

Like most Americans, I do not tend to think of a society that has been good to me and to my parents as "evil." But when he said that "somebody has power," it was difficult to disagree. It is possible that icy equanimity and self-pacifying form of moral abdication by the powerful will take more lives in the long run than any single drug-addicted and disordered parent. Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must "get tougher" with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?●

#### LIFE OF BARBARA JORDAN

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as the Nation mourns the loss of Barbara Jordan, I would like to take a few moments to celebrate her life.

Barbara Jordan became active in politics around the same time as I did. John Kennedy was running for President and the winds of change were sweeping across a nation and inspiring a young generation of new leaders.

It was different world for women then, one where the doors weren't nearly so open as they are today. And make no mistake about it—the doors are open wider today for women and for minorities because of the path cleared by Barbara Jordan.

Her start in politics was quite humble. She was a self-described "stamper and addresser"—meaning literally that she volunteered on President Kennedy's campaign licking stamps, addressing envelopes, and putting them in the mail. So many women started this way—behind the scenes doing the mundane but essential labor of grassroots politics.

But Barbara Jordan was not underestimated for long. Her most enduring talents—the power of her voice and the strength of her words—were quickly discovered and no one tells that story better than she did herself:

I had a law degree but no practice, so I went down to Harris County Democratic Headquarters [in Texas] and asked them what I could do. They put me to work licking stamps and addressing envelopes. One night we went out to a church to enlist voters and the woman who was supposed to speak didn't show up. I volunteered to speak in her place and right after that they took me off licking and addressing.

They would have been foolish not to.

If Barbara Jordan is remembered for just one thing, it will be the power of her words. Her message united people from vastly different walks of life, bringing them together to stand as one and nod their heads in unison and say, "Yes, each one of us can make a difference, and together we can make this nation stronger."

Where her words traveled, legions followed. And our Nation did change for the better as we began to offer opportunity to all our citizens.

Barbara Jordan broke all kinds of barriers throughout her life. If she were an athlete, she would have been a world-class hurdler because she spent

her whole life leaping over barriers with grace and dexterity. She broke records.

In Texas in 1966 she became the first Africa-American State senator. She entered that body with outright denunciations from some of her male colleagues, but when she left for Washington, DC, those same men endorsed a resolution commending her.

In 1972, Barbara Jordan and Andrew Young, of Georgia, became the first black southerners in Congress since Reconstruction.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, she quickly rose to prominence as a member of the House Judiciary Committee during Watergate. During the crisis, Barbara Jordan became one of our Constitution's greatest champions.

"My faith in the Constitution is whole," she told her colleagues and the American people. "It is complete. It is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution."

Whether it be freedom of speech, freedom of choice or equal opportunity, we in this Congress are also facing fundamental questions about the integrity of our Constitution. It is my hope that our faith in that sacred document is as whole and as complete as Barbara Jordan's.

After she left Congress, Barbara Jordan continued to give this Nation a lifetime of service—teaching young people in preparation for careers in public service. Her chairmanship of the independent U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, which is referred to as the Jordan Commission, took on the very difficult issue of fair immigration policy.

And just as young Barbara Jordan listened to the words of JFK and was "bit by the bug" of politics, so did she go on to inspire another generation of young leaders when she took the podium at the 1992 Democratic Convention. Speaking with an authority and voice that could only be Barbara Jordan's, she issued a new challenge to each and every one of us to reexamine our relationships with each other and what we stand together for as a nation. Above all else, she encouraged us to put our principles into action where help was needed most—in the hearts of our great cities.

She said, "We need to change the decaying inner cities to places where hope lives. Can we all get along? I say we answer that question with a resounding 'yes'."

Throughout her life Barbara Jordan was a voice for common ground, for the ties that bind. Hers were powerful, healing, uplifting words that challenged and inspired women and minorities, indeed all Americans, to reach for something higher and to believe in themselves and their own ability to change the world and make it a better place.

Her life was a testament to that idea.

A nation mourns a great loss, but it is my hope that the spirit of Barbara

Jordan will live on forever in the many Americans who have been touched deeply by her powerful words and exemplary life. I certainly have been.●

#### ANNIVERSARY OF ROE VERSUS WADE

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today marks the 23d anniversary of the monumental Supreme Court decision, *Roe versus Wade*, which legalized abortion nationwide and affirmed the right of all American women to choose safe, legal abortion services. I join Americans across the country in commemorating this important day in our history.

Yet this is a bittersweet celebration. We are still fighting to safeguard our rights, and battles are being waged on many fronts. Each year, antichoice forces in Congress use the appropriations process to erode women's abortion rights every chance they get. In 1995, they were successful in denying Federal workers abortion coverage in their health benefit packages. They will try again this year for more victories.

