I would also like to thank Mr. George Clooney and his father for calling these atrocities to our attention.

I hope to say more about this in the days to come.

A VOICE FOR THE CUBAN DISSIDENTS

(Mr. RIVERA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERA. Mr. Speaker, ahead of Pope Benedict XVI's visit to Cuba next week, Cuban authorities detained about 70 members of the dissident group Ladies in White over the weekend, including 36 on Sunday morning as they attempted to attend mass.

The Ladies in White demonstrate peacefully in solidarity with their loved ones who were jailed during the Black Spring government crackdown 9 years ago. In recent days, the nonviolent efforts of the Ladies in White have been met with the beatings and detentions that have become synonymous with the Castro tyrants. Given that this is occurring on the eve of the Pope's visit, these events are disgraceful and should be universally condemned.

Hopefully, during his visit to Cuba next month, Pope Benedict will meet with dissent leaders like the Ladies in White and Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, who has publicly called on the Pope to engage them. By doing so, Pope Benedict will give voice to those who long for freedom and speak out in the face of brutal repercussions, and he will give hope to those who risk their lives so that one day Cuba may be free.

OUTCRY FOR SYRIA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much longer can we continue to watch the bloodshed and slaughter in Syria without demanding the United Nations' collaborative action providing those rebels, along with states out of the Arab League, the weapons that they need? We know that there is a hesitation to begin air attacks; but when you see the slaughter, the loss of life of women and children, it is outrageous.

We learned today that Russia joined the Red Cross in calling for a daily truce in Syria for humanitarian needs. That is not enough. Russia and China should stop their blocking of the United Nations and the Security Council of providing some aid to save the lives of innocent women and children.

This is a humanitarian crisis and it calls for a quick response. Yes, the Red Cross and humanitarian aid should be allowed in, but we should provide for those who are trying to defend themselves against oppression the kind of support on the ground that is necessary.

Where is the Arab League? Where is the collaborative effort of the United Nations? Where is the outcry for the bloodshed in Syria?

THE HIGH PRICE OF GAS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my good friend Congressman POE from Texas a few minutes ago, and I was wondering if the President at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, if he is in town and not campaigning someplace, is paying any attention. If I had a chance—and I know I can't address the President from the well, but if I could address the President from the well, I would say:

Mr. President, the people of this country are hurting; inflation is taking off on all kinds of food products and anything else that is being transported by truck. It is because of the energy costs. Gasoline is at an almost all-time high, and you, Mr. President, should be paying attention to it. We ought to be drilling off the Continental Shelf and in the ANWR and in the Gulf of Mexico, and we ought to be fracking. We ought to be also using coal and oil shale. Mr. President, you're not doing any of those things, and the people are suffering. Stay home. Pay attention, Mr. President. It's your job.

□ 1610

THREAT FROM HUAWEI

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share troubling information that has come to my attention about Huawei, a Chinese telecom firm which is attempting to increase its market share in the U.S.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that, ''Huawei's network business has thrived at the expense of struggling Western network companies,'' and is ''quietly building and investing in its own brand of high-end smart phones and tablets.'' But many Americans may not be aware that numerous government reports have linked Huawei's corporate leadership to the People's Liberation Army, raising serious concerns about its products being used for espionage by the Chinese Government.

Last week, respected national security reporter Bill Gertz wrote:

New information about Chinese civilian telecommunications companies' close support of the Chinese military and information warfare programs is raising fresh concerns.

That is why both the Bush administration and the Obama administration have repeatedly intervened to block Huawei's growth. Huawei is controlled by the same government that jails Catholic bishops and Protestant pastors, oppresses the Uyghur Muslims, has plundered Tibet, and that is providing the very rockets that Sudanese President Bashir is using to kill his own people.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to know whether their government is doing everything it can to protect their cell phone and data networks from foreign espionage and cyberattacks. As Huawei increases its lobbying presence in Washington, the American people should be fully aware of the firm's intimate links to the PLA and the serious concerns of our defense and intelligence community.

I rise today to share troubling information that has come to my attention about Huawei, a Chinese telecom firm, which is attempting to increase its market share in the United States and around the world. Numerous government reports have linked Huawei's corporate leadership to the Chinese intelligence services and the People's Liberation Army (PLA), raising concerns about Huawei networks and devices being subject to espionage by the Chinese government.

