

is not true. Those kinds of generalizations will cause us to miss the problem, will cause us to miss the complexity of it.

But what we do know in this particular case was these young people had relatively easy access to these guns, and what we do know is that we have that part, as my colleagues know, that part of the solution coming together in the passage of these measures that have passed the Senate.

So I think we ought to keep and we ought to understand our children, and we should not, we should not paint them with the very broad brush of a relatively and, well, less than two handfuls of children that have perpetrated this kind of violence over the last 18 months. If this was the culture of violence in this young generation, as Michael Males, who is at the School for Social Ecology at the University of California, Irvine, points out, if this was a culture of violence, if we had raised children to kill children, then these killings would not be thousands of miles apart and months apart. This is what all children would be doing.

But they are not doing it. Like all of the children before them, they are going to school to get an education, to socialize and become part of their community, to grow up and to mature and decide what they are going to do with the rest of their lives. And their parents did not raise them to kill children.

But some parents unfortunately have been very irresponsible about leaving loaded guns and leaving firearms around, easily accessible to their children, apparently have not had the kind of communication or have not imposed upon their children the kind of discipline I grew up with about a gun.

I hunted, my father hunted, my children hunt. We have very, very strict rules about when one can touch a gun and when they cannot touch a gun and what to do with a gun in the home and what to do with the gun in the field.

Now some parents apparently have not been able to convey that or not willing to convey that or do not understand the kind of risk. We have got to deal with the questions of that kind of parental irresponsibility and with placing some responsibility and liability on those who fail to be the proper custodians of their children and of these firearms.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy at Columbine was heartbreaking for all Americans, but it was particularly difficult for the people in my home state of Oregon, where we endured a similar tragedy just one year ago at Thurston High School in Springfield.

At Thurston High, two young students were killed, and America reacted with sadness and sympathy.

At Columbine High, as we all know, thirteen students were killed by the two gunmen. America reacted with profound grief and a renewed sense of urgency.

Ladies and Gentlemen, thirteen children die every day in America—the result of handgun violence. Columbine happens every single day.

It is not nearly as dramatic, there are no CNN cameras, the nation does not stop and hold its breath, and watch . . .

But, every day in America, 13 children die unnecessary deaths from guns.

This is a children's health epidemic—and it is high time this Congress start paying attention to it, and take some steps in the right direction.

Now is the right time to begin the search for answers. Clearly, this is not an easy task. There are many approaches we can take to reduce youth violence:

We can make it easier for parents to spend time with their children.

We can reduce class size so teachers can identify troubled children, and get them the help they need.

We can better teach our young people the value of human life.

We can devote more resources to school counselors and mental health providers.

And we can simply open up the channels of communication between adults and teenagers . . .

What I've learned from listening to Oregon students in their schools, is that perhaps the most important thing we can do to make schools safer, is to create an atmosphere where it is more acceptable for students to talk to adults when they see danger signs.

These are all important steps . . .

Each will be helpful, but none alone or all together will be effective enough to curb this health epidemic without a commitment from this Congress to make guns less accessible to young people.

Conflicts and emotions that get the better of people can sometimes be sorted out with words, sometimes they get sorted out with fists, or with knives . . .

But the only tool of anger that can mow down thirteen students in a school library—is a gun.

Simply passing laws will not address the root causes of this tragedy, but there are steps we can take to keep guns out of the hands of violent juveniles.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support reasonable gun safety measures being introduced by Democrats:

First, let's close the "gun show loophole," which allows criminals to trade weapons anonymously. By instituting background checks for those seeking to anonymously purchase firearms at gun shows, we can make guns less accessible to criminals, and to violent youths.

Second, let's raise the minimum age for handgun purchases from 18 to 21.

Third, let's make sure that guns are childproofed at least as well as a bottle of aspirin—by requiring gunmakers to equip all guns with child safety locks.

And finally, let's show the American people that we're serious about stopping the illegal transfer of guns. I hope my colleagues will join Mr. WEXLER of Florida, myself, 95 other Democrats, and one Republican, Ms. MORELLA, in supporting HR 315—a bill which limits the number of handgun purchases to one per month.

Once again, I don't think that any law will ever be a complete solution. None of us do.

But we're not expected to always find the complete solution. We are here to do what we can to make this country better, safer, healthier, and more prosperous.

These sensible measures are steps in the right direction, steps down a right and sensible path.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will take these steps with us. Sooner rather than later.

