July 23, 2001

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its sincerest condolences to the families of the 42 people killed in the March 6, 2001, explosion at the Fanglin elementary school in the Jianxi province of the People’s Republic of China, including to the parents and families of the 37 young children who lost their lives as a result of this dangerous and forced child labor; and

(2) expresses its gratitude to the Chinese and international journalists who reported the true cause of the explosion in response to the Chinese Communist Party’s original attempt to put forward an “authorized”, but false, version of the events.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas on March 6, 2001, an explosion at the Fanglin elementary school in the Jianxi province of the People’s Republic of China’s killed at least 42 people, including 37 children;

Whereas the children, all between the ages of 9 and 11, were being forced by elementary school officials to manufacture fireworks when this tragedy occurred;

Whereas the parents of the deceased children report that the mandatory labor, which involved mounting fuses and detonators into large firecrackers, had been a daily practice at the school for years;

Whereas this systematic exploitation of children in the elementary school was not only known about but actually organized by individuals holding official responsibilities with the local Chinese Government; and

Whereas Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji has taken the important step of acknowledging these violations of internationally recognized labor standards: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY FUND-RAISERS

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us were revolted when the Democratic leadership took $1 million from Bernard Schwartz from Local Federal Governing, who should not be able to put some of this money into a fund-raiser that I would believe, Democrat leadership had a fund-raiser this weekend with Hanoi Jane Fonda, Hanoi Jane Fonda, that stood beside Vietnamese gunners as they were trying to shoot down American airplanes; Hanoi Jane and Tom Hayden, who stood beside those gunners, knowing that our POWs were tortured and brutalized, and said nothing. Yet the Democratic leadership this weekend has a fund-raiser in the face of campaign finance reform with Hanoi Jane Fonda. I hope you choke on every dollar.

FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

(Ms. WATSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fundamental guiding principles of our Nation is that individuals should be judged on their talents rather than on their heritage or their beliefs. It has been a long struggle for many Americans to secure the benefits of this principle. Even today, unfair discrimination prevents many Americans from achieving all they can. But most Americans can agree that our Federal Government should not sanction unfair discrimination but rather should fight it wherever it exists.

Last week, Congress took a decision that compromised this principle. The passage of the Community Solutions Act last week by this House permitted groups to discriminate unfairly against certain Americans. Worse yet, the bill actually would take away the right of communities to establish their own antidiscrimination laws.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for Congress to correct this House mistake. I encourage you to work with the Senate to see that any final version of this bill respects the rights of communities to enforce their own antidiscrimination laws and thereby protect one of our most cherished American principles.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2246, MEDIA MARKETING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as previously ordered of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise this evening and discuss a topic that is important to all of us, which is our Nation’s children.

Two months ago, I was in a truck stop and I saw a young man playing a video game. I did not think much about it, but I went up behind him and watched what he was doing. He was shooting a laser gun, but he was not shooting at targets. He was not shooting ducks. He was shooting people. Every time he hit one, an arm flew off and the blood spurted, or a head flew off and the blood spurted. I was really impressed by the violence of the game. This young man was about 10 years old. Nowhere on that game was any type of rating indicating that this was inappropriate for a young person.

As I saw that, I began to have a flashback to some of the school shootings we have had, and I realized that the United States currently is the most violent nation in the world for young people, with the highest homicide rate and the highest suicide rate of any nation in the civilized world. Our out-of-wedlock birthrate has risen from 5 percent in 1960 to 33 percent today. And so you say, what has happened here? Why has our culture unraveled in the way that it has?

I am sure we can point the finger at a great many different reasons and causes, but I would say one of the chief causes is the influence of violent, explicit material in the entertainment industry. Because, you see, the average child spends 25 hours a week watching movies, playing video games and listening to recorded music and probably spends about an hour or less talking to his or her parents. That 25 hours has a huge impact. Some of this benign, but much of it is really pernicious and very harmful.

In September of 2000, the Federal Trade Commission prepared a report entitled Marketing Violent Entertainment to Children. This is what they found, and I quote: ‘‘The pervasive and aggressive marketing of violent movies, music and
electronic games to children undermines the credibility of the entertain-
ment media industries’ parental advisory ratings and labels.

In other words, they were doing this in violation of their own ratings. The entertain-
ment industry at that time was warned to quit marketing adult material to children in violation of their own rating system. This was done in September of 2000.

Then a follow-up study was done of the entertainment industry’s progress in January of 2001. It was found that a year later some progress had been made but not very much. Whatever progress had been made was in ratings of movies, video games and their advertising, but practically no change at all had occurred in the ratings and in the advertising of the recording industry.

So much of the rap music, much of the music that young people listen to, is relatively targeted to kids; and much of it is violent and very explicit. Since there has been relatively little progress in this area, H.R. 2246, the Media Marketing Accountability Act of 2001, has been introduced in the House. This is a companion to Senate bill 792. This bill simply requires the entertainment industry to advertise adult-rated material to adult audiences.

