

to define what kinds of gatherings require approval would be up to the PRC.

Mr. Lee said Senate Resolution 271 reiterating the Senate's support for the Joint Declaration and stating that an appointed legislature would violate the Joint Declaration was extremely important. Mr. Lee said that other countries need to act as well—but that someone has to lead. Mr. Lee said that in the past he had favored a quiet, behind-closed-doors approach, but that China's failure to abide by its commitments in the Joint Declaration has shown that approach to be ineffective.

On the question of selection of the Chief Executive, Mr. Lee said that China itself acknowledges the selection process is not democratic. The selection will be made by the Preparatory Committee, a Beijing-appointed body which includes key officials of the PRC, such as Foreign Minister Qian Qichen. The Preparatory Committee will select 400 Hong Kong people to select the Chief Executive. Three candidates have been identified so far—C.H. Tung, a shipping magnate and former member of the Governor's Executive Council considered close to the PRC, Anson Chan, the Chief Secretary of the Hong Kong Government, and T.S. Lo, a solicitor and PRC advisor.

On the question of what U.S. policy should be, Mr. Lee said it is a matter for the U.S. to decide but Mr. Lee added that the development of democracy and the rule of law anywhere in the world is beneficial to the U.S. The violation of international agreements by China or other countries is not in the U.S.'s interest and would create a bad precedent. Above all, however, consistency is most important. The U.S. should make a policy and stick with it.

Other Meetings

The delegation also met informally with members of the Preparatory Committee, Paul Cheng and Frederick Fung, the Better Hong Kong Foundation, academics, civil servants and representatives of the U.S. business community to hear their concerns and recommendations for U.S. policy.

FORT LEWIS/MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE,
WASHINGTON

Shortly after arriving from Hong Kong the delegation had the opportunity to tour both McChord Air Force Base and the Army's Fort Lewis in Washington state. After the tour Senator Cochran and other members of the delegation had an informal dinner with Lieutenant General C.G. Marsh, Commander of the U.S. Army's I Corps. General Marsh, who has responsibility for the deployment of I Corps units in the Asia-Pacific region, commented that, having recently commanded U.S. forces in Korea, he is concerned about the volatility in the region. The situation is fluid and could erupt overnight, and the U.S. must be prepared to take action in Korea. General Marsh went on to state he has a close working relationship with others the delegation met with during the trip, such as Admiral Prueher (CINCPAC) and General Rollings (Commander, III MEF), and that their frequent interaction is a key aspect of the U.S. military's being prepared to act in the Asia-Pacific region, if necessary.

CONCLUSION

The Asia-Pacific region will dominate many aspects of American policy—foreign, security, trade—in the coming century. It is a region with stark contrasts: North Koreans reading recipes for cooking grass in "news-papers", starving in the cities and countryside, while their government spends money buying, building, and selling missiles and weapons of mass destruction; the Politburo of the People's Republic of China, allowing a market economy to run free in the south of

the country while at the same time attempting to harness and repress the individual rights of its citizens to think and act freely, all the while increasing the size of its military—for example, building a "blue water" navy, building new classes of intercontinental ballistic missiles, to include the PRC's first land-based mobile ICBM—beyond any conceivable needs for self-defense; the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, on the one hand proclaiming itself to be dedicated to the principles of communism yet, on the other hand, encouraging private business and freely allowing information into the country; and, the economic miracle that is most of Asia, where growth rates are the staggering envy of the rest of the world. This is a region that cannot be the afterthought of American policy in the 21st century.

American policy toward the region must take into account the differences within the region. In Indonesia, the United States must work with the government to improve its record of human rights while, at the same time, recognizing that Indonesia is a force for peace and stability in the region and has to be treated with respect. Restricting IMET participation for Indonesia is counter-productive.

In Vietnam, the United States must continue to insist on a full accounting of those American service members who are still missing or presumed dead. While there is every indication that the Vietnamese government is finally starting to cooperate fully with the United States on this problem, that cooperation must be sustained over a lengthy period of time to create the conditions for closer cooperation between our countries. During this period the United States should be doing everything possible to encourage the development of as open and free a market as possible; during the delegation's visit, it was clear that the Vietnamese government recognizes that its future financial prosperity depends upon allowing private ownership to take place and information flowing freely into the country. This is a country where eventual political reform will most likely be the by-product of an emerging market economy.

In Hong Kong, the United States must insist that the freedoms guaranteed by the Sino-British Joint Declaration are implemented by the People's Republic of China when Hong Kong reverts to PRC sovereignty on July 1, 1997. China has already made troubling assertions that it will not abide by parts of this Joint Declaration; these assertions can only be translated into reality if the government of the United States ignores its obligations under U.S. law.

