

humor that the gentleman has mentioned, that does not make it funny, can stop.

Because the question becomes, who are we as a Nation if we cannot provide the kind of health care to live up to our own reputation, with the excellent physicians? My own doctor, Michael DeBakey, traveled to Russia, and I think President Yeltsin is as fine and fit as I have seen him. That was a United States physician, trained in America, Dr. Michael DeBakey, who left here to supervise that open heart surgery. Today the President of Russia is considered healthy and robust physically, as Dr. DeBakey shared with me after his last check-up.

I think it is extremely important that we do not diminish what we have here in this country. We have it. We have the ability to be fiscally responsible with health care, and I understand that is important, and at the same time using the resources that we have to make our country one of the healthiest around.

What a tragedy, and the gentleman is a physician and he knows, that we have such a high death rate in certain instances because we are not getting the care and the technology and the expertise to the patient. If the doorkeeper is in there diminishing that access, that is why people cry out for universal access. They throw up their hands.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, let me relate another example. I recently had a woman pediatrician in my office. She left her medical practice, which involved running a pediatric intensive care unit, partly because she could no longer handle the types of things, the demands that were being placed on her from managed care. Let me give an example that she told me about.

One day she had a 5-year-old boy come into her ICU. The boy was a victim of drowning, so he was attached to a ventilator. He had his IVs running. All the medicines were being given. He had been in the ICU, been in the hospital, about 4 hours. This team of doctors and nurses and other health professionals were standing there, doing everything they could for this little 5-year-old boy, with the parents standing there.

Think of how you would feel if this were your 5-year-old boy who had been in that hospital for about 4 or 5 hours. They were basically standing around the bedside holding hands, praying for a sign of life, and the telephone rings. It is an HMO reviewer from some distant place.

So this pediatrician gets on the line and she tells this nonphysician reviewer what the situation is, and how it does not look very promising. Do you know what that reviewer suggested? The reviewer said, well, if the prognosis is so bad, have you thought about sending the child home on a ventilator in order to save money?

Mr. PALLONE. That is incredible.

Mr. GANSKE. That is an incredible but true story. It shows that that re-

viewer did not know what she was talking about, or he was talking about, I do not know which.

But I know how it happened. This reviewer was sitting at a computer terminal, and she saw "Respiratory distress"; moved up the algorithm, "Ventilator"; moved up the algorithm, "Poor prognosis." The next question you ask is, have you thought about home ventilation?

Let me tell the Members, that is a situation where this little boy's life was hanging in the balance. There is nobody that I know of, including myself or my wife, who is a physician, that could take a child in that situation home without all the technology that you would need in that intensive care unit and have a chance of that little boy surviving. Yet that is the kind of recommendations that we are getting from people that should not be giving the recommendations.

That is why part of this legislation we are talking about says that if you are going to deny care, the denial of care has to come from somebody who is legitimate and qualified to understand the situation in order to deny the care.

Then the legislation says that if you do not agree with that denial of care, you can appeal it, but the appeal has to be adjudicated on a timely basis, not 6 months from now, when, like this poor unfortunate lady, you may no longer be in this world.

Mr. PALLONE. What the gentleman is bringing up again is so important, because we had a forum in New Jersey with Senator TORRICELLI and myself in my district, and the people that came and talked about the problems they had with managed care, their biggest concern was the bureaucracy of having to deal with a denial; in other words, denial of certain services, denial of certain equipment, and how they had to go about appealing that or finding someone who would hear their case.

I just could not believe the hours and hours parents or a relative would spend trying to get through that bureaucracy to try to have someone hear their case on appeal, or whatever the grievance procedure is. I think that that is a very important part of the legislation that we are talking about here today, because how many people can do that? A mother maybe can do it for her child if she is not working, but most of the time you have to call during the day, and a lot of people just cannot take the time to go through the morass that has been set up in these organizations.

Again, I just want to say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) that the reason it is so valuable to have the gentleman here tonight if he is just pointing out how common-sense these patient protections are.

The gag clause, again, I think most people would not believe that their physician is not allowed to tell them what the proper treatment should be or make recommendations because of some gag clause, or the circumstance the gentleman just described. We are

only talking about things that I think most people would expect would be the norm, but unfortunately, they are not. That is the problem.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, we always hear from opponents to this that this legislation will cost so much. It is going to make premiums double.

Phooey on that. As far as I know, there is one independent study that has been done by Coopers & Lybrand, a well-respected actuarial firm, by a non-partisan group that has looked at the cost of a Patient Bill of Rights, exclusive of the liability provision, and the cost to a family for a year would be about \$31. All sorts of surveys across the country have shown people would be willing to have their premiums go up more than that in order to have their insurance mean something.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone for joining us. This was certainly worthwhile. We have to keep pressing to have patient protection legislation brought to the floor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I think America deserves it.

GROWING THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor on April 30 as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. As someone who holds that title, I have the responsibility to oversee NASA and America's space effort.

My purpose in that April 30 speech was to disclose what appeared to be a horrible threat to our national well-being. American companies, I charged, may have upgraded Chinese strategic missiles, compromising the safety of the American people, putting every man, woman, and child in our country in greater vulnerability to nuclear attack, a nuclear attack launched from the mainland of China.

