

much fairer to low-income workers, women who don't work outside the home, children and the elderly, who may not have a great deal of economic damages. I have no objection to making punitive damages proportionate to the harm caused by the product, the goal that the punitive damage limitation is intended to accomplish. That harm should not, however, be limited to out of pocket costs or lost wages. Non-economic damages can often be difficult to calculate, but that does not make them any less real.

Indeed, these compensate individuals for the things that they value most—the ability to have children, the ability to have your spouse or child alive to share in your life, the ability to look in the mirror without seeing a permanently disfigured face. As a notion of fundamental fairness, any congressional attempts to create a punitive damage standard should include both economic and noneconomic damages in its formula, as the Rockefeller-Gorton substitute now does.

In addition, the amended bill contains a provision that will allow a judge to increase the amount of a punitive damage award, if an increased award is necessary to either adequately punish a defendant for its past conduct, or to adequately deter a defendant from engaging in such conduct in the future. I know there have been concerns raised during the course of this debate that, in some cases, punitive damages awarded pursuant to the formula will not be sufficient to either punish or deter. I believe this judge additur provision addresses these concerns, and I want to thank Senators ROCKEFELLER and GORTON for their willingness to add this provision to their legislation. In my opinion, it makes a good bill even better, and it demonstrates their willingness to respond to the concerns of those of us “in the middle.”

Madam President, last year I stood on the Senate floor, after the Senate failed to invoke cloture on the Product Liability Fairness Act, and stated my desire not to filibuster this bill again. What I wanted to do was debate what alterations the Federal Government should make in the area of product liability law, and to act on a narrow, moderate product liability bill. I am pleased to have a chance to act on such a bill today.

But reporting a bill out of the Senate is only half of the battle; I also want to see this legislation enacted in to law. I believe that can happen, as long as a House-Senate conference committee keeps the bill limited to the subject of product liability, and rejects the draconian, anti-consumer provisions included in legislation which passed the House of Representatives. The votes in the Senate during the past 2 weeks should send a strong signal to the House that the U.S. Senate does not intend to restrict the ability of ordinary citizens to access the courts, under the guise of civil justice reform.

If our colleagues in the House of Representatives truly want a product liability reform bill, I have no doubt that we can obtain one. Our votes in the Senate spell out very clearly what will and will not be acceptable to this body, and I urge my House colleagues to consider those votes very carefully. For despite my desire to enact a product liability reform bill, nothing has changed about my underlying commitment to equal justice under law. I remain just as opposed to loser-pays provisions, caps on noneconomic damages, or changes that would restrict the right of individuals to bring suit for civil rights violations, employment discrimination, and sexual harassment, among other issues, as I have been in the past, and I will be compelled to oppose any legislation that returns from a conference including these provisions.

Madam President, in closing, I would like to commend Senators ROCKEFELLER and GORTON for all of their hard work to enact a product liability reform bill, not only this year, but in past Congresses as well. They are to be commended for championing an issue that needs to be addressed, and for doing so in a way that is balanced and fair. During the past 3 weeks, they have demonstrated a willingness to listen and resolve the concerns raised by myself and other Senators, and have taken steps to improve this legislation. I commend them for their leadership, and I am pleased to vote with them today.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending substitute amendment to H.R. 956, the Product Liability bill.

Slade Gorton, Dan Coats, Richard G. Lugar, John Ashcroft, Rod Grams, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Judd Gregg, Strom Thurmond, Trent Lott, Rick Santorum, Larry E. Craig, Bob Smith, Don Nickles, R.F. Bennett, John McCain, Connie Mack.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Coverdell-Dole amendment, No. 690, to H.R. 956, the product liability bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Abraham	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McCain
Bennett	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grams	Mikulski
Brown	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Burns	Gregg	Murkowski
Campbell	Hatch	Nickles
Chafee	Hatfield	Nunn
Coats	Helms	Pell
Cochran	Hutchison	Pressler
Coverdell	Inhofe	Pryor
Craig	Jeffords	Robb
DeWine	Johnston	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kassebaum	Santorum
Dole	Kempthorne	Smith
Domenici	Kohl	Snowe
Dorgan	Kyl	Stevens
Exon	Lieberman	Thomas
Faircloth	Lott	Thompson
Feinstein	Lugar	Thurmond

NAYS—38

Akaka	Daschle	Leahy
Baucus	Feingold	Levin
Biden	Ford	Murray
Bingaman	Glenn	Packwood
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Bradley	Harkin	Roth
Breaux	Hefflin	Sarbanes
Bryan	Hollings	Shelby
Bumpers	Inouye	Simon
Byrd	Kennedy	Simpson
Cohen	Kerrey	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Wellstone
D'Amato	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—2

Warner Moynihan

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Are there any Senators who wish to change their vote? If there are no other Senators desiring to vote, on this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 38. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

REGARDING THE VISIT BY PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 103, House Concurrent Resolution 53, relative to the visit by the President of China on Taiwan, and that no amendments be in order to the resolution or the preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 53, which is a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the Republic of China on Taiwan, Lee Teng-hui, be allowed to visit the United States. House Concurrent Resolution 53 is almost identical to my concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, which has 52 bipartisan cosponsors, including both the majority and minority leaders, for which I am most grateful. I ask unanimous consent the names of the cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSPONSORS OF SENATE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION 9

Abraham (R-MI)
Akaka (D-HI)
Ashcroft (R-MO)
Bond (R-MO)
Brown, Hank (R-CO)
Burns (R-MT)
Campbell (R-CO)
Chafee (R-RI)
Coats (R-IN)
Cochran (R-MS)
Cohen (R-ME)
Conrad (D-ND)
Coverdell (R-GA)
Craig (R-ID)
D'Amato (R-NY)
Daschle (D-SD)
DeWine (R-OH)
Dole (R-KS)
Dorgan (D-ND)
Faircloth (R-NC)
Feingold (D-WI)
Gorton (R-WA)
Grams (R-MN)
Grassley (R-IA)
Gregg (R-NH)
Hatch (R-UT)
Hatfield (R-OR)
Helms (R-NC)
Hutchison (R-TX)
Inouye (D-HI)
Jeffords (R-VT)
Kassebaum (R-KS)
Kempthorne (R-ID)
Kyl (R-AZ)
Lieberman (D-CT)
Lugar (R-IN)
Mack (R-FL)
McCain (R-AZ)
McConnell (R-KY)
Nickles (R-OK)
Pell (R-RI)
Robb (D-VA)
Rockefeller (D-WV)
Roth, William (R-DE)
Simon (D-IL)
Simpson (R-WY)
Smith (R-NH)
Snowe (R-ME)
Specter (R-PA)
Thomas (R-WY)
Thompson (R-TN)
Thurmond (R-SC)
Warner (R-VA)

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 was unanimously reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March of this year. That resolution specifically calls on President Clinton to allow President Lee Teng-hui to come to the United States on a private visit, and I wish to emphasize private. House Concurrent Resolution 53 was

submitted in the House by Congressmen LANTOS, SOLOMON, and TORRICELLI, and adopted by the House by a rollcall vote of 396 to zero last week.

Mr. President, the question is, Should we let the People's Republic of China dictate who can visit the United States? The current State Department policy of claiming that allowing President Lee to visit would upset relations with the People's Republic of China officials personally is offensive to this Senator.

Taiwan is a friend. They have made great strides toward American goals—ending martial law, holding free and fair elections, allowing a vocal press, and steadily improving human rights.

Taiwan is friendly, democratic, and prosperous. Taiwan is the 6th largest trading partner of the United States, and the world's 13th largest. The Taiwanese buy twice as much from the United States as from the People's Republic of China. Taiwan has the largest foreign reserves and contributes substantially to international causes.

Unfortunately, the United States continues to give the cold shoulder to the leader of Taiwan. You will recall last May, we were embarrassed when the State Department refused an overnight visit for President Lee, who was in transit from Taiwan to Central America. His aircraft had to stop for refueling in Hawaii and he would have preferred to stay overnight before continuing on. Unfortunately, the State Department continues to indicate that the administration will not look favorably on a request for a private visit.

