

let us all put those thoughts to work, stop shouting at each other and get on with making this great country what it should be and giving it the legacy it should have in the 21st century. We should be leading the world showing people how democracy works. We should be holding our head high.

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL EMERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to make some personal comments about our colleague, BILL EMERSON, who died Saturday night. BILL was a very honest, very decent, very ethical, very moral individual. As everyone knows, he had friends on both sides of the aisle. Republican and Democratic Members were very close to BILL personally.

I was in a small group with BILL that met in the House chapel every week. In the group are Republicans and Democrats, both backgrounds. We would pray for each other in the group, we would pray with each other in the group. BILL was an inspiration all the years together and was an inspiration during the very difficult time when he found out about his illness.

BILL EMERSON had a very strong faith, a very strong Christian faith. He loved the Lord very deeply, and his faith was very, very strong. As the other people know and the Washington Post points out today, BILL and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HALL worked together on the issue of hunger. The fact is BILL EMERSON went to many places with Congressman HALL, from Sudan to Ethiopia, to Somalia and similar places. I can safely say there are many people, hundreds of thousands or even millions of people that are alive today on the continent of Africa and other places that would not be alive had it not been for the work of BILL EMERSON working with Congressman HALL. BILL was totally committed to dealing with the issue of hunger and working together with TONY they did so much good that saved so many lives.

The fact is the people whose lives were saved do not even know how they were saved or why they were saved, but I want the record to show there are millions who are alive today because of the work of BILL EMERSON working with TONY HALL.

BILL loved his wife and loved his family, his four daughters, his wife Jo Ann. He would often talk about them. They were the center of his life, and he loved his family very, very much. Many times that we would meet he would talk about his wife and about his family, and we would exchange those things, and I just want that to be on the record.

□ 1500

BILL loved this institution. That should be on the record. He was a page

in this House. I believe he was a page in the House during the time that there was an assassination attempt in the House of Representatives. I remember seeing the picture of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BILL EMERSON, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, who were both pages. That is how long BILL EMERSON goes back as being identified with this body.

He loved history. I think he read every book about Winston Churchill. He probably knew more about Winston Churchill than any person I knew. He knew more about Abraham Lincoln than anyone I knew. He loved this institution. He loved the Congress and he loved the House and he loved history.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I know he loved the Lord and he loved Christ. I know in his death he has gone to be with Jesus Christ. I include for the RECORD an obituary in the Washington Post.

The material referred to is as follows:  
EIGHT-TERM REP. BILL EMERSON OF MISSOURI DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Rep. Bill Emerson (R-Mo.), who was found to have inoperable lung cancer last year while serving his eighth term in Congress, died June 22 at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center. He was 58.

Despite his illness, which sometimes led him to carry a portable oxygen canister to the floor of the House, Rep. Emerson was running for reelection. Agriculture dominated his district's economy, and he was in line to become chairman of the Agriculture Committee next year if he won and his party kept control of the House.

"He was a fighter," an aide said last night. Rep. Emerson believed "that he was going to beat this thing, and he fought it all the way."

Sometimes, in response to medical advice, he used a motorized scooter to help him get around Capitol Hill, aides said, but he was proud that he did not miss a vote this year until the week before he entered the hospital.

Rep. Emerson was admitted to Bethesda last Monday with a respiratory infection, and he issued a statement Thursday saying he was "resting comfortably and following doctors' orders."

Aides said he was a lifelong smoker who gave up cigarettes after his cancer was diagnosed last fall.

"All of Congress will feel the loss of Bill Emerson," said House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). "He was a leader on nutrition programs and a man who was admired on both sides of the aisle."

"Politics in America," a reference work on members of Congress, described Rep. Emerson as a man whose votes and speeches demonstrated "a streak of ideological conservatism" but whose legislative career bore the stamp of pragmatism.

He was named in another reference work as being one of two key Republicans on the Agriculture Committee who early last year persuaded Gingrich to drop from the Republican "Contract With America" a proposal to put food stamps into block grants to the states. The food stamp program is a major part of federal spending on agriculture.

Rep. Emerson, a member of the House Select Committee on Hunger, traveled to starvation-stricken Somalia in 1992 to spotlight conditions there. When the committee was abolished, its chairman, Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-Ohio), fasted 22 days; according to "Politics in America," Rep. Emerson fasted every Monday in sympathy.

Rep. Emerson, a native of Hillsboro, Mo., largely was raised by a grandfather who was a county judge, and he acquired early what was to be a lifelong interest in politics and government.

As a teenager eager to become a congressional page, he came to Washington in the 1950s without the promise of a job. But repeated knocking on the doors of members of his state's delegation won him admiration for his initiative and resulted soon in the post he sought.

Aides said he regarded the assignment as a dream come true. After receiving a bachelor's degree in political science from Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., he returned to Washington to work for Rep. Robert Ellsworth (R-Kan.). Subsequent jobs included stints as a lobbyist and as a staff member for Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.). In the meantime, he received a law degree from the University of Baltimore.

In 1980, he went back to Missouri to defeat a Democratic incumbent and become the first Republican to win the 8th District seat in 52 years.

Aides said Rep. Emerson's mother, Marie Hahn, his wife, Jo Ann, and his daughters, Elizabeth, Abigail, Victoria and Katharine, were at his bedside when he died.

#### MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS WITH CHINA, AND INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AMERICAN PATENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE BILL EMERSON

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in remembering the gentleman from Missouri, BILL EMERSON, a decent, hardworking man who made great contributions not only to this body, not only to our country, but to the cause of a humane and decent world. We will remember him. He made major contributions to this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, today I will be discussing something that goes to the heart and soul of a moral society, a decision that we will soon make about most-favored-nation status with China. Then, after a brief discussion on most-favored-nation status with China, in which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will participate, I will give a longer presentation on a bill that will be introduced shortly on the floor of the House dealing with the American patent system and major changes that are being made in our patent system.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that as we move forward to the day when Congress will be considering most-favored-nation status for China, we must recall that this happens every year. Every year we are told that we must grant most-favored-nation status for the Communist Chinese because it will help them evolve.

