

to fight their cancer and their health plans at the same time. That is not a fair fight.

We should pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. Now, the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights and this Senate passed what I call a "patients' bill of goods." It is a hollow vessel, one of those charade-like things that doesn't do anything. In fact, the Republican Congressmen from the House have said the Senate passed proposal is a step backward, even worse than nothing. It is a charade. We still have an opportunity to enact a real Patients' Bill of Rights. This legislation is still in conference. This Congress can, in its final days, pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. When Mary Lewandowski comes to Washington, DC, three times because her daughter died—and this young woman should not have died—and says, "Do something, please," we have a responsibility to respond. We ought to do it now.

If the past is prologue, of course, we will end this session and we will not do the kinds of things we should—putting a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program or enacting a real Patients' Bill of Rights. The American people will have lost. We will be back in January organizing as a new Congress and many of us will reintroduce exactly the same legislation. We will, once again, engage in this battle. The battle will not be over until we get done what needs to be done. Go back 40 years and the same people who stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed Medicare, oppose doing these important tasks. They do not think the Federal Government should do it. This same mentality is what is now providing the roadblock for doing what we should and adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare and passing a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

We can alter that result. We can do it this week, if there is the will. There is a way. The question for the Members of this body is, Does the will exist in the Senate to do the right thing in these final days? I hope so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from North Dakota that I very much agree with him that we should be taking up the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation. I hope he will join those of us on this side of the aisle when we bring a conference report to this body which will report a very important Patients' Bill of Rights piece of legislation. We would then hope to pass it in the Senate, send it over to the House of Representatives, and have the President sign it.

I am very much hopeful that we can get such a conference report to the Senate and that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will help us to pass it.

CHINA'S THREAT TO U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to talk about something this afternoon that I think is of great importance to this country and one of the biggest challenges we are going to face in the coming years; that is, the challenge of how the United States manages our relationships with countries that potentially present threats to our national security.

While few would like to admit it, I think China cannot be omitted from this scrutiny, and I, therefore, would like to discuss that question with respect to China today.

As my colleagues know, it was not long ago that the bill to grant permanent normal trade status to China passed through the Senate without amendment. I voted for this bill because I recognize the economic benefits it will have for many American workers, businesses, and consumers. That said, it is of utmost importance that we not lose sight of the fact that trade alone does not define our relationship with China. The actions and the heated rhetoric of China's communist leaders should be of great concern. So now, in the aftermath of our recent decision to grant PNTR to China, we are obligated to face the other challenges presented by the communist Chinese government.

Time and time again, Chinese officials and state-sponsored media have made bellicose and threatening statements aimed at the United States and our long-standing, democratic ally, Taiwan. They have even gone so far as to issue implied threats to use nuclear weapons against the United States. The question is, will we take them at their word on these defense matters as we did when they made trade commitments.

For example, in 1995, General Xiong Guangkai warned a visiting U.S. official that China could use military force to prevent Taiwan's gaining independence without fear of U.S. intervention because American leaders "care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan." An editorial in a military-owned newspaper this March was more blunt, warning that, "The United States will not sacrifice 200 million Americans for 20 million Taiwanese."

In February of this year, a state-owned paper again warned the United States against becoming involved in a conflict with China over Taiwan. The People's Liberation Army Daily carried an article which stated, "On the Taiwan issue, it is very likely that the United States will walk to the point where it injures others while ruining itself." The article went on to issue a veiled threat to attack the U.S. with long-range missiles, stating, "China is neither Iraq or Yugoslavia * * * it is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. Probably it is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which U.S. policymakers know fairly well also."

