

two wonderful children that are also growing up in Las Vegas.

When I first moved to town, Las Vegas was a destination where many families did not think of coming. But today I can tell my colleague it is an entirely different environment. We have some of the most magnificent hotels in the world that cater to children, cater to families and have made our community family-friendly, and I can tell my colleague that when it comes to my children, my parents who also live in Las Vegas, when they take the grandchildren for an afternoon, most times they take them to the Las Vegas strip so they can enjoy the many attractions that are designed specifically for children and for families who come to my wonderful community.

Mr. FOLEY. I think that is why it is important today for Members to come out and describe their districts and describe some of the value that the tourism and travel industry plays in their hometown communities because, as the gentlewoman is suggesting, years ago it was known as a destination primarily for gaming, but now it is the site of international conventions dealing with some of the most important issues. It has become very family-friendly and is a great resource for all residents of Nevada who enjoy employment, enjoy economic growth and opportunity and activity.

So it is very appropriate that we signal and salute the variety of sectors of the Nation, if my colleague will, and the 435 districts that make up the great United States of America.

Ms. BERKLEY. Well, as my colleague knows, a very interesting statistic:

In 1900 the census showed that there were 30 residents in the Las Vegas Valley. Now we boast of 1.2 million. It has been a remarkable, remarkable growth area, and that is primarily because our area is for tourism, it is a destination resort area, and the tourism industry has played an incredible and indispensable role in making Las Vegas what it is today. And when we have 30 million visitors a year coming to Las Vegas to enjoy what we have to offer, we invite the rest of the country to come to Las Vegas and enjoy the wonderful scenery that we have, the magnificent hotels that we have. And as my colleague knows, if he comes to the Las Vegas strip he can see pyramids, he can see the City of Paris, he can see the City of Venice, he can see medieval castles and New York, New York, a replica of the City of New York, the City of New Orleans. It is just the most spectacular place.

And I will boast this: Our pyramids, our medieval castles, our City of Paris, our City of Venice, and New York, New York are better than the originals. So I invite my colleague to come out and see it for himself.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, I am indeed tempted to, and I will also tell my colleague she gained national prominence with the opening of the Belagio, which has probably one of the great art collec-

tions that I understand being displayed for the benefit of art lovers as well.

Ms. BERKLEY. Well, if I can share something with my colleague for one half a minute more, Las Vegas has not been known as a cultural Mecca; however, with the addition of the Belagio Art Museum I can tell him that it has added significantly to our culture. And my own children, who have studied art in school, we took them to the Belagio Art Museum, and as soon as my children walked into the facility they were able to pick out Monets, Picassos, Renoirs, and they never would have had an opportunity to see these magnificent works of art up close and personal if not for the Belagio bringing them to our fair city.

So I invite my colleague from Florida to come out and not only see all those other wonderful things, but see a wonderful art collection as well.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for joining us today in this special order, and I do want to in conclusion thank a variety of groups that have helped supply some of the critical data that we have shared today.

I want to go over it real quickly again so people understand the, if my colleague will, great economic import of the industries we talk about today:

The travel industry supports 7 million jobs contributing 127.8 billion in payroll expenditures.

The restaurant industry is the leading source of travel industry jobs in the United States.

Employment growth in the travel industry continues to outpace job growth in the overall economy.

During 1997 the industry produced more than 200,000 new tourism jobs.

The travel industry generates more than \$70 billion in Federal, State and local tax revenue.

47.8 million foreign travelers visited the United States in 1997, spending \$94.2 billion.

Last year visits from international travelers fell 1 percent. This drop represented 627,000 less travelers, 950 million in lost spending and 121 million in lost tax to Federal, State and local governments.

The reason I bring that up is the fact that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a Member of Congress who represents the areas of Pebble Beach, and I decided that as former, if my colleague will, employees of the travel and tourism sector, we felt it vitally important to make certain that we remain competitive, that we try and see how we can continue to grow the industry, if my colleague will, again for the sake of providing jobs and opportunity for Americans and for Floridians, as I represent Florida.

The National Restaurant Association and the Travel Industry Association of America and the Travel Business Round Table and other groups have contributed mightily to the presentation, if my colleague will, today, of the statistical data. In fact, it was the

Travel Industry Association of America that worked in conjunction with the White House, the 1995 national strategy at the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, in order to determine exactly what the statistics are, because we want to be able to document for the record the significance of which travel and tourism relates to people's home districts.

