

of Accounting, evening branch, graduating in 1941.

Mr. Milton B. Gray worked part time through junior high, school and college in a variety of endeavors, ranging from selling soda in the stands at Braves Field and Fenway Park, to employment at the firm of Morse and Nizel, CPA and with the U.S. Navy Department in Quincy, MA. In 1943, he enlisted in the U.S. Navy, and was assigned to the South Pacific. In 1948, he became a partner in the firm of Gray, Gray, and Gray, CPA.

Mr. Gray is a member of the Massachusetts Society of CPA; the American Society of CPA; Life member of the Temple Emeth's board, and past president of their Parents Teachers Association; Life member Massachusetts Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and past board member. In 1970 he was instrumental in the organization of Chug Aliyah working with David Roizenblit, the Israeli shaliach, at that time.

Milton and Shirley Gray, originally from Bridgeport, CT have been married for 49 years and have three married children and nine grandchildren.

Joining Mr. Gray as an honoree is Dr. John E. Hall who will receive the coveted Harry Andler Memorial Award.

Dr. John E. Hall was born in Saskatoon, SK, Canada. He attended the University of Saskatchewan, McGill University, and received his F.R.C.S. from the Royal College of Surgeons, Canada; and his F.A.C.S. from the American College of Surgeons.

Dr. Hall is one of the world's leading orthopaedic surgeons. He is the former orthopaedic surgeon-in-chief, Children's Hospital, Boston, MA; Associate in Orthopaedics, Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston, MA; associate in orthopaedics, New England Baptist Hospital, Boston, MA. Dr. Hall is professor of orthopaedic surgery, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.

Dr. Hall holds and has held such positions as associate surgery, University of Toronto; president of medical staff, Ontario Crippled Children's Center, Ontario; chairman, medical advisory board, Prosthetic Research and Development Unit, Ontario Crippled Children's Center, Ontario; appointed chief of division of orthopaedic surgery, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto; and chief of clinical services, department of orthopaedic surgery, Children's Hospital Medical Center, Boston.

Dr. Hall is a member of the Canadian Orthopaedic Association; the Pediatric Orthopaedic Society; Examiner for the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery; he is past president of the Pediatric Orthopaedic Society and of the Medical Staff, Children's Hospital, Boston, MA.

Dr. Hall is author and co-author of over 100 articles that have been published in leading medical journals and books.

Dr. Hall lives in Brookline, MA with his wife Frances and is a devoted father of 7 children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues and the country the record of this excellent organization and the biographies of the two men they so justly honor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment to the 1996 military appropriations bill.

The arguments surrounding B-2 bombers are well known—in fact, we in this body considered the same amendment almost 7 weeks ago. We know that the Pentagon does not want and cannot afford any more B-2's beyond the 20 already being built. We know that B-2 bombers are being promoted not for the national security of our country, but rather for financial and economic reasons, many of which are parochial in nature.

My colleagues, let there be no question about it—this amendment strikes at the heart of our challenge in this Congress. We were elected amidst a growing national consensus that Federal spending has gotten out of control, burdening our children with a nearly \$5 trillion national debt and threatening the future of our Nation. Along with most of my other first-term colleagues, I feel I have a responsibility to the people who sent me here to make wise spending decisions that are in our national interest, even if it means voting against some financial benefit to my district. There are those in my district who will be affected by restricting B-2 spending, but these are the decisions that haven't been made in the past but that we were sent here to make.

Many of us who voted for the recent spending rescissions bill did so not because we relished in cutting the affected programs, but rather because we are deeply about the future of this country. And to vote against future commitments to education, Head Start, child nutrition and school lunches, and summer youth programs—in short, against investing in our children and our future—because of our deficit, and then to turn right around and see \$493 million added to a weapons system even the Pentagon does not want—to me that is a great injustice.

This amendment is not about jeopardizing national security; it's about whether we have the courage to save our country from financial disaster while trying to maintain other, key strategic investments in America that create opportunities for our children and future competitiveness for our Nation. Voting for this amendment to cap B-2 production may not be the easy thing to do, but it is the right thing to do. I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment.