Economic growth has accrued more than financial benefits to many of the citizens of the Asia-Pacific region. Free markets have blazed a path for free people, as the examples of elections in both the Republic of China and South Korea demonstrate. In Japan, our close friend and ally for the last half-century, we also see the political change that has come with the free market. Many other nations in the region are also taking a more serious attitude toward individual freedom, and it is clear that this change in attitude has almost always been preceded by a free, or freer, market.

America is the glue that binds the region together. Enmity is not quickly forgotten in Asia, and it is the American military presence in the presence in the region that has allowed to countries in the area to concentrate on economic growth rather than military expansion. The reassuring presence of an American carrier battle group—or the knowledge that one is often just over the horizon—has resulted in a stable environment that has been conducive to economic growth for many in the region.

The United States must remember that this is a region in which our ability to trade cannot be separated from our ability to defend our interests and, if need be, protect our friends. Our security guarantees must be credible. By allowing terrorist states like North Korea to acquire weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile delivery systems, some of our friends in the region have not-so-privately begun to worry about the credibility of the American security guarantee, particularly given the at best half-hearted effort by the Clinton Administration to build quickly effective defenses against ballistic missiles. American vulnerability to coercion is not missed in Asia; unless the vulnerability is redressed, the credibility of the American security guarantee will evaporate, leading states that are now in an economic race into the invisible arms race. This can only work against American interest.

The United States will continue to succeed in the region, our trade will continue to grow, if we remember that military strength is respected, and it is upon this strength that American credibility is based. Our military must remain strong and visible in the region, and our security assurances to our allies must be carried out with the spirit, and not just the letter, of our arrangements in mind.●

THE PRESIDENT AT 50

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge a recent piece of journalism that I believe has captured the true essence of political reporting. On August 1, 1996, an article was published in the Wall Street Journal by Trude B. Feldman in which she relayed excerpts from her exclusive one-on-one interview with President Bill Clinton a few days before his 50th birthday. In a time when civility and respect are often pushed aside by personal attacks and rumor and innuendo, Ms. Feldman has proven herself to be a journalist who has retained an exemplary style of reporting. Her article, entitled "The President at 50", sheds light on the President's personality in novel ways. Ms. Feldman presents an articulate and important account of the President, drawing from him new insights into the policies and politics of our day. In the end, Ms. Feldman produces a proud piece of journalistic work.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT AT 50

(by Trude B. Feldman)

This month marks the 50th anniversary of the birth of the president of the United States. And today is the 50th anniversary of the Fulbright Scholarship Program, initiated by William Jefferson Clinton's mentor, who inspired the president to make a genuine contribution to global understanding. Eighteen days after President Truman signed Sen. J. William Fulbright's legislation into law, the boy who would become the 42nd U.S. President was born, one month ahead of schedule, by Caesarean section.

In an exclusive interview for his 50th birthday, President Clinton spoke of the two milestones, recalling what he had learned from his first political role model.

"Senator Fulbright had a profound impact on the way I now view the world," the President told me. "He taught that education is

the solution to most of the problems of mankind; and he also cautioned against the arrogance of power.

"It was two weeks after Hiroshima when he sponsored the international education program that has affected the direction of policy in country after country. He changed our world forever, and for the better. And my goal is to continue on the path that he envisioned."

Sitting in the oval office for the one-on-one interview, the president was pensive as he expounded on the legacy of Fulbright's vision for the baby boomer generation. Mr. Clinton also spoke of his spiritual journey as well as his achievements, goals, and regrets. He addressed the character issue; explained his views on the economy; poignantly recalled the death of Vincent Foster; and reflected on what stirs within him as he reaches his half-century.

Excerpts from the hour-long interview follow:

Ms. Feldman: Is this milestone a turning point for you?

President Clinton: Yes, in many ways. I feel grateful to reach my 50th anniversary on Earth, to have my health, my family and this job at the time when I feel most able—mentally, physically, and emotionally—to do it. But I feel a sort of sea change. Being 50 gives me more yesterdays than tomorrows, and I'll now begin to think more about the long-term implications as well as the consequences of what I do. Since I've been president, I've become steadily more philosophical, but not less optimistic.

Q. Is there anything about yourself that you'd like to change as you turn 50?

A. Oh sure, lots of things. I'd like to develop more of what my wife calls the "discipline of gratitude." I'd like to be able to roll with the punches more. I've become much calmer in the face of buffeting events in the last few years, and I hope this continues so the highs and lows of events don't throw me off course.

