

sistent, comprehensive China policy that helps China get on the right track without turning it into an enemy. That is a moral obligation the leaders owe to America and America's children.

[Rev. Daniel B. Su is from China and now works in the US as the assistant to the president, China Outreach Ministries, Inc., Fairfax, Virginia]

OPEN LETTER ON CHINA'S PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Recently, letters have circulated on Capitol Hill from some groups and leaders involved in missions in China. These letters urge Members not to vote to revoke China's Most-Favored Nation (MFN) trade status. They cite potential dangers to the missions if the U.S. responds to Beijing's terrible record on human rights, national security and workers' rights.

There are points of agreement between us and those missions organizations. We can agree, for example, to put no individual at risk of retaliation. We should take great care in dealing with a regime that has demonstrated its willingness to settle disagreements with tanks and with bullets in the back of the head. We can also agree that those Christians directly involved in work in China are not necessarily the ones to lead the fight against MFN. They may be too close to the situation for prudence or safety to permit open opposition to the regime.

But the letters make other arguments. They suggest that a forceful response by the United States government to what everyone acknowledges is an appalling Chinese government record would be counter-productive. We cannot accept those arguments. As deeply as we respect Christian missionaries in China and throughout the world, we must disagree with a policy which allows China's rulers to manipulate the United States of America simply by threatening reprisals against these innocent, godly people. It is a form of hostage-taking.

For the U.S. to surrender to such threats would be to assure that Beijing will use threats whenever Americans cry out against the cruelty and injustice of the communist Chinese regime. Should we all keep silent about China's massive campaign of forced abortions and compulsory sterilizations? Should we avoid criticizing China's use of slave labor in the Laogai? Should we turn aside from China's latest violations of chemical weapons agreements, including shipments to Iran of poison gas? Is the United States truly the leader of the Free World? Or are we merely the "moneybag democracy" the Chinese rulers contemptuously call us?

There is a real danger that the arguments made by some U.S.-based missions may be seized upon by those whose only interest in China is profits. Some multi-national corporations have allowed the brutal Chinese birth control policies to be run in their factories. Some have also accommodated Chinese repression by banning religion in the workplace. And some have exploited prison laborers.

We wholeheartedly support missions throughout the world, and especially in China. We think it's necessary, however, to take a clear-eyed view of the conduct of the Chinese government. While missionaries seek no conflict with the government, the reality is that China's rulers do not view Christians so benignly.

Paul Marshall, in his well-received book "There Blood Cries Out," describes the attitude of China's elites. "In 1992, the Chinese state-run press noted that 'the church played an important role in the change' in Eastern Europe and warned, 'if China does not want such a scene to be repeated in its land, it

must strangle the baby while it is still in the manger."

We are proud to note the consistent and principled stance of the U.S. Catholic Conference in opposing MFN for China. Catholics are brutally repressed in China, as are Evangelicals, Muslims and Buddhists. But the USCC has never allowed Beijing's threats to deter it from its duty to speak up for the oppressed. Nor should we.

We know that we are not on "the front line" in confronting Chinese repression. Because we have a freedom to speak out that is not granted to those on the Mainland, we must use our God-given freedom to speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. When it is argued that the situation will be worsened if America takes action, we must ask candidly, how can it be worse for the Chinese dissidents? Our own State Department reports that all dissidents have been either expelled, jailed or killed.

We rejoice in the fact that American missionaries hold U.S. passports. We pray that a strong United States will help to safeguard our fellow Americans' lives while they do the Lord's work in China. But Chinese Christians are not so protected. For Pastor Wong, leader of 40 Evangelical churches, MFN has brought no benefits. He has been arrested four times for spreading the Gospel. The last time he was jailed, his fingers were broken with pliers. While Vice President Gore was preparing to visit Beijing in March, Chinese secret police invaded the apartment of Roman Catholic Bishop Fan Zhongliang in Shanghai, seizing Bibles and other religious articles. The move against the nation's highest Catholic prelate was clearly intended to intimidate millions of faithful Chinese Catholics. MFN has only made the Chinese police more efficient in denying basic human rights to Bishop Fan and his flock.

President Clinton's 1994 "delinking" of trade and human rights concerns has actually increased repression in China. Now, even if missionaries plant churches, the Chinese secret police can disrupt them. This view is affirmed by New York editor A.M. Rosenthal. He has written:

Knowing Washington would not endanger trade with China, even though it is mountaintop in China's favor, Beijing increased political oppression in China and Tibet—and its sales of missiles, nuclear material and chemical weaponry.

Rosenthal refers to the president as Beijing's "prisoner." Let us assure, by our steadfastness, that the rest of us do not wear such claims.

From the beginning of this debate, we have recognized that the argument over MFN is not just about what kind of country China is, it is also a dispute about what kind of country America is. We believe Americans have a moral obligation to stand up for human rights, for the rule of law and for the rights of workers. We know, from long and tragic experience in this blood-stained century, that a regime which brutalizes its own people is virtually certain to threaten its neighbors.

