we allowed the President of the Republic of China—free China—to visit the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as if that were not enough, there is another facet to the Chinese problem which is potentially more ominous than all of the Chinese crimes which I have cataloged. The Chinese are engaged in the most aggressive military modernization program of any nation in the world. They are building and buying a blue water navy. They have recently completed a series of offensive missile tests off the coast of Taiwan.

Taiwan poses no military threat to the Beijing dictators. There is only one reason for the Communists to embark on a missile buildup. They are deathly afraid that free China, with its robust markets and its expanding democracy, will provide the world with a stark contrast to the crimes and deficiencies of the Communist dictatorship. They believe that their missile tests will intimidate free China and force it off the world stage. Of course, they don't understand the mettle of free people.

Mr. Speaker, our State Departmemt has turned a blind eye to the threat posed to all of Asia by Beijing. While the Communists arm, Foggy Bottom does business as usual. Enough is enough. It is time to finally take a stand for freedom and draw a line in the sand against Communist aggression before its too late for our friends on Taiwan and across Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I have included for the House's review a chronology of Beijing's latest series of threats against free China.

CHINESE MISSILE TESTS

Background: September 30, 1994, President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China told the Wall Street Journal that he was willing to meet with PRC leaders to discuss relations between the ROC and the PRC. Beijing said no.

January 30, 1995, PRC leader Jiang Zemin issued an eight-point plan for future bilateral relations between the mainland and Taiwan,

April 8, 1995, President Lee formally responded to President Jiang's eight points with a six-point counterproposal.

May 22, 1995, bowing to Congressional pressure, President Clinton decided to allow President Lee to visit Lee's alma mater, Cornell University.

June 9, 1995, President Lee delivered the Olin Speech at Cornell University.

July 21, through 26, 1995, PRC forces staged ballistic missile exercises near Taiwan. The missiles were all MTCR class, four short range and two intermediate range. All were modern, mobile nuclear-capable. The tests in the open sea 80 miles from Taiwan forced the closure of fisheries and the diversion of commercial flights. The Taiwan stock market promptly plunged 6.8 percent amid jitters about a Chinese attack.

August 15 through 25, 1995, PRC forces resumed military exercises in the Taiwan Strait. A second round of guided missile tests. Firings of guided missiles and live artillery shells in the East China Sea north of Taiwan. The tests zone off Zhejiang is a few miles north of the area where China's military test-fired six surface-to-surface missiles from July 21 through July 26.

In addition, PRC launched strong personal attacks on President Lee Teng-hui. PRC's People's Daily (overseas edition), in four separate commentaries, called Lee stubborn, insisting on separating Taiwan from the motherland, creating two China's employing ''money diplomacy,'' ''vacation diplomacy'' and ''alumni diplomacy.'' Lee is a traitor and an advocate of Taiwan independence.

President Lee's response to the PRC: In a September 1 interview with Thomas Friedman of the New York Times, President Lee makes clear that ''he is not seeking internationally recognized independence for Taiwan . . . desire to . . . resume the quiet dialogue that had been going on between Beijing and Taipei. . . .''

Results of the missile tests and personal attacks on Lee: Fear and panic throughout Taiwan. The stock market plummeted to a 20-month low. Land prices sagged. Also, the Taiwan dollar has hit a 4-year low of 27.36 to the U.S. dollar.

PRC's motives: cutting support for President Lee Teng-hui and creating tensions in the Taiwan Straits before the island's December parliamentary elections and next March's presidential elections. Warning Taipei not to try to raise its world status such as returning to the United Nations or practicing ''pragmatic diplomacy.''

PRC threats continue: The worst nightmare in Asia is a Chinese invasion of Taiwan. PRC regards Taiwan as a renegade province, and repeatedly warns that it reserves the right to use force to recover Taiwan.

Clinton administration's response to China's escalation of its war of nerves against Taiwan has been nearly non-existent. Wall Street Journal (8/17/95) warns that if the administration ''continues to treat the threats to Taiwan with nonchalance, it will risk new political instability in a region that has been the major contributor to global economic growth.''

What is needed now? Wall Street Journal (8/17/95) calls for the Seventh Fleet to patrol the area: ''The U.S. has held back out of fear of seeming provocative over what looked like a shadow boxing exercise. But that has sent the wrong message, as China's escalation of the tests has demonstrated.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes:

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us makes grave changes in the Nation's highway safety law, repealing national speed limits and mandatory helmet laws. The result will be a new, enormous unfunded mandate: Costs to the States as well as to the Federal Government and the general public of emergency, rehabilitative and long-term health care for those injured because these protections are gone; costs to employers of lost workdays; and costs to insurance companies, paid for by everyone who purchases insurance. An incalculable costs to family and friends, and to the victims themselves, who might have avoided injury or death if speed limits and helmet laws had remained in place.

