

lenalidomide, which fights multiple myeloma. Private U.S. insurers often cover all, or at least portions, of the cost of many of these NICE-denied drugs.

NICE has also produced guidance that restrains certain surgical operations and treatments. NICE has restrictions on fertility treatments, as well as on procedures for back pain, including surgeries and steroid injections. The U.K. has recently been absorbed by the cases of several young women who developed cervical cancer after being denied pap smears by a related health authority, the Cervical Screening Programme, which in order to reduce government healthcare spending has refused the screens to women under age 25.

We could go on. NICE is the target of frequent protests and lawsuits, and at times under political pressure has reversed or watered-down its rulings. But it has by now established the principle that the only way to control health-care costs is for this panel of medical high priests to dictate limits on certain kinds of care to certain classes of patients.

The NICE board even has a mathematical formula for doing so, based on a "quality adjusted life year." While the guidelines are complex, NICE currently holds that, except in unusual cases, Britain cannot afford to spend more than about \$22,000 to extend a life by six months. Why \$22,000? It seems to be arbitrary, calculated mainly based on how much the government wants to spend on health care. That figure has remained fairly constant since NICE was established and doesn't adjust for either overall or medical inflation.

Proponents argue that such cost-benefit analysis has to figure into health-care decisions, and that any medical system rations care in some way. And it is true that U.S. private insurers also deny reimbursement for some kinds of care. The core issue is whether those decisions are going to be dictated by the brute force of politics (NICE) or by prices (a private insurance system).

The last six months of life are a particularly difficult moral issue because that is when most health-care spending occurs. But who would you rather have making decisions about whether a treatment is worth the price—the combination of you, your doctor and a private insurer, or a government board that cuts everyone off at \$22,000?

One virtue of a private system is that competition allows choice and experimentation. To take an example from one of our recent editorials, Medicare today refuses to reimburse for the new, less invasive preventive treatment known as a virtual colonoscopy, but such private insurers as Cigna and United Healthcare do. As clinical evidence accumulates on the virtual colonoscopy, doctors and insurers will be able to adjust their practices accordingly. NICE merely issues orders, and patients have little recourse.

This has medical consequences. The Concord study published in 2008 showed that cancer survival rates in Britain are among the worst in Europe. Five-year survival rates among U.S. cancer patients are also significantly higher than in Europe: 84% vs. 73% for breast cancer, 92% vs. 57% for prostate cancer. While there is more than one reason for this difference, surely one is medical innovation and the greater U.S. willingness to reimburse for it.

The NICE precedent also undercuts the Obama Administration's argument that vast health savings can be gleaned simply by automating health records or squeezing out "waste." Britain has tried all of that but ultimately has concluded that it can only rein in costs by limiting care. The logic of a health-care system dominated by government is that it always ends up with some

version of a NICE board that makes these life-or-death treatment decisions. The Administration's new Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research currently lacks the authority of NICE. But over time, if the Obama plan passes and taxpayer costs inevitably soar, it could quickly gain it.

Mr. Obama and Democrats claim they can expand subsidies for tens of millions of Americans, while saving money and improving the quality of care. It can't possibly be done. The inevitable result of their plan will be some version of a NICE board that will tell millions of Americans that they are too young, or too old, or too sick to be worth paying to care for.

□ 2230

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN MARK GARNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary sacrifice, patriotism, and heroism of Captain Mark Garner from Elkin, North Carolina. Captain Garner, an officer in the 82nd Airborne Division, fell in the line of duty in Afghanistan Monday when a roadside bomb exploded under the vehicle in which he and three others were riding.

Captain Garner was assigned to B Company, 1st Battalion, 4th Infantry Regiment, Hohenfels, Germany. Dedicated to unyielding service to others, he was among seven U.S. troops killed in what was described as one of the deadliest days for U.S. troops in Afghanistan since 2001.

Captain Garner was an outstanding leader throughout high school, college, and in the United States military. He graduated from Elkin High School in 1997, where he excelled in sports and won several football, basketball, and baseball awards.

In 2002, Captain Garner graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point as a second lieutenant. He was then assigned to an infantry unit at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Captain Garner leaves behind his loving parents and his wife, Nickayla. His absence leaves a hole in the hearts of the Garner and Myers families, the tight-knit community of Elkin, North Carolina, and the 82nd Airborne community.

Captain Garner was described by his friends and family as having lived to serve and sacrifice for others. From a young age, he aspired to be a soldier. He will long be remembered as a man who knew the meaning of service, sacrifice, and the call of duty to his family and his country.

Madam Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with Captain Garner's wife, parents, and extended family. May they feel God's comforting presence during this difficult time.