“THE CASE OF CHINA VS. CHINA”,
AN ESSAY BY RYAN DAI

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Ryan Dai, recently took part in Faces of China, a national high school essay contest sponsored by Friends of Free China. Contestants were asked to write a 3,000 word essay on the theme “Should Taiwan be Admitted to the United Nations?” Ryan wrote an excellent essay entitled, “The Case of China vs. China” and was awarded a \$1,500 scholarship to the college or university of his choice. The conclusions drawn from his fine work reflect my own opinions regarding the admittance of the Republic of China into the United Nations. This strong independent nation, the antithesis of the People's Republic of China has from its inception deviated from the Communist principles upon which its Red Brother resides. As a strong supporter of the ROC, I recommend this essay to my colleagues and congratulate Ryan Dai on his fine work.

THE CASE OF CHINA VS. CHINA

The United Nations Charter states that one of its main objectives is “to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.”¹ Well, if this is the case, then the United Nations has not been living up to this promise. Ever since the General Assembly of the United Nations decided to replace the “China seat” in 1971 with a representative from the People's Republic of China (communist China), the Republic of China has been denied any participation in global activities held by the UN that benefit humanity. The motive behind this change was the United States' strategy of allying with communist China in order to curb the Soviet Union during the Cold War.² Not only that, but the UN passed this resolution to oversimplify the problem of having “two different Chinas.” In reality, the decision to change representation has done nothing to solve this problem. Communist China has never taken control of the Republic of China. Without ever receiving help from communist China, the ROC has become a strong, independent nation with a thriving economy, a democratic government, and a bright future. Why is it that the UN could afford to have two representatives for Germany and another two for Korea? Despite being excluded from the UN, the Republic of China has of their own free will lived up to the standards the UN wishes to pursue.

In 1948, the United Nations passed the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” and in 1966, the “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”³ Both stress that every person has the right to partake in political, cultural, and economic activities. The ROC's government, much like the United States, unquestionably demonstrates these qualities. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the ROC, believed in “Three Principles of the People”—nationalism, democracy, and social well-being, which form

Footnotes at end of article.

the basis of the Republic of China's constitution.⁴ The ROC has lifted martial law, certified new political parties, terminated censorship, and recently held its first free election (in 1991).⁵ Unlike the People's Republic of China, which forbids any type of free election and strictly enforces censorship. How can it be possible to represent the ROC fairly with communist China taking charge at the UN? The two nations have entirely opposite view points on government. If given the chance to represent themselves in the UN, the ROC has the opportunity to show other countries that currently have political conflicts, the effectiveness of having a well-organized government that is just to everyone.

A prosperous economy certainly plays an important role in the development of any nation. Not only that, a gratifying economy enriches relationships with other countries as well. The Republic of China is no stranger to a thriving economy. Known as one of the "four little dragons" of Asia, the Republic of China is an economic powerhouse which holds the largest or second largest foreign exchange reserves in the world.⁶ They are the United States' fifth largest trading nation and the thirteenth largest trading nation in the world.⁷ The citizens of ROC alone have bought more than twice the amount of American goods than the People's Republic of China since January of 1994.⁸ The ROC's strong economy and trade relations all add up to one thing—the stability of employment. This "little dragon" purchases more than \$16 billion in U.S. exports and supports more than 300,000 American jobs each year.⁹ The ROC has the opportunity to expand trade and help increase the prosperity of other countries if given the opportunity to participate in the UN.

Furthermore, the Republic of China has been lending a helping hand to the world community for the past thirty years. The island nation has sent more than 12,000 agricultural technicians to numerous countries.¹⁰ These agricultural teams have helped developing countries progress in their agricultural base while introducing modern farming techniques.¹¹ The ROC has established the International Economic Cooperation Development Fund to share nation-building and technical experience to countries needing guidance in their economies. Training has been given by the ROC to almost 8,500 agricultural technicians and 44,000 agriculturists around the world.¹² Also, the ROC assisted the United States by donating \$600,000 to help the people of the Midwest during the devastating Mississippi River flooding.¹³ Unfortunately, the ROC has not been able to participate in UN sponsored organizations such as UNICEF, the World Bank, and the World Health Organization.¹⁴

As a result, the Republic of China has not been able to further its aid to the global community. Granting the ROC a position in the UN opens the door to another willing participant who can help strengthen the UN's goal of assisting nations in crises.