And again we have enjoyed being able to present these facts for people as we once again celebrate Travel and Tourism Week, May 2 through the 8, and again I would remind the staff of Members of Congress that on Wednesday, May 5, it is Tourist Appreciation Day, and we will again have a reception in the Longworth cafeteria from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m.

And again I want to thank specifically the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has been a leading proponent and advocate of travel and tourism in his district. We are a bipartisan committee. We are an advocate for the travel and tourism industry. We are equally represented by Democrats and Republicans because we recognize that the growth of opportunity and the growth of jobs and the growth of a strong community depends on the many components and parts that make up this unique and great industry.

GETTING TO THE BOTTOM OF ILLEGAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, of which I am chairman over the past 2½ years, has been investigating illegal campaign contributions that came in from a variety of countries around the world. Came in from South America, from Taiwan, from communist China, from Macao, from Indonesia, from Egypt, and on and on, and these illegal campaign contributions came in to the Clinton/Gore Reelection Committee and to the Democrat National Committee.

During the past 2½ years we have been trying, day and night, to get to the bottom of this. We have tried to get people to come forward and testify, we tried to get cooperation from the Justice Department, the White House, but we have been very, very unsuccessful because there seems to have been a stone wall erected by the White House and the Justice Department and other agencies to keep us from getting to the bottom of this.

We have had 121 people, 121 people take the Fifth Amendment or flee the country. That is unparalleled in American history, and I have been here on the floor a number of times talking about this because I think it is unbelievable that foreign governments

should be able to influence our elections and even elect a President. Millions of dollars have come in illegally into the Clinton/Gore campaign and to the Democrat National Committee, and much of that money has been returned because of our investigation.

Now today I rise on a different subject, but it may be related, and that is why it is so troubling to me. The Chinese communists, through people in their government, the head of their military intelligence and the head of their Chinese aerospace industry gave a man named Johnny Chung \$300,000 to give, at least in large part, to the Clinton Reelection Committee, and they were not doing it in my opinion for Mr. Clinton's good looks. They obviously had some kind of an agenda. The head of the Chinese military intelligence and the head of the Chinese aerospace industry giving campaign contributions to a candidate for President in this country would lead almost anyone to say there is something amiss here, there is something wrong, and it should be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Speaker, we just recently found out that at Los Alamos, one of our nuclear research facilities, that they had a man there named Wen Ho Lee who had been there for a long time who is believed to have been involved in espionage.

□ 1545

I am very concerned about some of the statements that have come out of the administration with respect to China's thefts of these U.S. nuclear secrets. Again and again we have seen administration officials all the way up to the President make misleading statements about what they knew and when they knew it. Let me provide you with some examples.

One good example is on March 19, 1999, President Clinton was asked by a reporter, "Can you assure the American people that under your watch, no valuable secrets were lost?"

The President responded, "Can I tell you there has been no espionage at the lab since I have been President? I can tell you that no one,"—listen to this—"I can tell you that no one has reported to me that they suspect such a thing has occurred." So the President was saying he was totally uninformed. He did not know anything about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the President's response about his knowledge of Chinese spying is not only troubling and disingenuous, it is just hard to believe. The Clinton administration, his administration, knew about the full extent of Chinese spying at Los Alamos and Livermore and other laboratories as far back as 1996, over 3 years ago.

Then the National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger, head of the NSC, was briefed about the Chinese spying by the Energy Department's chief of intelligence, a Mr. Notra Trulock. Berger was told that China had stolen W-88 nuclear warhead designs and neutron bomb technology. He was told that a

spy might still be passing secrets to China at Los Alamos, our nuclear research facility. He was even told that the theft of neutron bomb data occurred in 1995 under the President's administration.

Let me just tell you that the W-88 warhead is a miniaturized nuclear warhead that can be put on one missile. You can put 10 of these nuclear warheads on one missile so that with one missile you can hit 10 American cities and kill 50 to 60 million American citizens. We have no defense for that right now.

The neutron bomb technology would allow a neutron bomb to be launched on a missile to the United States, and, if it exploded over a major city, it would kill everybody in the city, but the infrastructure would not be damaged, so it would be something an enemy would like to do, protect the infrastructure, the roads, the buildings, and so forth, but kill all the people in it.