Technology transfers, at the least, may have undercut our country's ability to deal with an aggressive Chinese Communist regime in the future. Even worse, of course, our gallant defenders in the future may be shot out of the sky or die in their submarines, victims of weapons researched and developed by the American taxpayer and delivered to our potential totalitarian foe by greedy American businessmen.

Since my initial warnings in that April 30 speech, information that has emerged suggests the horror story that I described of our country being more vulnerable to nuclear attack from the Communist Chinese and the upgrading of other weapons systems, that horror story that I described is much worse than I originally imagined, as I have continued to look into this matter.

That is what I would like to report tonight to my colleagues and the Members in the House, to those people watching on C-Span and reading the Congressional RECORD. I thought I would give them a little update of what has happened since the last time I gave a special order on the floor of this House concerning this, what I consider to be the worse scandal not only of this administration, but perhaps the worst scandal in terms of the transfer of deadly technology to a potential enemy of the United States since the Rosenbergs transferred the atomic bomb secret to Josef Stalin back in the late 1940s.

As I have continued to look into this, I and others have heard testimony and discovered evidence that not only verifies the serious charges that I have made, those charges in general that we have upgraded the missile system and other weapons systems, but suggest that there is even a greater threat to our safety.

In that April 30 speech, I suggested, number one, that as a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton chastised President Bush for coddling Communist China and granting the despots in Beijing most favored trade status, which is what he opposed during the election, coddling the Communist dictators in Beijing and opposing most favored trading nation status.

I thought President Clinton would probably be easier to work with than President Bush was. After being sworn in as President, Bill Clinton did an immediate about-face. He boldly, or perhaps the better word is brazenly, decoupled any linkage between human rights and trade negotiations in our dealings with the Communist Chinese. This was the worst single setback to the human rights movement in my lifetime.

I remember when it happened, I was out of town. All of us in Congress were out of town. The President expected that all of the controversy would just sort of pass over by the time Congress got back into session.

□ 2200

In the years since the decoupling, in the years since he, and we can only use the word "betrayed," the human rights movement and betrayed our fundamental principles in doing so, the brutality against religious believers and against democracy advocates in Communist China has intensified. The regime in Communist China, since the decoupling of trade negotiations with any human rights considerations, the human rights situation has gotten worse. The genocide in Tibet is worse. The killing of the Muslims in the far reaches of the western part of China has gotten worse.

President Clinton, even seeing this, has done nothing to rectify his precipitous decision to decouple those negotiations.

As a result, the tough guys in Beijing are confident that anything that is said by this administration about

human rights is a hollow gesture for domestic consumption only. In fact, the Chinese Communist rulers have used the upcoming presidential visit to China, with its opening ceremonies scheduled to be held in Tiananmen Square, they have used this in their callous campaign to stomp out the memory of those who were slaughtered in 1989, those hundreds of democracy activists who were slaughtered in that very same square.

On the recent June 4 anniversary of that tragedy, and it was just 10 years ago June 4 when the gallant democracy advocates were mowed down in Tiananmen Square and their papier-mache copies of the Statue of Liberty crushed under the treads of the tanks. On that anniversary, Communist China claimed the Communist Party and government made a correct conclusion, end of quote, to order that slaughter. And they ruled out any revision of that official judgment.

And this morning, this very morning, scoffing at congressional requests that Clinton not be received in Tiananmen Square, the U.S. Ambassador, our Ambassador to China, James Sasser, told the Chinese press that the President, quote, will be pleased to be welcomed in the Great Hall of the People, which of course is right next to Tiananmen Square. And that gesture on the part of our President will further the concept that we have heard recently coming from this administration of a, quote, strategic partnership, end of quote, between our two countries. That is what our Ambassador is suggesting.

In that mind-boggling atmosphere, if the President even mentioned human rights there while he is in Tiananmen Square or right next to Tiananmen Square in his upcoming visits, if he mentions human rights it will only be making things worse because the ruling clique in Beijing will know that it is just for show and that even our own President is willing to make a cruel joke, a mockery out of what many of us have been raised to believe is the essence of America, that being a sincere belief in democracy and freedom.

Is that not what our country is supposed to be about? Is that not what that flag is supposed to stand for? We are not just a geographic location. We are people who came here from all parts of the world, every race and ethnic background and every religion. We came here because our Founding Fathers and the people who came before us believed in freedom. That is what separated us from the rest of the nations in the world and that was our responsibility, to carry the torch when they put it down that they had so gallantly fought for, this freedom in the last 200 years.

Well, that is not what going to Tiananmen Square will signal the world. It will signal the world that America no longer holds that dear to our hearts. And maybe in times of trial and in times of the Cold War we had to compromise and associate ourselves

with such dictatorships, but in a time of peace there is no excuse for this.

But most alarming, it appears that this administration's flawed strategic partnership view towards this brutal dictatorship in Beijing has even permitted the Communist Chinese to have access to the most sophisticated weapons that we built during the Cold War for our own domestic protection.

This idea of a strategic partnership has permitted sophisticated weapons related to aerospace technologies and defense technologies to be made available to a brutally harsh Communist dictatorship, a belligerent country that some day may be our enemy and may kill Americans. And even while making these technologies available, the administration cast a blind eye toward Beijing's role in spreading these weapons of mass destruction and the components of these weapons of mass destruction to other unstable areas of the world, making a mockery not only of America's fundamental beliefs in freedom and democracy and human rights, but also making a shambles out of our efforts to contain the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology so that countries like India and Pakistan do not face each other and possibly ignite a horrific conflagration that could cost millions of lives.