We pause to honor his memory and express our gratitude to his great bravery and profound sacrifice. Our Nation is a better place for his having been among us and is blessed to call him an honored son. We mourn his passing, and we pledge our dedication to the family he left behind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLEMING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized

for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight on the return of President Obama from his perhaps groundbreaking visit to Russia. I, as well, have recently returned from Russia.

I was there just prior to President Obama's visit, and I rise tonight to discuss America's relationship with Russia, as well as our continued involvement in NATO, as well as today's threats of radical Islam and tomorrow's looming threat of a powerful Communist China.

First and foremost, I think it's important for us to take a look at history, take a look at the present, and take a look at the future concerning America's exact positioning overseas. First and foremost, that would mean today that we need to look at NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This organization, of course, if we are honest with ourselves, should be looked at not as an institution we should be relying on today but, instead, a relic of the cold war. Not only is it strategically irrelevant today, but it may be actually making the world less stable and our country less secure.

Of course the United States needs to cooperate with other countries, and as such we need to reach out to potential friends in every part of the world, but when a relationship with another country or a group of countries no longer serves the goals of freedom, security and prosperity, when we no longer share those interests that bind us together as a people, we need to dissolve those relationships and seek different ones.

We now have reached a point with NATO where we should take a second look at NATO and perhaps think about what type of relationships we can have in the future that would better serve our country and the cause of peace.

NATO was a vital component to American security and world peace efforts in the late 1940s. In fact, in 1949, it was what an international relations theorist might call a tenet of realistic theory that we should form a powerful alliance to counteract the hostility of the Soviet Union and the threat of the expanding realm of communism, tyranny and militarism. That was in the late 1940s.

It made sense to strengthen our NATO alliance during the 1950s while the USSR was forming its Warsaw Pact and while the fall of China to Communist tyrants and the Korean Wars halted the vision of a peaceful world that we had hoped for in the aftermath of World War II. But it is no longer the 1950s. The cold war is over. This is the 21st century, and NATO no longer serves its purposes and is, in many ways, counterproductive.

Ronald Reagan's visionary leadership and the unrelenting courage of the American people brought an end to the USSR and the Warsaw Pact and also to

the Berlin Wall. Eastern Europe was freed at this time. And in the 1990s, the Russian Federation, freed from its Soviet shackles, had a real opportunity to partner with the West, to embrace classical liberalism and free market economics. And we, of course, created this relic.

NATO had a major impact in defending the peace and deterring a war with Russia up until this point. And let this cold warrior, who was very deeply involved in the cold war and supported cold war policies to the hilt, let me shock you by suggesting that Russia, after the fall of communism, attempted to embrace classical liberalism and free market economics. The Russian people and the Russian Government wanted to be part of the western community of nations. The door was open, and the Russians were not only willing but anxious to leave the cold war hostilities behind.

Well, we squandered this historic opportunity. Worse than that, we let rotten elements in the West ally themselves with looters there in Russia who were there taking advantage of Russia's weakened and vulnerable condition. The Russian people, rejected and isolated when they expected to be partners in building a new world, sunk into deep despair.

Now, it's easy, in hindsight, to look at the end of the cold war and to point out the mistakes that have been made since the end of the cold war. And it's easy to do that now because it has become clear that many, many mistakes were made by us and by our European allies and friends. Now, however, is not the time to lay blame. Now is the time to admit what has been wrong and to try to set things right and to push, as President Obama has said and Secretary of State Clinton has said, to push a reset button with the Russians. And, I would add, probably push the reset button with Russia and pull the plug on NATO. So let's look to the future. Let's take actions today that will overcome past mistakes and lead the world to a bright and prosperous future.

Ronald Reagan used to say that the Oval Office was not his office; he was just a caretaker, a temporary occupant. Well, Americans today, all of us who are fortunate enough to live in this great country of ours, are merely caretakers of this place for a relatively short period of time. We have inherited this country from those brave freedom-loving souls who came before us, and we will pass it on to our children and our grandchildren just as it was passed on to us because that was the right thing to do, and those who came before us took those stands that were right and courageous.

The stand today meaning, for me, that I'm making a new world for my children, my three small children, Anika, Tristan and Christian, who are now 5 years old, and will live in a country that will ensure liberty, justice, security, and hopefully prosperity, to its

entire people. The decisions we make now will have long-term effects and be affecting my children and all the children of America today.

Reagan gave us two decades of peace and prosperity because he did the right thing. The consequences of our actions since Reagan, however, are becoming more evident and more alarming with each passing day. We must have the wisdom and the courage to confront the enormous foreign policy challenges facing us and prevail over those forces which would, if they could, destroy America and would destroy our way of life.

The national security threats before us are real and did not materialize out of thin air. But contrary to the dominant paradigm of our era, our ongoing relationship with NATO since the end of the cold war has not worked to our benefit, nor does it make peace, stability, or our Nation's security more likely.

