

their entire family in the wake of this tremendous loss.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JAMES H. TOMPKINS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Judge James H. Tompkins, who passed away on January 9, 1996 at the age of 84. He had an abiding love for politics, public policy, and the law, and was known in Democratic circles all over the country since he attended so many Democratic national conventions over the years.

Jimmy Tompkins was a life-long resident of my home county, Colbert County, AL. He was a graduate of the University of Alabama and was a probate judge, district attorney, and practicing attorney in the county. He was a veteran of World War II, having served as lieutenant colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Office in Europe, Africa, India, China, and Burma.

The family of Judge Tompkins is truly one of judges. He served as probate judge of Colbert County. His father, Nathaniel Pride Tompkins, also was a Colbert County probate judge, as was his wife, Maybeth Robbins Tompkins, who succeeded Jimmy as the judge of probate. Their son, Pride Tompkins, is currently a circuit judge in Colbert County. Jimmy's brother-in-law, David "Pal" Cochrane, served as judge of probate of Tuscaloosa County.

Jimmy was an outstanding trial lawyer long before he became a probate judge. He practiced with the firm of Smith, Tompkins & Hughston, one of the leading firms in the State. Partner James E. Smith was a State senator at one time and was also the Democratic national committeeman from Alabama. Partner Harold V. Hughston served as a circuit judge of Colbert County.

He had a wonderful, pleasing personality. The smile he always had on his face was hard to forget. Jimmy Tompkins had many friends and he was a great friend to many, including me, over the years, and will be sorely missed.

I extend my sincerest condolences to Maybeth Tompkins and her entire family in the wake of their tremendous loss.

SALUTE TO RETIRING SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor one of the many—and I might add that there are far too many—colleagues of mine who have announced they will be leaving us at the close of this session. Senator WILLIAM SEBASTIAN COHEN announced his retirement recently, and I would like to pay tribute to this close friend of mine.

Early on in his career in the Senate, in 1978, Time magazine called Senator COHEN "one of the GOP's brightest new stars." Well, Senator COHEN isn't ex-

actly new anymore, Mr. President, but he remains one of the brightest stars in his party. It is a shame to see him leave when he seems in many ways more brilliant than ever.

Senator COHEN became the senior Senator from Maine at a very early age, and it was a title that he carried with determination and distinction. He quickly established himself as a leader on foreign policy issues, playing a key role in shaping the foreign policy that prepared America for the gulf war and the new world order of the 1990's.

Early on in his Senate career, the temperate young Senator from Maine opposed adoption of the SALT II Treaty out of concern that it failed to take a hard enough stand against the Soviets. He was simultaneously an unyielding advocate for a strong national defense. His stance proved that one did not have to be an extreme and ardent conservative to have a patriotic belief in the importance of protecting our country's security.

He continued to serve as a distinguished leader on foreign policy issues, employing intelligence and forethought that often put him ahead of the curve. He spoke out strongly against Saddam Hussein's stockpile of chemical weapons long before August of 1990. He also advocated redesigning our Navy to employ a greater number of smaller ships, with the massive sea-lift capability that the post-cold war world requires. Our Nation's shining success in the gulf war was due to a great many factors, but any attempt to take account of all those factors must note the shifts in our Nation's defense strategy during the 1980s in which Senator COHEN played a large part.

On domestic issues, Senator COHEN has taken a careful, reasoned approach. He has refused to sit beholden to any one ideology or dogma, instead showing an unwavering commitment to the interests of his constituents. He opposed a large dam project in Maine that threatened the environment of that beautiful State, and he pushed hard to relax stringent Social Security disability requirements. Many have called Senator COHEN a persistent moderate in his own party. Well, Mr. President, if being a party moderate means recognizing the fact that, where possible, the Government should try to help out folks who need a hand, or having the courage to speak out against those who would, out of misplaced zeal and foolhardy arrogance, undermine our Constitution, then I say we need more of it.

Mr. President, Senator COHEN and I came to the Senate only 2 years apart. Over the years, I have come to count him as a close friend, and I am sure we will remain close even after he leaves here. But I will still miss him, and I will always be grateful for his loyal service to this Chamber.

