the rigorous academic standards of its courses.

I wish to congratulate all those who have had a partnership in the growth of Concordia College, its faculty, staff, and students. I would also like to mention the outstanding leadership of Concordia's president, Charles E. Schlimpert, its Board of Regents and the Concordia College Foundation Board of Directors. The direction they are providing will lead Concordia University into a bright future.

Mr. President, I ask that Concordia University's formal mission statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

MISSION STATEMENT

Concordia University, of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, is a center of higher learning that assists students in their lifelong quests for full realization of spiritual, intellectual, social, physical, relational and emotional development. Professional education, grounded in the liberal arts and enriched by relevant co-curricular activities, will strengthen the Church and world community by encouraging the development of Christian values, and an attitude of service among Concordia University students.●

CONGRATULATING MARTIN C.M. LEE ON RECEIVING THE 1995 INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AWARD BY THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION LITIGATION SECTION

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, tomorrow, in Chicago, the American Bar Association's litigation section will present its 1995 International Human Rights Award to Martin C.M. Lee, the chairman of the Democratic Party in Hong Kong. The award is a high honor which Mr. Lee has earned for his efforts to win full democracy for the people of Hong Kong and to safeguard the rule of law as the territory nears its June 30, 1997, reversion to the People's Republic of China. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my warmest congratulations to Martin Lee and submit for the record an article by former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh which appeared on July 30, 1995, in the Washington Post.

The article is called, ''A Blow to Hong Kong's Future.'' The blow Dick Thornburgh refers to is the recent agreement by Great Britain and the People's Republic of China to set up a new high court for Hong Kong according to terms that violate the 1984 Joint Declaration. The terms, which include restrictions on jurisdiction and limits on foreign common law judges, have dealt a powerful blow to the colony's long tradition of judicial independence. Dick Thornburgh's article reports that the Hong Kong Government of Chris Patten has criticized the American Bar Association for bestowing its award on Mr. Lee. As the article says, the Hong Kong Government is disturbed that ''Lee, one of several leading lights in the democratic community, has been calling the court deal what it is: A sellout.''

China has made the future of Hong Kong's democrats painfully clear by announcing its intention to abolish Hong Kong's Legislative Council [Legco], abrogate the bill of rights ordinance, and destroy the rule of law. Over the next 2 years, we Americans must stand with Martin Lee and his fellow democrats as they stand up for the future, and autonomy they were promised.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1995]

A BLOW TO HONG KONG'S FUTURE

(By Dick Thornburgh)

What government recently denounced an organization that was planning to bestow an international human rights award on its most prominent democrat? No, not Burma. Not Nigeria. It was the British government of Hong Kong, which, although not yet in its final days, is conducting a fire sale of the protections that the rule of law built up over a century.

This month the American Bar Association's litigation section announced it would award Martin Lee, chairman of the Democratic Party of Hong Kong, its 1995 International Human Rights Award at its meeting in Chicago on August 8. A top Hong Kong government official promptly denounced the ABA, and continued the Hong Kong government's mounting attacks on Lee himself.

The Hong Kong government of Chris Patten has reason to be alarmed by the ABA award. It will bring Martin Lee and his criticisms of Great Britain's double-cross of Hong Kong to the attention not only of the ABA's approximately 350,000 members but to all Americans distressed by China's arrest of American activist Harry Wu, and the PRC's long record of human rights abuses.

Less than two years from now, Hong Kong will be transferred to the PRC under the terms of the Sino-British Joint Declaration. Under that 1984 agreement, both Great Britain and China pledged Hong Kong would thrive under an arrangement Deng Xiaoping called ''one country, two systems.'' Since then, however, China has reneged on virtually every one of its commitments, pledging to abolish the Legislative Council (Legco) and abrogate the bill of rights ordinance, and seeking to destroy the rule of law. The British Hong Kong government has stood by and done nothing.

In early June, the Hong Kong government signaled its final retreat. British and PRC negotiators cut a deal on the Court of Final Appeal, the new court needed to replace London's Privy Council as Hong Kong's high court. The deal violates the Joint Declaration in a number of respects, including restricting the number of foreign common law judges on the bench. Such judges have contributed to Hong Kong's highly regarded judiciary, and they will be crucial to the court's ability to resist PRC interference.

The deal also injects the future Beijing-appointed chief executive into the judicial selection process, another break with tradition. Most important, the British capitulated to Beijing on the court's jurisdiction. The court may not rule on acts of state ''such as'' defense and foreign affairs. These two words, to be interpreted by a party organ in Beijing, could prevent the court from hearing virtually anything Beijing chooses, including challenges to state power.

Finally, British and the PRC agreed not to set up the court until July 1, 1997, despite previous agreement to get it up and running much earlier. British appointees and pro-China members approved legislation establishing the court as proposed on July 26.

So why is the Hong Kong government so worked up over the award to Lee? Lee, one of several leading lights in Hong Kong's democratic community, has been calling the court deal what is a sellout. After building up a successful law practice and chairing the Hong Kong Bar Association, he entered politics in 1985, becoming the legal community's first representative in Legco through the government's byzantine ''functional constituencies'' system. These Legco members are chosen by tiny franchises representing business and professional groups such as real estate developers and bankers.

In Hong Kong's first-ever democratic elections in 1991, Lee won the most votes of any candidate, while pro-democracy candidates overall took 17 of 18 democratically selected seats. Lee, his Democratic Party and independent democrats are expected to outpoll pro-China candidates for the 20 seats open in elections this Sept. 17, the last elections before the PRC takeover. (The increase in democratic seats from 18 to 20 was the centerpiece of Patten's highly touted 1994 reform package.) China has pledged to abolish Legco, and recently announced that it will set up a parallel, appointed legislature well before 1997.

Beijing already had its sights on Lee—having ejected him from a committee to draft Hong Kong's so-called ''mini-constitution'' for supporting the demonstrators at Tianamen Square. Lee is a thorn in Governor Patten's side. And he will be a thorn in China's side. Unless something changes, we can all look forward to the time, a few years on, when Beijing in turn denounces an organization for bestowing a human rights award on Martin Lee.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1995

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m., on Tuesday, August 8, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately resume consideration of H.R. 4, the welfare reform bill, status quo until the hour of 12:30 p.m.; I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Also, on behalf of the leader, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the welfare bill tomorrow at 9 a.m., status quo until the hour of 12:30. Rollcall votes can be expected to occur during Tuesday's session of the Senate, possibly in relation to the welfare reform bill or the Department of Defense authorization bill. All Members should expect a late night session on Tuesday in order to make progress on both of those bills.