

the administration's funding of the war in Iraq. I am hopeful that Republicans will finally remember why they were sent to Washington and join us in creating this investigative committee. It is high time we look at the potential for war profiteering and abuse of these contracts and the money we are spending in Iraq.

We need to have oversight. We need to have accountability. It does not matter that there happens to be a war. It does not matter that it happens that we have a Republican president and a Republican Congress. We should all join together on a bipartisan basis to ensure there is accountability for this money before we proceed in spending any more of it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about Social Security and what is the right word to use. Is it a crisis? Is it just a problem? Is there no problem with a system awash in cash that perhaps just needs some minor adjustments down the road?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do believe there is a crisis, or at least a serious problem that is looming. There is no question we are held captive by our demographics. In order for our Social Security System to work, we need large numbers of young people to pay into the system. We also need people on retirement to not live very long after they retire. But the reality is our birth rates in this country are down, and our retirees are living longer lives.

Both situations are arguably good news, but they do portend a serious situation for our Social Security System. I would draw attention to this graphic. This was produced by the Congressional Research Service. It is not a partisan chart. But here is the year I was born, 1950, and we have a little over 16 workers working away to support every retiree. Fast forward, and here we are in 2005. We have three workers working to support every retiree. But as we move down the line, we go to two workers to support every retiree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, I believe very strongly in the American economy. And I would bet on the American economy over and above any economy in the world. And I just bet we can make those two workers a

lot more productive in those out years, in 2040 and 2050. But I do not know if we can make them productive enough for two workers to support one retiree. I think we have to look at some other things.

A lot of people talk about the trust fund, and, gosh, there is just money in the trust fund, and we will spend that money on retirees when the time comes. Again, I will go to the Congressional Research Service, and this is a graph produced by them just a few weeks ago. It is on the Web site. Anybody can go access it that wants to. Well, this shows the money in the trust fund. And again, you will see that there is a great deal of money coming in, and it is projected to increase. But we reach a point, looks to be about 2028, when the money starts coming down, and it comes down very rapidly.

□ 1715

This includes paying back the money that is in the trust fund that was borrowed. This includes monetizing the Social Security debt which in and of itself can be pretty painful for the markets when that time comes.

Mr. Speaker, there is a question of fairness here because 12 percent of the country's payroll pays into the Social Security system and does not really pay a fair rate of return. It pays by anyone's estimate 1.14, 1.19 percent interest. What Albert Einstein, probably the finest mind of the last century, described as the miracle of compound interest, this miracle is being denied to American workers.

The old axiom states we tax what you do not want, but surely we want jobs for tomorrow's American. Increasing the payroll tax is really not a solution that I can accept. So what are the solutions? What about cutting benefits as suggested by one of the other speakers. I did not come to Congress to cut benefits on Social Security. We could raise taxes, but I do not want to do that. Taxes on jobs are going to drive jobs overseas. We already create a punitive environment in this country for the creation of new jobs with our legal system, cost of health care, and our Social Security payroll tax. I do not think we need to contribute to that, and this Congress should make a pledge that it will not contribute to driving jobs overseas by increasing the payroll tax.

I have already alluded to growth in the economy, and I believe in this country and I believe our economy will grow, but I do not know that we can count on that to cover all of the projected problems with the shortfall in the Social Security fund. So that leaves one lever left to pull, and that lever is getting a fair rate of return on the money that is invested in the Social Security system.

The problem is if we leave that money for us in Congress, and I have

only been here for 2 years, but I know what other Members know, if we leave that money in Congress, we will spend it. We will spend it so quickly, we will not even know we have spent it. And when it comes time to pay the interest, we will write an IOU to pay the other IOUs we have in that filing cabinet in West Virginia.

The only way to protect the Social Security funds is to put them in accounts controlled by individuals where we cannot get at it. A question always comes how are we going to pay for this. We are already paying a great deal of money into the Social Security funds. We are paying a surplus into the Social Security system. So why not take that money in surplus, invest it and earn a fair rate of return on that investment.

There is debt that is owed to the Social Security system. That debt will some day have to be monetized. That money continues to grow as we pay the interest on it and as we continue to borrow from those funds. Why do we not just borrow the money? The obligation is already there. Let us refinance it like any American family would refinance a mortgage if they were trying to work their way out of a difficult financial situation. Refinance the money, make it real debt with a real interest rate. I think the markets would take a great deal of comfort in that. Markets do not like uncertainty, and I do not think in 10 or 15 years' time they are going to like the uncertainty when we monetize the debt that we owe the Social Security system.

So let us recognize it up front, call it what it is, it is a loan, we borrowed it, let us set a fair interest rate on it, and pledge to pay it back and set up a repayment schedule that we can all live with.

So the current obligation is already present. Let us finance the transition with that debt and convert an unknown obligation into bonded indebtedness and give the markets some measure of comfort that we in Congress recognize the problem and know what we are doing to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 70 years since Social Security was founded. Here in this House, let me just give a quote: "It is proposed that the Federal Government assume one-half of the cost of the old age pension plan which ultimately ought to be supplanted by self-supporting annuity plans." These words were spoken in this House in a joint address before Congress by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1935. I think he had it right, and I think it is time for us to work on that.

HONORING DR. JOSEPH M. STOWELL

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge and commemorate the accomplishments of Dr. Joseph M. Stowell, the outgoing president of the Moody Bible Institute. It is with great pleasure that I rise to honor Dr. Stowell for his 18 years of dedicated servitude to the Moody Bible Institute.

