

force. We are involved. So, therefore, the moral crusade that we are mounting in Kosovo is a continuation of a new kind of morality that we have established. We are saying that never again will the civilized world stand by and allow people to be destroyed by sovereign predators without intervention.

Sometimes that intervention, most of the time, it will be diplomatic condemnation. Diplomatic condemnation of genocide will always be a certainty, I hope, from now on when that happens. But sometimes military confrontation will also be possible, and it will happen in protection of a principle.

I hope that all the other sovereign predators of the world will take heed that they will not be allowed to exist without being labeled war criminals. General Pinochet, who is now sort of trapped in England, I hope we have seen the last of those people who think they can kill and maim and destroy people and then rise up and travel around the world as ordinary citizens and enjoy their old age. There ought to be a condemnation of the sovereign predators, if we cannot go to war with them, do whatever is necessary to make certain they never live among men again as normal people.

So I appeal to my constituents, I appeal to people everywhere to do a thorough analysis and remember the Hitler syndrome. Never again, the phrase we used in connection with the millions of Jews who died, must not be an abstract slogan. It must not be a slogan that our generation uses in the future because we sat by and let things happen and we feel bad about it and say we will not let it happen next time. This is the time. This is the time to stop it.

Each one of us has a duty to take a forefront position, to be thorough in our thinking and to support the most intelligent effort possible to end this war as fast as possible. But we should, in the meantime, be proud of the fact that this indispensable Nation of ours has both the will and the power to reinforce the foundations of a compassionate civilization.

The Roman Empire only dispatched their allegiance to achieve greater conquests and to bring home the booty. This American indispensable Nation has deployed its armies in an unprecedented campaign of compassion.

A CRISIS WE MUST NOT SHRINK FROM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes I have the privilege of visiting elementary schools in the 6th Congress-

sional District of Arizona, the folks whom I represent, and enjoy reading to elementary schoolchildren a book entitled "House Mouse, Senate Mouse", and it tells the story in bipartisan, or nonpartisan, fashion of the legislative process. It is written in verse, and it follows a letter sent to Capitol Hill by a group of schoolchildren. And as I point out to the students, if they ever want to receive a lot of mail, they need only be elected to the Congress of the United States, and they will receive mail on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, this time of year, I am sure my colleagues would concur, among the pieces of mail we get are a variety of commencement announcements and graduation invitations, and I received one such invitation today from one of this Nation's foremost institutions, the United States Military Academy at West Point. The announcement reads as follows:

"Congressman Hayworth, after 4 years, I wanted to write and thank you for the appointment to the United States Military Academy you obtained for me in 1995. I am graduating and will be a commissioned armor officer stationed in Germany. I look forward to this exciting challenge. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to serve my country and fulfill a childhood dream."

And the young man about to be commissioned as Second Lieutenant in the United States Army sent his graduation picture along.

And, indeed, as a previous Member of this Chamber long ago reflected upon this job, indeed one man in American history, the only man thus far to serve as President following the service in that same job of his own father, John Quincy Adams, who, following his service as President, was asked by the people of Massachusetts to return to government service in this role, as a Member of Congress, said, "There is no greater honor than serving in the people's House."

And I would only add to that, Mr. Speaker, by saying one of the great honors of service in this House is the opportunity to appoint outstanding young men and women to our military academies because their sense of duty, honor and country serves as an example to us all.

I have also had an occasion to travel around the width and breadth of the district I represent here, a district in square mileage that is almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Across the width and breadth of eastern Arizona, from the small hamlet of Franklin in southern Greenlee County, north to Four Corners on the sovereign Navajo Nation, west to Flagstaff, and south again to Florence, including portions of metropolitan Phoenix, North Scottsdale, Central Mesa, and what we call the East Valley, a district of incredible contrasts and diversity. And yet the stories remain the same, stories of proud service to our country.

In Pinal County last month I had occasion to speak at the dedication of a new city hall in Casa Grande, Arizona. And that city hall is a unique design for it is a renovation of the historic Casa Grande High School, and the city hall dedication almost served as a mini reunion for the proud alumni of Casa Grande High.

One of those who joined us that day was a member of the class of 1941, and he brought his school photograph, not unlike the West Point cadet who I mentioned earlier. This year, this alumnus of Casa Grande High School, brought his high school yearbook picture; and he related to me the story of how his dreams were deferred because of his sense of duty and the ominous and momentous acts, acts that have been recorded in history by our late President Franklin Roosevelt, who stood not far from this spot and proclaimed December 7, 1941, as a day which would live in infamy.

That proud member of the class of 1941 at Casa Grande High School spoke of his commitment to our Nation and his realization that the freedom we enjoy is never free. It comes at great cost.