The justification for not treating the Communist dictatorship like any other democratic nation, for example, like

Canada, the evidence for not doing this is overwhelming. Unfortunately, it is not strong enough to overwhelm the dreams of prophets, the glimmer in the eyes of American capitalists and international corporate elites. Up until now they have been able to win the day by claiming that our economic interaction with this brutal, genocidal dictatorship on the mainland of China will help it evolve into a freer, less repressive society. But by now it should be clear to everyone that China is not becoming a freer, less repressive society.

We keep granting most-favored-nation status, we keep having more international and economic interaction. Yet the Red Chinese regime, the last major Communist regime in the world, is becoming more belligerent, more repressive, and more contrary. It is becoming more contrary to the economic and moral interests of our people to continue this trading relationship that we have developed that is, as I say, the same as a trading relationship we would have with Canada or a democratic country.

The gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY, said something that I have heard him say many times, and there really is some truth in it. I like to steal phrases from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], which he knows. Plagiarism in this case is a form of flattery. Mr. ARMEY said insanity is doing more of the same but expecting to get different results.

Mr. Speaker, if we use this as our guide to our relations to most-favored-nation status relations with China, our policy is insane, because we continue to have the same policy of granting favorable economic status, as favorable as any other country in the world, but yet the situation continues to get worse. Economically, just economically, if we just judge it on that basis alone, they are the most protectionist regime of any that we are trading with.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are permitted to flood our markets with their goods, putting millions upon millions of U.S. citizens out of work, while they protect their own domestic markets with huge tariffs, tariffs that can be 40 percent and 50 percent tariffs.

What does that do? That means that in traditional economic terms, and those of us who do believe in free trade, and I happen to believe in free trade between free people, but when we take the equation the way the Chinese are having trade, they fought flood our market, and when economics would mandate, then those people laid off in our country would go to work for those factories that are now producing goods to sell in China, and what do we find out? We cannot sell our goods in China because they will not let our people go over and sell the washing machines and appliances because they have a protective tariff. They are protecting their own domestic industry.

If America wants to invest in creating new factories over there so that our laid-off workers or unemployed citizens

continue to be laid off and continue to be unemployed, that is okay with them. In other words, the Red Chinese are manipulating the system, and we have permitted them to do so, knowingly permitted them to do so, and that puts millions of our own people out of work, and benefits them to the tune of tens of billions of dollars of hard currency every year.

There are a few companies here that benefit from the trading relationship. Do not get me wrong. Aerospace, which is a very big industry in my own area, in my own congressional district, does benefit. So do those who are selling raw materials and food. It is just that everybody else except those in aerospace or those selling raw materials and food, not everybody else but large numbers of people in our society, are actually being hurt dramatically and losing jobs. I happen to believe there are more jobs being lost in our economic relationship with China than there are being created.

Who is losing? Regular working people. Who are really the main people who gain? A lot of people in the international financial community and the corporate elite. Basically, the Chinese continue economically in this relationship to basically serve themselves, but our government is not protecting the interests of our people while they protect the interests of theirs.

The Chinese blatantly steal American technology, and over and over again what do we do? We accept their word. They sign a little piece of paper with a bunch of scribbling on it, and then we accept their word, OK, we will not bring down sanctions on you this year because you have signed this piece of paper. Then we act surprised again as it becomes close to the time to debate most-favored-nation status to find that there has been a wholesale violation of all the agreements they have made.

We have had negotiating in the interests of the American people by people who are not committed to the welfare and best interests of the American people. Instead, we have had people who seem to be interested in a global concept of trade and commerce, and China has to be part of this. With that excuse we find Americans being thrown out of work, and our standard of living is slowly but surely edging down. At the same time, they steal our technology, they steal our intellectual property rights and use it against us.

Of course, what are they doing with these tens of billions of dollars in hard currency that we permit them to make every year? That is a conscious decision that we are making, to permit them to make every year? That is a conscious decision that we are making, to permit the rules of the game to be that they are going to have all of these extra tens of billions of dollars. What are they doing? They are building up a powerful military that is currently being used to threaten their neighbors. And someday, if the United States gets

in the way, those weapons will kill American citizens, America's defenders. What will they be killed with? With technology they have stolen from us, and billions of dollars of hard currency that we have permitted them to make as profit in an unfair trading relationship between our two countries.

One last economic issue. Why do people want to have most-favored-nation status? Why do big businesses want to have most-favored-nation status? They could still officially sell their products over in China and other countries that do not have most-favored-nation status. The real reason behind this, the underlying reason, if you have most-favored-nation status with China, companies can get, how about it, government guarantees of their investments in this dictatorship. You can have the Export-Import Bank and OPIC and the World Bank and all of these financial institutions, which actually get their money from good old U.S. taxpayers, those taxpayers end up subsidizing, let us say guaranteeing, the loan for somebody who is going to do business in China.

I will give Members one big example. This is mind-boggling. There is a \$30 billion public works program that they want to build in China to provide electricity, called the Three Gorges Dam project. We have people in here who said we have to support the Three Gorges Dam project because that means jobs in the United States. The Chinese want us, the Western bankers and American taxpayers, to guarantee these loans to provide the \$30 billion to build this big dam project.

What are they going to do with their own \$30 billion? The Chinese want to use their own \$30 billion to build weapons so that someday, if the United States ever gets in their way, they can take care of our military. They want to spend their money on weapons to destroy people and to bully their neighbors, but they want us to provide the loans and the guarantees for those loans so they can build their great public works project. And what are we getting in return? Caterpillar is going to be able to sell their bulldozers, rather than having Japanese bulldozers down there.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. For those people who think that is a good way to create jobs, would it not be better for us to spend \$30 billion and rebuild our own infrastructure and use those bulldozers, those caterpillars, here across the United States to rebuild our drainage systems and our sewer systems that are going kaput, the bridges that are about to fall down? That makes a lot more sense than spending \$30 billion to bolster a Communist regime in hopes that they may evolve into more liberal, wonderful, beautiful people, just like the elite that runs our country.

No, we should be thinking about the interests of the American people. That should be the basis of our negotiations. One of our problems is we have been sending the likes of Peewee Herman

over to do our negotiations when we should be using Arnold Schwarzenegger.

One last area in terms of most-favored-nation status. That is the following. It is not just an economic decision. It is not just a strategic decision for the United States in terms of the military. It is also a moral decision that goes to the heart of the United States of America: What do we stand for?