Sincerely yours,

Gary L. Bauer, President, Family Research Council; Ralph E. Reed, Executive Director, Christian Coalition; Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, President, Institute for Religious and Public Life; Keith A. Fournier, Esq., President, Catholic Alliance; D. James Kennedy, President, Coral Ridge Ministries; Joseph M.C. Kung, President, Cardinal Kung Foundation; James C. Dobson, Ph.D., President, Focus on the Family; Phyllis Schlafly, President, Eagle Forum; Chuck Colson, President, Prison Fellowship Ministries; Gov. Robert P. Casey, Chairman, Campaign for the

American Family; Steve Suits, South Carolina Family Policy Council; William Donohue, President, Catholic League for Civil and Religious Rights. Richard D. Land, President, Christian Life Commission; Steven W. Mosher, President, Population Research Institute; Gerard Bradley, Professor, Notre Dame Law School; John DiIulio, Professor, Princeton University; Robert P. George, Professor, Princeton University; John Davies, President, Free the Fathers; Kent Ostrander, Director, The Family Foundation (KY); Matt Daniels, Executive Director, Massachusetts Family Institute.

Rev. Donald E. Wildmon, President, American Family Association; Deal W. Hudson, Publisher & Editor, Crisis Magazine; Bernard Dobranski, Dean, Columbus Law School; Rev. Steven Snyder, President, International Christian Concern; Ann Buwalda, Director, Jubilee Campaign; P. George Tryfiates, Executive Director, The Family Foundation (VA); Randy Hicks, Executive Director, Georgia Family Council; Marvin L. Munyon, President, Family Research Institute (WI).

William T. Devlin, Executive Director, Philadelphia Family Policy Council; William Held, Executive Director, Oklahoma Family Council; William A. Smith, President, Indiana Family Institute; Thomas McMillen, Executive Director, Rocky Mountain Family Council; Michael Heath, Executive Director, Christian Civic League of Maine; David M. Payne, Executive Director, Kansas Family Research Institute; Gary Palmer, President, Alabama Family Alliance.

Jerry Cox, President, Arkansas Family Council; Dennis Mansfield, Executive Director, Idaho Family Forum; Michael Howden, Executive Director, Oregon Center for Family Policy; William Horn, President, Iowa Family Policy Center; Joseph E. Clark, Executive Director, Illinois Family Institute; John H. Paulton, Executive Director, South Dakota Family Policy Council; Mike Harris, President, Michigan Family Forum.

CENSUS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Washington Times puts the issue of how the 2000 census should be conducted in proper perspective. Considering how many administration departments have been politicized, we cannot risk having possibly millions of Americans disenfranchised because of census sampling. I submit the editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, June 12, 1997]
POLITICS AND CENSUS NUMBERS

After the fiasco involving the Clinton administration's utter politicization of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's last-minute, pre-election blitz last year to enfranchise felons and other likely Democratic-voting immigrants, is there really any wonder why Republicans fear approving this crowd's use of sampling for the 2000 census?

Sadly, New Hampshire Republican Sen. Judd Gregg was not stretching it a bit when he questioned whether Dick Morris would have a role in any population sampling conducted by this administration.

Having politicized everything in sight, from the White House Travel Office to international trade missions at the Commerce Department (which, by the way, also oversees the Census Bureau), President Clinton now criticizes the Republican Congress for "weighing [the disaster-relief bill] down with a political wish list." One provision that upsets Mr. Clinton would prohibit the Census Bureau from employing statistical sampling techniques to adjust the 2000 census, which, among other things, would be used to determine the population of states for the purpose of apportioning congressional seats and distributing federal dollars. For the first time ever, the Clinton administration wants to use sampling to adjust the "actual enumeration" that the Census Bureau obtains in 2000 from mail-in forms and subsequent door-to-door data collections, proposing only to count 90 percent of the population and apply statistical projection to the remaining 10 percent.

Everybody agrees that the census is not accurate. Supplemental research after the 1990 census revealed that about four million people, 1.6 percent of the U.S. population, were not counted. According to that sample, 2.3 percent of Asian-Americans (173,000), 4.4 percent of blacks (1.40 million), 4.5 percent of Native Americans (96,000), 5 percent of Hispanics (1.16 million) and 0.7 percent of non-Hispanic whites (1.33 million) were not counted in 1990. Contrary to popular belief, however, undercounting is as prevalent in rural areas as it is in urban areas. The Clinton administration, backed by the American Statistical Association, the Association of American Geographers and the National Academy of Sciences, argues that the use of sampling would produce the most accurate, cost-efficient census. Even the Census Bureau admits, however, that introducing sampling may simply substitute one type of error for another.

Moreover, even if sampling is more accurate, it addresses neither the political question nor the constitutional question. Politically, potentially two dozen House seats lie in the balance—meaning, for all practical purposes, majority control of the House, its agenda and all the committee and subcommittee chairmanships. Why should a Republican Congress commit political suicide by relinquishing its authority over the census to a hyper-politicized administration that has treated the Census Bureau's parent, the Commerce Department, as the Democratic National Committee's (DNC) soft-money subsidiary? The fact is that the Secretary of Commerce office has been occupied for five years by a who's who of Democratic fund-raisers: former DNC Chairman Ron Brown, California money maven Mickey Kantor and Chicago rainmaker William Daley. Looking for a place to stuff the likes of John Huang, Mr. Clinton appropriately selected Commerce.