And I mention my two constituents this evening, Mr. Speaker, one preparing to graduate, to become a commissioned officer in the United States Army; the other, now an honored senior citizen who gave the flower of his youth, the prime of his life, indeed, as one Hollywood motion picture of the 1940s was entitled "The Best Years of Their Lives", to preserving the freedom of our constitutional republic.

And I am reminded of Mark Twain's observation, which I have shared with the Speaker many times on the floor of this House, that history does not repeat itself, but it rhymes. Challenges remain, but we should thank our Heavenly Father that there are those who are willing to step forward to meet those challenges.

And a recurring theme throughout the history of this constitutional republic is the resiliency and the resolve of the American people. When confronted with a crisis, when put in harm's way, when our very national survival is threatened, the American people instinctively understand that to have economic security, that to have security in one's home, in one's community, we must also have a strong sense of national security. We have been willing to step forward.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit that I come to this floor tonight to relate and bring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and highlight different articles that have appeared in prominent national newspapers reporting on a crisis that we face today, a crisis which we need not shrink from, which we dare not shrink from, which both history and duty compel us to confront.

Joyce Howard Price writes in yesterday's Washington Times, and I quote,

"Energy Secretary Bill Richardson admitted Sunday that the Chinese government has obtained nuclear secrets during the Clinton administration despite the President's claims to the contrary. There have been damaging security leaks. The Chinese have obtained damaging information during past administrations and the current administration," Mr. Richardson said on NBC's Meet the Press.

The Energy Secretary's comments contradict President Clinton's statement of March 19. Mr. Clinton was asked about a classified congressional report detailing leaks at the nuclear weapons laboratory in Los Alamos, New Mexico. The initial disclosure of the congressional report, published in The New York Times, said the spying began in the 1980s but was not discovered until 1995. "To the best of my knowledge, no one has said anything to me about any espionage which occurred by the Chinese against the labs during my Presidency," the President said.

According to The New York Times, counter-intelligence experts told senior Clinton administration officials in November that China posed an acute intelligence threat to the weapons labs. The counterintelligence report, purportedly distributed to Mr. Richardson and others in the highest levels of the administration, and I would parenthetically add here that would include the President of the United States, warned that China was constantly penetrating computers at the nuclear weapons labs.

□ 2215

"The document revealed that the Energy Department, which has authority over nuclear weapons labs, recorded 324 attacks on its unclassified computer systems from outside the United States between October 1997 and June 1998. China was the worst offender. But there were others as well," the report said.

Mr. Speaker, from today's New York Times, William J. Broad writes:

"Secrets that China stole in 1997 about a space radar that can expose submerged submarines could aid it in finding subs from commercial satellites or airplanes and might also help it hide its own undersea weapons, intelligence experts say.

"For two decades, seeking to protect its submarine fleet from such surveillance, the Pentagon has tried to monopolize the radar. When it made its debut in 1978 with surprising powers of discernment, military powers blocked public release of satellite photos that showed deep, normally invisible wakes of speeding craft. Last year the military had the Federal Government set strict limits on the visual powers of proposed commercial radar satellites.

"Now it turns out, according to Pentagon officials, that an American sci-

entist gave radar secrets to China in 1997, forcibly easing the Pentagon's grip. The implications of this disclosure are unclear because the size of the breach is unknown publicly and because the secret method is reportedly difficult to put into practice even after years of study. But at worst, experts say, American subs are now in danger of losing some of their cover. Among the vulnerable are missile subs, the most important part of the Nation's nuclear arsenal because of their stealthiness.

"Publicly, the unanswered questions include how deep submarines must go to elude radar prying, and sea currents and temperatures can help restore visibility, and how advances with submarines, satellites, and computers will most likely affect such probing in the future.

"Today the radar technique is believed to be able to uncloak submarines hundreds of feet beneath the waves but not thousands of feet. Experts say that recent trends have already hurt the Pentagon's game and the Chinese espionage, at least in theory, has made things worse."

"As for China, it can use the stolen technology not only to hunt foreign subs but also to better cloak its own submarines finding ways to reduce the deep wakes that produce subtle clues of stealthy movement."

Mr. Speaker, these two articles from two prominent national publications today and yesterday compel this House to again renew the call, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the bipartisan Select Committee on Unauthorized Transfers of Technology to China, informally known as the Cox committee, that the report of that Select Committee be released at once to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time, at least 4 months, indeed just after the convening of this 106th Congress the Cox committee, in a bipartisan fashion, completed its report. Its findings are available to Members of the House once Members of Congress are willing to submit to a classified briefing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must again say that, with each passing day, the American people are deprived of the full knowledge they deserve of the extent to which China has penetrated our nuclear labs, stolen our nuclear secrets, and left this country with what euphemistically can be called a challenge with what, Mr. Speaker, must more realistically be called a clear, present threat.