On this special anniversary, we must remember those who have suffered and lost their lives because of their commitment to protecting the health of women in our country. Increasingly, the radical minority in the anti-abortion crusade has turned to violence to pursue their agenda, with blatant disregard for who is caught in their crossfire. Over the last several years, I, like so many Americans, have been greatly disturbed by images of clinics under siege by vandals and arsonists, and horrified by reports of doctors murdered because they perform abortions—a legal procedure. We cannot let our reproductive rights be taken away because of a threat of violence, nor can we allow the actions of radical fanatics to dictate our Nation's public policy decisions. Just as our clinics are under attack, so too are our personal freedoms.

Emboldened by their momentum, Mr. President, antiabortion forces in both Houses of Congress passed H.R. 1833, the so-called Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995. By their own admission, this is the first step in the antichoice movement's strategy to deny women their right to choose—one procedure at a time. This legislation is an affront to the women of this country, and an unprecedented intrusion into the autonomy of medical professionals to determine the best methods of care for their patients. I am reminded today of the frustration I felt during debate of this bill, of the misinformation and divisive rhetoric infused in the conversation.

The antichoice majorities in Congress may have forgotten that most Americans feel abortion should be legal. They may also have forgotten about the days of back-alley abortions and women dying of infection from unsanitary procedures. Well, I haven't

forgotten and I will do whatever I can to ensure the days of the back-alley abortion, a virtual death sentence for women, remain a tragic thing of the past. Let today remind us that, for now at least, the law is on our side.

I urge President Clinton to join us today in commemorating this landmark anniversary. And I respectfully request that he deliver on his promise to veto H.R. 1833. The women of this country are counting on him to do what is right. I know he will not let us down.●

#### CHINA'S CHALLENGE TO WASHINGTON

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the New York Times had an excellent editorial titled "China's Challenge to Washington."

There is a reluctance to be forceful with China on the issue of human rights.

When I say "forceful," I do not mean the use of force, but the willingness to stand forthright for what this country should stand for.

We turn a cold shoulder to our friends in Taiwan, where they have a multiparty system, and seem to quake every time China is unhappy with something someone says or does.

As the editorial suggests, we should "respond far more sharply to Wei Jingsheng's sentence."

I am pleased to back this administration when they are right, as in Bosnia, but I also believe that we should be much stronger in setting forth our beliefs as far as the abuses in China. I ask that the editorial from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

Along the same line, Stefan Halper, host of NETE television's "Worldwise" and a former White House and State Department official, recently had an op-ed piece in the Washington Times titled "Taiwan's Unheralded Political Evolution," which I ask to be printed in the RECORD following my remarks and after the New York Times editorial.

The reality is democracy has grown and is thriving in Taiwan, and we should recognize that in our policies.

The material follows:

#### CHINA'S CHALLENGE TO WASHINGTON

If the United States intends to develop a relationship of mutual respect with China, it must defend its interests as vigorously as Beijing does. Now is the time, for China has shown a dangerous new bellicosity in matters from human rights to military threats.

Last week Beijing again showed its contempt for the rights of Chinese citizens by convicting Wei Jingsheng of sedition and sentencing him to 14 years in prison. The activities the court cited included organizing art exhibitions to benefit democracy and writing articles that advocated Tibet's independence. This heavy-handed muzzling of the country's leading dissenter is a measure of the Chinese belief that America and other Western countries will not make them pay a diplomatic or economic price for the abuse of human rights.

Chinese behavior has been equally provocative in other fields. In recent months Beijing

has bullied the Philippines over contested islands in the South China Sea, twice conducted missile tests in the waters off Taiwan, resumed irresponsible weapons transfers and imposed its own choice as the reincarnated Panchen Lama, the second most important religious figure in Tibet. Meanwhile, as The Times's Patrick Tyler reports, influential military commanders have begun pushing for military action against Taiwan and turned to confrontational rhetoric against the United States.

Washington has minimized these provocations, setting them in the larger perspective of China's encouraging economic reforms and Washington's hopes for political liberalization. That was the same logic that led the Administration, early last year, to abandon its efforts to link trade privileges for China to Beijing's record on human rights, arguing that anything that helped China's booming economy would ultimately advance political freedom as well.

It is working out that way. The 19 months since that policy change have been marked by a serious deterioration in China's responsiveness on human rights and other issues. Discouragingly, this seems to be happening not simply because a new generation of leaders is maneuvering to succeed the failing Deng Xiaoping. Nationalist military officers are steadily gaining political influence, and the two top civilian leaders, President Jiang Zimin and Prime Minister Li Peng, seem committed advocates of political repression. That suggests the newly belligerent policies may not be just a transitional phase, or a sign of insecurity in the leadership group, as some China scholars in the West have said.

