

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. **Shinkus**). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. **Owens**) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the Million Mom March. The Million Mom March took place on May 14. I think the moms marching had a lot to do with our agenda here in Congress today and tomorrow and our agenda for the rest of the year. I just hope that the moms realize that their power, the power of mothers marching, is great enough to have an impact and an influence on what we do here, in many ways.

Their immediate objective was gun control, but there are many other items that I would like to see placed on their agenda. I would like to see the mothers set the agenda for what is going to happen here in Washington in the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, there is a secret, almost a secret, that nobody wants to talk about that I think the million moms and the fathers too ought to be concerned with and should be discussing. Fathers as well as mothers, and all of us, are concerned about the future and concerned about the Nation's future as it impacts upon our immediate children and our grandchildren. We want to see a greater America, we want to see a better world, and we have a golden opportunity here in this United States of America right now with the surplus of \$2 trillion over the next 10 years as a possibility. It is possible that we may have a surplus of \$2 trillion.

This year's surplus is definitely, by the most conservative estimate, going to be about \$200 billion, \$200 billion this year, and it will probably be no less than \$200 billion for the next 10 years. I think the million moms marching ought to know about that. I think they ought to be involved in a discussion of what happens with that \$2 trillion over the next 10 years to impact upon their lives and their children's lives.

I think the most comprehensive, the longest and the loudest discussion ever held in the history of our democracy should focus on this window of opportunity that we have at this point. We started the debate today on permanent trade with China. The relationship with China is relevant here in terms of the fact that some of us believe that the trade with China agreement will have a great impact on the working families of America because it is going to take away many of the jobs that people at the lower levels have.

Trade with China is definitely going to be as bad or far worse than the trade agreement with Mexico, which immediately began to drain away certain manufacturing jobs. China is so much bigger. China's economy is controlled and manipulated, and the likely danger that our economy will be greatly impacted by China is even greater than anything that happened in the case of Mexican cheap labor destroying jobs in America.

The question is, what does all this have to do with the million moms marching? What does it have to do with the setting of the agenda here in this Capitol for the next few months? What does it have to do with the \$2 trillion surplus we expect over the next 10 years? It all comes together because, as we lose those jobs that are going to fly away to China, inevitably corporations will pick up and they will go locate plants where the cheapest labor market is, where there are 25-cent-an-hour workers in China, where in some cases they use prison labor.

Already our economy and our stores are flooded with goods from China because everybody can make a killing. Companies can go and manufacture goods at dirt cheap prices and then come back into our advanced economy and sell them at very high prices, relatively speaking, and make a big profit. So no industry, no corporation is going to back away from the opportunity to make these big profits. They will be chasing dollars at the expense of the loss of many jobs.

So, what is one of the possible answers to the problem that will be created if the people who want to pass the trade bill prevail, and the rumor is that they have enough votes and they will probably prevail tomorrow and there will be a China trade agreement? There will be a huge loss of jobs. A country that has 1.2 billion people has a lot of customers, they say, and they want to get those customers. But before they get to the customers, they have a lot of workers who need jobs and who will work for almost nothing and will undercut the workers here in this country.

So one possible answer immediately is in the same breath that as we create jobs in China, as we lose jobs here and create more jobs in China, let us respond to the argument that so many of the proponents of the China trade bill have made, and that is that, yes, we will lose jobs in manufacturing; yes, we will lose jobs at the lower level of the economy, but we will gain tremendous number of jobs and sales in the high-tech industry. We are going to take off where a new boom, a new surge in the sale of PCs and in the sale of services to established Web sites and all of the telecommunications, high-tech technology that is necessary. We will be the suppliers of that.

It may be true that for a while there will be this great surge of need in the Chinese economy for American know-how and for American high-tech machinery. If that is the case, then there will be jobs created in America in the high-tech area. At the same time we are making a trade agreement, then let us guarantee that the thousands and thousands of workers who are going to lose jobs are also given an opportunity to get some training in these high-tech areas. Let them learn how to be the people who hook up the technology. Some might even travel to China. Let them learn how to manufacture the gadgets and the gears and the switches and the lines that might require skills that are different from the manufacturing skills that the people who make cars have, or the people who make refrigerators, or the various consumer products that are going to now be made in China. Let the people who lose the jobs making those products begin to make the products for the high-tech revolution. They cannot do it without some more training. They need training immediately.

I do not know of any place where there is any legislation on the drawing board which says we are going to have a massive emergency training program for workers who lose their jobs as a result of the China trade bill passing. In the long run, however, we do talk and have talked a great deal about revamping our school system, improving the way we educate young people, so that in the long run the young people who are in school now will get an education which allows them to fill those high-tech jobs. And at least the China trade bill will not take away jobs in the future because the young people will be able and capable of stepping out of school and commanding the jobs that do exist in the high-tech industry.