Why the Republic of China has been denied membership to the United Nations seems so puzzling. The twenty-one million inhabitants of this nation have followed and stood by the standards of the UN for the past twenty-three years. Despite being excluded from the United Nations, the Republic of China has consummated many ambitions that have helped the world. From the nation's per capita income exceeding \$10,000 (twenty-fifth in the world), and its determined will to create an orderly democratic society for its people, the Republic of China serves as an example to all nations what hard work and determination can accomplish.¹⁵ The future withholds nothing but promise if the ROC is admitted into the United Nations. The twenty-one million people of the ROC have made some outstanding accomplishments just by themselves. Government spokesman for the Republic of China, Dr. Jason Hu commented, "The ROC does not want to keep its success to itself. We would be more than pleased to do our part in promoting the global economy by sharing our...experiences with other nations."¹⁶ To the one hundred eighty-four member nations in the UN, it appears that having the Republic of China partake in the United Nations can do no harm but help reach the goal.

The ROC also wishes to obtain a seat in the UN to work on unification between the "two Chinas" and resolve conflicts between the two nations, not to create a segregation. An obvious and reasonable approach to help resolve the ROC's representation conflict is to invite Red China to take seat at a table and discuss the problem. The two nations' reasons and statements on this situation hold no significance at this point, unless the two hold a formal discussion face to face with each other. A conference involving the ROC, the People's Republic of China, UN officials, and representatives from other nations serves only as a preparatory stepping stone in reaching some sort of compromise or plan of action. To reach a solution, an understanding between the ROC and Red China must be established, and this understanding cannot exist without solid communication. Red China must understand that "talk" does not necessarily mean "immediate action." The Republic of China has been ignored for too long. It is time for this nation to have a seat in the United Nations and regain its membership to the global community it once helped establish.

NOTES

¹ Frederick F. Chien, *The Case for Participation of the Republic of China in the United Nations* (Taipei, Taiwan: Union Press Ltd., 1994), 8.

² Jason C. Hu, *Reality Check: The Republic of China of Taiwan belongs in the United Nations* (Taipei, Taiwan: China Art Printing Works, 1994), 1.

³ Chien, 8-9.

⁴ J.J. Nerbonne, *Taiwan: Guide to Taipei and All Taiwan* (New York, NY: IBD Ltd., 1985), 12.

⁵ Don Feber, "Taiwan Deserves Better Than it Gets," *Boston Herald*, 24 January 1994, 21.

⁶ Shaung Jeff Yao, "Taiwan Seeks Recognition for its Rise," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 26 November 1993, 42.

⁷ Shaung Jeff Yao, "Republic of China of Taiwan Deserves U.N. Membership," *Town Courier*, 16 July 1994, 23.

⁸ Shaung Jeff Yao, "U.N. Call for Taiwan Overdue," *The Blade*, 30 August 1994, 4.

⁹ Brett C. Lippencott, "Taiwan Deserves Better than Current Short Shrift from U.S.," *Star Tribune*, 25 August 1994, 10.

¹⁰ Yao, "Taiwan Seeks Recognition for its Rise," 42.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Shaung Jeff Yao, "Taiwan Has Come a Long Way. Deserves Seat in the U.N.," *The Capital Times*, 19 October 1994, 19.

¹⁴ Yao, "U.N. Call for Taiwan Overdue," 4.

¹⁵ William Rusher, "Taiwan's Right to a U.N. Return," *Washington Times*, 25 September 1993, 27.

¹⁶ Feber, 21.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 8, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this week I was privileged to attend the United Nations' Fourth World Conference on Women as a congressional observer. Consequently, I missed several votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call No.:	Vote
636	No
637	Yes
638	No
639	Yes
640	Yes
641	Yes
642	No
643	Yes
644	Yes
645	Yes
646	No
647	No
648	Yes