

I will leave it at that.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is another historical point worth making. None of us were here, we were all too young, but we have all read about the Bay of Pigs in 1961 in Cuba. For some of the younger people listening that do not know what the Bay of Pigs was, it was a failed effort to invade Cuba back in 1961. Lives were lost, and it was seen as a dismal policy mistake. John Kennedy had every reason politically to say this was a plan conceived by the previous President. He had every reason to say that this was something my CIA director foisted on me, this was something I did not want to do, and the military pushed it down my throat. He could have fired a number of people.

President Kennedy said something that is worth repeating. He said, "I am the responsible officer of the government. Defeat is an orphan, victory has a thousand fathers." That rings across the last 43 years. Defeat is always an orphan. It is something that happened. I did not do it; it happened. It is always something that no one wants to claim. Whereas victory, everyone wants to share in that and say, I did my part, you did your part.

We come back again to the same place. What I think so many of our people want is enough humility from up high, enough humility from the throne that we can conceive the possibility of error.

World War II is a wonderful analogy. We got some things wrong in World War II. The greatest President of all time, in my opinion, Franklin Roosevelt, signed the order that led to the internment of Japanese Americans. A Supreme Court that consisted of some of the finest jurists we have ever had approved that internment of Japanese Americans. We all know that was perfectly wrong now.

If men as great as Franklin Roosevelt and Robert Jackson and Hugo Black could be that wrong, maybe it should occur to us today that some of the individuals who sit in circles in power today could be wrong. Again, there is a lesson about humility to be learned there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was just enjoying listening to the gentlemen talk. I want to clean up a couple of things that were mentioned. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) mentioned that now we want to make sure that our soldiers have the equipment that they need, we want to make sure that the vehicles are up-armored and they have the vests and the plates to go into the vests and everything else.

We have gotten so caught up in the fact that we want to get it to them, we forget to ask, you are telling me we went to war and we did not have our troops properly equipped? Lack of preparation.

In the Defense appropriations bill that we just passed out of the House, we reimbursed parents or whoever for

people, parents who paid for vests for their kids. I mean, you have to be kidding me. We had to reimburse parents that paid for their protective vests for soldiers in Iraq.

The general that testified about the prison abuse said that there were a couple of problems, major problems. One, lack of training. One, lack of supervision. To me, after almost 2 years on the Committee on Armed Services and a layman, civilian, lack of training and lack of supervision to me means we do not have enough troops there. If you are not training them properly, you do not have enough people to train; and if you are not supervising them properly, you do not have enough people to supervise. I think that is basic common sense to say this group has not prepared us for this war.

One other thing I would like to say because some young people are probably sitting at home listening to this, remember as soon as President Clinton got in office, there were always investigations, investigating this, Travelgate, Nannygate, this gate and that gate. They were always investigating the man. Why? The House and the Senate were Republican. The White House was Democrat. We are now in a one-party rule system. The House is controlled by the Republicans, the Senate is controlled by the Republicans, the White House is controlled by Republicans. I am not saying that they are always wrong, and I am not saying that we are always right. All I am saying is when there is one-party rule, we cannot subpoena people out of this House because the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) from the Committee on Government Reform is not the chairman of the committee.

□ 1745

If he was the Chair of the committee, we could subpoena some of these people who wear the suits and bring them before committees in the House and have them sit and tell us what happened and why and make sure we are starting to hold people responsible for their actions.

That is just what I want to say to the American people, is you cannot have one party rule the whole government. It is unhealthy for the institutions; it is unhealthy for the country.

There is no balance right now. There is no one overseeing what is going on. We get fed a line from somebody like this, and no one can stand up and question it. That is not a good way to run your country. This country was founded on all the different aspects, the branches and everything else, in order to bring some balance to these institutions we have.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience, and to

refer to other Members in debate only in the third person, by State designation.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JUNE 8, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 3, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through June 8, 2004.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

THE CASE FOR A SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, "China is a sleeping giant. Let her lie and sleep, for when she awakens, she will astonish the world," wrote Napoleon Bonaparte. I would like to title this speech "The Case for a Special Relationship With China."

