

the country, the pleas from parents and grandparents, from children, to make our schools safe places to be in says to those of us who hold a public office we need to act and to move to try to help us with this problem.

We cannot be so fixed in our own agenda, in our own schedule, in everything that only we concern ourselves with to say we cannot change what it is that we do here so that we can meet this challenge, meet this need, take this opportunity to say, yes, we can act and act in the best interest of the American public. And that is all we are talking about. We have this opportunity this week. We would be derelict in the responsibility that we have been entrusted with if we walk away from that responsibility.

And again, my colleague said it, the Senate passed modest legislation, legislation that has consensus from the gun industry, from the sports councils, from others. Our duty and obligation is to pass that kind of legislation in this body.

I thank the gentlewoman and I thank my colleagues for joining us tonight.

□ 2030

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk to our colleagues about what I think is one of the gravest issues to face this Nation, certainly in the 13 years that I have had the honor of serving in this body.

I come before our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Republican Party but as someone who believes that national security issues rise above party politics. I am very proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that both times I ran for mayor of my hometown I was the nominee of both the Republican and the Democrat Parties. In fact I today enjoy significant support from Democrats back in my home district in Pennsylvania.

In Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have taken great pride in working with Members of the other side on national security issues, and I have been the first to acknowledge that many of the struggles that we have won in this body against the White House involving national security were won only because we had the support of strong leadership on the Democrat side as well as the Republican side. I give those comments today, Mr. Speaker, because I want to focus on what is happening with the debate surrounding the Cox Commission of which I was a member and the resultant information that has been put forward to the American people about a matter that needs to be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that when the administration got a preliminary view of the Cox Committee report in early January, in fact we gave it to the administration sometime around January 2nd or 3rd, they got a chance to see a document that nine of us, Democrats and Republicans, had worked on together for 7 months in a very nonpartisan way. We did not care where problems had occurred, in which administrations they were in. If we saw evidence of our security being harmed or potentially harmed, we laid the facts basically where they were. We did not attempt to spin them or distort them or attempt to have them be other than what they in fact were. We did that because we wanted to have the integrity of our report kept intact once it was completed. No member of the Cox Committee released any information to the media. We swore to ourselves that we would not in fact jeopardize our findings. We gave it to the White House the first week of January and we asked for a very quick response to assist us in making that report available in a declassified version so the American people and our colleagues could read it and talk about it. As we all know, that took 5 months. But what gave me the first indication that this report was going to be spun politically was about a month later, in February. In fact it was February the 1st. Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser to the White House, issued a statement that I have a copy of to selective members of the Washington media, responding to the 38 recommendations that we made in our Cox Committee report that were still classified. Without asking any member of the Cox Commission, Sandy Berger released the White House's spin in response to those recommendations.

Two days after he released that spin, I had the occasion of asking the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, in a closed National Security Committee hearing in front of 40 Members from both parties if he agreed as the head of the CIA with our findings that our security had been harmed. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was 2 days after Sandy Berger released public information about our still classified report. George Tenet said, "Congressman, we at the CIA haven't finished reading the document yet." Which meant, Mr. Speaker, that the White House, before the CIA had even completed reading our report, was spinning it publicly to try to deflect attention away from the White House and any responsibility of this administration. That is not what the nine members of the Cox Committee did and that is not the approach we used. We did not spin anything. Yet that was my first inclination that this White House was not going to deal in an honorable way with the findings and the conclusions that we drew from our extensive research into the results of the transfer of technology both legally and illegally to China.

Mr. Speaker, that spin continues today. Since the report was released

some 2 weeks ago, the administration has sent Bill Richardson, a friend of mine whom I served with in this body, out a road show traveling around the country convincing the American people that the only issue in the Cox report is Chinese espionage, the stealing of our W-88 nuclear warhead design, the stealing of our nuclear design technology. And the reason why the White House has wanted to spin the Cox Commission report in this way is because they can point to this stuff to having occurred before the Clinton administration took office. So what Richardson has been saying publicly, on national TV shows, on the talk shows on Sunday mornings is, "Look, when this administration in 1995 found out that China had stolen some of our designs, prior to us coming into office, we took aggressive steps to stop it. These problems didn't happen under the Clinton administration. They happened under previous administrations."

I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to challenge that notion and to offer to debate Secretary Richardson anytime anyplace in a public format on the issues that I am about to unveil. First of all, Mr. Speaker, even though the Cox Committee report did not just focus on the nuclear laboratories and their security, let us talk about the labs for a few moments, because if you listen to Secretary Bill Richardson traveling around the country, he would have us believe that the only problems with the labs were problems that started under previous administrations which he has now cleaned up. That is hogwash, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at the facts.

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1993 and 1994 when Hazel O'Leary was appointed to be the Secretary of Energy by President Bill Clinton that she decided that the color-coded ID system used in our Department of Energy labs which said based upon the color of the chain and the ID that you wore around your neck, you would only be allowed access to certain parts of our laboratories. It was the way that we kept people out of illegally accessing information that they did not have the proper clearance for. When Hazel O'Leary came into office, this long established practice that had been under previous administrations, Republican and Democrat, was overturned because she thought that color-coding was discriminatory. So what happened, Mr. Speaker, was in 1993 and 1994, the Clinton administration did away with that identification process which made it almost impossible for the lab directors and others to know whether or not a person was in a correct area of a lab gathering information and access to data that they should not have had.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that was a good decision back in 1993 and 1994 which maybe the President would say was the case, why then did this administration 2 weeks ago move to reinstate the policy that Hazel O'Leary did away with in 1993 and 1994? If it was good back in

1993 and 1994 and if the color-coded ID system was not necessary, why did they all of a sudden 2 weeks ago tell the labs, "You're now going to put back into place a color-coded ID system" at a tremendous cost to taxpayers. That was under this administration, Mr. Speaker.

