Mr. Speaker, I enter the rest of the statement as an extension of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the Members of this House and the American people to a potentially alarming development in our foreign policy. As was reported in this Sunday's New York Times, the Republic of Azerbaijan has made what the newspaper called a ''startling offer—it wants the United States to open a military base there.'' The article notes that American oil companies have invested billions of dollars in that country. The New York Times also makes a particularly relevant point: such a partnership ''might draw the United States into alliances with undemocratic governments.''

This story has also been picked up by Reuters and the Journal of Commerce, among other media outlets. While the State Department and the Defense Department denied plans to construct a military base in Azerbaijan, or to move an existing facility from the Republic of Turkey into Azerbaijan, unnamed U.S. officials were mentioned in press accounts as not ruling out the need for an undefined arrangement to insure the security of a future pipeline to deliver oil from the Caspian Sea basin to the Turkish oil depot at Ceyhan.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine a worse idea. While I strongly support new approaches to U.S. international engagement in the post-Cold War world, this proposal would not advance U.S. interests or American values. The only justification for this proposal is to make U.S. foreign policy and our military forces a tool for protecting a new—and unproven—supply of oil, and to try to placate the two countries that are deemed essential to the extraction and delivery of those oil supplies, Turkey and Azerbaijan—two countries, I might add, with terrible records in terms of democracy and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans may wonder why Azerbaijan, a formerly obscure republic of the former Soviet Union, is the subject of such intense interest. The answer, in a word, is oil. To Azerbaijan's west lies the Caspian Sea, an inland sea or salt lake (and the exact designation is the subject of a debate with important ramifications about who controls its resources) which some have claimed contains vast reserves of oil and natural gas. American and other western oil companies have a keen interest in developing these reserves—which, I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, remain unproven reserves. Oil companies have spent billions of dollars on this effort, and have sent in thousands of their employees to Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan.

Unfortunately, it is beginning to appear that America's policy in the region is being driven primarily by the desire to extract these unproven petroleum reserves. We have seen Azerbaijan's autocratic President, Heydar Aliyev, wined and dined at the White House, Capitol Hill and elsewhere in Washington. (The term ''autocratic'' is the New York Times's word, not mine.) The U.S. response to the lack of democracy, free expression and basic human and civil rights under President Aliyev—who seized power in a coup—has been muted at best. There have been efforts over the past few years under the Foreign Operations Appropriations legislation to reward Mr. Aliyev, and the oil companies, with political risk insurance and other subsidies, courtesy of the American taxpayer. Now, I'm afraid we could see that policy come to its logical conclusion with the placement of U.S. military forces in Azerbaijan. We must stop this proposal before it advances beyond the planning stages.

For some time now, Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of what I view as the Administration's apparent determination to see the pipeline from Baku to Ceyhan constructed. Ironically, the oil companies themselves are balking at this arrangement. The proposed pipeline is too long and costly, particularly as oil prices continue to drop. One major international consortium, led by the American firm Pennzoil, has announced that it will terminate its test drilling operations in the Caspian near Baku after finding only half the volume of oil and gas necessary to ensure profitable exploitation. Today, the Wall Street Journal reports that another group, led by Amoco and British Petroleum, is cutting personnel and deferring development on Caspian oil exploitation due to disappointing test results and declining oil prices. It is becoming apparent that the new pipeline proposal lacks commercial viability. It is a boondoggle whose only purpose is to placate the demands of Turkey and Azerbaijan, to give these two countries the power and prestige of controlling what some see as an important source of energy resources. Now, apparently, Azerbaijan craves the further benefits of a U.S. military commitment, and some ''unnamed'' U.S. officials are apparently toying with the idea.

Mr. Speaker, this week, I will be circulating a letter among my colleagues asking them to join me in making it clear to President Clinton, Secretary of State Albright and Secretary of Defense Cohen that we consider a U.S. military presence or commitment in Azerbaijan unacceptable.

Yes. Mr. Speaker, the Administration is right to identify the Caucasus region as an important American interest. But it is wrong to make oil the major, let only the only, basis for our engagement in that region. I hope we can stop this train before it leaves the station. Then we need to focus on a Caucasus policy based on economic development, the promotion of democracy and human rights, self-determination, and the resolution of territorial and other conflicts through negotiation.

CHINA POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate evening for me to be presenting what I have to say, whereas we have just heard about the changes in American defense that have taken place, some alarming changes that have taken place over these last 10 years, and in fact since 1985 there has been a dramatic decline in America's military power. At the same time, while America has been permitting its own military power to go astray or to be in decline, there have been noises being heard from across the pond, from across the Pacific Ocean, and those noises, unfortunately, are not the sound of a peaceful neighbor, but instead the sound of a neighbor that seems to be, instead of decreasing its military power and concentrating on peace and prosperity, instead seems to be the sound of a neighbor that is building a massively repressive military regime that threatens the United States and threatens our security, especially when we are considering the fact that America is no longer the military power it once was.