Mr. Speaker, the articles appearing in our major newspapers have given way to opinion columns. William Safire, a syndicated columnist, in this morning's Mesa Arizona Tribune in a column entitled "Connect the Dots on China," has this to say:

Mr. Safire relates that he called three friends in the Department of Energy, Defense, and Justice and asked

them to turn on their office computers and read the first banner that came on their screens. "Anyone using this system expressly consents to monitoring," is the message. "Government employees using Government equipment on Government time thus waive privacy claims.

"Wen Ho Lee, the scientist who downloaded millions of lines of the nation's most secret codes to a computer easy to penetrate, also signed a waiver consenting to a search of his computer without his knowledge. And yet the Reno Justice Department denied the FBI's request for permission to search Lee's government computer.

"Eric Holder, Janet Reno's deputy, decided that a court search warrant was necessary but then refused to apply to the special foreign surveillance court to get it. Of more than 700 such FBI requests a year, a surveillance official admits that a flat turn-down is extremely rare."

"Why?" Mr. Safire writes and asks, "why this one?"

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very curious about this. I was participating in a debate earlier tonight where the director of the CIA, it was proposed, should resign because of the bombing in Belgrade of the Chinese Embassy, quickly looking for a scapegoat.

Now, I hope that we are not going to be quickly looking for a scapegoat and put somebody's head on the chopping block too hastily as respects that. But it is interesting that that rumor, which may or may not have come from the administration, about let us fire the head of the CIA, we do not ever hear that about let us talk about Janet Reno.

Because, as my colleague knows, the attorney general, Ms. Reno, did not go along with Louis Freeh's recommendation for a special prosecutor to look into the Chinese money laundering scandal and the things that Johnny Chung, the great Democrat donor, testified today for 5 hours before a committee on. And yet here we have the same attorney general who did not want to proceed with the investigation of Mr. Lee.

Now, that is very curious to me. Because bombing the Embassy was tragic and a huge international mistake. Yet, at the same time, giving away our nuclear arsenal, the so-called W-88, which is the nuclear technology that can arm a Trident nuclear submarine, that is a huge matter. And why this administration and this attorney general drug their heels on taking disciplinary action or even investigating is beyond me. And I cannot see that.

And we are already hearing from the folks up at the White House that, well,

this started with the Reagan-Bush folks. Well, okay, everybody does it. We heard that before, "everybody does it." And I am appalled. But I know this, that the Reagan-Bush team did not know of spying and did not have the reason to believe that apparently this administration did that this was going on and yet totally ignored it. Nothing was going on. And for months and months and months reports of what was going on in Los Alamos were apparently forwarded on or forwarded up the ladder and they were ignored time and time again.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for his remarks and his very salient observations.

I would also point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that even while we have American fighting men and women placed in harm's way in an air campaign above Yugoslavia dealing with the challenges confronted by Kosovo, nonetheless, it is the Constitutional responsibility of this Congress to exercise oversight and to ask some important questions. And my colleague from Georgia outlines many.

I would offer another. It is worth noting that our national security advisor, one Mr. Sandy Berger, prior to his employ in this administration, was a paid lobbyist for the People's Republic of China. Indeed, according to Dick Morris, the political advisor who conducted the bulk of the 1996 reelection campaign for the President, he said in a publication here on the hill, fittingly titled "The Hill," quoting now: "Sandy Berger has about as much business being national security advisor as I do."

My friend from Georgia brought up the curiosities of the conduct of our attorney general. And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this House and our colleagues take a look at a commentary by this same Dick Morris appearing on the pages of the New York Post today where he outlines some very curious conduct and speculates on the reasons why the attorney general has been so reticent to take up these investigations and to exercise her constitutional authority to ensure that laws are being obeyed and, I might add, the same constitutional charge that we take on in an oath, that our friends in the executive branch take on, when we raise our right hand and swear to faithfully execute and protect and uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. We have a very troublesome situation on our hands.

My colleague from Georgia also mentioned the testimony today of Johnny Chung. I must, Mr. Speaker, confess to this House and to the American people at large how dismayed I am with my former colleagues in broadcast journalism, even now with the advent of 24-hour news networks, how noticeably devoid the cable cast and the broadcast

fair was of coverage of the testimony of Johnny Chung today before the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Contrast that with the gavel-to-gavel coverage in 1987 of the Iran-Contra hearings during the Republican administration. And please do not misunderstand, because I know the temptation of some on the left is to engage in cat calls and to say this is simply whining. But when we have observers from partisan think tanks, both left and right, saying that the news judgment of the major networks and the cable networks is sadly askew when they refuse to offer gavel-to-gavel coverage I think again, in our free society, sadly, some purveyors of information choose not to highlight issues that go to the very core of our national survival and our national security.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it is interesting that my colleague says that. Because we are both members of a communication team that looks at a lot of media numbers. The big three networks in percentage of news loss I think have gone from something like 60 percent of the market in 1990 to about 25 percent of the market now. Because Americans are turning on cable and they are watching Fox News, which did give gavel-to-gavel coverage of the 5-hour Johnny Chung, which this is an outrageous issue.

