

Mr. President, I realize that this is an especially sensitive time in Sino-American relations, and that this is not the only thorny issue with which we are presently grappling. Human rights issues, trade barriers, Taiwan, the proliferation of weapons to such rogue nations as Iran all complicate our relationship. What's more, with an ailing Deng Xiaoping apparently no longer in complete control of the party or the government, and the hold of Jiang Zemin and Li Peng on the reins of power less than firm, we face a possibility that taking a strong stand on any of these issues with the Chinese could aid in bringing in power reactionary hardliners inimical to a beneficial relationship between our two countries.

Despite this concern, I believe that the time has come to take a firm stand with the PRC on this issue. In the 1960's, Mao Zedong was fond of referring to the United States as a "paper tiger," a fierce countenance but no substance to back it up. In Wyoming we'd say "all bark and no bite." In my view we have, unfortunately, all too often lived up to that assessment. It is hardly in our own interest to be perceived as a paper tiger on this issue. Intellectual property is one of the fastest growing areas of the world economy. The PRC is not the only country we are having this problem with: Brazil, India, and others are sources for concern with the USTR. By taking a firm position now with the Chinese, I believe we help head off similar problems elsewhere in the future.

While I will be the first to acknowledge the importance and desirability of a strong relationship—both diplomatically and economically—with the PRC, such a relationship should not be built at the expense of America's businesses, or America's reputation for resolve. This administration, I believe, has been too quick to hold us hostage in the present in favor of the mere expectancy of an economic benefit in the future.

Later this week, I will be meeting with Ambassador Li Daoyu. While I intend to reaffirm with him our desire to maintain a strong relationship with Beijing, I also hope to discuss the importance of resolving this issue before advances can be made on other fronts. I support free trade, as long as it is fair trade. In my view, a failure on the part of the PRC to do so would indicate to me they do not desire a level playing field. Consequently, I would be hard pressed to continue to support the present trade relationship with the PRC.

Mr. President, the Chinese have a saying: "Either the East Wind prevails over the West Wind, or the West Wind prevails over the East Wind." It seems to me, though, that we should both strive for that preferred state where neither wind blows: Calm.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I doubt that there have been many, if any, candidates for the Senate who have not pledged to do something about the enormous Federal debt run up by the Congress during the past half-century or more. But Congress, both House and Senate, have never up to now even toned down the deficit spending that sent the Federal debt into the stratosphere and beyond.

We must pray that this year will be different, that Federal spending will at long last be reduced drastically. Indeed, if we care about America's future, there must be some changes.

You see, Mr. President, as of the close of business Friday, February 3, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,804,726,503,001.28. This means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,238.82 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

Compare this, Mr. President, to the total debt a little over 2 years ago—January 5, 1993—when the debt stood at exactly \$4,167,872,986,583.67—or averaged out, \$15,986.56 for every American. During the past 2 years—that is, during the 103d Congress—the Federal debt increased over \$600 billion.

This illustrates, Mr. President, the point that so many politicians talk a good game, at home, about bringing the Federal debt under control, but vote in support of bloated spending bills when they get back to Washington. If the Republicans do not do a better job of getting a handle on this enormous debt, their constituents are not likely to overlook it 2 years hence.

COMMENDING THE CHOIR OF ST. OLAF COLLEGE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the St. Olaf Choir, from St. Olaf College in Northfield, MN, and welcome its members to Washington, DC.

For more than three-quarters of a century—since 1912—the St. Olaf Choir has been Minnesota's musical ambassador, performing concerts in the United States, Europe, and Asia that have earned it a reputation for artistic excellence and have brought these talented young people international acclaim.

During its 83-year history, the St. Olaf Choir has garnered a considerable list of achievements. In 1970 and 1972, it became the only college choral group ever invited to perform at the world-renowned Strasbourg International Music Festival in France; it was one of only five choirs to sing at the 1986 Olympic Arts Festival in Seoul, South Korea; and the St. Olaf Choir celebrated its 75th anniversary season with a month-long tour of Japan, Taiwan, and the People's Republic of China.

Under the direction of Anton E. Armstrong, the St. Olaf Choir is performing

this week at Washington's Kennedy Center. I welcome them to our Nation's Capital, and I thank the St. Olaf College Choir, its students, and instructors for serving as Minnesota's musical voice to the world.

