

"Human beings are human beings," he declared.

But it was his comments about Taiwan as an "independent" entity that seemed likely to draw the wrath of Chinese leaders. Lee, speaking in heavily accented English, several times referred to Taiwan as "independent." When asked if he really intended to use a word Beijing considers provocative, he defended his characterization and repeated it.

While this has been Taiwan's position, Lee had kept a relatively low profile since his election in March 1996. Lee said he has been preoccupied with domestic concerns, but he showed no hesitation in speaking in clear, even blunt, tones.

"Taiwan is Taiwan," he said. "We are an independent, sovereign country." At another point, he said, "Taiwan is already independent. There is no need to say so. . . . Maybe they want us to say the ROC [Republic of China government] is a province of China. Twenty-one million people don't agree that Taiwan is a province of China."

China repeatedly has threatened to use force against Taiwan if its leaders formally declare independence. Beijing twice in the last two years has staged missile tests and military exercises in the narrow Taiwan Strait that separates the island and China.

Since becoming the first native Taiwanese president in 1988, and winning the country's first democratic election last year, Lee constantly has played to the island's separatist sentiment. He has sought to raise Taiwan's profile and break its diplomatic isolation, while being careful not to cross the delicate verbal line that would mark a formal declaration of independence.

Against that background, some analysts here were divided over whether Lee's repeated use of the word "independent" marked a shift in his rhetoric or whether he was rephrasing a familiar position that the Taiwan government is a sovereign entity representing all China. But most agreed that his statements showed a significant hardening of his position, demonstrating that for the moment he has no interest in restarting talks with China.

"If he says we are an independent sovereign state, that makes it clear we are independent and not a part of China," said Andrew Yang, secretary general of the Chinese Council of Advanced Policy Studies, a think tank.

"It changes a lot. People were really expecting a breakthrough in cross-strait relations.

"He is conveying a very important message to the United States and to the world—that Taiwan is not going to negotiate with China on Beijing's terms; Taiwan has its own agenda; and unless China accepts Taiwan's agenda, there won't be any talks," Yang said. "He has sent a message to Beijing that he must be treated as the leader of a sovereign state."

He added, "It is very clear it seems to me, that there's no room to reopen the talks."

Another academic who follows cross-strait issues, David Auw of the Institute of International Relations, predicted reaction from Beijing may be muted since the Chinese leaders have grown accustomed to Lee's rhetorical flirtations with secessionism and may have determined that they cannot deal with him.

"I think the mainland leadership no longer takes President Lee seriously," Auw said. "It's not the first time he has made confusing remarks. They are starting to question the ability of Lee to have a coherent mainland policy. The majority of scholars and officials on the mainland I talk to say they are willing to wait for the post-Lee era."

Auw and others said Lee may have been reacting to new pressures on Taiwan to restart

high-level talks, which were suspended after Lee's highly publicized 1995 visit to the United States to attend his college reunion. With Hong Kong's so-far successful reversion to Chinese rule under an autonomy formula, and with Jiang's successful visit to Washington, the spotlight has shifted to Taiwan as the largest of the many unresolved trouble spots between the United States and China.

But Lee denied feeling particular pressure to restart talks with China. He made it clear he intends to continue his diplomatic outreach, traveling abroad and pushing to gain membership for Taiwan in such international bodies as the World Trade Organization.

"No, I don't feel anything," a smiling Lee said, when asked if he felt under pressure. He said he sees no parallel between Hong Kong's handover to China and Taiwan's case, since Hong Kong was a British colony and had no say in its own destiny.

"Taiwan in Taiwan," he said. "They use this to pressure [us]. But I don't feel anything. We are an independent sovereign country."

On July 1, in the first hours after Hong Kong reverted to Chinese rule, Chinese Premier Li Peng said Taiwan should consider rejoining China under the same formula, known as "one country, two systems."

But Lee, in the interview, was dismissive. "They say, 'one country, two systems,' I say your system is a Communist system. Taiwan is a free and democratic society. You say Taiwan is a provincial government. I don't think so," Lee said.

Asked if Taiwan is prepared to make any gesture to restart the stalled dialogue with China, Lee replied, "We are waiting for them. We won't give anything to them."

He said the two sides have technical issues to resolve, including smuggling and illegal immigration, which could be addressed with low-level exchanges. But as for broader political dialogue at a higher level, Lee replied, "I don't see any political issues now."

Lee also said he does not feel bound by the timetable of Beijing's leaders, particularly Jiang, who would like to see the "Taiwan problem" resolved within the next decade. "We don't care about this timetable," Lee said. "That's his timetable. Here, it's a democratic society. What do the people think about this problem? We have our own reunification timetable. When China becomes free, democratic and has social justice—in that case, we will have unification."

For all his defiance, though Lee did express concern over a problem that could end up forcing Taiwan's integration with China faster than political leaders on either side of the strait can control: the rush by Taiwan businessmen to invest in the world's fastest-growing economy, and its largest market.