So this administration even turns an eye while Chinese Communists ship these weapons to these countries, causing great instability and causing a cycle of violence and a cycle of weapons advancement that will only put the entire world in greater threat.

In my April 30 speech, I outlined how our own country's elite has maintained a policy that has steadily shifted resources and power to China at the detriment of our own people. Not only the security of our own people, but to the economic well-being of our people.

What are we doing this for? Why are we making the Chinese better off, stronger, more capable of military aggression, more capable of beating us economically, putting our own people in jeopardy not only from nuclear weapons but also from being taken and shoved into the cold without a job, being shoved out of their jobs because of slave labor being used in China?

We have been watching a policy, an intentional policy that has been to the detriment of our people and building up China as a competitor and an adversary. Who is watching out for the American people? Is this not the fundamental job that we have as elected representatives? Who is watching out for the interests of our people?

First, we have obscured the trade relationship that allows China to charge 30 and 40 percent tariffs on American goods, so when we manufacture something here and want to sell it in China, they charge us 30 and 40 percent tariffs on the goods that are imported from the United States, while under Most Favored Nation status the Chinese goods which they produce over there flood into the United States with a

mere 3 percent duty. How unfair is that to our own people? How about those people who are manufacturing those goods in the United States who are put out of work? It is one thing to say then Americans can buy low-cost Chinese commercial goods, but if our companies cannot sell over there without a large or huge tariff, then there are not any other jobs being created for these people who are put out of work.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a betrayal of the interests of our own people and it has been going on year after year after year. And when we try to fight against Most Favored Nation status, we are being told that it creates jobs. Yet we are using taxpayer dollars to subsidize the building of factories in China that will end up exporting goods to the United States in competition with our own people, the people who pay those tax dollars to begin with.

This is the reason that we have this \$50 billion annual trade deficit with Communist China. Fifty billion dollars. And that is a minimum every year that we have had for many years now with Communist China. That puts our money into their pockets. Fifty billion dollars a year.

What do they do with those \$50 billion? First of all, it builds up their own dictatorship. It permits the Communist dictatorship to keep a stranglehold on anybody who would want democracy in that country. We upgrade their police techniques. We have trained their policemen for a totalitarian country. What do those people do when they go back? They throw Christians and other people in jail. They use their techniques to find out who wants democracy and to persecute them. We have them over here training in our country.

And that \$50 billion, what is it used for? Yes, it pays for some of that training. Perhaps we might charge them a little. And it finances their arms build-up and puts our own people out of work. More than putting dollars in their pockets, the trade relationship is so unbalanced and we have permitted them to have this 30 and 40 percent tariff against our goods, which is unfair to us because their goods come in at 3 and 4 percent. But we have also permitted them to make outrageous demands over and over again of our own business community. And again these demands have been to the horrible detriment of thousands of American working people.

For instance, in order to sell airplanes to China, and there will be someone in my office tomorrow from Boeing Corporation, the largest employer in my district, to tell me why we have to make sure that we have those airplane deals to China. But in order to sell those airplanes to China, in the past the Communist Chinese leaders have demanded that we build airplane manufacturing and spare parts factories in Communist China. That means 10 years from now, they will have a modern aerospace industry to

rival our own. It is short-term profit and even medium-term selling out our economic interests, not to mention the national security interests.

We even use U.S. tax dollars when they make these demands. "If we are going to buy your planes, you have to set up the wing manufacturing facility here in China," and we even use tax dollars through the IMF, through the Export/Import Bank and OPIC and other government subsidized agencies with our tax dollars, we use this tax money to guarantee the deal which builds those manufacturing operations in China.

We are building manufacturing units in China that will rival our own and put our own aerospace people out of work. In the medium run, again, a few fat cats may get rich. The Chinese will get a few more freebies. They get the technology and the American people will end up getting the pink slip.

With the wealth of technology that Bill Clinton and the corporate power brokers are transferring, China is steadily building a state-of-the-art Army, Navy, and Air Force and strategic missile force. This is a power that will threaten anyone who gets in their way. And we are financing it. We are subsidizing it. We are facilitating it. And this administration is celebrating it. And when the party is over, as I say, a very few rich Americans are going to be better off and a multitude of our own working people will be displaced by low-tariff imports.

And something else to consider: Our military personnel will be in grave danger and our country vulnerable to nuclear attack and high-tech warfare attack. All of this from this nonsensical policy. And it goes on and these are easy to calculate. They are easy to see.

What spurred my interest in this area was a few months back when I stumbled upon evidence that American technology was being used to upgrade Chinese rockets. It actually took my breath away to learn that U.S. aerospace companies may have flippantly violated lawful safeguards provided by previous administrations by providing the Chinese with technology they needed to upgrade their rockets and interballistic missiles putting millions of Americans in danger of incineration by a nuclear ballistic missile launched from China.

Recently, I have had a series of meetings with aerospace workers and I would invite anyone listening to this who has information about this to contact my office, because a number of aerospace workers, patriots in the aerospace industry, had information about this and contacted me and I met with them. They were disgusted that as patriotic Americans, technology was being used, American technology was being used in a way that would put our own country in jeopardy.

