important, Taiwan's foreign policy or its policy toward the mainland, he responded, ''If you are going fishing, is it the hook or the line that is important?''

Already, Mr. Chang is signaling a shift in tone from that of his predecessor, Mr. Chien, who held the more conciliatory stance that policy toward the mainland took precedence over foreign policy. It is Mr. Chang's stepped up efforts to raise Taiwan's international profile that has led some in Beijing to accuse him of betraying the ideals of his father and grandfather, who had hoped that the island would one day reunify with the mainland.

On some points, Mr. Chang strikes softer notes. Taiwan's continuing efforts to join international organizations, he says, will focus more on ''functional agencies'' such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

And while Taiwan will continue its efforts to take a more active role in the United Nations—the move on the international stage that most angers Beijing—Mr. Chang notes that Taiwan isn't formally seeking U.N. membership, but rather, it asks only that the U.N. study the issue of the representation of Taiwan, which hasn't been a member of the world body since 1971.

But in the next breath, Mr. Chang says he is planning overseas trips for later this year, and hopes to sign on new countries ''who want to have formal relationships with us,'' adding to the 31 nations that currently recognize Taiwan.

Which new countries might those be? The diplomatic veil drops again. ''You will hear about it,'' he promises, smiling.●

A NEW MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE EAST

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune had an editorial calling for a Marshall plan for Eastern Europe.

That really makes sense. I know that between now and election day we're not going to hear calls from our leaders for this, but after election day, I hope that will happen.

It would take courage, just as the original Marshall plan took courage. After President Truman and General Marshall announced the plan, the first Gallup Poll showed only 14 percent of the American public supporting it.

But what a great thing that was for the United States and the world; and let me add we need a Marshall plan for our domestic scene, particularly urban America.

President Clinton was not correct when he said that this is the end of the era of big Government.

The question is not whether the Government is big or small but whether it is good, whether it is doing the things that need to be done.

There are needs today in Eastern Europe and in the cities of our country. My hope is that the next President of the United States—and my hope is that it will be Bill Clinton—and the next Congress will show greater leadership than we have shown in foreign affairs and domestic affairs these last 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask that this editorial from the Chicago Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

A NEW MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE EAST

Sometimes the martial mind can discern more accurately than others how this nation should pursue its interests short of war. Think of Gen. George C. Marshall, who traded in his olive-drab for pinstripes after World War II and, as secretary of state, drafted the inspired plan (that now bears his name) to inject billions of dollars into the charred economies of Western Europe to create stable conditions in which democracy thrived and communism was held at bay.

Now that the Western democracies have won the Cold War, along comes another general with a compelling vision for America's role in Europe.

U.S. Gen. George Joulwan, the NATO supreme commander, argues that the Cold War's conclusion is not a time for America to disengage from Europe but to ''consolidate the gains of democracy.'' In military terms, he says, ''When you take an objective, the first thing you think about is not pulling back from the objective but of securing it.'' And the Western democracies, he says, have not yet consolidated their gains among the fragile, emerging democracies to the east.

True enough. But it is the method by which Joulwan proposes to achieve that consolidation—expansion of NATO—that gives us pause.

Pentagon troop strength in Europe, which forms the backbone of the Western alliance, has dropped to 100,000 from a Cold War high of 350,000.

Joulwan argues for expanding NATO eastward. That is the determination of both the North Atlantic Council that governs NATO and of his own commander in chief, President Clinton. (Republican challenger Bob Dole also favors allowing former Warsaw Pact states into NATO.)

But no military threat requires expanding NATO, particularly at a time when the wounded Russian bear would feel caged, provoked.

True, partnership training exercises between NATO and the armies of the East can teach discipline, order and the powerful concept of control over the military by a democratically elected civilian government. But even Joulwan avers that America ''stands for much more than ships, tanks and planes. It stands for shared values that are sought in the rest of Europe.''

Military alliances are no substitute for political and economic integration, and that is the best way to share western values with Central and Eastern Europe. Proof of that rests in the dusty archives of American diplomacy, in a proposal mostly forgotten as a casualty of the Moscow-Washington competition.

It's not widely remembered, but the Marshall Plan envisioned America's investing billions of dollars in Eastern Europe—yes, even in Russia—as well as in the West. Moscow vetoed that aid, so Marshall's visionary proposal benefited Western Europe alone.