Number two, it was this administration and Hazel O'Leary who decided that FBI background checks, which had been the case under previous administrations, before people could gain access to our labs, that FBI background checks had to be done so that we could determine whether or not those people were spies or whether or not they were appropriately entitled to have access to classified information. Again it was Secretary O'Leary, Bill Clinton's appointee, who in 1993 and 1994 put a hold in at least two of our labs on FBI background checks, allowing scores of people to get access to our labs, not just Chinese or Asian nationals but a whole host of people because they were not being required to have FBI background checks.

Number three, Mr. Speaker. It was in the 1993-1994 time frame when an employee of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory who had retired was accused of releasing sensitive and classified information in a public setting. The Oakland office of the Department of Energy did an investigation of that employee and they found out, and in fact accused him of violating the requirements of security at our labs. What did they do? They penalized that retiree by removing the access he had to classified information even as a retiree. They took the appropriate steps. What did Hazel O'Leary do, Mr. Speaker? When that removal of that retiree's classified status was undertaken and when he appealed it, all the way up to the Secretary's office, Secretary O'Leary overruled the Oakland office of the Department of Energy and reinstated the employee's classification status. Every employee in every laboratory in America saw the signal being sent by this administration, "We don't need color-coded IDs, we don't need to have FBI background checks, and when employees give out classified information, we're not going to consider that a major issue."

One more point, Mr. Speaker. And you do not hear Bill Richardson talking about these facts, but I am offering to debate him here tonight, anytime, anyplace. Mr. Richardson says that when this administration found out, in 1995, that the Chinese had stolen the designs to one of our most sophisticated warheads, the W-88 and the W-87, that they immediately took action, they began a process of closing in on the security, and he said that began in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call particular attention to my colleagues and to the American people this two-page spread that was in the July 31st, 1995 issue of U.S. News and World Report entitled "Shockwave" documenting the annihi-

lation and destruction that would be caused by a nuclear attack or a nuclear bomb going off. In this document, Mr. Speaker, is an illustration of the W-87 warhead. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, this was classified. Mr. Speaker, this administration, in 1995, leaked this document to U.S. News and World Report, giving the entire populace of the world, through U.S. News and World Report, access to the design of the W-87 nuclear warhead, the same year that Bill Richardson is saying they were putting the clamps on the control of our technology.

But it does not stop there, Mr. Speaker. Because when this occurred, the Department of Energy began an internal investigation as to who would have leaked this design of this W-87 nuclear warhead, who would have given this information out to a national magazine. Mr. Speaker, I have the name of the person that was conducting that investigation, and I have been told that he was told to stop the investigation because they knew where it was going to lead to, that it was Hazel O'Leary herself who gave U.S. News and World Report the actual diagram of the W-87 nuclear warhead in 1995. Yet Secretary Richardson, on the Sunday morning news shows, is saying, "We have taken the steps to close these gaps."

Mr. Speaker, I am today asking for a full investigation as to whether or not the Department of Energy did such an internal investigation and I want to know whether or not the individual who was overseeing this was told by his superiors not to pursue finding out who leaked this information in 1995. And, Mr. Speaker, if this administration was so intent on controlling access to these kinds of secrets, then they would surely be able to give us the answers to the questions I am posing tonight. Who did the investigation, and who did they find out leaked this particular diagram to U.S. News and World Report in 1995? It was not the Reagan administration, Mr. Speaker, and it was not the Bush administration. It was this administration.

Mr. Speaker, the comments of Bill Richardson around the country are hollow, they are shallow, and they are nothing more than political rhetoric being spun to deflect attention away from one of the most gravest issues that has confronted this Nation in this century, and, that is, the overall loss of our technology, in many cases where we relaxed standards to allow people to take information or where we lowered the thresholds to give people information. Today we have the Secretary telling us that our labs are secure. I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, there are no controls on e-mails that are being sent out of our labs at this very moment. They will tell you they have a software system that looks for keywords, that if an e-mail is sent to Beijing or some other city and a keyword is in that e-mail, it raises a flag and that person then will be investigated.

Raising a flag after the e-mail leaves the laboratory does us no good, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2045

So for Richardson to say that secure measures are in place today is wrong, it is factually wrong, it is not correct, and he needs to be honest with the American people.

Secondarily, Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that later on this year China will be testing the newest version of their long-range ICBM missile with a range of 13,000 kilometers that can be launched from a submarine that has the potential for a MIRV or a multiple reentry capability. This rocket, this long-range ICBM, the JL-2, is beyond anything they have had in the past, and it is almost a replica of the trident class ICBMs that we have used in this Nation.

We did not think China would have this capability until several years down the road. We now have word they will test that missile, that ICBM, this year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue. The American people need to understand what is happening to their country. They need to understand the blame game cannot stop by firing lower level employees who are only following directions. The blame game cannot stop by saying it was industries' fault. Industry was only abiding by the rules set by this government, and they cannot blame Chinese or Asian Americans, many of whom are some of our finest citizens. It was this government and this administration that failed the American people, and the American people need to see the factual information.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, the following two charts are now available on my web site nationally:

The first chart, Mr. Speaker, for the first time ever gives the complete linkage between those agencies and entities of the Peoples Liberation Army and the Central Military Commission of the PLA which are all indicated by the red boxes, and you cannot read them, our colleagues cannot read them, but you can get this off of our web site, and I have offered to give copies of this chart in a smaller form to every Member of Congress regardless of party.

The red boxes indicate Chinese arms of the PLA. The green boxes, Mr. Speaker, which are again too small to read, are the financing entities that were established to finance the acquisition of technologies for the arms of the PLA and the Central Military Commission. They would identify the technology, and the green financing entities would then finance the purchase of that.

How would they finance the purchase of it? Through the blue boxes or the front companies. Literally hundreds of front companies were established in this country, in Hong Kong, in Macao, all over the world, whose sole purpose it was, was to acquire western and American technology.