Great nations almost always miss important changes outside their world. Such errors threaten their future in ways they never dreamed. History also has examples of leaders who saw challenges early and responded well.

The leaders of Great Britain's late empire entirely missed the rise of the United States. Britain suffered years of combat in World Wars I and II before their American allies joined the fight. During both wars, the British Empire teetered in the balance. Conversely, President Truman wisely perceived his challenge in the Soviet Union and responded well. His actions contributed mightily to the winning of the Cold War.

In the 19th century, not everyone missed the rise of the United States. As early as 1835, Alexander de Tocqueville saw in the future clearly when he wrote, "Americans are already able to make their flag respected. In a few years, they will be able to make it feared."

Looking from Westminster across the Thames River in 1870, the British Empire's leaders did not share de Tocqueville's view. It was an easy mistake for them to make. Queen Victoria presided over the largest economic block on Earth. In the glare of an empire where the sun never set, her ministers largely ignored the significance of their American cousins.

Well-schooled leaders of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office were distracted by a number of small wars at

the fringe of their empire, Abyssinia, South Africa, Egypt and Sudan, to name a few. In 1868, *The Illustrated London News* warned, "We can ill afford a perpetual succession of little wars," but few took notice. European continental leaders were equally unaware of the American change that was under way in their century. German Chancellor Bismarck discounted the United States when he wrote, "There is a providence that protects fools, drunkards, children and the United States of America."

After only one single Victorian generation, America's economy grew to be twice the size of Britain's. By 1900, many of the British Empire's leaders dimly perceived the threat from Germany but remained unaware of how their world had changed across the Atlantic. It was hard for many leaders to take America seriously when Belgium's Armed Forces outnumbered the U.S. Army.

As a result of their ignorance, England's leaders entered the First World War without the backing of the American arsenal. In 3 short years, from 1914 to 1917, they exhausted the wealth of the empire. Finally, America joined the allies of World War I, but only on President Wilson's terms. It took British leaders two generations of conflict to understand how important America had become to them.

Today, London's policy towards the United States is rightfully called the "special relationship." Are there changes under way which call for American attention? Could the leaders of America's foreign policy make a similar mistake? In our vision of America's future, are there any countries deserving another special relationship?

Our history is filled with examples of countries where economic growth rapidly turned into political and military power. The rise of Japan, Germany and even some Gulf states show that economic expansion has an inevitable political and military impact. For the United States to be effective in foreign policy, the President needs advisers who see the world not just as it is but as it will become. When the White House advisers fail to outline strategic change, they doom our President to using short-term expedience to cope with a long-term threat.

With a clear strategic view, the advisers of President Truman served our country well. Writing his famous long telegram from the rubble of 1946 Moscow, U.S. Foreign Service Officer George Kennan correctly outlined the emerging threat from the Soviet Union. By removing President Roosevelt's friendly "Uncle Joe" veneer from Stalin, George Kennan warned his President clearly about the coming Cold War. The Soviet Union, in his view, was becoming a colossus, demanding more than short-term American expedience. The struggle between East and West could only be won with a strategic plan by the West.

Truman's answer to the challenge of the Cold War was massive. He backed

his short-term military defense of South Korea with a long-term set of new institutions: the Marshall Plan, the Central Intelligence Agency, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the World Bank, the Strategic Air Command, the United Nations and the Voice of America, to name a few.

After four decades of struggle, the East abandoned the Berlin Wall. In the heady days after communism's fall, many felt the U.S. stood unopposed at the dawn of a new Pax Americana. Francis Fujiyama asked in the *Washington Post*, "is this the end of history?"

History hardly ended, but the idea of American supremacy is now strong. America's Armed Forces won stunning victories: 1991 in Kuwait, 1995 in Bosnia, 1999 in Kosovo and 2003 in Iraq. Who can challenge America?