Mr. President, Taiwan and the People's Republic of China are making significant progress in relations between the two of them. I call my colleagues' attention to the existence of an organization known as the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Straits. That organization operates in Beijing. The counter to that is the Mainland Affairs Council in Taiwan. These two groups get together regularly. They talk about everything conceivable except the political differences between the two countries. That conversation includes such things as hijacking; it also includes such things as eliminating the necessity of goods from Taiwan having to go through Hong Kong before they can come into the People's Republic of China. They are addressing now the direct shipment of goods from Taiwan to the mainland of China.

So here we have evidence that there is this dialog based on trade and commerce, but still the United States is afraid to take steps to encourage our trade and commerce with Taiwan because of the objections from the People's Republic of China.

Now, we know that the People's Republic of China will object to a visit by President Lee because the People's Republic of China complains loudly about many United States initiatives such as United States pressure at the United Nations with regard to China's human

rights practices, criteria for China's World Trade Organization membership, and anything we do to help Taiwan. But in the end, the People's Republic of China Government makes a calculation about when to risk its access to the United States and our market. And I think we should make the same calculation.

The precedent does exist, my colleagues, for a visit by President Lee. The administration has welcomed other unofficial leaders to the United States—the Dalai Lama called on Vice President GORE, over the People's Republic of China's objections, I might add. Yasser Arafat came to a White House ceremony. Gerry Adams has been granted numerous visits over Britain's objections.

In these cases, the administration I think has made the correct choice to allow visits to advance American goals, and President Lee's visit would do the same thing. The USA-ROC Economic Council Conference is going to be held in Anchorage, AK, in September. Visiting Alaska would not be a political statement, by any means. We consider ourselves, as my Alaskan colleague Senator STEVENS often remarks, almost another country. President Lee's alma mater, Cornell University in New York, would like him to visit in June to give a speech. It is completely a private matter. It is not a matter of a state visit.

I have heard suggestions that the Special Olympics, which will be held in Connecticut, might extend an invitation to President Lee, as well.

So I would call on my colleagues to vote to send a strong signal to the administration that President Lee should be allowed to make a private—and I emphasize "private"—visit. I call on the administration to change the policy because it is simply the right thing to do and it is the right time to do it.

If the administration does not change the policy based on this resolution, I think they are going to face binding legislation that would force the President to allow the visit. The administration should act before facing such a situation.

Mr. President, it is my intention to ask for the yeas and nays on this resolution.

I also ask unanimous consent that editorials from cities around the country supporting the Lee visit be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 17, 1995]

A SNUB FOR TAIWAN'S DEMOCRATS

Taiwan's president, an alumnus of Cornell, wants to address his alma mater this June. But a visit to the United States by Lee Teng-hui is something that will not happen, says the assistant secretary of state for East Asian affairs.

This pusillanimous attitude ought to change, both for reasons of courtesy and as a sign the United States applauds Lee's work in moving Taiwan toward full democracy.

The United States has a vital interest in the sustenance of democratic governments in Asia.

At issue is the two-China question, one that has vexed US policy makers since Mao Zedong's Communists took over all of China except the island of Taiwan in 1949. For a generation, The United States erred in ignoring the Communist reality; it should not now denigrate the success of Taiwan.

While the mainland was enduring the excesses of the Cultural Revolution, the people of Taiwan were laying the groundwork for an economic boom. As Beijing cracked down on dissidents, the Nationalists on Taiwan were opening up their regime. Last December an opposition leader was elected mayor of Taipei, the capital.

While acknowledging these achievements, Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord said last year that the United States should do nothing that Beijing would perceive as lending "officiality" to US relations with Taiwan. This fear of offending Beijing explains why Lee was denied permission to visit Cornell last June and why Lord implied he should not bother to apply for a visa this year.

When thousands of Taiwanese regularly come to the United States, it is inconsistent to prohibit a private visit by Lee. Moreover, it compounds the insulting treatment he received last year when he was denied permission to spend the night in Honolulu while en route to Latin America. As an alumnus of an American university, he has ties to the United States that transcend politics.

Cornell wants Lee to give a speech at reunion weekend, Lord says Taiwan "has shown that political openness must accompany political reform and that Asians value freedom as much as other people around the globe." That message ought to be heard by university alumni and a billion Chinese.

[From the Providence Sunday Journal, Mar. 19, 1995]

DISHONORABLE DIPLOMACY

Lee Teng-hui came to the United States as a foreign student and earned his Ph.D. in 1968 from Cornell University, one of the nation's premier institutions. His thesis was cited as the year's best dissertation by the American Association of Agricultural Economics. After returning home, he had an eventful career, topped off in 1990 by being elected president of his native land, one of America's oldest and most loyal Asian allies.

To honor Mr. Lee, Cornell officials have invited him to participate in a three-day alumni reunion at the campus in Ithaca, N.Y., in June, when he is scheduled to deliver the school's prestigious Olin Lecture.

A heartwarming story. But there's one big problem: President Clinton may bar Mr. Lee from visiting Cornell.

Why? Because Mr. Lee is the president of Taiwan, and the Clinton administration fears that the Communist regime of the Chinese mainland will be offended if he is allowed to come to America. It's as simple—and as outrageous—as that.

Now, we can understand why officials in Beijing wouldn't want Mr. Lee to visit this country and receive the honors. They hate and fear him and what he stands for because his regime has put the Communists and all their works to shame. He heads a rival Chinese government that, by following largely market-oriented policies, has spearheaded the relatively small (population: 20 million) island of Taiwan's rise as a major player on the world's economic scene. Meanwhile, the Communists—by following the bizarre schemes of the "Great Helmsman," the late Mao Tse-tung—crippled mainland China's

economic development (until, in recent years, they finally started to move away from Marxist follies).

Furthermore, the regime on Taiwan is rapidly democratizing itself, allowing the presence of an active opposition party, which has won a strong minority of seats in the legislature. In this regard, it ought to be emphasized that Mr. Lee is the freely elected president of Taiwan. Whereas the Communists now ruling in Beijing—while admittedly not as bad as the mass murderer, Mao Tse-tung—cling to their dictatorial power: no opposition parties, no freedom of speech or press, no free elections. And, of course, no freely elected presidents.

Which gets us back to Mr. Lee. President Clinton, a Rhodes Scholar, is a clever fellow. And he has available to him some very high-priced legal talent, as well as numerous figures—in and out of the State Department—with considerable experience and skill in the diplomatic arts. President Clinton should be able to figure out an adroit way to allow Mr. Lee to make what is essentially a private visit to Cornell and receive his well-deserved honors.

If the Communists in Beijing want to fuss and fume, let them. They may no longer be our enemies, but they are most assuredly not yet our friends. Mr. Lee, on the other hand, represents a brave people who have been our friends and allies for more than four decades. If Mr. Clinton bars Mr. Lee from coming here, he would dishonor not only himself, which would be his business, but the entire United States as well, and the American people should not stand for that.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 9, 1995]

UNWELCOME MAT FOR OUR FRIENDS

(By Arnold Beichman)

There is every possibility that President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan may one day be allowed to enter the United States just like Yasser Arafat and Gerry Adams, onetime terrorists, and other statesmen as distinguished as the head of the Palestine Liberation Organization or the leader of Sinn Féin who have been allowed to do so.

The possibility of a visit by the elected president of Asia's island democracy has arisen because the House of Representatives International Relations Committee has urged President Clinton to allow Mr. Lee to enter the United States. Mr. Lee has been invited to attend graduation exercises at his alma mater, Cornell University.

The House panel didn't ask President Clinton personally to receive President Lee. How could it? After all, the appointments schedule of the president of the United States is controlled by the Politburo of the Chinese Communist Party, which decides what Chinese the president may or may not receive. So all the House panel asked Mr. Clinton to do is to allow President Lee to visit—that's it, nothing more—just visit the United States. If Mr. Clinton turns down that request will that mean the Chinese Politburo controls our Immigration and Naturalization Service, too? Perhaps Mr. Clinton could ask the Chinese Politburo to do something about illegal immigration.