Mr. Speaker, in this chart our colleagues and the American people can read for themselves who all of these players are and who all of these characters and all these organizations are, but there is something new here, Mr. Speaker:

For the first time that I am aware of each of these boxes are interconnected with solid and dotted lines. The solid lines indicate direct working relationships between financing entities, PLA organizations and Chinese front companies. The dotted lines indicate working relationships.

I am asking now to enter in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a document I entitled sources and references:

#### SOURCES AND REFERENCES

(1a) Chan, Christine. "More J&A Securities Staff Quizzed." *Hong Kong South China Morning Post*, July 16, 1998: p a1. Article in *Hong Kong South China Morning Post* which cites corporation chairman Zhang Guoqing and corporation president Yang Jun as under investigation in connection with their activities at the People's Liberation Army-backed J&A Securities.

(1b) J&A Securities (Hong Kong) Limited. Company Ordinance Increasing Share Capital and Creating Additional Shares. Company Reference No. 433562. June 8, 1995. Various company ordinances increasing capital, creating shares, and providing board information for the J&A corporation signed by Zhang Guoqing on behalf of the corporation.

(1c) J&A Securities (Hong Kong) Limited. 1997 Brief: Introduction to J&A Securities Limited. 1997. J&A Securities Limited company brochure for 1997 which lists corporation officer and board members.

(1d) J&A Securities (Hong Kong) Limited. Company Ordinances Appoint Directors and Officers and for Other Purposes. Company Reference No. 433562. December 21, 1993 through August 18, 1994. Various company ordinances changing the name, appointing directors and officers, and providing board information for the J&A corporation.

(1e) J&A Securities (Hong Kong) Limited. Company Ordinances Appoint Directors and Officers and for Other Purposes. Company Reference No. 433562. February 14, 1996 through July 18, 1997. Various company ordinances appointing directors and providing board information.

(1f) J&A Securities (Hong Kong) Limited. Mortgage and Charge Details. Company Reference No. 433562. April 1, 1998. Documents that detail loans and other incomes from The China State Bank, The Standard Chartered Bank. Documents also certify relationships with additional companies.

(2) Laris, Michael. "Chinese Executive Defend Loral's Role; Undue Missile Aid by U.S. Firm Denied." *The Washington Post*. June 22, 1998: p a17. Article in *The Washington Post* that identifies a Hong Kong businessman 'Zhang' (Zhang Quoqing) as the source of \$300,000 given to Johnny Chung.

(3) Rempel, William C.; et. al. "Testimony Links Top China Official, Funds For Clinton." *The Los Angeles Times*. April 4, 1999: p a1. Article in the *Los Angeles Times* that details the link between a Chinese intelligence official, Johnny Chung, \$300,000 intended for the Clinton campaign.

(4) "General's Daughter In Probe." *Agence France-Presse Wire*. Clips from a French Newswire with citations from the *South China Morning Post* which cites the link between Liu Chao Ying (Daughter of China's Top General and Aerospace Official), Johnny Chung, and executives from Hong Kong and Chinese companies.

(5) Chin, Michelle. "Lippo Fund to Focus on Chain Stores." *South China Morning Post*. July 13, 1995: p 3. Article that cites the directors of the Lippo Fund and lists the China Aerospace International Holdings corp as partner in the fund.

(6) Pusat Data Business Indonesia. *Conglomeration Indonesia*, 2nd edition. Jakarta, Indonesia. Pusat Data Business Indonesia. 1995. Company and shareholder information from a standard business reference work on nice conglomerates run by individuals with links to the Chinese government.

(7) Kelly, Michael. "TRB: CITIC-VIP." *The New Republic*. January 6, 1999. Article which links numerous high-profile Chinese government operatives who met with Clinton through Johnny Chung.

(8) Liu, Melinda. "The Portrait of a Hustler." *Newsweek*. March 31, 1997: p 36. Article in *Newsweek* that cites Johnny Chung's connection to the White House and the First Family.

(9) Partial citation and timeline of activity at Marswell Investments Limited. Document which describes the directors and officers at various Hong Kong 'Front' companies.

(10) Translation Section of the U.S. Consulate General in Hong Kong. "'Princeling' Influence Within PLA Said Growing." *Hong Kong Guo Jih Pao*. December 9, 1996. Serial: HK3012054596. Article translated from *Hong Kong newspaper* by FBIS which details the link between the PLA and CITIC.

(11) The Washington Post Company. "Campaign Finance Key Player: Wang Jun." *Www.washingtonpost.com*. January 6, 1999. Washington Post website profile on Wang Jun, chairman of an arms trading company and White House coffee attendee.

(12) The Washington Post Company. "Campaign Finance Key Player: Ng Lap Seng." *Www.washingtonpost.com*. January 6, 1999. Washington Post website profile on Ng Lap Seng, chairman of a Chinese financial conglomerate and DNC doner.

(13) Summary of documentation on China Aerospace International Holdings Limited (CASIL). An analysis of CASIL background and its involvement with the satellite business and a citing of key figures.

(14) Dun & Bradstreet. "Ever-Victory System Engrg." *Worldbase*. April 25, 1997: p. 48. Business citation that establishes the link between Asia-Pacific Satellite and China Aerospace International Holdings, Ltd.

(15) The United States Department of State. "Sasser Writes Home About the Chinese Army." *United States Department of State*. October 1, 1998. A report from the U.S. Ambassador to China on the PLA and their plans to develop communications networks with private companies.

(16) Lim, Wah Dr., et. al., "Independent Review Committee Report on the LM-38B Launch Failure." Palo Alto, California. Space Systems/Loral. May 10, 1996. A report initiated by the Loral Company to evaluate the cause of failure for a Chinese Space Launch Vehicle.