U.S. DEPENDENCY ON FOREIGN OIL BOX SCORE (FIRST REPORT)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have been deeply troubled for most of the 23 years I've been a Member of the Senate about the United States having become more and more deeply dependent upon foreign countries—many in the highly volatile Middle East—to supply the bulk of the energy needs of the American people. I held hearings on this perilous problem when I was chairman of the Agriculture Committee a decade ago, and more recently in my capacity as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The administration acknowledges that this is a national security concern, but, Mr. President, there obviously is a lot of fiddling while Rome burns—the administration has done precisely nothing about U.S. dependency on foreign oil.

Mr. President, Americans now are forced to rely on foreign oil for more than 50 percent of our needs. Not too long ago, 50 percent was pegged as the perilous threshold which must not be crossed. But, it was crossed, under President Clinton's watch, after U.S. blood was spilled in the Middle East in Desert Storm.

So, Mr. President, I begin today a report on this matter, a report that I will make to the Senate regularly. The American Petroleum Institute has confirmed that, for the week ending January 19, the United States imported 7,696,000 barrels of oil each day, 12 percent more than the 6,488,000 barrels imported daily 12 months ago.

Mr. President, as I say, I shall report to the Senate—and to the American people—on a regular basis regarding the increasingly dangerous U.S. dependency on foreign oil. We must not delay in seeking to solve this troubling problem.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business Thursday, January 25, the Federal debt stood at \$4,988,163,912,933.72, about \$12 billion shy of the \$5 trillion mark, which the Federal debt will exceed in a few months.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,933.50 as his or her share of that debt.

CHINA-TAIWAN RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to express my concern at recent reports in the domestic and foreign media that the Government of the People's Republic of China has formulated plans for a military invasion or blockade of Taiwan.

These reports surfaced first a month or two ago in Hong Kong papers known to be sympathetic to Beijing—known,

in fact, to be instruments of the Chinese Government—such as Ta Kung Pao. It was further reported in the colony's more mainstream papers, including a series of reports in the Eastern Express. Clearly, the initial discovery of this information was not the result of investigative reporting on the part of these papers. Rather, it shows all the signs of having been an organized leak on the part of the Beijing Government. The same information has been relayed to us through high-level channels in the People's Republic of China Government and military.

The purpose of the leak appears to me to be three-fold. First, it must be viewed in light of the present political situation in the People's Republic of China. As my colleagues know, while President Jiang Zemin is substantially in control of the Government as the successor to Deng Xiaoping, the succession is far from being settled with absolute finality. As a result, the leadership has been careful to court the conservative elements of the power structure: the People's Liberation Army [PLA]. The PLA, like armies everywhere, tends to be very nationalistic, and the reacquisition of Taiwan is at the top of its wish-list. Consequently, the People's Republic of China leadership has taken a more hardline approach to the Taiwan question than might usually be expected.

Second, many observers—and the Taiwanese officials with whom I have spoken—believe that the leaked information is designed to intimidate the Taiwanese people and their elected officials. The People's Republic of China believes that over the last year the Government of Taiwan, led by President Lee Teng-hui, has been increasing its attempts to raise Taiwan's status in the international arena. They cite increased diplomatic initiatives in Central America and Africa, the visits of President Lee and other high-level officials to countries such as the United States, Canada, and the Czech Republic last summer, and moves to join the U.N. and other international organizations.

The People's Republic of China apparently regards these efforts as an affront to their one-China policy, and a move by Taipei to create two Chinas or one China, one Taiwan. In an effort to stem this rising tide, Beijing has resorted to a number of reactions. The People's Republic of China conducted a series of provocative air-to-air missile tests from July 21 to 26 in an area only 60 kilometers north of Taiwan's Pengchiayu Island. The missiles fired consisted mainly of Dongfeng-31 ICBM's and M-class short-range tactical missiles. At the same time, the PLA mobilized forces in coastal Fujian Province and moved a number of Jian-8 aircraft to the coast. Following those tests, the PLA conducted a second round of similar maneuvers between August 15 and 25. In conjunction with these tests, Taiwan intelligence reported the movement of a number of F-

7 and F-8 long-range bombers and aircraft to bases within 250 nautical miles of Taiwan. There have also been reports that the People's Liberation Army-Air Force has stepped up practicing precision bombing and missile targeting.

