denying the request, a determination was made that the event did not comply with a requirement that all events be relevant to the mission of the Smithsonian and further that the Boy Scouts violated standards of non-discrimination with regards to religion. I have reviewed this determination and reversed it. Scouting is an important American institution that helps in educating young men and women about the outdoors with special emphasis on protection of the environment, a mission relevant to and shared by the National Zoo.

Further, as I mentioned in our meeting, I believe that our Special Events Policy clearly allows the sponsorship of events by all groups, including religious groups, that are consistent with the mission and tradition of the Smithsonian. This event certainly complied with that standard and its denial on that ground was in error.

The Smithsonian and the Scouts have over the years jointly sponsored many events too numerous to mention here. I apologize for this unfortunate mistake and look forward to continuing our long standing and mutually productive relationship with the Boy and Girl Scouts of America.

Sincerely,

I. MICHAEL HEYMAN,
Secretary.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, 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.)

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 19, 1997 he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 910. An act to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act 1997 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 1199. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding income protection allowances for certain students; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1200. A bill to provide that countries receiving foreign assistance be conducive to United States business; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. Con. Res. 53. A concurrent resolution commending Dr. Jason C. Hu, Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 1199. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding income protection allowances for certain students; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE WORKING STUDENTS' INCOME PROTECTION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Working Students' Income Protection Act, a bill to increase the number of working students who are eligible for Federal Pell grants. I am pleased to have Senator SNOWE, Senator HOLLINGS, and Senator ROBB as cosponsors.

This bill will correct a problem created by the 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act that unfairly denies aid to hundreds of thousands of deserving students. Let me explain the problem.

The formula used to determine the eligibility for Federal financial aid includes an income protection allowance, known as an IPA, which enables working students to retain a portion of their earnings to pay their basic living expenses. This allowance is not counted in determining eligibility for student aid. A portion of earnings above the IPA is used to calculate the contributions students can make to their education expenses. As students' incomes rise above the IPA, their eligibility for Federal student aid, especially for Pell grants, declines.

The 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act dramatically and drastically lowered the income protection allowances. For single students, financially independent of their families, the IPA was reduced from $6,400 to $3,000. The IPA for working dependent students was lowered from $4,250 to $1,750. As a result, the amount a typical independent student can receive under the Pell Grant Program begins to decline when his or her income exceeds $3,000, and the student becomes completely ineligible at an income level of $10,000.

Because of this decrease in IPA's, the number of independent students receiving Pell grants declined from over a million in 1992 to about 750,000 in 1993—a loss of over a quarter of a million grants to independent working students.

This change has three unfortunate consequences:

First, many nontraditional students are not able to pursue post-secondary education. Typically these are older individuals with jobs who are attempting to improve their skills. Because the IPA is not enough to meet living expenses, independent students find themselves unable to pay tuition and meet their basic living expenses. They are forced to defer or even forgo higher education.

Second, the current law creates a disincentive to work. If a student knows that earning more than $3,000 will reduce the size of his or her Pell grant award, the student can easily conclude that there is no reason to try to earn more than $3,000 a year.

Third, it penalizes students who are trying to pay for their education through work rather than by borrowing. This is particularly unfair to the almost 75 percent of dependent undergraduates who are working while studying to pay college expenses. When earnings result in lower grants, these students must turn to larger loans to finance their education.

The Working Students' Income Protection Act will make great strides toward correcting these problems. It will allow single independent students to retain $6,000 of their earnings for basic living expenses, married working independent students to retain $9,000, and working dependent students to retain $4,200 before they begin to loose their Pell grants. This will not only make higher education more affordable for these students, it will also encourage and reward work, a worthwhile objective.

Moreover, these changes will correct an injustice by providing benefits to a segment of the student population that has been largely overlooked by the changes in student aid recently passed or currently under consideration. Increasing Pell grants by $300, for example, a move that I strongly support, which was included in the budget agreement, will not help the working students who are ineligible for these grants because of the inadequate level of the current IPA. Similarly, the tuition tax credit will not help them because they are not earning enough to pay taxes. By increasing the IPA, these students will be able to share in the government assistance available to those seeking to pursue a higher education.