(17) Diamond, John. "U.S. Probes Hughes, Chinese General's Son, in Satellite Export Deal." *The Associated Press*. July 3, 1998. AP wire article.

(18) The Washington Post Company. "Campaign Finance Key Player: Maria Hsia." *Www.washingtonpost.com* January 6, 1999. Washington Post website profile on Maria Hsia, Veteran Democrat fund-raiser indicted on money laundering charges in connection with an event attended by Vice President Gore.

(19) Suro, Robert. "Gore's Ties to Hsia Cast Shadow on 2000 Race." *The Washington Post*. February 23, 1998: p a1. A Washington Post article that details the link between Maria Hsia and Vice President Gore.

(20) Reed Business Information Limited. "The Bank of East Asia Limited." *The Bank-*

*ers Almanac*. Reed Business Information Limited. 1998. Standard business reference material on the Bank of East Asia including profile and personnel information.

(21) Sun, Lena H.; Pomfret, John. "The Curious Cast of Asian Donors." *The Washington Post*. January 27, 1997: p a1. A Washington Post article on the Clinton connection to Asian Donors.

(22) China Charity Federation. "Founders of China Charity Federation and Permanent Members to the Executive Council." <[http://www.philiphayden.org/ccf/aboutus/permanent\\_members.html](http://www.philiphayden.org/ccf/aboutus/permanent_members.html)> January 6, 1999. Promotional Materials that link the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation to Silver Faith Holding.

(23) Liang, Hsiao-chi and Ma, Chien-hsing. "In a Major Reversal of Fortune in Struggle for Supremacy, Marketplace Wai Lands Himself in a Predicament." *Hong Kong Yi Chou Kan*. February 20, 1998: pp 38-42. Article in *Hong Kong newspaper* on CPC Officials and Triad links.

(24) Op. Cit. Liu, Melinda.

(25) The Hughes Corporation. "China Programs Starting from 1/1/96." *Hughes Network Systems*. Internal company document specifying programs in China.

(26) Gerth, Jeff and Golden, Tim. "China Set Cash to U.S. Bank, With Suspicions Slow to Rise." *The New York Times*. May 12, 1999: p a1. *New York Times* article on money sent to the United States from Chinese banks.

Mr. Speaker, this 4-page document gives 28 specific unclassified documents or 26 unclassified documents that are studied on this chart that provide all the linkages so the American people in unclassified form can read how all of these link together for the first time ever, and I encourage everyone of our colleagues and every person across this country to turn on the web site, get access to this, and then get access to these unclassified documents, and I would say to our colleagues, "If you can't locate them, I have a master copy of each of these documents in my office. In fact I have several master copies. I will give you copies of whatever one of these documents you can't find."

Now, as extensive as this is, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this is only scratching the surface. In one of our House hearings one of our colleagues asked the FBI when they were doing the investigation of these linkages how much of what they know is now available in public form with all the reports, all the investigations, how much of what the FBI and the CIA knows is available to the public, and this was the answer:

Less than 1 percent.

So, as broad as this is, as documented as this is, we only know publicly less than 1 percent of what the FBI and the CIA know about the linkages between PLA front organizations, front companies and financing mechanisms, and the bottom line question has to be asked, Mr. Speaker, is:

What made this happen? What was the grease that caused these transactions to take place? What caused these proliferation controls to be lowered? What caused these accesses to take place?

And that gets to my second chart, Mr. Speaker, which is the time line.

This chart, Mr. Speaker, for the first time that I know of gives a detailed analysis of what has happened in this country since 1993.

Now my colleagues on the other side are going to say, "Well, a minute, Kurt. You picked 1993. You are being partisan because that is when Clinton took office."

That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. I picked 1993 because two things happened.

Up until 1993, Mr. Speaker, under Democrats and Republican Presidents alike, there was a process in place to control technology from Nations like America to be sent abroad to what we consider to be Tier 3 nations or nations that are not allowed or were not supposed to have very capable technology that could come back to hurt us. This process was called COCON. COCON was an international organization of allied nations, the U.S. and Japan, that met on a regular basis, and they decided collectively what kind of technology would be allowed to be sold and to which countries it could be sold to.

In 1993, without pre-approval of any of the other countries, France, Great Britain, Japan or any of the other ones, this administration ended COCON, ended it, and the doors opened up.

Now they put into place something called the Wassenaar agreement which everyone has acknowledged is a total failure, yet COCON worked. In 1993 COCON ended, and the floodgates opened.

Something else happened in that year, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the White House dated September 15, 1993, to Edward McCracken, Chief Executive Officer of Silicon Graphics from Bill Clinton. Mr. Speaker, every American needs to read this letter because this letter was sent by the President of the United States September 15, 1993, and who did he send it to? To one of his biggest contributors and one of those blocks of people who supported his candidacy, Edward McCracken, Chief Executive Officer, Silicon Graphics, Mountain View, California.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, September 15, 1993.

Hon. EDWARD MCCrackEN,  
Chief Executive Officer,  
Silicon Graphics, Mountain View, CA.

DEAR EDWARD: Thanks for taking the time to come by for lunch on Wednesday. It was good to see you—and it was a pleasure to get your insights.

I wanted to bring you up to date on a topic we were not able to discuss at lunch; the issue of export controls. As you know, for some time the United States has imposed stringent exports controls on many of our most competitive exports. By some estimates, unnecessary export controls cost U.S. companies \$9 billion a year in lost sales. One reason I ran for President was to tailor export controls to the realities of a post-Cold War world.

Let me be clear. We will continue to need strong controls to combat the growing threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and dangerous conventional weapons, as well as to send a strong signal to

countries that support international terrorism. But we also need to make long overdue reforms to ensure that we do not unfairly and unnecessarily burden our important commercial interests.

