''Officers treated us like animals. They never explained to us what to do but communicated with the prisoners by whipping, kicking and cursing. While prisoners were being beaten, they couldn't stop working or look back at the officers. If a prisoner moaned or tried to avoid getting hit, she was put into solitary confinement, the worst punishment in prison. The solitary confinement cell was only high enough to allow a person to sit on the floor. Concrete thorns stuck out of the walls so the prisoner could not lean against them. The person could only sit and not move for many days. If prisoners were consigned to solitary confinement during the winter, their legs became paralyzed.''

''The different forms of torture are too numerous to recount. Sometimes they put a wooden stick with sharp edges behind my knees, make me kneel, and then trampled my body with their heavy boots. At other times, they would hang me by the shackles on my wrists, high enough so that I was forced to stand on tiptoe. At night water would fill the solitary cell up to my stomach, depriving me of any sleep. During the long hours underwater my body would gradually swell up, making it difficult for me to keep my balance. If I fell, the guards kicked me until I scrambled up again in extreme pain and fatigue.''

''The prisoners in the export factory were treated even worse than those in the other factories. Our days were a series of unendurable labor. Getting kicked and slapped was common. The female prisoners got used to an officer's kick or slap on the face. After a few years of little food, no sunshine, constant beatings and demanding work, prisoners began to lose the strength in their backbones. As the spine weakened, ligaments started popping out at the back of their necks. The prisoners became ugly like beasts. The export production was the fruit of unbelievable human abuse. These exports went to Japan, to Poland, to France.''

I would ask, do we want to participate in this as well? Let me end with this quote:

''When pregnant women came to prison, they were forced to abort their babies. Poison was injected into the babies cuddled in their mother's wombs. After the injection, the pregnant woman suffered tremendous pain until the babies were stillborn about 24 hours later. Medical officers walked around the pregnant women and kicked their swollen bellies if they screamed or moaned.''

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. These are a few excerpts of people that I have met. We must not forget these people. We must fight to stop the painful, horrifying torture and the other human rights abuses the North Korean people are enduring at the hands of the brutal dictatorship ruling that country.

SELF-ENRICHMENT FROM NUCLEAR POWER PLANT PRIVATIZATION

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, the United States Enrichment Corporation made the devastating decision to close its uranium enrichment facility in Piketon, Ohio, where nearly 2,000 dedicated Americans work. This is devastating not only to my community and to my region of Ohio but it is devastating, I believe, to this country. Some 23 percent of all of the electricity that is generated in our country is generated through nuclear power plants. Nearly all of that material that is necessary to provide the fuel for these nuclear power plants comes from two sites, in Paducah, Kentucky, and in Piketon, Ohio.

Until 2 years ago, the industry which produced this vital fuel for our Nation was under the ownership and control of the United States Government. We made the decision to privatize this vital industry. We did so with the hope and belief that the industry would thrive and that the private company would keep its obligations to this Nation and continue to operate the two plants through the year 2004. Sadly, the leadership of this new private company has broken faith with our government and with the American people, and they have announced that they are closing the Piketon plant.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. I am upset about this because of its immediate impact upon my district and upon the men and women who work in the facility in my district. But I am equally concerned because this decision can have a terribly adverse effect upon this Nation in terms of our national security and in terms of our energy security.

I am convinced that the management of this company cares for neither but simply is determined to do whatever it can to enrich itself, and the American people and the people who work in these plants can be damned.

That is why I am very, very pleased that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), who is the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, has recently written the CEO of this private company, Mr. Nick Timbers, a letter in which he expresses concern and asks certain questions. I would like to share a couple of paragraphs from Chairman BLILEY's letter to Mr. Nick Timbers. He says:

''Dear Mr. Timbers:

''As you know, the Commerce Committee is continuing its review of USEC privatization and its impact on our national security and the domestic uranium industry. I am writing to you with respect to recent troubling statements you have made on this subject and to obtain additional documents and information related to USEC privatization.''

Then Mr. BLILEY continues:

''Quoting the Wall Street Journal editorial dated Thursday, June 28, 2000, you indicated that USEC's recent decision to close the Department of Energy's Portsmouth gaseous diffusion plant was made in response to congressional intent in privatization legislation. Specifically, you state that USEC's decision to close the Portsmouth plant was, quote, the reason Congress privatized the company, close quote.''

Then Mr. BLILEY says:

''I can assure you that this is not the case. A single operating gaseous diffusion plant with no credible plan for a succeeding enrichment technology is not what Congress intended for the privatized company.''

My understanding is that we will have hearings this fall, and we will delve into the matters surrounding the privatization of this company. I think Mr. Timbers has some explaining to do, and I think those responsible for the decisions that led to privatization within this administration have some explaining to do. I think there was a terrible, unacceptable, conflict of interest that existed when Mr. Timbers was given the authority to advise and to consult and to give direction as to how this company would be privatized because the decisions that he made resulted in his self-enrichment. This man, who was making as a government employee approximately $350,000, ended up with a salary of some $2.48 million.

□

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE FOR SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as I have on too many occasions to speak out about the issue of Medicare coverage for prescription drugs. I say too many because the time is up for this Congress to act and to modernize Medicare to cover the way health care is provided today.

We have the most wonderful health care system in the world. I know a gentleman who takes a pill once a month instead of having open heart surgery. The pill costs $400. Medicare will cover the surgery. Medicare will not cover the pill. We have got to change and modernize Medicare so that our seniors are not left in the situation of getting up in the morning and saying do I eat today, do I get my breakfast, or do I get my medicine? Too many seniors in this country find themselves in that situation.

I have been conducting a prescription drug fairness campaign in Michigan now for a year. I set up a hotline, have asked seniors to write, to call, to share with me their situations so we can put names and faces on this problem and encourage, plead and beg with this Congress to act now.

