

today's op-ed. "Injection drug users place themselves at great risk. A University of Pennsylvania study of Philadelphia injection drug users found that four times as many addicts died from overdose, homicide, heart disease, renal failure and liver disease as did from causes associated with HIV disease."

Dr. James Curtis, Director of Addiction Services at Harlem Hospital Center, explains, and this is a quote from him, "It is false, misleading and unethical to give addicts the idea that they can be intervenous drug abusers without suffering serious injury."

So, in fact, the myth that we have folks behind bars, and again I appreciate the sensationalism that Mr. Geraldo Rivera tries to provide, and some of it is entertaining, but we must deal with facts, particularly on such a serious subject as what is happening in our society as a result of illegal narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Rivera in his piece cited, and again from his transcripts, two women, and one with tears in her eyes testified that she had only been arrested this one time on drug trafficking and, in fact, I think she said she was duped, she claimed, into carrying a package of cocaine for a drug dealer. That was one case. The second lady, who had received a mandatory sentence, was there because she was dealing with four ounces of cocaine.

He also cited that most of the people in Federal prison were nonviolent offenders. Well, the facts are a little bit different, and I have cited this study, but a study just out from the New York State Commissioner of Criminal Justice reports that, in 1996, 87 percent of the 22,000 people in jail in New York for drug crimes were in for selling drugs or intent to sell. Of the 13 percent doing time for possession, 76 percent were arrested for selling drugs and pleading down to possession. The study further shows that the most convicted first-time drug offenders end up on probation or in treatment, again contrary to what this national report by Geraldo Rivera tried to portray. It just does not hold water.

In fact, at a recent hearing we held in the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, the drug czar from Florida, Mr. Jim McDonough, testified that in a thousand cases they looked at, only 14 out of the total were there for possession and, in fact, some of that may have been also watered down for other offenses.

The facts are that, in fact, virtually all convicted criminals who go to prison are violent offenders, repeat offenders or violent repeat offenders. It is simply a myth that our prison cells are filled with people who do not belong there or that we would somehow be safer if fewer people were in prison. A scientific survey of State prisoners conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice found that 62 percent of the prison population had a history of vio-

lence and that 94 percent of the State prisoners had committed one or more violent crimes or served a previous sentence of incarceration or probation.

The New York study that we cited last week and again tonight was interesting. It was a rather in-depth study, and it showed that in New York, for example, one really had to work at it to be incarcerated in prison, and that no one was there just for a minor offense or for even for a first-time felony.

In California, the 1994 prison population rose to 125,000 inmates. Numerous experts and journalists insisted the State's prisons were overflowing with first-time offenders and harmless parole violators. The results of another study, this California Department of Corrections analysis of randomly selected felony offenders admitted to the state's prison and classified as nonviolent, reveals that 88.5 percent of these offenders had one or more prior adult convictions. The average number of prior convictions was 4.7. A fifth of these so-called nonviolent felons had been committed to prison once or twice before.

There is study after study to refute what Geraldo Rivera would try to lead the American people and the Congress to believe. A 1996 study of individuals in prison in Wisconsin found that about 91 percent of the prisoners had a current or prior adult juvenile conviction for a violent crime. About 7 percent of the prisoners were in for drug trafficking. None were sentenced solely for possession or as a drug user, and fewer than 2 percent were first-time drug or property offenders. Prisoners served less than half their sentence time behind bars, and 82 percent were eligible for discretionary parole within a few years.

So the facts are not as presented, again sensationally, by Geraldo Rivera. They do show a different picture, if we just take a few minutes to look at them.

According to a study published in the Journal of American Medical Association last year, nondrug users who live in households where drugs, including marijuana, are used, are 11 times as likely to be killed as those living in drug-free households. Drug abuse in a home increased a woman's risk of being killed by a close relative some 28 times.

So, again, the myths that were portrayed in this presentation tried to make us feel warm and fuzzy about releasing folks into the population.

□ 2310

I do not want to say that we do not need to treat folks in prison and I think a very good case could be made for that, but we must have effective treatment programs, not only in prison but also for other individuals, such as those portrayed, those individuals such as the young woman who was on drugs, as a young man who went back to drugs. We must work together to find solutions to this incredible problem

facing our society but we must also not just listen to the Geraldo Riveras but to the facts about drugs and illegal narcotics and their impact on our society.

#### CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, by the end of July, the Congress will again vote on most-favored-nation status, that is, granting this special status to the People's Republic of China. This is the 11th year in which I will have voted on this issue, and this time, however, it will be called, instead of MFN, most-favored-nation status, it will be called NTR, normal trade relations.