In that regard, I wanted you to know that we hope to announce some important reforms by September 30. As you may know, Commerce Secretary Ron Brown has been leading a process within the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee (TPCC) to examine how we might better promote U.S. exports. As part of that process, the National Security Council has led an effort to develop specific export control reforms. I hope to announce those when the TPCC issues its report on September 30.

We have not yet finalized all of these reforms, because I want to be sure that they get a full interagency review. But I am optimistic that the steps we take will help liberalize controls on many of our most competitive exports, while protecting our important national security concerns. Let me give you a sense of the reform we are considering:

**Liberalize Computer and Telecommunications Controls.** When this Administration began, the U.S. controlled any computer with a capacity above 12.9 MTOPs. My administration is in the process of raising that level to 67 MTOPs for most free world countries, relieving well over 13 billion of computer exports each year from the need for a license. By September 30, I hope to raise that level further—and also announce important liberalizations for telecommunications exports to most free world destinations.

**Reduce Processing Time.** Delays in processing export control licenses is a burden on business—and a legitimate gripe against the Federal government. I hope to announce significant reductions in the time it takes the government to process export license applications.

**Expand Distribution Licenses.** We hope to expand significantly the availability of distribution licenses for controlled computers so that exporters need not come back repeatedly to the Federal government for a license.

**Eliminate Unnecessary Unilateral Controls.** Controls imposed only by the U.S. (and not by competitor countries) at times can put our exporters at an unfair disadvantage as competitor companies export like products freely. I expect to announce that, by December 31, my administration will identify and eliminate wherever possible unnecessary U.S. unilateral export control policies.

I expect that these reforms will help liberalize controls on tens of billions of dollars worth of U.S. exports. It can help unleash our companies to compete successfully in the global market.

These reforms fit into a broader framework. Soon we will complete our review of nonproliferation and export control policy, which will set guidelines for further steps we should take. I am also currently engaged in seeking major reforms to COCOM, which should lead to significant liberalization of controls on computers, telecommunications and machine tools, while establishing a more effective structure for addressing the changing national security threats we will face in the years ahead.

Let me assure you that I am personally committed to developing a more intelligent export control policy, one that prevents dangerous technologies from falling into the wrong hands without unfairly burdening American commerce. It is important. It is the right thing to do. And many of these changes are long overdue. I look forward to working with you in building a new consensus around an effective exports control policy that meets these objectives.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

But what is the content of the letter, Mr. Speaker? The letter outlines the administration's plans to liberalize, liberalize the availability of technology to nations abroad.

So here it is in black and white where the President is telling the CEO of Silicon Graphics this is what we are going to do for you over the next 6 years.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. They did it.

What were some of the highlights? Let me read from the letter. Quote: Liberalize computer and telecommunication controls, reduce processing times, expand distribution licenses, eliminate unnecessary unilateral controls, and it goes into detail in describing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a free trader, and I believe in allowing our companies to compete. But what you had in 1993 was the wholesale opening of the flood gates. At the same time Hazel O'Leary is saying we do not have to worry about the people who work in our labs, they do not need color-coded IDs, they do not need to have FBI background checks, and when they give out classified information, we are going to ignore that and not worry about it. And, oh, by the way, US News, if you want this chart of the W-87, we will give it to you, and you can run it nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, these stories need to be told across America.

This time line from 1993 to 1999 shows every decision made by this administration that allowed a new technology to flow, in this case to China. It also shows activities of China in violation of arms control regimes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would ask at this time to insert Chronology of Chinese Weapons Related Transfers:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 21, 1998]

INDIGNATION RINGS SHALLOW ON NUKE TESTS

(By Curt Weldon)

Escalating tensions between India and Pakistan should come as no surprise to the Clinton administration. Since the president took office, there have been dozens of reported transfers of sensitive military technology by Russia and China—in direct violation of numerous international arms control agreements—to a host of nations, including Pakistan and India.

Yet the Clinton administration has repeatedly chosen to turn a blind eye to this proliferation of missile, chemical-biological and nuclear technology, consistently refusing to impose sanctions on violators. And in those handful of instances where sanctions were imposed, they usually were either quickly waived by the administration or allowed to expire. Rather than condemn India for current tensions, the blame for the political powder keg that has emerged in Asia should be laid squarely at the feet of President Clinton. It is his administration's inaction and refusal to enforce arms control agreements that have allowed the fuse to grow so short.

In November 1992, the United States learned that China had transferred M-11 missiles to Pakistan. The Bush administration imposed sanctions for this violation but Clinton waived them a little more than 14 months later. Clearly, the sanctions did not have the desired effect: Reports during the first half of 1995 indicated that M-11 missiles,

additional M-11 missile parts, as well as 5,000 ring magnets for Pakistan nuclear enrichment programs were transferred from China. Despite these clear violations, no sanctions were imposed. And it gets worse.

Not to be outdone by its sworn foe, India aggressively pursued similar technologies and obtained them, illicitly, from Russia. From 1991 to 1995, Russian entities transferred cryogenic liquid oxygen-hydrogen rocket engines and technology to India. While sanctions were imposed by President Bush in May 1992, the Clinton administration allowed them to expire after only two years. And in June 1993, evidence surfaced that additional Russian enterprises were involved in missile technology transfers to India. The administration imposed sanctions in June 1993, and then promptly waived them for a month, never following up on the issue.

Meanwhile, Pakistan continued to aggressively pursue technology transfers from China. In August 1996, the capability to manufacture M-11 missile or missile components was transferred from China to Pakistan. No

sanctions. In November 1996, a special industrial furnace and high-tech diagnostic equipment were transferred from China to an unprotected Pakistani nuclear facility. No sanctions. Also during 1996, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency issued a report stating that China had provided a "tremendous variety" of technology and assistance for Pakistan's ballistic missile program and was the principal supplier of nuclear equipment for Pakistan's program. Again, the Clinton administration refused to impose sanctions.