After 10 years in Congress, I find myself to be a senior member on two very powerful committees, the Committee on Science where I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Aeronautics, and the Committee on International Relations where I sit on both the committee dealing with export policy as well as the subcommittee dealing with Asian policy. Thus, I find myself playing a major role in the trade and technology transfer issues concerning communist China. I would like to focus on China policy this evening, and I thought that an appropriate lead-in was something that just happened to me recently in my own congressional district.

It was only a short while ago that I received a call in my office that the local Chamber of Commerce, with the support of the local city government, was planning to have a lunch co-hosted by the city and the Chamber of Commerce honoring the Consul General of the People's Republic of China, and I was asked whether or not I would be willing to present a certificate or a key to the city or some kind of greeting to this representative of the communist Chinese regime. And I felt at that time that even in my own congressional district at the time, with all the time and effort that I have put in to describing what is going on in Asia, even the people in my own congressional district did not understand the magnitude of the threat posed by this vicious dictatorship on the mainland of China.

In fact, I was called by Mayor Green when I expressed my disapproval of this luncheon honoring this representative of the Communist Chinese government. Mayor Green of Huntington Beach asked me, well, what is your opposition all about, and after I explained it to him, he understood why I was opposing this, and he said: But how should we treat officials from the communist Chinese government? I mean, after all, they are a government. How should we react to this? How should we act towards them, if not having this type of luncheon?

And I said, Mayor, you should treat the representatives of the Chinese communist government the same way that you would treat a representative of Adolph Hitler's Nazi regime in 1938. And if you would feel comfortable having a Nazi representing Adolf Hitler as a guest of honor, being honored by your city and Chamber of Commerce back in 1938, if you thought that would be an appropriate thing, well, then you would feel that it was appropriate that that is the way we honor a representative today of the world's worst human rights abuser, the communist regime in Beijing.

Well, that luncheon was canceled, and I am very grateful that the members of the local city government and Chamber of Commerce listened to what I had to say because I am sure that the communist Chinese would have used it as a propaganda tool to say that, see, even the American people in Congressman ROHRABACHER's own district do not go along with him.

Well, as soon as they knew the facts, the people of my district were very quick to respond, and I think what is vitally important is for the American people to know the facts; for them to know, number one, that we are not the same powerful military force that we were 10–15 years ago and that, number two, that there is a growing threat to world peace and a growing threat to our own national security on the other side of the Pacific.

During the Reagan years I worked as a speech writer while President Reagan was President, and I worked for him for 7 years, and during that time period I remember when he went to China. In fact, I remember working on his speech in which we offered American know-how to the Chinese if they would agree to have their goals as being peace and liberalization of their country. And at that time that made sense, and in fact President Reagan's approach was a positive approach, as Ronald Reagan was known, and it was something to try to give them the incentive to go in the right direction. When I say ''they'' I am referring to the leadership of the Communist Party that controls the government of China.

During that time period when I worked at the White House, a young Chinese exchange student walked into my office, and what was fascinating, that it was on a Saturday, and I was working there on Saturday afternoon, and almost no one was in the Executive Office Building. By the way, the Executive Office Building is that building right next to the White House where the President's top national security and economic advisers and policy advisers work. When most people say they work in the White House, they really work right next door in the Old Executive Office Building.

So the most sensitive area of our government, there a Chinese student walked in unaccompanied and just walked right into my office as I was working on his speech, and he explained to me that he had met one of the researchers in my department and that she had invited him to lunch and that he was coming there to meet this researcher. And he had been checked in through the security, and again without being escorted whatsoever he was walking by himself through the very heart of America's decision-making process at the Old Executive Office Building. I did not find that to be unusual at all because we were at that time convinced that China would never go back, that China had already evolved to a point that it would never be a threat to freedom, and that in fact the people of China were well on the way to a bright and prosperous and democratic future.

□ 1945

During the Cold War, of course, is when we started this evolution towards democracy in China, and it was right for President Nixon and the other presidents who followed the policy laid down by Nixon to play China off against Russia during a time when Russia threatened the entire world, when Russia's communist regime was arming itself to the teeth, sponsoring military actions and covert operations against the democratic governments all over the world.

Nixon, yes, played China against Russia in a way that permitted the western democracies to have the leverage they needed, the leverage they needed in the western democracies to prevent war and to prevent the dictatorships, the communist dictatorships of the world, from having the leverage they needed to win the day and to win the battle of the Cold War and to put us in jeopardy.

So we did. And during this time period, when we were playing China off against Russia, we developed a new relationship with China. And as part of that relationship, a democracy movement was building. This was what we saw when that young Chinese student was walking right through that building a few years later in the early 1980s. He represented a new China, the new potential for freedom and peace in China. And through the Reagan years, although the leadership of China remained tyrannical, just as it was under Nixon, there was a growing democracy movement that was undermining the tyranny that controlled the mainland of China, and it was an ever-increasingly powerful democracy movement, but it was invisible.

All of a sudden it became visible when, in Tiananmen Square, tens of thousands, perhaps even more, Chinese people, activists, democracy activists, gathered to tell the world that they were committed to democratic reform, and there, before the world to see and all of the national and international media, we could see that there was a democratic movement in China that gave us all hope, and it was a surprise to us and actually it was a surprise to the communist leadership.