Because this is an epidemic that waits for none of us. Every day we wait—thirteen more children die—another Columbine—every single day.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, these three measures that have passed the Senate are the beginning step in that area, so I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in this special order. I plead with the American public to call their Member of Congress, to call the Republican leadership, ask them to schedule these gun safety measures as soon as possible, to do it this week. We have a relatively clear calendar. It can all be passed and wrapped up before we go home for the Memorial Day break.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION CREATING PERCEPTION THAT ALL IS WELL IN THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we can only spin national security issues and concerns so long, and eventually the truth catches up to us. The truth is about to hit the fan this week in Washington on the national security concerns of this country.

For 7 years, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the rhetoric coming from the White House that the world is safe, there are no problems, our security is intact, and therefore, we can dramatically cut the size of our defense forces and we can, in fact, shift that money over to other purposes.

During the 7 years that that has occurred, Democrats and Republicans alike in this body and the other body have joined together to constantly remind the administration that things were not quite as good as they were being portrayed to the American people.

Unfortunately, we were not as successful as we would have liked. In fact, Mr. Speaker, State of the Union speech after State of the Union speech the President would stand before the American people and would talk about the economy, would talk about jobs, would talk about crimes domestically, but no mention of national security concerns. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this

past January, as I sat through the State of the Union speech in this very room, I timed the President's speech. He spoke for 1 hour and 17 minutes. The total amount of time he devoted to national security was 90 seconds, 90 seconds to talk about the problems we have with our relationship with China, 90 seconds to talk about the problems that are resulting from the economic instability in Russia, 90 seconds to talk about the proliferation that has now caused Iran and Iraq and Syria and Libya to begin to develop medium- and eventually long-range missile systems, 90 seconds to talk about the sabre rattling between India and Pakistan, 90 seconds to talk about the problems with North Korea, both our nuclear development program and their testing of long-range missiles which the CIA acknowledges now for the first time ever can actually hit the mainland of the U.S.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, during those 90 seconds, all the President did was point up to the gallery and praise one of our young pilots.

Mr. Speaker, support for our military is not when the commander in chief parades a group of soldiers down the White House lawn for a photo op, it is not when the commander in chief stands on the deck of an aircraft carrier and talks about the pride in our services while morale is reaching an all-time low. We have serious problems, Mr. Speaker, and this week, starting tomorrow, those problems are going to be made available for the American people to see firsthand.

Now, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we are aware that this administration has tried to create the perception, and with a great deal of success, that everything is okay in the world, all is safe, Russia is our new friend, China is our new friend and partner, we do not have to worry about the Balkans because we have got our troops deployed.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what has been occurring over the past 7 years with strong concerns expressed by both Democrats and Republicans alike in this body is that we have committed our troops to too many places in a short period of time to be effective in modernizing for the future and in protecting America's vital interests around the world.

I have used this comparison frequently, Mr. Speaker, and I want to use it again:

In the time period from the end of World War II until 1991, during the administration of all those Presidents in between, from Harry Truman through Democrat and Republican administrations ending with George Bush, all of those commanders in chief, as they have the ability to under our Constitution, deployed our troops a total of 10 times, 10 times at home and around the world. Some of those deployments were very serious, like Korea and Vietnam and Desert Storm.

Since 1991, Mr. Speaker, our current commander in chief has deployed our

troops 33 times, 33 times in 8 years versus 10 times in 40 years. Mr. Speaker, none of these deployments were paid for, none of them were budgeted for, none of these deployments had the administration asking the Congress to vote in support of the deployment before our troops were committed.

In the case of Bosnia, it was not that this Congress is isolationist. Nothing could be further from the truth. The problem in this Congress among Democrats and Republicans was why was America putting 36,000 troops into Bosnia when, for instance, Germany right next door, our friend and ally, was only committing 4,000 troops? It was a question of fairness. Why was America being asked in each of these 33 deployments to pick up an unusually large amount of the responsibility?

In Kosovo today, when we see the nightly news of the bombing raids the previous night, we see U.S. and British planes conducting the bulk of those air strikes. By law and by NATO's mandate, the U.S. is only supposed to provide 22 percent of the support for NATO.

□ 1945

So Members of Congress rightfully ask the question, where are the other NATO allies? Why is not Europe playing a larger role in these kinds of operations?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that was the reason why we passed the supplemental bill several weeks ago and just last week approved the defense authorization bill, calling for increases in funding to partially replace the funds that were siphoned off to pay for these 33 deployments, none of which were budgeted for.

