

[Mr. McCain] were added as cosponsors of S. 1108, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1219, a bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1220

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns.

S. 1246

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1246, a bill to amend titles 5 and 37, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of pay and the authority to make certain expenditures and obligations during lapses in appropriations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 147

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 147, a resolution designating the weeks beginning September 24, 1995, and September 22, 1996, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week," and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2699

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 2699 proposed to H.R. 1976, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—CORRECTING THE ENROLLING OF H.R. 402

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 27

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*

The Clerk of the House is directed to correct the enrollment of H.R. 402 as follows:

Amended section 109 to read:

#### "SEC. 109. CONFIRMATION OF WOODY ISLAND AS ELIGIBLE NATIVE VILLAGE.

The Native Village of Woody Island, located on Woody Island, Alaska, in the Koniag Region, is hereby confirmed as an eligible Alaska Native Village, pursuant to Section 11(b)(3) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act ("ANCSA"). It is further confirmed that Leisnoi, Inc., is the Village Corporation, as that term is defined in Section

3(j) of ANCSA, for the village of Woody Island. This section shall become effective on October 1, 1998, unless the United States judicial system determines this village was fraudulently established under ANCSA prior to October 1, 1998."

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 175—RELATIVE TO THE RECENT ELECTIONS IN HONG KONG

Mr. PRESSLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 175

Whereas the right to a fully elected legislature in Hong Kong is guaranteed by the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong;

Whereas on September 17, 1995, the people of Hong Kong demonstrated their commitment to democracy by freely expressing their right to vote in the Legislative Council elections; and

Whereas the voters of Hong Kong have overwhelmingly expressed their desire for the establishment of a fully democratic government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the people of Hong Kong are to be congratulated for exercising their right to vote on September 17, 1995;

(2) the People's Republic of China should respect the clear will of the people of Hong Kong to have a fully democratic government; and

(3) the Chinese government should enter into a dialogue with the democratically elected representatives of the Hong Kong people.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, when Mr. Christopher Patten became Governor of Hong Kong 3 years ago, he made a very important decision. He decided to allow the people of Hong Kong the opportunity to express their preference on a simple issue: Democracy—yes or no?

As the New York Times editorial today notes, "Hong Kong's voters declared overwhelmingly on Sunday their preference for democracy and their doubts about Beijing's plans for the colony's future." Final returns from Sunday's vote show the Democratic Party led by Mr. Martin Lee won the largest number of seats, 19, in the 60 seat legislative council. Other prodemocracy allies will give Mr. Lee a working majority of 31.

By contrast, pro-Beijing candidates of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong won only six seats and the party's top three officials were all defeated. Regrettably, spokesmen for Beijing have not learned to lose gracefully and have resorted to threats and intimidation.

Again Governor Patten has proved to be the best analyst: "Everybody has to recognize that Hong Kong has expressed its views about the present and the future with great clarity."

Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the recent elections in Hong Kong. The resolution congratulates the people of Hong Kong for exercising their right to vote, calls on

China to respect the clear will of the people of Hong Kong to have a fully democratic government, and calls on China to enter into a dialogue with the democratically elected representatives of the Hong Kong people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that number of articles and editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1995]

REBUFF OF CHINA PROVES SWEEPING—PRO-DEMOCRATIC BLOC IN HONG KONG LEGISLATURE COULD HOLD MAJORITY ON KEY ISSUES

(By Keith B. Richburg)

HONG KONG, Sept. 18.—China and Hong Kong today seemed set for a prolonged period of confrontation after residents here gave a substantial vote of no-confidence to Beijing's preferred legislative candidates, instead of choosing independent-minded lawmakers who are already promising to shout about human rights, free speech and the rule of law as Chinese rule approaches.

Final returns from Sunday's vote showed the Democratic Party, led by lawyer Martin Lee, will be the largest single party in the new legislature, with 19 of 60 seats. Counting other like-minded parties and independents, advocates of democracy who favor standing up to China will form a bloc of at least 27.

Published analyses indicated that on issues involving relations with China, the prodemocratic vote would be a majority of 31. The one clearly pro-China party won six seats.