NATO has recently engaged in a number of operations, for example, around the world, from fighting the Taliban to combating pirates, but whether one views these missions as relatively successful or a failure, one can hardly look at them and not realize that the cost of our continued involvement in NATO certainly outweighs the benefits.

In Afghanistan, the other 27 NATO countries sent a combined force of less than 5,000 troops, many in noncombatant positions. These 5,000 troops are there as part of a coalition force. While these fighters from our NATO partners are heroic and are helpful, they are dwarfed in comparison to the number of American boots on the ground.

The original members of NATO were the Americans, the French, the U.K., the Canadians, the Turks, and other European countries. Well, now add to that list Albania and Croatia, and others, and there is also talk about expanding NATO membership to other countries, smaller countries with little military relevance to the modern world.

One of the primary tenets of NATO membership is that any member will come to the defense of any other member if attacked. But realistically, is the United States going to come to the aid of these other countries at any time, and is the reverse of that proposition worth the cost to us? Do we need Albania or Croatia to come to our aid if we are attacked? The answer is obviously no.

And let us note that NATO's existence is unnecessary, and there is no strategic reason for us to stay in the alliance. And let us also admit that NATO can be counterproductive to the peace by, for example, convincing people with territorial disputes, like the Government of Georgia, the United States—I think that an impartial analysis of what happened in Georgia is that the United States, through our discussions of NATO with that government, emboldened that government,

the Government of Georgia, not to make compromises that were necessary for peace and stability in that region.

But not only did they not make the compromises, they perhaps were emboldened to conduct a military operation. And while the people of the United States were told over and over again that Russia had done something horrible in that part of the world and confronting Georgia and that it was all the Russians' fault, and all kinds of language that was used that would make it look like Russia was doing something evil and villainous, but the fact is that once you took a second look at what happened in Georgia, Georgian troops broke a truce that had been carried on for 7 years. And when it broke the truce and invaded two parts of what had been part of Georgia—let me note, the Osselians and the Abkhazians, who are the two areas that did not want to be part of Georgia, they had never been part of Georgia historically until Joseph Stalin made them part of Georgia.

□ 2245

And the Georgian Government, of course, emboldened by our talks with them about NATO's support, broke an agreement, a truce agreement, and conducted a military invasion of those two breakaway regions, which ended up, of course, in a major loss of life and a counterattack by Russia on Georgia.

Now, do we as Americans believe that we should have been involved in that? Does anyone believe that the United States should actually have Georgia as part of NATO or any of these other smaller countries in that part of the world as part of NATO so if there is a territorial dispute that we will send American troops into this far-off area and fight a battle perhaps with a country like Russia? Considering that this, of course, is in Russia's neighborhood and on the other side of the world from our country, that doesn't make sense. But it doesn't make sense at all for the United States to be in an alliance that might drag us into such conflicts that we have nothing to do with.

So if Georgia wants to become part of NATO or other countries like that, if Albania and Croatia, countries that I am very sympathetic with, and, by the way, I am sympathetic with Georgia. I am sympathetic with Georgia's wanting to be a separate country from what was then the Soviet Union and later became Russia and broke away. They had my total support in that, just as the Kosovars in Kosovo had a right not to be part of Serbia. But does that mean that we are going to enter into agreements with Kosovo or with Georgia or any of these other countries saying that we will use U.S. troops as part of a NATO agreement to guarantee the borders that they claim? That's ridiculous. If Albania and Croatia, two good countries, countries I like and support, if they do want to become part of NATO, well, that's okay with me. But in this case, perhaps, if they're getting

into NATO, we should be getting out of NATO.

Because Americans are an open-minded people, we are more than willing to enter into relationships with other countries. And I am not suggesting isolationism, nor am I suggesting that we should not have bilateral agreements, perhaps even defense agreements with other countries. We are by our very nature networkers. Even at young ages people are using Facebook and Twitter, perhaps talking to friends who are on the Internet all over the world. And it is that sort of a sense of building alliances and relationships that is natural to Americans. We do this sort of thing at the government level too. At the outset of the Cold War, we saw a clear and present Soviet threat, and we went to work strengthening our existing relationships with friendly countries and building new relationships with other countries. Well, we should create alliances, as I said, but we need to be realistic and honest in our assessment of the factors that are in play.

For whatever reason, perhaps just the lingering of Cold War attitudes and predispositions, Russia, which should have been a natural friend, Russia faces the same adversaries that the United States faces, but Russia has been positioned as our adversary. As I say, maybe that's a lingering of the Cold War mentality on our side, or maybe it's a lingering of the Cold War mentality on both sides that have brought us to this point, or maybe it's simply that we do not understand the Russian people and are wary about becoming their friends. But that would be contrary to America's personality. We are proud, and sometimes arrogantly so, but we are a friendly people. Whatever the reason, let this Cold warrior proclaim that the Russian people are a good-hearted people and they have the potential to be great friends to and allies of the United States of America. And that's us.