These workers that I have already talked to have firsthand knowledge of security breaches that put our country

in jeopardy. I was told that U.S. technology to ensure stage separation of Chinese rockets had been addressed. Guidance systems and control systems were upgraded. There was MIRVing that was not possible by the Chinese before, and yet on May 2 the Chinese launched a Long March rocket.

□ 2215

Three out of four of them used to blow up. This is a perfect launch. And not only did it get up there, but once it was up, it was able to spit out two satellites instead of one because it now has MIRVing technology, the same technology that permits that very same rocket to carry multiple warheads, warheads that could be aimed right at Los Angeles or Chicago or Detroit or anywhere, anywhere in the United States.

I was also told about the laser ring magnetic gyroscope, this system that was so important that Americans discovered and built to make us the technological leader of the world, a stabilizing system that is absolutely essential for MIRVing and for submarines and other launch rockets launched from other places, and for airplanes. If these things do not have this type of high-tech gyroscope, they cannot really fire their weapons as accurately, and the fear is that the Chinese Communists now have that gyroscope.

All of these items, I was told, of course, are built at taxpayer expense. These aerospace workers knew all along they were working for the taxpayers. This was money that we spent during the Cold War to give us the edge. This was things that we spent billions of, hundreds of billions of dollars we spent to make sure that our people had the qualitative edge.

While talking to these aerospace people, I was told that among those involved in this diabolical betrayal of America's security was a senior vice president from Loral Corporation. Some of his fellow workers had been appalled years ago by this very same man's breach of routine security procedures, yet the company had inexplicably sided with the security violator instead of the whistleblower. Now we are told that this same top executive, who is now even higher in the company than he was then, was the point man in getting U.S. missile technology and know-how into the hands of the Communist Chinese.

In the investigating of this controversy, much attention has been paid to what occurred after the explosion of the Communist Long March rocket in February of 1996 and the 200-page technical review report given to the Chinese by a U.S. technical team. We have heard the claim that this report concerns a simple soldering problem; a soldering problem, that is what we are being told. Yes, that is it, a few bad solders is what caused two out of every three Chinese rockets to explode at launch, a few bad solders.

Some of the aerospace engineers I have been talking to about this told me

when they heard that, they almost fell off their chairs laughing. To say that was not a believable explanation to these engineers who spent a lifetime building rockets.

After the explosion in 1996, Loral apparently went forward and intentionally and systematically upgraded the Chinese rockets, and we are not just talking about a few bad soldiers. As is clear in a letter from this very same Loral vice president, who they complained about years ago for not following security procedures, that Loral vice president, a man named Wah Kun, stated in a letter, and I believe that this letter is a smoking gun, if there ever was a smoking gun, of evidence of a crime, in this letter from Dr. Wah Lim the vice president of Loral to Lou Jiyuan, to the chairman of the China Aerospace Corporation, which is a part of their government and a part of their military, that Loral Vice President Lim states that an important goal for this review was, quote, using the failure, that means the 1996 blowup, as an opportunity to ensure that the Long March vehicles have the best reliable record in the future. We at Space Systems Loral would like China to be a strong supplier of launch services, and we will do everything in our power to help you, end of quote.

And to ensure that, he says, your company, and I quote, your company will take their share of the world market for satellite launch services, end of quote.

Only a week and a half earlier, in a committee strategy report, Lim outlined, that is vice president of Loral Lim outlined the objectives for the review team that has gotten so much attention these last few weeks, including recommending to China Aerospace and its launching subsidiary, the Great Wall, any other areas of improvement. So thus they will give them any advice they need in any areas of improvement for their system so that they can capture a share of the world's launch services. I am including, and I will include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, a copy of the full text of the letter from Mr. Lim to the Chinese aerospace leader.

In May of 1996, before the draft committee, this is after the work of this committee, and it had a 200-page report on this blowup of this Chinese missile, but before that report was submitted to the State Department for security review, the security review is mandated under export control law, Vice President Lim of Loral faxed a copy of that report to the Chinese. Lim did this knowing full well that China Aerospace Company, which controls all space launches, is the same military-owned company that builds China's ballistic missiles, the same company that builds the missiles that would land atomic weapons in our country and incinerate our people. It is the same company that builds the satellite launching rockets, almost the same technology.

According to U.S. intelligence, at least 14 of these missiles that the Chinese already have are targeted at the United States. That was denied by this administration, of course. And just as the President has sometimes mentioned things that sort of do not make sense and we disagree with, in this particular case the President suggested that there are no missiles aimed at the United States in Communist China. Of course, we all know that it takes about a half an hour to retarget a missile, and I am not so sure how much credence you have to put in a situation like that in terms of people's statements that we do not have much to be worried about.

The New York Times published this story that we are talking about in terms of the Loral upgrading of the Chinese missile, and to its credit that paper and several other publications have done a diligent job in providing this all-important information to the American people.

This past Sunday, for example, 60 Minutes, the news program on CBS, did a compelling report on a story concerning the transfer of deadly weapons and technology to Communist China. The 60 Minutes program, which was also covered by the Washington Post, described how in 1993, the McDonnell Douglas Company was blackmailed by the Chinese Communists into selling at fire sale prices sophisticated machine tools for the building of jet fighters, the B-1 bomber and the cutting edge C-17 transport airplane. And like a scene out of a movie, the American workers at the Columbus, Ohio, factory who had offered to buy the equipment, they wanted to keep that plant going, and they were willing to buy it for \$10 million, twice the price which the Chinese Government offered, those workers were turned down by the company, and like right out of a movie, they were there yelling epithets and attempting to block, quote, dark-suited Chinese officials, end of quote, who came there to inspect these huge machine tools which were used to produce sophisticated weapons.