When the President would commit our troops to, say, Bosnia or to Haiti, we would then have to find the money in our defense budget, taking it from other programs or from quality of life issues for the troops to pay the costs of these operations. The comptroller of the Pentagon estimates that that cost us \$19 billion over the past 7 years. In fact, Bosnia alone has already cost us close to \$10 billion. At a time where we have been convinced that the world is safe, partially because our troops are today at this time deployed all over the world, we have decimated our ability to prepare for the future in our military.

Some other things have occurred, Mr. Speaker, and I want to talk about them briefly.

First of all, this President, working along with Tony Blair from Great Britain, decided it was in the best interest of the U.S. and Britain, along with our NATO allies. And make no mistake about it, the bulk of NATO is decided by our President and Tony Blair, NATO really is dependent upon the leadership of the U.S. and Britain. I do not think Luxembourg would have much of a chance in stopping America from doing anything it wanted in terms of NATO. The decision to go into Kosovo was one

that required the debate and the consent of this body, but that was not to be.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, hindsight always being 20/20 we can now look back, as I have, and talk to some of our analysts in the intelligence operation, which I have. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have learned that every CIA Balkan analyst in the CIA, every one of them, unanimously, agree that an aerial attack on Serbia and Kosovo would not stop ethnic cleansing.

The CIA, for all of its faults, and I was as troubled by the bombing of the Chinese Embassy as anyone, but the CIA's analysts who are the experts on the Balkans told this administration that the bombing that we eventually got involved in would cause a massive problem of refugees. The CIA Balkan analysts told the administration that bombing would not work, would not stop the ethnic cleansing.

All of this was done prior to the administration's decision. In fact, there were documents internally within the intelligence community, submitted to the administration, outlining the CIA's concern that if the bombing took place it would cause a humanitarian catastrophe, and that is exactly what has happened. It is far worse than just the humanitarian catastrophe.

In fact, many of those analysts said that we actually contributed to the refugee crisis because when we bombed, it obviously caused the observers who were in the former Yugoslavia to leave that country, which then gave Milosevic a free hand to continue at a much higher level the ethnic cleansing and the significant attacks on innocent people.

So in effect, Mr. Speaker, what the intelligence community was saying to us as a Nation, prior to a decision to conduct the aerial campaign, was that if we went ahead, we would cause the situation to become much worse. That is exactly what has occurred.

We are now into our 60-something day of consecutive bombing and many in this body, having seen the fact that we do not have the dollars to put forward to pay for the Kosovo deployment, which is now in excess of probably \$2 billion, are now wondering what our strategy is to stop the bombing, what is our strategy to end the crisis. Since many of our colleagues, including myself, do not feel that we have a legitimate strategy to end the conflict, we wonder what the strategy is to win the conflict, because we are controlling what our military can and cannot do in Kosovo, in Serbia.

We are limiting the strikes. We never committed to a ground force. So the question we have to ask is, if we do not have a strategy to end the conflict, and if we do not have a strategy to win the conflict, what is our strategy? For many of us, there is no strategy, Mr. Speaker. It is just a continuing massive amount of aerial attacks that in many cases are harming innocent civilians.

Now, let me add further, Mr. Speaker, if we have to look at the situation in the former Yugoslavia and see what we have done, we can look certainly at three different things. We have now rallied all of the people in Serbia, many of whom were against Milosevic, many of whom are ready to try to remove him forcefully, we have managed to rally all of them in support of Milosevic as their hero.

We have managed to help cause an extensive increase in the refugee crisis, to the extent now that we have almost 1 million men and women and children in outlying regions around Kosovo, with no decent housing and no decent food and no timetable to return them to their country.

We have done something else, Mr. Speaker. We have managed to do what one colleague of mine from the Russian Duma told me the Soviet communist party could not accomplish in 70 years, after expending billions of dollars, to convince the Russian people that America was evil, that we really were designed as a nation to hurt innocent people. He said Russians are now convinced, after some 55 days of bombing, which it was when he was here, that this country really is evil. So we have managed to do in 55 days what the Soviet communist party could not accomplish in Russia in 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing ourselves long-term harm in our relationship with Russia. First of all, after starting the aerial campaign, we did not engage Russia. Now the administration would have us believe otherwise. There was no direct contact with Russia after Rambouillet until, in fact, a group of Russian pro-western parliamentarians contacted us in the Congress and said: You do not understand what you are doing. You are driving our party out of power. We who support strong relations with America, we who want to help you solve the proliferation problem in our country, we who want to get rid of the communists and the ultranationalists are being driven out because your policies in the Balkans are causing the Russian people to identify with the communists and the ultranationalists.