There was no more fierce opponent of the Soviet Government and of Marxist-Leninist tyranny than I was during the Cold War. During the Soviet war in Afghanistan, I went there to Afghanistan and fought briefly along the side of Afghan warriors, the mujahideen, who were engaged in battle against a Soviet Army occupying their country. I personally was engaged in combat operations against Soviet troops during the Cold War. Very few people can say that.

My chest swelled with pride every time Ronald Reagan spoke about the freedom for all subjugated peoples, including the Russian people, and I helped prepare some of those speeches that he gave as President. I was Ronald Reagan's speech writer for 7 years. When the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, pleaded with Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall, I was part of the team that broke through the foreign policy establishment's blockade that would have

neutered this historic freedom statement even before Ronald Reagan gave it. And I cried with joy and retrospect when that wall finally came crashing down, hammered and chiseled down by freedom-loving people on both sides of that grotesquely evil barrier. I despised the Soviet Union because I loved freedom. Freedom for all people, including the Russian people.

I was just in Russia and I met a Russian who had been active in his government and active in fighting for his government during the Cold War, and I told him, I had been your worst enemy during the Cold War. And he stopped me and he said, No, no. You weren't the Russian people's worst enemy. You were the enemy of communist tyranny, and thank God for that. There are many Russians today that fully understand that they have left communist tyranny behind and it is a wonderful opportunity for them now.

But the Cold War was not a war between our people. We didn't have a fight with the Russian people. It was a conflict of ideologies. The Russian people were victimized by communism just as the people of the West were threatened by communism. But the Russians are a wonderful and a creative people. They share many personal values with us, their sense of humor, their love of children, of fun, of drink, of dance, and, yes, their reverence for God and faith that was never beaten out of them by atheistic communism, which held them in its grip for five decades. There was openness and vulnerability of these people as the Soviet Communist system collapsed. Yet they were vulnerable, and yet we did not do what was right by them.

The Russians and the Americans share more than cultural traits. We now share very real common threats to our countries. And those are radical Islam, which is upon us, and a totalitarian China, which is rapidly becoming an enormously negative power in the world.

The totalitarian Government of China is the world's worst human rights abuser. It is a natural enemy of the United States. It is also an enemy and a threat to Russia. Yet we embrace that government, the world's worst human rights abuser, Communist China, and we build their economy. We build their manufacturing base and their technological capabilities even while simultaneously at the same time we find ways to continue hostilities and noncooperation with Russia. With open trade policies, credits, investment, and technology transfers, we run up massive trade deficits with China, and we haven't even been able to bring ourselves to officially end Jackson-Vanik economic restrictions on Russia. These are holdovers. The Jackson-Vanik restrictions on Russia are holdovers from the Cold War days. It is an insult and a sign of our own incompetence that we have not been able to lift the Jackson-Vanik restrictions on Russia. It's a joke, a cruel joke, when

we even mention it to the Russians now after two decades of promising that these restrictions would be eliminated. All this, all this while we give China every benefit.

Well, this relationship with Russia as well as our relationship with China has been wrongheaded and gravely so. China, in stark contrast to the great changes in Russia, where there has been political reform, where you have opposition parties and, yes, there are imperfections, but you go there and there is talk radio show complaining about leadership in Russia. In Russia you do have opposition parties, but, of course, the current party that's in power by its very nature is more popular because it won the election. And there were people on the ballot, but they were not elected. Well, there has been reform in Russia, although it's not perfect. It's far from perfect.

But there has been no liberalization in China. China is not a worthy trading partner. China is not a worthy trading partner in any respect of the word, not an economic partner; and it's not a partner for peace nor is it a partner for world stability. China has had no reform of its political power structure, and it is, unfortunately, our most likely future enemy. Those words are very hard for me to say. They are not our enemy now, but it is clear that unless we have political reform in China, liberalization there, and the dictatorship there continues to grow stronger, it will be and it is today America's most likely future enemy. It is already a deadly economic competitor of our people, and it is also openly hostile to those basic values which make us Americans: a respect for human rights, religious freedom, the environmental stewardship that we have taken upon ourselves in recent years, treating each person with common decency. These things are not part of the Communist Chinese Government's agenda. In fact, they see these things as contrary to their basic concepts of what government should be all about and what their society should be all about, while we see these things as positive elements that should be fostered and nurtured in our society: human rights, religious freedom, environmental stewardship, prosperity, openness, opportunity.

Because of the irreconcilable differences between the United States and the Communist Party apparatus in China, our current relationship with China has resulted in an economic and security disaster for America. It is time to have the courage to admit this fact, and it is time to reverse the poor decisions and bad policies that have made the world that we live in and led us to this point. If these are not reversed, if the policies that have led us to this point are not reversed, the result will be national and, yes, global catastrophe.