Every year, as the Communist Chinese refuse to lower their huge tariffs on American exports, goods that in fact make it impossible for us to have a trade balance with them and we end up with, every year, even though we vote most-favored-nation status, they keep those huge tariffs on our goods while their goods can flood into our country at very low tariffs and thus we end up every year with a huge deficit in our trade balance with the Communist Chinese and they have a huge surplus, 60, \$70 billion worth of surplus.

So what are we doing? Why are we doing this year after year after year when the final result is always that they maintain high tariffs against our products while we permit their products to flood into our markets? What is going on here? Is that something that is good for the United States of America? Is it good for us to have an unfair trading relationship with the world's worst human rights abuser? Of course we are being told that if we do this, other things will happen, like, for example, not only will they lower their tariffs eventually, but eventually they will liberalize their country and become more democratic.

Of course, we have not seen any evidence of that at all. There has been no evidence that they are reforming in terms of opening up their markets to our people who would like to sell our products there and there is no evidence that they are becoming more liberal or that there is less oppression in Communist China.

The difference between this year's vote and past years when we voted on this will be that Congress is voting most-favored-nation status, or, I should say, normal trade relations status and we are granting that to the Communist Chinese, not only knowing that it is not lowering their tariffs and their trade barriers to our products coming in while they exploit our own, putting our people out of work with cheap products, of course, again knowing that it is not having any impact on liberalization, in fact it is more repressive now in Communist China than it

was 10 years ago. There was an opposition 10 years ago. Now there is none. There are no free newspapers, opposition party or anything such as that. No, but we have known that all along. What is the difference this time is that we are doing this this year, Congress will be voting on this issue this year knowing, thanks to the Cox Committee and the New York Times and the Washington Times that the Beijing dictatorship is at this moment now beginning to produce nuclear weapons based on technology that it has stolen from us.

So here we are about to vote to grant this trading status, normal trading relations with Communist China, this Communist dictatorship, knowing that at this very same moment they are beginning to go into production on the first generation of weapons of mass destruction that have been improved and made possible and their delivery made more reliable and more certain by U.S. technology. These weapons of mass destruction, which will soon be able to incinerate any city in the United States, will be delivered by a new generation of Chinese rockets that have been made, as I say, more reliable and more deadly by American corporations and scientists working on either our government's payroll or working on the payroll of these huge American corporations. But, of course, the technology that they are giving and bestowing on the Chinese to make their rockets more reliable and more effective, this is deadly weapons technology which cost us, the American taxpayer, tens of billions of dollars to develop over the Cold War. They taxed it from our pockets in order to protect our country. We were told we were doing this in order to make our country more secure. But instead, this technology has been used and when we vote for normal trade relations with Communist China, we will now do so knowing that our relations with Communist China have not made it better for us economically in terms of the trade barriers are still there, it has not made China any freer but that they have actually, on top of all of these things, managed to upgrade their rockets, upgrade their capabilities with this technology, billions of dollars of technological secrets from the United States, and, of course, the rockets are loaded with their most deadly weapons, weapons beginning to be built based on the technology again that they got from the United States. In that case they stole it from us.

Of course we are being told that our trade relationship with Communist China is mutually beneficial. It is a mutually beneficial relationship. That means it must be good for us in some way, as well as for the Chinese people in some way. Well, it is not good for the Chinese people. It is good for their clique that holds power with an iron fist in China beating down all opposition. And it is good for a few billionaires here in the United States—I call them Bill's Billionaire Buddies—but it

certainly is not making China any less a threat to the peace and it certainly is not making our country any more prosperous, and even though China supposedly is more interdependent on us now, they do not seem to be any less belligerent, hostile and aggressive than they were 10 years ago. Yet every year, 50 and \$60 billion in hard currency, because we have molded the relationship with Communist China, these are the rules we have set down. The leaders of the United States of America have determined what the rules of the game are. They have sat down with the Communist Chinese, their bosses in Beijing, and said, we agree to these rules of the game. And at the end of the year, the Communist Chinese gangsters who run that country, they earn and they have to play with \$60 billion in hard currency.

So any talk about human rights and all these other things that are paraded up and down like the administration will suggest they believe in these things, the Communist Chinese dictators know that that is a lot of baloney, because if we really meant that we supported democracy and human rights or we were really concerned about the massacres in Tibet or the massacres of Muslims in the far western reaches of their country, we would be changing the rules of the game so that the Communist Chinese would not end up with these tens of billions of dollars of hard currency.