This is hardly idle speculation. As the non-partisan Statistical Assessment Service observed recently, "[O]nce the sampling precedent is set, what is to prevent us, in principle, from lowering the actual enumeration from 90 percent to 80 percent or 70 percent or lower? . . . This creates a powerful temptation for the party in power to skew the sampling adjustment its way. The ability to 'create' or 'eliminate' millions of strategically placed citizens with the stroke of a pen introduces a potent and disturbing new political weapon . . . and a dangerous new set of political temptation."

Constitutionally, the Supreme Court only last year (*Department of Commerce v. City*

of New York et al.) confirmed that the Constitution confers wide authority and discretion upon Congress in conducting the census. The Court unanimously ruled that former Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher, by virtue of authority delegated to him by Congress, properly refused to adjust the 1990 census to correct its undercount. Interestingly, the Clinton administration argued on behalf of Mr. Mosbacher's use of the authority Congress had delegated to him. Now, Congress merely seeks to exercise its authority. Moreover, it is by no means certain that the Supreme Court would permit a census to be adjusted by sampling. The Constitution mandates an "actual Enumeration," and last year's Supreme Court decision did not address this issue. As a practical matter, any cost savings from sampling would be overwhelmed by a Supreme Court decision rejecting the practice.

If the Clinton administration has demonstrated it cannot be trusted to process citizenship applications of immigrants properly—heretofore a very nonpolitical undertaking—how can it be remotely trusted not to politicize "a potent and disturbing new political weapon"?

HONORING GREEK-AMERICANS

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a vital, but far too frequently unacknowledged, segment of the American mosaic: Greek-Americans.

In their short existence in this Nation as an ethnic group, they have excelled in every field that they have applied themselves. From business to the arts; from athletics to the media; from public service to education; Greek-Americans have made vital and lasting contributions to America's rich civic life.

The Pancretan Association of America represents a portion of the Greek-American community whose ancestry comes from a historic island of Crete. Throughout history, the people of Crete have valiantly fought to defend their soil, their heritage, religion, and democratic ideals against tyrannical invaders and occupiers.

True to these ideals, Cretan-Americans have proudly served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America, defending the very same principles that have guided their ancestors throughout history.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring these historic Cretan-American veterans. They have fought with courage, honor, and conviction to preserve and defend the ideals that have bound the United States and Greece in a historic partnership for peace, stability, and democratic values.

MOTHER TERESA AND THE GOLD MEDAL

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the pro-

found effect a recent event had on me. As a Roman Catholic serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, my heart swelled with pride when Congress awarded Mother Teresa the Congressional Gold Medal.

The rare ceremony took place in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol on June 5. Without question, it was one of the most powerful events I have ever witnessed.

Of course, one did not have to be Christian to take inspiration of the moment. Believers of many faiths crowded the space to see Mother Teresa, and to be moved by her prayer for the "poorest of the poor."

The Gold Medal is no ordinary recognition. It is the highest honor bestowed by Congress, approved by bill on behalf of the people of the United States.

Leaders of both chambers and parties were on hand as Representative HENRY HYDE described the one he called a living saint. "You believe that every human being, no matter how abandoned, no matter how poor, no matter how 'useless' or 'inconvenient,' * * * is an image of the invisible God, is invested with an innate and inalienable dignity and value, and thus commands our attention, our respect, and our care, and you have poured out your life in the service to that belief."

Indeed, she has. The ministry she founded, the Missionaries of Charity, extends to 120 countries with 568 houses dedicated to the unwanted, the unclothed, and the unfed. In Calcutta alone she and her sisters have provided for the successful adoption of 8,000 children. Of the hundreds of Congressmen and Senators assembled before her, she asked only our prayers for her and her ministry.

"The more we help the poor, the more we honor God," she told us. She thanked America for the parents who have given the "gift of daughters and sons to do the work of missionaries, to serve the poor, to serve Jesus."

Instantly, my mind took me back to February 4, 1994. Mother Teresa was the keynote speaker at the annual National Prayer Breakfast. At my table were legislators from five other States and ambassadors from four foreign countries. Flanked by President Clinton and Vice President GORE, she delivered a speech that rocked Washington.

Amid her discussion of charity and the church's special preference for the poor, she quickly turned the topic, "But, I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child." A grenade of truth tossed into a room full of politicians, her remarks caused 3,000 of us to squirm in unison. I remember it as yesterday.

Then, she returned us to ease with the simplicity of her response. "Each child is created in the special image and likeness of God for greater things—to love and to be loved," she said. "I will tell you something beautiful. We are fighting abortion with adoption."

"Please don't kill the child," she begged. "I want the child. Please give me the child. I am willing to accept any child who would be aborted, and to give that child to a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child." True to her word, her Sisters of Charity have yet to refuse a child, anywhere.

Mother Teresa is a profile in contradiction; a light in the darkness, strength among the weak, courage among fear. Standing at the seat of democracy, in the strongest nation of the world, the terms of secular power—military, economic, and bureaucratic—became tiny by her greatness.