Again, we are talking about government, a specific government, not its people. The Chinese people are hard-

working, family-oriented people, and I have all the sympathy and respect for them in the world. They are, in fact, freedom's greatest ally, our greatest hope. The Chinese people, America's greatest hope, the American people's potentially greatest friends.

The Chinese Government, however, is a loathsome tyranny, a dictatorial clique that has enslaved their people in that country and is intent on dominating the rest of it. It is a government that, as I speak, is shooting down Muslim Uyghurs in East Turkistan, which is that far region in the western provinces of China. A government that arrests and murders Falun Gong religious practitioners. The Chinese Communist Government arrests and murders these Falun Gong, and who are they? Pay attention, America. Who are they? The Falun Gong want nothing more than the religious freedom that we hold so dear. And what do they believe in? They believe in yoga and meditation.

□ 2300

Yet, thousands of them were picked up by the Chinese Communist dictatorship, thrown into prisons. And oftentimes they never come out of those prisons. And too often we find that what is coming out of those prisons where Falun Gong members have been thrown, what do we find is coming out of those prisons? Body parts being sold to Americans and other people as medical body parts. Kidneys and organs of the body that have been extracted from people who were put in jail for religious purposes and murdered. That is the type of ghoulish regime that now controls the country of China and the Chinese people.

In China, there are no unions or workers' rights, there are no democratically created environmental standards. There are no concerns about human rights or considerations for the inherent dignity of all humankind. There is no liberty; no independent judiciary; no freedom of the press; no rule of law; no opposition parties; no right to criticize the nature of their government or to criticize the clique that rules it.

For these reasons, a billion working people are held in bondage so that goods can be manufactured in China for far less than in the United States. And with the one-way free trade that we have permitted and the short-term profit desired by America's corporate elite, our country has been partners in building the Chinese economy into a monstrous threat, while at the same time weakening and destroying our own economic base.

Over the last two decades we have built China from a relatively backwards economy into a Frankenstein monster. When I say we, I mean the policies of the United States government have lifted the economic capabilities of a country that has had no political liberalization, no political reform of their dictatorial system, and a country that, yes, is also engaged in re-

building its military. And, yes, we have built this Frankenstein monster. And that monster is slowly turning on its creator. It is turning on us.

We find ourselves today in an economic disaster. It is a severe recession. We can all feel it. It is around us. Our friends and neighbors and even our families are suffering. It is a Depression—perhaps not as dire as the one in the 1930s, but it might get there. It is devastating. People are losing their jobs and their houses. And who is to blame for this horrendous situation and what can be done about it? The blame, dear Brutus, lies with us.

We gave China Most Favored Nation status even though they have had no political liberalization. Despite our better judgment and despite the fact that China is a brutal dictatorship, we permitted them this advantageous economic relationship. We gave them this trading status because America's corporate elites wanted to make a quick buck for themselves with lots of good bonuses for the corporate elite and then to sell us goods—us, the American people—goods at a cheaper price. We should never have realistically expected to get goods that cheap, but at the same time there was a price to pay that was not on the pricetag.

What have we gotten? What was that price that we paid? It's called economic ruin of the United States of America.

We have given China everything and we are left wanting now, begging for favors. Small and mid-level manufacturing bases in the United States, our mid-level manufacturing base—small and mid-level—have been virtually destroyed. Our small and medium-sized and even large industry is gone. Our manufacturing jobs have gone.

And where have they gone to? They have gone to China so their people have the jobs. And their country is accumulating the wealth. And because we have had this Most Favored Nation status and had a relatively one-way free trade agreement, the Communist bosses have been able to set the rules and to manipulate the trade so that it benefits their power structure.

We were told that if we had Most Favored Nation status with China and that we had trade and we embraced them economically, there would be political liberalization. For 20 years, for 30 years we were told that. And that has not happened, but just the opposite has happened.

What we have now is with China a massive debt that can be purchased and is now being purchased by China. We have a massive debt here. Actually, just even this year's debt is going to be \$2 trillion higher—\$4 trillion budget, \$2 trillion in debt. And the Chinese are very happy to buy it because they are holding it over our head and grabbing us by the throat.

We have given China everything, and we are left with nothing but ruin and cheap, poorly manufactured goods, poisonous toys and, all too often, poisonous food.

We need first and foremost to demand that our policymakers who are negotiating trade agreements with foreign governments, that their primary concern be—and I say this emphatically—the primary concern of our negotiators should be what is good for the people of the United States and that those negotiators be patriots in their perspective and not globalists who are tied to some notion of what is good for the world or some philanthropist who wants to help other peoples and other countries at the expense of our own people, the American people. We have not had that.

