

IN SUPPORT OF THE REPUBLIC OF
CHINA—SENATE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION 9

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, in submitting a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that President Lee Teng-Hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan [ROC] should be allowed a private visit to the United States.

This concurrent resolution makes an important statement in the future direction of United States/Republic of China relations. The State Department's refusal last year to allow President Lee, a freely elected leader from a democratic nation, an overnight layover in Hawaii during his trip to Costa Rica, was very unfortunate. It is hoped that, with the passage of this legislation, the indiscretion that occurred last year will not be repeated. And, Mr. President, it is important to note that this bill expresses support for a private visit to the United States.

Last May I had an opportunity to visit the Republic of China on Taiwan. It was a wonderful experience forging new friendships and strengthening the many ties between the Republic of China and my home State, Idaho. I was very much impressed by the public officials with whom I met and enjoyed the engaging conversations about the politics in the Republic of China and the recent elections.

During my meeting with President Lee Teng-Hui, I learned of his genuine interest in seeing his country play a larger international role, which is a goal befitting Taiwan's economic power and place within the international community. President Lee urged all nations, especially the United States, to give their support to Taiwan's campaign to return to the United Nations. It is my hope that this goal will someday be realized. In addition, President Lee expressed a very sincere desire to travel privately to the United States. I shared with him an invitation extended by one of my constituents, who was concerned about the incident in Hawaii. In addition, I expressed my hope that he would be able to visit Idaho.

Mr. President, Idaho and the Republic of China have enjoyed the mutual benefits of a long and close relationship. During my visit last year I had the pleasure of joining then Governor of Idaho Cecil Andrus and Governor James Soong of the Taiwan provincial government to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the sister-state relationship between Idaho and the Taiwan Province. Through this friendship my State has greatly benefited by expanding trade, cultural, and educational exchanges. Idaho exports to the Republic of China range from agricultural and wood products to electronics. In addition, the growth in trade has been enhanced by the placement of an Idaho trade office in the world trade center, in Taipei. Eddie Yen, the gentleman that operates the office for the Idaho

Department of Commerce has been an asset to our State and has played an essential role in furthering the Expansion of Idaho's trade to Taiwan.

The United States also benefits from a stable relationship with the Republic of China on Taiwan. After extensive internal review, there has been recent progress toward upgrading the relations between the United States and Taiwan, which was good news from the Clinton administration. The administration has agreed to help Taiwan enter certain international organizations, especially those that deal primarily with trade and commerce. I applaud and encourage that endeavor.

The Clinton administration has also agreed to allow the Republic of China to change the name of its offices in the United States from the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office. These modest improvements in relations between our two countries are certainly a step in the right direction. It is hoped that we will see this pattern of improvement continued.

The concurrent resolution submitted by Senator MURKOWSKI is yet another step in the right direction. Mr. President, I hope that remaining issues or obstacles can be resolved so that President Lee Teng-Hui can be allowed to visit the United States. It is my understanding that a number of my colleagues have extended invitations to President Lee and other leaders from Taipei, to visit Capitol Hill. I know for a fact that President Lee has much insight to share with us, especially on East Asian affairs, and, Mr. President, since the Republic of China on Taiwan is a tremendous example of economic prosperity and democratic freedom for developing nations around the world, we would undoubtedly benefit from the insights of a leader such as President Lee Teng-Hui, who has played a central role in the achievements of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH
COUNSELING WEEK, APRIL 30—
MAY 6, 1995

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to acknowledge the importance of mental health to everyone's and society's well-being and to call our attention to counseling as a vital part of maintaining good mental health.

Mental health counseling is provided along a continuum of patient needs, from educational and preventive services, to diagnosis and treatment of mental illness, to long-term and acute care. It assists individuals and groups with problem-solving, personal and social development, decision-making, and self-awareness.

Such counseling is offered through community mental health agencies, private practices, psychiatric hospitals, college campuses, and rehabilitation centers. It is often provided in

conjunction with other mental health professionals, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, psychiatric nurses, and marriage and family therapists so that the most appropriate treatment for each patient is assured. It is provided by professionals with advanced degrees in counseling or related disciplines, practicing within the scope of their training and experience. They are currently licensed in 40 States and the District of Columbia.