And yes, our working people wanted those jobs, and they deserved the jobs that those tools could provide, but they also knew that those tools were going, Communist China would produce things that would kill Americans. But unlike management, the workers knew, I guess, and that plant, that when you see the term "U.S.," that means not just United States, it also means us. Who is the United States? When we are talking about America, the U.S. security interests, we are talking about us, all of us together, e pluribus unum. We are all together in this, and we believe in freedom. That is what ties us together. They knew they were being betrayed, and their interests were being betrayed. They could not even offer more money than the Communist China expected to get those pieces of equipment that would permit them to earn a decent living. They had only

given half their lives in service to building weapons during the Cold War to protect our country.

The aerospace workers, the unsung hero of the Cold War, the aerospace workers are the ones who developed the technology we needed to deter war with Russia until it collapsed in its own evil. They were the ones that gave us that technological edge because we could not have matched them man for man. Now when it is all over, we sell our tools to Communist China, and they give their jobs away.

Although the sale of these tools was opposed by the Defense Department in the end, it had the support of the Clinton administration, and the Chinese got these tools, of course, and when they were buying the tools, they said they were going to use them to build civilian aircraft. Of course, guess what? Many of these same tools ended up in a Chinese factory that produces Silk-worm missiles, missiles that will threaten American ships if we ever try to protect Taiwan again, thousands of our sailors put in jeopardy with American technology.

And in 1996, the U.S. Justice Department opened up a criminal investigation into whether McDonnell Douglas knew or should have known that the Chinese commitment to using these tools for civilian use was bogus. To their credit, the McDonnell Douglas officials reported that Chinese treachery immediately upon discovering that the tools had gone to the wrong location. However, neither the administration nor the company should have succumbed to the Chinese blackmail in the first place.

Even if the Chinese would not buy the civilian airplanes, we should not have told them we were going to build them a plant to build airplanes themselves. And even if those tools would have been used to build civilian airplanes rather than military planes, we should not have made that as part of our deal in the first place. Even if it did not put our national security in jeopardy, it certainly put our working people in jeopardy. Their jobs were in jeopardy.

In the end the Chinese, here is the hook on this whole thing, in the end the Chinese had promised to buy billions of dollars worth of planes from McDonnell Douglas if they sweetened that deal, if they could get their hands on all that defense-related technology, those tools and machine things that would permit them to build these weapons, but as soon as they got their hands on that technology, guess what, the rest of the deal fell apart. McDonnell Douglas did not even get the sale of their airplanes. They cut the deal short and only give them a minor, a minor purchase of McDonnell Douglas airplanes, while at the same time they not only now have all this technology at their disposal, but 1,000 skilled American workers were denied the chance to rescue their factory.

They wanted to buy it for \$10 million, and they were denied that and denied

the decency of earning a living and owning part of the company, which they wanted to do out of some scheme that they thought would bring them untold riches from the China market.

□ 2230

Even if the deal was kept, the American workers would have had the shaft in the long run. The company sold out the ability of its own workers to compete by giving that technology to the Communist Chinese. And as I say, even in the short term, that profit was not realized because the Communists reneged on their agreement to buy all those airplanes.

In response to the public disclosure of these type of reckless export deals, the Clinton administration has reacted with its typical obfuscation and evasion, and this is what we have come to expect from this administration. This administration and its media allies have turned on the confusion machine now that this missile upgrade situation has reached a national controversy. Their confusion machine is designed to get the American people confused and mixed up.

First of all, the first purpose of the administration's strategy for confusing the American people is to minimize the facts. We have been told, of course, that these technology transfers by Loral and others to the Communist Chinese were a little more than a few solderings, which we have already discussed. So you minimize. "Don't worry about it. We're just talking about a few solderings."

This is parallel to the FBI file scandal when President Clinton himself claimed that it was only a few FBI files that were mistakenly sent over to the White House by a Defense Department detailee. Remember those words? We all remember that being said on the White House lawn, only a few FBI files, and it was made by accident by a detailee from the Defense Department. Of course later we found out that that detailee was not just a detailee, after all. He was someone who had been placed at the Defense Department by the Clinton administration and sent back to the White House intentionally, and he was one of their people. He happened to be an opposition researcher for the Democratic Party, and he did not have just a couple of FBI files, he ended up with hundreds of FBI files in his possession. Of course this is all about just a few solders. Remember, just a few solders in a Chinese missile. That is all this is about.

Another tactic being used by this administration is to sidetrack the growing public rage over this scandal with an obvious attempt to confuse the public about what is the central issue that we are all upset about. If President Clinton and his apologists, his allies in the media, of course, if they can confuse the people, this incredibly serious issue might just be shrugged off as yet another attempt by Republicans to get this guy, as my good friend Geraldo Ri-

vera implied on television and has implied several times, we are just out to get the President. No matter what, we want to get him.

No, that has nothing to do with what is going on in this case. I cannot talk for the other issues because I have not participated in these other scandals that have been talked about over this last year, but I can say this issue is very serious and deals with the survival or perhaps the death of millions of Americans who otherwise would not die, dying at the hands of Communist Chinese tyrants who have American technology.