It isn't the first time that the appointments schedule of the president of the United States was under the control of a foreign communist power. In 1975, President Ford declined to receive Alexander Solzhenitsyn since such an act of hospitality and respect for human rights would have offended the Soviet Politburo. Or so Secretary of State Kissinger believed. After his election defeat in 1976, Mr. Ford confessed that he had erred in barring the great Russian dissident from the White House.

The power of the Chinese Communist Politburo extends not only to which Chinese can visit the United States but it also determines who can overnight on our soil. Last year, Mr. Lee was barred from overnighting in Honolulu lest such a simple act enrage the Beijing gerontocrats. However, it's quite all right to enrage the British government and Prime Minister John Major in receiving Gerry Adams and allowing him to engage in dubious fund raising.

What presidents and their advisers do not understand is that the reaction of totalitarians to American policy depends less on a given American action than it does on the party's long-range view. It didn't matter to Josef Stalin that Adolf Hitler inveighed against the Soviet Union or communism. When it suited Stalin's needs, he signed a Nazi-Soviet pact in August 1939. And when it suited Hitler, he attacked the U.S.S.R. despite the Nazi-Soviet Pact. President Nixon ordered the bombing of North Vietnam while he was in Moscow. The Soviet Politburo didn't order Mr. Nixon out of the Soviet Union to show its displeasure. Moscow negotiated with the United States despite the bombing of its military ally, North Vietnam.

Whenever it suits Beijing to violate its agreements with the United States, it will. Whenever it suits Beijing to lose its temper with Mr. Clinton, it will—regardless of protestations of past friendship.

For the United States to continue to treat Taiwan as an outcast nation as it has for a quarter-century because of the Communist Politburo is a sign of weakness that will not be lost on Deng Xiao-ping's successors. After all, Taiwan's democratic credentials are of the highest. Its market economy has propelled Taiwan—remember this is a country with a population of but 21 million—into the 13th largest trading nation in the world. Taiwan enjoys a rule of law. It recognizes property rights. There is a legal opposition and a free press.

If we continue to treat a friendly people, a friendly government and its chosen representatives as nonpersons at a time when we would like to see a world of democracies and when to further that course we have even sent troops overseas, as we did to Haiti, isn't it time—at the very least!—to tell the Beijing totalitarians that the president of Taiwan can overnight on American soil anytime he wants to? And, perhaps, even stay for two nights?

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1995]

KOWTOW—THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S BOW TO BEIJING

(By Lorna Hahn)

Lee Teng-hui, president of the Republic of China on Taiwan, wishes to accept an honorary degree from Cornell University, where he earned his PhD in agronomy.

Last year, when Cornell made the same offer, Lee was refused entry into the United States because Beijing belligerently reminded the State Department that granting a visa to a Taiwanese leader would violate the principle of "One China" (Cornell subsequently sent an emissary to Taipei for a substitute ceremony.) This year, on Feb. 9, Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord told a congressional hearing that our government "will not reverse the policies of six administrations of both parties."

It is high time it did. The old policy was adopted at a time when China and Taiwan were enemies, Taiwan's government claimed to represent all of China, and Beijing's leaders would never dream of meeting cordially with their counterparts from Taipei. Today, things are very different.

Upon assuming office in 1988, Lee dropped all pretense of ever reconquering the mainland and granted that the Communists do indeed control it. Since then, he has eased tensions and promoted cooperation with the People's Republic of China through the Lee Doctrine, the pragmatic, flexible approach through which he (1) acts independently without declaring independence, which would provoke Chinese wrath and perhaps an invasion; (2) openly recognizes the PRC government and its achievements and asks that it reciprocate, and (3) seeks to expand Taiwan's role in the world while assuring Beijing that he is doing so as a fellow Chinese who has their interests at heart as well.

Lee claims to share Beijing's dream of eventual reunification—provided it is within a democratic, free-market system. Meanwhile, he wants the PRC—and the world—to accept the obvious fact that China has since 1949 been a divided country, like Korea, and that Beijing has never governed or represented Taiwan's people. Both governments, he believes, should be represented abroad while forging ties that could lead to unity.

To this end he has fostered massive investments in the mainland, promoted extensive and frequent business, cultural, educational and other exchanges, and offered to meet personally with PRC President Jiang Zemin to discuss further cooperation. His policies are so well appreciated in Beijing—which fears the growing strength of Taiwan's pro-independence movement—that Jiang recently delivered a highly conciliatory speech to the Taiwanese people in which he suggested that their leaders exchange visits.

If China's leaders are willing to welcome Taiwan's president to Beijing, why did their foreign ministry on March 9, once again warn that "we are opposed to Lee Teng-hui visiting the United States in any form"? Because Beijing considers the "Taiwan question" to be an "internal affair" in which, it claims, the United States would be meddling if it granted Lee a visa.

But Lee does not wish to come here in order to discuss the "Taiwan question" or other political matters, and he does not seek to meet with any American officials. He simply wishes to accept an honor from a private American institution, and perhaps discuss with fellow Cornell alumni the factors that have contributed to Taiwan's—and China's—outstanding economic success.

President Clinton has yet to make the final decision regarding Lee's visit. As Rep. Sam Gejdenson (D-Conn.) recently stated: "It seems to me illogical not to allow President Lee on a private basis to go back to his alma mater." As his colleague Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-N.Y.) added: "It is embarrassing for many of us to think that, after encouraging the people and government on Taiwan to democratize, which they have, [we forbid President Lee] to return to the United States . . . to receive an honorary degree."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 15, 1995]
TWO VISITORS

Gerry Adams can tour the United States, but Lee Teng-hui can't. Gerry Adams will be feted and celebrated Friday at the White House, but when Lee Teng-hui's plane landed in Honolulu last year, the U.S. government told him to gas up and get out. The Gerry Adams who is being treated like a head of state by the Clinton Administration is the leader of Sinn Féin, the political arm of the Irish Republican Army. The Lee Teng-hui who has been treated like an international pariah by the Administration is the democratically elected President of the Republic of China, or Taiwan. The disparate treatment of these two men tells an awful lot about the politics and instincts of the Clinton presidency.

Gerry Adams's face will be all over the news for his Saint Paddy's Day party with Bill O'Clinton at the White House, so we'll start with the background on the less-publicized President of Taiwan.

Cornell University has invited President Lee to come to the school's Ithaca, N.Y., campus this June to address and attend an alumni reunion. In 1968, Mr. Lee received his doctorate in agricultural economics from Cornell. The following year, the American Association of Agricultural Economics gave Mr. Lee's doctoral dissertation, on the sources of Taiwan's growth, its highest honor. In 1990, Taiwan's voters freely elected Mr. Lee as their President. He has moved forcefully to liberalize Taiwan's political system, arresting corrupt members of his own party. Last year, the Asian Wall Street Journal editorialized: "Out of nothing, Taiwan's people have created an economic superpower relative to its population, as well as Asia's most rambunctious democracy and a model for neighbors who are bent on shedding authoritarian ways."

Asked last month about President Lee's visit to Ithaca, Secretary of State Christopher, who professes to wanting closer links with Taiwan, said that "under the present circumstances" he couldn't see it happening. The Administration doesn't want to rile its relationship with Beijing. The Communist Chinese don't recognize Taiwan and threaten all manner of retaliation against anyone who even thinks about doing so. That includes a speech to agricultural economists in upstate New York. This, Secretary Christopher testified, is a "difficult issue."

Sinn Féin's Gerry Adams, meanwhile, gets the red carpet treatment at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Adams assures his American audiences that the IRA is out of the business of blowing body parts across the streets of London. He promises the doubters that if people give him money, it won't be used to buy more guns, bullets and bombs for the high-strung lads of the IRA.

Now before the Irish American communities of Queens and Boston get too rolled over our skepticism toward Northern Ireland's most famous altar boy, we suggest they take their grievances to John Bruton, who is Irish enough to be the Prime Minister of Ireland. He, too, will be at Bill Clinton's St. Patrick's Day party for Gerry Adams, and he has a message for the two statesmen: The IRA has to give up its arms. "This is an item on the agenda that must be dealt with," Premier Bruton said Monday in Dublin. "It's a very serious matter. There are genuine fears felt by members of the community that have been at the receiving end of the violence."