They laugh at us. They think that it is a big joke. They think that our leaders do not believe in a darned thing and that human rights is nothing more than sloganeering; and that when this Congress again votes for most-favored-nation status or, as it is called now, normal trade relations, we too will be confirming for these dictators in Beijing, the world's worst human rights abusers, the people who now are using our technology to aim weapons at our cities that could potentially incinerate our populations, they know that we are still if we bestow on them this status, that Congress itself does not care enough about these violations in order not to vote to change the system that is working against us.

□ 2320

Yes, in this hall all of us, all of my colleagues, we will all vote on this issue, and it will be a message to those Chinese dictators, and unfortunately it will be a message to the people of China. What is really unfortunate is that the people of China are America's greatest allies. Those people who are now trying to defend their horrendous actions in supporting the Communist Chinese dictatorship are doing everything they can to try to divert the argument by claiming that this is in some way anti-Chinese.

Those of us who are concerned about Communist Chinese power and what the economic relationship and what the other relationships we have had with the Communist Chinese have done

to our country, we are, we are not in any way condemning the people of China. The people of China live under a Fascist like dictatorship. We cannot blame them, and in fact they are our greatest allies; we are on their side.

What we want is freedom for those people in China, and when China has a democracy and the people of China are able to choose their own leaders and demand honest government and demand humane government and demand a government that respects the rights of people and does not waste their money on militarism and weapons systems, then China will no longer be a threat to the world; China will be a friend.

In fact, if China had a democratic system now like Great Britain or Italy or Japan or other countries like that, we would not even be concerned that perhaps they would learn some of our nuclear weapon secrets. We would not care because it was a democratic, peace loving country. No, those people who are arguing that there is some kind of racism behind this are trying to deflect criticism, trying to deflect those who would unravel this mystery that has been left behind of what our policy is all about and why we have a policy that is so demonstrably against the economic and security interests of our country and of the Western World.

Tonight I hope to convince anyone willing to listen that our trade relationship with Communist China is wrong. It is not working for the benefit of the American people, and it is not making China more open, nor is it making it more democratic. It is not making peace more likely, and in fact our China policy is merely filling the bank accounts of a new class of billionaires, both billionaires here and billionaires there.

You have Chiang's cronies, his crony comrades, and Bill's billionaire buddies. At the same time, this perverted process bolsters the military might and economic power of, as I say, a nation that is controlled by a militaristic dictatorship that is the planet's worst human rights abuser, a government that is engaging in genocide in Tibet and has recently obliterated any organized political opposition among its massive population. It is a ruthless government that even while modernizing its military is already bullying its neighbors, and let us remember this when we are talking about China:

We just spent tens of billions of dollars in the Balkans in order to save those people in Kosovo who were under the threat of genocide. Yet China, Communist China, is committing that same kind of genocide on the people of Tibet. They are committing similar genocide, and we are conducting, we do not know what is going on right now, but in the far reaches of western China against their Muslim population. But the people of Tibet continue to face this brutality in an attempt to wipe their culture off the face of the map. But yet when it comes to China, we

have policies that encourage American businessmen to invest in China, building up their industrial capabilities while a reaction in Serbia and in Kosovo is to basically declare war on Serbia.

Now let me just say for the record I did support the Kosovars' right to freedom and independence, and I thought we should have armed the Kosovars and recognized their independence. I think that the people of Tibet and other people in the world have that right, but the United States, and now I am not advocating that we go into Tibet and go into these countries around the world where they do have people who are being oppressed like this, but we should always side with people who are being oppressed by dictatorial regimes, by monstrous dictators like Mr. Milosevic.

Mr. Milosevic is a Serbian dictator, and we have put a price on his head. At the same time we are shaking hands with the monsters in Beijing who have committed bloody crimes that are at least on the scale of Mr. Milosevic, and we are setting up a trading system which will be reaffirmed by a vote on Most Favored Nation status, normal trade relations, that will in the end result in tens of billions of dollars, \$60 billion of hard currency at the end of the year, at the end of the accounting, will be in their hands because of the rules that we have set up.