Even as Taiwan drifts further from China culturally, socially and politically economic relations are seeing an unmistakable convergence, similar to the kind of convergence that linked Hong Kong to southern China long before the actual transfer of sovereignty this year. And in Taiwan's case, the economic integration is even more dramatic, considering that Taiwan only lifted its travel ban on citizens going to China in 1987, and the two sides are still technically in a state of hostilities.

According to government figures 16.5 percent of Taiwan's exports go to China, making China the second-largest export market for Taiwanese goods and its largest foreign investment market. Between 1991 and 1996, the sum of Taiwanese investment in China rose to \$14.9 billion about what the United States and Japan invest there.

But much of the Taiwanese investment in China goes through Hong Kong and Macau and is unaccounted for, leading some aca-

demics to estimate its true size as closer to \$30 billion.

Lee, in a written answer to a question on the investment problem, said "excessive investment by Taiwan-based businesses there [in China] may increase the political and economic risks for Taiwan as a whole."

He said China pursues a long-standing "economic united front tactic," meaning Beijing is trying to "gradually increase Taiwan's economic independence on the mainland, and to undermine Taiwan's political bargaining position." Lee said China has "stepped up its economic united front tactics" since its missile tests and military exercises failed to intimidate Taiwan last year.

Lee became most animated near the end of the interview, when dealing with the question of "Asian values" as espoused by some regional leaders, including Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad, Hong Kong Chief Executive Tung Cheehwa and Singapore's founder and elder statesman, Lee Kuan Yew.

Those leaders, and other proponents of the "Asian values" theory, have suggested that Western-style democratic systems, with their emphasis on individual liberties, are unsuited for Asian countries that value consensus, community and solving problems without confrontation. Critics have said the "Asian values" proponents merely are offering excuses for authoritarian government.

Lee, who oversaw Taiwan's "quiet revolution" from authoritarianism to free-wheeling democracy, dismissed the idea that democracy is unsuited to Asia. "Asian people are people, are human beings," he said. "They have their culture and heritage and tradition—that's different. But you can't say human nature is different."

DISAPPROVING CANCELLATIONS
TRANSMITTED BY PRESIDENT
OCTOBER 6, 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2631. This bill is vital in correcting mistakes that were made in the President's line-item veto of the Military Construction Appropriations Act. I would also like to thank Mr. SKEEN for the introduction of this important resolution and Chairman PACKARD and Chairman HEFLEY for their hard work in bringing H.R. 2631 to the floor. Both the National Security and Appropriations Committees worked diligently to provide for the proper defense of our Nation with increasingly limited resources. In doing so, the House has made great strides in areas of quality of life, readiness, and military construction to support our Nation's military in spite of the current administration's national security policy.

The line-item veto power that the 104th Congress passed and the President signed is an important tool that, when used correctly, could serve to reduce our Nation's budget deficit. However, when that power is used carelessly, it not only devalues this budget tool, but as the use in the military construction bill and the defense appropriations bill demonstrates, it threatens to undermine important national security objectives.

On October 6, 1997, the President struck 38 projects from the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998. This occasion marked the third time the President exercised the authority granted in the Line-Item Veto Act and the single largest use of that power to date. Of all 72 line-item veto transmissions, it is these 38 items which have caused the largest cry of concern from Congress. Failure to override these vetoes could erode the readiness or quality of life of our military personnel.

The concern that has come from Congress does not deal with the concept of the line-item veto. The concern instead stems from the seemingly haphazard manner in which it was applied to this bill. The President identified three new criteria establishing the worthiness of military construction projects that had never been used in the appropriations process.

The first criterion the President established was that the project must be in the President's budget. Over 85 percent of the canceled projects are actually in the administration's defense plan and each project was carefully screened by the authorizing committee. This criterion also attempts to invalidate Congress' role in the defense of our Nation. Each year Congress must address shortfalls in the President's budget for areas such as military housing and National Guard construction. Failure to correct these annual shortfalls could damage the capability of our military forces.

The President's second criterion was more of a moving target. The second requirement initially was that the program must have completed all design specifications. Congress has historically used a 35 percent design completion criterion for inclusion in the appropriations process. This historical precedent was ignored by the President without consultation with or notification of Congress. When the administration realized appropriations typically include the funding for design completion, the criterion was changed to require that the ability to begin work on the project happen in the same fiscal year as appropriated. Again, the administration erred in judgment. In testimony before the House National Security Committee, Chairman HEFLEY indicated that each of the 38 canceled items could begin work in fiscal year 1998. This further highlights the folly of any of the 38 line-item vetoes.

The final criterion, that the project must impact quality of life, is not only the most ambiguous, but also the most widely ignored. There were few, if any, projects that did not in some way impact the quality of life for our service personnel. Some of the projects were required for training and readiness, others for the operation and maintenance of military equipment, others yet for mitigating dangerous working conditions that existed at military facilities around the Nation.