I would like today to once again read a letter. This one is from my hometown of Lansing. Jackie Billion wrote to me, and I would like to share with you this letter:

''Dear Debbie:

''I live alone in a subsidized ground floor apartment. I'm 70 years old and have osteoporosis, rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis and fymalogy. I also have macular degeneration. I'm legally blind in the left eye. Last week, I spent 2 days at Beaumont Hospital.

''I receive $645 a month and quite often I have to decide whether to get some of my prescriptions or eat. I hope and pray that seniors will receive prescription drug coverage soon.

''Thank you, Jackie Billion.''

I thank Jackie for sharing these comments with me and for speaking out on behalf of literally millions of seniors that have the same situation that she has today.

This Congress has the opportunity with the best economy in a generation to fix this if we have the political will to do it. If we are willing to stand up to those who are fighting us, who are not understanding or caring about what is happening to Jackie Billion, we can fix this and modernize Medicare for our seniors and for those who will be the next generation of seniors. I would call on the Congress again to take this opportunity, the best economy in a generation, budget surpluses that we have not seen in my lifetime, and place a priority on modernizing Medicare to cover costs of prescription drugs so that seniors like Jackie Billion will not have to worry about choosing between their meals and their medicine.

□

LOOKING BACK AT 6 YEARS OF REPUBLICAN CONTROL IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we rise tonight to talk a little bit about what has happened in the last 6 years, and I am delighted to have with me tonight one of my colleagues who came to the Congress with me in 1994. I think once in a while it is important to remind our colleagues where we were in 1994, what was happening here in Washington, what was happening with our government, when the American people said, in effect, enough is enough.

□ 1930

They sent 73 new Republican freshmen to this Congress to begin to change the way Washington did business. We had with us a Contract with America, not a Contract on America, some of the critics like to say, but it was a Contract with America. And we said if you will elect us to the Congress, here are some things we are going to do.

I am happy to report that virtually all of those planks in that contract with the American people have now come to fruition. In fact, we kept every item. We kept our bargain on every one of those items. We had a vote on a few occasions. There were not the constitutionally required majorities, and so those have not become law, for example, with term limits. But on virtually every other item.

One of the first items on that contract was to make Congress live by the same laws as everybody else, and perhaps later this evening, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will join us and talk about that particular plank. I am privileged tonight to have one of my colleagues who came with me in 1994, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS); and we have really come a long ways.

Let me just talk about the budget side of the equation, and I will talk about this more after the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) leaves us. But when we first came to Washington, the Congressional Budget Office, and I have a copy of this, if any Member would like a copy of what the Congressional Budget Office said, our official scorekeepers were telling us back in 1994 and 1995, they were telling us that the on-budget deficit for each of the years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000 was going to be $208 billion, $176 billion, $207 billion, $224 billion, $222 billion, $253 billion and $284 billion. Now, that was the deficit that they were projecting when we came to Washington in 1994.

That did not include all of the money that the Congress was regularly taking from Social Security to spend on other items; if we include that, we are actually looking at deficits of $259 billion growing ultimately to $381 billion by fiscal year 2000.

That is where we were back in 1994, and what the American people said in that election is listen, there must be a better way. Every family, every business, every association has to balance its budget and somehow they figured out a way to make the income meet the expenditures. Every family does it every week.

It really is time for the Federal Government to do the same, and so they sent some of us there and said, listen, if you do nothing else, at least balance the Federal books.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that we not only have balanced the Federal books, we are now looking at enormous deficits. We will talk more about that. I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) to talk just a little bit about where we were, where we are and hopefully where we are going with this Congress.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) for yielding to me. And I am appreciative of the fact that the gentleman has chosen this time tonight over the next hour to talk about what we have done in Washington and, although, he and I are Republicans, the wins, the victories that we have seen over the last 5½ years really are not Republican victories. They have been victories for the American people.

I recall back when we were sworn in. I was sworn in on January 9, 1995, my colleagues were sworn in 4 days or 5 days before I was, because of some obligations I had back home, but when I was sworn in on January 9, I believe, and I think the gentleman has the numbers there, that the deficit of that year in 1995 was about $285 billion, somewhere thereabouts, $285 billion or $300 billion. Those were the deficits, and deficits means that we have spent out a whole lot more money than we take in and we create a deficit position.

As the gentleman has said, we came in and wanted to do things differently. We felt like Washington could be better, and it is interesting the Contract with America items that the gentleman has mentioned, about 80 percent of those items today are law.

Although people campaign and they talk about the evils of the Contract with America, 80 percent of the Contract with America today is law and a Democrat President signed those things into law.

A balanced budget amendment, we did not pass that. We did not pass term limits, but I think we both voted for term limits and both voted to say that we should amend the Constitution, have an amendment to force Congress to do about what 39 different States around the country have to do, by law they have to balance their books. They cannot spend out one dime more than they were appropriated or that the legislators appropriated.

So what we have done over the last 5½ years, we do have a balanced budget today. We do not spend out more money than we take in. Welfare reform, we were beaten on that, because we wanted to reform welfare to say, let us not define compassion by how many people we can have on food stamps and AFDC or in public housing, instead let us define compassion by how few people are on food stamps and AFDC and public housing because we have helped them climb the ladder of economic opportunity.

Today 6 million more Americans are in the workplace because we chose to define compassion in a different way.

We cut committee staff by a third for the first time, I understand, in the history of the House of Representatives. We audited the books of the House of Representatives. If Members will recall, back when the gentleman and I were freshman, every morning we would have people pushing these little carts around that had these buckets of ice on them that would give Members a bucket of ice. I thought this was somewhat unusual. The gentleman thought it was unusual, because we had refrigerators inside of our offices that keep