written in the blood of so many Americans, was nothing less than a second American Revolution.

It is no accident that our Department of Justice was born in 1871 following the Civil War as a response to the wave of hate crime terror instituted by the Ku Klux Klan. And, within the space of a few years the DOJ brought more than 500 prosecutions under the Enforcement Acts which broke the back of the Klan. It is unfortunate that the second and third incarnations of the Klan were not met with similarly forceful responses.

We need additional legislation on the Federal level to reinforce and upgrade the tools, both criminal and civil which give law enforcement the ability to prevent and punish hate crimes. Now is the time for state and local government to review their hate crime laws and upgrade the training of law enforcement officials to respond to hate crimes.

Most important, we must rally every American, every man, woman and child to join in defending our democracy. The best defense against hate crime is mass revulsion and rejection of racism, sexism and homophobia.

To paraphrase the remarks of Frederick Douglass, of July 4, 1852 condemning slavery and racism:

> * * * It is not light that is needed, but fire; it is not the gentle shower, but thunder. We need the storm, the whirlwind and the earthquake. The feeling of the nation which is insensitive to such crimes must be quickened; the conscience of the nation which tolerates such crimes must be roused; the propriety of the nation which ignores such crimes must be startled; the hypocrisy of the nation which tolerates such crimes must be exposed; and these crimes against God and community, men and women must be proclaimed and denounced and fought against with every fiber of our national will.

Hate crimes must not be tolerated at any level in our society.

AN ACCURATE READING OF THE COX COMMITTEE REPORT

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, following the public release of the Final Report of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, more commonly referred to as the Cox Committee report, there have been attempts to discredit the work of the select committee.

As one of the nine members of the select committee, this Member would like to reemphasize the truly bipartisan nature of the select committee and underscore that every finding made by the Cox committee in its report is fully corroborated with evidence detailed either in the public report itself or in the classified version.

The Cox committee report is not and has never claimed to be a comprehensive report, nor was it ever meant to be one. When rumors first arose that sensitive military technology was being illegally transferred to the People's Republic of China, the House of Representatives created a select committee to investigate such allegations with emphasis on the launch failure investigations of the failures of two Chinese rockets carrying commercial satellites produced by American companies and an investigation of the sale of high performance computers to China.

In the course of our investigation, far more disturbing information came to light that took us into unanticipated directions. Even as we were trying to close the select committee's operations, new revelations kept being brought to our attention by whistleblowers. It became clear that a very deep institutional problem had existed for some time in some of our Federal agencies and particularly the Department of Energy and its national laboratories, there at least since the late 1970s. I believe that these lapses of security at the DOE weapons laboratories taken together resulted in the most serious espionage loss and counterintelligence failure in American history. Moreover, these lapses facilitated the most serious theft ever of sensitive U.S. technology and information.

Clearly, what the select committee revealed is very disturbing. Americans should be angry that their own government's lax security, indifference, naivete and incompetence resulted in such serious damage to our national security. The loss of sensitive nuclear weapons information to China is a national embarrassment and an incredibly important loss.

The bipartisan Cox committee report should be used as the starting point in our efforts to fix the serious problems the select committee identified. Rather, some have focused on discrediting the report by improperly interpreting the very clear language we used and questioning the construction of the report. Instead, they should just focus their attention on the actual meaning of straightforward, plain English meanings of the words we used. We were very careful in what we said and how we said it.

The most recent distortion circulated in Washington and in the national media is a document written by Dr. James Gordon Prather entitled ''A Technical Reassessment of the Conclusions and Implications of the Cox Committee Report.'' It was released personally by the Honorable Jack Kemp after Empower America, the organization to which Mr. Kemp belongs and which sponsored Dr. Prather's research, refused to endorse the final document. The Prather document was also the subject of a Wall Street Journal article and one of Robert Novak's columns last week.

□ 2130

Dr. Prather claims that our select committee erred in finding that Chinese espionage penetrated U.S. weapons labs. Indeed he claims there was no evidence of Chinese espionage, that the real culprit is the Clinton administration's policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament and opening up the Nation's nuclear secrets to the world.