These connections are particularly noteworthy given Huawei's rapid rise as a telecom giant. According to an article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, ''Huawei Technologies Co. has almost doubled its work force over the past five years as it strives to become a mobile technology heavyweight.''

The article also noted that, ''Huawei's network business has thrived at the expense of struggling Western network companies such as Alcatel-Lucent Co. and Nokia Siemens Networks. Initially, Huawei supplied low-cost phones to telecommunications operators in the West under their own brand, but over the past year, Huawei has also been quietly building and investing in its own brand of high-end smartphones and tablets.''

Huawei executives make no secret of their goal to dominate the telecom market. In a March 6, 2012, interview with the technology news Web site, Engadget, Huawei device chief Richard Yu said, ''In three years we want Huawei to be the industry's top brand.''

However, Huawei's growth in the U.S. market should give all Americans serious pause. Last week, respected national security reporter Bill Gertz wrote in the Washington Free Beacon that, ''New information about Chinese civilian telecommunications companies' close support of the Chinese military and information warfare programs is raising fresh concerns about the companies' access to U.S. markets,'' according to a report by the congressional US-China Economic and Security Review Commission. ''One of the companies identified in the report as linked to the People's Liberation Army (PLA) is Huawei Technologies, a global network hardware manufacturer that has twice been blocked by the U.S. government since 2008 from trying to buy into U.S. telecommunications firms.''

The congressional report noted that, ''Huawei is a well established supplier of specialized telecommunications equipment, training and related technology to the PLA that has, along with others such as Zhongxing, and Datang, received direct funding for R&D on C4ISR [high-tech intelligence collection] systems capabilities.''

The report further added, ''All of these [Chinese telecom] firms originated as state research institutes and continue to receive preferential funding and support from the PLA,'' the report said.

Huawei's efforts to sell telecom equipment to U.S. networks have long troubled the U.S. defense and intelligence community, which has been concerned that Huawei's equipment could be easily compromised and used in Chinese cyberattacks against the U.S. or to intercept phone calls and e-mails from American telecom networks.

According to a 2005 report by the RAND Corporation, ''both the [Chinese] government and the military tout Huawei as a national champion,'' and ''one does not need to dig too deeply to discover that [many Chinese information technology and telecommunications firms] are the public face for, sprang from, or are significantly engaged in joint research with state research institutes under the Ministry of Information Industry, defense-industrial corporations, or the military.''

In fact, in 2009, the Washington Post reported that the National Security Agency ''called AT&T because of fears that China's intelligence agencies could insert digital trapdoors into Huawei's technology that would serve as secret listening posts in the U.S. communications network.''

Over the last several years, Huawei's top executives' deep connections to the People's Liberation Army and Chinese intelligence have been well documented. As Gertz summarized in his article, ''A U.S. intelligence report produced last fall stated that Huawei Technologies was linked to the Ministry of State Security, specifically through Huawei's chairwoman, Sun Yafang, who worked for the Ministry of State Security (MSS) Communications Department before joining the company.''

That is why senior administration officials in the Bush and Obama administrations have repeatedly intervened to block Huawei's access to U.S. networks. ''In 2008, the Treasury Department-led Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) blocked Huawei from purchasing the U.S. telecommunications firm 3Com due to the company's links to the Chinese military,'' Gertz reported. ''Last year, under pressure from the U.S. government, Huawei abandoned their efforts to purchase the U.S. server technology company 3Leaf. In 2010, Congress opposed Huawei's proposal to supply mobile telecommunications gear to Sprint over concerns that Sprint was a major supplier to the U.S. military and intelligence agencies.''

It's not just Huawei's longstanding and tight connections to Chinese intelligence that should trouble us. Huawei has also been a leading supplier of critical telecom services to some of the worst regimes around the world. Last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that Huawei ''now dominates Iran's government-controlled mobile-phone industry . . . it plays a role in enabling Iran's state security network.''

Gertz reported that Huawei has also been ''linked to sanctions-busting in Saddam Hussein's Iraq during the 1990s, when the company helped network Iraqi air defenses at a time when U.S. and allied jets were flying patrols to enforce a no-fly zone. The company also worked with the Taliban during its short reign in Afghanistan to install a phone system in Kabul.''

Mr. Speaker, given all of this information, there should be no doubt Huawei poses a serious national and economic security threat to the U.S. It is no secret that the People's Republic of China has developed the most aggressive espionage operation in modern history, especially given its focus on cyberattacks and cyberespionage.