We don't at all doubt that somewhere amid the Friday merriment, Mr. Clinton will ask Mr. Adams to give up the guns and that Mr. Adams will tell the President that is surely the IRA's intent, all other matters being equal.

It is hard to know precisely what motivates Mr. Clinton to lionize a Gerry Adams and snub a Lee Teng-hui. The deference to China doesn't fully wash, because when Britain—our former ally in several huge wars this century—expressed its displeasure over the Adams meeting, the White House essentially told the Brits to lump it. Perhaps the end of the Cold War has liberated liberal heads of state into a state of light-headedness about such matters. We note also this week that France's President Francois Mitterrand has been entertaining Fidel Castro at the Elysees Palace.

But it's still said that Bill Clinton has a great sense of self-preservation. So if he's willing to personally embrace Gerry Adams while stifling the Prime Minister of England and forbidding the President of Taiwan to spend three days with his classmates in Itha-

ca, there must be something in it somewhere for him.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal,
Apr. 22, 1995]

LET LEE VISIT

Eleven months after Communist China's old tyrants loosed the tanks on pro-democracy students in Tiananmen Square, Taiwan's new president, Lee Teng-Hui, released several political prisoners—the first step in his rapid march to democratizing "the other China." Now guess who—the despots or the democrat—is being banned from setting foot in the Land of the Free.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher drones that to grant Lee a visa to address his alma mater, Cornell University, in June would be "inconsistent with the unofficial character of our relationship" with Taiwan.

That relationship dates from 1979, when Jimmy Carter severed diplomatic ties with Taiwan to stroke Beijing, which views the island nation as a rebellious province. Presumably, the red carpet remains out for the massacre artists whose sensibilities Christopher cossets.

Not everyone in Washington abides this outrage against a country making strides toward real political pluralism and free-market economics. The House Committee on International Relations, burying partisanship, recently voted 33-0 in moral support of Lee's visit. (The Senate Foreign Relations Committee backed a similar resolution in March.)

With more bite, Rep. Robert Torricelli (D-N.J.) has introduced legislation that would compel the State Department to issue visas to democratically elected Taiwanese leaders. Meanwhile, Cornell president Frank Rhodes says Lee's return to campus "would offer an extraordinary educational opportunity."

The administration's posture—stubborn pusillanimity—is odd. Lee's visit clearly would not be a state-to-state affair. If Communist China's leaders sulked anyway, so what? How would they retaliate? Give their tank commanders directions to California? Refuse to sell us the \$31.5 billion in goods they exported to the United States in 1994?

Congress should reaffirm America's welcome to democracy's friends by quickly passing the Torricelli bill; as for the administration, its Christopher is obviously no patron saint to all travelers.

[From the Durham Herald-Sun, Apr. 20, 1995]
TAIWAN PRESIDENT; SORRY, YOU CAN'T TALK
HERE

For a country that beats its chest about freedom of speech, we're setting a very hypocritical example in the case of Lee Teng-Hui, the president of Taiwan. He wants to come back to Cornell University, his alma mater, to give a speech.

No way, says the Clinton administration, which argues that mainland China is the one and only China. Presumably that leaves Taiwan, at least in Washington's eyes, as pretty much what Beijing says it is: a rebellious province.

Rebellious or not, at least Taiwan is moving toward a more open and democratic society than the mainland. Yet Lee is being denied a visa for his Cornell visit because, in the words of Secretary of State Warren Christopher, it would be "inconsistent with the unofficial character" of this country's relationship with Taiwan. The United States recognized Taiwan as the legitimate government of China until 1979, when then President Jimmy Carter decided that ties with the mainland regime were more vital to the interests of the United States.

In the long shadow of history, Carter's decision is likely to win favor as the correct

one. But that doesn't mean we ought to slam the door on the elected leader of Taiwan just because the gerontocracy in Beijing might get a case of political heartburn. These fellows are, after all, the very officials who turned the Chinese army loose in Tiananmen Square.

In any case, Lee's visit to Cornell would not be a pomp-and-circumstance state visit, but rather a low-visibility affair. The House Committee on International Relations knew that when it voted 33-0 on a resolution backing Lee's visit. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee also adopted a resolution in favor of Lee. In addition, Frank Rhodes, the president of Cornell, has spoken up for Lee.

Rep. Robert Torricelli, a New Jersey Democrat, is so incensed by the administration's deliberate snub of Lee that he has introduced a bill in the House that would mandate the State Department to issue a visa to Lee or any other freely elected official from Taiwan.

Good. If the State Department won't let Lee into the motherland of the First Amendment, then Congress ought to see to it that he gets a visa. As for the State Department, it could use some sensitivity training in good manners.

[From the Washington Times, May 2, 1995]

A MATTER OF HONORS DUE A STAUNCH FRIEND (By James Hackett)

After two years of insulting America's friends and allies while accommodating America's enemies, the Clinton Administration finally has hit bottom. The matter involves Lee Teng-hui, president of the Republic of China on Taiwan, who has been invited by Cornell University to receive an honored alumnus award at ceremonies at Ithaca, N.Y., in early June. Mr. Lee received his Ph.D. at Cornell and wants to accept the honor bestowed by his alma mater.

President Lee is a native of Taiwan and the first popularly elected president of a country that long has been a close friend and ally of the United States. But incredibly, the State Department will not allow Mr. Lee to visit the United States, even for such an unofficial purpose, lest it annoy the communist rulers on the mainland.

The State Department's China hands, with the approval of the Clinton White House, are trying hard to accommodate the wishes of the government in Beijing. Last year, Mr. Lee and his minister for economic affairs were denied permission to attend an Asian economic summit in Seattle, despite Taiwan's status as an Asian economic powerhouse that buys more than twice as much from the United States as mainland China.

The worst insult to Taiwan, however, was a disgraceful episode last May when Mr. Lee was denied permission to stay overnight in Honolulu after his plane stopped there to refuel. The State Department is following a policy of no overnight stays on U.S. soil for senior Taiwan officials, treatment more appropriate for criminals than for friends and allies.

In contrast, the administration is eager to please the regime in Beijing, a government that continues to test nuclear weapons while developing a whole new series of ballistic missiles, including some that can carry nuclear weapons anywhere in Asia and even across the Pacific. China also is buying frontline Russian SU-27 combat aircraft, Russian Kilo-class submarines, and other equipment under a major military modernization program. This Chinese development of power projection capabilities is a direct threat to Taiwan and the other democracies of Asia.

China's military buildup is being achieved even as the communist regime continues to

suppress human rights, commits systematic genocide in Tibet, confronts its neighbors with claims on oil deposits and islands in the South China Sea, and threatens to invade Taiwan if that democracy declares its independence. Yet the Clinton administration wants close relations with the Chinese military and is eager to sell China high-speed computers and other advanced technologies that have significant military applications. Last October, Mr. Clinton sent Defense Secretary William Perry to Beijing to cement relations with the Chinese army, and Mr. Perry wound up toasting the commanders who crushed the democracy uprising.

Policy toward Taiwan, however, continues to be shaped by the Shanghai Communiqué that was signed before the Tiananmen Square uprising, which requires the United States gradually to decrease the quality and quantity of military equipment sold to Taiwan. Consequently, even the F-16A/B aircraft that President Bush approved for sale to Taiwan just before the 1992 election are the oldest models of that fighter, inferior even to the model being sold to Saudi Arabia.

As China builds up its offensive military force, the United States must help Taiwan defend itself. Congress should disavow the ill-considered Shanghai Communiqué and press Mr. Clinton to sell first-line military equipment, including the best available air, sea, and missile defenses, to our friends on Taiwan.

Members of Congress of both parties are increasingly unhappy with Mr. Clinton's China policy and irate at the treatment of Taiwan's President Lee. The House International Relations Committee approved by a vote of 33-0 a resolution calling on Mr. Clinton to welcome President Lee to visit Cornell University, and to allow him to attend a planned meeting of the U.S.-Taiwan Economic Council in Anchorage, Alaska. But the administration has ignored this unanimous bipartisan congressional resolution.