I would like to give you some examples from the University of Southern Maine, a State-supported institution serving 10,000 students. These students have an average age of just under 30 years. They are largely independent students and they are balancing jobs, school, and often family responsibilities. When these students have incomes above the IPA, which they must have to survive, they are not eligible for Pell grants under the current law. Let me describe two of these students to you.

Both are single students. The first is a 25-year-old junior recreation therapy

major. She has worked as a nurses aide since graduating from high school, and she continues to work full time during the summers and part time during the school year. The second is a 31-year-old social work major. He works year round in a variety of part-time restaurant and clerical jobs. Both have total gross earnings of about $15,000 per year.

The current income protection allowance permits each of these students to retain only $3,000 for basic living expenses. It assumes that the remainder is available for calculating the family contribution toward educational expenses. The Working Students' Income Protection Act will allow each of these students to retain $6,000 for basic living expenses and will restore their eligibility for Pell grants. It will allow them to complete their education without incurring significant amounts of debt.

The president of the University of Southern Maine, Richard Pattenaude, has often noted that the mission of a public university is to help people of diverse backgrounds achieve their goals. These citizens, including recent high school graduates, adult learners with jobs and families, and single parents, all come to us, he says,

> With dreams of becoming more than they are. I am always moved and inspired by how hard our students work to realize those dreams and how deeply they care about their educations. These students underscore the significance of maintaining support for higher education if we are to enter the 21st century with an educational system ready to meet the needs and challenges of the people we serve.

By increasing the income protection allowance, the Working Students' Income Protection Act will take a major step toward meeting this challenge by helping working students afford college and encouraging them to pursue higher education.

Later in this Congress, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, whose chairman is here today, will mark up the Higher Education Act reauthorization legislation. It is my hope that this legislation will be incorporated into the committee's bill.

Enacting this modest change will make a significant and positive change in the lives of thousands and thousands of students in the United States I urge my colleagues to show their support by cosponsoring this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the American Council of Education on behalf of seven higher education associations which support this bill be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1997.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: The higher education associations listed below, representing the nation's 3,700 colleges and universities, strongly support the legislation you are sponsoring to correct current inequities in the need analysis formula for the Pell Grant program. Your legislation parallels the reauthorization proposal we have advanced to reinstate or expand eligibility for single independent students and for dependent students who work.

A broad-based consensus exists among students, campus officials, and higher education policy analysts, as well as the Clinton administration and many members of Congress, that the 1992 Higher Education Act (HEA) amendments made it overly difficult for single, independent students and dependent students with earnings to receive Pell Grants. These changes were felt immediately and had a substantial, negative impact on access to higher education. For example, at least 200,000 single independent students lost their Pell Grants as a result of these changes in the first year they were implemented.

For a number of years, the cost of providing greater grant access for these extremely needy students has been cited as a reason against acting to assist them. However, the President has requested funds for this purpose this year, and the House Appropriations committee has included funds that will make a substantial contribution toward addressing this problem in its version of the FY 1998 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. Securing these funds, along with passage of authorizing legislation such as yours to permit the funds to be spent, will provide tremendous relief and benefit to students on campuses across the country.

Again, we are grateful for your leadership on this important issue. Prompt consideration and passage of your bill immediately following the August recess will pave the way for appropriations to follow, enabling students and their families to make financial plans for the next academic year. We are eager to assist you in any way to secure passage of your legislation.

Sincerely,

STANLEY O. IKENBERRY,
President.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1200. A bill to provide that countries receiving foreign assistance be conducive to U.S. business; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, many of my colleagues and I have received complaints from constituent companies, or from constituents who are affiliated with companies, which are encountering unfair and illegal business practices in other countries. What is especially disturbing is that many of these countries are receiving significant amounts of U.S. foreign assistance.

Ukraine, for example, is the fourth largest recipient of United States foreign aid, receiving approximately $228 million in 1997. Yet, despite this generous U.S. assistance, corrupt government officials cheat and threaten U.S. businesses and investors.