Everybody has some regrets, but I've been so fortunate that I feel I've gotten a better deal in life than I deserved.

Q. What is your most significant accomplishment in the past 50 years; and in the last four years?

A. The most significant accomplishment in my life was convincing Hillary Rodham to marry me. It changed everything. There is no question about that.

The most significant accomplishment in the last four years is that I have largely succeeded in changing the way we think about ourselves and our future. By doing this, I helped to make it possible to make substantive changes. That's more important than any specific bill I passed.

Q. This is the third anniversary of Vincent Foster's death, so may I ask if you ever think about whether you could have helped avoid that tragedy by talking out his problems with him?

A. Absolutely, I think about that. We knew each other since I was four years old. Vince worked daily with Hillary [in a law firm] in Little Rock. But he was always so quiet and unassuming . . . that months would go by when we wouldn't have any contact. So his persona made it more difficult to see that he was profoundly depressed. When he worked here [as White House deputy counsel] I knew he had been under a lot of stress. I called him the night before he killed himself and asked if he wanted to come back and watch a movie. He said he was already at home and didn't want to leave his wife and return to the White House.

Then, he said, "I want to talk to you about something." And I said, "I want to talk to you about some things."

That was Monday. I told him I was busy on Tuesday and asked to meet him on Wednes-

day. He said, "Sure," and sounded very calm. I don't know whether, at that time, he had already decided to kill himself. And I don't know whether I could have helped.

I hated that I was insufficiently aware that he was going through that kind of pain, and I feel very bad that I missed it. You know, at that time, [July 1993] we were all getting beat up very badly. Everybody was sort of bruised and also amazed that the press coverage was the way it was. Still, I showed up everyday for work and I thought that's what Vince was doing. We thought we would work our way through it.

I still remember the last time I saw Vince. He was standing with his hands folded, over there at the back, to the right [Mr. Clinton pointed to the Rose Garden] during the ceremony when I nominated Louis Freeh as FBI director. Vince was pleased about the selection. He thought it would be well-received in the country and in Congress. [That was on Tuesday morning, July 20. He was found dead that evening.]

Q. Do you agree with Vince Foster's alleged suicide note, in which he scribbled that ruining people is considered sport in Washington, D.C.

A. Well, Vince was a proud person. He was a successful lawyer and everyone who knew him respected him. He was a good and highly ethical person, whether or not you agreed with his politics. And to get the kind of licking from the editorial pages of one newspaper bewildered him.

In retrospect, I didn't handle it well. I told him the attacks should not worry him so, but he must have been taking them more seriously than I knew.

Apparently, this is what happened to Adm. [Jerry M.] Boorda. There are other victims of smear campaigns who would not go that far. But they are still left with lifetime scars because of mean-spirited attacks.

It is particularly painful because they know many of these attacks register with the public even though the attackers often have no reason to attack. The smear campaigns have gotten too personal.

You know, if I win re-election, I hope to find ways to minimize the destruction and the unfair, subtle personal attacks because our country needs more civility.

Q. How concerned are you about the decline in civility in the nation today?

A. Very much so and I'm constantly trying to do something about this loss of civility and the impact it has—dividing us one against the other. Too often the debate goes, "If you disagree with me, you must be no good." Or, "If you can't prove yourself innocent of whatever I decide to charge you with today, you must be guilty."

Q. Given the relentless attempts at character assassination, why do you want a second term here in the Oval Office?

A. Because I can divorce those attempts from this job. They are called character assassination. There is nothing any person can say or do that can affect my character one bit. My character will be judged by what I do and will be judged ultimately by my God, not by any of these people who criticize me. They may assassinate my reputation, but they can't lay a hand on my character. Whether it's good or bad or somewhere in between, their ability to influence it or impact on it is nil.

Q. How has your presidency influenced your spiritual life?

A. It has tested my spiritual life. But at times the presidency has been good for my spiritual life because I realize I was not smart enough to make a lot of these decisions on my own. I realize that no matter how hard I work or what kind of brain God gave me, I cannot think my way through or calculate entirely some of these decisions. I

have to feel what is the right thing to do and do it. And to do that, I have to be spiritually grounded. If I go through a week when I neglect my spiritual life, I can feel it. Little alarms go off and I try to get back in my groove.

I also spend a lot of time thinking about the relationship of personal morality to public purpose and public life. When I was younger I read Reinhold Niebuhr's "Moral Man and Immoral Society" and Max Weber's "Politics as a Vocation." They both had a profound impact on my feel for the moral, spiritual challenges to people involved in politics.