In a victory press conference today, an elated Lee promised to continue the same kind of tough rhetoric that already has made him China's nemesis in the colony. Lee said the elections proved that Hong Kong people "want legislators who will stand up for them" to protect the territory's freedoms in the coming battles with China's Communist leadership.

Lee said the democracy bloc of the new legislature will use the remaining 21 months of British rule to try to strengthen laws protecting press freedom and free speech, to enact a freedom of information ordinance, and to try again to change a Sino-British agreement for a new supreme court to guarantee that future judges can act with greater independence.

Lee's statements are the sort that most unnerve mainland China, and make it more likely now, in the view of some analysts, that Beijing will take an even tougher stance toward Hong Kong, keeping its vow to jettison the local legislature and possibly even doing away with direct elections entirely after reversion in July 1997.

Pro-China politicians and official Chinese statements from Beijing tried to put the best face on the election results. The leader of the main pro-China party, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong (known as DAB), Tsang Yok-sing, explained the loss to reporters by saying the Democrats fielded far more incumbents and had more experience campaigning and organization.

A statement from the official New China News Agency said the elections "showed that hope for a smooth transition and love of the motherland and Hong Kong remain the main trend in Hong Kong." But the agency quoted an official in Beijing of the Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office as repeating China's vow to dismantle the legislature and replace it with a provisional body whose deputies would be picked by China.

"Beijing will feel more insecure and more suspicious toward Hong Kong," said Joseph Cheng, a political science professor at the City University here. It's likely to result in "a tougher line."

"It seems the Hong Kong people want candidates who dare to criticize China, to provide some checks and balances, or at least to articulate their grievances," he said.

But Cheng said that under the existing colonial system, with most power still resting with the British governor, the new lawmakers may find themselves frustrated over the next 21 months. The legislature may not introduce any bills that would increase government spending, and the governor can ignore the legislature whenever he chooses.

Most analysts said the dismal performance of the main pro-China party suggested a new era of confrontation. Had more of its candidates won seats, the theory goes, China might have felt more comfortable about the idea of direct elections in Hong Kong and less inclined to abolish the legislature when it takes over.

But many of the candidates openly aligned with China were decisively beaten by the democracy advocates. The main pro-China party could manage no more than six seats.

Moreover, the pro-China party's three senior officers—the chairman, the vice chairman and the secretary general—all were crushed. The pro-China candidates together received about 30 percent of the popular vote, compared to more than 60 percent for the Democratic Party politicians.

In other results, the pro-business Liberal Party, which in pursuing commercial interests is likely to vote with them in mind, won 10 seats. The remaining 17 seats also represent interests that might shift according to the issue.

Analysts said the loss of so many pro-China politicians, considered relative moderates, means a likely dominance now of more hard-line Communist voices in Hong Kong's pro-Beijing United Front. The front as a whole took no part in the election, even as the DAB—a part of the front—went its own way on this matter and did so. This could presage a further heightening of the rhetoric and increasing polarization of the political dialogue, these analysts said.

The result also means the political situation is likely to become more confusing in the waning months of British colonial rule. Christopher Patten, the British governor and the man who engineered the changes that made the elections possible, is to remain until the end of June 1997. But the new legislature he helped create can claim it has the legitimacy of the people, since unlike the governor, all 60 members were elected, directly or indirectly.

China has said it will unveil its own "provisional legislature" next year, and although technically it will have no power until the turnover in 1997, it is foreseen as a "shadow legislature" competing with the elected one for influence. And China is also expected to name the team that will run the government in Hong Kong after July 1997, meaning there will also be a shadow executive and cabinet waiting in the wings.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1995]

#### CHINA AND HONG KONG VICTORS SQUARE OFF AFTER THE ELECTION

(By Edward A. Gargan)

HONG KONG, September 18.—As jubilant members of Hong Kong's Democratic Party celebrated their sweeping defeat of pro-China parties in legislative elections on Sunday, Beijing renewed its promise that the legislature would be disbanded on July 1, 1997, the day the territory is scheduled to revert to Chinese rule.

"The last legislature of the British administration in Hong Kong will end on June 30, 1997," a spokesman for China's Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office was quoted as saying today by the New China News Agency. "The attitude of the Chinese Government on this issue is consistent and will not change and will not be influenced by the result of the election."