We have permitted a trade policy with China and other countries that have drained our country of resources with basically one-way free trade agreements. In China, we could only export our manufactured goods if they were made in China. So our capitalists were anxious to go there. But they could certainly export everything they wanted to into our country.

That one-way free trade doesn't work, and it has been a major factor in the economic crisis we face today. And that policy was permitted to continue. Because people were telling us if we just do this with China, they will liberalize and become a liberal democracy. I call that "hug a Nazi, make a liberal." That's the theory. Hug a Nazi, make a liberal. No.

We can get as close to them and do favors for them all we want, but we should have demanded the political liberalization, which would have opened up a two-way free trade relationship rather than a one-way.

Proponents of liberalization of trade, as I say, frequently claim that even the one-way trade, even the liberalization of trade as it existed, would create jobs in the United States, create U.S. exports, and improve the trade deficit with China. That's what we heard. Not only just that it would liberalize China, but it would be good for us in the meantime.

President Clinton claimed that the agreement allowing China into the World Trade Organization, which was negotiated during his administration, and I quote President Clinton, "creates a win-win result for both countries."

Well, has it been a win-win result? Our country's, as I say—our country's small and mid-level and even large manufacturing units have been decimated. People who had good manufacturing jobs now have low-paying survival jobs. Their children have no really great aspirations to be industrial leaders or great entrepreneurs and businessmen because the lifeblood has been sucked out of our country as our manufacturing jobs have gone to China.

And while it's true that exports support jobs in the United States, as we were told, we must now recognize that it is equally true that imports destroy American jobs. Yes, that's right. Exports create American jobs, but imports do what?

I know that because in my two harbors, two ports that I represent, 90 percent of all the commerce coming through those ports are containers coming in from China and the East, and only 10 percent are going out.

We are destroying jobs of our people, those jobs that are necessary for people to live in homes, for people to have decent standards of living. The net result of the trade flow on unemployment, it's very clear when you see the trade imbalance that exists, why we have an increasing level of unemployment.

And those people who are employed and have been employed over the last 10 years are getting jobs that are far worse and not as uplifting and not as socially mobile upwards as those jobs that their parents were getting back in the fifties and in the sixties.

China's economy and China's as military capabilities have been growing and expanding even as our country has been declining. But the trouble of it is when you look at the economic and the military capabilities that are growing in China, it quite often is based on the utilization of technology that came from the United States. In fact, some of this technology was actually developed by American taxpayers, not even by these big corporate giants who go over there and set up their manufacturing units. They end up taking technologies that we have paid for, for the research, and doing what? Manufacturing it over in China.

Right now, there's a big issue. What is that issue? It's whether or not we should loosen some of the controls on our technology exports. Well, I have been insisting we do that only to Democratic countries—and we especially do not loosen the technology controls on China.

It was just about 15 years ago during the Clinton administration when they permitted American satellites to be launched on Chinese rockets. At the time, I thought it was a good idea. I will have to admit that. I thought it was a good idea. But within a very short period of time I recognized what a horrendous reality was being created.

What we were doing were perfecting those Chinese rockets in order to send up our satellites at a cheaper rate. Thus, we undercut the development of our own missile and rocket industry, our own aerospace jobs, and at the same time we perfected the Chinese rockets and missiles so that they could more easily what? Carry military payloads as well as civilian payloads.

No, we shouldn't be loosening any of our technological restrictions on the transfer of technology to China. And even to this day, as we want to loosen them to democratic countries, there are moves here in Washington to try to take the exemption of China out.

I will make this very clear. I am part of the team that's trying to move forward legislation to permit our high-tech industries to export to friendly democratic countries. But I have personally put into and worked with my

other Members of Congress to ensure that part of the legislation restricts that loosening of controls to China so that they won't be able to launch American satellites on Chinese Long March rockets, because we know that will result in a technological transfer and an upgrading of those rockets.

For example, we have developed a chip that serves as a gyroscope. Costs us hundreds of billions of dollars to develop that chip. That was 15, 20 years ago. Today, of course, because of what happened 15 years ago, all of the Chinese rockets have a gyro on a chip. It didn't cost them a cent.

And all of these other manufactured goods that are being shipped over here, the Chinese haven't had to pay for the development costs. We've paid for it. The taxpayers and the corporations. And when a corporate leader sends his company to China, guess what? Yes, he gives himself a bonus for a few years and then disappears with tens of millions of dollars of bonus while his own company, the stockholders, and especially the workers of that company, suffer the damages when their jobs are eliminated and actually when the company is taken over by the Chinese.

Well, ironically, we have liberalized our trade with China, but China has not even liberalized its own government. In fact, China has been getting worse over these last two decades, not better. It was Tiananmen Square that was the turning point. Up until Tiananmen Square, there was a legitimate reason for us to build the economy of China to create closer ties because there was a movement on to create a new and democratic China that would be friend of ours and the world. There was a positive evolution going on politically and economically in China.

