

to be remembered simply as a "good priest." Cardinal O'Connor was more than a good priest, he was a great man. He was an example to people of all faiths about how to live a truly God-filled life. Whether it was his work with AIDS patients or his commitment to education, Cardinal O'Connor kept himself immersed in helping others.

Cardinal O'Connor loved God. He loved the Church. He loved his family, and he loved his friends. But he also loved and was committed to the less fortunate. His life serves as an example to us all.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest sorrow to the people of New York and to pay tribute to a great man. We all are much poorer today, because during the night, His Eminence, John Cardinal O'Connor died.

Cardinal O'Connor was a spiritual leader to 2.3 million Catholics. Despite this challenge, he did not limit his advocacy to strictly Catholic matters. Rather, he spoke out on a variety of issues. For example, Cardinal O'Connor has condemned racism in any and all forms. Cardinal O'Connor has also reached out to New York's Jewish community. He has issued condemnations of anti-semitism and spearheaded the effort to establish diplomatic ties between the Vatican and Israel. An endowed chair of Jewish Studies is named in his honor at the Catholic Seminary in Dunwoodie, New York.

But more importantly, the Cardinal was not only a man of words, but of action. During the early and most frightening stages of the AIDS epidemic in the 1980s, he opened New York State's first AIDS-only unit at St. Clare's Hospital. He remained a frequent visitor and volunteer at this unit, spending untold hours with those in pain and suffering, and counseling patients in their last moments on this earth. Catholic parishioners in America knew well of Cardinal O'Connor's contributions for the betterment of our society, most especially his many humanitarian endeavors such as his work on behalf of disabled persons and the people who care for them.

Cardinal John O'Connor was a great man, who has finally found peace from a devastating illness and we are all better people for having known him.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who spoke today about the death of Cardinal O'Connor. In the passing of this tremendous spiritual beacon, millions of American worshippers have lost a great shepherd of the faithful.

Cardinal O'Connor was an unabashed champion for human life and human dignity. His presence will be missed. Throughout his illness he showed us how to face death with dignity as well.

John Cardinal O'Connor was a giant. He lived his life as a true pillar of faith. In a time when our nation and our world has witnessed a general move toward the devaluation of our common humanity, this man stood firm against the grain. There has never been a time when it has been as difficult as it is now for people to stand against the worst traits of modernity. Cardinal O'Connor's example shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that humans can continue to stand firm for noble goals even in this most difficult of times.

Having had the opportunity to correspond with him recently, I can attest that he remained a gentle and principled man until the very end of his earthly life. May God continue to bless the Cardinal and reveal Himself in all of His majesty to this great man in the place he has now been welcomed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 317.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, appointed on February 14, 2000:

Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina, Vice Chairman;

Mr. DREIER of California;
Mr. BARTON of Texas;
Mr. EWING of Illinois;
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois;
Mr. BILBRAY of California;
Mr. STENHOLM of Texas;
Mr. PASTOR of Arizona;
Mr. FILNER of California;
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California;
and

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Post and also in today's Washington Post there were two articles in which Vice President GORE is scolding Governor Bush, candidate for president, on Social Security. In today's article, Vice President GORE in a speech yesterday to labor union members in Atlantic City said that Governor Bush had a secret plan to gut the Social Security program.

Now, the vice president is quite effective in being an advocate for the politics of fear, and it is a shame that he would be using this opportunity to scare those most vulnerable in our society, and particularly those senior citizens who depend upon Social Security for their livelihood. So today I just wanted to take a few minutes to talk about Social Security.

The Social Security program began in 1936, and between 1936 and 1998, a period of 62 years, in about 47 of those 62 years there was a surplus in the Social Security account. In other words, there was more money coming in through the payroll tax than was being paid out to beneficiaries.

During those 47 years of surpluses, the Democratic leadership controlled the Congress for about 95 percent of that time, and during that time in excess of \$800 billion was spent by the government from that fund.

Now, the sad thing about it was not only was the Congress during that period of time spending all of the income tax, both personal and corporate, but they were also spending all of the Social Security surplus, and they still were creating deficits, annual deficits, in excess of \$200 billion a year in many of those years.

□ 1645

So I went back and I wanted to look at Vice President GORE's record while he was in Congress. Now, he served in the U.S. Congress and in the U.S. Senate from 1977 to 1992. During that time, Congress spent \$269 billion of the surplus of Social Security. At least from the research that I looked at, I did not see anywhere that Vice President GORE expressed any opposition to spending that surplus money. Then, during that period, from 1977 to 1992, the Federal debt increased by \$2.4 trillion. I did not find any record where Vice President GORE objected to that kind of addition to our Federal debt.

So I read this article about the Vice President using the politics of fear to scare senior citizens about the future of Social Security, and I said, what is the real issue here? When we have people come to Congress to lobby on Social Security, we obviously have senior citizens who depend upon it for their livelihood. But we also are having more and more young married couples with children coming, and they are paying

frequently more in payroll tax than they are in income tax, many of them do not have any health insurance, they do not qualify for Medicaid, their employer does not provide health insurance, and they cannot afford it, and many of them do not believe that Social Security will even be there for their benefit when they retire. So Candidate Bush simply elevated for discussion the possibility which many of these young people want of allowing them the opportunity to direct up to 2 percent of their payroll tax into the equity markets.