Next week we will recess in order to celebrate the Fourth of July, when our Founding Fathers proclaimed that every individual has certain rights and those rights are granted by God. The Declaration of Independence was not just a declaration that we were no longer going to be under British tyranny, and it was not just a declaration that we would have democracy here. It was a declaration of the rights of the individual, and that no government has legitimate rights unless they receive them from the consent of the governed. It was a proclamation saying America will be a different kind of land, a different kind of country, and we would be a shining beacon of hope to the world and to the oppressed. Wherever they are, they can see there will be hope as long as the United States stands true to its principles.

In this case, that is what we will be discussing, most-favored-nation status, right after we celebrate the Fourth of July. But the human rights violations and the tyranny on mainland China would tell us our Founding Fathers would roll over in their grave if they thought that we would have the same type of relations with this type of vicious dictatorship as we do with other democracies in the world.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who has been stalwart in the battle for human rights, has cataloged many of the abuses that the people of China have had to endure. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia so he can share with us some of the things that are going in China today.

Mr. WOLF. I will, and I appreciate the gentleman taking out this special order, Mr. Speaker. I think he is absolutely right. This is, whether we like it or not, a fundamental moral issue, perhaps the overriding one internationally that this Congress will have to address.

As the gentleman said with regard to human rights, as we vote on this issue, we should think of several things: There are more slave labor camps in China today than there were in the Soviet Union, and we all remember Solzhenitzen's book, *Gulag Archipelago*. I was in one of those camps, Perm Camp 35, with the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH. They are very grim places. And yet Members should know, the world and the body should know, that there are more slave labor camps in China than there were in the Soviet Union during the heyday of the Soviet Union.

Second, there are more individuals in those gulags, slave labor camps, logi camps, than there were in the Soviet

Union. Also, they make goods, they make supplies, they make socks; they make different items like that for export to the United States, in competition with American workers. As the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has said many times, we lose more jobs than we gain.

The gentleman from New Jersey and I were in Beijing Prison No. 1, where we saw a number of Tiananmen Square demonstrators working on socks and plastic jelly shoes for export to the United States. They had little golfer insignias on the side of the socks. What the gentleman from California said is true. This is driving American jobs, and it is also, I think, fundamentally a major moral issue: Do we want to purchase the goods made with slave labor out of a gulag camp so we can get a better buy? I think the American people are saying no.

Second, I think there is major fundamental religious persecution going on in China, perhaps more than any other place in the world.

□ 1515

Everyone should know, no one should say I did not know, that is why I voted for MFN. Today, there are Catholic priests and Catholic bishops in jail for worshipping and practicing their religious faith. Some have been in jail for years, not 6 months, not 9 months, but for years. There are also evangelicals who are in jail.

Almost every week Protestant house churches are raided and many times the people are picked up, arrested and sent into the logais and the slave labor camps and the gulags or in prison. So we have numerous, both Catholic priests, Catholic bishops, and Protestant pastors arrested and sent to jail.

We also know, and the gentleman I think mentioned it and knows as well as anyone, Tibet has been plundered by the Communists in China. They have abused and imprisoned and tortured Buddhist monks. They have also done horrendous, horrible things to Buddhist nuns. They have plundered Tibet, so we know what they have done. They are also now in the process of persecuting those of the Moslem faith in certain provinces in China.

So they have gone after the Catholic priests and bishops, they have gone after the Protestant pastors, they have gone after the Buddhist nuns and priests, and now they are going after the Moslems. So from a religious persecution issue, this country is number one in persecuting people.

Third, we know that they sell body parts. When they kill people in their prisons, they line them up, and we have this on film if any Member wants to see it, they line them up, they invite crowds to come in to watch, they put pistols at the back of their heads, and they shoot them, they fall to the ground.

Trucks and ambulances come and take them away. They take them to hospitals and they take their kidneys

out and their corneas out for transplantation, for sale to people in the West, \$35,000 per kidney. So they have a major business of executing people, taking their corneas out, taking their kidneys out for transplantation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, are any of these people who are being shot, is there any evidence that they could be just people who are advocating democracy?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I do not know if they are or not. We have pictures of them. It is hard to say why.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But we do know that people have been executed in China only for opposing the regime?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, we do know that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So we know that the Chinese dictatorship is willing to execute someone simply for exercising what we consider to be our rights as citizens and the rights of free people; we know that, and we also know that they are engaged in a ghoulish enterprise of after executing some prisoners, or executing prisoners in general, taking from them their body parts and selling them on the world market?

Mr. WOLF. We know that for a fact, and we have pictures of it, taking place as late as February of this year.

Last, before I get to the last one I would mention, we also know that they were so barbaric that they were trying to sell AK-47's and shoulder missiles to street gangs in L.A., near your area, which would have been used to kill innocent people, and we also know that the People's Liberation Army was behind this and the top leadership of those companies are people who are connected to the leaders in Beijing. I mean they were selling AK-47 weapons, assault weapons and also shoulder missiles that could take a 747 aircraft down coming in at any airport.

Last, let me cover something with regard to human rights. In the 1980's, and I know the gentleman was in the Reagan White House in those days, writing speeches for President Reagan. In the 1980's, the gentleman knows that no Member of Congress would have ever come to the floor of the House, no person in the Reagan administration would have ever gotten up and said that we should have granted MFN to the Soviet Union when Sakharov was under house arrest in Gorky and Scharansky was in perm camp 35. No member of the administration, no Member of Congress on either side would have ever been in support of granting MFN for Russia, and now we see the granting of it for China.

My closing comment is, I would like to read to you a statement by Elena Bonner, who was the wife of Sakharov on the MFN status in China. Her marriage to Sakharov changed Elena's life. She took early retirement as a disabled war veteran to devote herself to Sakharov. She was Sakharov's ambassador to the world at large. She represented him at the 1975 Nobel Peace

ceremony in Oslo. She reported on her visits into Italy and America, was exiled in January 1980. She served as a sole link with Moscow and the West until 1984, when she too was barred from leaving Gorky. In August of 1994 she was tried by a Gorky court, found guilty of anti-Soviet agitation and sentenced to exile. So I will submit her entire bio for the RECORD at this point.