At the end of the briefing that Mr. Berger, the head of the National Security Council, received, Trulock referred to a recent intelligence report. In the report a Chinese source, a Chinese spy that spies for us, a Chinese source said that officials inside, inside, China's intelligence service, were boasting about how they had just stolen U.S. nuclear secrets, and how those secrets allowed them to improve their neutron bomb technology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again in July of 1997, a year before his meeting with President Jiang of Communist China and 21 months before his meeting with Prime Minister Shu of China, Sandy Berger received a second detailed briefing about China's spying, and soon after told the President about the weaknesses at the laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore, and about the Chinese spying. This was in 1997.

Now, remember, the President just a few weeks ago said that no one had informed him. Yet Sandy Berger, the head of the NSC, did tell him for sure 2 years ago in 1997. Why would the President misspeak? Why would he mislead the American people? I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, in August of 1997, Gary Samore, the senior National Security Council official assigned to the China spy case, received a briefing from Mr. Notra Trulock, who is the head of intelligence security over at the Department of Energy, and immediately after the briefing about this spying, he went to the CIA director and asked the CIA director to seek an alternative analysis about how the Chinese had developed these small nuclear warheads.

So after he had been told they stole this nuclear technology and that spying was going on, he went to the CIA and said, "Can't you give us a different way they got this technology?"

Why would he do that? Why, when presented with such overwhelming evidence of Chinese espionage, did Gary Samore seek to downplay the signifi-

cance of the information, asking the CIA to come up with another explanation, other than espionage, about China's advances? We had already gotten some of this information from our intelligence sources over in China.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1998, Notra Trulock, the Energy Department's director of intelligence, was demoted; he was demoted after he brought this information out, to acting deputy director of Intelligence, after he made a third report to the Energy Department's Inspector General about a steady pattern, a steady pattern of suppression of counterintelligence issues. They did not like what he was saying, so they demoted the guy.

I want to go back just a minute to this briefing that took place about the neutron bomb. The Chinese intelligence source that we have also said that Chinese agents solved a 1988 design problem by coming back to the United States after they had already been involved in espionage in 1995 to steal more secrets. Trulock's April 1996 briefing to Sandy Berger could not have been more detailed and it could not have been more alarming. So the head of the NSC, the man who reports to the President about security issues, was completely informed about this in 1996, in April.

When Paul Redmund, the CIA's chief spy hunter was given a similar briefing from Trulock a few months earlier, he said that China spying, now, get this, China spying was far more damaging to the U.S. national security than Aldrich Ames, who is now serving a prison term for spying, and it would turn out to be as bad as the Rosenbergs, who were put to death because they gave Communist Russia, the Soviet Union, secrets back after World War II.

Mr. Speaker, is it really, really likely that Sandy Berger, the head of the NSC, after hearing such a detailed and alarming picture of Chinese espionage, would not tell the President about it? Yet the President just a few weeks ago said no one brought it to his attention, and this was 3 years ago. If you were the President or if I was the President and our head of National Security did not tell us this, you would fire him. You would have him hung out to dry, because this a national tragedy, a national security issue. Yet the President said he did not know about it just a few weeks ago.

According to the White House, Berger first briefed the President about Chinese spying in July of 1997. So why did the President say he had not been informed about it? He did so after he received a second briefing from Notra Trulock, which, according to Berger, was much more specific than the first.

In addition, according to NSC spokesman David Levy, Berger "did not detail each and every allegation."

Why would he not detail each and every allegation? We are talking about spying at one of our foremost nuclear research laboratories and about technology that could endanger every man,

woman and child in the country. Mr. Levy gave this explanation, after being asked if Berger had told the President about the neutron bomb data that was stolen in 1995.

Apparently the White House wants us to believe that Berger only told the President about the W-88 design theft which happened before 1992, which was done under his watch, and left out the theft of the neutron bomb data and China's recent spying at Los Alamos.

Are we to believe that 3 years after the President's national security adviser received his first briefing about this wave of espionage that happened under the President's watch, that he would not have told the President about it? And, after that, how can you believe anything the administration says?

Why does the President, despite all the evidence to the contrary, continue to accept every Chinese denial, not only of spying, but also of illegally funneling money to the Clinton-Gore reelection committee?

We know that the President was briefed about China's spying in July of 1997. Why then, while in China in 1998, with President Jiang, did he quickly accept President Jiang's denial that China had illegally funneled money to the Clinton-Gore reelection committee? He already knew about the spying. He already had Chinese nationals coming in and out of the White House on a regular basis. Johnny Chung was bringing them in, Charlie Trie was bringing them in, John Huang, Mark Middleton, and on and on and on. They were running in and out like they were on a railroad train. Yet he said he believed President Jiang when President Jiang said they were not illegally funneling money into the Clinton-Gore reelection committee. We know for a fact that that was going on.