In March of this year, the Motorola Corp. pulled out of a $500 million investment because of arbitrary decisions made by powerful bureaucrats. News reports indicated that Motorola's decision came less than 2 weeks after the consortium it was leading was selected as one of three winners in a tight competition to install cellular phone networks in that country. As reported, the government kept changing the rules up to the last minute which drove Motorola to its startling decision to pull out. The Wall Street Journal called Motorola's experience ''a case study of the pitfalls faced by investors in Ukraine.

The Foreign Operations Subcommittee of which I am a member held a hearing on May 6 regarding the Ukraine, Russia, and the New Independent States. The hearing considered the administration's request for millions of dollars in new funding for these countries. A number of subcommittee members and I raised with the witnesses specific examples of United States companies and American investors who are victims of corruption and dishonesty by the Ukrainian Government.

I would like to take a minute and highlight some statements made by AID Assistant Administrator Thomas Dine at that hearing which underscore how serious the situation is in the Ukraine. Mr. Dine testified that ''there are real problems in the Ukraine. The perceived level of official and unofficial corruption is pervasive and deep.'' He also testified that ''the Deputy Prime Minister, the country's leading reformer, recently resigned.'' And, ''major and small U.S. companies, faced with harassment, intimidation, and bribery are leaving the country.'' Mr. Dine further testified that ''we cannot expect American investors to do business in Ukraine or any of the NIS countries if they are not going to be treated fairly.'' I fully agree with this last statement, and believe we in Congress should act to ensure American investors are treated fairly, especially in those countries which are receiving millions in American tax dollars.

Corruption is a major problem for companies around the world. The World Bank recently surveyed international executives who identified corruption as the biggest problem they face in doing business in Latin America, the Caribbean, and sub-Saharan Africa.

And, we have seen disturbing news reports of the extent of corruption and illegal practices which are adversely affecting U.S. businesses abroad. A New York Times article of May 24, 1997, cited a Commerce Department finding that U.S. companies lost approximately $11 billion in contracts since mid-1994 because of bribery by their foreign competitors of foreign officials. And, this staggering loss is attributed only to those high-profile cases which were identified. Another report cited in the June 2, 1997, Economist Intelligence Unit, cited a loss of $45 billion to American companies because of corruption.

How many more millions of dollars have U.S. companies lost because of corrupt practices by foreign officials?

Mr. President, corruption in foreign countries hurts the U.S. economy. Trade with foreign countries creates and supports American jobs. Trade helps keep prices low, provides a greater selection of goods, and creates a larger market in which American companies can sell their products. Corruption limits the possibilities for U.S. investment and exports. It increases the risk and costs of doing business to the detriment of U.S. businesses and consumers.

Some important steps are being taken on the international scene. In May 1997, the 29 member nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], which is composed of the world's largest industrialized nations, reached an agreement to fight corruption. This agreement is the first international accord which makes it a crime to bribe foreign officials.

And, on July 31, the International Monetary Fund decided to end its $216 million loan agreement with Kenya because of corruption and governmental mismanagement in that country.

But, more needs to be done.

The United States, in effect, is subsidizing other countries which are harassing U.S. companies and American investors abroad. This is unfair to U.S. businesses and unfair to U.S. taxpayers. And, this practice should stop.

That is why I am introducing today the International Anti-Corruption Act of 1997. This legislation requires the State Department to submit a report and the President to certify by March 1 of each year that countries which are receiving U.S. foreign aid are, in fact, conducive to American businesses and investors. If a country is found to be hostile to American businesses, its aid from the United States would be cut off.

The certification would be based on whether a country is making significant progress in, and is committed to, economic reform aimed at stemming corruption. The specific factors of economic reform which the State Department would consider include: market principles, private ownership, equitable treatment of foreign private investment, adoption of a legal and policy framework necessary for such reform, protection of intellectual property rights, and respect for contracts. The certification also would determine whether that country is making significant progress to eliminate corrupt trade practices and become integrated into the world economy.