ELENA BONNER—BIOGRAPHY

Elena Bonner was born on February 15, 1923, in Merv, Tadjikistan. She grew up in the restless, cosmopolitan atmosphere of the Hotel Luxe on Gorky Street, which lodged important foreign Communists working in Moscow. Her father, Gevork Alikhanov, was a prominent Armenian Communist and a secretary of the Comintern, the "general staff of the world revolution." Her mother, Ruth Bonner, was born in Siberia in 1900, joined the Communist Party in 1924, and was dedicated to bringing culture to the masses. Elena's childhood sweetheart, Vsevolod Bagritsky, lived only a couple of blocks away. (He was killed at the front in 1942, shortly before his twentieth birthday.)

Elena's life as a Moscow schoolgirl ended abruptly when her father was arrested in May 1937. Ruth moved with her two children to her mother's apartment in Leningrad but did not escape her fate. She was arrested later that year and sentenced to hard labor as the wife of a traitor.

Elena became a proficient survivor. She finished high school in Leningrad, volunteered as a nurse when war broke out, was wounded twice, and was honorably discharged in 1945 as a lieutenant and a disabled veteran. After two years of intensive treatment, the loss of vision caused by her wartime injury was brought under control, and she enrolled in the First Leningrad Medical Institute. After graduation, she worked as a pediatrician, a district doctor, and a freelance author and editor. She married Ivan Semyonov, a classmate from the medical school, and, ignoring warnings that child-bearing could endanger her life, gave birth to a daughter, Tatiana, in 1950, and a son, Alexei, in 1956. (Elena and Ivan separated in 1965).

She succeeded in reestablishing contact with her mother as the war was drawing to a close. It was only in 1954, however, that Ruth was exonerated, granted a special pension, and informed that her husband died in confinement sometime in 1939. (It took another 52 years for the truth to be revealed—four years after Ruth passed away, Elena gained access to the KGB files and learned that her father was executed in 1938.) Ruth was also assigned an apartment on Chkalov Street, comfortable by Soviet standards. This apartment became Elena's home and in 1971 it was here that Andrei Sakharov moved in.

Elena paid her respect to the memory of Vsevolod Bagritsky by putting together a book of his diaries, letters, and poems, which was published in 1964. She mingled with the generation of writers and artists who has been inspired by the post-Stalin thaw, but she also helped prisoners and their families. Elena met Andrei Sakharov in October 1970 when both were attending the trial of human rights activities in Kaluga. They got to know each other better in December while defending Jews sentenced to death for attempting an escape from the USSR in a hijacked plane. By August 1971 friendship turned into love, and in January 1972 they formally registered their marriage. The unlikely match between a reserved Russian physicist and a scrappy, streetwise Armenian-Jewish physician endured.

Her marriage to Sakharov changed Elena's life. She took early retirement as a disabled war veteran and devoted herself to

Sakharov, serving as his chief of staff and secretary as well as cook and bottle washer. She also became Sakharov's ambassador to the world at large. She represented him at the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in Oslo; reported on her visits to Italy, France, and America; and after his January 1980 exile, served as his sole link with Moscow and the West until May 1984, when she too was barred from leaving Gorky. In August 1984, she was tried by a Gorky court, found guilty of "anti-soviet agitation" and sentenced to exile. By then she already had a serious heart condition and was in urgent need of surgery.

In 1981 Elena and Andrei went on a successful hungerstrike to secure the right for their daughter-in-law to join her husband, their son Alexei, in the United States. But it took three hungerstrikes by Sakharov, totalling almost 200 days, for Elena to gain permission to travel to US in December 1985 for open heart surgery. She returned to Gorky in June 1986 with six bypasses, to Andrei and to indefinite exile. But a love story deserves a happy ending—on December 15, 1986, a telephone was installed in their Gorky apartment. The next day it rang for the first time, and Mikhail Gorbachev personally asked the Sakharovs to return to Moscow. They arrived at the Chkalov Street apartment on December 23, 1986. The curtain was raised for the next act.

Since Andrei Sakharov's death in December 1989, Elena Bonner has continued the campaign for democracy and human rights in Russia. She joined the defenders of the Russian parliament during the attempted coup of August 1991, and lent her support to Yeltsin during the constitutional crisis of 1993. She writes frequently for the Russian and American press. She has campaigned tirelessly in defense of self-determination for the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh and for all the peoples of the former Soviet Union.

Dr. Bonner has published a number of books in the United States and in Russia.

Dr. Bonner has two children and five grandchildren, all of whom live in the United States and whom she comes to visit from Moscow.

But this is what Dr. Bonner said in a letter to me the other day. She said:

JUNE 17, 1996.

I believe it is dangerous to grant the most favored nation status to China, while mass-scale violations of human rights are taking place there, confirmed by many authoritative international human rights organizations.

The United States possesses only one real mechanism for protection of human rights in other countries—granting or not granting such status. There should be no double standards in this issue and there should be no double standards for protection of human rights no matter in which part of the world.

More than 20 years ago Andrei Sakharov has addressed the U.S. Congress with appeal to introduce the Jackson-Vanik amendment and by doing this to confirm commitment of your country to the human rights cause. Today, I dare to warn American legislators against hasty refusal from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. By giving up this amendment, the U.S. Congress, in my mind, is going to lose completely its influence on human rights situations in any part of the world and will practically admit that protection of human rights is no longer a matter of priority and a long-term goal of the Congress and the U.S. people.

ELENA BONNER.

So I think Doctor Elena Bonner has said it and said it well. I will tell the gentleman too, if he looks at the surveys, the American people are overwhelmingly against granting MFN to

China. So while it may be a close issue in the Congress and certainly gone, lost in the administration, the American people agree with the position of the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. When the American people see their Congressmen over the Fourth of July holiday, it would be actually a good moment to remind the Member of Congress that we should be standing up for what our forefathers believed in, these principles of freedom and individual rights, that this country was going to be better than just some conglomeration of people seeking profit and seeking monetary reward, that we do indeed stand for freedom.

Before the gentleman leaves, I would like to mention one last story on this particular issue. I agree with him wholeheartedly when he says that no one could ever have gotten away during the cold war with suggesting we will make Russia better, this dictatorship in Russia better, by granting most-favored-nation status and transferring all of our technology to Russia. No one would have ever dreamed of that.

