

ticker tape parades like our military sometimes does, as if they are something less of American servants than the people in uniform.

Actually these people, our intelligence personnel, perform an enormous service for our country, and they do it, generally speaking, in a way in which they receive very little credit for what they have done.

In the end, at the end of their career, they know what they did. One or two other people, or maybe a handful of people, may know what they have done for their country. But, as I said, they do not come home to ticker tape parades.

I think we have to adjust our attitude about the value and the patriotism of the folks who work in the intelligence services for our country. I hope we get to the bottom of what happened in Africa. I hope that it serves a warning bell to us in this House that we need to put more resources into the intelligence and the counterterrorism area.

I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, has any comments.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just quickly make one final point, and that is that acts of terrorism, we know now, are not carried out in a vacuum. They are part of an overall plan to destabilize some kind of activity. I would suggest that, in this case, Mr. Speaker, it appears that it is an activity to destabilize our overseas international operations. I think the American people ought to be aware that it is not just an act. It is a planned covert activity that is being carried out in general against our country.

CELEBRATION OF 50 YEARS OF INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I want to join with the people of India and the Indian American community as we conclude a year of celebrations in honor of the 50th year of Indian independence.

The 51st anniversary of India's independence will actually occur on August 14th of this year, when Congress is in recess. So I wanted to take this opportunity today to mark this important occasion before my colleagues and the American people in this House.

On August 14 of 1947, after years of determined and dignified struggle, the people of India finally gained their independence. That midnight hour, a vote by India's first Prime Minister, Nehru, in a stirring speech to the Parliament, marked the beginning of an inspiring effort by the people of India to establish a Republic devoted to the principles of democracy and secularism.

In the 5 decades since then, despite the challenges of sustaining economic

development while reconciling her many ethnic and religious and linguistic communities, India has stuck to the path of free and fair elections, a multiparty political system, and the orderly transfer of power from one government to a successor.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, India once again demonstrated its continued commitment to democratic values through its parliamentary elections in which more than 300 million people voted. The 1998 elections were but the latest example of the vibrancy of the electoral process in the world's largest democracy.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, while the programs and policies have changed over the years, successive Indian governments representing various parties and coalitions, have continued to build on the dream of India's first Prime Minister Nehru to move forward on the path of representative democracy and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, there is a rich tradition of shared values between the United States and India. The United States and India both proclaimed their independence from the British colonial order. India derived key aspects of her Constitution, particularly the statement of fundamental rights, from our own Bill of Rights. The Indian independence movement has strong moral support from American intellectuals, political leaders and journalists. One of our greatest American heroes, Dr. Martin Luther King, in his struggle to make the promise of American democracy a reality for all of our citizens, Dr. King derived many of his ideas of nonviolent resistance to injustice from the teachings of the father of India's independence movement, Mahatma Gandhi.

In our time, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing another exciting way in which our two societies are moving closer together, namely through the influx of immigrants from India who have made their homes in America. The Indian American community, now numbering more than 1 million, have become an important part of the ethnic mosaic in my home State of New Jersey and in communities throughout the United States. As they strive for a part of the American dream, Indian Americans continue to enrich our civic, political, business, professional and cultural life through their commitment to hard work, family values and communities. The Indian American community also serves as a human bridge between the world's two largest democracies.

Another way in which India and America continue to grow closer is through economic ties. The historic market reforms begun in India at the beginning of this decade continue to move forward, offering unparalleled opportunities for trade, investment and joint partnerships, all of which include a human dimension of friendship and cooperation, in addition to the economic benefits for both societies.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this House will soon after the recess pass legislation I have sponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), which would allow the Government of India to construct a statue of Gandhi here in Washington, D.C. The legislation, which has been reported out of committee and is ready for floor action, stipulates that American taxpayers would not have to bear any costs for constructing or maintaining the memorial, but merely provides the land for the Government of India to construct the monument. The location of the monument would be adjacent to the Indian Embassy on Washington's "Embassy Row" on Massachusetts Avenue. The National Capital Memorial Commission has already given its approval to this proposal.

Washington, as we know, is a city of great monuments and memorials that help define who we as Americans are and what we as a Nation stand for, and I believe that the proposed Gandhi memorial would be a worthy addition to the landscape of our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, we Americans celebrated the Fourth of July. For nearly 1 billion people in India, one sixth of the human race, the 14th of August holds the same significance, and I am proud to extend my congratulations to the people of India as they embark on their second half-century of independence and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the August recess after today, the United States and India are preparing to meet and discuss peace and security in south Asia. We all know that our relations were somewhat dampened after the explosion of the nuclear bombs, the tests that occurred back in May of this year. Last week the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans met with Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia, Rick Inderfurth. And Mr. Inderfurth has accompanied Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot for talks in New Delhi. Mr. Inderfurth said that the meetings in India were positive and he believed that progress was being made in terms of improving relations. He categorized the bilateral meetings as successful "quiet diplomacy." He told the India Caucus that the United States was not demanding, but helping India take the proper steps towards international consensus on nuclear nonproliferation.

Later this month in Washington, Mr. Talbot will again meet with India's Prime Minister's representative, Mr. Jaswant Singh, to reconcile U.S. differences on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I am confident that progress will be made at this meeting.

I am confident because earlier this week, India's Prime Minister Vajpayee told the Indian Parliament that India was close to signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The Prime Minister felt that India was ready to sign, because India's national security is no longer compromised and it is not necessary to conduct further nuclear tests.

Furthermore, he said that he wanted to improve bilateral relations with Pakistan and that he wanted to conduct ranging talks with Pakistan that incorporated long-term vision.