Perhaps that is why Beijing has ensured that Huawei is able to continue its global market growth by ''unsustainably low prices and [Chinese] goverment export assistance,'' according to January 2011 congressional report on the national security implications of Chinese telecom companies. Due to China's secrecy, the full extent of Huawei's subsidies are not be fully known. But given its unrealistically low prices, it remains unknown whether Huawei is even making a profit as it seeks to dominate the telecom market. Why would the Chinese government be willing to generously subsidize such unprofitable products?

Earlier this year, The Economist magazine published a special report on Communist Party management of Chinese corporations. The Economist reported that, ''The [Communist] party has cells in most big companies—in the private as well as state-owned sector—complete with their own offices and files on employees. It holds meetings that shadow formal board meetings and often trump their decisions''

The Chinese even have an expression for this strategy: ''The state advances while the private sector retreats.''

Author Richard McGregor wrote that the executives at Chinese companies have a ''red machine'' with an encrypted line to Beijing next to their Bloomberg terminals and personal items on their desks.

Last year, the Financial Times reported that the PLA has even documented how it will use telecom firms for foreign espionage and cyberattacks. A paper published in the Chinese Academy of Military Sciences' journal noted: ''[These cyber militia] should preferably be set up in the telecom sector, in the electronics and internet industries and in institutions of scientific research,'' and its tasks should include ''stealing, changing and erasing data'' on enemy networks and their intrusion with the goal of ''deception, jamming, disruption, throttling and paralysis.''

The same article also documented the growing number PLA-led cyber militias housed in ''private'' Chinese telecom firms. The article reported on one example at the firm Nanhao: ''many of its 500 employees in Hengshui, just south-west of Beijing, have a second job. Since 2005 Nanhao has been home to a cybermilitia unit organized by the People's Liberation Army. The Nanhao operation is one of thousands set up by the Chinese military over the past decade in technology companies and universities around the country. These units form the backbone of the country's internet warfare forces, increasingly seen as a serious threat at a time of escalating global cybertensions.

Senior U.S. military and intelligence officials have become increasingly vocal about their concerns about the scope of Chinese espionage and cyberattacks. According to recent testimony given before the Senate, Defense Intelligence Agency chief General Ron Burgess said, ''China has used its intelligence services to gather information via a significant network of agents and contacts using a variety of methods . . . In recent years, multiple cases of economic espionage and theft of dual-use and military technology have uncovered pervasive Chinese collection efforts.''

Last year, the reticent Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive issued a warning that, ''Chinese actors are the world's most active and persistent perpetrators of economic espionage.'' The counterintelligence office took this rare step of singling out the Chinese due to the severity of the threat to U.S. national and economic security.

And March 8, 2012 Washington Post article described how, ''For a decade or more, Chinese military officials have talked about conducting warfare in cyberspace, but in recent years they have progressed to testing attack capabilities during exercises . . . The [PLA] probably would target transportation and logistics networks before an actual conflict to try to delay or disrupt the United States' ability to fight, according to the report prepared by Northrop Grumman for the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.''

We are beginning to witness the consequences of this strategy. According to a March 13, 2012 New York Times article, ''During the five-month period between October and February, there were 86 reported attacks on computer systems in the United States that control critical infrastructure, factories and databases, according to the Department of Homeland Security, compared with 11 over the same period a year ago.''

In an interview with the New York Times, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said, ''I think General Dempsey said it best when he said that prior to 9/11, there were all kinds of information out there that a catastrophic attack was looming. The information on a cyberattack is at the same frequency and intensity and is bubbling at the same level, and we should not wait for an attack in order to do something.''

A 2010 Pentagon report found ''. . . In the case of key national security technologies, controlled equipment, and other materials not readily obtainable through commercial means or academia, the People's Republic of China resorts to more focused efforts, including the use of its intelligence services and other-than legal means, in violation of U.S. laws and export controls.''

The report also highlighted China's cyber-espionage efforts. The U.S. intelligence community notes that China's attempts to penetrate U.S. agencies are the most aggressive of all foreign intelligence organizations.

Notably, Chinese espionage isn't limited to government agencies. In an October 4 Washington Post article, Rep. Mike Rogers, chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, remarked, ''When you talk to these companies behind closed doors, they describe attacks that originate in China, and have a level of sophistication and are clearly supported by a level of resources that can only be a nation-state entity.''

