

eighth-largest trading partner. With its presidential elections tomorrow, Taiwan becomes the first Chinese state in history to become a full-fledged democracy. It thus constitutes the definitive rebuff to the claim of Asian dictators from Beijing to Singapore that democracy is alien to Confucian societies. Hence Beijing's furious bullying response.

The second issue has nothing to do with Taiwan. It is freedom of the seas. As the world's major naval power, we are, like 19th century Britain, its guarantor—and not from altruism. Living on an island continent, America is a maritime trading nation with allies and interests and commerce across the seas. If the United States has any vital interests at all—forget for the moment Taiwan or even democracy—it is freedom of navigation.

Chinese Premier Li Peng warns Washington not to make a show of force—i.e., send our Navy—through the Taiwan Strait. Secretary of Defense William Perry responds with a boast that while the Chinese “are a great military power, the premier—the strongest—military power in the Western Pacific in the United States.”

Fine words. But Perry has been keeping his Navy away from the strait. This is to talk loudly and carry a twig. If we have, in Perry's words, “the best damned Navy in the world,” why are its movements being dictated by Li Peng? The Taiwan Strait is not a Chinese lake. It is indisputably international water and a vital shipping lane. Send the fleet through it.

And tell China that its continued flouting of the rules of civil international conduct—everything from commercial piracy to nuclear proliferation, culminating with its intimidation of Taiwan—means the cancellation of most-favored-nation trading status with the United States.

Yes, revoking MFN would hurt the United States somewhat. But U.S.-China trade amounts to a mere two-thirds of one percent of U.S. GDP. It amounts to fully 9 percent of Chinese GDP. Revocation would be a major blow to China.

Yet astonishingly, with live Chinese fire lighting up the Taiwan Strait, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin said Tuesday that the Clinton administration supports continued MFN for China. He did aver that Congress, angered by recent events, would probably not go along.

This is timorousness compounded. Revoking MFN is the least we should do in response to China's provocations. Pointing to Congress is a classic Clinton cop-out. The issue is not Congress's zeal. It is Beijing's thuggery.

Quiet diplomacy is one thing. But this is craven diplomacy. What does it take to get this administration to act? The actual invasion of Taiwan? you wait for war, you invite war.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 27, 1996]

CLINTON VOWS HELP FOR YELTSIN CAMPAIGN—
ARKANSAS' INTEREST IN POULTRY DISPUTE
DISCUSSED AT ANTITERRORISM SUMMIT

(By Bill Gertz)

President Clinton, in a private meeting at the recent anti-terrorism summit, promised Boris Yeltsin he would back the Russian president's re-election bid with “positive” U.S. policies toward Russia.

In exchange, Mr. Clinton asked for Mr. Yeltsin's help in clearing up “negative” issues such as the poultry dispute between the two countries, according to a classified State Department record of the meeting obtained by The Washington Times.

Mr. Clinton told Mr. Yeltsin that “this is a big issue, especially since about 40 percent of U.S. poultry is produced in Arkansas. An ef-

fort should be made to keep such things from getting out of hand,” the memo said.

White House and State Department spokesmen confirmed the authenticity of the memo but declined to comment on what they acknowledged was an extremely sensitive exchange between the two leaders.

The memorandum on the March 13 talks in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, does not quote the two presidents directly but paraphrases in detail their conversation.

According to the classified memorandum, Mr. Yeltsin said “a leader of international stature such as President Clinton should support Russia and that meant supporting Yeltsin. Thought should be given to how to do that wisely.”

The president replied that Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov “would talk about that” at a meeting in Moscow. The meeting ended last week.

Mr. Clinton told Mr. Yeltsin “there was not much time” before the Russian elections and “he wanted to make sure that everything the United States did would have a positive impact, and nothing should have a negative impact,” the memo said.

“The main thing is that the two sides not do anything that would harm the other,” Mr. Clinton said to Mr. Yeltsin. “Things could come up between now and the elections in Russia or the United States which could cause conflicts.”

The memorandum, contained in a cable sent Friday by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, was marked “confidential” and was intended for the “eyes only” of Thomas Pickering, U.S. ambassador to Russia, and James F. Collins, the State Department's senior diplomat for the former Soviet Union.

The memo said Mr. Clinton suggested that the chicken dispute and others like it could be made part of talks between Vice President Al Gore and Russian Prime Minister Victor Chernomyrdin.

Mr. Gore announced Monday that Russia has lifted the ban on U.S. chicken imports that had been imposed out of concern that the chicken was tainted with bacteria.

The Washington Times reported March 8 that Mr. Clinton intervened personally in the poultry dispute late last month.