Instead, we were strong and we were tough and when Ronald Reagan came in, his tough stand helped end the cold war and bring a greater potential for freedom and peace in the world than anyone had ever dreamed. Well, during that time period, there was a hero of freedom named Natan Scharansky. He was a Jewish man, a dissident in Russia who was a champion of liberty, and he was arrested and thrown into the gulag, and when we say the gulag, we are talking about the harshest of prison conditions that Americans cannot even imagine. There he was, struggling to survive in the gulag and his Communist captors said, all he needed to do is sign this document admitting that you were lying about the repression in the Soviet Union and admitting that you are some kind of a spy or something, and we will let you go, and he refused to do it. All he had to do was sign a piece of paper.

Eventually, his fame spread throughout the world. Here was indeed a man, a lone individual, a champion of freedom standing up against a totalitarian power, and all he had to do to end his suffering was to sign his signature.

Well, eventually we traded him for a Russian spy. We actually sent a Russian spy across a bridge and he went back another way, and when Natan Scharansky came to the United States, he made his way to Washington and to the White House where he met with President Reagan.

As a speech writer for President Reagan, I will never forget that day because when he left the Oval Office, he met with the press corps and the reporters asked him, "What did you tell President Reagan?" And Natan Scharansky, this heroic individual,

said, "I told him not to tone down his speeches," not to tone down his speeches. He said, they were the only things. He said, I described for them in the gulag, and he was describing for these reporters how in the gulag, somebody smuggled in little pieces of paper that had Ronald Reagan's words of one of his speeches on it, and he said, as long as I knew that the President of the United States believed in these principles, there was hope, and it gave me the hope to struggle on.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, this is such an important point. Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I visited the gulag that Natan Scharansky was in. The fact is we hollered out that we were Congressmen from the United States and we met with 21 of the men. In fact, we interviewed, on camera, an interview with Natan Scharansky's cell mate and that night, late into the night in the Ural Mountains in this gulag, the men said, and I had forgotten it, but you triggered it, the men said precisely what you said.

We gave the men Bibles and we started to ask them questions. All of the men said they knew of the statements that Ronald Reagan had made, and I do not understand how they got it in there, and it gave them hope and encouragement and by us speaking out, by Ronald Reagan speaking out, they were bold and solid.

The gentleman said to Natan Scharansky, when Natan Scharansky was exchanged, Natan Scharansky was to walk across the Glienicke Bridge in Berlin and the Communists told Natan Scharansky to walk straight. What Scharansky did is he walked zigzag. He walked this way on the bridge and that way on the bridge and that way on the bridge and that way on the bridge, and he denied the Communists for the very reason that you said, because we gave Scharansky and we gave his cell mate and we gave those people hope.

The gentleman is exactly right. If we had the same type of rhetoric coming out of the White House, the language that Ronald Reagan used, we would solve this problem. The Chinese would stop persecuting Christians, stop persecuting priests and ministers and Buddhist monks, and you are exactly right.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman would probably be interested in knowing that the day after Scharansky met with Ronald Reagan, I was in the Israeli Embassy at a reception honoring Scharansky, and through the crowd, he was the honored guest, he walked straight toward me and he came up to me and he said, I understand that you write Ronald Reagan's speeches and I said yes, that is true, and he said, I have often wondered who you are.

Well, he knew that some people were behind Ronald Reagan and working with him to try to make sure that we took these bold stands and beat back the bureaucracy and the elitists in every country that would say, oh, do not make moral stands, do not make a

stand of morality and a stand for freedom because it will rock the boat. But he knew, ever as a prisoner in the gulag, that I was there and other people were there.

Today it is the same thing. Although they do not know us by name, they know that there are American people everywhere throughout our country who believe in the cause that George Washington talked about on the 4th of July, believe in what Thomas Jefferson was talking about and James Madison and our Founding Fathers when they started a country on a Declaration of Independence and a declaration that talked about the individual rights that are a gift of God to all people.

Mr. WOLF. Can the gentleman imagine the feeling that would roll through China if they found out that the United States House of Representatives, the people's body, voted to deny them MFN? Can you imagine how the dissidents would feel? Can you imagine how the prisoners in the gulags in China would feel?

The gentleman is exactly right. I hope that we defeat MFN when it comes here. I know they are going to get MFN because President Clinton is going to give it to them, but if we defeat it, the gentleman is right, the message that we will send through China to the dissidents will be the same message of the 1980s.

Do you remember the rally that was held on the lawn from the Capitol down to the Washington Monument on that Sunday for those of the Jewish faith who had been persecuted? Do you remember the hundreds of thousands that came? If we could not that for those who are suffering in China, can you imagine the difference that it would make?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If we had made that stand a few years ago instead of heeding those naysayers who said, do not let the moral stand, we are going to evolve China away, rather than making a tough stand, we would probably right now be voting to grant most-favored-nation status to a new and more democratic China.

Mr. WOLF. And I would be voting for it and the gentleman would be voting for it and we would be pushing trade.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct. I thank the gentleman very much, and I appreciate his jointing me.

The second issue that I would like to discuss today is also an issue that deals with trade, interestingly enough, and the well-being of the American people and the relationship with others, because I believe what is pushing our most-favored-nation status with China at the expense of the American people is the same thing that is motivating us to destroy the American patent system.

I would like to ask a question. What was one of the first things that Bill Clinton did after becoming elected President? The answer is, he appointed Bruce Lehman as Commissioner of the Patent and Trademark Office.

□ 1530

What was one of the first things that Bruce Lehman did when he became head of that office? He hightailed it to Japan and met and reached an agreement with—this is an agreement that almost nobody knows about outside a few people in Congress—Mr. Wataru Asou, the commissioner of the Japanese patent office. They had a meeting with Mr. Lehman.

That is right. These two unelected officials entered into an agreement which, if it holds, could change the face of the American economy as we know it. It could effectively remove America, and I predict will effectively remove America, from our economic predominance in the world.

What is the intent of this agreement that I am talking about? Who knows about this hushed-up agreement between the head of the patent office in Japan and the Patent Office in the United States?

The purpose of this agreement is to harmonize the American patent system to the Japanese system. Their intent is to take the best patent system in the world, that of the United States of America, the patent system that has offered the strongest patent protection of any country in the world, and in the name of global and Japanese harmonization of law, convert it into a mirror image of a system in Japan that has stifled innovation and creativity and kept the Japanese people under the heel of their economic elite.