Finally, in recent months we have learned that China may have been responsible for the transfer of technology for Pakistan's Ghauri medium-range ballistic missile. Flight tested on April 6, 1998, the Ghauri missile has been widely blamed as the impetus for India's decision to detonate five nuclear weapons in tests earlier this month. Again, no sanctions were imposed on China.

Retracing the history of these instances of proliferation, it is obvious that Pakistan and India have been locked in an arms race since

the beginning of the decade. And the race has been given repeated jump-starts by China and Russia, a clear violation of a number of arms control agreements. Yet rather than enforce these arms control agreements, the Clinton administration has repeatedly acquiesced, fearing that the imposition of sanctions could either strain relations with China and Russia or potentially hurt U.S. commercial interests in those countries.

Now the Clinton administration has announced a get-tough policy, threatening to impose sanctions on India for testing its nuclear weapons. But what about Russia and China, the two nations that violated international arms agreements? Shouldn't they also be subject to U.S. sanctions for their role in this crisis? Sadly, the Clinton administration is likely to ignore the proliferators and impose sanctions solely on India. In the meantime, China and Russia will continue their proliferation of missile and nuclear technology to other nations, including rogue states such as Iran, Iraq and Syria.

Date of transfer or report	Reported transfer by China	Possible violation	Administration's response
Nov. 1992	M-11 missiles or related equipment to Pakistan (The Administration did not officially confirm reports that M-11 missiles are in Pakistan).	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	sanctions imposed on Aug. 24, 1993, for transfers of M-11 related equipment (not missiles); waived on Nov. 1, 1994
Mid-1994 to mid-1995	dozens or hundreds of missile guidance systems and computerized machine tools to Iran.	MTCR; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
2nd quarter of 1995	parts for the M-11 missile to Pakistan	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Dec. 1994 to mid-1995	5,000 ring magnets for an unsafeguarded nuclear enrichment program in Pakistan.	NPT; Export-Import Bank Act; Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act; Arms Export Control Act.	considered sanctions under the Export-Import Bank Act; but announced on May 10, 1996, that no sanctions would be imposed
July 1995	more than 30 M-11 missiles stored in crates at Sargodha Air Force Base in Pakistan.	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Sept. 1995	calutron (electromagnetic isotope separation system) for uranium enrichment to Iran.	NPT; Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act; Export-Import Bank Act; Arms Export Control Act.	no sanctions
1995-1997	C-802 anti-ship cruise missiles and C-801 air-launched cruise missiles to Iran.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act	no sanctions
Before Feb. 1996	dual-use chemical precursors and equipment to Iran's chemical weapon program.	Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act	sanctions imposed on May 21, 1997
Summer 1996	400 tons of chemicals to Iran	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Aug. 1996	plant to manufacture M-11 missiles or missile components in Pakistan.	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Aug. 1996	gyroscopes, accelerometers, and test equipment for missile guidance to Iran.	MTCR; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Sept. 1996	special industrial furnace and high-tech diagnostic equipment to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in Pakistan	NPT; Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act; Export-Import Bank Act; Arms Export Control Act.	no sanctions
July-Dec. 1996	Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) reported "tremendous variety" of technology and assistance for Pakistan's ballistic missile program.	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported "tremendous variety" of assistance for Iran's ballistic missile program.	MTCR; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported principal supplies of nuclear equipment, material, and technology for Pakistan's nuclear weapon program.	NPT; Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act; Export-Import Bank Act; Arms Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported key supplies of technology for large nuclear projects in Iran.	NPT; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act; Export-Import Bank Act; Arms Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported "considerable" chemical weapon-related transfers of production equipment and technology to Iran.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Jan. 1997	dual-use biological items to Iran	BWC; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
1997	chemical precursors, production equipment, and production technology for Iran's chemical weapon program, including a plant for making glass-lined equipment.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Sept. to Dec. 1997	China Great Wall Industry Corp. provided telemetry equipment used in flight-tests to Iran for its development of the Shahab-3 and Shahab-4 medium range ballistic missiles.	MTCR; Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions
Nov. 1997/April 1998	may have transferred technology for Pakistan's Ghauri medium-range ballistic missile that was flight-tested on April 6, 1998.	MTCR; Arms Export Control Act; Export Administration Act.	no sanctions

<sup>1</sup> Additional provisions on chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons were not enacted until February 10, 1996.  
 ABWC—Biological Weapons Convention; MTCR—Missile Technology Control Regime; NPT—Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, this CRS document, which I had prepared a year ago, outlines approximately 17 cases where we caught the Chinese selling technology illegally. This administration knew about it, and it is all documented here. They imposed the required sanctions twice and waived them each time. All of those or most of those transfers are documented here.

Something else is on this chart, Mr. Speaker: White House presidential visits. I could only complete it up through 1995, the number of times that key peo-

ple involved in this massive scheme were able to get into the White House.

Now, I can tell my colleagues my constituents cannot ever get in the White House. We cannot even get White House tour tickets which are available for schools because we only allow four a year. These are American schoolchildren.

Let me read you, Mr. Speaker. John Huang; he visited the White House four times in March of 1993, four times in April of 1993, two times in May, one

time in June, one time in November, all in 1993.

Now my constituents cannot do that. Yet this White House opened the floodgates to welcome selected people in who were a part of this network, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the House Clerks Office tonight to give me the price of what it would take to put this document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not going to put it in tonight until I get the price. What is this document, Mr. Speaker? These

are the FBI wiretap transcripts of conversations between Chung and Robert Lu, the FBI wire tapped transcripts that took place from May 6 of 1998 all the way through August of 98. In these transcripts in the words of these key players in this process, the American people, Mr. Speaker, for themselves can see what was going on and can read with their own eyes about the discussions that were taking place.