The amendment I intended to offer would have required States, prior to raising their speed limits, to take a snapshot of the current costs of motor vehicle crashes, and another snapshot 1 year later, after changes had gone into effect. If we are going to permit repeal of safety laws, we should at least know the consequences of these actions.

The amendment agreed to with my good colleagues, which I offer now, is more modest. It requires the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with any State that raises its speed limit, to prepare a study of the costs to the State of deaths and injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes, and the benefits associated with the repeal of the national maximum speed limit.

To provide meaningful, useful information, the report should include information on the costs before the State changes its safety laws, and after. It would thus be my intent that the Secretary's report, due September 30, 1997, include information on the costs of motor vehicle crashes in the year before changes go into effect; and again a year later.

That report should include, at a minimum, the costs of acute, rehabilitative and long-term medical care, sources of reimbursements and the extent to which these sources cover actual costs; and the costs to all levels of government, to employers, and others.

All States are not alike. Each State will want to know its own data, so that it can determine whether its problems are coming from alcohol-related or speed-related causes, from not wearing seatbelts or helmets, or other causes, and perhaps adjust its laws accordingly.

The report should therefore also include additional factors such as whether excess speed or alcohol were involved in the accident, whether seat belts and motorcycle helmets were used by those involved in the crash, and any other factors the Secretary may wish to add, or State to know.

We do know that the costs of motor vehicle crashes are substantial, even with the current laws in effect. NHTSA's data indicate that the lifetime economic costs of motor vehicle injuries, fatalities and property damage that occurred in 1990 will be $137.5 billion. American taxpayers will pay $11.4 billion of that total to cover publicly funded health care ($3.7 billion), reduced income tax revenue ($6.1 billion) and increased public assistance expenses ($1.6 billion).

The lifetime economic costs of alcohol-related motor vehicle injuries, fatalities and property damage that occurred in 1990 was $46.1 billion. Of this, the American taxpayer will pay $1.4 billion to cover publicly funded health care and $3.8 billion to cover reduced income tax revenue and increased public assistance.

States and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] have good data now on which to base the first report. NHTSA has been working with the States to develop such databases.

States want and need these data. The National Association of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives wrote on behalf of my original amendment:

NAGHSR believes that such a requirement is both reasonable and necessary. It would allow every state to establish a baseline of data with which to determine the costs of motor vehicle crashes prior to the repeal of the mandatory federal safety requirements. It would also allow a state to determine the changes in these costs over time. States would be able to use the information to evaluate the effectiveness of their highway safety programs and Safety Management Systems. * * * The requirement will not be onerous to the States since crash cost information is already available through NHTSA.

The Federal Government—and Congress—have a legitimate interest in knowing what is happening on a Federal transportation system. We are not preventing States from doing what they want, but we and the States have a responsibility to know and squarely face the consequences of our actions.

We and the States need the facts. This report will provide the data and help guide future decisions. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK REDMILES

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Frank Redmiles, a man who has dedicated 45 years of his life to bettering his family, his community, and the lives of tens of thousands of working men and women throughout Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York.

Frank Redmiles is retiring from four decades of toil and service in behalf of the men and women of the United Auto Workers. And while he may be retiring from active service, his legacy is certain to live on and inspire future generations of labor advocates.

From the very beginning of his working life, in 1950 at the former ITE Circuit Breaker Co. in Northeast Philadelphia, Frank Redmiles was a union man. He began in the then-independent union, the ESU, which later affiliated with the United Auto Workers.

He started out, like so many advocates, as a shop steward. He served 12 years on the United Auto Workers' negotiating committee. He became chairman, of that committee.

Frank Redmiles was in the forefront of the affiliation of the ESU with the United Auto Workers in 1969. He served as a trustee and as shop chair, and then was elected president of UAW Local 1612—a post he held for 7 years.

In 1979, Mr. Redmiles was appointed as an international representative of the UAW for southeastern Pennsylvania, and in 1985, he reached the pinnacle of his union advocacy when he was appointed Pennsylvania area director of region nine of the UAW—a post from which he represented the interests of more than 75,000 working men and women.

The 1980's, as we all know, were difficult economic times for working men and women in the United States. The constant pressures from foreign companies and foreign competition fell particularly hard on the automobile industry, and the workers of the UAW felt those pressures and hard times.

But through every one of those difficult days, months and years, Frank Redmiles never stopped fighting. He never stopped fighting for fair and equitable contracts for his rank and file. He never stopped fighting for a living wage. And he never stopped fighting to save the jobs of American workers.