The Japanese system benefits large conglomerates. They crush any creative attempts by individual inventors. The Japanese system, which they are now trying—and, remember this, they want our law to be exactly like the Japanese law, and they are moving to change it, to superimpose that law on us—the Japanese system is so slow that it takes many years to grant a patent at great expense of the applicant.

Turning abuse into injury, the Japanese publish every patent application in 18 months. By the time the patent is issued, years later, a phenomenon known as patent flooding has already occurred.

What is patent flooding? We are going to know all about that, because we are changing our law to be exactly like their law. That is when patents very similar to the original idea flood the patent office, slowing the whole process and rendering the original application almost valueless, unless of course it is a huge corporation or a fabulously wealthy inventor who can defend himself. Even then it makes the process much more expensive.

Where did the patent flooders get the information, in Japan to flood the patent office? The information, by the way, was just in the inventor's original patent application that had to be published after 18 months.

By the way, under our system traditionally when you file for a patent, until you are granted that patent, it is

a secret. Nobody knows. Thus an inventor has the incentive to invent things and to make an application for a patent and it is protected.

Americans have always been the innovators of the world because we have had this system. Our patent system supports innovation. The Japanese, however, have been copiers and their patent system supports copying. The proof of this, and it is glaring, the United States has 175 of the world's Nobel laureates in science and technology. Japan has just five.

Why would we want to change our system to make it more like their system? Global harmonization is the answer. That is what we are being told, although there are other excuses, but that is the main one, that we need to globalize all the rules of the game so we can have a global economy, and gutting the American patent system is the first step towards globalizing us with the rest of the world.

Does it make sense to everyone that we should just globalize our economy, even if it means gutting rights that have been inbred into our system for 200 years, that our Founding Fathers thought were sacrosanct? First let us recognize that the strongest advocates of a global market are not the advocates of free markets at home. Once the authority to regulate a global market is empowered, it will be too late.

We do not appreciate most of the important things in our lives until we are on the verge of losing them. Americans will find that freedom in the economic arena has everything to do with controlling one's own destiny and determining one's own life. But the regulators of this global market on a worldwide scale will have little or no regard for the desires of ordinary Americans.

The global market will be regulated by a new set of managers. It will be the arrogance of officialdom times 10. Huge multinational corporations may be able to thrive in such an environment, but individual citizens and small businesses will not. They will see what they have considered their rights as an American evaporate.

There are those who believe that globalizing is good for America, and we understand that participation in the world trading system is essential for our economic well-being. I certainly believe in trade. As I say, I believe in free trade between free people. But we cannot sacrifice the rights of our people or especially destroy our innovative process to achieve this goal.

What has been the factor that has given America the strength in the economic marketplace to maintain a high standard of living for our people even though many people overseas receive much less money in pay? It has been our technological genius and our innovation. That is what has permitted us to succeed and our people to prosper. What is being proposed is the sacrifice of the rights of Americans, the sacrifice of our future, of the standard of living of our people, all in the name of globalism and harmonization.

Megabusiness, however, has a different approach. The cartels have no loyalty to the American people, and that is us. We are talking about us here. Those huge multinational conglomerates are profitmotivated and that is it. They now have a dream that they can maximize profits throughout the world and help trade flow through a global economy. The first step, however, in achieving that is putting the American people in their place. That means a lower standard of living, that means fewer rights, that means the individual no longer has the protections that the individual has had in the past. Phase one of this assault on America is the assault on America's technological rights because that is what has given us as Americans our leverage, our ability to ensure our freedom and to build a high standard of living for our people. The first step in this organized strategy to destroy our patent system was snuck into the GATT implementation legislation we passed about a year and a half ago. We accepted a fast-track system to pass the GATT implementation legislation because we were promised that nothing would be put into this legislation except that which was mandated by the GATT agreement itself. However, dramatic changes in the patent term were snuck into that legislation even though the position on patents in GATT just simply suggested that the patent term should be no less than 20 years from date of filing, which means, if one reads that, that we need not change America's current patent system. But they put the massive change—that may seem hard to understand but it will have incredible results—into the GATT implementation legislation. What did it do? Basically it eliminated the 17-year guaranteed patent term.

A patent term, let me note, has been a right. A guaranteed number of years as a patent term has been the right of Americans since 1790, since the establishment of our Constitution. A patent office is actually in our Constitution. The implementing legislation created an uncertain patent term. We then took a guaranteed patent term and exchanged it in that implementation legislation for an uncertain patent term which dates 20 years from the date of application. That means, in the new system, and, by the way, the new system is nothing more than the Japanese system superimposed on us. It is much different than our past system and it is hard to understand but under the new code, the day the inventor files for a patent, 20 years later, his time is up. He has no more rights, he or she has no more rights to ownership of that patent. If it took 10 years for a patent to be issued in the past, the inventor still had a guaranteed term of 17 years. Under the new system, however, if it takes 10 years for a patent to issue, half of the inventor's patent term has been eaten up, it is gone, he or she will never get it back, and the clock continues to tick against the inventor, not

against the bureaucracy. Every second that ticks is against the inventor. Anyone who has studied the process knows that it is not unusual for a breakthrough technology, and these are the innovations that changed the world, innovations like the airplane and the microprocessor and many others. I will explain a couple of those in a moment.

Polyurethane plastic, by the way, which has changed our life, it took 33 years for the inventor to receive his patent. It took 17 years for the microprocessor and 21 years for the laser to receive their patent. These patents will determine the flow of tens of billions, if not hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of wealth. By making sure that they now receive almost no protection, because the new system would offer them almost no protection, it has changed the flow of wealth in the world.

What does it mean when the clock is ticking against the inventor? It means the bureaucracy and special interests have leverage on the inventor, because he wants some reward for his creative invention.

During the negotiations which are part of the patent granting process, the inventor, just like in Japan, will end up being ground down because now he or she is vulnerable. If a patent can be delayed, what does it mean? If they can delay the patent or shorten the time when the patent is actually in effect because he now only has half of his patent term because the rest has been eaten away, it means that those royalties that were once going into the bank accounts of American inventors, royalties from basically technologies that were created by Americans, those royalties will now be in the bank accounts of huge domestic and multinational corporations. These people will not be able to control their technology. To claim stolen royalties or to reclaim control over one's technology after these huge corporate and multinational interests have taken the technology, the individual American will have to pay lawyers and legal specialists to go to court.