This makes no sense. It is contrary to the principles of our country, it is contrary to the values of our people, and worse than that, it is contrary to our national security interests. It is contrary to the safety, it undermines the safety of each and every person who lives in the United States of America, and we have seen that because they are taking that money and modernizing their weapon systems and using technology that they have stolen from the United States and that they have used to lure American businessmen into giving them to enable them to have rockets and missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction capable of incinerating millions of Americans that they would never have had in 20 or 30 years from now if it was not for the help that we were giving them and the relationship that we have established with this incredibly nonsensical, idiotic trade relationship.

Dealing with China today is reminiscent to the threat that the world faced from the emerging Japanese military power in the 1920s. It is almost *deja vu*. As Yogi Berra said, it is *deja vu* all over again. Think about the 1920s. We are now in a period of prosperity as we were in the 1920s, and there was a new power emerging in the world, but yet the United States did not feel that it could focus on that power, and in fact in Europe where Adolf Hitler just a few years later would emerge, the Japanese were ahead of Hitler. We ignored that threat as well because by the time that threat happened things were too ominous for us. And in the 1920s, we had a

country, the Japanese empire; it was run by thugs, it was run by gangsters, these people who brutally beat up and murdered anybody who believed in democracy in their country, and there was a bit of a power struggle there with people who wanted to go toward the west in Japan in the early 1920s who were murdered and suppressed. We saw that happening. The thugs that ran Japan in the 1920s believed in racial superiority.

□ 2330

They are perceived that they had an historic right to dominate Asia and the Pacific; and, of course, they saw something else. The Japanese realized that the United States was the only country capable of standing between their goals of domination of Asia and the Pacific and that we were the only country, the courage of our people was the only thing, that could stop them from expanding their brutal regime and its control to all of Asia and the Pacific basin.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that that is the kind of threat that we face now in Asia. It is not the 1920s, but there is a regime that is run by gangsters and dictators, thugs, people who are murdering their opposition, people who hate the West and hate everything that we stand for, people who believe that they are racially superior, people who believe that they have an historic right to dominate all of Asia and the Pacific basin. This country, of course, that I am referring to is Communist China.

Communist China, again, if it was a democracy, would be no problem. This would be an era of hope. It would be an era of incredible opportunity for all humankind if China would be ruled by democracy rather than ruled by gangsters and thugs who commit heinous crimes to maintain their power and stand for everything that we oppose.

Yes, just like with Japan, the Communist Chinese regime understands that only the United States has the power to stand between them and their goals; and their goal in Communist China today, their goal is to dominate all of Asia, all the way from Central Asia, where I predict soon we will see a massive influx of Chinese into the sparsely populated Central Asian republics. We will see territorial claims made there and claims on Siberia and Mongolia and Manchuria, and we will see claims as we have already seen of the Communist Chinese, rights to dominate all of Southeast Asia down through Burma and Cambodia and, yes, our great ally, Thailand. The communists in Vietnam, that dictatorship, is frightened to death.

We see that the Communist Chinese are trying to expand their area of domination. They now have taken over small islands very close to the coastline of the Philippines. The Philippines, one of our great allies, a country struggling to be democratic, a country that has such close ties with the United States, a country that has a

free press and freedom of religion, a country that represents the type of democratic reform and economic progress and the attempts by their new president to uplift the poorest of the poor in the Philippines, these people are trying their hearts out, they are doing everything they can to uplift their country only to be confronted with a militaristic threat of Communist China on their doorstep, where the Spratly Islands now, which are only 100 miles off their shore and 800 miles off the shore of Communist China, the Communist Chinese have come in and occupied some of those islands and built fortifications and stationed war ships in the lagoons; this to a practically demilitarized Philippines.

This kind of bullying cannot be ignored. We ignored it when the Japanese did this during the 1920s, and it led to a war that cost millions of lives.

Today we still have a chance to try to change that. We sold the Japanese during this time airplane designs. We sold them fuel. We sold them metal. We had quite a trading relationship with them. In fact, Germany with all this talk about how free trade and interactive trade is going to make somebody less aggressive, totally was interactive economically with the rest of Europe. We even had exchange programs with the Japanese. We let the Japanese militarists study our systems up close. There were military exchanges. We actually gave Japanese military officials the right to look at our military bases and talk to us about our military tactics and have interaction with our military in the 1920s.

Of course, the Japanese thought we were weaklings. Their reaction to our openness was not, oh, my, the Americans then are not really our enemy. Instead, the Japanese militarists were saying what weaklings these are, because we were dealing not with a democratic regime that would have looked at that as a friendly gesture but a dictatorship, tough guys running a country, and that is what we have in China today.