Despite our ascendancy, we must ask the question, is there a major change in the world for which the U.S. should prepare? As Truman did in the 1940s, should the United States create institutions that respond to this change?

The American view of foreign policy has more to do with our European past than our Asian present. By a two-to-one margin, Americans believe that our policy towards Europe is more important than Asia, but our trade with Asia surpassed Europe a generation ago. Today, American trade with Asia totals 50 percent more than our trade with Europe. The U.S. State Department has just 579 full-time Americans stationed in Asia, compared to over 1,300 in Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union. Asian economies are both larger and growing faster than Europe. Beyond the Asian Tigers of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, the growth rates of China and India clearly show that most of our history in the 21st century will be written in Asia.

One country looms large across the future of the United States, China. China's absence from the first rank of world powers is a historical anomaly. Throughout recorded history, the Chinese people were responsible for many of the advances of modern society: paper, gunpowder, even spaghetti.

Seventy years before Columbus, China's famous explorer, Admiral Cheng Ho, mapped much of the Arab world from a ship that was twice the size of the Santa Maria. But for the Emperor's decision to recall the fleet, China would have discovered Europe, not the other way around.

As recently as the 1830s, China produced one-third of the Earth's wealth. Most of her advances and talent were squandered by corrupt governments, wars and a Chinese dictatorship. Despite a massive population and storied culture, China declined into socialist poverty. Under Mao, the Chinese people lost two generations of progress and were home to the worst famine of the 20th century. But following Mao Zedong's death, Deng Xiaoping led a Chinese economic reform of historic

proportions. It is very difficult for many Americans today to understand the breadth and scope of this historic change.

When we accurately look at today's China, we note it produces more steel than the United States, consumes twice the grain of the United States, has built highways twice the length of Germany and France combined, graduates three times the number of engineers as India, and is home to over 200 million cable TV subscribers. It replaced Mexico as America's number two trading partner, and it replaced America as Japan's number one trading partner. There are 200 cities with populations over 1 million, and the economy doubles every 8 years. We now estimate that its economy will be larger than the United States in the next decade.

China is not only growing year to year, it has sustained a growth rate of over 9 percent annually for a generation. Given the difference in price of many domestic goods in China, economists now debate how to measure the size of the Chinese economy, using a traditional gross domestic product or a more up-to-date purchasing power parity to take into account the lower cost of Chinese domestic goods.

Either way, the effect of China's sustained growth has profound proportions. Under a GDP measurement, the United States economy now stands at \$11 trillion, whereas China's economy stands at only \$1.5 trillion; but using purchasing power parities, our \$11 trillion economy stands next to China's \$7 trillion economy.

Using purchasing power measurements, the International Monetary Fund projects China will be home to the world's largest economy as early as 2007, during the next American President's administration. Koishi Ishiyama recently wrote that China's rise can be compared to the Shock and Awe operation in Iraq.

Foreign direct investment did not significantly exist in China before 1980, and while such investment in all other developing countries fell in 2002, it rose by 15 percent in China, netting \$52 billion in new investments.

The pace of China's growth is also accelerating. In the next 10 years, the City of Beijing will double its supply of housing. The Chinese highway system and the number of cable TV subscribers will also double in size. While this change is dimly seen in official Washington, it is having a profound effect on the Chinese people.

China's hosting of the 2008 Olympic games will be one of many upcoming international events in China. China last year became the third country on Earth to orbit a human in one of its own space vehicles.

□ 1800

Next year, China plans to orbit a two-man vehicle, the *Shenzhou VI*, on its way to building its own space station and lunar rover.

China's progress can be overstated. Over 200 million Chinese still live on less than \$1 a day. There is a great gap now opening between the poorer western provinces of China and the newfound wealth of China's east coast. Environmental challenges also loom, including over 100 of China's cities with air pollution exceeding the World Health Organization's guidelines for sulfur dioxide.

The World Bank's World Development Report still ranks China at number 76 out of 129 countries measured for personal income; and despite progress, the World Bank estimates that Chinese per capita income totals just \$1,000 per year.