Not only has China warned against U.S. military intervention in the event that Taiwan declares its independence, Chinese officials have also issued threats against U.S. sale of theater missile defenses (TMD) to Taiwan. In February 1999, China's top arms control official, Sha Zukang, was interviewed by a reporter for the publication Defense News. When asked if U.S. assistance on theater missile defense for Japan, South Korea and possibly Taiwan could cause damage to U.S.-China relations, he replied, "If the U.S. is bent on its own way on this issue, it will not, to put it lightly, be conducive to the development of legitimate self-defense needs of relevant countries." When further questioned about theater missile defense for Taiwan, he stated, "In the case of Taiwan, my God, that's really the limit. It constitutes a serious infringement of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It also represents a deliberate move on the part of the United States to provoke the entire Chinese people. Such a move will bring severe consequences." (Emphasis added) According to the Washington Post in July, that same Chinese official warned that the sale of U.S. technology to Taiwan for a smaller scope theater missile defense system would "lead to serious confrontation" because it would be tantamount to restoring a military alliance between Taipei and Washington. He stated, "This is of supreme national interest. It will be defended at any cost." (Emphasis added)

These are not examples of isolated threats. They are a small sample of the bellicose statements that China's government has made recently. I have compiled dozens of such statements and am disappointed at the sparse attention they have received. Mr. President, I have compiled a document containing 14 pages of threats issued by communist Chinese officials. It is by no means a comprehensive compendium of such statements, and is merely a sample. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the rhetoric from Beijing has also been accompanied by troubling actions. China has long-range nuclear-tipped missiles targeted at American cities, and is already increasing its arsenal of such weapons. It is greatly increasing the number of short-range missiles aimed at Taiwan, and has taken steps to improve its ability to invade or blockade the island.

China has also been the world's worst proliferator of missiles and weapons of mass destruction. It has sold ballistic missile technology to Iran, North Korea, Syria, Libya, and Pakistan, despite promising to adhere to the Missile Technology Control Regime. It has sold nuclear technology to Iran and Pakistan. It has aided Iran's chemical

weapons program and sold that nation advanced cruise missiles. Because of China's assistance to rogue nations and its military advances, the American people, and our forces and friends abroad, face a much greater threat.

Mr. President, as we craft effective national security policies for the United States, it's important that we look for warning signs of problems. As Winston Churchill said, in his "Iron Curtain" speech in 1946, less than one year after the end of World War II, "Last time, I saw it all coming and I cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her * * * There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe * * * but no one would listen * * * We surely must not let that happen again."

Now, more than 50 years later, we live in a very different world. The collapse of the Soviet empire, the spread of democracy and civil society in Eastern Europe and the Baltics, and the emergence of the United States as the sole-surviving superpower could lead some to mistakenly assume that the world is no longer a dangerous place.

To the contrary, the threats we face today are even more complex and harder to predict than those we faced during and before the Cold War. We must now be more clear than ever in our own minds about our strategic intentions, and just as clear in signaling these to our potential aggressors.

Obviously, China is not Nazi Germany, and it presents different challenges, yet the message delivered by Churchill about the need to heed warning signs is timeless. Many are quick to dismiss the rhetoric from Beijing as empty threats. This could be true, but I believe we must be prepared for another possibility—what if China's leaders mean what they say?

China's proliferation of the technology for ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction has increased the threat faced by the United States and our allies. China is increasing the size and capabilities of its strategic nuclear force targeted on the United States. And furthermore, China has tried to use the threat of missile attack to coerce the United States into staying out of any future conflict in the Taiwan Strait.

These are but three of the many compelling reasons why we need a national missile defense system to protect the United States and to guarantee our freedom of action. I disagree with those who claim China's objection to our proposed national missile defense, NMD, system will lead to an arms race with that country. As Secretary of Defense William Cohen testified to the Senate in July of this year, "I think it's fair to say that China, irrespective of what we do on NMD, will in fact, modernize and

increase its ICBM capability." Of course, that is precisely what China has done. Left with this reality, we have no option but to deploy a national missile defense system that will protect the United States.

Frankly, I am disappointed that for the last eight years, the Clinton-Gore Administration has failed to pursue the most promising forms of missile defense and has underfunded the limited programs it has authorized due to loyalty to the ABM Treaty. For example, one of the Administration's first decisions in early 1993 was to return unopened proposals the Defense Department had requested from three teams of companies that had bid to develop a ground-based national missile defense interceptor. In 1993, the Clinton Administration also cut the budget for missile defense for fiscal year 1994 by \$2.5 billion over the amount requested in President Bush's final budget, and has continued to underfund missile defense programs every year.