Based on the State Department's findings, the countries would be assigned to one of three categories regarding their business climate: Conducive for U.S. business; not conducive to U.S. business; or hostile to U.S. business.

If the President certifies that a country is hostile to U.S. businesses and investors, the U.S. Government would immediately cut off foreign aid to that country. The United States also would vote against any loans to this country in the multilateral development banks. The aid would remain suspended until the President certifies the country is making significant progress in implementing the specified economic indicators and is no longer hostile to U.S. business.

If the President certifies that a country's business climate is not conducive for U.S. businesses, that country will, in effect, be put on probation. The country would continue to receive U.S. foreign aid through the end of the fiscal year, but aid would be cut off on the first day of the next fiscal year unless the President certifies the country is making significant progress in implementing the specified economic indicators and is committed to being conducive to U.S. business.

This probationary period is similar to the one in S. 457, which I introduced on March 19, 1997, regarding the drug certification process. This new approach would provide a specific time period during which the country on probationary certification would be expected to comply with certain conditions stipulated by the administration. If these conditions were not met at the end of this period, the United States would act firmly and cut off aid.

I initially designed this alternative to put countries on notice that the United States had serious concerns about their lack of cooperation. But, I also wanted to provide a fair period of time during which those countries could address U.S. concerns.

I included the probationary period in the bill I am introducing today for those countries which fall in the ''not conducive for U.S. businesses'' category, because I believe it is important to provide adequate notice to these countries which may have important ties to the United States. And, access to more timely and specific information during this probationary period would assist Congress in exercising its legislative and oversight responsibilities.

The third category applies when the President certifies a country is conducive to U.S. businesses. Foreign aid continues without interruption.

My bill includes the customary waiver authority where the national interests of the United States are at stake. For countries certified as hostile to or not conducive for U.S. business, aid can continue if the President determines it is in the national security interest of the United States. However, the determination expires after 6 months unless the President determines its continuation is important to our national security interest.

The bill also contains a provision which would allow aid to continue to meet urgent humanitarian needs, including food, medicine, disaster and refugee relief; to support democratic political reform and rule of law activities; to create private sector and nongovernmental organizations that are independent of government control; or to develop a free market economic system.

Finally, the bill directs the Commerce Department to establish a corruption hotline. Through this toll-free number, U.S. businesses and investors will be able to report unfair and illegal practices they are encountering in foreign countries. The Commerce Department would use that information in its investigations and would pass the information along to the State Department to be included in its annual report.

At a time when we are working to balance the Federal budget and make tough spending choices here at home, we can no longer tolerate or afford to have our Government misdirect U.S. foreign assistance to corrupt countries, especially countries harassing American investors.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill I am introducing today to fight corruption, protect American investors and businesses abroad, and improve the allocation of U.S. foreign aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''International Anti-Corruption Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPORT AND CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees a certification described in paragraph (2) and a report for each country that received foreign assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 during the fiscal year. The report shall describe the extent to which each such country is making progress with respect to the following economic indicators:

(A) Implementation of comprehensive economic reform, based on market principles, private ownership, equitable treatment of foreign private investment, adoption of a legal and policy framework necessary for such reform, protection of intellectual property rights, and respect for contracts.

(B) Elimination of corrupt trade practices by private persons and government officials.

(C) Moving toward integration into the world economy.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in this paragraph means a certification as to whether, based on the economic indicators described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), each country is—

(A) conducive to United States business;

(B) not conducive to United States business; or

(C) hostile to United States business.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—

(1) COUNTRIES HOSTILE TO UNITED STATES BUSINESS.—

(A) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Beginning on the date the certification described in subsection (a) is submitted—

(i) none of the funds made available for assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including unobligated balances of prior appropriations) may be made

available for the government of a country that is certified as hostile to United States business pursuant to such subsection (a); and

(ii) the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each multilateral development bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of such institution to or by any country with respect to which a certification described in clause (i) has been made.

(B) DURATION OF LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the limitations described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to a country that is certified as hostile to United States business pursuant to subsection (a) until the President certifies to the appropriate committees that the country is making significant progress in implementing the economic indicators described in subsection (a)(1) and is no longer hostile to United States business.