That is pure nonsense. Of course there was espionage. After careful review of the Prather document, this Member concludes that it was written with an underlying political agenda in mind; that is, to focus attention and blame on the Clinton administration, particularly its policy of engagement with China and its declassification of nuclear secrets. There is plenty of blame that might be headed that direction, but that should not discredit the Cox Committee Report.

If partisan politics is the purpose of the report, then we should recognize it as such, but it is a disservice to the Nation to discredit the work of the Cox committee if the result is that their recommendations are not implemented.

The cover letter to the Prather document clearly states, quote, ''the White House is using the espionage angle to mask the real security risk which comes not from foreign spies, but rather from the Clinton administration's own ill-conceived strategy,'' end of quote. Of course the United States is a target of foreign espionage, including Chinese espionage. To ignore or fail to act on such evidence is an embarrassment to the Clinton administration, and it is dangerous.

Without the Cox Committee, we would still not know of this massive failure or be seeing corrective action. There is a significant difference between analyzing the motive behind whatever partisan spin and public relations angle the White House has given to the Cox Committee Report and the Prather analysis of the contents and conclusions of the report itself.

It appears to this Member that the Prather document mixes up these distinctions for its partisan purposes. In order to better support and prove its conclusions, the Clinton administration policy alone, and not any Chinese espionage, is responsible for American national security losses. The Prather analysis necessarily had to redefine the Cox committee report in a critical way. Unfortunately the overall credibility of the Prather document is suspect, given its numerous flaws and its noticeable selective cherry picking of the Cox committee report.

For example, the Prather document essentially dismisses the charge that China stole design information for the neutron bomb with the help of Taiwan-born Peter Lee.

This dismissal is based on a deliberately selective reading of our report, faulty assumptions and a disregard for other information which is still classified. The Prather document called this theft charge (quote) ''ridiculous'' (unquote) and opined that the Cox Committee, in its zeal to be bipartisan, claimed the Chinese stole neutron bomb information (quote),

''because the alleged spying happened on Reagan's watch, not Clinton's watch.'' (unquote). Notwithstanding Dr. Prather's interpretations, Peter Lee pled guilty to willfully passing classified U.S. defense information to PRC scientists and to providing false statements to a U.S. government agency.

The Prather document also introduces the case of Wen Ho Lee, another scientist at Los Alamos. In fairness, the Prather document states that ''Wen Ho Lee is not mentioned by name in the Cox Report . . .'' He is not. However, aside from the caveat, Prather treats the Wen Ho Lee case as if it was the lynchpin of our investigation. It was not and furthermore the allegations against Wen Ho Lee are, at this time, still just that—allegations.

This Member does not disagree with Dr. Prather that through our open system, smart people can gather significant amounts of information other countries would consider very sensitive. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues may recall the publicity that was given to the book ''Mushroom'' which was written back in 1978 by John Phillips, then an undergraduate student at Princeton University. Mr. Phillips wrote about how he was able to design an atomic bomb using only the open-source information available in the university's library. Experts confirmed the design was valid. This Member is sure that the Chinese and others have similarly used our open system, as Dr. Prather states. However, the detailed design plans and other extremely sensitive information relating to the neutron bomb and other thermonuclear warheads have not been declassified and are not in Princeton's library or on the Los Alamos public website.

There are numerous other instances in the Prather document of inaccurate interpretations and distortions of the Cox Committee Report for which there is not enough time this evening to detail. However, given the apparent political objectives of the Prather document and the questionable selectivity of its analysis, it should be seen for what it really is: a partisan attack or a partisan counterattack to a Clinton Administration selective leak and spin operation against the findings of the Cox Committee, and it therefore does not warrant any further attention.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has just begun the job of implementing many of the 38 recommendations made in the Cox Committee Report. Most can be implemented by the executive branch without legislation. Some recommendations, such as increasing the penalties for export control violations, are relatively easy to legislate. Others such as reauthorizing the Export Administration Act, are not so simple and will take time and effort. This Member strongly urges his colleagues to concentrate on implementing these recommendations and not be distracted and dissuaded from this duty by those critics like the author of the Prather Report who all too apparently has a different agenda.