Although a recent meeting between India and Pakistan's prime ministers did not lead to concrete and positive results, they may meet again in South Africa later this month, and I am hoping that they will meet and resolve some issues that have kept them apart and begin talks for peace in south Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that the U.N. Conference on Disarmament is close to beginning new talks on halting the production of nuclear bomb fissile material. India, a member of the conference, has agreed to take an active role in the talks; and ironically, India and Pakistan's nuclear tests have revived the talks after they stalled for 3 years.

When we return from the August recess, I look forward to working with Members of this body in giving the President proper sanction waiver authority so that he may have more flexibility in imposing sanctions. Senator BROWNBACK has amended the Senate agricultural appropriations bill so that the President would have a limited waiver authority. And this amendment is similar to the proposal put forward by the Senate Task Force on Sanctions.

Although the House agricultural appropriations bill does not include a similar amendment, I hope that my colleagues will include the amendment in the conference report. I have introduced similar language to the Brownback amendment and the Senate task force proposal, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the Brownback amendment and give the President proper waiver authority.

When India conducted nuclear tests earlier this year, for a period of time there was no dialogue between our two countries, but now we are talking and determined to maintain peace in south Asia. To encourage such dialogue, President Clinton should continue with his plans to visit India, probably this November. It has been almost 20 years since a U.S. President has been to south Asia, and if the President is serious about peace and nuclear non-proliferation, he should go to India.

Mr. Speaker, I have a large Indian American constituency in my district in New Jersey, and this community feels very strongly that U.S.-India relations need to prosper, regardless of the two countries' views towards nuclear tests. One leader in the community, Dr. Sunil Jaitly, recently noted that the gap between India and the United States is not large and that the differences can be resolved. Dr. Jaitly said, and I agree, that "the U.S. and India need to express to each other clearly and open-heartedly" so that "we may eliminate any and all misunderstandings created by the May 1998 events."

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to say that it is important that we support

the administration and India in their efforts to reconcile their differences in an effort to bring peace not only to south Asia, but throughout the world.

TRANSFER OF AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY TO CHINESE COMMUNISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 of this year, I came to the floor of the House to use 1 hour of time available to me in a special order to discuss a matter of utmost importance to the security of our country and the safety of the American people.

In that special order, which I gave on April 30, I disclosed information that indicated that American aerospace firms, with the acquiescence of officials in the Clinton administration, and perhaps the President himself, had facilitated the transfer of sophisticated rocket technology to the Communist Chinese. If true, I stated, Americans have been put in jeopardy and that this could be the worst technological betrayal of our country since the Rosenbergs.

For those of my colleagues who do not remember the Rosenbergs, the Rosenbergs were people who worked for the United States in our own program to develop an atomic bomb during World War II; who, for whatever reason, gave the secrets of producing that atomic bomb to Communist Russia, to the Soviet Union when it was under the control of Joseph Stalin.

Well, today, unfortunately, it appears that some major American aerospace companies may well have given to the world's worst abuser of human rights, tyrants that are on the par with Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse Tung and other tyrants of the past, may have given them secrets that we developed during the Cold War for our own protection. They have given them those secrets in a way which will increase their capability of building rockets that could hit the United States with nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor again today to update my colleagues and interested parties on what has happened since my initial disclosure, as well as disclose new information that has come to light concerning the use of technology developed and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers, handed over to the Communist Chinese.

First and foremost, since my first address, nothing has emerged that suggests that my original statements were inaccurate. The more information that becomes available, the more certain it becomes that aerospace firms like Loral Space and Communications, Hughes and Motorola, callously disregarded the security of our country. To be fair on this, Hughes Corporation

denies that they have done anything to improve Communist Chinese rocket capability, and is taking steps to provide me with information which they believe will demonstrate this fact and will demonstrate the fact they have remained true to the United States.

Hughes notwithstanding, there is ample evidence that American technology was transferred to this hostile potential enemy of the United States and that the vast experience of some of our best aerospace engineers provided the Communist Chinese the guidance needed to upgrade and perfect highly sophisticated weapons systems, increasing the reliability and capability of Communist Chinese rockets. This has given what anyone has to admit is at least a potential enemy of the United States, a better ability to deliver nuclear warheads to our country, to American cities, to incinerate millions of our people.

Did the Communist Chinese have that capability before? Yes, they did, minimally, have that capability. Perhaps they could have gotten a rocket to us. But now, thanks to American know-how, given them by American aerospace companies, their rockets are more accurate and are more reliable, and now their rockets can kill more than one nuclear warhead, and this, thanks to American know-how.

I expected, after my first speech on this issue, that the companies in question would protest that I was wrong, that my fears were unfounded, that my sources had exaggerated the damage being done to our security. That has not been the case. The dangers to our country may, in fact, have been understated. Since disclosing the limited information I uncovered, there have been several hearings in the House and in the Senate looking into this horrific possibility that the money that we Americans spent developing technology to defend us ended up perfecting Communist Chinese rockets, and in the House, a select committee of nine distinguished Members has been appointed. Under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), this select committee is now organizing its efforts to thoroughly investigate the situation.

One of the executives in question is Bernard Schwartz of Loral. Schwartz was hell-bent to sell an arsenal of high-tech weapons to the Communist Chinese, weapons that would have put tens of thousands of American military personnel in jeopardy, our military personnel, our sons and daughters on our ships or in our airplanes. In any future confrontation between the United States and China, our military people would have been put in jeopardy of being shot out of the air, blown out of the water, and murdered by Communist Chinese who are being armed with technology that was developed by the United States for our own defense.

This is what Bernard Schwartz wanted to sell to the Communist Chinese. We do not know exactly how much of