(2) COUNTRIES NOT CONDUCIVE TO UNITED STATES BUSINESS.—

(A) PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—A country that is certified as not conducive to United States business pursuant to subsection (a), shall be considered to be on probation beginning on the date of such certification.

(B) REQUIRED IMPROVEMENT.—Unless the President certifies to the appropriate committees that the country is making significant progress in implementing the economic indicators described in subsection (a) and is committed to being conducive to United States business, beginning on the first day of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which a country is certified as not conducive to United States business pursuant to subsection (a)(2)—

(i) none of the funds made available for assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including unobligated balances of prior appropriations) may be made available for the government of such country; and

(ii) the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each multilateral development bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of such institution to or by any country with respect to which a certification described in subparagraph (A) has been made.

(C) DURATION OF LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the limitations described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B) shall apply with respect to a country that is certified as not conducive to United States business pursuant to subsection (a) until the President certifies to the appropriate committees that the country is making significant progress in implementing the economic indicators described in subsection (a)(1) and is conducive to United States business.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) NATIONAL SECURITY INTEREST.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to a country described in subsection (b)(1) or (2) if the President determines with respect to such country that making such funds available is important to the national security interest of the United States. Any such determination shall cease to be effective 6 months after being made unless the President determines that it continuation is important to the national security interest of the United States.

(2) OTHER EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to—

(A) assistance to meet urgent humanitarian needs (including providing food, medicine, disaster, and refugee relief);

(B) democratic political reform and rule of law activities;

(C) the creation of private sector and nongovernmental organizations that are independent of government control; and

(D) the development of a free market economic system.

SEC. 3. TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

The Secretary of Commerce shall make available a toll-free telephone number for reporting by members of the public and United States businesses on the progress that countries receiving foreign assistance are making in implementing the economic indicators described in section 2(a)(1). The information obtained from the toll-free telephone reporting shall be included in the report required by section 2(a).

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE.—The term ''appropriate committees'' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANK.—The term ''multilateral development bank'' means the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 484

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a pediatric research initiative.

S. 1008

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1008, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the tax incentives for alcohol used as a fuel shall be extended as part of any extension of fuel tax rates.

AMENDMENT NO. 1137

At the request of Mr. HARKIN the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1137 proposed to S. 830, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1139

At the request of Mr. DURBIN the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1139 proposed to S. 830, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1140

At the request of Mr. DURBIN the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1140 proposed to S. 830, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 53—COMMENDING THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 53

Whereas Dr. Jason C. Hu has served with distinction as Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) since June 1996, and has ably represented the interests of the Republic of China on Taiwan;

Whereas Dr. Hu has been a firm and consistent advocate of democratic principles throughout his distinguished career;

Whereas Dr. Hu has established many deep friendships with Members of Congress and other Americans during his tenure in Washington; and

Whereas Dr. Hu has been asked to return to Taiwan to serve as the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress hereby—

(1) commends Dr. Jason C. Hu for his service as Representative of the TECRO office; and

(2) expresses to Dr. Hu and his family its best wishes for his continued success in the future.

COMMEMORATING REPRESENTATIVE JASON HU OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a Senate resolution to commemorate Representative Hu of the Republic of China for his outstanding service as the head of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office [TECRO] here in Washington, DC. President Lee Teng-hui has called Dr. Hu back to Taiwan to serve as the Minister of Foreign Affairs. This new appointment is a tremendous honor, and I am sure that he will serve his government as ably as Foreign Minister as he has done in Washington, and in his other previous posts.

Serving Taiwan so well here in Washington, DC, has been no easy task. Dr. Hu must balance the needs of Taiwan with the difficult dynamics associated with the issues surrounding the Republic of China. Maintaining stability and peace in Southeast Asia while promoting democracy and strengthening our ties with our allies should be a top priority for both our governments.

I have spoken often on the floor of the United States Senate regarding numerous issues including our commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act, Taiwan's bid to enter the World Trade Organization, President Lee's visit to