Time to dust that plan off. The successor administration of the Marshall Plan, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, is alive and healthy today. Along with European Union membership and American guidance, it represents the best strategy for integrating the new Europe.●

TRIBUTE TO MERRILL MOORE

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to salute Merrill Moore, an experienced and devoted journalist who has become a living legend in upper east Tennessee and southwest Virginia. Merrill Moore is recognized by many in his community as the steadfast anchorman on WCYB-TV in Bristol. For 30 years, he has been one of the most trusted and most watched journalists in the five State area.

Moore began his career in radio broadcasting as a student at East Tennessee State University [ETSU]. He was a familiar radio personality on WETB, the college radio station, and remained active in broadcasting throughout his college career. After 2 years of military service, Moore returned home to the tri-cities area and to the radio booth.

Mr. President, at the urging of his colleagues Moore moved to WCYB-TV in Bristol where he worked his way through the ranks. In 1962, Moore anchored his first newscast at 11 p.m. and by 1964, he was anchoring the 6 p.m. newscast. Thirty-four years later, Merrill Moore has reached the pinnacle of his broadcasting career. In those years, he has covered countless national and local events and has had the opportunity to interview Presidents Ford, Carter, Bush, and Clinton.

Most importantly, Moore has had the opportunity to witness the growth of the tri-cities area. Many of his reports have spanned the beginning and completion of area projects, such as the construction of the East Tennessee State University Medical School and the highway connecting the tri-cities to Asheville, NC. He has been a main source of information to the community from the drawing board to the dedication of many area improvements. And he never fails to provide an up-to-date and informative newscast.

Recently, Merrill Moore was awarded the prestigious George Bowles Broadcast Journalism Award for his many years of dedication to WCYB-TV and the tri-cities area. The award, presented by the Virginia Association of Broadcasters, is an annual honor given to successful broadcast journalists that are respected by their peers and the community. It also honors journalists for their devotion to their work and the amount of insight they bring to the stories they cover. Merrill Moore most certainly qualifies for this award and has maintained these high standards for many years.

Mr. President, I would like to ask you to join me in applauding the efforts and continued service that Merrill Moore has provided upper east Tennessee and south west Virginia. His commitment to the tri-cities is to be admired by many.

OBJECTION TO CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1296

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am announcing that I would object to any request for unanimous consent to proceed to consider the conference report on H.R. 1296.

I would object to any unanimous request to proceed with this conference report because it contains a provision to that would allow the Secretary of the Interior to sell corporate sponsorships to America's National Parks System.

This provision has the potential to completely change the character of our

national parks and fosters conflicts of interest between the Department of the Interior and potential sponsors. Importantly, it would fail to contribute significantly to critical funding needs of the National Parks System.

I will object to consideration of the conference report because I don't believe we should consider such a controversial provision under procedures that do not provide for the debate and amendment of such objectionable provisions.●

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of the programs sponsored by the National Endowment for Democracy and the four core groups that are part of the endowment family. For a very modest investment from the U.S. Government, this nongovernment organization has accomplished remarkable achievements in promoting democratic institutions, advancing the norms of a civil society, and furthering the principle and practice of market economics abroad. NED has contributed significantly to the foreign policy goals of the United States.

It is exciting to chronicle the rich and positive role the NED has played in the promotion of American political values since its inception in 1983. It has been helpful in winding down the cold war in Eastern and Central Europe, in facilitating democratic transition, growth and consolidation in Asia and Latin America, and in supporting proponents of human rights and freedom in all geographic regions of the globe and in more than 90 countries.

Rather than listing the additional successes of NED, I ask that a statement entitled ''The United States Needs The National Endowment for Democracy'' be inserted in the RECORD for all Members to read. The statement was drafted by the Forum for International Policy whose president is Brent Scowcroft and whose chairman is Larry Eagleburger. They, along with virtually every individual who served in the positions of National Security Advisor and Secretary of State in every administration since 1983 have endorsed the NED's work and support its full funding. I ask all Members to read this statement carefully.

The material follows:

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

The United States' only international political foundation, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), is under threat. Establishment in 1983, the Endowment operates openly and independently to support individuals, groups and institutions who are working to promote and consolidate democracy in their own countries. Although it is federally funded and subject to Congressional oversight, NED is not a government agency. An independent, non-partisan board of directors sets its policies and strategies. The Endowment channels its support directly to grantees or through four core institutes: the Center for International Private Enterprise, the International Republican Institute, the Free Trade Union Institute, and the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. They, too, are independent of any government direction. The House of Representatives has approved an appropriation for fiscal 1997 of $30 million, reflecting no increase over the current level. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, has recommended that funding be eliminated entirely on the grounds that the Endowment is a Cold War institution which has outlived its usefulness. That is a short-sighted judgment and should be reversed.