□ 2315

When it reached its tipping point at Tiananmen Square, the United States didn't stand tall. If Ronald Reagan would have been President, I can assure you he would have sent a telegram to the leaders, I'd say, to the gang who controls the Government of China. And he would have said, if you turn loose the army and slaughter the democratic movement in Tiananmen Square, all of the economic understandings we have, all of the capital investments and technology transfers, it's off. Reagan would have done that in a heartbeat. But George W's father, George Herbert Walker Bush was President. He did not share that same commitment, and there was no message sent to the Chinese, which was the worst message of all, because they now understood they could manipulate even the highest level of people in our government and of industry for short-term profit and that our elite does not give a damn about democracy or any of the other values that we, the American people, hold dear.

So we let our corporate elite dictate to us, and our government, under

George Herbert Walker Bush, took the easy way out. We acted like Tiananmen Square didn't count, and we let the corporations continue to make their quick buck so the corporate elites could give themselves their big bonuses. And in the end they were sending more jobs and more technology transfers and more capital investment to China, even though they had just slaughtered the democratic movement in Tiananmen Square. And now look at us. When we do something immoral, we come back and we pay a price for it.

Part of the reason we are in such economic hardship today can be traced right back to the immoral decision that I just mentioned. We've permitted this China, an authoritarian, totalitarian China, to have an open free-trade policy with the United States. But it was only free trade in one way, and there was no liberalization going on whatsoever. China should never have been given most-favored-nation status, and of course, we look at it now. China's been given that. Russia can't get anything. Russia can't even get the Jackson-Vanik restrictions to be taken off.

The tipping point in Russia came in 1991, which obviously caused a massive economic dislocation in Russia as it moved out of its socialist economy. So, in 1991, the great reforms were happening in China. The democratic movement wasn't slaughtered like it was in Tiananmen Square, but the Russian people were suffering hardship. The Russian economy collapsed, and there was a national despair in Russia, of course, and we watched this. While we built and fueled and invested in the Chinese economic machine, we said "No thanks" when it came to broadening our relationship with a liberalizing Russia.

Russia's not a little country. Russia is not insignificant. On the contrary, in the long term and in the grand scheme of history, we need Russia just as much as the Russians need us. If we are to confront the menace of radical Islam and the terrorist threat, we are going to have to stop the rogue states that are trying to acquire nuclear weapons. We're going to do that or combat radical Islam.

If we're going to combat, as I say, Iran or North Korea, we need to work with the Russians. We need to be partners with the Russians, not antagonists, and we certainly should not be looking at them as an enemy at a time when they have been trying to liberalize their country and have had great strides of liberalization since the Stalinist days of the Soviet Union. To be scrupulously accurate, we did, indeed, start a number of Russian-American partnerships in the 1990s.

In 1992, Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar pushed us to work with the Russians to secure and dismantle nuclear weapons arsenals in and around the former Soviet Union, a project that would make everybody safer. It was brilliant, and eventually

it evolved into the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. This program, the CTR, was a joint exercise between the United States, Russia, other former Soviet states and various military contractors. For a while, it went very, very well even though it had its ups and downs, and it's still going well. Despite the fact that certain people in the United States are complaining about it, they complain about the costs, but mostly they complain about working with the Russians to secure the Russians' weapons.

Well, that makes all the sense in the world to me that we work with them to dismantle weapons, nuclear weapons, and that gets to the heart of the problem. The type of people who are now deadly against us even trying to help the Russians dismantle their own weapons. We have a chance. And President Obama—I will have to say I've been very critical of him in his dealings with countries like Iran and elsewhere where he's not being tough, but he's trying to reach out to the Russians, and I applaud that. What he's trying to do is to find something that is mutually beneficial to us and that would be a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons cost a lot of money to both of our countries, and we are building them so that they can't be used. We are praying they will never be used. So if we are going to have money for the military, which we have to use to defeat radical Islam and to confront China, we need to make an agreement with Russia to bring down the level, not to eliminate nuclear weapons but bring down the level of those weapons that we believe should never be used so that we can afford to pay for the defense that we need to use.

And why aren't we doing that? I mean, Obama has laid the groundwork, but already we have people on my side of the aisle raising their voices with an ingrained sense of hostility towards Russia on any idea of reducing nuclear weapons. Well, how come we don't have that same antagonism towards China, who we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars to? The United States did withdraw from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. I supported that, and I still do, even though I know the Russians didn't like that and thought it was a hostile act. I believe in missile defense. That's why we withdrew from that treaty.

I believe we should reduce our number of nuclear weapons and build a missile defense system, but I disagree with how the Bush administration rushed forward to deploy a system in the Czech and Polish Republics right on Russia's borders. We should have done what Ronald Reagan advised, and that is, if the Russians would withdraw from Eastern Europe and give up this Communist attitude of dominating the world, we should make the Russians partners in designing, building, maintaining and operating an antimissile system.