LANETT'S CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the recent 100 year birthday of Lanett, AL, a small textile city located on the bluffs of the Chattahoochee River in Chambers County. Lanett—named for Mr. Lafayette Lanier, an early councilman and president of West Point Manufacturing Co., and Mr. Theodore Bennett, a Bostonian who served as the selling agent for West Point Manufacturing Co.—is a town rich with history.

On December 7, 1865, the Alabama Legislature convened in general assembly and passed the act of incorporation for the town of Bluffton, AL. Twenty-eight years later, a new charter was sought. Bluffton had grown, and the citizens of the town deemed it appropriate to change the town's name. On February 1, 1895, a charter for the newly named town of Lanett was approved by the State legislature.

The new charter provided means by which the town clerk could assess taxes and sell property of delinquent taxpayers after a proper notification. Police were given jurisdiction over areas 1 mile beyond the town boundaries. Road and street work, which previously was demanded of every male over the age of 18, could now be exempted upon payment of a \$3-a-year street tax.

The city of Lanett struggled in its infancy for financial survival. Early records show the city had to borrow money at 8 percent interest in order to pay its bills. Happily, in the year of 1902, the treasurer reported for the first time that income exceeded the town's debts and that there was even a balance on hand at year's end.

Other problems beset the first few years of Lanett. The smallpox epidemic of 1903 had a grave impact on the city. Dr. S.H. Newman was paid \$10 a year by the city to treat the patients. After a long bout with this disease, a fumigation and vaccination program was begun.

The city of Lanett has come a long way over the past 100 years. Today, it is a healthy city of over 9,000 residents. It owns and operates its own electrical, natural gas, water, an sewage treatment systems. It has a street department and collects its own garbage. Furthermore, it has one of the most modern police, fire and emergency medical service departments in the State. As you can see, Mr. President, Lanett has a lot going for it.

The centennial celebration committee has chosen as its theme, "Remembering the past as we prepare for the future." Mr. President, I believe that

Lanett, AL, is evidence that small town America is alive and well.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER: IT MUST BE RESTORED

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate, since the inception of the 104th Congress, has thus far participated in two significant debates. The first determined the role of the Federal Government in the affairs of the States; and the second will decide whether, after decades of insane spending of the American taxpayers' money, the U.S. Congress will finally get around to controlling itself with a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

All of us should recognize the importance of these significant issues. Certainly, I do. However, one wonders whether liberal politicians, who time after time have beaten back attempts to restore moral and spiritual principles to our society, are not content for Congress to focus its attention on the Nation's economic woes while spiritual issues—for example, protecting unborn life and restoring school prayer—are being sidetracked with harsh rhetoric such as extreme, worthless, and insignificant.

Mr. President, lest our leftward-tilted friends become too satisfied with the neglect of religious and spiritual values in America, they should be reminded of what our Nation's first President acknowledged—and what so many in Congress have disregarded—that our Nation's material and spiritual wealth is bestowed by the Creator only when we seek His guidance in our Nation's affairs. George Washington stated:

* * * the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation which disregards the eternal rules of order and right which heaven itself has ordained.

Mr. President, in 1962, the Supreme Court forfeited by judicial fiat the rights of millions of American children to invoke in their schools the blessings and guidance of God. Consequently, this act begat a popular culture, the values, discipline, and moral standards of which are devoid of God and laden with relativism. A greater crime against our children could hardly be conceived.

Today, all of us should take note of the desperate need to return to our Nation's children their constitutional right to voluntary prayer in the public schools. In this regard, a guest column published by the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer and authored by Dr. Norman Geisler, dean of Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte, NC, is very worthy of broad consideration. Dr. Geisler titled it "10 Reasons for Voluntary School Prayer."

Dr. Geisler is a foremost theologian as evidenced by his impressive catalog of degrees and achievements. He has lectured and traveled in 50 States and 24 countries on 6 continents. Dr. Geisler has been honored and listed in many leading publications including

"The Who's Who in Religion," "The Writer's Who's Who," and "Men of Achievement." He has authored or co-authored 45 books on a wide range of social, moral, and religious issues.