This prolific espionage is having a real and corrosive effect on job creation. Last year, the Washington Post reported that, ''The head of the military's U.S. Cyber Command, Gen. Keith Alexander, said that one U.S. company recently lost $1 billion worth of intellectual property over the course of a couple of days—'technology that they'd worked on for 20-plus years—stolen by one of the adversaries.' ''

That is why, in February 2012 testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence FBI Director Robert Mueller said that while terrorism is the greatest threat today, ''down the road, the cyber threat will be the number one threat to the country.''

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that Huawei is one face of this emerging threat. And the American people have a right to know whether their government is doing everything it can to protect their cell phone and data networks.

As Huawei increases its lobbying presence in Washington, members should be fully aware of the firm's intimate links to the PLA and the serious concerns of our defense and intelligence community.

Verizon, Sprint, AT&T, T-Mobile and other U.S. network carriers should not be selling Huawei devices given these security concerns. But if they do, they have an obligation to inform their customers of these threats. This is especially important when carriers are selling Huawei phones and tablets to corporate customers.

They have a right to know that Beijing may be listening.

CBC HOUR: THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight the Congressional Black Caucus again thanks the Democratic leader for allowing us to have this hour to talk about something very important.

As we approach the second anniversary of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, a truly landmark law that's bringing about health reforms that are helping millions of Americans not only save money but have healthier lives, we want to review some of those facts this evening, not the myths, not the misrepresentations about this great law, the facts.

There's so much that's being spread that is just flat-out wrong, wrong about the facts and wrong to tell our fellow Americans things that are just not true about this law.

At this time, I would like to begin yielding to some of my colleagues. I will begin by yielding such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from Cleveland, Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much. And I want to thank Representative CHRISTENSEN for continuing to host this hour. Thank you very much for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, hard-working Americans have paid the price for policies that handed free reign to insurance companies and put barriers between patients and their doctors. We all want to be in charge of our own care, and it is not too much to ask. The Affordable Care Act forces insurance companies to be responsible, prohibiting them from dropping your coverage if you get sick or billing you into bankruptcy because of an annual or lifetime limit.

For the first time, under Federal law, insurance companies are required to publicly justify their actions if they want to raise rates by 10 percent or more. The law also bans insurance companies from imposing lifetime dollar limits on health benefits, freeing cancer patients and individuals suffering from other chronic diseases from worrying about going without treatment.

The law also ensures that everyone pays their fair share and gets affordable insurance because, when people without insurance get sick, the costs get passed down to the rest of us. Despite other claims, you can keep the coverage you have if you want it, or, if you like your plan, you don't have to keep it. You can pick an affordable insurance option so that you can take responsibility for your health and your family's health.

Having everyone take responsibility for their own care started as a Republican idea, but unfortunately they have abandoned it in an effort to dismantle the new health care law. We know that the American people strongly support what the new health care law does, even though Republican rhetoric has encouraged many not to support the law. When you ask about specific provisions, you get a much clearer picture.

□ 1910

According to a poll done by the Kaiser Family Foundation, 85 percent of people support the discount seniors will get in prescription drugs, which began this year. Seventy-nine percent support subsidies to help low- and moderate-income people buy insurance, which is scheduled to start in 2014. Seventy-eight percent support tax credits to small businesses to offer coverage to workers. The credits are available starting this year. Seventy-one percent of people support prohibiting insurers from denying coverage to people with preexisting conditions, a provision that goes into effect in 2014. Sixty-six percent support making insurers meet a threshold of spending on actual medical care as opposed to administrative costs and profits. This provision goes into effect this year. Sixty-five percent support the law's provision making some preventive care services free to Medicare beneficiaries. It's now in effect. I won't keep going, but I could, Mr. Speaker.

Americans support the provisions of the Affordable Care Act because it gives them the reins. It gives them the ability to choose, not the insurance companies. Americans overwhelmingly agree that the health care system we had before was broken.

The Affordable Care Act is already helping millions of Americans as well as small businesses. 105 million Americans have had the lifetime limit on their coverage eliminated. Seventeen million children who have preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers. Two and a half million additional young adults now have health insurance through their parents. 360,000 small employers used the small business health care tax credit to help them afford health insurance for 2 million workers in 2011. $2.1 billion is the amount that seniors in the doughnut hole have already saved on their prescription drugs. That's an Average of $604 per senior.