LT. COL. EILEEN COLLINS, FIRST FEMALE PILOT OF A SPACE SHUTTLE

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about a first that is, in my opinion, long overdue. Early tomorrow morning, shortly after midnight, Lieutenant Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman in the history of NASA, will command a 5-day Columbia space shuttle mission to launch NASA's most powerful space telescope, the Chandra X-ray Observatory.

Lieutenant Collins, who also can boast that she is the first female pilot of a space shuttle, is a good example of how far our space program has come since the first lunar landing 30 years ago tomorrow.

In these days of economic progress and budget surpluses, I urge all of my colleagues to support continued funding of the manned space program so that today's little girls can grow up knowing that they may be one of the first to walk on Mars or to conduct research in the international space station right alongside scientists from Italy, Russia, Japan, or wherever else in the world.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, and I guess a confirmed space nut, it makes me proud that I represent Johnson Space Center and its efforts to put more women into manned or, perhaps I should say, womaned space program.

Lieutenant Colonel Collins, I wish her Godspeed, a most successful mission, and a safe return for her and her crew.

HMO REFORM

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Another week has gone by, and the House of Representatives, United States of America, has done nothing to address HMO abuses in this country.

Of course we had, Mr. Speaker, a big debate on the other side of the capital last week, and I want to talk a little bit about that, that bill that passed, because I think that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will need to educate themselves on some of the details of that bill that passed the Senate last week.

I think we may be looking at that bill in the near future. I hope at least we will be looking at some bill on the floor in the near future. After all, it was about 2 weeks ago that the Speaker of the House told me personally that it was his intent to have HMO reform legislation on the floor by the middle of July.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am looking at my dates here, and here we are, it is past the middle of July; and furthermore, we are going to find time this week to debate a tax bill and other bills, and there is nothing in sight to even be having a committee markup in the Committee on Education and the Work Force or in the Committee on Commerce on HMO reform.

It is not exactly, Mr. Speaker, like we have not been dealing with this issue for the last 3 or 4 years in Congress. It is not exactly as if earlier this year we were overworked here on the floor when we were naming post offices. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we get this issue to the floor. There are people that are losing their lives and losing their limbs and their health is being injured because HMOs are making medical decisions that are not in the best interests of their clients, their patients.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk specifically about some of the provisions that are in Senate bill S. 1344, which passed last week in the Senate, because, Mr. Speaker, I have the bill here, and I have been reading through this bill, and you know, there is an old saying here in Congress: the devil is in the details. You can have awfully good headings, Mr. Speaker, but once you start looking at the language, you can find out that it comes up rather empty.

So let me just go over a few problems and deficiencies with the bill that passed the Senate last week.

Now a couple years ago we here in the House, the other body, passed a bill for Medicare and Medicaid recipients that was signed into law by President Clinton. It said that if you were having a chest pain, severe chest pain in the middle of the night such that a prudent lay person would say, hey, that could be a heart attack, you could go to the nearest emergency room and be treated, and your health plan would be responsible for covering the cost because we know from the American Heart Association that if you delay prompt treatment, diagnosis and treatment of a heart attack, you could be dead before you get your treatment; and unfortunately many HMOs have said, as my colleagues know, you could go to that emergency room, but if they find out that instead of having a heart attack that you just had a severe case of inflammation of your esophagus, for instance, well, that proves that you did not have a heart attack and we are not going to pay for it.

The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that once that information gets out, people are a little bit hesitant to go to the emergency room when they have crushing chest pain because they think, oh, my goodness, what if I am not having a heart attack? Then I could be left with thousands of dollars of bills. So maybe I will just be a little extra careful, and I will just stay at home here sweaty, really sick, until I am really sure that I have a heart attack.

Mr. Speaker, we wanted to fix that. We did that in Medicare and Medicaid. We passed what is called a lay person's definition of an emergency, and we told the Medicare health plans that you have to cover those services if a patient goes to the emergency room.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that it would not be too difficult to get the language right in a patient bill of