If President Lee is denied permission to receive his honors at Cornell, the Clinton administration's lack of principle will have dragged this country to a new low. The House is expected to bring this issue to a floor vote today to demand prompt approval of a visa for Mr. Lee and the restoration of common decency to our relations with Taiwan. The Senate should quickly follow suit.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Apr. 19, 1995]

ODD WAY TO REWARD A FRIEND

Eleven months after Communist China's old tyrants loosed the tanks on pro-democracy students in Tiananmen Square, Taiwan's new president, Lee Teng-Hui, released several political prisoners—the first step in his rapid march to democratizing “the other China.” Now guess who—the despots or the democrat—is being banned from setting foot in the Land of the Free. Secretary of State Warren Christopher drones that to grant Lee a visa to address his alma mater, Cornell University, in June would be “inconsistent with the unofficial character of our relationship” with Taiwan. That relationship dates from 1979 when Jimmy Carter severed diplomatic ties with Taiwan to stroke Beijing, which views the island-nation as a rebellious province. Presumably, the red carpet remains out for the architects of the Tiananmen massacre whose sensibilities Christopher cossets.

Not everyone in Washington abides this outrage against a country making strides toward real political pluralism and free-market economics. The House Committee on International Relations, burying partisanship, recently voted 33-0 in moral support of President Lee's visit. (The Senate Foreign

Relations Committee backed a similar resolution in March.) With more bite, Rep. Robert Torricelli, D-N.J., has introduced legislation that would compel the State Department to issue visas to democratically elected Taiwanese leaders. Meanwhile, Cornell president Frank Rhodes says Lee's return to campus “would offer an extraordinary educational opportunity.”

The administration's posture—stubborn pusillanimity—is odd. Lee's visit clearly would not be a state-to-state affair. If Communist China's leaders sulked anyway, so what? How would they retaliate? Give their tank commanders directions to California? Refuse to sell us the \$31.5 billion in goods they exported to the United States in 1994?

Congress should reaffirm America's welcome to democracy's friends by quickly passing the Torricelli bill; as for the administration, its Christopher is obviously no patron saint to all travelers.

[From the Seattle Times, Feb. 11, 1995]

THE WRONG CHINA POLICY

President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan has again been denied entry into this country and it's time once again to ask the simple question: Why?

Lee is the democratically elected leader of the 22 million Chinese on Taiwan who form an economy that is one of America's most vigorous trading partners. He has a Ph.D. from Cornell University in upstate New York, something one would wish more foreign leaders possessed.

Cornell wants to offer this distinguished graduate an honorary degree. The Clinton administration, following the policy of previous administrations, says Lee can't come back to this country. The reason is that the mainland Chinese would be offended.

That policy is inexplicable. Essentially, the U.S. is allowing mainland China to dictate the terms of our relations with one of our best trading partners. Lee's policies and economy is far more admirable than the mainland's, but we keep him at arm's length. At the minimum, Lee should be allowed to visit his alma mater. An official visit to Washington, D.C. is not a bad idea, either.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sept. 26, 1994]

TALE OF TWO NATIONS

The Clinton administration is committing hundreds of millions of dollars, and potentially the lives of many American military personnel, to the “restoration” of democracy in Haiti. If that third-rate nation's brutal politicians and policemen suspend their practice of murdering their critics and oppressing the populace, the United States may reward the country with generous economic aid for years to come. And, of course, its diplomats will continue to receive invitations to White House soirees.

Meanwhile, how does the Clinton administration reward an old American ally that is democratizing by choice, that has established a commendable record on human rights, that has embraced the free enterprise system, and that does enough business with the United States to support more than 300,000 American jobs? By throwing it a few crumbs and telling it to keep its officials away from the White House and the State Department.

That about explains the Clinton administration's new and supposedly improved policy on the Republic of China on Taiwan. The President has condescendingly allowed Taiwan to rename its unofficial mission here from “The Coordination Council for North American Affairs” to “The Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative's Office in the

United States," which more clearly described the mission's function.

He also has removed the ban on direct contacts between American economic and technical officials of non-Cabinet rank and Taiwanese government officials in Taipei, but Taiwanese officials stationed in the United States will not be permitted to visit the State Department. And the President may support Taiwan's membership in certain international organizations, such as those concerned with trade, when he can do so without implying diplomatic recognition of that country.

In other words, Taiwan is to remain a diplomatic pariah whose president is not even permitted to land on American soil long enough to play a round of golf.

Taiwan deserves better treatment. It is the United States' sixth-largest trading partner. It stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States during the darkest and most dangerous phases of the Cold War. It has used the United States as a model in building its economic and political structures. Voluntarily and enthusiastically, it is developing exactly the kind of democracy that the United States advocates.

The United States withdrew diplomatic recognition from Taiwan during the Carter administration, and denies it still, in an effort to cultivate the friendship of mainland Communist China, which asserts sovereignty over Taiwan and vows to reclaim that island someday. Taiwan is also committed to eventual reunification. The two countries have developed important commercial ties in recent years, but they are far from agreement on the terms for merging politically into a new united China.

Strong arguments based on both principle and political reality can be made against the United States' eagerness to appease Communist China at the expense of an old American friend. Tomorrow Senator Robb will convene a hearing of his Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the administration's China policies. The exchange promises to be vigorous.

Democratic Senator Paul Simon of Illinois considers it wrong as a matter of principle for the United States to disain a country that has "a multi-party system, free elections, and a free press—the things we profess to champion—while we continue to cuddle up to the mainland government whose dictatorship permits none of those." Heritage Foundation China analyst Brett Lippencott suggests that by developing closer ties to Taiwan the United States could promote the reunification of China. The reason, essentially, is that the failure to enhance Taiwan's "international status could weaken those in Taiwan who favor eventual reunification . . . and strengthen those who seek an independent Taiwan."

Obviously, the actual existence of two Chinas creates a difficult and delicate problem for the United States. But in dealing with it, our leaders should occasionally do what is right instead of always doing what they think will please the tyrannical rulers of the world's last remaining major Communist stronghold.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 27, 1994]

TAIWAN—SENATE SHOULD URGE GREATER WHITE HOUSE SUPPORT

For the second consecutive year, Taiwan's bid for membership in the United Nations has been thwarted. But however many "no" votes may have been cast against Taiwan at the U.N., the island democracy off the coast of mainland China deserves far better treatment from the Clinton administration.

Last week's anti-Taiwan vote by the 28-member General Assembly steering committee was hardly surprising. Because Communist China considers Taiwan to be a "renegade province," China has waged an ongoing and heavy-handed campaign against Taiwan since 1949.

As relations have warmed between the United States and China, U.S.-Taiwan relations have suffered. U.S. policy continues to be based on the traditional formula that says, "There is only one China, and Taiwan is a part of China." To be sure, President Clinton attempted to boost economic and commercial ties with Taiwan earlier this month by calling for more high-level visits. He is putting special emphasis on those relating to technical and economic issues. But that's insufficient.

Today may be another milestone in the evolution of U.S.-Taiwan relations. The Clinton administration's new Taiwan policy is scheduled to be examined by the East Asian and Pacific affairs subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As Sen. Paul Simon of Illinois has pointed out, the first thing the Senate should note is that Taiwan features a multi-party system, free elections and a free press. He's right.

Earlier this year, President Clinton said in his State of the Union message that "the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere." The East Asian and Pacific affairs subcommittee chairman, Charles Robb of Virginia, should recite those words in his hearing room today.

Taiwan is the perfect place for the Clinton administration to translate words into action. The way to do that is by giving Taiwan greater recognition for its democratic advances.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 18, 1995]

LET TAIWAN PRESIDENT VISIT

President Clinton's China policy (essentially, give Beijing whatever it wants) is about to be challenged over his snubbing of Taiwan.

Cornell University has invited one of its graduates to address an alumni reunion in June. He is Lee Teng-hui, who received a doctorate in agricultural economics from Cornell in 1968. He is president of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Since 1979, Washington has taken the position that the Communist government in Beijing, one of the most repressive on earth, is the exclusive representative of the Chinese people. Taiwan is a democracy and one of our largest trading partners.

