims have the right to be given notice, to know when there are public hearings related to the crime in which they have been victimized, to be heard if they are present, and if they are not, to submit a written statement at all public proceedings where a sentencing occurs or a plea bargain is agreed to or there is a prospect that the criminal will be released from custody.

It provides the right under this constitutional amendment to be notified if that convict is released or escapes from custody, and because justice needs to be sure and swift, to seek relief as victims from these unreasonable delays related to the crime; the right to have

restitution, because for many of victims of violent crime, especially if they lose a spouse or someone who is a source of income and revenue for their family, not only do they lose a loved one but they lose the financial support, the ability to send their children to college, the ability to spend time and have a house in which their children and those who survive the victim can live.

This constitutional amendment ensures that the victim's safety is always considered when a parole board or similar organization is looking at releasing a criminal in custody at whatever level. Finally, because rights mean nothing if we do not know of them, in this constitutional amendment we ensure that victims are notified of these rights early in the process.

As obvious as these rights are, the fact of the matter is, today in America very few enjoy them. With the exception of some enlightened States and some individual communities, for the most part the victims have no rights in these proceedings, are ignored in the process, are left behind, bewildered at a time in their life when they are stunned by what is occurring to them.

Our family has had some experience in this matter. When I was 12, my father was murdered in a South Dakota courtroom. While I was young at the time, and we do not remember everything as distinctly, I recall our family going through the trial, through the conviction, through the sentencing. And like a lot of families, we were before the parole board trying to keep dad's killer behind bars.

We have been through it. The fact of the matter is that no one ever expects it to happen to them. They are sure it only occurs in someone else's neighborhood, someone else's family, in someone else's community. But the fact of the matter is, in this America there are two classes of Americans: those who have been touched by violent crime and those who someday will be.

This constitutional amendment is designed to protect those who have not yet been victimized by a crime, to make sure that at a time in their life that they never thought that they would be involved in, when justice seems so distant and remote, that they get the one thing in life that they most need at that time, which is justice.

□ 2000

Last year, I think in the year before, many of us watched the O.J. Simpson trial. We watched and read about the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing, and we had to pass a Federal law to ensure that the victims of Oklahoma City bombing could be present in the courtroom when that trial occurred. In most States all that a shrewd defense attorney has to do is identify the family or the victim's family as a possible witness in a courtroom case and excludes them, leaving the courtroom where the accused has a family behind them and full of supporters and where the victim

is basically abandoned and empty. It is time that jurors see the victims of these crimes so that as they weigh the evidence, as they weigh the sentence, they understand that these are real people whose lives they affect.

I support this constitutional amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

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

RANCHERS IN COLORADO KNOW HOW TO TAKE CARE OF THE LAND

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I woke up this morning and, doing the usual morning, looked at the newspapers and read some of the comments about Earth Day yesterday, and I was surprised at some of the remarks that were made that seem to want to imply to the American people or convince the American people that the way to protect our environment is to have a larger and bigger government in Washington, D.C.; that the people in Washington, D.C., truly know better than those of you out there who own property, who have worked property, who work your land and live your land; that the people in Washington, D.C., really should be trusted with your water, they should be trusted with utilization of your land, they should be trusted with all of the decisions to be made about the environment.

So briefly tonight I wanted to talk to you about a few people that live on the land.

David and Sue Ann Smith, the Smith ranch located in Meeker, Colorado, that ranch is what they call a centennial ranch, which means one family has been on that ranch more than a hundred years. In the Smith case, it is one of the most beautifully managed ranches that I have been on, and I have spent a lot of time on it. It is a centennial family, they care about it, they make their living off that land.

Down in Carbondale, Colorado, former Congressman Mike Strang, Mike and Kit Strang have their ranch down there. It looks out over Mount Sopris. They take care of that land as if it were their own child.

You go back up to Glenwood Springs, Colorado, Al Strouband's. Al has a beautiful ranch up there, Storm King Ranch. He takes care of it. You should see what he does with the vegetation, you should see what he does with the utilization of the water, how he takes care of the game.

And not only does Al have a ranch in Colorado, he also has a farm in Vir-

ginia. Go down and see the farm and what he does with his farm, how well manicured it is, the animals that are taken care of, how he takes care of the environment, the soil, the water.

And you come back to Colorado. Go back up to Meeker again, go visit Bart and Mary Strang. They have been there a long time, these Strang families, long, long time. See how they take care of the land, see how protective they are of the environmental issues.

Go back up to Evergreen, Colorado, to Bill and Leslie Volbright. That is the utilization of conservation easements so that they can protect their land into the future.

Or if you want to, go back to Grand Junction, Colorado, Doug and Cathy King. I go up there every year to bugle elk. Some of the finest elk in the country are up in that area, beautiful aspen trees. You should go up there sometime in the fall, should go and ride in the pickup truck with Doug and see how much he cares about that land, how fragile they are with the land.

Go to Carbondale, Colorado to Tom and Ruth Perry's ranch; to their in-laws, Tom and Rossie Turnbull's. Look at what they do with their land and how protective they are.

You will find three things in common with all of these families. Obviously the first thing in common is they care about that land. They love that land. They know how important the land was for generations before them. They know how important that land is for generations ahead of them.

The second thing they all have in common is no one in Washington, D.C., no one in Washington, D.C., no Environmental Protection Agency, nobody from Earth First or the National Sierra Club had to march onto this property and tell these people how to care for that land. Nobody from Washington, D.C. or Earth First or these organizations had to tell them about the future generations. Nobody in Washington, D.C. or Earth First or any of those programs know anything about the past generations of this land.

The other thing that is in common, they are all Republicans.

Now when I read the papers this morning, the Democratic Party seems to think that through big government, through a larger EPA, through organizations like Earth First, that that is the way we ought to control and protect our environment. Well, I am telling you they have got it all wrong.

What they need to do is just take a few minutes, go talk to their local members, go talk to the local ranchers, go talk to the men and women that make their livings off farms and ranches. Take enough time to ride around on horseback or in a pickup or walk around, whatever you want to do. That land, see how they care for it, see how they talk about it, see how they cuddle it like it is a small child, see how they talk about future generations, and then reassess whether it is