

after she leaves the Senate at the end of this month. I join my colleagues in thanking her, commending her, and wishing her all the best as she embarks upon a well-earned retirement.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 22, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,062,405,341,134.69.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,139.65 as his or her share of that debt.

EVENTS IN ASIA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to briefly address two events which transpired in Asia over the weekend, one which bodes well for the continued growth and vitality of democracy in Asia and one which, unfortunately, does not.

First, as I'm sure my colleagues are by now aware, despite unprecedented military threats and vituperative media pressure from the People's Republic of China, the people of Taiwan have elected Lee Teng-hui as their President. The election, aside from its practical result, was important for several reasons. First, for the first time in its almost 5,000 year history, China—or, more precisely, a portion thereof—has elected its paramount leader in a free, fair, and open democratic election. With the election, the ideals of human rights and representative democracy—which some in Asia, especially authoritarian regimes, have argued are peculiarly Western inventions with little or no applicability in their region—have taken a dramatic step toward universality.

Second, Taiwan's electorate clearly demonstrated to Beijing that its bellicose campaign of threats and intimidation was ill-conceived and ineffectual. Rather than diminishing support for President Lee, as Beijing and the PLA had hoped, the People's Republic of China's recent round of missile tests and live-fire military exercises seems only to have served to solidify his support; President Lee won with some 54 percent of the vote. In other words, the People's Republic of China's plans backfired, much as I and others of my colleagues predicted. I would hope that they come away from the past month having learned that the best course is not one of brazen threats, but open bilateral dialog across the Taiwan Strait.

I wish to convey my personal congratulations to the Government and people of Taiwan, and hope to do so in person to President Lee when I travel to the People's Republic of China and then on to Taipei next week.

Mr. President, in contrast the second issue I'd like to discuss today is not so encouraging. On Sunday at its second plenary session, China's Hong Kong

Preparatory Committee—the body charged by Beijing with overseeing the transition of the British Colony to a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China in 1997—voted by a margin of 148 to 1 to scrap the elected Legislative Council and install in its place an appointed body.

Members of Hong Kong's Legislative Council, or Legco, have traditionally been elected not by universal suffrage but by a narrow group of functional constituencies. In other words, the trade unions had a certain number of votes, the civil service had a certain number of votes, lawyers had a certain number of votes, et cetera. Last year, in a move to increase the representation of the average citizen on the Council, a number of changes were made by the colonial government in the way elections are conducted.

Beijing objected to the changes in the election process, ostensibly because they were made unilaterally by the British; of course, Beijing overlooked the fact that they themselves had refused to seriously negotiate on the issue. However, most observers—correctly I believe—felt that the real reason for Beijing's opposition was that the changes made the Legco even more democratic, a status that they would then be forced to acquiesce to after 1997.

The reason that increased democracy is a problem for the People's Republic of China is fairly obvious; the government presently installed in Beijing is antithetical to democracy. Despite lip service to its promises that it would ensure the continuation of Hong Kong's rights and civil liberties after 1997, the People's Republic of China has taken a number of steps over the last 2 years to call that commitment to democratic norms into serious question. Its opposition to the reconstituted Legco is one of the more visible.

Another is the fate of the lone dissenting vote, by Mr. Frederick Fung, in the 148 to 1 vote tally on the Legco question. As a result of his dissenting vote, the head of the Preparatory Committee—Lu Ping—announced that because of his vote Mr. Fung should be disqualified from the transitional bodies planning Hong Kong's post-1997 government and from any governing role after the British withdraw. What does this petty and vindictive statement say about the People's Republic of China's commitment to democracy; that instead of tolerating dissent the Chinese will seek to punish those who express their opinions and fail to follow the party line.

Actions and statements such as this are not, sadly, surprising. The People's Republic of China has made several moves in the past year to exclude pro-democracy figures from the transition process; it even prevented one pro-democracy legislator from entering China to attend a conference, solely on the basis of his being a critic of the Government in Beijing. I believe that moves like these call into question the

People's Republic of China's commitment to the Basic Law, and its commitment to safeguard the rights of Hong Kong's citizens after retrocession. It would behoove them to remember that each move they make is under very close scrutiny by Hong Kong's—and the world's—commercial community. How Beijing acts will be directly reflected in that community's confidence, or lack thereof, and its willingness to maintain its investments there.

This is the People's Republic of China's reaction.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ANGOLA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 134

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola.

other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against Angola (UNITA). There have been no amendments to the Regulations since my report of September 18, 1995.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benguela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. The FAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has re-

sulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including special fliers and computer bulletin board information initiated by FAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 18, 1995, through March 25, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Angola (UNITA) are reported to be about \$226,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 1996.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 22, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

For consideration of the House bill (except for section 101(c)) and the Senate amendment (except for section 101(d)), and modifications committed to conference: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OBEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

For consideration of section 101(c) of the House bill, and section 101(d) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WICKER, Mr.

LIVINGSTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mrs. LOWEY.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the enrolled joint resolutions were signed subsequently on March 22, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the House:

H.R. 2969. An act to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the resolution (H. Res. 387) returning to the Senate the bill (S. 1518) to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by prohibiting funding for the Board and by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1987, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate.

At 1:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 125. An act to repeal the ban on semi-automatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 125. An act to repeal the ban on semi-automatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1996" (Rept. No. 104-243).