So let me warn everyone about what they are facing, this tactic to try to confuse them. This administration and its liberal allies are trying to get you to believe that what we are upset about is nothing more than a decision to permit U.S. satellites to be launched on Chinese rockets. You will hear that over and over again. U.S. satellites launched on Chinese rockets, that is what everybody is upset about. Any newspaper or radio or television journalist or administration spokesman, or whoever, who starts talking about U.S. satellites on Chinese rockets as being the crisis or the scandal, at that moment, understand that that person is intentionally trying to lie by confusing you. So put that in the back of your head, if you hear someone say that, they are trying to confuse you, they are trying to lie, to get you not to understand the magnitude of what is going on. They know exactly what they are doing. It is called deception. So, please, my friends, do not be deceived.

Besides all the administration spokesmen who are trying to use this deceptive tactic, of course, the liberal left media troopers have been mobilized to throw dust into our face. Let me read to my colleagues a story from the Los Angeles Times from Monday, June 8:

Republican leaders have charged that Clinton satellite exports may have jeopardized national security by helping China develop its missile capabilities.

It goes on.

I am also worried if we can continue to play patty cake with China while they continue to be involved in weapons of proliferation, said Senator Majority Leader TRENT LOTT.

It goes on.

Administration officials have countered that they were merely continuing the policy of satellite exports initiated by Presidents Reagan and Bush and that the satellites were exported under procedures that protected American technology.

Then the last sentence says,

The Loral controversy is now the subject of congressional investigations.

Oh, all right. So we are talking about satellites here. Listen to the wording. You end up thinking that we are talking about a satellite controversy. And if you listen to the President or his paid spokesmen or his unpaid spokesmen or the spin masters, one thinks the issue is about satellites. And then

it was pointed out that the Republicans, including Presidents Reagan and Bush and, by the way, including yours truly, Members of Congress like yours truly, suggested that U.S. satellites could be permitted to be launched on Chinese rockets. Thus if you listen to this and get confused enough by it, you believe that President Clinton is just acting consistently with everybody else and he is being unjustly attacked, that we are just out to get him and that everything is justified in what has happened and there is no grave danger.

Reagan and Bush approved it, so forget it. Go to sleep. Have a good night's rest. Don't even ask any questions about it.

No, I am afraid that is not it. When the deception brigade starts talking about satellites, keep telling yourself, no, this is not accurate, these people are not concerned about satellites, that is not what they are upset about. In reality the core issue is not satellites. The core issue that people are upset about is the upgrading of Chinese Communist missiles. Let me repeat that. The upgrading of Communist Chinese missiles that can launch nuclear weapons at the United States and upgrading the Communist Chinese missiles puts millions of Americans at risk who would not otherwise have been at risk. All the others trying to talk to you about the satellite deal and the rest are doing their best to confuse the issue. Remember, when they talk about it, to tell yourself that. We are concerned about warheads landing in our country and incinerating our neighborhoods and with the incredible, just incredible thought that this could be happening and made more likely to happen with the use of American technology developed for our own defense.

The decision to let American satellites be launched on Chinese rockets may or may not have been a good idea. At the time of Reagan and Bush, they had strict enforcement provisions to ensure that there was no transfer of technology. The Chinese would not even gain any information from that. However, that was also at the time of before Tiananmen Square when China was evolving toward a more democratic society. The fact is that that may or may not have been a good decision, but that is not what is being called into question. Because no one who decided that those American satellites could be launched, no one believed that it was at all permissible and it would ever justify the upgrading of Chinese rockets. No one ever believed that. No one believed that the military capabilities of these rockets and missiles would ever be changed. This idea that we had some knowledge of that or Reagan or Bush thought that that could happen is absurd. I believe that what we have got here is a Chinese nuclear weapons delivery system that has been made more efficient with the use of American technology. Is that enough? Is that not enough? So let us not confuse it by talking about satellites. Even though

we did not think that could ever happen, it apparently happened.

We also know that some Federal watchdogs, Federal employees that were watching out for our security, they were minimized during this whole situation. They were not permitted to do their job by pressure from on top. We also know that when an attempt was made to prosecute Loral for illegally transferring this technology, for upgrading this Communist Chinese missile, that President Clinton, against the advice of his own Justice Department, personally signed a waiver that he was warned would undermine any prosecution of Loral. In effect he was signing a retroactive permission for this deadly weapons of mass destruction technology and know-how to be given to the Communist Chinese. It is all a bit mind-boggling. There will soon be a House Select Committee to investigate the issue. It will be chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), a man of impeccable credentials and character. Each and every American is now in greater danger from Communist Chinese missiles and our defenders in military uniforms will find their lives in greater jeopardy.

We should, and this will be true if we ever, ever confront the Chinese if they become belligerent, this is something that makes the magnitude of the investigation of the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) many degrees more important to our country than any of the other charges that have ever been leveled at President Clinton. But let us not overlook that the upgrading of Communist Chinese nuclear weapons and delivery systems is just the most significant of the betrayals of our country's national interest in this administration's dealings with Communist China.