Such low numbers, though, hide profound progress. Between 1978 and 1998, the World Bank estimates the number of poor people in the world fell by 8 million. The number of people who were poor outside China actually rose by 82 million. But the world's total numbers were compensated by the profound reduction in Chinese poverty. From 1978 to 1999, Chinese adult illiteracy fell from 37 percent to 17 percent, while infant mortality dropped from 41 per live births in 1978 to 30 in 1999.

Changes in China had an impact on Americans as well. Motorola now employs over 10,000 people in China and owns the country's best-recognized trademark. By last year, over 1,500 U.S. firms invested \$25 billion in China. One U.S. corporate executive advised the Congress that his top three issues in Washington were China, China, and China.

The story of Wal-Mart shows the profound change that is under way both in China and in the United States. Unlike traditional retailers such as Sears Roebuck or J.C. Penney, Sam Walton recognized the importance of China and the advantage of its lower-cost merchandise. Relying heavily on Chinese suppliers, Wal-Mart grew to become America's largest employer. Selling in nearly every town in America, Wal-Mart doubled its purchases of Chinese goods to \$12 billion per year. And last year, Wal-Mart sold 10 percent of everything that China made. In many ways, the face of all-American Wal-Mart is really the face of China, Incorporated.

There are many examples of how China's transformation influenced America's private sector. Like British merchant bankers who understood America's rise and bankrolled the Union Pacific Railroad, companies like Boeing, General Electric, Baker MacKenzie, and hundreds of other U.S. private sector interests understand what is happening and are risking a great deal to capitalize on the opportunities presented by the rise of China.

But this understanding is not well understood by America's government. Like their British Government forefathers that missed America's rise, there is little evidence that the Federal Government perceives or is moving to realign the world to the rise of

China. Many European powers discounted turn-of-the-century America and its puny Armed Forces. Many Americans likewise dismissed the capabilities of the People's Liberation Army and its potential to change the course of Asian history. By China's own plan, military modernization ranks fourth in their list of four modernizations.

Following the recent victories of America's Armed Forces, the raw size of a country's army is no longer evidence of its future prowess in battle. The People's Liberation Army, numbering 2.4 million, still stands as the world's largest; but it looks anachronistic and unable to enforce the will of China's leaders very far from its borders.

A Council on Foreign Relations Task Force under former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown estimated last year that China was "at least 2 decades behind the United States in terms of military technology and capability." According to the Pentagon, Chinese military leaders closely studied NATO's operation over Kosovo and described it as the first "no-contact" war.

In the post-Cold War world, Deng Xiaoping gave a key directive to the Chinese security establishment based on his "24-character strategy" and that was, "keep cool-headed to observe. Be composed to make reactions. Stand firmly. Hide our capabilities. Bide our time. Never try to take the lead, and be able to accomplish something."

While seeking short-term opportunities with the United States, the Pentagon reported, "China's leaders assert the United States seeks to maintain a dominant strategic position while containing the growth of Chinese power, ultimately dividing and Westernizing China."

Much of China's military budget and plans were influenced by scenes of conflict in the Balkans and Iraq played out on televisions tuned to the 24-hour news channels. After the U.S. victory in Kosovo, China's leaders seriously considered upgrading the fourth-ranked priority they attach to their military. The army developed a new response doctrine called the "Three Attack and Three Defenses," focusing on attacking stealth aircraft, cruise missiles and helicopters, while defending against precision strikes, electronic warfare, and enemy reconnaissance. Chinese Air Force chief of staff Lieutenant General Zheng Shenxia noted that without adopting a preemptive doctrine, the chances of a PLA victory are limited.

In November 2002, China overhauled its Politburo Standing Committee, the center of the Chinese Government decision-making. Every member of the politburo was replaced except Hu Jintao. Following this shakeup, senior leaders reaffirmed their emphasis on economic growth, but did increase funding for military modernization. Acknowledging its weakness in the face of such

complete U.S. victories, Chinese leaders tempered their sense of vulnerability, knowing that unlike Kosovo, China is a nuclear power. Its 2002 defense White Paper, in contrast to its 2000 White Paper, did not explicitly criticize U.S. deployments in Asia.