Have you got that? That is the little inventor in the United States versus Toshiba. Where do you think we are going to get on that? The little guy gets ground down, just like the Japanese people have been ground down over the years, now those same corporate interests will be here in our country grinding down our people. The Wright Brothers will be smashed by the Toshibas and the Sonys of the world and the aerospace workers that should be producing the aerospace technologies of the future may well not be American aerospace workers. Our people will be impoverished.

This system, which our Patent Commissioner Bruce Lehman wants American law to emulate, has ill-served the Japanese people. Little, if any, innovation is born in Japan and few, if any, inventions start there. The Japanese, as I say, are rightfully known as copiers and improvers, and that is fine,

they do a good job at that, but they are not innovators and inventors. Their laws, which Bruce Lehman wants America to emulate, have permitted powerful business conglomerates to run roughshod over their people. Their people have been beaten down. Anyone who raises their head gets beaten down over there. Now those same interests will have that same kind of leverage over American inventors. After successfully beginning this harmonization through the legislative maneuver which, as I said, went through the GATT implementation legislation, basically they got step No. 1, which is eliminating the guaranteed patent term for American inventors.

But, now, we see step No. 2. Step No. 2 happens to be authored, it is H.R. 3460, the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act which I call the Steal American Technologies Act. What this legislation does is finish the job of harmonizing our law like that of Japan's. In our country, the rights of the individual are paramount and these patent laws were meant to protect individual property rights. Basically, these individual property rights would be respected by our Government just as other property rights, of small farmers and businessmen and others who own property in our country, and this system of private property for the individual has worked well. We believe it is through individual endeavor and personal responsibility that someone prospers and when individuals as a whole population act in that way, the whole society prospers. Lehman's approach treats individuals as secondary, sort of as ants in a collective hole who, if they insist on rights for themselves, will be crushed.

□ 1545

Of course, those trying to challenge our system will never admit this. The debate is coming not as part of a major debate in our democratic process, but I believe these changes are coming, they are trying to sneak these changes through, hoping that none of us will never understand the complexities of patent law. Well, when one can force the advocates of these patent changes to engage, they claim their goal is not destroying the American traditional patent system, but instead they are going to solve a problem which they call, well, it is called the submarine patent problem. What is that? They believe some inventors, certainly a few self-serving inventors, may have been able to elongate the process in which their patent application was being considered; thus, if they put off the issuing date of their patent, they will have a guaranteed 17 years of patent. That means that some inventors will enjoy some royalty benefits in the outyears when, you know, if they had not gamed the system, they would have been receiving those royalties in the outyears. They would be receiving them in the in-years and perhaps after a length of time, certain technologies are more valuable.

Well, making things worse, according to the other side, let us say someone games the system for 10 years. Some other companies may have decided to use that technology, which they have discovered independently, in some of their own products and then when the submariner finally allows his patent to be issued, well, then those other companies have to pay that submarine patent a certain royalty.

Now, this is all very confusing. But the fact is we are talking about less than 1 percent of all patents where people are actually able just to prevent their patent, through gaming the process, from being issued right away. And I agree, that is not something we should tolerate, but it is not something that will in any way justify, basically, the elimination of the guaranteed patent term and the obliteration of the patent system in the United States and replacing it with a Japanese system.

The vast majority of all patent applicants, more than 99 percent, are doing everything in their power to get their patent issued. They are not submariners. They beg, they plead, please issue my patent, because that is when they know they can start earning their rewards. And if they delay, what is going to happen? They know if they delay their patent being issued, new technologies might come up and make their patent worthless. But there are a few submarine patenters, and they are a minuscule part of the system, and this problem can and will be dealt with and should be dealt with by patent examiners and by using the patent system as it is today, rather than eliminating the patent system and eliminating the guaranteed rights of Americans.

My bill, in fact, includes a provision that we publish the application of any inventor who uses a continuance to intentionally delay the process. Over and over again in the year and a half that I have pushed this issue, I have offered to put many changes into law that will curb submarine patents as long as those changes did not eliminate the guaranteed patent term. But the other side never would come up with a suggestion except, oh, I am sorry, this is the problem, so we have to eliminate the guaranteed patent term. I was willing to compromise in any way just so long as you get those submarine patenters. There are a few of them out there.

You know, sometimes when someone is unwilling to compromise and make a change like that, you maybe get the feeling that perhaps his real target was eliminating the guaranteed patent term and not correcting some minor problem, the submarine patent. Well, interestingly enough, there is a system in place in the Patent Office called the patent application and monitoring system, the P-A-L-M, the PALM system, which can and does print out the status of all pending applications in the Patent Office monthly, and if a patent has an unusual term of waiting, if an application is judged to be special by the

Commissioner, he has the right to publish the application at any time. And this is in existing law. Thus it is already possible to solve the submarine patent. It is already solved. But this is being used as an excuse to destroy the guaranteed patent term in the United States of America.

Well, history will judge their motives, but those claiming to end the submarine patent as their goal have refused every other method except eliminating the guaranteed patent term.

By the way, this move to harmonize our laws with Japan happened long before anyone had ever heard of the word "submarine" patent and this whole idea of eliminating the guaranteed patent was part of that harmonization process.

During the debate, Mr. Lehman has used the bogeyman of the submarine patents, and when we have checked his figures, we have found that many of the patents he claimed to be submarine patents, again, this is the excuse they are using to destroy our patent system, when we checked out the submarine patents, we found many of them had not been issued because the Defense Department had said this is a security risk, we have to keep these particular technologies secret.

You can imagine what secrets will be made available to America's enemies if we just publish all of our patent applications after 18 months.

My bill, H.R. 359, would restore the guaranteed patent term of 17 years and facilitate the action against those who are trying to manipulate the system and delay the issuance of their patent. I am offering this as a substitute to H.R. 3460, a bill which, as I say, is the next step in totally harmonizing our law with Japan. H.R. 3460, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act, better than anything else demonstrates what really is going on because it is understandable and its goals are easy for regular working people to understand what is happening.