But members of the Democratic Party, founded in the wake of the 1989 Tiananmen massacre to challenge China's plans for controlling Hong Kong and regarded by Beijing as a subversive organization, refused to accept what appears to be the inevitable demise of their careers as lawmakers.

"This election makes clear the will of Hong Kong," said Martin C.M. Lee, the party's chairman who decisively regained his seat in the Legislative Council. "This election is a referendum on the aspirations of the people of Hong Kong."

"Hong Kong people voted with their hearts and their minds for freedom and genuine democracy," he said. "The elections, in short, are a mandate for democratic government in Hong Kong and real constitutional, legal and human rights reform to ensure basic freedoms in Hong Kong after 1997."

Sunday's elections for the 60-seat Legislative Council, the last under more than a century of British rule, marked the first time that all seats were elected, whether directly or indirectly.

The Democrats took 12 of the 20 directly elected seats, and secured another 7 indirectly elected seats. Another 10 to 12 successful candidates who ran as independents or from smaller parties are regarded as allied to the Democrats, potentially giving the pro-democracy bloc a majority in the new legislature.

Most surprising, commentators said, was the defeat of the pro-China Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong. The party's top three officials were defeated and the party managed to secure only six seats, all but two from indirectly elected constituencies.

"From the Hong Kong people's point of view, the message is quite clear," said Joseph Cheng, a professor at City University of Hong Kong's Contemporary China Research Center. "The Hong Kong people always want a spokesman who can criticize China and who can provide checks and balances."

In their monthlong campaign, the pro-China candidates hammered the theme of their close relationship with the Chinese Government, cautioning Hong Kong voters that their interests would be best served by electing legislators who could communicate well with Beijing. Many Democratic candidates described that campaign as little short of blackmail, a suggestion that seemed to be borne out today in bitter comments by Gary Cheng Kai-nam, the No. 2 official in the pro-China party.

"The Hong Kong people will have to pay for it," he said, referring to the strong showing by the Democratic Party. "We warned that it would be better to see different voices."

Chinese companies, newspapers and the Chinese Government's official presence here, the Hong Kong office of the New China News Agency, were active throughout the campaign in support of the Alliance. Employees in Chinese companies were aggressively lobbied, left-wing unions rallied members to volunteer for Alliance campaigns and the pro-China newspapers daily assailed the Democrats for anti-China attitudes.

But the poor showing by pro-China candidates has created, in many people's views, new problems for China, one put bluntly by Gov. Christopher Patten, the architect of the elections.

"Everybody has to recognize the results," Mr. Patten said at a news conference today. "Everybody has to recognize that Hong Kong has expressed its views about the present and the future with great clarity."

Today, in one of his most forceful comments, Mr. Patten challenged China today to show how the elections violated either agreements reached with Britain or the territory's constitution, the Basic Law.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1995]

#### HONG KONG VOTES FOR DEMOCRACY

Hong Kong's voters declared overwhelmingly on Sunday their preference for democracy and their doubts about Beijing's plans for the colony's future. Pro-China candidates lost consistently to members of the Democratic Party, which favors autonomy for Hong Kong after the planned takeover by China in 1997.

Ominously, China quickly threatened to dissolve the newly-elected Legislative Council. Perhaps even more ominously, Gary Cheng Kai-nam, an official of the pro-Chinese Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong, said the colony's six million people would "have to pay for" their choice. It is not in the interest of either Hong Kong or China for Beijing to crush Hong Kong's vibrant economy and developing democracy in 1997.

Britain is to hand Hong Kong over to Beijing's control when the 99-year lease on the colony expires. The agreement governing the terms of the handover was signed in 1984, at a time when China seemed to be liberalizing both its economic and political systems. Hong Kong's political structure then was not strictly democratic, and the prospects for finding a workable accommodation between the two systems seemed difficult but not impossible.

But since the Chinese crackdown on democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square in 1989, the match has seemed increasingly awkward. Hong Kong residents showed their revulsion for Beijing's brutality in a one-million-strong demonstration after the tanks rolled through Tiananmen Square. Since then Christopher Patten, Britain's last Hong Kong Governor, has sought to encourage and strengthen democratic institutions. Sunday's balloting was his latest move to cross the Chinese.