Now, he did not say that he advocated that, he said that he wanted to explore it, because all of us know that by the year 2032, Social Security will be bankrupt. There is a surplus now and there will be until the year 2013, but at that time, the Federal Government is going to have to start repaying some of the \$800 billion that it owes Social Security.

So Candidate Bush is looking for some long-term solutions for Social Security and its solvency. Of all of the articles that I have read about Vice President Gore, I do not see that he has ever advocated any solution, but he has been effective in advocating the politics of fear.

Now, we know from his record that this Vice President has no objection to the government spending every dime of the Social Security surplus. But, it appears from what he said yesterday and the day before that he does not want to even discuss giving young people just entering the workplace the opportunity to invest up to 2 percent of their payroll tax into the equity markets. We know that historically the Federal Government on the \$800 billion of the Social Security money that it has borrowed is paying on the average of 5 percent a year. That is about what it averages out to. We know that historically the equity markets have increased over that period of time by about 14 or 15 percent a year.

So I would simply say, it is time for us to stop using the politics of fear as advocated by the Vice President and start looking for real solutions and having real discussions about how can we solve the long-term solvency of Social Security so that not only will it be available for senior citizens today, but it will also be available for those young men and women just entering the workplace today.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in order to accommodate the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) catching his airplane, that he could take the first 5 minutes, and then I could immediately follow with 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NO MORE I LOVE YOU'S

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to warn my colleagues and the Nation of a computer virus that as we speak is really sweeping the world. This is a computer virus that is going to be shortly called the "I Love You" virus, and believe me, there is nothing romantic about it, because this may be one of the most insidiously destructive viruses we have seen in several years. It has already destroyed 600 files in my office, and I am afraid that in many, many other of my colleagues' offices this afternoon we will have incurred substantial damage. I wanted to alert anyone who may be listening to this of a couple of things about this virus.

First, anyone who receives an e-mail where the subject is "I Love You" should immediately delete the e-mail. That is the modus operandi of this e-mail, and no one should open up an e-mail with that subject matter now or perhaps forever, considering this virus. The reason is, there is a second aspect of this virus that is very damaging, and that is we have learned this afternoon that this particular virus will also damage common files that are on a shared server of anyone who opens up that e-mail. What has already happened this afternoon in my office is that we had someone open up that e-mail and it then destroyed other common files on our shared server system. In our system, it happened to destroy our graphic files under the JPEG type files and there may be others that are subject to damage. So I hope that everyone can spread the gospel with their friends not to open up any "I Love You" e-mail messages.

I have another message that is important for those who are responsible for this destructive act. That is, you will be hunted down; you will not be able to hide. There will be nowhere you can hide to escape the impact of your actions. You will be hunted down like dogs, and you will be prosecuted. The reason is, that these juvenile vandal efforts are enormously destructive, and I can assure the perpetrators of this: that the U.S. Congress, beginning next Tuesday, is going to do what we can to make sure that the investigatory authorities have the technological tools at their disposal to find those who are responsible for this and make sure that they are prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I think this points up an important point that we in Congress have to understand. In the West, when the technology of the stagecoach was invented, Congress responded by cre-

ating, if you will, a Marshals Service to respond to the stage coast heists. We now have to be additionally attentive to give our law enforcement officials the statutory authority and the resources and the technological resources that are necessary to track these folks down and make sure that they are prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to suffer significant damage nationally as a result of this. The person power hours that are going to be required to respond to this is going to be a major national problem. I think that we should commit ourselves when we return to our offices next Tuesday or Monday to be very diligent in making sure that we adopt the technology necessary to respond to this new threat.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in support of the United States Congress granting permanent normal trade relations to China. I rise as a Democrat, one who believes that this policy of economic engagement is in the best interest of the United States on a number of issues.

When we look at the history of Congress and all of the trade agreements that we have had to vote on, seldom, if ever, have we had the opportunity to gain increased access to a market and not have to have given anything in return.

This administration was able to negotiate an agreement that resulted in the United States not reducing their tariffs 1 percent, not reducing their quotas 1 percent, not giving up anything, and in return, we achieved significant across-the-board reductions in tariffs. We received increased market access into China. We received the opportunity to have direct investment to China to over the 50 percent-ownership level in most sectors of their industry.

This is an agreement that is good for American workers, it is an agreement that is good for American businesses, it is an agreement that is good for American farmers.

One has to understand what is going to be the repercussions of the United States Congress failing to support PNTR for China. If we fail to vote for this measure, we are going to ensure that there are U.S. workers that are not going to benefit from the significant reductions in tariffs.

Just to put this in kind of graphic terms, if my colleagues can really think if the United States is still facing the same tariff schedule with China as we are today, and maybe it is in the exportation of auto parts, and if we are