In 1983, President Ronald Reagan called for a non-governmental institution along the lines of political foundations in other Western democracies. The National Endowment for Democracy was created to assist the transition to modern, pluralistic, particularly systems in other countries within the context of their own individual histories, cultures and traditions. The United States has fundamental and enduring interests in the promotion of American political values and ensuring the spread of pluralism, freedom and democracy throughout the world. Pursuit of those interests is no less important today than it was at the height of the Cold War. Our own national security and economic prosperity are no less at stake. NED and its core institutes are uniquely able to accomplish this task by the employment of non-governmental structures untainted by direct association with the U.S. Government.

At the official level, our choice of instruments to pursue democracy support strategies is limited. The Agency for International Development's (AID) focussed programs have been effective, but they reflect the immediate priorities of any administration in office (or of actively interested members of Congress). Because of the way they are funded and operated, the emphasis of AID programs is too often on short to medium-term results. They are managed by federal employees in accord with bureaucratic rules and regulations. AID's ''official'' programs require us to work with host governments or at least with their tacit acceptance. The State Department, the United States Information Agency, and other federal agencies as well, promote democracy, but they, too, must operate within limits and norms set for official government representatives in foreign lands. NED and its institutes, however, are able to use their resources to nurture the development of grass roots democratic movements and long-term processes which must grow from within. NED operates where there is no official U.S. presence and it is not obligated to work through official channels. NED is not driven by the short-term imperatives which often, quite legitimately, drive government decisions and actions.

The Endowment's non-governmental approach has worked. Through its low-cost programs NED does openly and aboveboard what our government is not able to do: it supports monitoring of elections, conferences and exchanges in Russia on party organization, polling methods, publicity and the nuts and bolts of open elections which have been credited with contributing to the success of democratic forces in the recent elections. In the Central Asian Republics it has funded civic education centers. In Slovakia it supports teacher-training workshops to introduce citizenship education into primary and secondary schools. In Bosnia it has kept an important source of news alive. It helps sustain Burma's hard-pressed democratic movement. It supported grass roots education for Palestinian voters. In Mexico it aids a coalition that focuses on electoral reform, political participation and accountability of public officials. NED even funds initiatives to strengthen democracy and human rights movements in Cuba. In many instances, however, despite free elections and outward signs of change, the transition to more deeply-rooted, stable democracy is incomplete or even at risk. It is in our interest to sustain NED's efforts because today's initiatives are no less important than those of the past.

Signs that America is prepared to disengage from the important work of fostering democracy are unsettling to our allies and do not serve our national interests. The National Endowment for Democracy has proven itself to be a cost effective, long-term investment in America's security. It would be a mistake to eliminate it. The Senate should restore funding for the National Endowment for Democracy as approved by the House.●

THE FORGOTTEN INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE LATIN AMERICANS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most shameful episodes in our Nation's history was the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. In response, although belatedly, Congress enacted in 1988 the law providing reparations to those who were uprooted and sent to internment camps.

There is another group of people who suffered the same injustice, but are ineligible for redress under the law. As detailed in a recent article in the Los Angeles Times, more than 2,200 Japanese Latin Americans were taken from their homes in 13 countries, mostly from Peru, and brought to the United States to be detained. Most spent the war in a camp in rural Texas, and some were even held until 1948. The U.S. Government never officially acknowledged a reason for this policy. Since the Japanese Latin Americans were not legal residents of the United States at the time of their internment, they are not eligible for an apology or reparations. Clearly, this injustice demands a remedy.

Of those who were forcibly brought to the United States, only 200 were allowed to return to Latin America. Others returned to Japan, while many stayed in the United States and eventually became citizens. Some 300 applications by Latin American Japanese for redress under the 1988 law have been denied because they were not legal residents before the law's June 1946 cutoff date.

The article gives an account of a journey of a detention ship that in 1944 was steaming from South America to the United States escorted by destroyers and submarines. In the year of the invasion of Normandy, not to mention the war in the Pacific, it is astounding that our Nation saw fit to devote military resources to this shameful and questionably legal undertaking.

I have written Senator INOUYE, who authored the 1988 reparations bill, to see if something can be done. While I will not be in the Senate next year, I hope that my colleagues will consider legislation in the next Congress to provide payments to family members of the Japanese Latin American who were detained. After so many years, that would be the right thing to do.●