But by then Ronald Reagan was no longer the President of the United States. George Bush was President of the United States, and, unlike Ronald Reagan, President Bush did not believe that the promotion of democracy and freedom was on the highest level of priority for the United States Government. In fact, George Bush's administration, instead of talking about freedom and democracy, spent most of its time talking about stability and trying to build a new world order.

What that led the communist Chinese to believe was that if they came down hard on the democracy movement in Tiananmen Square, that this administration, meaning the George Bush administration, would go along, because they were interested in stability.

In fact, that is what happened. There was a massacre of the democracy movement in Tiananmen Square. Thousands of people lost their lives, and then throughout China there was a great leap backwards, where people who believed in democracy, people who believed in religious expression and different various religions, people who were bringing China into a new era, were arrested throughout that country and thrown into a logi prison system that was similar to the gulag archipelago that the Russian people were thrown into by their communist bosses.

In a very short period of time, the positive and pro-democratic and pro-peaceful future of China was turned around dramatically, and instead, the picture of China controlled by thugs and goons, putting their boot in the face of the people of China forever, was the vision that emerged.

This, of course, happened very quickly, because I think there was something that was happening that we did not really fully appreciate that was happening in the United States at the same time that the democracy movement was gaining strength in China. You see, while we had this special relationship with China, and thus there was a democracy movement developing there, there was another movement developing in the United States that could be traced, its origins, back to that same relationship that we are talking about.

American billionaires and would-be billionaires were using their considerable leverage on the United States Government to ensure that they had a policy, that we had a policy, in dealing with China, that would permit them to exploit what was little more than slave labor in China.

American business interests, powerful American business interests, wanted to go there and wanted to make a quick profit, and they could care less about the other implications of doing business within a regime that was so tyrannical and so militaristic.

Of course, the businessmen who were doing this described their motives in the best possible ways. In fact, they claimed that the China market was so large and potentially so valuable that it would be a sin against the American people to let America's competitors get that business, when they should be the ones getting the business, as if those American business interests really had the interest of freedom and democracy or even the interest of the American people at heart.

Well, those big corporations were wrong, or perhaps they were just lying, because perhaps they did not care anyway. That remains to be seen. Perhaps some of the people who have invested in China care deeply about the Chinese

people. Frankly, there have been hundreds of businessmen that I have spoken to on this issue, and while they claim that the more contacts they have, business contacts, with China, will make China more liberal, not one of them seems to have ever spoken about human rights to any of the local government officials in those areas in which their own factories are located.

Well, all we have to do is look at the record. Over these last ten years, since the Tiananmen Square massacre especially, repression has increased, even though investment in China has gone along at a very brisk rate. So no matter how much money our businessmen are putting into China, the repression continues, and it has gotten worse. In fact, there was a democracy movement at one point, and now all the democrats are in jail or they have been executed or they have been forced into exile, and there is not a viable democracy movement today.

So has this, our trade, really helped stimulate more democracy? No. In fact, the Chinese dictators have seen our investment as evidence that Americans really do not believe in freedom, do not believe in democracy, do not even believe in their Christian principles or other religious principles enough to side with the religious people of China who are being persecuted.

Let us note this at this moment: China, although we have been told is this vast market, little Taiwan, with 20 million people, little Taiwan buys twice as much from the United States as does all the billion, over 1 billion people, perhaps 1.5 billion people, on the mainland of China.

Is this such a vast market? Well, one of the reasons, of course, that vast market is not being exploited is that there is a government policy by the United States to permit the communist Chinese regime to charge a tariff on any American products being sold in Communist China that is far greater than any of the tariffs we charge on their goods that are flooding into our markets.

Thus, many of our goods that we would like to see sell in China to their consumers are charged 30 and 40 percent tariffs, while we only charge them 3 or 4 percent tariffs, and they flood our markets with shoes and commercial items and consumer items that have put many American businesses out of business.

No, my theory is when looking at what has been going on is the big businessmen who are investing in China really do not care about America's, about America's, future share in the Chinese market. What they care about is the 25 percent quick profit that they themselves will make by investing in China today, and they have done so in these investments over these last few years with not one concern at all of the human rights abuses, nor any concern about the American people. In fact, as I say, much of this investment has been done at the expense of the American people and the expense of people who are working and providing goods and services here.

In fact, a large number of the sales that China is making here can be attributed to U.S. companies that have built manufacturing units in China in order to use the Chinese, that have no environmental rules, no labor legislation. In fact, the Chinese laborers have none of the rights of the American laborers, and actually they receive a pittance many times as compensation. So, a lot of times our people, they say we have to invest in China in order to make sure that America can sell its goods. In reality, what they are doing is they go to China and set up a manufacturing unit and then sell those goods back to the United States.

If a refrigerator company would like to sell a refrigerator in China, no, they go there and set up a refrigerator manufacturing company and sell the refrigerators not to the Chinese, but back to the people of the United States, taking full advantage of the slave labor in China.

In fact, I have heard that people who believe in certain religious faiths, Christians and others, who have not joined the official church in China, sometimes have been dragged out kicking and screaming, out of certain factories, even factories owned by Americans, and yet the American employers have done nothing to prevent these people from being arrested because they belong to a church that is not registered by the state.

Yes, there are some companies, Boeing Company, for example, is a company that is the largest employer in my district, and I respect the fact that they want to sell airplanes. As I say, most of the time when people are talking about selling, they are not really talking about selling the product. A lot of times they are talking about setting up a manufacturing unit.

In Boeing's case, they actually do sell some airplanes. But along with these deals to sell airplanes, how many of us realize that part of the deal is that Boeing will be setting up manufacturing units in China, so after a given period of time, in dealing with enough American aerospace firms, they will have the capability of manufacturing airplanes and aerospace technology on par with the United States.

Yes, there is a quick profit to be made by a sale this year or next year, but if we are doing that by setting up manufacturing units which will permit the communist Chinese to outcompete our own aerospace workers and put them out of work five years down the road, who is to profit? The communist Chinese will benefit from that, and the American people, in the long run, will lose.

Well, we have a fight every year here in Congress over most-favored-nation status for the communist Chinese, and in fact we have just passed a rule today that is changing that to say, what is the trading status they want to change it to, it is the standard trading status, or something. Normal trading relations, that is it. They want to change most-favored-nation status to most normal trading relations. I did oppose most-favored-nation trading status for China, and I oppose normal trading relations for China, because by passing this classification of China, we are saying that the communist Chinese will be treated just as we treat Belgium or Italy or Canada in terms of our trading relations.

No, if we have free trade with other people, free trade should be between free people, not between a dictatorship that manipulates it on one end and free people who permit their billionaires to invest with no concern about the national security implications to our country or the long-term national economic interests of our country. So I would be opposed to normal trade relations.

Also there is the side benefit that the communist get, by the way, as well as the billionaires who want to invest in China get, by having normal trade relations. And that is what this issue really is all about. It is hard fought on this floor of the House every year, and you will hear speech after speech saying we cannot isolate China. We have to sell our products. We have to engage in commerce with China.

□ 2000

No one is talking about isolating China, and no one is talking about preventing these businessmen from selling whatever they want to sell to China, except perhaps some very sophisticated military equipment, which I will discuss in a few moments. But by and large, American companies, or no one who opposes Most Favored Nation status or normal trading relations with China are opposed to them selling these things, and they will not have anything to prevent them from selling these things.

However, with normal trading relations just like we have with the other democratic countries, these large financial interests, these billionaires who want to seek ever more money with no concern about the effect that it has on jobs in the United States, are then subsidizing, they are eligible for subsidies by the American taxpayer. By having normal trade relations, we then have set up a situation where the Export-Import Bank, or the World Bank or OPEC or any number of other financial entities paid for by the American taxpayers, can provide a subsidy or a loan guarantee or a loan at a lower interest rate for their investments in communist China.

Now, what does that mean? That means working people in the United States are being taxed and their money is being given to a very wealthy interest in order for that interest, to guarantee that interest's investment in a dictatorship, in order to use slave labor to export goods to the United States to put our own people out of work. What

we have done is we have made it more attractive to invest in a hostile dictatorship than to invest in our own country.

We actually can say businessmen can think about earning a large profit margin and have their investment guaranteed by the American taxpayer. That is what normal trade relations is all about. That is what Most Favored Nation status has really been about. Because these businessmen could still, if they manufacture a product here, there is no one stopping it. This has been an effort to confuse the American people; their arguments have been designed to confuse and to lie to the American people, so that they do not realize that in reality their own money is being used against them.

This whole system, to be fair, was in place before Bill Clinton became President of the United States. And I remember when he first ran for President, he accused George Bush of kowtowing to the communist Chinese dictators. And President Clinton, when he became President after he won the election, just like in so many of the other things that he has done as President of the United States, has gone in exactly the opposite direction than what he promised the American people when he ran.

In fact, this administration's policies on human rights and democracy have been a catastrophe that has been an administration with the worst human rights record in the history of this country. People all over the world who look to us and believe that the United States stood for democracy and freedom have now lost hope, because they see an administration that wraps its arms around not just the communist Chinese, but just about every vicious dictatorship in the world.

Ronald Reagan understood that there is a relationship between peace and freedom. He understood that unless we fight for democracy and stand firm for our principles of freedom, that we will not have peace, because there is a symmetry in this world in which economic freedom and political freedom and peace are all connected. And there is a price to pay, there is a price to pay when one wraps his arms around criminals or when a country wraps its arms around a vicious dictatorship like that in China, which is the world's worst human rights abuser.

The American people are just now beginning to learn the truth about the risks of treating a vicious dictatorship in the same way that we treat a democratic nation. They are beginning to learn the truth about the risks that we have been taking by having normal trade relations or Most Favored Nation trading status with China, and treating them the same way we would treat the English or the Italians or the Austrians. Let me put it this way. In those other democratic countries, they are ruled by people who are elected and who respect the rights of individuals, of their own citizens.

Those people who run these dictatorships around the world hate the United States. These gangsters that murder their own people and have aggressive goals, and they look with an eye towards the resources and the land of their neighbors, these people who suppress people for their religion, these people who would murder someone for speaking up against them, these gangster regimes hate the United States and hate the people of the United States because they know that we are the only thing that stands between them and being secure in their power. Because they know it is the goodwill of the people of the United States of America that has saved this world in this century twice during the world wars, and then during the Cold War, from tyranny and totalitarianism, and it was only the strength and courage of the American people and our determination to live up to the ideals that were set forth by our Founding Fathers, it was only that commitment that prevented monsters like they are now from achieving total power on this planet. The Hitlers and the Stalins are still in power, but they are in power in China and in others of these little petty dictatorships around the world, and they hate us, and they know that we are what stands between them and having a secure hold on power in their own country and their ability to bully their neighbors.

President Clinton thinks he is trying to make friends with these people in Beijing by calling them, wrapping his arms around them, calling them our strategic partners, saying that the United States Government, the people of the United States, the most freedom-loving people in the world, people who take their religion seriously but believe in freedom of religion for all people, that we are strategic partners with the world's leading abuser of human rights, a regime that has been manipulating the trade between us so that it has tens of billions of dollars every year to increase their military power and their military might.

Well, as they do increase their military power and President Clinton calls them our strategic partners, one must wonder whom are we the strategic partners against? Are we in partners against the democratically elected government in Taiwan, or how about the democratically elected government in Japan, or how about the democratically elected government in the Philippines, or how about South Korea? What do the people who live in these democracies think when they see the President of the United States calling our relationship a strategic partnership with this militaristic regime that opposes their own people so thoroughly?

Even while President Clinton was in China the last time, the Chinese dictators are so cynical that they were testing a new rocket engine that they are trying to bring out and deploy in a new weapons system, and this new rocket engine in this weapons system is designed for one thing. It is to kill Americans, kill American military personnel and perhaps even put our country in jeopardy.

And when they were testing this rocket engine while President Clinton was there, he knew about it, he had read the cables. His National Security Council had read the cables. They knew the intelligence information, and guess what? President Clinton did not bother to bring it up to the Chinese. It just did not come up in the conversation. Do you think that the strong-arms and tough guys and the gangsters who run communist China respect President Clinton, or are they more likely to be friends of us, friends of us because he did not bring it up, he did not embarrass them by bringing it up in a conversation?

Mr. Speaker, when we do not mention the genocide in Tibet or the threats against Taiwan because it was having free elections, or the arrest of Christians and the repression of a free church, forcing everybody to register in a communist-recognized church; when one does not bring up a free press or forced abortions, one should not be surprised that the communists who control China do not take our calls for human rights seriously. And when they do not take us seriously, we should not be surprised to find out that they are building their military forces in a way that threatens the United States and that they are beginning to commit acts of aggression against their neighbors. That should not surprise us at all.

This hug-a-Nazi-and-make-him-a-liberal strategy of the Clinton Administration is doomed to failure just as it was when Neville Chamberlain and those people in the 1930s confronted that threat to world peace and freedom.

President Clinton of course has gone beyond that. He is not just hugging the communist Chinese dictators, he is encouraging American corporations to do business. It is this administration's policy that taxpayer money be used as a guarantee for businessmen who will invest in China. In fact, it was President Clinton's administration that encouraged even our aerospace companies to go in and do business in communist China. Of course, there is evidence that during the last election some of these companies were also major contributors to President Clinton. In fact, Bernie Schwartz was the biggest contributor to President Clinton's campaign, and he also of course was the head of Loral Corporation, which is now accused of sending missile and other technology, weapons technology secrets to the communist Chinese who will now use that information, if they have it, which we know they do, to threaten the United States and to threaten the lives of the American people.

So, but one cannot determine, was it the aerospace companies, some of these big corporations pushing Clinton, or was it Clinton pushing them?

The Chinese have invested money in American elections, not to buy perhaps opinion but at least to meet people and to have friends in high places. We all remember that the communist Chinese provided certain amounts of money, and we still do not know if that money was the money that was given to Vice President GORE when he went to that Chinese monastery, all of those Buddhist monks out there on the West Coast who had all of those thousands of dollars to donate. Even though they had been living a life of poverty all through the years, they just had those checks that they gave to the President's reelection effort. Where did that money come from? Did we ever learn where that money came from?

The bottom line is there has been a lot of shenanigans going on, but what is worse is the fact that weapons technology that was developed and paid for by the American taxpayer to help us preserve the peace has made its way into the hands of a regime that hates the people of the United States and hates everything that we stand for as a Nation. And now they have technology for weapons of mass destruction paid for by the American taxpayer that has been put into their hands.

Now, I am proud to have played a role in exposing this to the American people. It was about a year ago when I first made my first speech on this issue. Because earlier than that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I had actually gone to a meeting of aerospace workers and engineers, and one of them was describing how he was involved in upgrading the capabilities and the efficiency of communist Chinese rockets in order to lift off satellites, American satellites.

I said, wait a minute, wait a minute. You are telling me that you are using American technology, your know-how, and you are improving the capabilities of these rockets? He says, Congressman, they do not even have the right stage separation technology and they will blow up shortly after lift-off, and they do not even have the capability in some of these rockets to carry more than one payload. I said, wait a minute. A communist Chinese rocket blowing up, that is a very good thing.

□ 2015

He says, ''Don't worry, Congressman. You are thinking about the security implications.'' I said, ''Yes. Yes, I am. I am worried about the security implications of American technology upgrading the capability of Communist Chinese rockets.'' He says, ''Don't worry. The White House has given us waivers. This is part of an overall program that the White House has totally approved of.''

That is when the alarm bells started going off. Who is watching the watchdogs? I talked about this. I did my own investigation. I verified what this engineer had told me. I talked to subcontractors and major contractors and major aerospace companies.

In just a very short time I was able to confirm that some of our aerospace giants had used the technology that we had made available to them in a way that enables the Communist Chinese to have a better chance to effectively drop nuclear weapons in the United States of America and to upgrade their weapons systems, putting American military personnel at risk. It was enough to knock the wind right out of my lungs.

While I was doing this, the New York Times was also involved in an investigation, an investigation that turned up the same type of information that I was coming up with. I tried to alert people. All over this body I was talking to chairmen and people. I tried to tell Newt, but things were very confused and things were going fast. I told Newt several times.

Finally I remember when I got his attention, because Newt was a man of history. I said, you know, Newt, this is really the worst betrayal of America's security interests since the Rosenbergs. He turned to me and said, what did you say? I said, yes, the Communist Chinese, people who hate us, now have the ability, a greater ability to incinerate millions of Americans, and it is due to American technology.

He turned to his aide right over there in that corner, I will never forget, and he said, is DANA right? His aide said, yes, there are some reports out that what DANA is saying is accurate. And Newt immediately called together the leadership of the Committee on National Security, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Science, and the Committee on Intelligence, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CHRIS COX) was assigned, after a long discussion. The gentleman from California (Mr. CHRIS COX), a man who was one of top legal counsel to President Reagan, was assigned to head up a select committee to find the details about this transfer of technology to the Communist Chinese.

While I have not read the Cox committee report because it is labeled top secret, and I wanted to be able to speak freely on this issue, but those who have read it, and the gentleman from California, (Mr. COX), in his summary, which is not a classified summary, indicates that the charges that I have made against certain American aerospace companies have been verified, and that there has been a sustained and systematic effort by the Communist Chinese to get their hands on American weapons technology, especially the technology of weapons of mass destruction.

During the Reagan and Bush years the Communist Chinese stole this technology. They stole it because we were trying to operate with them on a friendly basis. During the Clinton years this technology has been up for sale, up for sale, and the Clinton administration has overseen the transfer of American technology through these large aerospace companies. That means that American citizens by the millions could lose their lives in a future confrontation with the Communist Chinese.

As I say, it is perhaps the worst betrayal of American interests that I have ever seen in my lifetime. The Cox committee report verifies that, but the American people are not being permitted to see the Cox committee report.

This is kind of a funny situation, because the Chinese know what information they stole from us. Now our government knows what information they stole from us. The only people who do not know the details about the technology that they have paid for to protect their interests, now being used by a vicious dictatorship to threaten the American people, the only ones who do not know about that are the American people themselves, because this report is being kept under wraps, except it is, of course, being exploited by this administration, which I will go into in a few moments.

In the meantime, as the Communist Chinese ability to fight and kill Americans is increased, they have become more and more belligerent, more and more tyrannical, more and more aggressive toward their neighbors. Whether we are talking about the Spratly Islands, where they have been bullying their neighbors, or in Tibet, where they are committing genocide against the people of Tibet, or in Burma, where they are the godfathers of that vicious dictatorship that holds the whole population of Burma in a grip, in a dictatorial grip, or the helping hands they are giving to other anti-western dictatorships throughout the world, these are things that are happening now because the Chinese have lost all respect, the Communist Chinese have lost all respect for us, because they know that we do not care about a thing that we say, that it is just phony baloney when we talk about human rights, because this administration has done nothing to prevent the flow of weapons technology, and in fact has done nothing to prevent the billions of dollars that they have left over from this unfair trade relationship, which we have permitted them.

Not only have we permitted them to have an unfair trade relationship, we have subsidized this unfair trade relationship, giving them tens of millions of dollars to upgrade their military capabilities. What is the solution? There is a solution. This is as serious as anything we have confronted as a Nation, and we need to focus on it.

First of all, we must not treat the Communist Chinese regime as if they are a friendly regime. We must not treat them as normal trading partners like we would Italy, Belgium, or the Netherlands. We must treat them as a potential enemy of the people of the United States. They have earned that with the repression and murder that they have brought down on their own

people, much less the aggression they are committing against their neighbors. That is number one.

We must classify them and understand what they are, and we should not, we should not in any way subsidize them, either through technology transfers or through an unfair trading relationship, or through Export-Import Bank guarantees to businessmen who would set up factories in Communist China.

We must support the freedom elements in China itself. Radio-Free Asia, the National Endowment for Democracy, we must support these people in every way we can, support those who are struggling for democracy in this vicious dictatorship, because they are the ones that will free the world from this terror as they themselves free themselves from oppression of the Beijing regime.

It is only when the people of China who love freedom and love democracy and love the United States, I might add, because they are our brothers and sisters in freedom and democracy, when they ascend to their rightful place as a representative government, they will no longer be a threat to the United States, because the people of China are not our enemy, it is the dictatorship in China that is.

Finally, we must insist, and I hope every one of my colleagues and everyone who may be reading this or listening insists that the Cox report be made public. They should write and call their congressman and say that, why are the American people being left in the dark? The Cox report on Communist China must be made public so we can know what the Chinese have and what they have been able to steal from us, and what role American companies have played in preparing the Communist Chinese to kill Americans.

I come to the floor tonight to inform my colleagues and to inform the American people, and perhaps to mobilize them. I personally witnessed some things, by the way, that underscore the very points that I have been making.

In a recent fact-finding trip to Asia I overflew the Spratly Islands, and I could see that there, on Mischief Reef, a small sort of island like an atoll, because at low tide it is above water but at high tide it is below water, but it is an atoll about 150 miles from the Philippines, a country that is a democratic country that has very little defense. They are trying to spend their money on improving the life of their people.

But that little island or reef, that lagoon situation 150 miles from the Philippines, is over 800 miles from China, and the Communist Chinese are trying to bully the Philippines and the other nations of the Pacific into letting them, and not letting them but in acquiescing to them, in giving in to them and giving in to their claim that this is their territory.

I flew in an old C–130, a Philippine Air Force plane. As we went through the clouds and were heading towards this reef 150 miles off the Philippine mainland, as the clouds parted right above the reef, what did we see but three Chinese warships perched in this lagoon, armed to the teeth, helicopter decks there.

And what else did we see nearby but scores of Chinese workers who were so fervently constructing a concrete military outpost on this reef that even as we flew over, their acetylene torches continued to build this fortification on that reef.

Last week the Philippine military command called this Chinese buildup the greatest threat to the Philippines and America's interest in Asia since World War II. The Chinese are committing acts of aggression. They are willing to bully their neighbors. They are willing to murder their own people.

This chain of islands, this chain of islands that we are talking about, the Spratly Islands, and some, as I say, are under water at low tide, serve and will serve as bases for the Chinese communists. They will be like stationary aircraft carriers and helicopter aircraft carriers that will threaten the most important strategic areas, trading areas, and trading routes in the world.

Now we understand that the Chinese have an anti-ship missile that can be fired from the helicopters that will be stationed on these island bases. This missile that can be fired is a supersonic cruise-like missile, the SSN–22, the Sunburn missile they have achieved from Russia.

These missiles were developed specifically by the Russians to destroy American aircraft carriers and Aegis cruisers. They are essential to a sea-based antimissile system, the Aegis cruisers. Yet, if we have any type of antimissile system, they will be vulnerable now to the Communist Chinese and their Sunburn missiles that they may be able to fire and probably are setting up bases for deep into the Pacific Ocean, 800 miles off their own shore; in fact, right off the Philippine coast.

This is a threat to the United States as well as to the people of the Philippines and the people of the Pacific. A large hunk of the world's trade goes right through the straits between these islands and the Communist Chinese mainland.

Also to highlight what I am saying, and also to highlight why an anti-missile defense system is so vital for the United States and our allies in the Pacific, in early December while I was in the region the Communist Chinese launched a mock missile attack exercise against Taiwan.

During this exercise, for the first time the Chinese targeted U.S. military bases in Japan, in Okinawa, and South Korea. We know what they targeted. We know what their game plan was. The game plan was to put their finger on American bases to kill tens of thousands of Americans, and they have also now the ability to use these bases in the Spratlys, and these missiles that the Russians have sold them, to kill tens of thousands of American sailors.

These bases that they have targeted for the first time, these are bases that are essential for the defense of Taiwan and essential for the peacekeeping in that whole region.

Later this week when the Pentagon releases its congressionally-mandated report on the Chinese missile threat to the region, it will become public knowledge that China is in the midst of a massive buildup of ballistic missiles that are intended to overwhelm Taiwan and American military outposts in the Pacific.

Ironically, the Chinese military has built its first military communication station in the South Pacific. Their first military communications station is located on the atoll of Tarawa. It is there where thousands of American marines perished, battling to turn the tide of Japanese militarism during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has confirmed what I revealed on this floor last year, that China, with the help of U.S. corporations, has modernized its growing nuclear missile force so it can now strike at the continental United States from the mainland of China.

□ 1630

American people by the millions, our neighborhoods, our peoples are at great risk because American technology has been transferred to the Communist Chinese. It is still not too late, however, to defang this emerging dragon before it is ready to strike. But we must begin the process, and we must be realistic about what we are trying to do.