When the elections are held this year, if you continue this policy, you are going to drive Russia back into a Cold War era like we saw in the Soviet days.

Our policies in the Balkans are very much of a concern to me, not just because of the crisis being created with the Serbs and with the Kosovars and the refugees, but also because of the long-term implications in our relationship with Russia.

Now, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. Like all of our colleagues in this body, I abhor what Milosevic has done. He is a thug. He is a war criminal, and after this is over we need to proceed in convening a war crimes tribunal.

Our policies, Mr. Speaker, have not succeeded either. We need to have this administration understand that con-

tinuing a mistake is worse than trying to find an honorable solution. We have that opportunity.

As I said on this floor several times, 11 Members of this body, 5 Democrats and 6 Republicans, attempted to find common ground with members of the Russian Duma 2 weeks ago in Vienna. We found that common ground. In fact, the agreement that we reached became the basis for the G-8 accord that came out 5 days later, which the U.S. was a signatory of.

That agreement calls for a negotiated settlement along the lines of the five key NATO principles that our President has said are most important for us. Now is the time for us to use the leverage that we have and our NATO partners have and Russia has to convince Milosevic that he must come to the table on our terms.

I am not convinced our administration is still at this very moment doing enough to engage the Russians in applying the appropriate pressure to Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement that we reached in Vienna we brought back to Washington, we faxed to the 19 parliaments of all the NATO countries and we asked them to apply pressure to their governments, not to cave into Milosevic, not to hand him a victory but to say now is the time to use our leverage to get this crisis done at the negotiating table, which I am firmly convinced can occur.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we introduced a resolution in support of our framework agreement in the Congress 2 weeks ago, and held a congressional hearing in the Committee on International Relations last week on that resolution. The Duma, following our lead, did the same, and on Friday of last week the State Duma of the Russian Federation passed that document as a formal document on the floor of the State Duma.

We are now asking our leadership to work with us to accomplish a similar task, not because we are trying to embarrass the administration but because we understand the urgency of solving this crisis before any more lives are lost, before any more ethnic cleansing is done, before any more Americans are placed in harm's way. Now is the time for this administration to stand up and do what is right, and that is to bring Milosevic to the table and to do it directly, and to use the Russian leverage, which is considerable, in having Milosevic agree to the terms that we laid out with our NATO friends. This disaster is having a terrible effect on our long-term relationship with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, we were supposed to have on Thursday of this week the Russian parliamentarians come back to Washington for a public press announcement in support of the work that we are doing. Because of the press of business and the fact that we will break for the Memorial Day recess this week, they will be coming back the first full week in June.

Something else will happen tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. Two things of significant importance to all of our colleagues, which I hope our colleagues will convey to every constituent all across America. The first is, between 4:00 and 6:30 we will host probably one of the most investigative reporters on security issues in this city at a book signing ceremony in EF-100 of the U.S. Capitol building. Bill Gertz, who writes for the Washington Times, will be here to unveil to Members of Congress and our staffs his book entitled "Betrayal."

Every Member of Congress should read this book. In fact, it has hit the bestseller list in just the first week it was on the stands. Why is this book so important, Mr. Speaker? Because it details, in depth, an analysis of this spin on defense concerns in this country over the past 7 years.

In one chapter in this book Mr. Gertz goes into great detail to talk about an incident involving a Canadian and a U.S. military officer that were flying in a helicopter out in the Seattle area, when a Russian ship that was supposedly spying, pointed and fired a laser weapon at that helicopter. The laser beam hit our American officer in the eye and did permanent eye damage to him.

That incident, Mr. Speaker, if one reads the Gertz book, was covered up for 30 days. To this day, our government has never acknowledged that that Navy officer was hit deliberately by a Russian laser generator on a Russian vessel. We did not do the proper investigation. We did not hold the Russians accountable.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I am someone who spends a lot of time working on improving relations with Russia, but with Russia we have to understand one very basic tenet that Ronald Reagan knew very well. We must deal with the Russians from a position of strength, consistency and candor. When we are not candid with the Russians, when we do not call them when they violate treaties, when we do not ask them about things like Yamantau Mountain in the Urals where they are spending billions of dollars on a huge underground complex that we just do not know the purpose of, the Russians lose respect for us.