Before I yield to my good friend, Mr. Speaker, I want to say what the rallying cry of this Member, and I would ask for, if I could, a price for that for the next day so I can decide whether or not to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I would tell the American people it is available. It was given to me by Carl Cameron from Fox News. It is running nationwide, and I would encourage every American person, every colleague of mine, to read the transcripts contained in here of conversations as documented by the FBI.

Mr. Speaker here is the real story:

If this administration has nothing to hide, they can do one very simple thing: release the entire text of the memos sent by Louis Freeh and his subordinate investigator to Janet Reno requesting that a special prosecutor be named to handle this whole situation. If there is no other question we need to ask as Americans, for the next year and a half it is this one question because Louis Freeh, the head of the FBI, and his top investigator recommended Janet Reno, but because of all this data, and they have a lot more than I have shown my colleagues; in fact, I have seen a lot more as a member of the Cox Committee that I cannot put on here because it is classified. But they seen all of this data, the other 99 percent we cannot show, and they made their recommendations, and Janet Reno choose not to follow their recommendations.

The American people are owed, owed an explanation as to why Janet Reno choose not to follow the advice of her chief law enforcement agent for this country. Every person in this country needs to send a card to the White House, every Member of Congress needs to ask the question why the White House will not release the FBI internal memos that Louie Freeh and his assistant sent to ask for a fully completed investigation of this network, of this operation, because that will tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there were motives behind the transfer of technology that caused America's security harm, and that question needs to be asked by everyone in this country.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that all of our colleagues in this body and the other body will have literally tens of thousands of letter writing campaigns, post cards to the White House asking, and Janet Reno asking one simple question.

This can be very confusing, and I do not expect the American public or even our colleagues to understand every nuance of what is explained here. It is

very confusing, but they can ask one question:

Why will you not release the Louis Freeh memos to Janet Reno in regard to the investigation of the connections between the PLA and the Central Military Commission, the Chinese front companies, the financing mechanisms including the donations of campaign funds to certain individuals to see whether or not there really was a tie and a connection in each of these cases?

□ 2100

That question needs to be answered more than any other single question that I can think of. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of our colleagues to make that their rallying cry over the next year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss at the outset of my remarks if I did not publicly acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has been at the forefront of explaining to the American people and many of his colleagues in Congress the necessity, the imperative of a strategic missile defense, who has been among the leaders in understanding a prospective missile defense system, who has gone many times to the former Soviet Union, now the Russian Republic, to establish dialogue with the members of the Duma there, so, in the words of Dwight Eisenhower, once Americans and Russians get together they can understand what is at stake here.

But more compellingly tonight, Mr. Speaker, our colleague at the outset of his remarks framed the question most appropriately and eloquently when he said, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that does not confront us as Republicans or Democrats; this is a security concern for all Americans.

Indeed, as the gentleman points out, the inadequate, shallow and incomplete responses of our former colleague from New Mexico, Mr. Richardson, now the Secretary of Energy; as he points out the misguided, to say the least, efforts, if you will, of former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary; as he points out the curious selective investigations by this Justice Department and Attorney General Reno, as he offers, and, Mr. Speaker, I will move with my staff to make available on my web site as well the China connection that my colleague from Pennsylvania has remarkably put together and the time-line that he also offers.

This is something that should concern every American, for what we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is a quantum leap in technological prowess by the Communist Chinese, with our know-how, with our expertise.

Indeed, I would just say to my friend from Pennsylvania, whatever price it might cost to include those transcripts

of the FBI wiretaps in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is a small price to pay on behalf of the American people to understand the width and breadth of this scandal. "Scandal" is an overused term, we have seen so many, and yet, again, we have this remarkable, troubling, dangerous development in our national security.

I have said before, Mr. Speaker, this is as if we are in an Allan Drury novel come to life. But you cannot close the book on this. This is a problem of incredible magnitude that goes to the security of every family.

Mr. Speaker, as the President of the United States stood at the podium just in front of the Speaker's Chair and in a State of the Union message bragged that no American child went to sleep a target of Russian missiles, how sad it is that now the Communist Chinese have the technology and have aimed their missiles at America, to the extent that we had the Chinese defense minister in defending a provocative action against Taiwan say, "Oh, we believe you," meaning the United States, "value Los Angeles more than you do Taiwan."

The bellicose nature of the threats and, more than rhetoric, the reality of the technology transfer, is inexcusable, and we, not as Republicans nor as Democrats, but as Americans, need to follow the lead of my colleague from Pennsylvania and get to the bottom of this, because it is an outrage.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, it does not only concern former Energy Secretary O'Leary; it does not only concern Attorney General Reno; it does not only concern the spin offered by our former colleague, current Energy Secretary Mr. Richardson; it goes all the way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

U.S. News & World Report put that document in, as shocking as that was. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of the American people have seen the videotapes of the Communist Chinese leaders who contributed to the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1996 in the Oval Office? People who are part of these front groups.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have too many ducks on the lakes in Arizona, but if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, Mr. Speaker, a preponderance of the evidence seems to indicate that it is in fact a duck. What we have here is a serious problem.

I would also note the outrageous and curious behavior of our so-called National Security Adviser, Mr. Sandy Berger, a former lobbyist for the Communist Chinese on trade issues. In April of 1996 we know for certain that he was informed of the Chinese penetration of our labs in Los Alamos, and apparently he did nothing.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, April of 1996, that was when Vice President GORE went to Southern California for his campaign fund-raiser, what he

first described as a community outreach event at the Buddhist temple in Southern California.

The American people have simple questions that need to be answered. Are we safe? Are those who took the oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and thereby provide for the common defense in fact being good stewards and good custodians of that trust? As my colleague from Pennsylvania eloquently and substantively explains tonight, that is a serious question for which there may be troubling answers.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for joining me. I would like to stay here and engage the gentleman, but I am supposed to do a TV shot, so, unfortunately, I have to yield back my time. But I would like to thank the gentleman for coming over and joining me.