Businessmen, blinded by the prospects of fast megabucks, have been manipulated and used by the Communist Chinese over and over again. Not only Chinese rockets but a widening arsenal of high tech weapons have been provided to the Communist Chinese. These high tech weapons and the machines needed to build those weapons are now in the hands of the Chinese. We are upgrading their entire arsenal one way or the other. Economic cooperation with the Communist Chinese made sense at one time because the Communist Chinese were loosening their grip. It looked like the country might evolve. But that was reversed 10 years ago in the bloody action that took place in Tiananmen Square. That was almost 10 years ago exactly. The country had been seeming to move toward freedom. However, since that Tiananmen Square massacre, China has been sinking deeper into the vice grip of gangsters and thugs who are responsible for more tyranny, more terror, more human rights abuses, more belligerence than ever before. Even as they have broken promise after promise on their weapons of mass destruction program and even as they have transferred technology to other

dangerous nations, this administration continues to lavish favors on its buddies in Beijing.

For the past 2 months, this administration has been suggesting that President Clinton would be proposing a, quote, strategic partnership and even more aerospace technology deals with this regime during his upcoming visit in Beijing. It was also leaked to the press that the President might even propose a greater cooperation in space efforts. When I heard the administration official at the International Relations Committee call for a strategic partnership, I could not help but ask, Against whom? Who are we going to have this strategic partnership against? Against India that has a democratically elected government? Against Taiwan with a democratically elected government? Against South Korea with a democratically elected government? Thailand with a democratically elected government? The Philippines with a democratically elected government? Or how about Japan with a democratically elected government?

We are going to have a strategic partnership with the one massive Communist dictatorship in a region filled with democracies? Give me a break. And then the administration official said,

Well, partnership doesn't mean you're against anyone.

I said,

Well, what does the word strategic mean if it doesn't mean you're putting yourself in juxtaposition with someone else and it has something to do with a military and economic power?

We should not be in a strategic partnership with a bloody Communist dictatorship. We should be encouraging people to invest in the democracies of the area instead of giving them an unequal trade relationship and subsidizing our businessmen when they want to do business in those areas. We should be directing them to the Philippines that are struggling for democracy, or some other country. If we are going to direct them anywhere, it should be to a democratic country. But not to a dictatorship where if a union person wants to form a union, he is thrown in jail or he is sent to the gulag, their laogai which is the equivalent of the gulag and worked to death so that they can export products here without any unions and without any labor legislation and without any dignity and without any ability to complain, without any ability to change your job, without any ability to worship God or have a day off.

□ 2245

So this administration wants to have a strategic partnership with that kind of regime.

So this looks a little bit, what we see happening and seen happening looks a little bit like parallel to what happened and was described in Gerry Aldrich's book, Unlimited Access. The

standards have broken down. This administration has blurred the lines, have violated the standards right from the beginning, the standards of being right and wrong, of good and evil, of democracy versus tyranny, of patriotism versus globalism. The standards have been broken down.

Unlimited access; there is unlimited access to the White House and unlimited access to American technology, and one cannot, and we must recognize, and this is what we are seeing right now, one cannot give up one's standards, one cannot give up time-honored principles without paying a serious price. And today we are increasingly in jeopardy. American national security has been undermined by political leadership without principles, and of course businessmen are blinded by the dream of a fast buck in the so-called China market. And we have been put in jeopardy because we have left our principles behind.

This fantasy of this fast buck in the Chinese market has made idiots out of executives who should have known better. There are cases, the McDonnell-Douglas fire sale and transfer of defense machine toolery to China, where much of it landed in this weapons factory. Motorola built a computer chip factory there, and now there are these chips being used. Guess where? Guess what we found the latest? The latest we found Motorola chips in land mines that have been built by the Chinese and put all over Southeast Asia. In Cambodia we have a U.S. Army team trying to deactivate some of those mines, and they found out that the new mines were blowing up, and they were killing the people who were trying to diffuse them. And why were they blowing up? Because these were different kinds of mines. These were smart mines, and when they finally got them open, what did they find out? They were smart mines; they were killing the people who tried to diffuse them. They were designed that way because they have a computer chip inside these mines, a computer chip made that came from a factory, a Motorola factory that had been built by Motorola in Communist China.

Is that what we want? And is that making people in the United States, are the workers at Motorola any better because we built that factory over there? Nobody is any better, nobody is any better.

What about airplane wings? They are now being manufactured for transport planes. They were supposed to be, you know, for civilian aircraft. Yes, in order to have a deal to sell more airplanes, we set up the factory to build the airplane fuselages and their wings. And guess what? Now that factory is producing wings and fuselages for cruise missiles and Chinese fighters that will be sent against American forces if we ever have to confront them in the Taiwan Straits again.

American military personnel put at risk. We closed our eyes against even

as Israel has transferred war technology, and AWACs technology was sent over there as well as other sophisticated radar communications gear has been sent by Israel to the Communist Chinese. We have closed our eyes to that.

Over and over again we see our technology paid for by billions of dollars just for our own security, and the American people believed we should give our military a qualitative edge so we would not have to fight, we could deter war. Like the C-17; the C-17 was developed for what? To give our military the most efficient and reliable military transport plane in the world, and now they are talking about turning it into a civilian model and selling it to the Communist Chinese. Of course the civilian model will be painted in pastels rather than that military green.