□ 2000

That is the problem this administration has with Russia. We were so concerned with not embarrassing Boris Yeltsin that we forgot over the past seven years that Russia had to be held accountable for those things it did that were in violation of arms control regimes, that were things that destabilized our relationship, and we are now paying the price for those policies.

A second chapter in Mr. Gertz's book deals with a letter that, up until this book, has been classified. The letter was sent and signed by President Bill Clinton to President Boris Yeltsin. Mr. Speaker, every one of our colleagues needs to read this letter because in the

letter our President tells Yeltsin, "Don't worry. Our policies will help you in your reelection effort."

We were so concerned about not doing anything to expose Russian problems for what they were that we even went to the length of ignoring reality. When the Russians transferred technology to Iran for the SHAHAB-3 missile, we ignored it. When we caught the Russians transferring accelerometers and gyroscopes to Iraq, we ignored it. We were afraid to do anything to expose violations because we did not want to embarrass President Yeltsin.

We are now paying the price for those policies, Mr. Speaker, and our national security has been harmed because of the absolutely overwhelming proliferation that has gone out from Russia to every destabilized country in the world, technology being used for missile proliferation, weapons of mass destruction, because we did not want to hold the Russians accountable for violations and for their lack of tight controls in terms of technology that could be used abroad. We are now paying the price for those policies, and Russia is a much more destabilized nation.

And now, because of the Kosovo conflict, we are backing Russia into a corner, and the pro-western leaders in Russia are saying we are going to hand Russia over to the Communists and the ultranationalists if we do not get our policy back together again.

The Gertz book documents these stories, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage our colleagues to stop by EF-100 tomorrow between 4 o'clock and 6:30 to meet Bill Gertz personally and get a copy of his book and to read for themselves the hard evidence.

In fact, I saw an article last week that the FBI may be considering actually pressing charges against Gertz for some of the revelations that he has exposed. It is an absolute shame and outrage when, in America, we have to have a reporter for a newspaper expose to us information that Members of Congress and the public should have a legitimate right to understand and know.

It reminds me of that famous national intelligence estimate that this administration spun out four years ago when the President said we have no need to worry about any long-range missiles hitting America for at least 15 years, when the CIA publicly put that document out and the President used that document to veto our defense bill. Three years later, after tremendous pressure from many of us in this room from both sides of the aisle, the CIA has now publicly reversed itself and has acknowledged that North Korea has a long-range ICBM today. That is the kind of spin that this administration has placed on national security issues for seven years, but now it is about to unfold.

Also tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, at 10:30 in the morning the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and nine members in total of the Cox com-

mittee, the Select Committee to look at technology transfer from the U.S. to China, which I was honored to be a member of, will issue our public statement.

For five months, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to get the administration to declassify the Select Committee's report, and for five months we have been stonewalled. Nine Members of Congress, five Republicans and four Democrats, very honorable people, met behind closed doors all during the breaks, all during the holidays from July through January 1 and 2 of this year.

Behind closed doors we interfaced with the FBI, the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency. We held hearings, we called witnesses in, and we said nothing on the record. In a bipartisan way we developed a document that resulted in 32 specific recommendations of how to deal with the tremendous amount of technology transfer that has occurred to the People's Republic of China. We looked at cases where there was espionage involved. We looked at cases where companies went too far and perhaps violated U.S. laws, and we looked at cases where our government relaxed our technology controls to allow Chinese companies to buy technologies that should not have been on the marketplace.

All of that information was summarized and by the first week of January of this year, our report was complete. With its 32 recommendations, all of which were classified, and with the volumes of data we had assembled, we sent the report to the administration and we asked the administration to look at our recommendations, to come back to us and begin a dialogue of how to protect our Nation's security.

What did the administration do? Mr. Speaker, as they have done for seven years, they spun America's national security. Instead of dealing with it up front, putting the report on the table, they leaked stories out.

One story that was leaked to the Wall Street Journal by the administration dealt with the Chinese acquiring our W-88 missile technology, or our nuclear warhead technology, not missile technology. And the reason why that was leaked is because that leakage occurred during a Republican administration.

Now, I can tell my colleagues that the members of the Select Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, were not looking at what administration was responsible for security breaches. We did not care whether it was Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter, whomever. Our job was to do the right thing for America.

But what did the administration do? They tried to spin it: "We will leak the story about the W-88 because of the press feeds on that, and they will think that is what the China Select Committee looked at, and that was done during a Republican administration," and as the administration tried to say, "Well, we corrected those problems." That was their initial spin.