The main mission of the Chinese military is to fight and win a conflict over Taiwan. In March 2002, Chinese Finance Minister Xiang Huaicheng announced a 17.5 percent increase in its official defense spending. While China reports an official defense budget of approximately \$20 billion, its actual spending ranges to twice or three times that level, totaling \$45 billion to \$67 billion annually. The Department of Defense and the Council on Foreign Relations both estimate that annual spending in real terms could increase three to four-fold over the levels I just quoted by 2020. Most defense modernization spending occurs outside the public defense budget.

Chinese military spending in this range roughly equals the \$65 billion spent by Russia and dramatically exceeds the \$43 billion Japanese defense budget or the \$38 billion British military budget. A three-fold increase in spending by China would put their military budget above all other nations, except the United States.

China's rising military budget masks a structural problem in its military. Since large armies no longer guarantee success, China has cut the size of her armed forces from 1997 to 2000 by reducing 500,000 men, including 11 percent of her naval personnel, 12 percent of her air force personnel, and 18 percent of her army personnel. Sixty of 100 maneuver divisions were collapsed into the remaining structure of 40 divisions and 40 brigades. The air force retired older aircraft, dropping from over 5,000 aircraft at the end of the 1990s to 3,500 now. Of the remaining aircraft, only 150 are modern fourth-generation fighters. China still regards its military as too "infantry-heavy" with an army so large as to "impede rapid deployment and equipment modernization."

By reducing the size of the armed forces, China provided funding dedicated to military modernization. The air force is adding advanced SU-30MKK fourth-generation fighter aircraft, AA-12/ADDER active-radar guided air-to-air missiles, and a new SU-30 naval variant capable of carrying air-launched, anti-shipping cruise missiles. The Navy added four SOVREMENYYY-class guided missile destroyers and produced its own new design SONG-class diesel-electric submarines, the first with quieter skewed propellers. It took delivery of four quiet KIL0-class diesel-electric submarines and has another eight submarines under contract, all equipped with a new 3M-54E Novator Alpha anti-shipping cruise missile. Given the sum of investment and rapid modernization, China did forgo one important upgrade, and her navy has now shelved plans for its own aircraft carrier.

The pace of development accelerated for China's army. The land forces are developing a light tank, an amphibious tank, and an amphibious-armored personnel carrier, all added to over 1,500 type-96 main battle tanks that are already delivered. This kind of new equipment is now flowing to China's revamped three airborne and two marine brigades.

The Ministry of Defense now emphasizes recruitment, retention, and more training for officers and key NCOs. Training now emphasizes small-scale specialized maneuvers under the new doctrine of fighting a limited war under high-tech conditions. All infantry divisions now have armor, up from only half in 1997.

Since 1989, China has been cut off from most U.S. and European military technology. Its defense establishment cannot innovate as fast as it could if it had access to foreign equipment. China's leaders responded with a foreign policy emphasizing cooperation and good relations with the United States. Over time, such a strategy could reopen their access to key Western technologies, even in the military field.

The transformation of China's new military power is clearest in its missile force. China maintains a limited force, including 20 nuclear missiles capable of hitting targets in the United States. A number of U.S. Government agencies project that this rise in the missile force will lift by a factor of three to over 60 missiles capable of striking the United States, using the new CSS-4 Mod 2 ICBM. This Chinese force will be augmented by the brand-new solid-fuel DF-31 ICBM and an entirely new generation of Chinese nuclear submarines, the 094-class, carrying a naval variant of the DF-31. China is also developing two other classes of solid-fuel intercontinental ballistic missiles. It is also developing a heavy-lift space launch vehicle, capable of lifting 25 tons into low orbit by 2007.

