

March 17, 2005

will still serve EMILY's List in an advisory capacity, and offer her our best wishes as she begins this new chapter in her life.

NATIONAL EYE DONOR MONTH—
MARCH, 2005

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2005

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues and to all of our constituents across the Nation that March, 2005, is National Eye Donor Month. As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Health Subcommittee, I have long been a champion of the cause of donation and particularly the needs of our nation's eye banks. But it was a special honor to be asked this year to participate in this proclamation, for 2005 marks the centennial of the first corneal transplant performed in 1905 by Dr. Eduard Zirm.

Since Dr. Zirm performed that first corneal transplant one hundred years ago, and in partnership since 1944 with our nation's eye banks, we have made tremendous progress. Each year in the United States, more than 46,000 people, ranging in age from nine days to 107 years old, have had their sight restored through corneal transplants, and hundreds of thousands are helped through important research to find cures for other blinding diseases.

But we cannot rest on our laurels. The purpose of Eye Donor Month is to educate each and every American individual and family about giving the gift of sight and to make a terrific difference in someone's life. This month marks an opportunity to raise public aware-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

5443

ness and to honor past donors and their families. The process to become a donor takes just a few minutes. All donors need to do is to sign a card, and, most importantly, discuss their donation wishes with their families. Our eye banks across the nation, in partnership with the Eye Bank Association of America, will continue to work to ensure that all Americans will receive the tissue they need and that this tissue will be safe and effective.

As National Eye Donor Month proceeds, I encourage my colleagues to work with their local eye banks to increase awareness of corneal transplantation and the continuous need for donors, and I encourage all Americans to sign a donor card and speak with their families about their desire to give the gift of sight.

CHINA'S ANTI-SECESSION LAW

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 2005

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, in December, the Standing Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress announced its intention to include an "anti-secession law" in its legislative agenda. This law would define China and Taiwan as a unified country, and unilaterally change mainland China's legal approach to status of Taiwan. This is an unwelcome and provocative action that would increase, rather than calm, tensions in the region.

In 1949, China and Taiwan were separated by civil war, each establishing its own form of government. Taiwan has never been a part of the People's Republic of China, much to the dismay of Beijing.

If the legislation passes, Beijing will be usurping all diplomatic efforts and simply de-

claring that its desired outcome is the only acceptable alternative to the current impasse. China has been claiming that this legislation is a reflection of its sincere desire to solve this dispute peacefully, and to maintain Taiwan's stability and prosperity. But Beijing real motivation is clear: China is laying the legal groundwork for forcible unification. And far from solving the dispute peacefully, passage of this law is tantamount to a demand. If unification is to occur, it must be through peaceful negotiation and without the threat of military action.

Understandably, the Taiwanese people are alarmed by China's action. Self-ruled Taiwan cannot be expected to accept such an affront to the legitimacy of its government and the self-determination of the Taiwanese people. Taiwan's government has said that if the anti-secession law passes, Taiwan would be forced to respond with a law against annexation by the People's Republic of China. This is entirely reasonable, as any free people would affirm their opposition to the imperialistic claims of another power.

Our country must make its deep displeasure with an "anti-secession law" known to the world and, most specifically, to the Communist leaders on the mainland. In The Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the United States committed to aiding Taiwan against any unilateral attempt by China to unify Taiwan with the mainland. This responsibility is not only a legal one. Taiwan is a budding democracy, and the people have participated in multi-party democratic elections since 1996. By contrast, China is a repressive regime that denies its citizens the essential freedoms of religion, political dissent and representative self-government. It is our responsibility, morally and legally, to stand with Taiwan against Communist aggression and unsound Chinese law.