If China takes a heavy-handed approach and eliminates the new political institutions that Hong Kong's people clearly want, it risks undermining the business confidence that makes the territory such a valuable asset. Political turmoil is the enemy of a flourishing economy.

Beijing needs to take a longer view. If it wishes to preserve Hong Kong's unique role as a regional financial hub, it must find ways to accommodate its lively, individualistic culture, flavored by its long-term and intimate relationship with Western capitalism. Hong Kong's people, many of them refugees from the mainland, will not be easily silenced.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 19, 1996]

#### HONG KONG VOTERS HAND SETBACK TO CANDIDATES BACKED BY BEIJING

(By Peter Stein)

HONG KONG.—Voters here signaled their willingness to stand up to China by giving pro-democracy candidates to the territory's Legislature a landslide victory over their China-backed opponents.

The magnitude of their triumph in the last Hong Kong elections to be held before the British colony reverts to Chinese sovereignty in mid-1997 seemed to take even the

pro-democracy camp by surprise. Led by Chairman Martin Lee, the Democratic Party won 19 out of the 25 seats they contested, while allies of the Democrats secured eight more seats in the 60-seat Legislative Council. Before the vote, campaign staff had privately anticipated the party winning about 15 seats.

China-backed candidates fared worse than expected. The pro-China Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong won six seats. But the party's top leadership, including Chairman Tsang Yok Sing, a Marxist schoolteacher, were defeated by pro-democratic candidates.

Sunday's vote, Hong Kong's broadest exercise in democracy, represented the culmination of political reforms first introduced by Gov. Chris Patten three years ago. Riled by those reforms, China has already vowed to dissolve Hong Kong's Legislature when it takes control of the territory July 1, 1997.

For Hong Kong's pro-democracy camp, which also swept the 1991 elections, the performance was a vindication of its hardline approach to dealing with China. "It has certainly quelled all our doubts as to whether we enjoy the support of the Hong Kong people," Mr. Lee said. The results signaled that "Hong Kong people love democracy, they love the rule of law, they want their rights preserved."

Throughout the campaign, China-backed candidates attacked the Democrats and their allies for their inability to enter into a dialogue with Beijing. Meanwhile, the pro-democracy candidates campaigned on their willingness to stand tough against Beijing on issues such as preserving Hong Kong's rule of law. Democrats campaigned hard against a compromise agreement between China and Britain on Hong Kong's future court of final appeal, which they argue will destroy the independence of Hong Kong's judiciary.

China's official Xinhua news agency, reporting on the election, avoided any mention of the Democrats' victory. "The results of the Hong Kong Legislative Council elections showed that hope for a smooth transition and love of the motherland and Hong Kong remain the main trend in Hong Kong," a Xinhua spokesman was quoted as saying. The spokesman nonetheless branded the elections as "unfair and unreasonable."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 19, 1995]

#### ONE CHINA?

Coming on the heels of all the recent thunder out of China, the Hong Kong elections have a significance reaching far beyond one island. Especially since the anti-Beijing outcome is certain to be repeated in legislative elections in Taiwan in December, it's time for the U.S. and other democracies to review the basics of their China policy.

The "one China" policy was originally set out in the famous 1972 Shanghai communique. The U.S. declared that it "acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is part of China. The United States government does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves." (In the same communique, China declared "China will never be a superpower and its opposes hegemony and power politics of any kind.")

When the U.S. established diplomatic relations with Beijing and suspended them with Taiwan in 1978, the joint communique stated that "the people of the United States will maintain cultural, commercial and other unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan." In a unilateral statement at the same time, the U.S. declared that it "expects that the

Taiwan issue will be settled peacefully by the Chinese themselves." These understandings were codified into U.S. law by the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979.

In 1982, when the U.S. agreed to reduce arms sales to Taiwan, President Reagan issued a statement that the policy was based on "the full expectation that the approach of the Chinese government to the resolution of the Taiwan issue will continue to be peaceful." He added, a "We will not interfere in this matter or prejudice the free choice of, or put pressure on, the people of Taiwan in this matter."