#### HMO REFORM NEEDED NOW

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress I was a reconstructive surgeon. I took care of a lot of children who were born with cleft lips and pallets, similar to this little baby here. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, about half of the reconstructive surgeons in the country in the last couple of years have had proposed surgeries to correct conditions related to this birth defect turned down by HMOs because they are "cosmetic."

Mr. Speaker, when you have a normal process like aging and you do an operation to make it better, that is cosmetic. But, Mr. Speaker, when a baby is born with a birth defect in the middle of their face, like this, that is not a cosmetic procedure. I can give you many functional reasons why this should be fixed. But there are children in this country in the last several years who have been denied medically necessary treatment by HMOs.

Mr. Speaker, I closed my medical practice when I came to Congress, but I still go overseas to do surgeries to correct birth defects like this. I remember a few years ago I was down in Guatemala and a 30 year old man came in with an unrepaired cleft lip just like this. He lived all his life with an unrepaired cleft lip. So we fixed him the next day.

He had come in with his mother, who was probably about 50, but she looked like she was about 80. They were of Indian extraction. When we took him back to the recovery area in this small hospital up in northeast Guatemala, his mother broke down and started crying. She said in Spanish, "Ahora el va a Dios con felicidad," now he will go to heaven happy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of this Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), should be

commended, because he has helped raise funds for those surgical trips abroad, many of them done by Dr. Bill Riley, to help correct this type of birth defect. But we have a situation in this country where even if you are paying a lot of money for your insurance, you are getting turned down because your HMO arbitrarily declares this not medically necessary.

When HMO reform comes to the floor, I hope my colleagues who have participated in helping children get charitable care to correct this type of birth defect will vote for legislation that makes it necessary for insurers in this country to cover correction of this type of birth defect.

Mr. Speaker, the clock continues to tick. Another week has gone by without legislative action in the House on HMO reform. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, has promised the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) that we would have a subcommittee markup "sometime in June." But where is a firm commitment to a date certain, and where is the commitment for a full committee markup, and where is the commitment from the Republican leadership in this House to move HMO reform to the floor? Or do we just continue to delay?

Managed care reform should be on the floor by July 4th. There are four weeks until the July 4th recess. So, colleagues, let us get moving.

Now, why is it so important to move this legislation in a timely fashion? Because, Mr. Speaker, people are being hurt every day by decisions by managed care health plans that they make when they know they cannot be held responsible for those decisions.

I recently read an account of a gruesome crime, and I saw an analogy in that crime to what we have with Federal law as it relates to HMOs.

Mr. Speaker, in late 1978 a woman by the name of Mary Vincent made a fateful decision. She jumped into a blue van on a freeway while hitchhiking in Berkley, California. Later the driver pulled off the highway and, in a flash, Mary saw a hammer swinging at her head. Her attacker then tied her hands behind her back and he raped her viciously, repeatedly. She screamed for her release. Finally, he untied her hands, only to sink an ax, an ax, into her left forearm. Then he did it again, and again, and her left arm was off in three blows. Four blows later, and he had cut off her other arm. This sadist then dumped her molested and violated and mutilated body into a culvert off of a lonely road, where she was found the next morning, miraculously, still alive.

Mary was in the hospital for a month and was eventually fitted with prosthetic arms that have crab-like pinchers for her hands. She later testified against her attacker, and when she left the witness stand, he swore at her, "If it is the last thing I do, I am going to finish the job."

Eight years later Mary was living in Puget Sound when she heard on her

wedding day that her attacker had been freed from San Quentin after serving only eight years. She lived in fear for years that this rapist would return to finish the job.

Finally, in February 1997, her mother called her with more bad news. Her attacker had killed a Florida woman. Last year she flew to Florida to testify against her attacker again.

□ 2115

This time he got the treatment he deserved. He is now on death row.

Parentetically, Mr. Speaker, it is crimes like those done to Mary Vincent that caused me and many other of our colleagues to support the death penalty. Any person who is not criminally insane should be responsible for his or her actions.

So what does the horrendous tragedy that befell Mary Vincent have to do with managed care reform? Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it reminded me of an equally tragic event that happened to a little 6-month-old baby named Jimmy Adams.

At 3:30 one morning Lamona Adams found her 6-month-old boy Jimmy panting, sweating, moaning, with a temperature of 104, so she phoned her HMO to ask for permission to go to the emergency room. The voice at the other end of the 1-800 number, probably 1,000 miles away, told her to go to Scottish Rite Hospital. Where is it, asked Lamona? I don't know, find a map, came the reply. It turns out that the Adams family lived south of Atlanta, Georgia, and Scottish Rite was an hour away on the other side of the Atlanta metro area.

Lamona held little baby Jimmy while his dad drove as fast as he could. Twenty miles into the trip, while driving through Atlanta, they passed Emory Hospital's emergency room, Georgia Baptist's emergency room, then Grady Memorial's emergency room. But they still pushed on to Scottish Rite Medical Center, still 22 miles away, because they knew if they stopped at an unauthorized hospital, their HMO would deny coverage for any unauthorized treatment, and they would be left with possibly thousands of dollars of bills.

They knew Jimmy was sick, they just didn't know how sick. After all, they were not trained medical professionals. While still miles away from Scottish Rite hospital, Jimmy's eyes fell shut. Lamona frantically called out to him, but she couldn't get him to respond. His heart had stopped. Can you imagine Jimmy's dad driving as fast as he can while his mother is trying to keep him alive?

They finally pulled into the emergency room entrance. Lamona leaped out of the car. She raced to the emergency room with Jimmy in her arms. She was screaming, help my baby, help my baby. The nurse gave him mouth-to-mouth resuscitation while the pediatric crash cart was rushed into the room. Doctors and nurses raced to see