Here is a person who gets money filtered to him through General Ji of the People's Liberation Army of Communist China. He gives \$360,000 to the Democrat National Committee, which they admitted to and they returned. He has pled guilty, I think, of \$20,000 of it, which has been nailed on him pretty solid.

This is not casual stuff, and China is not some casual country out there. It is not like, they came from Luxembourg and we have got to watch those folks in luck Luxembourg. This is Communist China, not exactly strong American allies right now, particularly under this administration. But it is not covered.

But what is interesting is that each year the network news loses more and more of its market share, and I think one reason is people are tired of filtered news. They enjoy C-SPAN. And I am sure many of the people watching tonight are channel suffering. They may be here 10 seconds, they might be here 5 minutes, and they are going to move on. But that is what Americans want in choice of television and choice of coverage right now.

But this is a huge situation where we have an operative who visited the White House 50 different times and he was peddling influence. And not all the money that he got from Communist China went to the White House or the Democrat National Committee. I am not going to say that it did.

Just like when I was in college and my dad had a little checking account for me and he would give me money for gas, some of that money found its way to beer.

□ 2230

But I am saying it was the same account. The man had one account, and that money was dispersed to politicians. And 50 different visits to the White House. Let me ask you, you are on the Committee on Ways and Means, clearly one of the most powerful committees in the United States House of Representatives. How many times have you, as a member of that powerful committee, gone to the White House? Fifty, 60, 70 times? You have been up here 6 years. Eighty times? One hundred times? How many times have you been to the White House?

I am not talking about meeting with the President, but I am talking about meeting with the administration as a key committee member during the passage of welfare reform, tax reductions, balancing the budget. Surely you have been there at least as many times as Johnny Chung.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I have not been invited to the Oval Office nor to the White House to discuss policy with the President or any of his immediate advisers on a single occasion. The visits to the Oval Office I have made, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia, the old goose egg, zilch, zero, nada.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me ask you this. So you are one of the 435 Members of Congress and you have never been invited to the White House for anything but a social occasion, but let me ask you this. Surely the Democrat members, let us get partisan here, the Democrat members have probably been there 50 or 60 times. You know a lot of your Democrat colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means. Estimate how many times they have been over there.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would not presume to speak for my friends on the other side of the aisle but, based on my own observations, I would think even with, pardon the pun, the most liberal interpretation, the ranking member and some of the leaders or my friends on the other side of the aisle on the Committee on Ways and Means have probably been there maybe a dozen times, two dozen if we want to be very charitable, but certainly not 50 occasions to my knowledge.

Mr. KINGSTON. So here is a man named Johnny Chung, gives generously to the Democrat National Committee, is partially funded through the Chinese Communists, and he goes to the White House 50 times. And during this period of time we transfer approval of nuclear technology sales to China, we transfer that from the Department of Defense, which is very, very protective of national security to the Department of

Commerce which is very, very pro-trade, not worried about security. And during that period of time China is not only buying nuclear technology knowledge, but they are also stealing it at Los Alamos. Meanwhile, Mr. Chung is running around in the White House.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would point out as Wesley Pruden, editor-in-chief of the Washington Times pointed out in a column about a month and a half ago, the same month when Vice President GORE had his self-described community outreach event at the Buddhist temple in Los Angeles, later proven to be a fundraising exercise again involving non-American citizens, that same month the aforementioned Mr. Berger, the National Security Adviser, we understand, was informed of the security breach at Los Alamos.

There are those in this city, in fact, Mr. Chung was part of the spin today, if you heard some of his comments, and I have heard them rebroadcast on some of the cable news outlets in the 30-some seconds they would devote to the story as opposed to gavel-to-gavel coverage, where he impugned the American political system in terms of fund raising. I must tell you, that tradition is in keeping with the curious reaction of many others in this city about financing campaigns and having people involved. In fact, to me the historical analogy would have been for Bonny and Clyde at the height of their crime spree to suddenly call a press conference to invite the leading newspapers and newsreels of their era and come out publicly for stiffer penalties against bank robbery.

It is asinine to see some of the spin going on here. Now you have the desperate attempt by Secretary Richardson, our former colleague, my neighbor from New Mexico, saying, "Well, now we're going to get tough. Now we're going to appoint a security czar at Los Alamos."

Friends, the nuclear genie is out of the bottle. The nuclear horse has left the barn. To continue to mix metaphors, the nuclear chickens are coming home to roost. And it is a little late, after the fact, for Mr. Berger, Secretary Richardson, Attorney General Reno or, as described in various accounts, the hustler named Johnny Chung to purport to lecture the American people about the conduct of campaigns, to attempt to lecture the American people about how now, once these ills have been exposed, "Oh, now we're going to get tough." It leads to cynicism and distrust on the part of the body politic.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman something. You have been an active Member up here. Foreign nationalists, can they give to campaigns in the administration? I know they cannot give to Members of Congress. What is Mr. Chung saying is the problem with the law?