The President vetoed construction modifications to a dining hall in Montana where the current facility fails State health inspections. A facility at White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico was slated to have renovations completed with funds from the bill. This facility suffers documented safety hazards and is infested with rats. Despite these conditions, the President deleted the renovations from the bill. In my own State of South Dakota, the President's pen struck a hanger facility for an air ambulance squadron of the National Guard. The administration's actions would leave these helicopters and Guardsmen exposed to the

same harsh weather that prompted three successive disaster declarations in the past year. Each of these projects are examples of mistakes caused by the President's new criteria.

These criteria were not only confusing to the authorizing and appropriating committees, but also to the administration and Pentagon officials that advised the President. This became evident when stories appeared in the press—and were later confirmed by the administration—that several projects had been vetoed by mistake. Originally it was believed only a few projects were cut by mistake, but that number quickly rose to 11. Then it escalated to 18. And now the Senate has indicated up to 28 projects were errantly vetoed. This problem is compounded by the Office of Management and Budget's inability to provide Congress with an exact accounting of errors that were made.

Should the President choose to reprogram funds this year to cover the mistakes, Government spending would not be reduced. The dollars Congress appropriated to the 38 vetoed items would go toward deficit reduction. At the same time, the President would fund those items with dollars taken from other worthy projects. Should the President instead decide to make these items a part of the fiscal year 1999 budget, the funds Congress appropriated for these items in fiscal year 1998 would still be spent on deficit reduction. The, next year, we would have to pay for them again. If we wait for the President to take action, the taxpayers would not save a dime. In fact, we run the risk of either taking funds from other valuable national security projects or having to pay for these 38 projects twice.

Congress has a tool to correct these mistakes. That tool is H.R. 2631. This disapproval resolution is not a referendum on the line-item veto. Instead, we are using the process the line-item veto law provides. If the legislative branch does not agree with the rationale for a veto, it is the body's obligation to let that be known. The disapproval resolution ensures that Congress maintains an active voice in the appropriations process.

This is a bill that is important for our military forces. Our service men and women support our Nation every day, putting their lives on the line in the defense of our Nation. They do not deserve to work in cramped facilities or to repair aircraft in subzero wind chills. Without this bill, that is what will happen. We need to support our military personnel.

It is important to reiterate that this is not a referendum on the line-item veto law. It is not a referendum on the administration. A vote in favor of H.R. 2631 is however a vote for fiscal common sense and for correcting admitted mistakes. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support our Nation's military personnel.

SUPPORTING THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

SPEECH OF

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the already loud chorus of Members supporting the \$300 million funding

level included in this year's Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriation bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] for fiscal year 2000. This sum represents a \$50 million increase over last year, but unfortunately an amount that only partially offsets the consecutive 3-year reduction in recent years.

However, while I am elated that the Congress has once again come to recognize the important role public broadcasting plays in our American life, we have neglected to properly and adequately fund programming dedicated to celebrating our multicultural country. In 1994, CPB committed to creating a formal partnership between the National Minority Public Broadcasting Consortia, television stations and other public broadcasting organizations to achieve this end, included in this effort is CPB's initiative Diversity 2000. Unfortunately, our goal has not yet been realized.

My sincerest hope is that this year's additional funding will enable CPB to endeavor toward creating the type of multicultural partnerships envisioned in the 1994 agreement. As our Nation changes, grows, and develops, public broadcasters, above all others, have a responsibility to mirror back to us our progress, our achievements, and our shortcomings. This effort can only be successful if broadcasters allow us to view the full panorama of our Nation and its cultures.

IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that last evening H.R. 2709, the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1997 introduced by my colleagues Mr. GILMAN and Mr. BERMAN, passed on the consent calendar. This legislation addresses a severely destabilizing development in the Middle East region: the acquisition by Iran of long-range missile capabilities—capabilities that threaten U.S. forces in the region, Israel, our NATO ally Turkey, and territory as distant as Central Europe.

H.R. 2709 takes a step beyond the concurrent resolution which passed last week in both bodies. That resolution urged the Administration to impose sanctions on Russian entities proliferating to Iran. As its author in this body, I believe that measure sent an immediate signal that continued cooperation between Russian entities and Iran in ballistic missile technology would not be tolerated.

This legislation does more. It adds a requirement that the President submit periodic reports to Congress identifying the entities providing Iran with missile technology. In so doing, the bill establishes a incontrovertible basis for imposing sanctions.

H.R. 2709 also allows the President to waive sanctions if there is subsequent evidence that an identified case of trade with Iran did not assist Iran's missile program. And, the legislation grants the President authority to waive sanctions if he determines that doing so is essential to U.S. national security.

Thus, this legislation is the logical next step to the resolution adopted by both houses of