

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