To placate the People's Republic, the president of Taiwan isn't allowed to visit the United States, even in an unofficial capacity. Last May, when Lee stopped in Honolulu en route to Costa Rica, the State Department generously offered to permit him to enter the airport, provided he remain in quarantine. Lee chose to stay on his plane.

Why the administration must allow Beijing to jerk its strings is a mystery. The regime is not the least cooperative on human rights or trade.

Congressional Republicans are threatening to revolt. Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska) has 35 co-sponsors on a resolution calling on the administration to allow Lee to visit Cornell. If the resolution is ignored, Murkowski is threatening to reopen the issue of U.S. relations with Taiwan.

This is a fight the president doesn't need. Beijing may bluster but ultimately will do nothing. The world won't come to an end if one of Cornell's more distinguished alumni visits his alma mater.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Mar. 26, 1996]

WHY TREAT TAIWAN LIKE DIRT?

Standing up for what you believe is not always easy in international affairs, and President Clinton probably wishes people wouldn't force him into areas of diplomacy where he is so uncomfortable.

But it's happening again. Pesky Cornell University is inviting one of its graduates, Taiwan's President Lee Teng-Hui, to give a speech there in June. So President Clinton must decide whether to allow the visit, sure to anger mainland China, or to continue the policy of pretending Taiwan's top leaders have the plague.

Helping keep the issue in the public eye is a proposed Senate resolution, sponsored by Frank Murkowski of Alaska and co-sponsored by Sen. Connie Mack of Florida and 34 others.

Each of the many "whereas" paragraphs in the resolution contains a bit of information sure to make the President twitch. Taiwan is the United States' sixth-largest trading partner; it supports democracy and human rights; it has a free press and free elections; its elected leaders deserve to be treated with respect and dignity; and the U.S. Senate has voted several times last year to welcome President Lee to the United States.

Perhaps if President Clinton were more confident in the diplomatic skills of his administration, he would be less cautious about putting a few old Communist tyrants in a temporary huff.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 24, 1995]

STRENGTHEN U.S.-TAIWAN TIES

Taiwan has made remarkable efforts to do the kinds of things that United States foreign policy has asked of it. The Clinton administration ought to reward that effort by further loosening the shackles on U.S. Taiwanese relations. It made some hopeful changes last September, but badly needs to do more.

Members of both parties in Congress are dismayed—rightly so—at how this country has treated Taiwan's reformist President Lee Tanghui. It forbade him to stay overnight when his plane landed in Hawaii for refueling last May on a trip to Central America, and so far has refused permission for Lee to enter the United States, even as a private citizen acting in a wholly unofficial capacity, to receive an honorary degree from his alma mater, Cornell University.

The reason for that is the "one China" policy adopted in 1979, when the United States finally abandoned hope that the rump Nationalist government on Taiwan would ever regain control of mainland China, the communist People's Republic.

China considers Taiwan a rogue province. By a combination of bluster and threat, it has long persuaded other nations and international organizations to isolate Taiwan.

But that doesn't mean the United States shouldn't do much more to strengthen its unofficial economic, political and cultural ties with Taiwan pending a final resolution of the Taiwan-China dispute.

Taiwan is our fifth-largest trading partner (third-largest for the Columbia-Snake River Customs District) and an economic powerhouse in Asia. We ship twice as many goods to the island of 20 million people as we do to the mainland.

Taiwan has made immense progress along the road from virtual dictatorship under the late Chiang Kai-shek and his son, Chiang Ching-kuo, to representative democracy.

One result has been that Lee's ruling Nationalist Party faces significant opposition

not only from the populist Democratic Progressive Party, which favors Taiwanese independence from China, but also from a break-away Nationalist group calling itself the New Party.

Unlike the People's Republic, Taiwan has a free press and a television system that is only nominally government-controlled. The Taipei government tolerates an illegal cable TV system that broadcast a "democracy channel" and news from the mainland.

Unlike the People's Republic, Taiwan has acknowledged past human-rights abuses, including the Nationalist slaughter of thousands of native Taiwanese in 1947, two years before Chiang's forces finally lost their civil war against the communists, and has made far more human-rights progress than the mainland.

Taiwan has taken more positive steps than the mainland to protect U.S. intellectual property—the current sore point between Washington and Beijing.

These are exactly the combination of reforms and brisk march toward democracy that the United States urges on Russia, China and some Latin American nations, among others. The only difference is that Taiwan is getting it done.

That should be rewarded with closer ties to the United States and U.S. help in getting Taiwan full participation in the World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Bank and other organizations that should be more concerned with facts as they are than facts as China might like them to be.

And let Lee visit Cornell.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I intend to offer my thoughts on House Concurrent Resolution 53, but before doing so, I would like to know if my colleague from Alaska might engage in a colloquy on a particular point about this resolution on which we would agree: that it is important to maintain a productive relationship with the People's Republic of China.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with my good friend from Louisiana on this point.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I wonder if it is the Senator's intent by this resolution to begin a two China policy, that is to violate the terms of the agreement the United States made with the People's Republic of China in 1979 to recognize the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China? As my colleague knows, since signing that agreement, the United States has maintained only unofficial relations with Taiwan, keeping commercial, cultural, and other relations without official Government representation and without diplomatic relations.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I believe this resolution is consistent with our agreements with the People's Republic of China and is consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act as well. This resolution does not, in this Senator's opinion, violate our one-China policy. I believe that the United States can allow a private visit by President Lee to his alma mater, Cornell University, and to a business conference in Alaska without compromising United States foreign policy toward the People's Republic of China.

This resolution merely calls on the administration to recognize that Presi-

dent Lee should be admitted to attend private events in the United States to promote our friendly, albeit unofficial, ties with the Republic of China on Taiwan, as envisioned under the Taiwan Relations Act.

Since 1979, circumstances have changed between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China on Taiwan. I would direct my colleague's attention to the relationship that has developed between the People's of China and the Republic of China on Taiwan through their unofficial entities: the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Straits in Beijing and the Mainland Affairs Council in Taiwan. The two sides get together and talk about everything but politics. Trade and investment has ballooned. It seems entirely appropriate that the United States should also be able to take actions to increase our trade and economic ties with Taiwan.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Alaska for that clarification. As I know my colleague is aware, diplomacy is often a gray area, and I believe there can be honest disagreements over when an action crosses a sometimes arbitrary line. On this particular issue, the Senator from Alaska and I might disagree over where that line is drawn. From this colloquy I think we agree that it is in the interests of the United States to maintain the fundamental United States-People's Republic of China relationship.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my friend from Louisiana for that colloquy.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

Mr. President, even with this important clarification, I remain extremely concerned about how actions such as this, no matter how harmless they may appear, could impact the United States relationship with the People's Republic of China. For almost 15 years, the United States has remained committed to a one-China policy that includes only unofficial recognition of Taiwan. This commitment is backed up by several joint communiqués issued by the United States and the People's Republic of China and by the Taiwan Relations Act. I am concerned about the ambiguities and confusion a visit by President Lee to the United States could raise in the eyes of the People's Republic of China. Although this visit would be a private one, Mr. Lee is the President of Taiwan, he would be staying on American soil in an official capacity, and the United States does have a commitment to the People's Republic of China to maintain only unofficial relations with Taiwan. I hesitate to muddy the waters and compromise our carefully crafted, delicate relations with the People's Republic of China by initiating vague policies of recognition of Taiwan's leaders, whether such visits are private or not. The People's Republic of China is entering a period of

transition. Deng Xiaoping is over 90, and it is unclear who will succeed him as head of the Chinese Government. Now is not the time to look as if we were altering the United States steadfast commitment to a one-China policy.

Should this resolution pass, as I expect it will, I urge the State Department not to follow this nonbinding resolution and not to issue a visa to Mr. Lee. I have the greatest respect for President Lee and this is in no way meant to be a personal affront to him. I have seen relations between the United States and Taiwan grow and improve and I have seen Taiwan take great strides toward democracy. In fact, this administration completed a comprehensive review of our policy with Taiwan last year and implemented a number of appropriate steps to further improve our relationship with Taiwan. Taiwan has held free and fair elections for some offices, and I hope this trend of expanding free and fair elections will continue in the near future, including for the office of the Presidency. I hope the United States will continue to maintain its ties with Taiwan, but these ties must remain unofficial.