The president's directives to his staff to solve the problem right away benefited powerful Arkansas poultry concerns. Among them is the nation's leading producer, Tyson Foods Inc., whose owner, Don Tyson, has long been a major contributor to Mr. Clinton's campaigns.

U.S. poultry exports made up one-third of all U.S. exports to Russia and are expected to total \$700 million this year.

Asked about the memo on the Clinton-Yeltsin meeting, White House Press Secretary Michael McCurry said yesterday that it is “inaccurate” to say Mr. Clinton promised to orient U.S. policy toward helping the Russian leader's political fortunes. Rather, he said, the president wanted to make sure that issues in the two countries do not hamper good relations. The poultry issue was raised in that context only, the press secretary said.

Mr. McCurry, who said he was present at the meeting, also said the president was referring to “positive relations” between the two countries and not political campaigns.

Those present at the meeting included Mr. Christopher, CIA Director John Deutch, National Security adviser Anthony Lake and, besides Mr. Yeltsin, four Russian officials, including Mr. Primakov and Mikhail Barsukov, director of the Federal Security Service.

During the discussion, Mr. Yeltsin outlined his political strategy for winning the June

presidential elections and said he still had doubts about running as late as last month.

“But after he saw the Communist platform, he decided to run,” the memo said. “The Communists would destroy reform, do away with privatization, nationalize production, confiscate land and homes. They would even execute people. This was in their blood.”

Mr. Yeltsin said he will begin his campaign early next month, traveling throughout Russia for two months to “get his message to every apartment, house and person” about his plan to strengthen democracy and reforms.

“The aim of Yeltsin and his supporters would be to convince the candidates one by one to withdraw from the race and to throw their support behind Yeltsin,” the memo said.

Russian Communist Party leader Gennady Zyuganov is “the one candidate who would not do this” because he is “a die-hard communist,” and Mr. Yeltsin noted that he “would need to do battle with him.”

Mr. Yeltsin dismissed former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev as “not a serious candidate.”

“He had awoken one morning and decided to run and would wake up another morning and decide to withdraw his candidacy,” Mr. Yeltsin said of his predecessor. “This would be better for him because he now had some standing and if he participated in the elections, he would lose any reputation he had left.”

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ADVANCEMENT

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly supported our Contract With America. Today we take another step toward implementing the commonsense reforms the American people support.

The measure before us today goes a long way toward ensuring the American dream. It raises the Social Security earnings limit to \$30,000 by 2002. The current law punishes our seniors who chose to remain productive beyond age 64. Seniors lose \$1 in Social Security benefits for every \$3 they earn above \$11,250. Today's seniors have a lot to offer and the Government should not penalize them for it.

One of the greatest things this country has to offer is its entrepreneurial spirit. Yet ironically, it is the vehicle for this entrepreneurialism—small business—that bears the burden of overwhelming regulatory machinery. The small business items in the contract return common sense to the regulatory process and gives small businesses the advantages they need to succeed. Small business is the engine that drives this country. When small business succeeds, America succeeds.

Finally, we have the opportunity to implement one of Ronald Reagan's great visions—the line-item veto. This provision would allow the President to selectively weed out wasteful pork-barrel spending in a bill. It ensures Government spends hard-working American's tax dollars wisely.

Mr. Speaker, the Contract With America outlines a vision for our country based on the values that our Nation holds dear—individual liberty, economic opportunity, and personal responsibility. Our vote today puts us another step closer to making this vision a reality.

WOMEN, WAGES, AND JOBS

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, for bringing us together to discuss the vital issue of women and wages in our country.

While women have made some economic strides in the past few decades, we still have a long way to go. This session of Congress, under our new Republican leadership, was especially brutal for women—it was, and continues to be, antiwoman, antichoice, and antiworking family.

Today, most women work and spend less time with their children and families. Many cannot afford health insurance for their families and worry about their economic security in old age.

This Republican-led Congress has passed many bills to weaken and threaten women's rights, health, freedom, opportunities, economic equity, and economic security.

They have cut student loans, Social Security, family planning services, and child care. They have tried to take away our constitutional right to choose. They have attempted to slash funding for school nutrition programs, and have abolished important job training programs that train women for higher paying, nontraditional jobs. They have attacked affirmative action.

Let's talk about affirmative action, and how we need it to help level the playing field with men. Today women are still paid less for the same work. Women taxpayers are not getting their money's worth. Even with affirmative action, we make only 72 cents to a man's dollar. This is a disgrace.

In 1993, female managers earned 33 percent less than male managers, female college professors earned 23 percent less than male professors, and female elementary school teachers earned 22 percent less than male elementary school teachers. Let's not dismantle affirmative action until these discrepancies in wages are entirely erased.