I want to congratulate the American Mental Health Counselors Association on their designation of April 30–May 6, 1995 as "National Mental Health Counseling Week," and urge each and every American to seek the assistance of a qualified mental health counselor when needed. After all, our mental health is just as important as our physical health.

WELCOMING CROATIA'S DECISION
ON U.N. TROOP PRESENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I welcome the decision by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman to allow an international force to remain in Croatia. As one who has long opposed sending United States ground troops to Bosnia or Croatia, the good news about President Tudjman's decision seemed to be tempered, however, by a report in this morning's New York Times.

According to that article, Secretary Perry announced that United States troops would be sent to Croatia to help with the reconfiguration of U.N. forces. Upon further examination, however, it appears that this morning's report may have been premature, as the President has not—repeat not—yet made a decision with regard to a commitment of United States troops. Moreover, the administration continues to assure me that if United States troops were deployed, it would not be for the purpose of helping with a reconfiguration or withdrawal of U.N. troops from Croatia.

Nonetheless, there is a great deal of confusion surrounding this issue, and accordingly, the administration needs to clarify its intentions with regard to troop commitments. Before any decision is made to send U.S. troops, I fully expect the administration to follow through on its commitment to consult with the Congress.

The issue of United States troops aside, President Tudjman's decision walks us back from the brink of disaster in Croatia and indeed, the entire former Yugoslavia. I can sympathize with President Tudjman's fear that a continuation of the status quo might have contributed to a permanent separation of Croatia, creating in effect, another Cyprus.

Despite Croatia's legitimate concerns, it would have been a grave mistake for U.N. troops to withdraw at this time. Following President Tudjman's January announcement that UNPROFOR would have to begin withdrawing by March 31, there were

strong signs that the Krajina Serbs and the Croatian Army were girding for war. A renewed war in Croatia would almost certainly have drawn in Serbia as well as the Bosnian Serbs—leading to a greater Balkan conflict.

While the United Nations does not have a flawless record in Croatia, UNPROFOR's presence since early 1992 has prevented the reemergence of full-scale war. Let us hope that the reduced U.N. force, under a new mandate, will help maintain the peace. The reduced U.N. force also will have as part of its mandate the patrolling of Croatia's borders with Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina—which will go a long way toward legitimizing Croatia's international borders.

We are not out of the woods yet, however. Neither the Krajina Serbs, who control 30 percent of Croatia, nor Serbian President Milosevic, who serves as their patron, have indicated their views of the new mandate. Their response will be key to determining the ultimate success of the U.N. mission.

The larger question, however, is where we go from here, and how a reduced and newly reconfigured U.N. force fits into the big picture. It appears that renewed war in Croatia will be averted in the near future—thanks in no small part to United States efforts. But now we must ask whether we are going to continue simply to put out fires in former Yugoslavia or whether we have long-term interests to pursue there. I am afraid that if we do not answer this question affirmatively, we will find ourselves in a continual crisis mode. We may find ourselves meeting one deadline after another—the next of which is the end of the Bosnian ceasefire on April 30—without a clear sense of purpose. I hope this impending deadline does not divert all of our attention from the remaining unresolved issues in Croatia. The two conflicts are after all, interconnected, and we must address them simultaneously.

Before President Tudjman's January announcement that the United Nations would have to leave, an international plan to resolve the status of Croatia's U.N. Protected Areas [UNPA's] was on the table. By all accounts, the so-called Z-4 plan satisfies many of the concerns of both the Croatian Government and the Krajina Serbs. It calls for the restoration of Croatian sovereignty to all the U.N. areas, with considerable autonomy for the local Serbian population.

Now that the immediate crisis has been averted, I hope that we will not miss out on an opportunity to address the underlying issues in Croatia. Now is a good time to revisit the Z-4 plan.