One of the provisions was introduced last year under a bill entitled the "Patent Application Publication Act." This bill is now part of H.R. 3460 and is titled "Early Publication of Patent Applications." The title is self-explanatory. That provision in this bill—hold on to your hats—mandates that after 18 months every American patent application, just like in Japan, whether it has been issued or not, will be published for the entire world to see. Every thief, every brigand, every pirate, every multinational corporation, every Asian copycat will be handed the details of every patent application. Our newest and most creative ideas will be outlined for them, for the thieves of the world, even before the patent has been issued to the American citizen.

It is an invitation for every thief in the world to steal American technology. Lines will form at the copy machines and the fax machines to get this information out to America's worst enemies and our fiercest competitors.

H.R. 3460 is entitled as I say, the "Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act." The author of the bill suggests that we need not worry about an abrupt early publication of patent applications if domestic or foreign or multinational corporations steal the ideas; the patent applicants, once he or she gets the patent issued, can sue the pirates. Like I say, it is Toshiba versus John Q. American citizen. The price tag on this simple infringement suit, by the way, is a quarter of a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars for just an uncomplicated suit. Our citizens who will be up against Toshiba, Sony, and even the Chinese People's Liberation Army, which is engaged in stealing our technology.

As this bill was being passed through subcommittee, I was in my office with the president of a medium-sized solar energy corporation. When I asked what would happen if this provision became law, he clenched his fist and angrily predicted his Asian competitors would be manufacturing his new technology before his patent was issued, and they would use the profit from selling his new technology to defeat any court challenge that they had and destroy his company. On top of that, his overseas competitors would have a further advantage in the fact that they would never have had to invest in research and development to get the new technology they were benefiting from.

This is a nightmare that faces every small- and medium-sized company. Anyone who cannot afford a stable of expensive lawyers is at the mercy of the worst thieves of the world. The big guys have the contacts overseas and the money to divert and deter such thievery, but it is open season on the little guys, on the average Americans. Of course, we will do everything we can to prevent this bill, but what is their goal?

They say we have to do everything, we have to go, we have to destroy the American patent system, we have to make all of our technological secrets known to the world in order to protect us from submarine patents. Because a few people want to elongate the system on their patent and they will get 5 or 10 years more protection here, a few Americans, so we have to open up our system to this type of massive theft. I would suggest that maybe we should think about the arguments about the submarine patent argument.

What they are telling us, it is sort of like you are going in to your doctor and saying, doctor, I got a hang nail here on this toe and it is really hurting me. The doctor says, I really am opposed to hang nails. Those hang nails are terrible and we are going to solve your problem. We are going to cut your leg off, we are going to amputate your leg.

No, no, doctor, please. I just got this little hang nail down here. He says, I bleed for you, and he goes into a big lecture on hang nails, and at the end of it he says, well, we are going to cut

your leg off. Well, if your doctor is telling you that to cure a hang nail, that he is going to amputate your leg, I think you better question your doctor's motives or maybe your doctor's sanity if he is trying to do that on you.

Another major provision in H.R. 3460, it is the abolition of the Patent Office. That is right, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, will abolish America's Patent Office. Now, it is in our Constitution. Ben Franklin saw to that. Thomas Jefferson saw to that. It has played a vital role in protecting our property rights ever since then, yet now H.R. 3460 will separate the Patent Office from our Government, limiting congressional oversight. That means those of us who have been elected to represent the interest of the people will not have the same oversight after the Moorhead-Schroeder Act passes. It will remake the Patent Office into sort of a corporate-like private corporation-government corporation, sort of like the post office.

Now, I am in favor of privatizing services when government does not have to do that, but this is a core function of our Federal Government. Protecting the rights of our people as we head into an era of technology, that is even more important. But we need the government to make sure of that. Who is there to determine and protect the intellectual property rights of our people? That is their core function all the way back since 1784.

Well, along with corporatizing and taking away our congressional oversight, the civil service protection for our patent examiners will be stripped from them. It is like stripping the judge's robes off of him, and basically the patent examiners make judicial decisions that will affect billions of dollars worth of ownership in our society. It is the quasi-judicial decisions, and under this bill, they are not going to have any more civil service protection. It opens up our system to outside influences and to corruption that we have never had before. Taking away the civil service protection is a travesty, and these people who work at the Patent Office try their best, and even when they are protected, it is a hard job.

If our Patent Office is corporatized, the head of the Patent Office, Bruce Lehman, Mr. Harmonize Our Laws With Japan, can make the changes he and his board of directors want with limited congressional scrutiny and recourse. Thus, in the coming era of technology and creativity, we basically will be decoupling the protection of patent rights from our Government, cutting off this congressional oversight, and leaving it in the hands of an autonomous board of unelected officials.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to be on that board? Whose special interests will be represented on that board overseeing the decisions as to who owns what technology in the future? Maybe they won't even be people who have allegiance to the United States, who

knows. But they will be making the decisions, and we do not know who they are.

H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, must be defeated. My bill, H.R. 359, the Patent Rights Restoration Act, can be substituted in its place when it comes to the floor of Congress for a vote. The choice is our choice as the American people, as Members of Congress. It is H.R. 3460, the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act or the Rohrabacher substitute. One might ask why has a bill that is so obviously detrimental to America's interests, why has it gone this far? First and foremost, and this is a problem we talked about earlier, our big businesses have bought off on the idea of a world economy, and if harmonizing our patent rights is part of that deal with a global economy and even if our foreign competitors renege later, we must change our laws now as a sign of good faith to get everybody working together. This mindset is a great threat to the well-being of the American people.

Second, let me say these huge corporations have enormous influence on Members of Congress. Your biggest corporation in your district comes to see you, the president of that corporation, you listen to that head of that corporation. But these corporate leaders are not representing the interests of their own working people, much less the greater constituency of the people of the United States. These corporate leaders may have good hearts and may be well intended, but they are wrong headed when it comes to globalization. Their loyalty should be in the long term with the people of the United States. Instead, what we find here are people who basically bought into an idea, we are going to create a whole new world, and it is going to be a more perfect world where commerce is flowing.

Watch out, Mr. and Mrs. America, when you run into somebody who is going to change the whole world and make it so much better, even at the expense of the American people and our rights. That is the threat we face today, and right after the Fourth of July when this bill comes to the floor, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, has to be defeated and the Rohrabacher substitute should take its place.

□ 1600

#### ECO-SANITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House here to talk about the environment. I think as the election process starts this year, we are going to hear many elected officials talk about the environment and they will say one party is destroying