They interpret our willingness to have these same type of military exchange programs, our willingness to let Communist Chinese scientists come into our laboratories, our willingness to permit a trade relationship to continue that gives them \$60 billion a year of hard currency, they look at that as weakness. They do not look at that as being friendship.

I went to the Spratly Islands. I went there. The State Department did everything they could to prevent me from going there, and I went with a member of my staff, Al Santoli, and a couple of other Americans, with a couple of Filipino legislators, and we flew right over the Spratly Islands and saw them building those fortifications. Our government, the State Department, tried everything they could do to prevent me from getting there so that I could not explain that to the American people and take the pictures that would open up this debate.

I have also led the congressional opposition to what I consider the mind-boggling military exchange program that we have had between the Pentagon and the Communist Chinese. This year, the so-called game plan for military exchanges included Communist Chinese officials attending workshops or seminars on supplies, how to supply their army and do so effectively, on logistics, on special operations, on military strategy. This was part of the Clinton administration's game plan for how we were going to interact with the Communist Chinese military. It included letting the Communist Chinese attend sophisticated air and naval war games as well as observing our elite 82nd Airborne Division at its paratrooper training operations at our National Training Center in California.

Now, this was part of the administration's game plan for this year, despite the fact that the administration already knew that the Communist Chinese had a major espionage effort that had stolen our most sacred secrets, our most well-kept secrets on nuclear weapons. They knew the Communist Chinese had come into possession of nuclear weapons secrets that had cost us tens of billions of dollars and were upgrading their rockets and upgrading their weapons systems based on this technology. But yet they went right ahead to plan this military exchange program as if there was nothing wrong.

Yes, well, something is wrong. Something is wrong all right. Something is terribly wrong here in Washington. And despite the revelations of Chinese weapons espionage, the espionage at our weapons laboratories, a Chinese delegation, now this is after we have known all about how the Chinese have managed to get their hands on some of this technology that eventually came from our weapons laboratories, this administration still had scheduled a Chinese delegation to visit Sandia National Nuclear Weapons Laboratory in New Mexico.

□ 2340

All of these exchange programs with the military even went there. First of all, what I want to know is why any potential hostile power to the United States has its scientists roaming around our laboratories in the first place. But now we are being told even after the administration knew that they had stolen these secrets, secrets that could put in jeopardy or are putting in jeopardy, these secrets are putting in jeopardy the lives of tens of millions of Americans, they are still moving forward with this, blase, blithely moving forward and blithely, again, coming to Congress asking us, forget all about that, forget about all the security stuff, go ahead and grant most-favored-nation status, normal trade relations with the communist Chinese as if none of that has taken place.

We have learned a lot of this since last year. For 10 years we have been

voting to grant this. If Congress votes again to do this, it will do so knowing these revelations, knowing about these revelations of this espionage and about how damaged our national security has been.

Of course, we are being told that China is being liberalized by our trade. Let us just tackle that question, is China actually being liberalized because we are trading with them? And by the way, no one is talking about cutting off trade. We are just talking about not granting them the same trade status we would to a democratic society.

During this time when we have granted this vicious dictatorship the same trading status we would to Italy, Belgium, or England, we have found that they were going in the opposite direction. There is no more opposition in China. They are either in their Lao Gai prison camps or they are in exile or they have been murdered.

Ten years ago there was an opposition. Tibet is still being destroyed. There is still genocide going on. In fact, the World Bank, supported by our tax dollars, is thinking about spending \$100 million in order to help transport regular Chinese people into the territory where Tibetan people live. Gee, thanks. Our taxpayers are even subsidizing the genocide.

There is no free press in China. There has been no evolution towards a free press.

Now the Chinese, of course, are insisting that we register religious people. If you just register these religious people, they will be free to practice their religion. We have heard that before. Did we not hear that in Germany in the 1930s, if the Jews just register, everything will be okay? We have seen this in the past in China, where people were lured out into the open, and then a few years later when the hammer came down, they were arrested and they were slaughtered.

Anybody suggesting, and this goes for Billy Graham or whoever else is trying to convince Christians to register in China, should be ashamed of themselves because they are not reading history and they are giving the benefit of the doubt to this bloody regime, and they in the end will cost the lives of these believers.

Of course, they also have forced abortion, which continues unabated, and we have seen no development of an independent judiciary. In fact, the President of the United States, for us to vote on most-favored-nation, for it to be granted, I should say normal trade relations, the President has to certify every year that there has been some progress made toward these democratic goals, that human rights are being more respected.