RATIFICATION OF THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION IS NEEDED TO PROTECT THE FISHERY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, many of my colleagues know that I have had an

abiding interest in oceans issues in general and the Law of the Sea Convention in particular. Consequently, I was delighted when on October 7, 1994, the President transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (Treaty Doc. 103-39). We are now in the unique position to become full participants in this Convention and finally reap the benefits of decades of constructive negotiations conducted by Democratic and Republican administrations.

There is no doubt in my mind that this Convention will serve the interests of the United States best from a national security perspective, from an economic perspective, from an ocean resources perspective and from an environmental perspective. I have addressed many of these perspectives during earlier remarks in the Senate. Today, I speak to the importance of this Convention to our Nation's fishery resources.

Some have argued that the United States should not ratify the Convention because of a perceived negative impact which it might have on international fisheries agreements negotiated by the United States with its international partners. I submit that quite the opposite is the case. Ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention will be an important step towards assuring the continued benefits of these other agreements and protecting the fishery interests of our country.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by Ambassador David Colson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, which addresses precisely this issue. In it, he shows the paramount role that the Law of the Sea Convention will play in the implementation of the important international agreements to which the United States is already a party: The 1992 Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, approved by the Senate on August 11, 1992, Treaty Doc. 102-30, Ex.Rpt 102-51; the U.N. General Assembly Resolution on Large-Scale High Seas Driftnet Fishing (approved by the Senate on November 26, 1991, Treaty Doc. 102-7, Ex.Rpt 102-20), the recently concluded Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea, "the Donut Hole Agreement" (approved by the Senate on October 6, 1994, Treaty Doc. 103-27, Ex.Rpt 103-36) and the FAO Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (approved by the Senate on October 6, 1994, Treaty Doc. 103-24, Ex.Rpt 103-32).

The United States has long taken a pro-active approach to fisheries, both within its own exclusive economic zone and on the high seas. Through these recent successful negotiations, we have ensured that our international partners will be submitted to no less strin-

gent rules. The United States will put an end to overfishing and further depletion of threatened stocks only if we can ensure that sound management practices are applied by the other major fishing nations. This is why the administration has negotiated in earnest to achieve what are widely perceived as breakthrough advances in strong and responsible arrangements.

Concerns have been expressed that ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention would jeopardize these agreements. Ambassador Colson shows that, far from hindering these processes, the entry into force of the Convention will actually benefit their implementation.

In the case of salmon, a very important commercial, recreational, and subsistence resource, the Law of the Sea Convention has provided a foundation upon which to build understandings for the States of the North Pacific region. The Law of the Sea Convention, in essence, prohibits fisheries for salmon on the high seas. It also recognizes that states in whose waters salmon originates have the primary interest in these stocks. The Anadromous Stocks Convention, approved by the Senate in 1992, achieved the major goal of ending all high seas fishing, thanks in great part to the clear mandate and requirements of the Law of the Sea Convention. Further, the implementation of this agreement will be facilitated by the entry into force of the Law of the Sea, as the prohibition on high seas salmon fishing will apply to all member states, not just the signatories to the Anadromous Stocks Convention.

The use of large-scale high seas drift nets in another issue that the United States has attempted to solve in international fora. A resolution was passed unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly that created a moratorium on the use of those drift nets on the world's oceans and seas at the end of 1992. The drift net moratorium builds upon basic principles of the Law of the Sea Convention, which provides for a limited and qualified right to fish on the high seas, making it subject to the obligation to cooperate in the conservation and management of high seas living resources. Enforcement will be facilitated in view of the fact that the Convention's standards would be violated by any high seas large-scale drift net fishing that occurs contrary to the moratorium.

With regards to the Bering Sea issue, problems arose for the United States when a straddling stocks fishery began outside our exclusive zone and Russia's. Concerns about stocks conditions led to measures to restrain fisheries in the U.S. zone and increasingly urgent calls by American fishermen for the Government to take steps to control the foreign fishery on the high seas. The Donut Hole Agreement approved by the Senate on October 6, 1994 was the result of lengthy negotiations between the United States and the other states involved in fishing in the area.