As I see it, laws were broken. We do not need to revamp the campaign finance law, although there are certain things we can do, but for this particular situation, we do not need to revamp campaign laws, we just need to follow them. Or am I missing something?

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, you are quite right. To offer another analogy, it would be like someone speeding and have an officer stop the speeder and the speeder say to the officer, oh, gee, I was going over 50 in that 35 miles per hour zone, but you know that is such a hazard at just 35 miles an hour, you ought to lower that speed limit to 25. And because I had the moral suasion to make that observation to you, officer, just let me go along on my way. Because, after all, I cared enough, officer, I cared enough, to tell you that the speed limit is excessive even though I broke it many times over.

This asinine reasoning and this cynical spin that permeates this town is both sickening and cynical and it needs to stop, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia. And to the American people, Mr. Speaker, who join us tonight, we need to move beyond spin for some straight talk with the American people. And whether it is campaign finance reform or these emerging scandals that threaten our very national security, Mr. Justice Brandeis was right, Mr. Speaker, when he said, sunshine is the best disinfectant.

That is why, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I renew my call for this House, if necessary, to go into closed session as soon as possible and to vote the release of the Cox committee report, because we know that our colleague from California has worked in a good-faith effort to negotiate with this White House.

We also know that the President of the United States has within his power under existing law the ability to release the select committee report today if he would take it up. I would, Mr. Speaker, invite our President to release the report forthwith, if he is to deal with us in candor and to serve effectively as our Commander in Chief as he sends American men and women into harm's way in the Balkan theater. He owes no less to the American public so that we understand what exactly is at stake across and around the world in terms of our defense capabilities.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to clarify two things.

Number one, what the Cox report is; and the Cox report is the bipartisan commission report, special appointed committee by Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to look into this scandal of Chinese money influencing the American election system and taking nuclear secrets from America.

Now, that is point number one, that is what the Cox report is, but, number two, it was passed unanimously by the

committee, Democrats and Republicans, 100 percent passed it. Now it is at the White House waiting to get their approval to declassify some of the information, and the White House is dragging. What you are saying is, if the White House persists on dragging, then it is likely the Democrats and Republicans at large in the House of Representatives will vote to get this thing out on the floor and so that we can address these problems.

That is where there is some real hypocrisy by this administration. They are saying, number one, well, all administrations have had spying at Los Alamos, in the nuclear labs. And then they are saying, but we are the only ones to deal with it. That is not quite true, but if you were dealing with it, you would put the Cox report out so we could all say, what is going on? Do we need more money here? Do we need more involvement here? Do we need this nuclear secrets czar which Energy Secretary Richardson has promoted now?

To me, I do not know if we do or we do not. If the Attorney General is not going to enforce the law, maybe we do need a nuke czar. I do not know. But let us put the Cox Commission report on the table and look at it, because we are united that the Communist Chinese were trying to influence the election. We are united in the knowledge that the Chinese communists were trying to get our nuclear secrets. We are not pointing fingers at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. We are pointing fingers at Beijing right now. I think that is a very significant and unifying factor.

Right now China is certainly unified against America. They are burning flags. They are rioting. They are protesting. They are doing everything they can. They are having bigger protests than Tiananmen Square. The Ambassador, Mr. Sasser, cannot even leave the American embassy over in China right now. They are on the streets. They are demonstrating. As you know, it is morning there right now and the three journalists who were killed in the embassy, their bodies are returning to China today as we speak, and the Chinese people are all unified against America. What is worse than that, they are unified with Russia against America. China has become a player now in Kosovo. So our Chinese problems are just beginning. We need to go ahead and get beyond the Cox report and figure out what we should do.

Mr. HAYWORTH. As my colleague so capably points out, Mr. Speaker, it is time to address this, not as Republicans or as Democrats but as Americans. This is a situation which confronts us with reference to our national security and the safety of all our citizens, and the future of our country with reference to the rest of the world and most specifically to that giant nation in the East, Communist China. We

must be resolute, rational, sober-minded about this, but it is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, and the frustration seeps over in the constant spinning and cajoling and cynical remarks that emerge in a very defensive fashion.

I believe my colleague from Georgia used that well-worn chorus, "Everybody does it. Oh, people spy all the time. What's the big deal?" Mr. Speaker, here is the big deal, as has been reported in the mainstream press. While many in this town very publicly search for what they call their legacy, the irony is that their legacy quite literally is our legacy, the legacy codes to America's nuclear arsenal that were transferred, downloaded into unsecure computers, where the Communist Chinese and others could have access to the width and breadth and majority of our technological know-how that American taxpayers subsidized in our national interest to protect this American Nation. That sadly is the legacy. Our national security has been squandered and jeopardized, and we must get to the root of that very vexing problem.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things I wanted to point out to you when you talk about a country of 1.2, 1.4 billion people, their army is 3 million strong right now. Now they are downsizing it to a skeletal 2 million people, but this is a huge army. They have just recently purchased 50 Russian SU-27 fighters and are building about 100 more. They have plans to install 650 short range missiles on China's coastline. This is an army that is being reorganized but it is on the move. But perhaps one of the best things they got in terms of stolen secrets were these so-called legacy codes.