Then they went to the business community and they said, "You have to understand what the Select Committee is doing. They are about ready to come out with a report that is going to lay all the blame at the feet of American industry," and that was not the case and is not the case, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am going to publicly say tomorrow, as I am saying tonight, that while there were some cases where American companies went too far, and there are criminal investigations of at least two of those companies under way right now, the bulk of the time American companies have done the right thing. They have wanted to abide by the law.

Now, the law has been changing. The regulations have changed. But it was not for us to blame only industry.

Mr. Speaker, the administration would also have some believe, through its spin efforts, that it is all the fault of China, and China is this bad country that has been able to use espionage to get access to technology that they should never have gotten access to. And in some cases, that is the story. We are currently seeing that with the story on our laboratories.

But, Mr. Speaker, how can we blame a country like China for buying technology if we as a Nation voluntarily allow that technology to be sold abroad? That is what has occurred over the past seven years. We allowed technology to be sold abroad that up until this administration was very tightly controlled and regulated, and was checked by a series of efforts within the intelligence community and the defense and State Department establishments to make sure that that technology would not enhance the capability militarily of a potential or current adversary. So blaming China alone is not going to be acceptable.

No, Mr. Speaker, the reason why, as we will see tomorrow, we have had such problems with our technology has, in my opinion, largely been the direct result of this government, our own government. We have sent the mixed signals. We have lowered the threshold. We have removed the whistleblowers. We have stopped people from doing their job. The question of why that occurred is something that needs to be explored. Our Select Committee did not look at that, but the problem of the technology being transferred is real.

For five months, Mr. Speaker, we have tried. Every one of the nine members of the Select Committee has tried to get this document out for the public to see. My comment was repeatedly, look, let us not have any more spin, just release the document and let the American people and the Members draw their own conclusions. It has taken us five months to make that happen. Tomorrow, that report will be released.

I can remember back to February 1, Mr. Speaker, and this is probably the best example I can give of the attempt

to spin this that I can think of. February 1, Sandy Berger, head of the National Security Council, issues a public response to selected media personnel in this city of the response of the administration to the 32 classified recommendations that we made in the Cox committee.

So in January we make our recommendations and we issue the report and it is all classified. Without discussing their actions at all with any member of the Cox committee, on February 1 Sandy Berger releases in a public format the White House's response to those 32 recommendations.

Now, if that was not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, two days later we have a Committee on National Security brief that is open to Members only. The brief is being given to us by the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet. When he is finished his brief about emerging threats and we get to the question and answer session, I ask the DCI, the Director of Central Intelligence, a question.

I said, "Mr. Tenet, you know that the China Select Committee one month ago issued its report, because we gave you a copy. You are the intelligence leader for our country. In that report we made 32 recommendations for changes, but we also reached a very simple unanimous conclusion, and that conclusion, Mr. Tenet, you know is that America's national security has been harmed in a significant way by technology transfers to China." I asked Mr. Tenet, "Do you agree with that assessment that the nine of us reached unanimously?"

This was his answer, Mr. Speaker, two days after Sandy Berger gave the media an unclassified response to our recommendations. George Tenet said, "Mr. Congressman, can I get back to you? I have not finished reading the report yet."

So here was the White House on February 1 issuing to selected media outlets unclassified response to a report that the Director of Central Intelligence two days later said he had not finished reading yet.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we have problems with our national security. Tomorrow, the American people get to see for themselves. They get to hear about the warheads and the technology that we have lost. They get to hear about the neutron bomb. They get to hear about technology involving our space launch capability. They get to hear about the MIRVing nuclear warhead. They get to hear about military-industrial technology, high-performance computers.

They get to hear about all of these things, and in the end, the administration is going to try to blame someone. They are either going to try to find a scapegoat within the administration who they can say caused these problems, as they are currently trying to do in the Department of Energy, trying to blame the labs, when some of the labs were doing an adequate job but

others were not; or they are going to try to blame someone up in the Cabinet who can be the fall guy or gal who takes the blame for what has occurred.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the blame for our security lapses, as Harry Truman said, started at the top where the buck stops. The administration sets the policy.

Now, some would say, well, the President cannot know everything, and this is true. Some of my CIA friends have told me that this is one of the first Presidents since Eisenhower who never sees the CIA's morning briefers, never sees them. He chooses not to see the briefers who are coming in to advise him of security concerns. The CIA does not even know if the President reads the daily brief provided to him. What the CIA analysts that I have talked to say is that they think that what Clinton gets is filtered through Madeleine Albright and Sandy Berger.