Mr. Speaker, the Bible says in the Book of Mathew 20 and 27: "And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be servant."

Mr. Speaker, by his steadfast commitment to his ministry, I believe Dr. Stowell is servanthood personified.

Dr. Stowell, devoted husband and a committed family man, is a man known for his compassionate leadership style. In fact, his love for his students and belief in their capacity to make a difference in the life of the community and for Christ have been the hallmark of his tenure as president.

Under his leadership and by the grace of God, various Moody Bible Institute ministries have been strengthened. These ministries have focused on methods that embraced the diversities in the body of Christ, including color, caste, and class distinctions; and has sharply focused attention to the ministry needs of urban centers.

In addition, the MBI graduate school has made significant strides with a Master of Divinity program and other academic majors that are designed to prepare students for ministry in a changing and diverse world. Dr. Stowell's most recent contributions at MBI led to a restructuring of its many ministries to emphasize the unique contributions of the work of Christ through education, broadcasting, and publishing. His leadership did not just stop there. In 2001 the Distance Learning Center launched Moody Online which now has students enrolled throughout 28 countries. And over the past 18 years, MBI Broadcasting Network has expanded from 11 to 33 owned and operated radio stations which broadcast the award-winning radio ministry known as "Proclaim."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stowell has authored many books, including the recent Gold Medallion-winning book entitled, "The Trouble with Jesus." Dr. Stowell has earned tremendous respect from all people who know him. His unique leadership style, his love for the ministry, and his faithfulness in spreading the gospel of Christ was admired by the faculty, students, and others in ministry and in the community. Without question, Dr. Joseph Stowell was one of the most effective presidents in the history of Moody Bible Institute.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that states: "When you start to benefit more than the people you serve, you are no longer a servant," and I submit today that Dr. Joseph Stowell has exemplified genuine servanthood and he

has impacted the lives of those around him more than he will ever know.

He has now been called to his next season of servanthood to advance the cause of Christ, and he leaves Moody Bible Institute with a tremendous legacy. So today, I rise to recognize and commend the legacy of true servanthood which will never be forgotten. I commend Dr. Joseph Stowell.

SAFETY FOR AMERICANS FROM NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce legislation that I first introduced in the last Congress called the Safety for Americans From Nuclear Weapons Testing Act. Let me tell a brief story that has brought me to introducing this legislation.

From 1951 to 1992, over 1,000 tests were conducted at the Nevada test site. At the time, the government told people in this country that the tests were safe. What we know now is the government lied. In fact, only testing took place when the winds blew the fallout in the least populated direction from the test site, which happened to be southern Utah. These findings were discovered in the 1970s when my father, who was Governor of Utah at the time, received more and more information about the high cancer rates in southern Utah. He got documents declassified at the Pentagon showing that the government knew there was risk with the testing and only did the testing when the fallout was blowing in the least populated direction.

Now, history is pretty clear. We know that the government knew people were at risk. We know the government lied to our citizens, and we know that thousands of people have died of cancer from the fallout from nuclear weapons testing, and yet the last test was in 1992. So why are we talking about this today? We are talking about this because the Federal Government is taking steps to resume nuclear testing.

One thing Members may hear about nuclear testing is the dangerous ones were above ground. Now we do tests underground. The picture next to me took place in 1970. It was an underground nuclear weapons test, the Baneberry Shot it is called. In this picture, we see debris 10,000 feet in the air above the valley floor of the test site.

The DOE's own data shows that underground testing does not contain the fallout. In fact, fallout is emitted into the atmosphere.

This is not just a southern Utah issue or a Western issue. In fact, the National Cancer Institute completed a study looking at concentrations of iodine 131, the isotope that causes thyroid cancer, and looked at how this was

dispersed across the country from the testing. And from the Nevada test site going north and east, Members can see it has crossed the country, and even some counties in upstate New York and Vermont received higher concentrations of fallout than some counties close to the test site. So this is indeed an issue of national importance and national scope.

I have introduced legislation that I think is very responsible in terms of ensuring safety before any nuclear weapons testing can take place again. This legislation calls for a full environmental review, an environmental impact statement, before testing can happen so we can establish all of the health and safety risks and how they can be addressed before testing can happen. That has never been done before.

It also calls for setting up an extensive nationwide monitoring system so we can detect any radiation and fallout from the testing. It will not just be a government-run system; we will have a second monitoring system run by independent third parties through our university system to ensure that we understand the truths about what is going on with nuclear testing and exposure to radiation.

I think this is a responsible step. We cannot go down the path again of nuclear weapons testing. If Members do not think that we face the potential for nuclear weapons testing, let me repeat a quote from an article in the February 15, 2005, Salt Lake Tribune. The article discusses Energy Secretary Samuel Bodman's testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Bodman said the administration remains convinced the "readiness posture" of the nuclear proving ground must be enhanced. He said, "We will continue our efforts to maintain the ability to conduct underground nuclear testing and complete the transition to the 18-month readiness posture that is mandated by Congress."

Two new kinds of nuclear weapons have been discussed for development. If we are going to develop those nuclear weapons, I fear they are going to be tested. The Department of Energy has projected over half a billion dollars of expenditure over the next 5 years for testing of this new type of nuclear weapon.

If we are going to go down that path, which I do not think we ought to go down for a number of reasons, we surely ought to ensure safety if any nuclear weapons are going to be tested. That is why this legislation I have introduced is a responsible approach. Everyone in America ought to want to make sure that we ensure safety, and do not blanket this country with cancer-causing fallout, as happened once before.

□ 1730

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.