It is absurd. We did not develop the C-17 with all its incredible capacity to fight a war in order to help the Chinese Army move into Tibet, to destroy the Tibetan people, or to fight the Muslims in the far reaches of their country or to put down Christians in some part of their country. We did not do that. We did not build a C-17 for that. We built the C-17 to transport our own military in the defense of our country, and we were willing to put the research and development into that plane.

It is not just the C-17, but all of these equipment that we are talking about, all of this gear that we are talking about. We invested in it willingly. The American taxpayers did this because it would give us the edge to preserve our precious freedom, and we wanted our defenders to have that qualitative advantage so they could win and come home safely.

Well, today these weapons are being handed over for nothing, for nothing, to the Communist Chinese, and nothing maybe perhaps except for campaign contributions, some political campaign contribution. We will never get to the bottom of that. I wonder where all those Buddhist monks who gave those \$5,000 contributions in that Buddhist monastery, where did they get that \$5,000 from? They were impoverished Buddhist monks. They did not get it themselves. Where did it come from? We will never find that out.

We permitted an unfair trade relationship to provide Communist China with \$50 billion in hard surplus and hard currency and their trade surplus to purchase high-tech weapons and tools and machines needed to produce these weapons. At a tiny fraction they are getting them of the cost that we invested in those weapons and those machines in the first place. They are getting the weapons at a bargain-basement rate, and the taxpayers are ending up through the Export-Import Bank financing some of these sales, some of the sales from manufacturing units. And what are the Communist Chinese—this is practically giving them this technology that will put us

in danger and endanger the lives, endanger the lives of our military personnel if there is ever a confrontation with this bloody and belligerent Communist regime.

I think this is a scandal of monumental importance.

America's future is at stake. Our young people will live in a dangerous world, and what will they think when they learn that we made it more dangerous because we provided the world's most dangerous military power with weapons as well as tools and machines to produce their own tools and their own weapons. What will they think? And what will America's military personnel think when they find that their fellows and their brothers and sisters at arms are being wiped out and being torn apart, I mean blown out of the sky with weapons that were perfected by U.S. technology?

The 40 pieces of silver in the pockets of our corporate leaders will not just weigh upon their consciousness and their consciences if we let this happen, because it will not be just the corporate elite who is at fault, although they must bear the burden of making immoral decisions as well and decisions that hurt our country. But we ourselves will have to bear some of that responsibility. We ourselves will have to bear that responsibility if we do not put a stop to this, because today we are aware of the erosion of our national security, and if we do nothing to stop it, we must bear some of the blame.

We cannot afford to surrender the future of our country, the future of peace, forfeit the survival and freedom of America's next generation. It is impossible that the Chinese military could attack the United States; is that right? It is impossible; that is, we have heard that. It is not going to be impossible. Let me tell you in the future it will not be impossible for them to attack the United States.

We could confront, we could confront the Chinese in the Taiwan Straits a few years ago when they were launching the rockets across Taiwan trying to intimidate them. We confronted them with our aircraft carriers, confident that the aircraft carriers could defend themselves, all those thousands of our sailors on those carriers, and confident that our homeland would not be attacked by atomic bombs and missiles launched from the mainland of China. That is not true anymore, and every day what we are seeing is our American technology is making not true, and, if we have to confront them in the future, we will be doing so at great risk and perhaps lose thousands of our military peoples' lives.

In 1996, a Chinese publication, in a Chinese publication, a major general of the Chinese, in fact, it was the vice commander of the Academy of Military Services in Beijing, was quoted as saying, and I quote:

As for the United States, for a relatively long time it will be absolutely necessary

that we quietly nurse our sense of vengeance. We must conceal our abilities and bide our time.

End of quote.

They are biding their time. They are biding their time until we are vulnerable.

Finally, if a decade from now a crazed or power-hungry Chinese general even by mistake or perhaps unintentionally or even intentionally launches a missile attack on the United States, perhaps it will be just one rocket or maybe two, but they launch it over towards our country, millions of our people will be incinerated. The horror of it, and it is unthinkable, and if that happens at that ghastly time, we will have to remember that President Clinton opposed developing a missile defense system, and even worse, we may remember that the upgrades of those Communist Chinese missiles happened with American technology under President Clinton's watch. We cannot defend ourselves, and we have given the technology to kill us.

50TH BIRTHDAY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 32 minutes, approximately one-half the time remaining until midnight.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I hoped to have a complete hour, but was going to be divided in two parts anyhow. One part I wanted to utilize to congratulate the State of Israel on its 50th birthday. I wanted to do that some time ago, but it has been very difficult to get time on special orders recently. So I am a little late, but it is still the year of the celebration of the 50th birthday of the State of Israel, so I think that it is appropriate that I make these remarks. And I want to make the remarks in the spirit of comparison of Israel with many other nations and draw some lessons from the conduct of the leadership of Israel.

Second part of my presentation I wanted to deal with leadership in the United States as compared to leadership of Israel and other parts of the world on the vital issue of education, and I hope that I will be able to do that. I know the rules are that I cannot do that if the majority Representatives show up to claim the last 30 minutes. But I do hope to have the time to do that. If not, I will settle for just using the first 30 minutes to discuss the birthday of Israel and the significance of that in this modern world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wish Israel a happy birthday and state that it is 50 years old, and among nations that is really an infancy, it is an infant nation. You know, the United States is 222 years old, and we are considered quite a young Nation at 222 years. Israel at 50 years is an infant nation.