And, while Mr. Redmiles was serving as such a tireless advocate for UAW workers, he was also finding time to serve his larger community as well. He served on the Philadelphia Mayor's Scholarship Advisory Committee, and he served on the city's zoning board as well, eventually as chairman. In addition, he served on the board of the Ben Franklin Partnership, and in 1992 he was appointed to serve on the transition team of Mayor Edward G. Rendell.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to bring to the House's attention the life story and public service of Frank Redmiles, a man whose 45 years of advocacy to the cause of the working men and women of the United Auto Workers do much justice to the historic legacy of a proud American labor organization.

TONGASS TRANSFER AND TRANSITION ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, throughout the West, a growing frustration with Federal land barons and their policies is rekindling the sagebrush rebellion. Nowhere are Federal land decisions more destructive to families and hard working people than in the 17 million acre Tongass forest in southeast Alaska.

In a forest that large it should be easy to balance the uses and make people happy, but the Federal Government has failed miserably.

The bill that I am introducing today gives Alaskans a chance to take control of their future in the Tongass National Forest. Today I propose a way to end the continuing Tongass brawl and give Alaskans a chance to resolve their differences at home.

When this bill becomes law, and the Alaska State Legislature and our Governor take advantage of the privilege offered in the bill, ownership of the Tongass National Forest automatically transfers to the State of Alaska. One year later when the transition period expires, management of the Tongass will be in the capable hands of Alaskans. Everyone will have a better chance of stability.

I have no choice but to make a proposal to liberate the Tongass and the Alaskans so adversely affected by the current Federal policies and requirements in the Tongass.

Since statehood, it has never been worse in the Tongass.

Nobody is happy. It takes 3 years for tourism operators to get access permits in a 17 million acre forest. Leaders in fishing groups complain existing protection for fisheries are not enforced. Crabbers fight for space and permits to store their crab pots. Cabin permits become Federal issues when simple improvements are made. Millions of dollars are spent on studies that produce no conclusions and call for more money for more studies. Even the environmentalists are so unhappy with decisions in the Tongass that they continually appeal and sue the agency.

Time after time, the Federal Government has failed those who rely on the Tongass. Congress has withdrawn 6 million acres in the Tongass only to have the agency propose even more land withdrawals. A series of new Federal laws and more impossible regulations are added.

Alaskans in the Tongass are frustrated with the leadership of the U.S. Forest Service, particularly the political appointees who control it. While they ignore the needs of Alaskans, their decisions produce no real benefit to the environment or to fish and game and do not consider the needs of people.

I told the agency heads back in January that Alaskans had suggested the type of proposal that I am making today. I told them that I was considering a proposal that would transfer their lands. I asked that they improve their policies and decisionmaking on our national forests and public lands. I have seen no improvement. Decisions just keep getting worse.

Even after the President's political appointees in the Government decided to cancel the large timber contract, they still refuse to offer timber to small business people. While 80 million board feet should be available for small mills, only 35 million board feet has been provided in the Tongass this year, most of it at the end of the season when it does little good.

Communities in southeast Alaska are suffering. Productive, hardworking people are out of work. Forty-two percent of the timber jobs are gone in Southeast. The President's political appointees who control the Federal land managers just do not seem to care. They continue to propose problems instead of solutions.

Alaskans and others realize that their State legislature is closer to the economic and ecologic needs in the Tongass. It has a much better understanding of policies that will bring peace to the Tongass than does the U.S. Congress and the Federal Forest Service.

Given the choice, a majority of southeasterners would rather see the State of Alaska own the Tongass than continue with Federal management. Fifty five percent would support a Tongass transfer to the State according to a recent poll. Alaskans clearly favor what my bill seeks to accomplish.

No particular group asked for this bill. I stress that point. No particular group asked for this bill, but I have listened to what Alaskans have been saying since the passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act. I have discussed the ideas in this draft with Alaskans.

I have listened to our Governor of Alaska speaking through Commissioner Willie Hensley. At Senator MURKOWSKI's workshop on the Senate bill Commissioner Hensley said:

> The hallmarks which guide our [state] policies in connection with the Tongass include . . . maximum self determination for the people of Southeast Alaska with respect to land management decisions which affect them, and a minimum of legislative prescriptions from Washington D.C.

My bill relies on the Governor's wisdom. My bill gives Alaskans a chance to achieve maximum self-determination for the people of southeast Alaska. There will be no running back to Washington, DC, to a Congress that uses the Tongass as a political pawn. Tongass policies will be Alaskan policies. Our Governor wants no Washington, DC, legislative mandates and that is what my bill proposes.

I also heard elected leaders of the State legislature. This year the Alaska Legislature overwhelmingly passed Senate Joint Resolution 6. That resolution noted that America's Founding Fathers knew that control of land is power. They knew that centralized Federal Government with a substantial land base would eventually overwhelm the States and threaten individual freedom. Senate Joint Resolution 6 said:

> Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature urges the 104th Congress of the United States to . . . transfer to the states, by fee