So, instead, we set up this system that we knew would be considered a hostile act and would antagonize the Russians even at the same time as we were inviting Chinese military observers to observe our own military operations. We've got it totally backwards. The country with no liberalization whose government hates our way of life and imprisons people for religious purposes, that government we're inviting to observe our military operations and cooperate with their military while Russia, which has had every liberalization, even though they're imperfect, that country which wanted and would love to work with us on missile defense, we set up a system which is aimed at Russia. Well, if we keep expanding NATO and inching around Russia, you can expect them to think that we're doing this as a hostile act. We do this even as we try to open up our relations even further with China.

We chastise Russia for its imperfections, but we have not bothered to make demands on China even as we have invited the Chinese military to observe our military operations. We keep expanding NATO, as I say, inching around, but we always have a negative word for Russia; yet, in China, there has been no reform of its tyrannical and repressive practices.

So what else have we done? We haven't even offered support for those elements in China that do believe in reform and democracy. We can't get ourselves to have strong condemnations of the brutal massacres going on now with the Uyghurs, the Muslims or the Tibetans or the Falun Gong. We can't get our government to actually condemn China for the brutality, the massive brutality that they are perpetrating on their own people, much less, I might add, condemn them for their continued insistence on territorial claims.

China is not only an economic threat, but China is a massive threat to us as it builds its military, its rockets and missiles, in particular, as it claims huge territories of Russia and India and huge areas of the ocean right up to the shores of the Philippines. These are claims that China is making; yet the United States is not counteracting those claims even as we are antagonistic towards Russia.

If we are to have a free world, if we are to combat radical Islam, we need Russia on our side. If we are going to combat those rogue nations in Iran and North Korea, we need Russia on our side. And if we are to live at peace and to thwart these desires by China to dominate the world, we must have Russia on our side.

So far, American policy has been totally upside down in terms of Russia and China. We need to make sure that we enter new relationships. Instead of taking NATO and expanding it, we should now show Russia that we want a new coalition in this world and that Russia will be part of it.

I would suggest that as we leave NATO, that we instead form a new coalition, perhaps not formally, but a coalition of interests, of security interests with countries like India, Japan, Russia and the United States. They are the four legs to the table that will create stability for humankind. Other democratic countries will join with us. But we need to have a relationship, a viable relationship with those countries in order to combat those challenges that are upon us with radical Islam and that threat that looms over us, which is an ever-more increasingly powerful Communist China.

The future's up to us. We've got to be realists, but we've also got to remain true to our principles as Americans. And when we are not true to those principles, when we close our eyes to the repression going on in China, even as we speak at this moment, where Muslims are being shot down in parts of China because they are not willing to accept the repression of their own culture and the repression of their faith, or the Tibetans who have suffered the same, or the Falun Gong who want nothing more than to meditate and have yoga exercises, if we do not speak up for these persecuted people, we will be persecuted, and we will suffer as a result.

The economy is suffering because of incredibly stupid policies, economic policies, and the China trade policy has been one of the worst. Our country will suffer in the future if we do not have a rational policy of security and cooperation with Russia, with India, and with Japan.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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 Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 15.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today, July 9 and 10.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 15.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and July 9.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, July 9.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2515. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Kingdom of Bahrain pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2516. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Norway pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2517. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Tapentadol into Schedule II [Docket No.: DEA-319P] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2518. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — E-911 Grant Program [Docket No.: NHTSA-2008-0142] (RIN: 2127-AK37) received June 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2519. A letter from the Acting Division Chief, TAPD, WCB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2520. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800 MHz Band, Consolidating the 800 and 900 MHz Industrial/Land Transportation and Business Pool Channels [WT Docket 02-55] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2521. A letter from the Acting Division Chief, CPD, WCB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matters of Local Number Portability Porting Interval and Validation Requirements [WC Docket No.: 07-244]; Telephone Number Portability [CC Docket No.: 95-116] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2522. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2009, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2523. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2524. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the six-month period ending March 31, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2525. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Federal Aviation Admin-

istration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2526. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2527. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Federal Transit Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2528. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Office of the Secretary, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2529. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Office of the Secretary, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2530. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Office of the Secretary, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2531. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Office of the Secretary, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2532. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Research and Innovative Technology Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2533. A letter from the Department of Transportation — Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2534. A letter from the Acting Director, Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for the period beginning October 1, 2008 and ending March 31, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2535. A letter from the Office of the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's semi-annual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2536. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Rockets Over the River; Bullhead City, Arizona [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0070] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2537. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; AVI July Fireworks Display; Laughlin, Nevada [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1261] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2538. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Ohio River mile 265.2 to 266.2 and from