Mr. President, this is a very, very critical time for China, the largest nation in the world upon which the stability of all of Asia and, some would say, the stability of all of the world depends.

Deng Xiaoping, their leader, is transitioning out. New leaders are coming in. Therefore, it is very important that the United States not do anything to upset what is one of the most important pillars of our relationship with them, which is a one-China policy.

Now the question is, Does this violate the one-China policy?

The Secretary of State testified before the Budget Committee in February that the United States has committed itself to the concept of one China and to having an unofficial relationship with Taiwan. He also stated that if the President of Taiwan "is wanting to transit to the United States when he is going someplace else, that would be acceptable under the new arrangements. But it is regarded as being inconsistent with the unofficial character of our relationships with Taiwan for the President to visit here in what would be, in effect, an official capacity." It is my hope that, should this resolution be enacted by the Congress, the administration will continue to hold to this policy and will not issue the travel visa to President Lee. As I said earlier, while I have the greatest respect for the President and people of Taiwan, and commend them on the significant progress they have made toward democracy, the United States Congress should not alter over 15 years of United States foreign policy with a single resolution. Our current foreign policy toward China and Taiwan brings maximum benefit to the United States; we have official diplomatic ties with

Beijing while maintaining trade and cultural relations with Taipei. We should not change a policy that continues to serve U.S. interests so well.

Our Secretary of State believes this does violence to the one-China policy. I, therefore, would urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, and I urge the Secretary of State not to issue the visa called for by this resolution. I stand second to no one in my affection and regard for Taiwan. But the way to show our regard and affection for Taiwan and President Lee is not by departing, however ambiguously, from the one-China policy.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I will take only 1 minute.

I think this is a sound resolution. I want to get along with the People's Republic of China, but they cannot dictate what we do. Taiwan has a freely elected government and a free press, all the things we say that we allow. The President of Taiwan wants to come over here on a private visit and go to his alumni meeting at Cornell University. I think for us to knuckle under to the People's Republic of China under those circumstances just goes contrary to everything we say we profess. I strongly support the resolution.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this resolution has one fault: It is too late in coming. It has been reported out favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a mistake that we should have corrected a long time ago.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I, and others, have for a long time been protesting this travesty in the conduct of U.S. foreign relations. How and when did the United States reach the point in United States-Taiwanese relations that United States foreign policy could preclude a visit to the United States of the highest ranking, democratically elected official of Taiwan?

Though I did not often disagree with Ronald Reagan—I did on occasion, and one of those times was when President Reagan's advisers made a regrettable decision which risked jeopardizing our relations with Taiwan by cuddling up to the brutal dictators in Beijing. Since that time, we have been hiding behind a diplomatic screen when demonstrating our commitment and loyalty to the Taiwanese people.

Mr. President, at the time President Reagan's advisers made that grievous error, Congress was promised that the United States would continue to "preserve and promote extensive, close and friendly * * * relations" with the people on Taiwan. But successive administrations have not lived up to that promise. How in the world could any one consider it close and friendly to require the President of Taiwan to sit in his plane on a runway in Honolulu while it was refueled? I find it hard to

imagine that United States relations with Red China would have come to a standstill because of a weekend visit to the United States by Taiwan's President Lee.

The President's China policy is in poor shape at this point—even members of his team recognize that. So, how can anyone really believe that allowing President Lee to travel to his alma mater—or to vacation in North Carolina—would send our already precarious relations with Red China plummeting over the edge?

Last time I checked, the Mainland Chinese were obviously enjoying their relations with the United States—a small wonder since they are benefiting \$30 billion a year from the American taxpayer as a result of United States trade with Red China.

Time and again, the U.S. Congress has urged the administration to grant President Lee a visa. We have amended our immigration law so that it now specifically mentions the President of Taiwan. Congress has passed resolution after resolution encouraging the President to allow President Lee into the United States for a visit. All to no avail.

But today the delay is over. I hope I will have the privilege of being one of the first to welcome the distinguished President of the Republic of China on Taiwan. He deserves a warm welcome from all of us.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I strongly hope that the concurrent resolution will be agreed to. The President of Taiwan has studied and taught at Cornell, as well as Iowa State. This is a single visit. It fits within the guidelines of the policy review carried out by the White House and the National Security Council. It is a resolution which should get an "aye" vote.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that Senator NICKLES be added as the 54th bipartisan cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise this morning as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to join in the sentiments expressed by my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, on Taiwan, and in particular on the visit of President Lee.

I need not repeat in detail for the Senate Taiwan's many accomplishments, either economic or political; these have often been discussed on the Senate floor. It is sufficient to note that this country is our fifth largest trading partner, and imports over 17 billion dollars worth of U.S. products annually. More importantly, though, Taiwan is a model emerging democracy in a region of the world not particularly noted for its long democratic tradition.

The Taiwanese Government has ended martial law, removed restrictions on freedom of the press, legalized the opposition parties, and instituted electoral reforms which last December resulted in free elections. Taiwan is one of our staunchest friends; I think every Member of this body recognizes that, and accords Taiwan a special place among our allies. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the administration apparently does not share our views. Rather, the administration goes out of its way to shun the Republic of China on Taiwan almost as though it were a pariah state like Libya or Iran. Sadly, the administration's shoddy treatment of Taiwan is based not on that country's faults or misdeeds, but on the dictates of another country: the People's Republic of China.

It is because the People's Republic of China continues to claim that it is the sole legitimate Government of Taiwan, and because of the administration's almost slavish desire to avoid upsetting that view, that the State Department regularly kowtows to Beijing and mal-treats the Government of Taiwan.

The administration refuses to allow the President of Taiwan to enter this country, even for a private visit. A private visit, Mr. President. President Lee is a graduate of Cornell University, where he earned his Ph.D. He has expressed an interest in attending a class reunion at his alma mater this June, and a United States-Taiwan Economic Council Conference. Yet the administration has made clear that it will not permit him entry.

Mr. President, the only people that this country systematically excludes from entry to its shores are felons, war criminals, terrorists, and individuals with dangerous communicable diseases. How is it possible that the administration can see fit to add the President of Asia's oldest republic to this list? We have allowed representatives of the PLO and Sinn Fein to enter the country, yet we exclude a visit by an upstanding private citizen?

Mr. President, I think we have made clear to Beijing—I know I have tried to—the great importance to us of our strong relationship with that country. This relationship should, in my opinion, transcend squabbles over diplomatic minutiae. I will always seek to avoid any move that the Government of the People's Republic of China reasonably could find objectionable. I believe that countries like ours should try hard to accommodate each others' needs and concerns, in order to further strengthen our relationship.

However, I believe that the People's Republic of China needs to recognize the reality of this situation. Both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China are strong, economically vibrant entities. Both share a common heritage and common culture, yet have chosen political systems that are mutually exclusive. And despite these differences, the United States has a strong and important relationship with both.

I strongly believe that it is the Chinese who must work out their differences among themselves, without resort to or interference by outside forces. While I am sure that a solution will come eventually, it is liable to take a number of years. In the meantime, it does no good to continually place the United States in the unproductive position of having to walk a tightrope between the two, of continually having to choose sides.

Mr. President, our Taiwanese friends have been very understanding about our relationship with the People's Republic of China. I would hope that our friends in Beijing would be equally respectful of our relationship with Taipei. I fully support the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the concurrent resolution offered by Senator MURKOWSKI, which I am pleased to cosponsor.

This, very simply, would state the sense of the Senate that we should remove existing restrictions on the right of President Lee Teng-hui, of the Republic of China on Taiwan, to travel to the United States. As my colleagues have already heard, the President of Taiwan wishes to come here to visit his alma mater, Cornell University. However, he cannot, because existing U.S. policy prevents him from staying here overnight.

It is certainly no secret to my colleagues that a principal reason for this restriction is the particular sensitivity of the Mainland Chinese Government to how the United States deals with and treats the Taiwanese. I would simply say that I speak as someone who has—and will—stoutly defended the United States-China relationship, even when Mainland China was under attack here in the United States for alleged human rights transgressions. I have consistently argued that the best policy toward China is one of mutual exchange and respect, of cooperation in trade, environmental work, population issues, and all else. So I do not believe that I can fairly be accused of being heedless of the very real and delicate sensitivities that the Chinese might display regarding this matter.