I am going to read from a Wall Street Journal article today:

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, the most valuable data comes in the form of legacy codes. These are computer programs used by scientists at the two U.S. weapons labs to model how a newly configured weapon might work based on digital records of hundreds of U.S. tests that are built into the codes. It can take 5 years for a beginning U.S. weapons scientist to master the codes even with support from veteran bomber designers. Discovering just when China may have obtained these codes may be one of the keys to determine how fast it could develop its arsenal.

So it is these legacy codes that are just as important as the W-88. The W-88 as we have pointed out earlier, that is the nuclear design for the nuclear submarine stuff. They also got the W-56, W-57, and I think it was W-72 and W-78 and W-87. These are all our nuclear warhead secrets, the drafts and the designs and the plans. As one of the Pentagon officials said, "They basically have all the secrets in our nuclear arsenal right now."

□ 2245

The only question remains is how much, how far they are along in applying this information. It is scary.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Small wonder then that a long-time observer of our intelligence scene and apparatus described this breach, and it has been reported, again in the mainstream press, as the worst breach of national security since the Rosenbergs, and, Mr. Speaker, that is chilling. But the challenge for us is not to stand mortified or paralyzed or irresolute or intent on political gamesmanship. Mr. Speaker, the challenge for us is to remember what has worked through our history, to have a deep and abiding faith in the American people.

My colleague from Montana was here earlier tonight along with my colleague from Colorado and a colleague from California, and he made this point that I have seen time and again, and I am sure my friend from Georgia would echo this sentiment. When we return home to our districts, when we meet with our constituents, we are reassured and overwhelmed by the common sense of the American people who understand a clear and present danger and who do not shrink from a threat to their family's security and to the national security.

We have learned through our history, Mr. Speaker, and it appears as a paradox, but in fact it is the foundation of our successful policy around the world in what has been referred to as the American Century, and that is we find true peace through our military strength and we seek strength not to dominate or colonize the world, as our detractors would say, using the buzz phrase of imperialism. No, we only seek that power and advantage in our own national interest so that we may ensure the peace in our own legitimate national interests.

That is why I was pleased to vote one week ago to supplement our defense capabilities, to give our men and women in uniform a much needed pay raise for the work they do, to recognize their value and to refortify our Nation's Armed Forces because, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation fast developing that was reminiscent of what we saw 20 years ago, the erosion of our capabilities, our manpower, our munitions, our material, to the point where our capabilities were described as a hollow force.

Again we face those challenges because even as this administration has disagreed with the new majority in Congress while we have tried time and again to increase allocations to preserve our national security, and the administration said, no, we do not need to spend funds in that fashion and put our national security at risk, we have a situation where our Commander in Chief has deployed our Armed Forces into more than 30 locations, and now we are faced with the vexing dilemma of having an Armed Forces apparatus incapable of fighting a two-front war or dealing with two regional conflicts.

That exacerbates the problem today in the Balkans. Whatever one's opinion

of the course of action that should be followed, and good Americans can disagree as to the intent and what should be done, and certainly the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I have weighed in with our points of view on this in the past, but incumbent upon this Congress and our Commander in Chief is to act in the national interest to make sure that we have the manpower, the materiel, the munitions necessary to defend our constitutional republic.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it was interesting. Yesterday I went to an Air Force base, and I am not sure if I should say the name so I will not, but they told me that last year they had 11 fighter jets that sat basically on the tarmac because they needed spare parts, and they sat there, and, as my colleague knows, it is a tragic waste of millions of dollars worth of equipment. They finally got the spare parts, and now they are up and running because last year, as my colleague knows and he supported some money for spare parts; very simple, you just have to do that in the world; but, as my colleagues know, the other bad part was the morale.

As my colleagues know, here we have these trained pilots who say, look, you know I work hard, it is very competitive to get where I am, and I got here, and now you will not let me fly these jets because you do not even spend the money on the spare parts. I am out of here. I can find a better job in the private sector. Will not be what I wanted, will not be the excitement and the thrill of flying a jet, but there is no reason.

And so also in the bill that my colleague supported last week was money for more spare parts for tanks and equipment, and, as my colleagues know, maybe it is a little mundane, a little boring, to have to spend money responsibly on things like spare parts, but we have to have it.