Is there any evidence of that at all? No. The only evidence is that the President is not taking that job seriously when it comes to certifying that there has been human rights progress. I think that is the most charitable way

that I can put this, because he certifies that there has been progress made in China on human rights when all of this bloody repression goes on.

This trade relationship has, as I say, resulted in this annual trade surplus for the communist Chinese. We are being told if you believe in free trade, you have to believe in this. You have got to support it, because after all, you are for free trade. That is one of the reasons we have been having some good times here in the United States is because we have free trade.

I have three words for that: Baloney, baloney, baloney. We are not talking about free trade here. Free trade is something that is mutually beneficial. We have already demonstrated that this is not mutually beneficial trade, it is going to help the clique that runs communist China who are billionaires, and a few of our billionaires. It is trade that is manipulated by this powerful and ruthless and calculating communist Chinese regime.

On our side, of course, we do have these multinational corporations who have shown us just how loyal they are by taking their first chance. Whenever they can get away with doing it, they will bestow upon the communist Chinese weapons and technology that could very well end up killing Americans, and they know darned well that that is the risk of what is happening, but they are eager to make a buck, a very quick buck.

These multinational corporations, and by their very nature, multinational means they end up with the flag of the United States not even sometimes being flown outside. Sometimes they will fly the U.N. flag or whatever.

Then of course we have a clique of billionaires who also are benefiting, because we have set up this system so it not only provides the communist Chinese with \$60 million in hard currency, we have set up a system that subsidizes businessmen when they decide to close up a factory in the United States and open it up in China; in other words, building the industrial capacity and technological capacity of this vicious dictatorship.

That is what this vote, by the way, is all about. It is not about the ability of American corporations to sell American products in Communist China. It is not about that at all. If we do not grant most-favored-nation status or normal trade relations, as they now call it, it will not deny any American businessman the right to sell over there. The only difference is whatever business he does in Communist China will have to be done at his or her own risk.

By granting most-favored-nation status, we are permitting these businessmen to obtain loans that are subsidized or guaranteed by the American taxpayer through the Export-Import Bank, through OPEC, through IMF, World Bank, Asian-Pacific bank, all kinds of things. There are so many of

these institutions out there that we do not even know about, but of course if we do not grant them official status, they will not get these guaranteed loans or these subsidies. And thus, by voting on "free trade," what we are really doing is subsidizing businessmen for closing jobs here and closing factories here which will only make them 5 or 6 or 7 percent, because they have competition and environmental laws and things like that that they have to deal with here; but instead, it permits them to have it guaranteed in order to set up a factory over in a Communist dictatorship, taxing our people in order to guarantee the loans so the guy will set up a factory providing jobs in Communist China which will eventually put our people out of work over here.

Almost none of the trade we are talking about with Communist China is where we are selling refrigerators or selling some product that is manufactured here, because the Chinese erected all these barriers that we cannot get through. When they talk about business with China, what they are really talking about is American companies going over there and setting up factories for production in China.

Does that make any sense? This is not good for the United States of America, it is not good for our people, especially when it is a dictatorship.

On top of that, we have other countries that are democratic countries, even in Indonesia now, where they actually are trying to have democracy after 20 years, and I think they have a real chance if we get behind them and try to help establish the democracy in Indonesia. They have such a corrupt, terrible dictatorship now the Indonesian people have risen up. Let us try to help them and the Philippines.

But certainly, why should we do that, why should we encourage people to invest in a Communist dictatorship, instead of the Philippines or these other countries? What is happening is we have some very powerful interests in the United States of America who are making big bucks off short-term profits, and it is done at the expense of our country, at the expense of the economic well-being and the expense of our national security.

These people are having a tremendous impact. They are in fact doing everything they can to ensure that this system continues.

Today we heard evidence at the Committee on Science. It was a report given to us by former Senator Rudman, who gave us a report on the security situation of our national labs, which he had been studying for several months.

He verified a story that recently ran in the New York Times just a few days ago that the White House actually knew of the Chinese espionage that we have been talking about tonight, that the White House was made aware of this in 1995.

□ 2350

This was Senator Rudman today verifying that fact. This is a full year

before what we have been told now. Up until now the White House has always told us, remember, like there were only going to be a few FBI files and it turned out to be hundreds of FBI files? The White House until now has told us they did not know about it until 1996. That was bad enough. Now we find out they were actually alerted to this in 1995, and Senator Rudman's report condemned the administration for not treating this information with the due diligence that it deserved.