It was no accident that the tests were so close to Taiwanese territory, or that they coincided with Taiwan's regional elections. The message to Taiwan was clear: "continue down this road, continue to move forward toward a complete democracy, and we are more than capable of reacquiring you forcibly." This message is similarly timed; it comes very close to Taiwan's first fully democratic elections, scheduled to be held in March.

Third, it appears that the information was intended to send a signal to us in Congress, as well as the administration, that we should rein in our support for Taiwan and its elected leaders, and reconsider any thought of supplying Taiwan with defensive weapons or similar support. It will not surprise anyone here that Congress has been supportive of Taiwan and its people. Since 1949, the citizens of Taiwan have made amazing strides in developing their country both economically and politically. Taiwan has become the world's ninth largest economy; moreover, it has moved from a military authoritarian government to oligarchy to full participatory democracy. That move will be capped in March by the first democratic election of the country's President. Given this progress, I know that many Members of Congress, and the American people, cannot help but feel a bond with the people of that island. It is that bond that worries the People's Republic of China, and which it seeks to stem.

The Chinese Foreign Ministry, through two of its spokesmen, Shen Guofang and Chen Jian, issued a somewhat vague denial of the reports. I would like to take that denial at face value, and indeed the reaction in the military and intelligence circles here has been that the entire issue may be somewhat overblown. I would stress that there is no concrete proof of the allegations but for the news reports. However, as we have seen in the past, sometimes the denials of the Ministry do not match the Government's actions. Just in the unlikely event that this is the case, I'd like to make my position as the chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction clear.

I will agree, to a point, with Beijing's assertions that any eventual reunification of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan is an internal affair for the Chinese people in which other countries should not interfere. But I cannot stress strongly enough my feeling that it is not the People's Republic of China's internal affair alone; it is one for Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Straits to decide. There are 27 million people in Taiwan who have made clear their desire to live in a free and democratic society. It is consequently not

for the People's Republic of China, under the guise of reuniting the motherland to unilaterally dictate the terms, timing, or conditions of that reunification.

The People's Republic of China should make no mistake; I strongly believe that any attempt to establish a military or economic blockade of Taiwan, or other such military threat, will be met with by the most resolute condemnation and reaction on the part of the United States, and indeed the rest of the community of nations. It is my view that actions such as the missile tests and threat of military force will have the exact opposite of their desired outcome. As we have seen, the people of Taiwan did not let themselves be intimidated at the polls by the launching of Dongfeng missiles. I believe that such threats can only serve to make them more resolute in their goals.

Similarly, it is my opinion that such actions can only backfire in regards to their intended effect on the United States. The People's Republic of China would do well to remember the provisions of the joint United States-People's Republic of China communiques, and more importantly of the Taiwan Relations Act. We have stated repeatedly that we expect the future of Taiwan to be settled by peaceful means, and that we consider any move to settle it by other than peaceful means to "be a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States." The Taiwan Relations Act, and the communiques, safeguard our right to sell Taiwan weapons to enable it to protect itself from aggression. If the People's Republic of China continues to threaten Taiwan and its security, then it is not out of the realm of possibility that in reaction the amount and frequency of those arms sales might increase.

In closing Mr. President, while I believe that the reports—especially that in the New York Times—have tended toward the alarmist, I feel it is very important that the People's Republic of China know exactly where I stand on this issue. That is why I have come to the floor today. And similarly, toward that end I call upon the administration to relay our position to Beijing in the clearest and most unequivocal terms.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, for the first time in nearly half a century, we are rapidly approaching the end of the first month of the first year in which American farmers are without a farm bill. To those not directly engaged in agriculture, this fact may be little more than a slightly interesting footnote to a much larger story of deadlock in Washington. Actually, the only people not involved in agriculture are those who don't eat. But to men, women, and families across this Nation whose livelihood comes from the production of food and fiber, this simple fact is keeping them awake at night.