Q. Turning to the economy, is the 2.5% growth of the GNP enough to satisfy the needs of the American people?

A. We would be better off if we could grow a little faster. If we grow at 2.8% to 3%, for a period of three or four years, perhaps we could bring more private sector growth and job opportunities to isolated inner city areas and rural areas; and we could see genuine increases in incomes for all groups. Then we wouldn't have this continuing inequality of income that we've seen in the last few years.

But the truth is, no one knows what the optimum rate of economic growth without inflation is. The only thing I tried to do in dealing with the Federal Reserve was to show that I would be responsible in getting the deficit down, but I didn't want them to get in the way of economic growth. What I hoped we could do is develop a relationship where I did not interfere with the Fed's decisions, that they would be governed by a philosophy that basically would move on the evidence, and not on some old theory about how the economy operates. With so much global competition and technological change, it's possible you can grow faster today without inflation than you could 30 years ago. We just do not know and we need to find out.

Q. Can you explain why you were unable to keep you 1992 campaign commitment for a middle class tax cut?

A. First, it's important to make the point that we made a serious down payment on it. We gave 15 million families a big tax cut through the Earned Income Tax Credit, which today is worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to a family of four with an income of \$28,000 or less.

We stopped there because, frankly, after I won the presidency it was obvious to me that the deficit was bigger than I thought it was going to be, that getting it down would be tougher and that we had to get a hold of it. I believed that if I could cut the deficit enough, we would get interest rates down and middle class people would be better off because more jobs would be created and they could then refinance their homes and get cheaper car payments and better interest rates on their credit card payments.

In fact, that's true. Since I've been president, eight million Americans have refinanced their home mortgages at lower rates. So I think I made the right decision. But it was a difficult one because I wanted to do even more. Now, for the last year I've been pushing for a targeted middle class tax cut dedicated primarily to education—the \$1,500 credit for people to go to community colleges for two years; a \$10,000 deduction for the cost of college tuition; an IRA for people that would permit them to withdraw without penalty for the cost of a college education, a first-time home or a family medical emergency.

I hope these middle class tax initiatives will be adopted by Congress, and I believe they will—either before or after the election. Then, we'll have a fairer tax system, but we'll also have a much more healthy economy than if I had sacrificed deficit reduction in 1993 to cut taxes more.

Q. If you are re-elected, do you expect any tax cuts?

A. Yes, the ones I just mentioned—unless we get them done before Election Day. If we get them done this term, in the context of the balanced budget, I would not expect significant tax cuts in the next term because we must continue until we balance the budget. But we already have enough savings identified to balance the budget and have a middle class tax cut targeted to education and child-rearing.

Q. Your reply indicates you expect to be re-elected. Do you?

A. I'm hopeful about winning the election, but I'm not overconfident by any means. As we do this interview the polls look good, but it is forever until the election. I am working hard as president, and also to be ready for the campaign, but I'm not overconfident. I believe we'll be successful because of our emphasis on the future.

Q. Speaking of the campaign, how do you compare your style with Bob Dole's?

A. Bob Dole is not like me; we're very different. Also, he has never lost an election in Kansas and I lost two [in Arkansas.]

Q. In your estimation, what are his strengths and his weaknesses as a campaigner?

A. I think Sen. Dole is a good campaigner, a very tough and effective one, and I expect him to do rather well. I'm also impressed with his patriotism. He was severely wounded in World War Two and could have become indifferent and bitter but he became a fine senator and public servant. You know, I think it's healthy to say positive things about competitors. I don't mind Senator Dole saying anything he wants to about how he thinks I was wrong on the budget or the Brady Bill or about any issue on which he disagrees with me. I look forward to a vigorous debate. ●

IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF HART T. MANKIN

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the dedication, public service, and patriotism that personified the life of Judge Hart T. Mankin. Hart T. Mankin, an associate judge on the Federal Appellate Court of Veterans Appeals, passed away on May 28. I knew Hart well, having worked closely with him at the Pentagon during the turbulent years of the Vietnam war.

Hart served as the General Counsel to the Department of the Navy from 1971 to 1973. It was my privilege to first serve as Under Secretary of the Navy, and then Secretary of the Navy during this same time period. I remember Hart as a hard working, dedicated man, who gave his time, talent, and efforts to the service of his country.

Judge Mankin is survived by his wife Ruth, to whom he was married for 42 years, and three children—Margaret Mankin Barton, Theodore Mankin, and Susan Mankin Benzel. He was also a grandfather to four lovely granddaughters.

Hart's son, Ted, delivered the eulogy at his father's funeral service. I believe the words he used to honor his father's memory are very touching, and I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

REFLECTIONS OF H.T. MANKIN

The great jazz musician Count Basie once said, "To make great music, it is not the

notes you play, but the notes you don't play." I would like to think that my father made his music or lived his life the same way.