What Senator Rudman did not put in his report was what happened to those loyal watchdogs who warned the White House of this communist Chinese espionage at the Department of Energy that resulted in their ability to operate their nuclear weapons systems and their rockets. What Senator Rudman did not put in his report was that Notra Trulock, who was someone who was overseeing security at the Department of Energy, tried to warn the administration and was demoted and was castigated and was attacked and almost thrown out of a job. What we did not hear about was Ed McCallum, Chief of Security at the Department of Energy, who warned the administration that something terrible was happening and that we had to look at the security issues, and right now he has been put on administrative leave because they went digging and digging until they could find something on that man to try to hurt him for alerting us to that information. Victor Reis, Victor Reis, who today Senator Rudman applauded for his diligence, an assistant secretary, one of the shining lights of responsibility at the Department of Energy, was fired just this week from the Department of Energy. Three people trying to warn America, watchdogs, trying to scream out, "danger, danger," and instead what are they given for their diligence, for their hard work and loyalty to this country? They are beaten up, they are cast off out of their jobs, their families are put in jeopardy of losing everything. These are civil servants. This is a pattern of abuse, it is a pattern of abuse of these contentious watchdogs, and it is beyond imagination that this administration has been doing this, and we just sit by and let it happen.

These watchdogs warned us that the communist Chinese were acquiring these deadly weapons which put Americans in jeopardy by the tens of millions, and for it they were fired, they were demoted, attacked, humiliated, their families' lives were put in jeopardy in terms of their income.

This is a pattern by this administration of coverup, of deceit and betrayal. This cannot happen. We cannot let this happen.

Ronald Reagan once said that there is nothing that is wrong with the United States Government that cannot be cured by one good election, and we just need, and I am not talking about Republicans or Democrats, I am saying we need to elect people with integrity,

we need to elect people who are honest. We need to elect people whose main loyalty is to the people of the United States of America, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

We may disagree about what direction, but we have been tied to some billionaires who are making money in China even though it is not in the interests of our country. We have got to change that. We have got to change that right here in Congress.

We are going to vote on that very shortly. There will be a vote sometime before the end of July. But, like anything else that we can accomplish, we cannot just do it here. We need the American people to be involved. If anybody is listening to this presentation or reading it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who thinks that, well, we can just leave it up to the politicians, see how bad all the politicians are, no. If the American people do not act, our country is going to go to hell in a hand basket, and we are already halfway there. Our security, tens of millions of our citizens, hundreds of millions of our citizens now are at risk from weapons systems that came from our own technology development, that were taken from us and are now aiming in our direction.

We have got jobs that are being taken away, plants being closed here, and we are subsidizing jobs being created in communist China, so when they build these new factories over there, they are doing so with guarantees for money that is taxed from us.

We have to end this policy, that gives them a \$60 billion surplus which they can use to modernize their weapons systems and terrorize their neighbors and brutalize their own people. But we need the American people to be active. The American people must express their will, and that means each and every American, veterans organizations. Anyone who is part of a veterans organization should be making sure that in this July 4th recess, when we go back, and we are leaving Friday for a full week back in our districts, every Congressman should be contacted by their veterans, by religious organizations concerned about the oppression that is going on of religious believers in China, labor unions that know this relationship, where we are building factories over there to compete with our own jobs there, that is wrong.

We have got to make sure people who believe in human rights are concerned about China's domination of Burma. We had a gentleman here talking about the drug problem before I got up. Yeah, where do those drugs come from? A lot of that heroin comes from Burma. And who controls Burma but the communist Chinese, in a bloody deal with that dictatorship called the SLORC dictatorship. They have given them the weapons they need, and they are slowly but surely turning Burma into a vassal state and taking their teakwood and opium and selling it on the world market. No one wants to talk about that. Oh, you can't prove that.

Where does it go? How does it get past, if the communist Chinese dominate that part of the world? We need people who are concerned about the people of the United States and our safety, about people in our military who are going to be facing technology, facing technology that was developed in the United States and then it might end up killing Americans.

When I was a young boy my father was a United States Marine. I lived in Japan with him, and he flew missions, they were spy missions along the coast of Japan. He told me he would fly at very low altitude taking pictures, and they would take pictures of the coastline to see if anything was going on on the communist coastline that could threaten Japan, Korea or Taiwan. There were a group of men that did this.

We lived in this little enclave of American families, and one day one of those men was shot down. That is when I was 10 years old. I still remember the tears of my young playmates and the fear in the eyes and the sorrow in the eyes of the wife of this pilot who lost his life defending his country, and I do not remember his name. I bet nobody remembers his name. But he gave his life defending this country against communist Chinese aggression.