These are the principles that the U.S. has followed ever since Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger started the rapprochement with China. They stress above all that reunification should be peaceful. And they include a not-so-tacit premise that reunification is the desire of Chinese people on *both* sides of the Taiwan Strait, a premise that looks increasingly dubious.

To sharpen the point, throughout the history of the "one China" policy the United States has studiously avoided any suggestion that it would participate in forcing Taiwan into China against the will of its people. Of course this is precisely what Beijing wants when it talks of "one China" or "sovereignty" or an "internal matter." The course of events is splitting this delicate straddle, and a yes-or-no answer may impend.

This is why China threw a tantrum over the visit to Cornell by Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui, though to use a college reunion looks like the unofficial relations contemplated by the 1978 communique. The missile tests splashing down north of Taiwan were a clumsy effort to intimidate the electorate there. President Lee has been pushing for more recognition of Taiwan in international organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund. The opposition party takes the position that Taiwan already is an independent nation; it holds a third of the parliamentary seats, and expects to gain in December.

China's efforts at intimidation will surely backfire, as they so clearly did in Hong Kong. While branded as "unpatriotic" and "subversive," Hong Kong's Democratic Party carried 12 of 20 contested seats, while like-minded independents took four more. Democratic leader Martin Lee got 80% of the votes in his own constituency, the highest margin of any candidate. The main pro-Beijing grouping, the DAB, captured only two seats, while its chairman and vice chairman were trounced in their races. These results confounded the public opinion polls, no doubt because residents did not give truthful answers to callers who might be reporting to Beijing.

It's easy enough to understand why voters in Hong Kong or Taiwan would have doubts about being ruled by the present government of China. It's been prone to lurches such as the Cultural Revolution and the post-Tiananmen crackdown. But at the same time, the current Chinese leadership can rightly feel that it has done much for its people over the past decade, by unleashing the economy and hastening development. In particular, an educated middle class has already started to emerge. The shape of China's transition, internal and external, will be determined by Chinese, but America and the Western World can help or hurt the prospects. With the Cold War over, surely there are few more important diplomatic tasks than incorporating a quarter of mankind into a peaceful and prosperous world system.

What China most of all needs from the world's remaining superpower is a constancy that has been sorely lacking. The world

would have been far better off if the Clinton Administration had from the first said it would decide who could visit Ithaca. China did in the end release Harry Wu, after all, and has agreed to negotiate a code of conduct concerning the disputed and possibly oil-rich Spratly Islands. Beijing, that is, is perfectly capable of acting responsibly if someone stands up and asks it to.

The U.S. should be telling the Chinese authorities something like this: That the U.S. intends to maintain its historic "one China" policy, wishing the Han people well in efforts to forge one nation, but steadfastly opposing the use of force. That it's unthinkable that the U.S. would try to coerce a democratic Taiwan into an unwilling union, and seeking such an American commitment will be disruptive and counterproductive. That with the incorporation of Hong Kong in 1997, China will have an opportunity to show good faith by keeping its promise of a high degree of autonomy. That bringing Hong Kong to heel, destroying its institutions, is the last policy likely to result in a one China.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

#### THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

#### DOLE (AND HELMS) AMENDMENT NO. 2707

Mr. HELMS (for Mr. DOLE for himself and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the committee amendment, add the following new title:

#### TITLE VII—CONSOLIDATION AND REINVENTION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

##### SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Foreign Affairs Reinvention Act of 1995".

##### SEC. 702. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to reorganize and reinvent the foreign affairs agencies of the United States in order to enhance the formulation, coordination, and implementation of United States foreign policy;

(2) to streamline and consolidate the functions and personnel of the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency, and the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in order to eliminate redundancies in the functions and personnel of such agencies;

(3) to assist congressional efforts to balance the Federal budget and reduce the Federal debt;

(4) to strengthen the authority of United States ambassadors over all United States Government personnel and resources located in United States diplomatic missions in order to enhance the ability of the ambassadors to deploy such personnel and resources to the best effect to attain the President's foreign policy objectives;

(5) to encourage United States foreign affairs agencies to maintain a high percentage of the best qualified, most competent United States citizens serving in the United States Government while downsizing significantly