Mr. President, I fervently hope that all Senators will spend a few minutes reading Dr. Geisler's convincing defense of the right of children to pray in public schools. His defense of one of our Founding Father's rule(s) of heaven has never been more needed nor more eloquently stated.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the January 30 guest column in the Charlotte Observer, "10 Reasons for Voluntary School Prayer," be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Jan. 30, 1995]

10 REASONS FOR VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

(By Norman L. Geisler)

There are many good reasons for a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in the public schools. Ten come to mind.

1. Our government was based on religious principles from the very beginning: The Declaration of Independence says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by God with certain unalienable rights . . ." Indeed, it speaks of God, creation, God-given moral rights, the providence of God, and a final Day of Judgment—all of which are religious teachings. Indeed, the Supreme Court affirmed (Zorach, 1952) that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." And school prayer has been an important part of our religious experience from the very beginning.

2. The First Amendment does not separate God and government but actually encourages religion. It reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The first clause merely declares that the federal government cannot establish one religion for all the people. It says nothing about "separation of church and state." In fact, five of the 13 states that ratified it had their own state religions at the time. The second clause insists that the government should do nothing to discourage religion. But forbidding prayer in schools discourages religion.

3. Early congressional actions encouraged religion in public schools. For example, the Northwest Treaty (1787 and 1789) declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of learning shall forever be encouraged." Thus, religion, which includes prayer, was deemed to be necessary.

PRESIDENTS ENCOURAGED PRAYER

4. Early presidents, with congressional approval, made proclamations encouraging public prayer. President Washington on Oct. 3, 1789, declared: "Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favour, and Whereas both Houses of Congress have, by their joint committee, requested me 'to recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer. . . .'"

5. Congress has prayed at the opening of every session since the very beginning. Indeed, in a moment of crisis at the very first Continental Congress Benjamin Franklin urged prayer and observed that "In the beginning of the Contest with G. Britain, when we were sensible to danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection.—

Our prayers, Sir, were heard, & they were graciously answered. . . . And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? . . . I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayer imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessing on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service." Congress has begun with prayer ever since. If the government can pray in their session, why can't the governed pray in their (school) sessions?

6. Public schools had prayer for nearly 200 years before the Supreme Court ruled that state-mandated class prayers were unconstitutional (Engel, 1962). The fact that prayer was practiced for nearly 200 years establishes it by precedent as a valid and beneficial practice in our schools.

7. Since the court outlawed prayer, the nation has been in steady moral decline. Former Secretary of Education William Bennett revealed in his cultural indexes that between 1960 and 1990 there was a steady moral decline. During this period divorce doubled, teenage pregnancy went up 200%, teen suicide increased 300%, child abuse reached an all-time high, violent crime went up 500% and abortion increased 1000%. There is a strong correlation between the expulsion of prayer from our schools and the decline in morality.

8. Morals must be taught, and they cannot properly be taught without religion. There cannot be a moral law without a moral Law Giver. And there is no motivation for keeping the moral law unless there is a moral Law Giver who can enforce it by rewards and punishments.

SECULAR HUMANISM ESTABLISHED

9. Forbidding prayer and other religious expressions in public schools establishes, in effect, the religion of secularism.

The Supreme Court has affirmed that there are religions, such as "secular humanism," which do not believe in God (Torcaso, 1961). Justice Potter (Abington, 1963) rightly feared that purging the schools of all religious beliefs and practices would lead to the "establishment of a religion of secularism." In fact, the beliefs of secular humanism are just the opposite of the Declaration of Independence. By not allowing theistic religious expressions, the courts have favored the religious beliefs of secular humanism, namely, no belief in God, God-given moral laws, prayer and a Day of Judgment.

10. To forbid the majority the right to pray because the minority object, is to impose the irreligion of the minority on the religious majority. Forbidding prayer in schools, which a three-quarters majority of Americans favors, is the tyranny of the minority. It is minority rule, not democracy. Why should an irreligious minority dictate what the majority can do? The majority wishes to preserve our moral and spiritual values and, thus, our good nation.

"MEET THE PRESS"—FEBRUARY 5, 1995

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC News program, "Meet the Press," of yesterday, Sunday, February 5, 1995, be printed in the RECORD. The guests were Senator BOB DOLE, Senate majority leader, and Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. The moderator was Tim Russert of NBC, with panelists Robert Novak, of the Chicago Sun-Times, and