The Clinton Administration, having done all it reasonably could to smooth relations, including an October meeting between Presidents Clinton and Jiang, now needs to recognize that a less indulgent policy is required to encourage more responsible behavior by China. The first step is to respond far more sharply to Wei Jingsheng's sentence, beginning with a concerted diplomatic drive to condemn China before the United Nations Human Rights Commission next March. U.N. condemnation would be an international embarrassment for China, one it desperately wants to avoid.

Another step is to oppose non-humanitarian World Bank loans to China, as already provided for under United States law. Some Administration officials also want to consider human rights issues in judging China's application to join the new World Trade Organization, even though that is likely to bring objections from other W.T.O. members.

The Administration still refuses to reconsider the simpler, more obvious step of restoring a link between trade and human rights. In this critically important diplomatic game, the United States may no longer be able to deny itself the leverage that link could bring.

[From the Washington Times, Dec. 13, 1995]

#### TAIWAN'S UNHERALDED POLITICAL EVOLUTION (By Stefan Halper)

In an era that believes America's future lies in Asia, what is the Asian democratic model? Singapore and Malaysia are single party states refreshed a bit by economic freedom. Hong Kong, still a colony, has lately been given a measure of self-government—which Americans of 1770 would have scorned—only to be swallowed whole by the not-so-democratic People's Republic of China in little more than 18 months. South Korea? It's dominated by a government party whose last president is now up on charges of stealing \$600 million—give or take a couple of hundred million.

Japan, for 38 years, has been run by a corrupt single party (the LDP) only to cede

power to a collection of reformers who themselves squandered the chance for real change. Today the LDP is back in a cynical misalliance with its nemesis, the socialists, whom it hopes to shortly expel.

When does that leave us? With the Burmese, or the Indonesian generals, or perhaps Thailand, where politicians are so corrupt they stay out of jail?

Reading the Mainland press, Taiwan's recent peaceful, multiparty elections never happened. No mention—the dog that didn't bark. A decade ago, the phrase "Taiwanese democracy" would have been rightly dismissed as an oxymoron, though compared to Mao's mainland, the island republic was widely seen as an economic miracle.

Ironically, it is this economic strength today—\$100 billion in hard currency reserves and America's ninth-largest trading partner—that has obscured Taiwan's political evolution. The late Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang single-party rule, was replaced by his son and successor Chiang Ching-kuo, who created a supportive environment for democratic pluralism before he died in 1988. Martial law was lifted, opposition parties were legalized, press restrictions were eliminated and it was agreed that Chiang's successor would not be a member of the family or even a transplanted mainland. Instead President Lee Teng-hui is a native Taiwanese so far determined to further reform by supporting younger, Taiwan-born politicians as leaders of the KMT.

In the last eight years, three legislative elections have been held, each time with slowly shrinking KMT majorities. The old National Assembly dominated by KMT geriatrics has been mercifully stripped of its powers. Direct presidential elections will be held for the first time in Chinese history next March.

Literally nowhere in Asia, except Taiwan, has a ruling party allowed itself to be eclipsed. Nowhere has the attack on political corruption been so singleminded as it is in Taiwan. Vote fraud, unlike Thailand and Korea, has been almost eliminated. Vote buying in the recent Dec. 2 poll has been reduced to rural areas and to a level that would boggle the minds of most Japanese and Thai voters.

At present, the KMT holds a six-seat majority in the legislature. Sessions will continue to be raucous, often undignified—not unlike the 19th century U.S. Congress or for that matter Congress today, recall the Moran-Hunter fight a few weeks ago—but so what? The opposition has strengthened as the exhausted Nationalists confront the reality of an increasingly pluralist Taiwan.

Though Democratic politics is often a matter of shades of ugly, the alternatives in Asia—both left and right—are vastly less attractive. Why the, despite Taiwan's effort, has its progress been ignored? Are American interests served by recognizing and nurturing democratic growth—or has some blend of security and mercantile priorities cast our lot with the Mainland? The Clinton administration, still struggling with this Wilson-Roosevelt policy cleavage, has said nothing on the subject, even while embarrassing itself before and after Lee Teng-hui's summer address at Cornell, his alma mater.

Yet in the hall of mirrors that passes for Taiwan's politics, the Nationalist Party-KMT reflects its belief in "One China" while the opposition New Party, with 13.5 percent of the vote, is even more forceful on the subject. And as for the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), it is split on the issue with the majority having muted the call for independence. Maybe the mean Chinese uncle in