The old boy network is alive and strong. Sexism and racism still exist and must be remedied. That's what affirmative action is all about. We must encourage and train women to seek higher paying jobs in order for them to successfully provide for their families.

Did you know that women who choose non-traditional female careers, such as fire-fighters or engineers, can expect to have lifetime earnings that are 150 percent of women who choose traditional careers like clerical workers or beauticians? We will not crack the "glass ceiling" until we break out of the "pink collar ghetto."

At this time of corporate downsizing and Government budget cutting, women must work

even harder to secure a place in a changing economy. This is no easy task, especially when important programs for women have been slashed, such as the School-to-Work Opportunities Act.

This program, reduced by 22 percent this year, particularly affects female students who need exposure to high-skill, high-wage career options that are not traditional for girls. Cuts in job training programs, and the elimination of the Women's Educational Equity Act further hurt women's prospects for achieving pay equity with men in the near future.

There is some hope, however. We must start to teach our daughters—the next generation of women workers—to become independent thinkers and problem-solvers, so that they may increase their self-confidence and attain high-paying jobs as adults. We can praise them for taking risks, and for their ideas rather than their appearance.

We can encourage them to master computers and take leadership positions. We can enroll them in sports and begin to discuss career options now. We can serve as mentors and role models.

A few women have made it to the top of the corporate ladder. Two women sit on the Supreme Court, two head the Justice Department, and a record 31 percent of President Clinton's appointments to the Federal bench were women. My State, California, is the only State headed by two female Senators.

President Clinton, in this 1997 budget, has preserved funding for many programs important to women and families, including child care, child support, and job training.

The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, under the leadership of Congresswoman NITA LOWEY and Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA, has been very active in assuring that women's concerns are not forgotten, even when we represent only 10 percent of the House of Representatives. Later on this year, we will continue the tradition of introducing the Women's Economic Equity Act. This package of bills will help women continue to succeed in the workplace.

Thank you, again, Congresswoman NORTON, for your commitment to women and economic equality, and for this opportunity to discuss women in the workplace.

HONORING ROBERT P. HARTZELL

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1996

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Robert P. Hartzell, the outgoing president of the California Association of Winegrape Growers [CAGW].

The wine and winegrape industries are extremely important to my district and to the State of California. Let me share with my colleagues some figures to illustrate this point:

At \$1.7 billion, grapes are the second highest-ranked California commodity based on farm gate value.

The State's wine industry generates over \$10 billion in annual revenue.

In 1995, over 3 million tourists visited California's wineries.

The California industry produces over 90 percent of the wine produced in the United States.

More than 2.6 million tons of grapes are crushed annually for use as wine and concentrate.

These numbers clearly demonstrate the beneficial impact of this important industry on California's economy.

Mr. Hartzell, who has served as CAWG's president since 1978, recently announced his retirement from the association. Prior to his tenure at CAWG, Mr. Hartzell served as deputy director of the California Department of Food and Agriculture under then-Governor Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Hartzell's 17 years of hard work and dedication has contributed to the success of California's winegrape growers in developing a successful and profitable industry. In the mid-1970's, grape growers faced extremely difficult economic times. During those years, Mr. Hartzell was instrumental in the development of a statewide winegrape grower group created to assist the industry.

Mr. Hartzell also is credited with increasing the industry's ability to compete in international markets through his extensive efforts to fund viticulture, consumer, and marketing research. As this industry grows, the development of new export markets becomes increasingly important. Mr. Hartzell recognized the importance of exports long before many others in the wine and winegrape industry.

Over the years, Mr. Hartzell has served as a diplomat for California's winegrape industry, and his efforts have earned the industry respect in the United States and throughout the world.

I commend Mr. Hartzell for his years of service on behalf of the winegrape growers. His efforts will be greatly missed by the entire industry. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

PORNOGRAPHY ON THE INTERNET

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1996

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about recent stories of children accessing pornographic material on the Internet. This does not, however, mean that there is a problem with the Internet, rather it tells us how much the moral fiber of America has decayed. In short, this material is available because people are demanding it.

When a product is in demand, such as pornographic material on the Internet, there is no system more powerful in delivering these demands than our free market. Therefore, we must focus on strengthening our families' and citizens' morality, so it is no longer acceptable to transmit or possess this material. The Government cannot prevent the market from delivering its product to a want in consumer. We must change the focus of the debate from Government prevention, back to the family responsibility.

Short of this, the Government can only hope to help business by allowing them to be responsible and close off children's access to this material. That's why I supported Representative CHRIS COX's amendment in the House, which allowed business to filter material without threat of a lawsuit.