How could the President say, I do believe him, that he did not order, authorize or approve such a thing, the illegal contributions, and that he could find no evidence that anybody in governmental authority had done that?

The head of the Chinese military intelligence was running money through Johnny Chung. The head of the Chinese aerospace industry, who benefitted from the technology transfer I am talking about, was involved. They were very high up. In fact, the head of the Chinese National Aeronautics Agency over there, the aerospace industry, her father was the head of the Chinese Liberation Army, the People's Liberation Army. He was right in the Politburo, right next to the President of the country.

For them to say the head of the country was not involved is just ludicrous, because if you do not keep the head of the government involved in a Communist society, you are either put away for good or you are killed.

Mr. Speaker, again in April of this year, how could the President listen to Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji deny that Chinese had any involvement

in spying and respond by saying, and this is what the President said, "China is a big country with a big government, and I can only say that America is a big country with a big government, and occasionally things happen in this government that I do not know about."

He was implying the Chinese did not know, the head of the Chinese Government, did not know they were stealing through espionage nuclear technology from Los Alamos and Livermore. That is just insane. I do not think anybody could believe that.

Mr. Speaker, our leadership cannot continually be blind and accept each and every denial that comes out of China. Newsweek recently reported that a team of U.S. nuclear weapons experts in America practically fainted when the CIA showed them the data that China had obtained. These are the guys that know what these weapons can do. They practically fainted when they found out that technology had been taken by espionage to the Communist Chinese.

What did this data show? It showed that Chinese scientist also routinely used phrases, descriptions and concepts that came straight out of Los Alamos and Livermore labs. The Chinese penetration, they said, is total, one official close to the investigation said. They are deep, deep into the labs' black programs. Those are the top, top secret programs involving our country and our security.

Now, today, because of these things that happened, the head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Mr. SHELBY, started investigating it. Mr. SHELBY said that he had known there was an ongoing investigation and that it confirmed his worst fears. He said we have got to get to the bottom of this. He is working on it right now.

One of the people, a senior analyst and nuclear weapons expert at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said, "It is staggering. I am still in shock here."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The gentleman should please refrain from quoting Members of the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will do that. I will mention the other body generically, Mr. Speaker.

"It is staggering," he said. "I am still in shock here," a senior analyst and nuclear weapons expert at the Natural Resources Defense Council said. He said, "If someone had access to Lee's," that is the fellow who was involved in the espionage, allegedly involved, "unclassified computer, this could be all over the world."

What he was talking about, this was this Mr. Wen Ho Lee, took this top secret information and he transferred it from a top secret computer into a non-top secret computer, where all you had to do was put in a password and you could get every one of our nuclear secrets that he had available to him.

This has been going on for some time. Norris's colleague, physicist Mat-

thew G. McKenzie said that "unauthorized access to those programs, so-called legacy codes, used to simulate warhead detonation, would represent an unprecedented act of espionage in his scope. Get this. The espionage in the Manhattan Project, that was right after we discovered the nuclear bomb that ended World War II, the espionage in the Manhattan Project would pale, would pale, in comparison."

This is so much more damaging. We are focusing everything right now in the media almost on Kosovo, and our heart goes out to the people who are suffering over there. But this espionage endangers every man, woman and child in this country if we ever go to war with Communist China. And they have made threats in the Taiwan Straits. They have made overt threats about we would not go into Taiwan to protect them because we value Los Angeles more than we do Taiwan, which was an implied threat. So you do not know what might happen. They are a Communist dictatorship. Yet they got all this, and we keep working with them and dealing with them as if nothing happened.

Asked whether Clinton stands by his statement that he made last month that there was no evidence indicating Chinese espionage on his watch, David Levy, a National Security Council spokesman, said, "Administration officials are investigating a number of recent allegations and are under no illusion that China and other nations continue to acquire secrets. This does not come as news to this administration," he said.

Does not come as news? The President said just a few weeks ago that he had not been informed about it, even though the national security adviser, the head of National Security in this country, found out about it in 1996.

Why? Why was this money coming into America from Chinese Communist sources into the campaign? Why did this technology transfer take place, this espionage? Why did that take place? And why did the President say he did not know about it?