I will tell you something else my father did. There was one of the things he did in the Marine Corps, he really did not have a major career, he was there for 23 years, but one thing he did was develop the Navy way of dropping the atomic bomb.

It was like this. It is sort of a maneuver where the plane goes down, and it can be with a fighter bomber. It lofts the bomb as the plane goes off this way. It permitted our aircraft carriers to become strategic weapons.

During that process, my dad told this idea to the commanding officer, and he was immediately given a squadron and told with all speed get this done. Develop this. It will change the formula of the Cold War and make your country safer, because we will have a better balance of these nuclear weapons.

My dad went out and he pushed these pilots in this squadron, and they knew what they were doing. They knew they were trying to protect our country, and four of them lost their lives during that time period of six months where they were pushing the envelope to try to figure out how to develop this new weapons system, this nuclear weapons system, in order to protect our country.

My mother told me of how they and my father had to go to a family, to a wife who was waiting for her husband, and her husband had died in a crash that night. It was their first wedding anniversary. She was never told why her husband died, because it was top secret that he was developing this new way of delivering this bomb.

People have died to protect this country. I do not remember the name of that woman or those four men who

gave their lives or even the father of the playmates that I used to be with who died, but we owe it to them to keep our country safe and secure and not to let these secrets go to our enemies, not to let weapons that can shoot down our own pilots get into the hands of the enemy or weapons that could incinerate us. This is obscene. This is an obscene betrayal of our country. Most-favored-nation status is at the heart of it, because it tells the Chinese communists we do not care.

Well, I hope that you will visit your Congressman and you will visit anyone who will listen and make your voice heard at the 4th of July parade, saying no most-favored-nation status for communist China. Democracy for China. Then this government will listen and we can save America and save freedom and save the peace of the world.

#### TRIBUTE TO DONALD R. POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Napolitano) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in praise of Mr. Donald R. Powell, a distinguished public servant in my 34th Congressional District in California, who is retiring as City Manager of Santa Fe Springs, California after an illustrious career spanning 33 years of service.

Don Powell's stellar performance in local government has made him a recognized leader in the field of public administration. He is the recipient of numerous awards and commendations including the prestigious Mark E. Keane Award for Managerial Excellence, which was presented to him last year by the International City/County Management Association.

Don Powell also served our nation as a Captain in the United States Air Force, during which time he received a commendation for operational improvements to the Bangkok Aerial Mail Terminal. Don is graduate of Whittier College and holds a masters degree in International Public Administration from the University of Southern California.

Don Powell's career with the City of Santa Fe Springs began in 1966 as an Administrative Intern. His outstanding service was recognized as he rose through the administrative ranks to take the helm as City Manager in which he has excelled for the past nineteen years. Don's vision, tenacity, skill and managerial excellence helped transform a small town dominated by oil fields and smoke stack industries into one of the most vibrant and prosperous contemporary business communities in Southern California. He was able to achieve this tremendous example of suburban renewal while carefully balancing fiscal responsibility with a deeply abiding respect for the rich historical and cultural heritage of the city.

I have known Don Powell for over thirteen years, since my own service as a City Councilmember and Mayor of the neighboring city of Norwalk, California which borders Santa Fe Springs to the south. I have greatly admired Don Powell's professionalism and unsurpassed level of personal commitment to the

City of Santa Fe Springs, neighboring cities in Los Angeles County, the State of California and to the profession of public service.

Don Powell leaves a legacy rich in the beautification and prosperity he so skillfully guided on behalf of a grateful and well-served community. His immense contributions to the transformation and maturing of Santa Fe Springs, an All American City, has nurtured a strong sense of civic pride among its residents.

The City of Santa Fe Springs will surely miss the outstanding work of City Manager Donald R. Powell. On behalf of the many business and residential citizens, Mayor Albert L. Sharp, Mayor Pro-Tempore George S. Minnehan, Jr., Councilman Louis Gonzalez, Councilman Ronald S. Kernes, Councilwoman Betty Putnam, Councilwoman-Emeritus Betty Wilson, and the entire City staff, I extend heartfelt thanks and appreciation to Don Powell for his exemplary service, and further extend best wishes to Don and his wonderful wife Jackie Powell for every continued happiness, great health and success in the years ahead. It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to a superb public servant and fine American citizen Don Powell on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington. Thanks for every thing Don.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

#### 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. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLIARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.