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a bad week in the history of America. The Kosovo crisis continues; Russia is being backed into a corner, to the point where they are now very antagonistic toward America; Bill Gertz comes out with a book called "Betrayal" which documents specific events that have occurred that have undermined our national security; and tomorrow, a select group involving nine Members of Congress, five Republicans and four Democrats, present a unanimous report and finding of what we found, that our national security has been harmed by our sale and transfer of technology to China.

Many Members are going to use this as a platform to jump all over China and blame the Chinese and say they are an evil nation. I am going to be one, Mr. Speaker, that stands up and says, let us pause a moment.

□ 1815

We need to engage China. Has China done some things that are wrong? Yes. We must deal with them. Does this mean we should isolate ourselves from China and consider all Chinese to be bad people? Absolutely not, because, in the end, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the bulk of the problems that we uncovered were caused by our own government. If we are stupid enough to allow another nation to buy sensitive technologies, then we cannot blame that nation. We blame our own policies that caused those technologies to be allowed to be sold for the first time.

In our testimony and in public statements that have been on the record, so I am not revealing any sensitive information, the first director of our Defense Technology Agency called DTSA, whose responsibility it was to monitor applications for technology sales abroad, and which was decimated during this administration, Steve Brian said that in 1996 China had zero high performance computers. None. These are the high end supercomputers, high performance computers in the 8 to 10,000 MTOPS range, very capable com-

puters that are only used for very elaborate research or for weapons design. China had none.

Only two countries were manufacturing those high performance computers at that time, the U.S. and Japan, and both of our countries had an unwritten understanding that neither would sell these high performance computers to those nations which were or could become potential adversaries of the U.S.

We relaxed our policy on exporting high performance computers, Mr. Speaker, and in two years, by 1998, China had acquired over 350 high performance computers.

Now, we were told the State Department would monitor where they were being used, but they did not do that, because China would not let our State Department monitor where these computers went. We know now that many of them are being used by organs of the People's Liberation Army. They are being used for their nuclear programs, and those devices came from this country.

Mr. Speaker, China did not steal those high performance computers; they bought them. They bought them because we changed our policies. We allowed Chinese entities to acquire technologies that up until the mid-1990s had been tightly controlled and monitored by those people who are watching out for our security concerns, now and in the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, by Thursday of this week I expect to unveil two new documents, documents which I have been working on with a small group of people for the past four months. These two documents will not just focus on the China Select Committee, but will go beyond that.

By Thursday of this week, it is my hope, if the graphic artists have completed the work, which I expect they will, to present two large charts, if you will, the visual presentation of what has happened in terms of technology transfer to China.

The first chart, Mr. Speaker, which I have a rough sketch of, will trace every front company and operative arm of the People's Liberation Army that tried to acquire and did acquire technology in America, who the leaders were, what their ties are and were, and how they were able to get the approval to buy technology that is very sensitive and is being used by the Chinese military today, most of it with the support of our government.

The second chart, Mr. Speaker, will be a depiction of a time-line, starting in 1993 and running through 1999. It will take every major technology area of concern that we have, encryption, high performance computers, military-industrial technology, space launch capability, nuclear weapons, it will take all of those technology disciplines and will track them through that 6 year time period, and it will list specific dates when actions took place in this administration to allow those technologies to

be transferred. Almost all of those actions were done voluntarily by our country.

Mr. Speaker, in the end we have got to understand that we are now going to begin to pay the price for 7 years of gloating over our economy, 7 years of gloating over what was supposed to be world security, 7 years of pretending Russia and China were not potential problems, and rather than being up front and candid and transparent with Russia and China, we glossed over problems. We pretended things were not happening. We told Yeltsin we would help him get reelected. We did not want to offend Jiang Zemin. In doing that, we gave away technology that America is going to have to deal with for the next 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans in this body and the other body have been together on national security concerns. Democrats and Republicans have worked hand-in-hand over the years in protecting America's security.

This battle, Mr. Speaker, is between the White House and the Congress. This White House has done things that this Congress has tried to stop and overturn.

Starting tomorrow and continuing through the next year and a half, until the presidential elections and both parties attempt to win the White House, the American people will have to judge as to whether or not our security has been harmed, how extensively it has been harmed, what is going to be the remedy for us to deal with these concerns that we have relative to technology flowing into hands that eventually could be used against America.