The transfers took place from 1983 to 1995 when Los Alamos began installing a new mechanism that would have made such transfers more difficult. It looks like he was moving quickly, Mr. Lee, in the last few months, to get it transferred before the new system came in. They were coming up with a new system.

When the FBI finally searched Lee's computer last month, following his dismissal on March 8, the official said they found he had made an effort to erase what he had been doing as far as classified information was concerned.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that the FBI a couple of years ago wanted to put electronic surveillance on Mr. Lee and the Justice Department said no. The Justice Department told the FBI two years ago that they did

not want electronic surveillance on Mr. Lee because the information was not current enough. We were talking about espionage of our most top secret nuclear weapons systems, and the Justice Department denied the FBI the right to put electronic surveillance on this guy.

In addition to that, they wanted a warrant to go in and look at his computer and search facilities of his, and that also was denied by the Justice Department. Why? What in the world is wrong with this administration, from the White House all the way to the Justice Department? I do not understand it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to come down here to the House floor to compliment the gentleman for what he is trying to do, to educate the American people and also educate some of our colleagues, in fact, many of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the Air Force, and I was in a classified program dealing with top secret material, and the access we had to have to get into the room where we worked was coded, and the code would change, and we would have to punch it in. Then, when we had classified material on our desks, we had to account for this at the end of the day, and we had to account for it the next morning. There were very detailed procedures on how we handled it.

What I read today in the paper, and in The New York Times yesterday, is very alarming, and I think the gentleman is talking about this scientist, Wen Ho Lee. It was reported in The New York Times on March 24 that he was already under investigation. Now, the gentleman may have said this and I might have missed it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, they started investigating him in 1996-1997.

Mr. STEARNS. It was reported on March 24 of this year, he was under investigation as a suspected spy for China to run a sensitive weapons program, and it is just outrageous that they would continue to take a person like this and put him in that responsibility. Then he was asked, as the gentleman knows, to hire his own special assistant. So he hired a special assistant.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This was after he was under surveillance.

Mr. STEARNS. After he was under surveillance, after he was working there. So he hired a researcher who was a citizen of China. Intelligence and law enforcement officials have confirmed this. The FBI has said that they wanted to put a wiretap on Mr. Lee. And so it is sort of flabbergasts the American people, I think, if they look at it, how this individual could get a top secret clearance and get access to so much information.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And why the Justice Department denied electronic surveillance on the man.

Let me just interrupt my colleague and tell him something else that we recently found out, and I will be having other Special Orders going into other aspects of this, but the gentleman is welcome to stay so that we can discuss this.

We found out under Hazel O'Leary, the previous head of the Department of Energy, that she relaxed, cut the budget for security, cut the security force to such a degree that the head of intelligence for the Energy Department was really alarmed. Not only that, they changed the cards, the cards that they used to have, one card for top secret people, another card for somebody else, color codes so people could not get into the top secret areas, she did away with those and came up with one card for everybody so you could not track who was going in and out of the top secret areas.

This was an invitation to espionage. I cannot figure out why in the world they relaxed, they cut the budget for security, especially in view of the fact that this man was a suspect back as far as 1996. It does not make any sense to me.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just to confirm what the gentleman is saying, throughout all our military they do not have that type of operations in their classified programs, they do not have that one-pass-fits-all, and I do not think any classified program of that delicate a nature should have be relaxed; in fact, they should have increased security.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct. However, this administration, for whatever reason, from top to bottom, is guilty of either just mishandling all of this or worse. I do not know what it is. But we need to get to the bottom of it because this endangers, as I said before, every man, woman and child in this country.

Let me just go on with this article, because I have some things I would like to comment about it. When the FBI finally searched Lee's computer last month following his dismissal, they found that he was trying to erase top secret information that he had put in the computer. The official said that a password was needed to access the information even after Lee transferred it from the classified computer system, but all he had to do was give the password to one of his Communist friends and they could access every nuclear secret before him at that laboratory, everything that was in that computer, and this was top secret information that had been transferred to a non-top secret computer.

The unclassified system allows investigators to determine when and whether the data was accessed, the official said, and initial indications are that the materials was accessed. So they think somebody did get into the com-

puter and get this technology, at least a little bit.

Who was looking at it remains unclear, the official said, since Lee could have given the password to anyone else in any government.