However, I believe that it is possible—indeed, imperative—that we be open in our dealings with Mainland China and with Taiwan simultaneously. We must not insult the one in order to please the other. Indeed, even China and Taiwan are coming to increasingly recognize the foolishness of their mutual antagonism of the last several decades. It is still a sensitive and difficult problem for each government, but “behind the scenes,” we are seeing more travel across the Taiwan Strait, more investment, more economic and cultural exchange. That relationship is beginning, however slowly, to change.

In any case, there are limits to how much we should rebuff the Taiwanese in order to preserve our relationship with Beijing. We should strive to trade

with the Chinese, to cooperate with them on a large number of issues, but not to refuse to participate in relationships that are beneficial and proper for the United States. One of these is with the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Mr. President, I have always been one who has argued that there is a vital stake in old foes coming together to hammer out their ancient differences and eternal conflicts. I believe that backchannel contacts were indispensable to bringing about the possibility for expanded, public talks to bring about peace in the Middle East and in Ireland. So I have not publicly criticized the administration for its dealings with Yasir Arafat, or with Gerry Adams, or any of a number of at times even justifiable blameworthy international figures.

But it does strike me as very odd that we can reach out so much to individuals who have previously engaged in fully criminal conduct, yet we cannot even allow one of our true friends, the President of Taiwan, to come to the United States for a private—I stress, private—visit.

And he is indeed a friend to the United States—his administration has made it far easier for the United States to pursue a desirable economic relationship with Taiwan without sacrificing any of our principles on human rights. Taiwan has recently enjoyed the freest and fairest elections in its history. There is unprecedented political competition, and public debate, and fully indulged criticism of the Government, in that country. It is not an American-style democracy by any stretch. But the progress has been quite remarkable.

What we have here is a policy of punishment for precisely the type of behavior which we would hope to see in our overseas counterparts. President Lee has not only worked to make the United States-Taiwan relationship less troublesome, but even has exerted energy to lessen strains in the Taiwan-China relationship as well. That takes genuine political courage.

So I congratulate my fine friend the Senator from Alaska, FRANK MURKOWSKI, for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I pledge to him my full support in this and future efforts to repair and resolve this situation.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise in support of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution offered by the Senator from Alaska is, in essence, a statement of a basic American principle: free association, or our right to meet and speak with whomever we choose. It is strictly limited to this issue, and raises no fundamental questions of China policy.

This resolution welcomes the visit of President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan, as a private citizen, to attend the United States-Republic of China Business Council conference in Alaska, and give a speech at Cornell University. These activities would in no way violate any

of our commitments to China, and would make sure we give President Lee the respect he has earned as one of Asia's great democrats.

The principal objection to this resolution is the claim that it would violated American commitments to the Chinese Government. Let me review precisely what these commitments are. In 1972, 1979, and 1982, we signed a series of three communiques with the People's Republic of China. In the last of these, to quote the text:

The two sides agreed that the people of the United States would continue to maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan.

I believe we should keep our promises. We have made commitments to China to maintain a one-China policy and keep our relationship with Taiwan on an unofficial basis. And as long as China keeps its side of the bargain—to “strive for a peaceful resolution” to its differences with Taiwan—we should keep ours.

But the text of the communique is very clear. It says that our relationship will be unofficial. What is does not say is equally clear. That is, neither the 1982 communique nor the other two make any commitment whatsoever which Chinese citizens shall be eligible for visas. Thus, I am convinced that the proposed visit by President Lee as a private citizen would fall entirely within the framework of “cultural, commercial and other unofficial relations.”

Once again, this concurrent resolution, rightly construed, does not bear on China policy at all. It is simply as statement of our right as Americans to meet and speak with whom we choose; and of our respect and friendship for President Lee personally and the people of Taiwan in general. I support it and hope my colleagues will do likewise.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, could I just make an announcement? The Budget Committee intended to go back to mark up and vote after the two votes. I would like to tell them all we are going to go back to committee and have two votes, one after another. I hope they will all come. No proxy votes allowed.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Bradley	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchinson	Roth
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cohen	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simpson
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lieberman	
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—1

Johnston

NOT VOTING—2

Moynihan

Warner

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, that will give everybody interested in the product liability bill an opportunity to discuss what their remaining strategy or plans may be. We would like to complete action on the bill today. And then, if possible, we would like to move to the trash bill sometime this afternoon and try to complete action on that bill this week.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the evidence of support to extend an invitation to President Lee Teng-hui to visit the United States in an unofficial capacity. I think the support, as evidenced by the vote of 97 to 1 is a clear message of the prevailing attitude in this body toward extending this invitation.

It is my hope that the administration and the State Department will understand the intensity of the feelings with regard to our friends in Taiwan as evidenced in President Lee visiting his alma mater and to a send him to the United States-Republic of China Economic Council Conference in September of this year. I thank my colleagues for their assistance, understanding, and support of this resolution.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GORTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 768 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Delaware.

(The remarks of Mr. ROTH and Mr. D'AMATO pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 117 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S SUMMIT IN MOSCOW

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today the President of the United States is participating in Russia's May 9 commemoration of V-E Day. President Clinton accepted Russian President Boris Yeltsin's invitation to this event despite the fact that I and many of my colleagues encouraged him to select another time for a United States-Russian summit. We were concerned that because of the moral ambiguity of this commemoration, United States participation would undermine the relationship we seek to develop with Russia. We must not forget that the Soviet Union contributed to the outbreak of World War II, exploited the war's end, and committed countless atrocities to Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and other peoples subject to its brutal domination.

President Clinton should not have accepted this invitation, but now that he has, it is for these reasons that during his visit to Moscow he must meet not only with Russia's leaders, but the Russian people and emphasize three key themes. First, he must emphasize human rights. Second, democracy. And, third, rejection of empire. In doing so, the President would encourage all Russians not to look nostalgically back on the Soviet Union, but forward toward the potential of a democratic and postimperial Russia.

That should be the principal purpose of President Clinton's visit.

Toward this end, President Clinton must emphasize that his role in this celebration is not to honor the Soviet Union, but the valor and sacrifices of all the peoples who fought in opposition against Nazi aggression.

He must underscore the fact that while the United States, as a whole, celebrates victory in this war, it has not forgotten the victims nor any crimes committed during that era, be it by the Nazis, Stalin and his henchmen, or others.

This will not slight those who fought valiantly against fascism, as indeed did millions of Russians. It will in fact honor them even more highly by ensuring that their contributions are distinguished from the war-mongering and atrocities of that brutal time. And, in this way, the President will clearly differentiate the United States from those who seek to reanimate the Soviet past.

In articulating these themes, the President must publicly and forcefully address the ongoing war in Chechnya. Moscow's management of the Chechnyan autonomy movement is depressingly reminiscent of the policies that Stalin, himself, used to terrorize the peoples incorporated into the former Soviet Union. It indicates the fragility of democracy in Russia and, perhaps, even a weakening of its impulse.

President Clinton vowed that he would not visit Russia as long as Moscow continues the war against Chechnya. Indeed, Mr. President, in the weeks preceding this summit meeting, President Yeltsin actually stepped up military operations against the Republic, leveling more towns and killing more innocent civilians, both Russian and Chechnyan.

It is therefore absolutely essential that President Clinton speak forthrightly to the Russian people, not hiding the fact that America condemns the brutal use of military force against Chechnya.

He should state that America's relationship with Russia is contingent upon Moscow's peaceful resolution of its differences with the Chechnyan people. Hesitation on this matter will undermine the legitimacy of Russia's true democrats who have valiantly protested against this war and will strip credibility from our efforts to support Russia's still embryonic democracy.

The bottomline, Mr. President, is that human rights is an international issue. If Russia avows to be a member of the community of democracies founded upon respect for inalienable human rights, it must live up to those standards.

Third, in order for a true strategic partnership to evolve between the United States and Russia, Moscow must respect the sovereignty of the non-Russian nations of the former Soviet Union and former Warsaw Pact.