Some people bring up the issue of the first amendment. They say, well, this is obviously a violation of free speech principles. Yet I think it is important that we think about this a little bit, because this bill does not in any way tell the entertainment industry what they write or what they produce. It does not edit content. It simply says if you are going to have a rating system, PG, R, adult, whatever it may be, they write or what they produce. It does not edit content. It simply says this: If you are going to have a rating and not advertise in preteen and teenage magazines and on movies that are G rated and do not market it on TV programs that are primarily aimed at children.

It is very simple. It is not a violation of free speech. I think that we have really let our standards slip abysmally in this country. All of us who are adults have stood by and we have let it happen. We have watched it happen. I think that it is time that Congress steps up to the plate. I think Congress can do something about this. I think we can send a message to the entertainment industry. I hope that Congress will do the right thing and will support H.R. 2246, the Media Marketing Accountability Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there was an extraordinary report published

the end of last week which should be required reading for every American. It is a staff draft of the Bush Social Secu-

rity privatization commission. Now, they want to call it the bipartisan commission on the future of Social Secu-

rity or something, but let us make no bones about it. It is a privatization commission. The basic assumptions that the Bush people and the orders they have from the President are they must privatize at least a portion of Social Security.

But that is no surprise. President Bush has taken that position for many

years, as have many on the other side of the aisle who have never liked the idea of Social Security. But what is

shocking about this report is that on page 14 they say, we have become used to the idea that Social Security is going to have a financing problem beginning in 2038. Beginning in the year 2038, Social Security under current as-

sumptions, without a single change, can pay 73 percent of benefits from that date forward but 100 percent of all promised benefits up to 2038. That is a fact.

The Bush commission, the privatiza-
tion commission, says they question whether Social Security can or will pay any benefits beginning in 2016, which means they are raising the spec-
ter first raised by Treasury Secretary O’Neill that they may not honor the debt of Social Security. That is, the fact that we have all paid taxes in ex-
cess of that necessary to pay current benefits with the idea we are accumu-

lating a trust fund, the trust funds are held in Federal Treasury securities, and Federal Treasury securities are supposed to be the safest security in the world.

Now, Secretary O’Neill and, by impli-
cation, now the President, are raising the question whether the Federal Govern-
ment will honor those securities. That is unbelievable. That is extraordinary. It is frightening. It could bring about an economic collapse worldwide.

Beyond that, they are doing it for one petty reason, because they hate Social Security, they want to attack it, and they want to privatize it. Be-
cause the people on Wall Street say, “Hey, if we could have 250 million sepa-
rate accounts to manage, we would charge you a little bit of money every month, we would make tens of billions of dollars.”

Disregard the fact that those manage-
ment fees over a person’s lifetime would reduce their retirement by 40 percent in that little fund, and, for most lower income workers and others who this report feigns to really care

about, that is a kick in the head. Shocked, that the widows and poor peo-
ple and minorities do not have large re-
tirement plans. They are not offering anything new for them, they are just

saying Social Security has not been providing them with a high standard of living. Yes, that is true. But at least it has been there, it has been predictable.

This year, Americans will pay $93 bil-
lion, “B,” billion more in Social Secu-

rity taxes than are necessary to meet current benefits. We thought that $93 billion was then being deposited with the Federal Treasury with notes and it would be paid back, but Secretary O’Neill and this Commission and Presi-
dent Bush are saying no, we might not pay that back.

Well, if that is the case, then let us lower the tax now. You rushed out here to lower taxes for people who earn over $273,000 a year, yet more working Americans pay more in FICA taxes to Social Security than they do income taxes. If you are saying you are not going to pay the other $93 billion tax that tax today. Give us back that $93 billion extra we are going to pay this year, if you are questioning whether you are going to honor that debt.

It is absolutely extraordinary and ir-
responsible and unbelievable that this group, the Privatization Commission, is going down this path. The trust funds hold not accumulated reserves of wealth, but only promises that future taxpayers will be asked to redeem. That is the same as any other Federal Treasury security. So they are raising a question about whether the full faith and credit of the Federal Government lies behind not only the Social Secu-

rity trust funds, but the $6 trillion of debt the United States of America has accumulated over the years.

If that filters through to the world fi-
nancial markets, there will be a cata-
strophic collapse of the dollar, a run on the dollar; U.S. securities will be dumped in the market, and it will bring about economic catastrophe.

I recognize they are trying to do a job here. The President ordered them to come up with the rationale for pri-
vatization. But do not do it in this ex-
traordinarily irresponsible way. Just say, look, we want to cut people’s bene-
fits so that we can then transition to a privatized plan, and, of course, the models in Great Britain, Argentina and Chile did not work out so well, but we think they will work out better here. But if the Bush Administration is going to do it, they do not threaten the security of the world by threatening the sanctity of U.S. Treas-
ury bills.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EUDORA WELTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) is recognized for 5 min-
utes.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may not yet be aware of the death earlier today of one of Amer-
ica’s giants. Eudora Welty died this
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