I want to caution our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, not to rush to snap judgments. We should not tomorrow when the China Select Committee reports come out and bash all Chinese citizens, or certainly not Chinese-Americans. Some of our most capable leaders in this country are Chinese-Americans. In fact, some of my best friends are Chinese-Americans, leaders in the academic world, the scientific world, the technology world. We must make sure that we let them know that they are solid Americans that we respect. We must not let this report come out and be an effort where Members of Congress come out and trash China and trash our relationship with those Chinese American leaders in our communities across this country.

The problem in the end, Mr. Speaker, is with us. It is within our own government. We should not try to find any scapegoats. We should not try to blame industry. We should not try to just blame the Chinese. We should not just try to blame any one group.

The bulk of the problems I think we will find were caused by our own actions, by our own decisions, to ease up on the control mechanisms, to make technology available for sale. This is not to say there are not cases of espionage, because there are, and they need

to be dealt with, as in our laboratories and the network that the Chinese established. But if we are foolish enough to allow China to set up front companies and buy technology from us, who is wrong? The Chinese, who are abiding by our laws and buying technology in many cases that we sell them, or are we at fault for loosening our controls and allowing them to buy these technologies?

The same thing is true with companies. American industry by and large wants to do the right thing, but if we send confusing signals, if we change the regulations, if we loosen up the standards, then most American industry should not be blamed when these very technologies are then sold abroad because we have allowed those practices to go on.

As I said earlier, there are companies that deserve to be investigated, and two are under criminal investigation right now. But I would hope tomorrow and for the rest of this week as we get ready to celebrate the Memorial Day holiday that we as a Nation step back and begin to seriously consider our national security.

It has not been a high focus for the past 7 years. We have been lulled into a false sense of complacency. The economy is going strong, people are working, inflation is low, unemployment is low, and we have been convinced that the world is safe. Now, all of a sudden, we wake up and see Russia backed into a corner, China involved in technologies that we never thought they should have, North Korea deploying long and short range missiles that now threaten not just our territories, but the mainland of the U.S., Iran-Iraq developing medium range systems with the help of Russia, India and Pakistan saber rattling with nuclear warheads and medium-range missiles.

Where did they get the weapons from, Mr. Speaker? Where? We saw China supplying Pakistan with the M-11 missiles. We saw China supplying Pakistan with ring magnets. We saw China supplying Pakistan with the technology for the nuclear furnaces. We saw Russia supplying India with technology.

Why are we surprised? All of a sudden we come with the realization, we have problems in the world, and we have not dealt with those problems in a fair, open and honest way, in spite of tremendous efforts by Republicans and Democrats in this body and the other body.

It is time to end the spin, Mr. Speaker. It is time for this administration to end the nauseating spin, the spin doctors at the White House, who want to spin everything, to make it look as if they have no role to play, just as they did when they lost the Congressional elections and did not want to accept any responsibility in the White House. It was all the fault of those Members of Congress who were out of touch.

It is about time this administration and this President understand that once in awhile he needs to accept the

responsibility for his actions and the collective actions of this administration.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share with the American people and the Members of the House a special order on Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

As many people know, and it is being widely celebrated in various communities throughout the Nation, May of every year is Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I want to thank the previous speaker for making a clear distinction between some of the problems and some of the issues concerning espionage and some of the security issues that we are currently experiencing. Mr. Weldon certainly is one of the body's leading experts on national security, and I serve with him on the Committee on Armed Services, and while we may not fully agree on some of the interpretations given to some of the challenges we face, we are certainly unanimous in the sense that all of this discussion should stay clear of any kind of aspersions cast upon the Asian-American community.

As chairman of the Asian Pacific American Caucus for the 106th Congress, it is my privilege and honor to try to bring to the attention of the body and the attention of the American people the multifaceted contributions of the Asian Pacific American community to American life and society.

As members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus tonight, my colleagues that will participate and I will use this opportunity to honor, remember and celebrate the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in our country.

In fact, it is important to note that over 65 Congressional districts have a population of at least 5 percent Asian Pacific Americans, and some 28 Congressional districts have over 10 percent Asian Pacific Americans in their home areas.

The history of APA month dates back to some legislation introduced by former representative Frank Horton from New York in 1978 establishing Asian Pacific American Heritage Week to draw attention to the contributions and to the conditions of this growing part of the American population. In 1990 the week was extended to a month, and it was not until 1992 that legislation was actually passed to make APA month a permanent occasion during the month of May.

This is supposed to be the time that America recognizes the heritage that the many communities which actually make up the rubric of Asian Pacific