They predict that there may be as many as 1.5 million job vacancies in the high-tech industry in the next 5 years because of the fact that we are not training enough people in computer sciences and related sciences in our colleges so that vacancies

are going to be there. So our schools, then, must rise to meet the occasion and prepare youngsters for these guaranteed jobs.

In the absence of any special education effort, what we are doing is going abroad. And one item that is going to be on the agenda in this Congress in the next few weeks is the H-1B program. The H-1B section of the immigration law allows us to bring in foreigners to fill the vacancies that are created in the high-tech industry. And primarily that is the target. They are not bringing in these people for anything else. The great need is in the high-tech industry, information technology industry. So what we did not train our youngsters for in the past, will now be taken care of by foreigners. And that will keep going.

How are we going to deal with the vacuum created by the movement of manufacturing jobs to China if the only source of the manpower to fill the jobs that do exist is going to be the foreign countries, foreign countries who have information technology expertise and will send the personnel here?

Weaving this story together may, at the beginning, sound very complicated, but it really is not. It is quite simple. Mothers should be aware of the fact that the best way they can take care of their children is to have an impact on the policies that are made here in Washington, on the bills and the legislation that come to this floor. Mothers should have an impact.

I congratulate the mothers for understanding the relationship between their marching and the possibility of making their schools safer, of making their neighborhoods safer, of ridding our society slowly of a menace that has grown over the years because mothers have not been active in attempting to end that menace. We have more than 200 million guns in our society. Those guns out there are menacing. Those guns out there represent danger to our children. They recognize that, and their immediate focus in marching here on May 14, Mother's Day, was to deal with the menace of the gun, the immediate threat to the lives of children.

I think that is appropriate, and I congratulate them for focusing on something very concrete. It is possible to get some results if the mothers stay organized. It is possible we will get some basic legislation passed which will make the world of our children safer with respect to guns. We have very limited objectives this year, and we ought to be able to meet those objectives.

But beyond that, mothers need to set a larger agenda. I think that The New York Times certainly had it right when they said that perhaps the best fate for the holiday, Mother's Day, would be to make Mother's Day again a day of open activism as they did on this May 14. Mother's Day has an interesting history, a very interesting history.

People say it is very unusual, very nontraditional, very unorthodox to have mothers marching on Mother's Day, May 14. In my community, there were large numbers of mothers who thought it was an insult. We did have one bus load of mothers who came from my district. They actually left the city from my office, and they were mothers mostly of children who had been injured or killed by guns. There were large numbers of other mothers who were really more traditionalist and said, no, I am not ready yet.

But I think I would urge all mothers to rethink the possibility that Mother's Day should be a day of activism, and maybe fathers should take note too and make Father's Day a day of activism. If we care about the next generation, our children, our grandchildren, one of the ways we should express our concern for their survival is to try harder to have an impact on what happens in our government.

Now, let me just read from The New York Times editorial on May 14, which I thought was very appropriate, where they applauded the activism on Mother's Day. `No matter how simple it looks, Mother's Day is a complicated holiday. It has its roots in mid-19th century women's activism, championed first in 1858 by Anna Reeves Jarvis and then in 1872 by Julia Ward Howe. Their causes, honored locally on various mother's days in mid-spring, were improved sanitation, first aid, and world peace.

`But activism is about the last thing Mother's Day had begun to call to mind in the 20th century. Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first official Mother's Day on May 8, 1914, fulfilling a joint resolution of Congress that authorized the President to proclaim the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day and to request a flying of the American flag as a token of that fact. The patriotism has filtered out of Mother's Day over the past 86 years, making it hard to think of this holiday as an acknowledgment, as the joint resolution put it, of the service rendered in the United States by the American mother.'

Continuing to read from the New York Times editorial of May 14: `The day has instead been formalized, commercially into a festival of flowers and feminine gifts and perhaps a few minutes of hard-earned leisure. But it has also been informalized, made a more intimate and less civic display of feeling. There is something a little ambivalent, a little archaic, about the formulaic ways we celebrate this day, if only because the status of mothers has never been more complex.

`In 1914, the mother's service outside the home was mainly inferential. The American mother, Congress wrote at that time, is doing so much for the home, for moral uplift and religion, hence so much for good government and good humanity. There is a lot in that word `hence.' But these days there is no inference about it at all. Mothers are as likely to work in government as they are in the home.

`Perhaps the best fate for this holiday would be to make it again a day of open activism, as it was for the woman marching on behalf of gun control in many cities across this country today. Not everyone believes as Julia Ward Howe did, that if mothers could only come together somehow, world peace would ensue. But the second Sunday of every May could come to symbolize a powerful reality of contemporary American politics. Women united behind a cause can be a powerful force for progressive social policies, better child care, broader health coverage and fully equal opportunity for them and their children.' That was the New York Times editorial of May 14, the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter the statement in its entirety in the Record.