Another high-ranking official reported no indication that the information was compromised. He denied a published report of evidence showing a password had been misused to gain access. He also denied that the FBI had been derelict in not searching Lee's computer at the beginning of the espionage investigation in 1996. At the time the FBI agents from the Bureau's Albuquerque field office wanted to search the computer but were told they needed a search warrant from the Federal court under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The warrant was denied, the official said, because a lack of evidence showed that Mr. Lee was engaged in acts of espionage.

If there was any doubt, why would the Justice Department not grant a search warrant? That would have been the prudent thing to do. They could have done that.

I can tell the gentleman, the FBI would never go to the Justice Department without probable cause. If they think there is probable cause that espionage took place and they went to the Justice Department and that was denied, that is darn near criminal.

Lee became a suspect in 1996 after the Energy Department and intelligence agencies determined that a Chinese military document that the CIA had obtained from some of our sources a year earlier contained classified data about the size and shape of the newest miniaturized nuclear weapon, which I was talking about, the W-88. The FBI was unable to gather hard evidence against him, and he has not been charged with a crime yet, but Lee was fired in March for security violations after the investigation was disclosed. The official said transferring data to an unclassified computer system would be or could be a crime, depending on the intent of the person who did it.

As soon as FBI agents discovered Lee had transferred massive amounts of secret data to his unclassified computer, Richardson ordered to shut down, Mr. Richardson is now the head of the Energy Department, Richardson ordered a shutdown of the classified computers at Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories.

The problem is this: The cat is out of the bag. The secrets have been taken by the Chinese communists. The things that our taxpayers spent millions and millions and millions of dollars and hundreds and thousands of man-hours researching to protect the citizens of this country have been given away through espionage to the Chinese communists, endangering every man, woman and child in this country.

My committee will continue to investigate the illegal campaign contributions. The Cox report which looked into this espionage should be made

public. The White House has blocked, according to the information I have, the White House has continued to block the Cox report from being made public. Much of it has been leaked to the American people through the media, but not all, and that information needs to be made known to every man, woman and child.

Because if this administration has been derelict in its responsibilities and endangered every man, woman and child, it is more important than Kosovo. It is more important than anything. And we need to get to the bottom of it and those who let this happen, for whatever reason, campaign contributions or because they like the Chinese or whatever reason. They need to be held accountable and brought to justice.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would just echo what the gentleman says. If nothing else, at some point we in the House should have an up-or-down vote to make the Cox report public if the White House continues to procrastinate on this, and at that point the House can redact or take out the things that they think would compromise some of our agents, but somehow we have to get this report public.

So I think the gentleman's effort here this afternoon in trying to say to the American people, this is important to us, this is important to Congress, we have to get to the bottom of this, is right on target. As the gentleman pointed out earlier, the Department of Energy as well as the administration knew all about this a long time ago. They relaxed the security provisions, and that in itself is terrible. The fact that the White House did not move quickly to put in place more secure operations is a sad commentary.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one other thing. Just a few weeks ago the President denied he had knowledge of any of this, and yet we know that he was briefed by Sandy Berger as far back as 1997. I can not understand why he is saying that.

This chart, which I did not get to today, but I will get to in a future Special Order, and I hope the gentleman from Florida will once again join me as I get additional information for people regarding this espionage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LUTHER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DAVIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SHERIDAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLETCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
 Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, on May 3.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1999, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1780. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1781. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 2000 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1782. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965 and thereby set the stage for strategic activities the Administration will pursue to more effectively and efficiently serve older Americans and their caregivers in the 21st Century; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1783. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting Life Cycle Asset Management; to the Committee on Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report which describes current conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States, the report covers the period since the last report in March 1998; to the Committee on International Relations.

1785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department

of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of land within the boundary of the Home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt National Historic Site to the Archivist of the United States for the construction of a visitor center; to the Committee on Resources.

1786. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure as adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 106-53); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1787. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure adopted by the Court; (H. Doc. No. 106-54); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1788. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure adopted by the Court; (H. Doc. No. 106-55); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1789. A letter from the President, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting a report of the audit of the Institute's accounts for fiscal year 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4607(h); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Education and the Workforce.

1790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Department of State to carry out its authorities and responsibilities in the conduct of foreign affairs during the fiscal years 2000 and 2001; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Government Reform, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1183. A bill to amend the Fastener Quality Act to strengthen the protection against the sale of mismatched, misrepresented, and counterfeit fasteners and eliminate unnecessary requirements, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-121, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1211. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 833. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-123 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Banking and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 833 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1183 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.