These developments pale when compared to China's expanding arsenal of medium-range missiles all aimed at Taiwan. China currently has a force of 450 such missiles and is adding 75 each year. Beyond large nuclear additions to China's armed forces, China places a very high priority on information warfare. The PLA believes that the U.S. Department of Defense is too dependent on networks that are vulnerable to attack. By attacking these systems, planners in China's army believe the U.S. forces could be degraded "anonymously."

The anonymity of information attacks could play a key role even now. The House of Representatives recently reported regular attempts by computer systems located in China to enter the main computer server of the House Committee on Armed Services. The Pentagon may have referred to this when it recently reported that China "places unusual emphasis on a host of new information warfare forces instead of information superiority and the sys-

tem of systems approaches popular in the United States."

□ 1815

There have been several official references about leveraging China's growing presence on the Internet, including references to a "people's war" in "net warfare", suggesting a stronger role in nationalist hacking.

China also has a commitment to electronic warfare equaled only by the United States. Unlike many countries now totally dependent on U.S. leadership in this exotic field, China is developing electronic jamming aircraft for several variants and may have several programs to develop escort jammers on transports, tactical aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicle platforms. It has equipped the Su-30 with anti-radiation missiles that work on the same principle of U.S. weapons that were so crucial to our own victories. China's anti-radiation missile, the FT-2000, is described in their sales brochures as an "AWACS killer." The PLA is also producing state-of-the-art technology to improve intercept, direction finding and jamming. It may also be producing jammers for use against America's most successful weapon, the satellite-guided JDAM munition that so accurately uses the U.S. Global Positioning System.

Their efforts also include producing laser weapons, such as the man-portable ZM-87, advertised for blinding human vision and electro-optical sensors, radio-frequency weapons and possibly a ground-based anti-satellite weapon. They have also invested considerably in developing short- and medium-range unmanned aerial vehicles, including an unmanned combat aerial vehicle.

According to the Chinese military publication Junshi Wenzhai, China has already produced an "Assassin's Mace" or trump card to counter U.S. superiority in the Western Pacific. One article identifies five major, quote, Assassin's Maces, unquote, including fighter bombers, submarines, anti-ship missiles, torpedoes and mines designed to destroy foreign aircraft carriers. These systems would be backed by new research by China on other technologies, including kinetic energy and low-observable platforms.

This research can be accelerated by acquiring foreign technologies such as the recent activities of two Chinese students at universities collecting information on Terfenol-D, an invention of the U.S. Department of Energy's Ames laboratory.

These developments show that China's growing economic power may already be translating into military power. It is clear that most large American companies already perceive the size and importance of China. What is not clear is if the U.S. Government has made a similar intellectual leap to understand the new geography of the 21st century.

In 2002, the U.S. State Department conducted a major study of the needs

of the U.S. Government in China. The Beyond China 2000 Action Plan cut 55 people from permanent U.S. Government desks in China. The State Department's Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs noted the decision reflected, quote, hard-nosed decisions, unquote. Congress recently ordered the State Department to review the future needs of the U.S. Government in China by 2010. In its February report, it is difficult to see what measures the State Department used to justify reducing the size of the U.S. Government in China.

In 1975, the new U.S. liaison officer in Beijing under Ambassador George Herbert Walker Bush, who later became president, processed 651 non-immigrant visas to the United States. In 2003, U.S. consular officers handled 320,000 such applications. From a handful, the number of Chinese students rose to over 60,000 in the U.S. last year.

Only 38 Americans registered with the Beijing liaison office in 1975. Today, over 3,600 Americans are registered in addition to over 1 million American tourists visiting China each year. The State Department admitted to Congress noting that staffing in the U.S. embassy in Beijing and the Consulates General is currently inadequate to the growing workload.

The workload of the U.S. Government in China is growing for other reasons. In 2001 alone, China joined the international coalition against terrorism, the World Trade Organization, hosted the Asian-Pacific Economic Conference, and won the bidding of the 2008 Olympic games. These issues came in addition to key concerns regarding nuclear nonproliferation, human rights, intellectual property, and religious freedom.