I am especially troubled by the President and the Secretary of State continuing to use the Communist Chinese and label the Communist Chinese as strategic partners. That has got to stop.

The unwillingness of the United States, as the leader of democracy and freedom in the world, to even object to the human rights abuses committed by the Beijing dictators and their henchmen against the people of China is little less than cowardice.

The ghoulish repression in China is being ignored so that our billionaires can reap huge profits in the short term, while putting our own people out of work in the long run and putting our country in great jeopardy. Then we excuse all of this with flippant phrases like, for example, when we complain about this, these human rights abusers, we are told, oh, do not worry. We have a multifaceted relationship with China.

Multifaceted. That is what our Secretary of State used to excuse the fact that we are not using the strength of our own moral courage to complain and to put the Chinese on notice that we will not put up with human rights abuses and aggression.

I cannot believe that a young Madeleine Albright, while she was fleeing the Nazi-occupied Europe, that threat

to mankind in those days, I cannot believe that a young Madeleine Albright would have accepted that we cannot, that the United States could not be too harsh on Adolph Hitler and his goons because, after all, we had to preserve a multifaceted relationship with Adolph.

In fact, throughout the 1930's, the United States did try to appease Adolph Hitler's Germany and fascist Japan, despite the full knowledge of the atrocities that were being committed in Czechoslovakia and Poland and elsewhere to the Jews and the gypsies and others.

Appeasement did not work. Leaving the subject out of conversations did not work. It led to World War II, and it led to a massive loss of American lives.

There is a relationship between peace and freedom and democracy. What do we need to do? Again, let us refrain from referring to the Communist Chinese as strategic partners. Let us label them what they are, potential enemies of the United States.

Let us develop a missile defense system for ourselves and our friends and our allies. Let us encourage those people who are struggling for democracy and dictatorships everywhere but especially in Communist China.

Let us today commit ourselves that the Cox committee report, which will disclose this treachery, this betrayal of American interests, this transfer of weapons of mass destruction that we develop with our own tax dollars, that this transferred technology, the upgrading of Communist Chinese rockets, and their capability of hitting the United States, that we need to have that verified for the American people.

The Cox committee report must be made public. I urge the White House to release the entire document. But I was outraged yesterday when the White House selectively declassified information in the Cox report and leaked it to the press. It leaked it in order to rebut the committee's recommendations which were aimed at preventing weapons of mass destruction and related technology from being sold to Communist China.

So here, instead of disclosing all the information, just little pieces of it was disclosed so that friendly members of the press could then use it to defeat the very purpose of the select committee that the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) headed.

Does this administration have no shame? Is there no level to which it will go? We are all in jeopardy. Then they play this kind of game. I do not care what administration it is. If a hostile power has been helped by American technology, and we know about it, and they know about it, the American people should know about it, and they should know the details. Every one of us should be insisting that this be done.

The Chinese must know that we are on the side of the Chinese people who long for democracy. But the Communist Chinese leadership must know that there are political and diplomatic consequences for the actions that they are taking and that we will be willing to stand strong, and that we are Americans, the same Americans that stood for freedom.

We may be losing the Save Private Ryan generation, those people who saved the world from the Nazis, those people we are so proud of. I lost my father recently who fought in World War II. But we are the same American people, and we stand for those same principles.

We are on the side of people who love freedom. We are not on the side of ghoulish dictators like the Nazis or the Communists or like the Chinese who make their deals with American billionaires. We need to act as a people, the freedom loving people of the world need to act together, and we as Americans need to lead them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

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 Mrs. JONES of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Duncan) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1999, at 10 a.m.

A REPORT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, January 6, 1999.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) mandates a review and report on the applicability to the legislative branch of federal law relating to terms and conditions of employment and access to public services and accommodations.

Pursuant to section 102(b)(2) of the CAA, which provides that the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall cause each such report to be printed in the Congressional Record and each report shall be referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is pleased to transit the enclosed report.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN D. NAGER,
Chair of the Board of Directors.

Enclosures.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE—SECTION 102(b) REPORT—REVIEW AND REPORT ON THE APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Prepared by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance Pursuant to Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. §1302(b), December 31, 1998

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINED TERMS

The following acronyms and defined terms are used in this Report and Appendices:

1996 Section 102(b) Report—the first biennial report mandated by §102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, which was issued by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance in December of 1996.

1998 Section 102(b) Report—this, the second biennial report mandated under §102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, which is issued by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance on December 31, 1998.

ADA—Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.

ADEA—Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, 29 U.S.C. §621 et seq.

ADR—Alternative Dispute Resolution.

AG—Attorney General.

Board—Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

CAA—Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. §1301 et seq.

CAA laws—the eleven laws, applicable in the federal and private sectors, that are made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA and are listed in section 102(a) of that Act.

CG—Comptroller General.

Chapter 71—Chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code.

DoL—Department of Labor.

EEO—Equal Employment Opportunity.

EEOC—Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

EPA—Equal Pay Act provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §206(d).

EPPA—Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, 29 U.S.C. §2001 et seq.

FLRA—Federal Labor Relations Authority.

FLSA—Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. §201 et seq.