As my colleagues know, these planes go from Georgia to the Middle East. They get sand in the engine. They have to be down for two or three days while they clean everything to make sure that the sand is out of there because it grinds it down. Then they go to another region that has completely different elements, and they have to keep up with their equipment. But when we are spending millions and millions of dollars on it, it is well worth it.

But the equipment is nothing compared to the soldiers and the soldiers. My colleague mentioned deployments. I believe the rough numbers are that from World War II until 1989 there were 11 United States deployments of Armed Services, 11 from World War II until 1989, and since 1989 there have been 33, and this administration with its very peculiar relationship with the military or its view of the military seems to deploy them at the drop of a hat, and, as

my colleagues know, we have fought putting Americans under command of U.N. generals. We want our American soldiers under the commands of Americans. As we get more into this strange period of when we have a defensive coalition like NATO that is acting offensively, when we are involved in a civil war where there is no clarified American peril, and you know there is an American peril if you back into the argument of whether economic stability in Europe is at stake. I am not 100 percent sure that it is, but let us say you buy that. Then why out of 19 NATO countries is America picking up anywhere from 60 to 80 percent of the cost of this war?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on that observation I thank the gentleman from Georgia for raising that because again one cannot help but note the contrasts with this latest campaign in Kosovo and the air campaign of the NATO forces, and yet the fact that our European allies are not paying their fair share of this military involvement, and it almost sounds, Mr. Speaker, like a test question for history: Compare and contrast the demands of President Bush on the allied nations in Desert Storm with the lack of demands President Clinton has placed upon our European NATO allies during the Kosovo campaign. Again, good people can disagree as to the advisability of having forces in the Balkans, but we should be united in the observation that our European allies, who have this action in just the fact of geography and of life that the Balkans theater is there closer to their homelands, literally in their own backyards. They should pick up their fair share of that burden if there is to be involvement at all.

Mr. KINGSTON. And if they decide that they cannot pick up their fair share of the military action, let them weigh in on the humanitarian assistance.

Can you imagine 750,000 refugees outside of the country, and tonight I saw statistics that said there are 600,000 inside the country.

Now, as my colleagues know, the numbers are fluid so we are never 100 percent sure, but these are people who have left their homes with nothing, no time to pack, no money, no food, no clothing, no transportation, and if they are lucky enough to return, then their house may be destroyed, the roads and transportation will be destroyed, the hospital will be destroyed, their food system, the distribution system, so we are going to need medicine, food, shelter. We are going to be committed to this humanitarian part of the war for a long, long time, and let us hope that our NATO allies, their European brothers and sisters, are going to be on the front line of that because that is going to cost us a lot of money for many, many years.

Can my colleague imagine the rebuilding that we will be involved in?

Mr. HAYWORTH. And it boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Georgia points this out, there is of course a larger context both to the Balkan theater that is transpiring in Kosovo and the other challenges we face around the world, and, Mr. Speaker, there is a legacy of modern conservatism and a common train of thought reflected in the notion of peace through strength, which President Reagan was so dogged and devout in pursuing, and indeed earlier this century by our former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II, later President of the United States, General Dwight David Eisenhower. In his book *Eisenhower, The President*, William Blake Ewold sets forth the components that Eisenhower used, the criteria upon which Eisenhower based any notion of military involvement by our Nation.

No. 1, said Ike, define the compelling national interest that would prompt us to act militarily. No. 2, Eisenhower said, let us have a clearly definable military objective. General Eisenhower, subsequently President Eisenhower, went on. No. 3, understand that there is no such thing as a little force. Once the decision to use force is made, force must be applied overwhelmingly and, yes, even brutally to achieve the desired ends. And, No. 4, once the objectives are achieved, there must be a clear exit strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I must lament the fact that whether it is in Kosovo or simply the notion of state craft and diplomacy confronting the challenges as we do today with Communist China how bereft and bankrupt and totally removed from the criteria Eisenhower outlined in what came to be known as the Eisenhower Doctrine, how far afield this administration is both in the conduct of our foreign policy and in the use of American fighting men and women around the world. Unapologetically we should stand for our national interests and our national security, and to those who come to this floor and offer what they believe to be a humanitarian argument, I notice very seldom do we hear about the almost 2 million people who have died in the Sudan, or the tribal warfare that has gone on in Rwanda, and that is not in any way to diminish the suffering in Kosovo, but let me suggest this, Mr. Speaker and my colleague from Georgia:

If we are to change and enlarge the definition of our national interest to include every atrocity that occurs somewhere around this world, we would be asking for the conscription of American men and women for almost a 10-year tour of duty, and this constitutional republic would look more like the ancient city state of Sparta in terms of our citizens under arms.

No, we must have a logical, sober, reasonable definition of our compelling

national interest clearly and unapologetically, and that is the foundation upon which we must base all of our actions in the field of diplomacy and certainly in the introduction of our military forces.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman has pointed out why America is now divided on this war effort. In Desert Storm, as my colleague knows, preceding the January bombing, we had a 6 month build-up of the military called Desert Shield, and we got our allies on board, and we got the American people on board, and that was not done in this case, and we went in there, as you and I have heard rumors from the Pentagon, expecting a two or three day campaign, and yet there was warning that it was going to be prolonged, that we could not achieve the objectives without ground forces, but we also understood that people within the White House thought it was going to be a two or three day campaign, and lo and behold, here we are now with 45th, 46th day; I am not certain.

But we have not clearly articulated to the American people and the administration has not what the peril is, and it is just this vague, well, humanitarian assistance and economic stability of Europe.

But the interesting thing I think right now is that there is this overture of if you quit bombing, we will have a peace talk, and I think most Americans right now are actually on the side of, okay, let us stop bombing and let us get talking again and see what happens.

Now there are critics who say once you stop bombing you cannot start again because the NATO alliance might not stick together. Well, I do not think that is that big of a deal based on what they have been contributing.

□ 2300

I think what we need to do is to get back to the peace table and start talking. Remember, we did not even start boycotting Yugoslavia for trade until 2 weeks ago. We should have done that a year ago, even earlier than that, because this has been going on since really 1989, 1990 and 1991 when the Republic of Yugoslavia started breaking out. Slovenia pulled out, and then Croatia and Bosnia.

None of this stuff has been surprising. Again, the bombing of the Chinese embassy, why did the most powerful military alliance in the world not know that they were bombing an embassy?

Mistakes happen in war, and I am certainly not going to say that is the biggest problem we have right now but that one they should have known. Was it the fault of the CIA or is that just a neat little package that we are going to put a scapegoat on? Or is it just this chain of NATO command where we have too many cooks in the broth? Is

this a war by committee? That is, I think, one of our big problems that we are not even discussing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) adds to the litany of compelling, provocative questions that confront us as we prepare to enter the next century.

I mentioned earlier in this special order that this has been referred to as the American century. Some around the world might claim that is a bit jingoistic, but it is a label that for better or worse has been given the 20th century.

History does not occur in a vacuum. All of the questions outlined by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, are undergirded again by this notion: To have security here at home, to have economic security, to have the security that promotes domestic tranquility, undergirding all of that is the notion of our national security.

In the beautiful preamble to our Constitution, those who gathered in Philadelphia for what Catherine Drinker Bowen called the miracle at Philadelphia wrote that it was their purpose, in ordaining and establishing a constitution for the United States, to provide for the common defense. That challenge continues even more in this world today.

Mr. Speaker, I began this hour speaking of an invitation I had received for commencement exercises at the United States Military Academy at West Point. I might also add, and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, shares this sentiment, there is no greater honor than calling a young man or woman to congratulate them upon their appointment to one of our fine military academies.

Just a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to do that for a young lady in one of the high schools in the northern part of our district, and a reporter from the White Mountain Independent was there, as the phone call was patched through on a speaker and this proud academy nominee and her family gathered along with her friends, and the reporter asked me, what does this mean to you to be able to nominate this young woman to the academy?

I said to him, you have to understand what this young person is doing. Yes, she is given a tremendous opportunity to receive an unparalleled education but it comes at a price because she and her family understand in no uncertain terms that quite literally her life will be on the line.

Those of us who are constitutional officers, whether in this legislative branch or at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the executive branch, have first and foremost a duty to the men and women in uniform and the people they protect that we unapologetically pursue our own national interest and that through over-

sight we allow the sunshine to come in to expose unsavory relationships, to get to the bottom of espionage scandals and to preserve our constitutional republic.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and May 12, on account of business in the district.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of family medical reasons.

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 Mr. STUPAK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENHAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROEMER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes each day, today and on May 12.

Mr. PORTMAN, for 5 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 18.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CAMPBELL, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 432. An act to designate the North/South Center as the Dante B. Fascell North-South Center.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1981. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Suspension of Collection of Recapture Amount for Borrowers with Certain Shared Appreciation Agreements (RIN: 0560-AF80) received April 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1982. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Beauveria bassiana (ATCC #74040); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-300821;FRL-6068-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1983. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethomorph, (E,Z) 4-[3-(4-chlorophenyl)-3-(3,4-dimethoxyphenyl)-1-oxo-2-propenyl]morpholine; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300857; FRL-6079-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1984. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for an emergency FY 1999 supplemental appropriation for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to help the people and communities devastated by the terrible tornados that hit Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, and Tennessee and provide for other disaster relief needs, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 106-61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1985. A letter from the Health Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter to advise that the Department has not yet completed its review and internal coordination for the report required by Section 715 of the FY 1999 National Defense Authorization Act.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a plan to redesign the military pharmacy system, pursuant to Public Law 105-261; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1987. A letter from the Acquisition and Technology, Under Secretary of Defense,