The State Department projects that the number of U.S. Government agencies wishing to station personnel permanently in China will rise from 12 agencies to over 20 by 2010. Several agencies, including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, developed but then halted plans to deploy in China. The United States broke new ground on a new embassy complex last February. With the new embassy, the State Department plans only a modest increase in official Americans stationed in China from 960 to 1,200.

Plans to expand America's eyes and ears in China do not depend only on the size of our embassy in Beijing. They also depend on increasing the number of Americans in the diplomatic service who can master a very difficult language. In 2000, the State Department launched its China 2000 Initiative. The mission of the Initiative was to develop infrastructure to meet the projected physical and human needs, including language. This Initiative is very small, modestly increasing the number of Chinese students in the State Department annually from only five to only 15. The Initiative also includes some advanced training for just five students in Beijing and a mail program for lessons to

only 30 other students to maintain Chinese language proficiency.

Such efforts appear grossly inadequate compared to China's central role in the 21st century. With the largest trade surplus, the largest economy, the largest military budget outside the United States, China deserves a special relationship with the United States.

In November, 2002, a task force under Japan's Prime Minister Koizumi released their report designating China as Japan's top foreign policy priority for the future. The decision makes sense for Japan but, given China's growth, its position on the U.N. Security Council, and the future size of its economy, it may make sense for the United States to do this as well.

Our country has been the home of the world's largest economy for 130 years, but that is about to change; and this change will be one of the most profound shifts of the new century. There was a time early in the history of the United States when our national income was not at the top of the international heap. Today, under our Pax Americana, it may be difficult for us to reconnect with our forefathers and mothers who were forced to depend only on diplomacy in the face of very long odds.

Avidly, we retell parts of U.S. history, the Revolution, the Civil War, and the victories of World War I and II, all to stoke American pride; and these examples are used to confirm the superiority of our own ideals. But American history has less-well-known examples of when we struggled without our traditional advantage in material and money.

I put this question to the House, when was the last time that U.S. Armed Forces faced a military from a country whose economy was larger than our own? One summer day in August, 1814, comes to mind. British soldiers and marines marched on in Washington in one of the last acts of the War of 1812. U.S. forces met them in what we now call the Battle of Bladensburg. The battle went so badly for the Americans that British called it the "Bladensburg races" because U.S. forces ran away so quickly. Britain's 85th Foot Regiment still displays eagle-flagged standards of two American regiments captured that day. The following day British forces burned the Capitol and Executive Mansion to the ground.

History reminds us that the United States has not and will not always be the Nation on Earth with the largest economy. With an America of unquestioned commercial dominance, we can afford to make diplomatic mistakes. In a world where America holds fewer cards, we cannot afford miscalculation.

We are quickly nearing a world in which China will play a central role in the diplomatic life of the United States. British diplomats before the world wars would have scoffed at the notion of their American cousins playing a central role in world politics. Let

us hope that the new American diplomats of the 21st century understand how quickly the post Cold War world has changed.

Our President Truman set the record of his time for being an unpopular president. In 1946, he stood at just 32 percent in the polls. Thankfully, he steeled his heart and made the tough decisions needed to design a successful campaign through the Cold War against the Soviet Union. America and freedom won the Cold War without fighting World War III.

When we look towards the 21st century and China's coming role in its history, will our leaders lay the foundation for America's diplomatic success? I ask that question to the House tonight.

And I thank Reed Bundy of my staff for helping me prepare these remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a family medical reason.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of a family emergency.

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. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, June 9.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, June 9.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1721. An act to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to improve provisions relating to probate of trust and restricted land, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the Allied landing at Normandy during World War II.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 2004, at 12 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE—MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 108th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

STEPHANIE HERSETH, South Dakota At Large.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Anibal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, Frank W. Ballance, Jr., Cass Ballenger, J. Gresham Barrett, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Bob Beauprez, Xavier Becerra, Chris Bell, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael