

in Beijing, they tested the first time a motor for their new DF-31 missile, a missile that will enable them to hit the United States with a nuclear attack from the mainland of China. This happened while the President was there. The President was alerted to this, and yet there was no indication that he raised this issue with his hosts.

What are the Communist Chinese to think? We give them these platitudes about human rights, and then we have nothing to back it up, there is no action at all taken to back it up, that we insist on a change in their policy. They must mean we do not believe in that. And then we are there at a time when the President of the United States is there with them, they are conducting a weapons test, making a mockery of his visit, and the President does not have the courage to bring this up? No wonder they hold us in disdain.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker, I would point out the comments of the majority leader in the other body on this Hill, Senator LOTT saying in a televised interview this weekend that in the wake of these revelations concerning China, and technology transfers and espionage in the nuclear field that it is entirely reasonable, prudent and proper for this Congress to reevaluate whether the People's Republic of China should gain admission to the World Trade Organization. Mr. Speaker, what should be understood by the Communist Chinese is that provocative actions carry consequences.

If my friend would indulge me, a personal recollection in my first term. The Counsel General of the Chinese Embassy from Los Angeles paid a visit to Arizona, and he said, paraphrasing: "We want to be friends." And I said to him, "Good, let us speak as friends." It is extremely disturbing to hear the bellicose statements of the Chinese defense minister who threatens our mainland in the wake of a crisis involving Taiwan and Formosa by saying, quote:

We believe the Americans value Los Angeles much more than they value Taiwan.

I asked him, and I would ask all in this body and all within the sound of my voice, especially our friends, Mr. Speaker, from the PRC who may be monitoring this, how else do we interpret those remarks other than a threat?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time for a moment, that was clearly a veiled threat, if not an unveiled threat, and what was it made over? Why were they threatening us? They were threatening us because we were standing between them and intimidating the people on Taiwan not to hold free elections. They were involved with an act of aggression upon people who were trying to conduct a free election.

So now we have in the United States, we have a government that has declared the Communist Chinese our strategic partners and continue to do so even after they have made threats to blow up Los Angeles, even after they have conducted aggression in the Spratly Islands and in the South China Sea against the democratic countries and with the knowledge, as we know now from this New York Times report, that the Communist Chinese were in the midst of obtaining sensitive atomic secrets that we had paid for to build their own nuclear weapons and that we and American aerospace companies with the acquiescence of this administration had been, as my colleagues know, upgrading Communist Chinese rockets' reliability, and their effectiveness and their capabilities.

What message are we sending to the Communist Chinese, what message are we sending to our democratic allies? No wonder why the Chinese are becoming more aggressive and disdain the Clinton administration when the Clinton administration tries to warn them about anything. There is nothing that that administration can say that will be taken seriously by these militarists in Beijing when they know that our administration knows about these vile acts and these threats against us.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would simply add, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, that those who watch around the world, Mr. Speaker, would do well to remember that ours is a constitutional republic with a Chief Executive who is, quite correctly, our commander in chief. But they should understand a lesson that oftentimes escapes them in terms of the nuances of the big picture, and it is this. This Congress constitutionally is charged with oversight. When it comes to our national security, when it comes to the well-being of this American Nation, when it comes to our legitimate concerns overseas, it is this Congress which maintains oversight of the Executive Branch, and those who feel they can inject themselves into the American political system with campaign contributions and other forms of influence and somehow change our policy, while there may be evidence of that occurring sadly, it will change.

The American people deserve nothing less than a government that deals with them honestly and protects them.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me reclaim my time so we know the administration will try to fussy this issue by claiming that some of these thefts that we are talking about started during the Reagan years. And let me be very specific when they were making this attempt to cloud this issue.

During Ronald Reagan's term of office I was working in the White House. During that time period there was a strong democracy movement building in Communist China, and, yes, we cooperated with the Communist Chinese

in order to split them away from the Russians, a tactic that ended the Cold War. But at the same time we pushed for democracy.

□ 1700

We did not give meaningless platitudes to requests for democracy and human rights, and there was a thriving democracy movement that we thought could well take over China. We thought it was irreversible at the time, and it was not until the massacre at Tiananmen Square that that optimism should have been reversed.

The fact is that we could well have had a democratic country in China by now, but what happened was during those years some of this information the communists were able to steal from us but we realized that the government itself in China may be undermined by the democratic movement there.

There was an excuse for having looser controls at a time when communist China was becoming more democratic. After Tiananmen Square, when they massacred the human rights workers and the democratic movement, there is no excuse as the country, as communist China, slid further into militarism, into tyranny and into hostile positions to the United States of America. So, thus, during the Reagan years, yes, some problems happened, but during the Clinton years, when there was no excuse whatsoever because the democracy movement had been annihilated and in fact the human rights report last year of the Clinton administration noted that there has been a substantial decline in human rights even from last year, which was already on the way down, that there was no excuse for this administration to try to cover up the wrongdoing of that regime and no excuse for them to cover up the threat that that regime was putting itself in to threaten our well-being and our security by upgrading their own military capabilities, especially in their weapons of mass destruction.

So I would hope that my colleagues and the American people are not confused, intentionally confused, by this administration in an attempt to shuck the responsibility and to throw off the responsibility. For the fact that our country has been put in terrible jeopardy, at a time when they knew the facts, when China was becoming more totalitarian, when they had been briefed on this threat, they continued to belittle those of us who were calling attention and sounding the alarm.

THE GREATER MIAMI JEWISH FEDERATION'S SUPER SUNDAY PHONATHON

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, continuing on its long tradition of

service to all of us in the south Florida area, the Greater Miami Jewish Federation will hold its annual super Sunday phonathon this coming weekend, and this charitable event unites volunteers from throughout our area in an effort to raise the funds to provide necessary services to the many needy individuals in south Florida, but it extends even wider, to Israel and 60 other countries throughout the world.

As in past years, hundreds of volunteers will help raise funds that will be destined to programs that will provide free hot meals to poor elderly in our community who otherwise might go hungry. It will also assist youngsters learn more about the Jewish experience through educational programs that it offers. Moreover, Jewish refugees will be assisted with the funds through a resettlement program that aims to help these displaced persons begin a new life free of persecution from their native homelands.

The Greater Miami Jewish Federation of south Florida has become a source of pride and support for all of us in south Florida, but in particular to those who are needy. For decades, it has been the leading community activist organization that has served the less fortunate. The work of this outstanding organization is an example of how the private sector can help the less fortunate in the community at a time of dwindling government resources, and they do so with great effectiveness.

I congratulate the Greater Miami Jewish Federation on its continuing efforts to help the poor in our community and wish them the best of success to all of those involved in this worthwhile event, and I urge all of our south Florida community to come out this super Sunday and become one of the many volunteers helping the Greater Miami Jewish Federation in its very successful phonathon.

FREEDOM FOSTERS ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, running across the road today to speak in this House Chamber I encountered a hard snowfall outside. A friend suggested a speech criticizing the groundhog who predicted an early spring.

I suggested that maybe we should not be so tough on the groundhog for this faulty prediction, as Washington is receiving its toughest winter storm of the year. In Washington, D.C. politicians and economists are not much better with their predictions.

I remember 4 years ago when we first came up to Washington, D.C. I heard over and over again that this government could not balance its budget and

that our plan to restore fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity to the way that Congress and Washington and the White House ran its business, I heard that we could not get it done.

Let us look at what happened 4 years later. Today we have an economy that is exploding. Some say that it is an economy that is stronger than any American economy ever before, and there are a lot of people that are lining up, taking credit and assigning responsibility to these great economic times.

It is very important that we remember, back over the 4 years, about what we did and what sacrifices we took to make America as strong as it is going into the new millennium.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when I first ran for Congress in 1994 talking about the need of balancing the budget, talking about the need for Americans to have a government that handled their checkbook as well as Americans handled their checkbook at home, because if we have a Federal Government that continued and continued to spend more money than it took in, it would not only damage our credibility here in Washington, it would also damage our children's possibility of pursuing the American dream that we were all able to pursue in our life.

When I first got to Washington, D.C., the deficit was at \$300 billion and the debt was approaching \$5 trillion. Now, we throw out numbers. Everybody loves throwing out numbers in Washington, D.C., and few people really understand what those numbers mean, but I can say this, what a \$300 billion deficit meant was that interest rates were up because the markets were jittery.

I remember getting elected, coming here and talking about how we were going to balance the budget in 7 years, and I remember how the President and the liberals in his administration and the liberals in this House said that balancing the budget was irresponsible and saying that it would destroy the economy.

In fact, they said balancing the budget in 7 years would wreck the United States economy, cause the markets to collapse and cause widespread unemployment and recession.

Let us look just 5 years later and see what our results were. We now have a Dow Jones average that was not at 3900 like it was when we first got here but is now at 9500. We have unemployment rates that are lower than they have been in years and years, and we have an economy that is growing at a faster rate than ever before, and it is all because we were able to discipline ourselves to do what we ask every middle class American to do, and that is spend only as much money as you take in.

So what did Alan Greenspan say back in 1995? He actually came to the Committee on the Budget, chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), and

he said if the Republicans are serious about balancing the budget, and if they pass this plan to balance the budget, I will predict that interest rates will drop and the economy will grow at a faster rate than it has since the end of World War II.

That is what the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said, Alan Greenspan. All the while I love hearing columnists and pundits and pollsters saying, you cannot do it; Washington cannot balance its budget. It sounded like what people said about me when I first ran for Congress 4 years ago. They told me there was no way I could win. Well, I learned then, never say never.

We learned in the budget fight, sometimes you just kind of have to turn off your hearing aid to these pollsters and pundits, because if they were right all along we would have never even tried to balance the budget.

Now, of course, 4 years later everybody is lining up and saying what a great job they did, but it is important for us to remember who was for the balanced budget and who fought it, and what philosophy was underlying those of us who supported the balanced budget plan.

□ 1715

And what philosophy underlies those people that opposed the balanced budget plan? Let us start with the people that were against it. Unfortunately, the administration and the people on the left of this Chamber had a government and had a Congress that they controlled for 40 years, and for 40 years they believed in bigger government, more oppressive taxes, and less freedom for Americans.

In fact, we saw deficits explode well up into \$300 billion, and the way they proposed bringing the deficit down was by raising America's taxes. In fact, in 1993, they passed the largest single tax increase in the history of this great republic, and believed that they could not cut government spending. Well, we believed otherwise, and we still believe otherwise, that the Federal Government spends too much of American taxpayers' dollars. But taxes kept exploding. We came in and tried to cut them down; we passed some tax cuts, but all along the administration has fought us and the liberals have fought us time and time again. Now, they say they are for tax cuts, but when push comes to shove, they just will not propose them.

Why is that? It is because at the heart of their philosophy, at the heart of the philosophy that ran Washington for 40 years, they believe that big government is the solution. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the big hearts of America, that the communities of America, that the families and individuals in America are the ones who should make the decision on how to spend their money.