From the New York Times, May 14, 2000

[FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, MAY 14, 2000]

Activism on Mother's Day

No matter how simple it looks, Mother's Day is a complicated holiday. It has its roots in mid-19th-century women's activism, championed first in 1858 by Anna Reeves Jarvis and then in 1872 by Julia Ward Howe. Their causes, honored locally on various mother's days in mid-spring, were improved sanitation, first aid and world peace. But activism is about the last thing Mother's Day called to mind in the 20th century.

Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first official Mother's Day on May 8, 1914, fulfilling a joint resolution of Congress that authorized the president to proclaim the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day and to request the flying of the American flag as a token of that fact. The patriotism has filtered out of Mother's Day over the past 86 years, making it hard to think of this holiday as an acknowledgment, as the joint resolution put it, of 'the service rendered the United States by the American mother.'

The day has instead been formalized, commercially, into a festival of flowers and feminine gifts and, perhaps, a few minutes of hard-earned leisure. But it has also been informalized, made a more intimate and less civic display of feeling.

There is something a little ambivalent, a little archaic, about the formulaic ways we celebrate this day, if only because the status of mothers has never been more complex. In 1914, a mother's service outside the home was mainly inferential. 'The American mother,' Congress wrote, 'is doing so much for the home, for moral uplift, and religion, hence so much for good government and humanity.' There is a lot in that one word 'hence.' But these days there is no inference about it at all. Mothers are as likely to work in good government as they are in the home.

Perhaps the best fate for this holiday would be to make it, again, a day of open activism, as it is for the women marching on behalf of gun control in many cities across the country today. Not everyone believes, as Julia Ward Howe did, that if mothers could only come together somehow, world peace would ensue. But the second Sunday of every May could come to symbolize a powerful reality of contemporary American politics. Women united behind a cause can be a powerful force for progressive social policies, better child care, broader health coverage and fully equal opportunity for them and their children.

Mr. Speaker, there is a second editorial that was done the next day by The New York Times, and it reads as follows: 'The surge of energy was palpable yesterday as hundreds of thousands of marchers gathered on the Mall in Washington to demand stiffer gun control measures, and additional crowds joined in the demonstration at other sites around the country.'

'The event may not have reached the million mom goal set by some alliteration-loving promoters, but the turnout, estimated at more than 750,000, was nonetheless impressive, especially on a day traditionally devoted to family gatherings. There is a

real hope that the seed planted by this march could blossom into a movement that could change the dynamics of the national struggle to achieve sensible gun control.'

I am quoting from The New York Times editorial. I am not going to read the entire editorial, but another section of it reads as follows: 'The marchers offered a sound agenda ranging from the registration of all handguns and the licensing of all handgun owners to mandatory safety locks and full background checks before all gun sales.'

This is a very limited, very practical, very reasonable agenda of the mothers who came here on May 14. They are asking for very little. I think it is possible that if they still organize they could gain this. I will just reread what can be the summary of what they came for: 'The marchers offered a sound agenda, ranging from the registration of all handguns and the licensing of all handgun owners to mandatory safety locks and full background checks before all gun sales. That is an agenda that mothers set to make their children safer in a very immediate and practical way.'

The editorial of the New York Times on May 15, the day after the march ends as follows: 'It is not yet clear how the gun control issue will play out politically. Even as mothers were mobilizing for their march, a new poll showed that the gender gap on guns is growing with men more apt to support the rights of gun owners and women more interested in gun restrictions. The challenge for the marchers will be to turn the event into a sustained political movement.'

'Many speakers held this as a historical turning point in the gun control struggle, but it will only become so if the marchers keep up the pressure on Congress to pass the modest but useful gun control measures that remain blocked in a conference committee and on candidates running in the fall elections to support strict gun control laws.'

'The hands that rock the Nation's cradles have the potential to rock its political institutions, but only if they keep rocking hard.' That is the conclusion of the New York Times May 15 editorial on the day after the Million Moms March. The hands that rock the Nation's cradles have the potential to rock its political institutions, but only if they keep rocking hard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit the entirety of the New York Times editorial of May 15 into the Record.

From the New York Times, May 15, 2000

[FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, MAY 15, 2000]

The Power of Mothers Marching

The surge of energy was palpable yesterday as hundreds of thousands of marchers gathered on the Mall in Washington to demand stiffer gun control measures--and

additional crowds joined in the demonstration at other sites around the country. The event may not have reached the 'million mom' goal set by some alliteration-loving promoters, but the turnout--estimated at more than 750,000 by the organizers--was nonetheless impressive, especially on a day traditionally devoted to family gatherings. There is real hope that the seed planted by this march could blossom into a movement that could change the dynamics of the national struggle to achieve sensible gun control.