Dad's quiet strength and confidence affected everyone and everything he touched.

As a child growing up, whenever the we wondered how Dad could accomplish a certain feat, he would respond "Clean living." And you know what He was right.

While never claiming sainthood or looking for credit or attention, Dad's humility contributed to the strength other derived from him.

Dad could have been considered unemotional at times, but he was quite the contrary.

Always centered and anchored, Dad's emotions weren't symptomatic or reactionary, but honest and heartfelt.

At work, his calm transcended the litigious. At home, his calm transcended partisan politics.

His methodical thorough approach to life helped us all look before we leapt.

LISTEN

That was one of Dad's secret. Whether it was personal, work, or any other kind of problem, Dad listened. He might help you find your path, but would never push or force you into any decisions. But once your decision was final, he would support you to the end.

To Dad, the philosophical, the intellectual, the theological or spiritual were inextricably one. Any one movement to one side of the triangle affected the other two sides.

And Dad constantly pursued the truth, and at times defined it legally; and at other times left the truth open ended. The gray areas intrigued Dad, making him hungry for more interpretations.

Not that Dad didn't have his light side as well. Anyone who knew Dad, knew his dry sense of humor was clever yet playful. We all appreciate the time Dad spent doing his small part to save Delaware's Mountains.

Which brings us back to strength, this time strength of convictions. In our family, to get a word in edgewise is a feat in and of itself. But Dad, always choosing his words carefully, spoke softly and always above the fray.

Every word he spoke was very deliberate, well thought out, and almost always correct. One did not guess or take shots in the dark with Dad. Come prepared before you make your point. What some men say in 200 words, Dad could say in 20 words.

On the other hand, Dad did not wear blinders, and always listened to every point of view. Because of his rare gift to carefully consider every vantage point, he gradually was recognized outside of his immediate family and peers as someone who might really possess the truth. Some may consider this blasphemous, but to many of us right here, he was the truth.

To Dad, humanity was the coexistence of all through the truth. Humanity didn't just mean kindness or tranquility, it meant everyone striving for the truth and how it applied to their own particular life.

Dad taught from legal and religious texts, but what most learned from Dad came from the discipline in his demeanor.

We learned from my Dad, Hart Mankin, that truth and beauty can be found in Maritime law, Milton, or a Texas Straw Hat.

God will help Dad uncover the truth, and we will continue his journey. Dad we love you and miss you already. ●

U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY DINNER HONORING THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, on September 17 the U.S. Capitol Historical Society hosted a wonderful dinner honoring the Senate Armed Services Committee as the Committee celebrates our 180th anniversary. For those who may not be familiar with the history of the Senate committees, the Senate established the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs in 1816, and these two committees were replaced by the Armed Services Committee in 1946.

Under the leadership of former Congressman Clarence Brown, the Capitol Historical Society does an outstanding job of preserving the history of the Congress and promoting and encouraging the public's interest in this great institution. I want to express my appreciation to Congressman Brown and the staff of the Capitol Historical Society for the delightful evening honoring the committee.

Mr. President, the featured speaker at this dinner was Dr. James Schlesinger, a man who has made an enormous contribution to our national security.

I have known and worked with Jim Schlesinger since I came to the Senate in 1973. Over the years he has testified numerous times before the Armed Services Committee—both as a cabinet official and as a private citizen whose advice and counsel the committee has repeatedly sought on most of the difficult national security issues we have faced over the years. All of the members of the Armed Services Committee—both Democrats and Republicans—regard Jim Schlesinger as one of the pillars of this Nation's security.

In my remarks at the dinner, Mr. President, I recalled a Senate resolution which the Armed Services Committee and the full Senate adopted in 1975 and which I coauthored with our late colleague Senator Scoop Jackson. It was Senate Resolution 303, and it read:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States commends Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger for his excellence in office, his intellectual honesty and personal integrity, and for his courage and independence. The Senate believes that our country and the free world owe a great debt of gratitude to Secretary Schlesinger for his untiring efforts to improve the efficiency of our armed forces, the cohesiveness of our alliances, the wisdom of our strategic policies and doctrine, and for his determination to convey to the American people the truth as he saw it and the sense of the future he so deeply believed they must understand.

Mr. President, those comments about Jim Schlesinger are as true today as they were when the Senate passed this resolution in 1975. As I end my Senate career, I want to thank Jim Schlesinger for his tremendous contributions to U.S. national security and foreign policy and to me personally.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Schlesinger's remarks to the Capitol