I believe that the ABM Treaty is obsolete. It was made with an entity that no longer exists. In the words of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, this treaty "constrains the nation's missile defense programs to an intolerable degree in the day and age when ballistic missiles are so attractive to so many countries." Dr. Kissinger has also stated that, "Deliberate vulnerability when the technologies are available to avoid it cannot be a strategic objective, cannot be a political objective, and cannot be a moral objective of any American President." We must not allow loyalty to an outdated piece of paper called the ABM Treaty to stand in the way of a sound defense given the threats we face.

In addition to the deployment of a national missile defense system, it is important for the United States to use the full range of economic and diplomatic tools to halt China's proliferation of the technology for missiles and weapons of mass destruction. I believe the Senate missed an opportunity when we failed to pass an amendment offered by Senator THOMPSON to combat this problem. I hope this legislation will be considered and passed next year. In addition, we need to ensure that strong export controls on U.S.-made products are in place so we don't inadvertently help China modernize its military.

It remains to be seen whether the rhetoric from Beijing will become reality, but in light of China's troubling actions, prudence demands that we take steps to address China's behavior. We ignored warnings in the past and paid a high price. We surely must not let it happen again.

THREATENING OR BELLICOSE STATEMENTS BY CHINESE OFFICIALS OR DRAWN FROM OFFICIAL STATE-RUN MEDIA

MISSILE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

The PLA could use military force to prevent Taiwan's gaining independence without fear of U.S. intervention, because American leaders, "care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan."—Remark by an offi-

cer in the People's Liberation Army (PLA) to former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas Freeman, Jr., "As China Threatens Taiwan, It Makes Sure U.S. Listens," New York Times, January 24, 1996.

"On the Taiwan issue, it is very likely that the United States will walk to the point where it injures others while ruining itself. As is known to all, if the 'Taiwan independence' elements openly and brazenly advocate separatism, the PRC government will be forced to resort to the use of force ultimately to resolve the Taiwan issue. Once the cross-strait war breaks out, the U.S. government will face a dilemma: If it chooses not to intervene, the United States has to consider the 'Taiwan Relations Act,' besides, U.S. allies will doubt whether the promises made by the United States will hold. If the United States chooses to engage in substantial interventions, U.S. policymakers will be left with no choice but to consider the possible enormous pressure to endure and the possible exorbitant price to pay. *China is neither Iraq or Yugoslavia, but a very special country: on one hand, China is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council; on the other hand, it is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. Probably it is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which U.S. policymakers know fairly well also.*—"Safeguarding the One-China Policy is the Cornerstone of Peace in the Taiwan Strait—Splitting the Motherland by 'Taiwan Independence' Elements is Bound to provoke a War," People's Liberation Army Daily, February 28, 2000. (Emphasis added.)

"The United States will not sacrifice 200 million Americans for 20 million Taiwanese."—Excerpt from article in Chinese state-owned Haowangjiao Weekly, "Chinese Military Paper Warns Taiwan and U.S.," as reported by Philadelphia Inquirer, March 21, 2000.

"China is a country that has certain abilities of launching a strategic counterattack and the capacity of launching a long-distance strike. [If the United States intervenes in Taiwan it would lose the conflict and] even be forced to have a complete withdrawal from the East Asian region as they were forced to withdrawal from southern Vietnam."—Commentary in the People's Liberation Army Daily, "Threat By China Downplayed," Philadelphia Inquirer, March 1, 2000.

"Entitled, 'The United States Will Suffer Disastrous Blows,' the signed article [in a Chinese military journal] quotes an expert as saying that if the United States dares to obstruct China's reunification, China is bound to employ its nuclear weapons, and that for the sake of its national interests, China has made full preparations to fight a nuclear war with the United States."—"Beijing Military Journal: Nuclear War Will Certainly Break Out If United States Gets Involved," Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao, April 11, 2000.

MISSILE DEFENSE

In reference to provisions in the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Defense Authorization Act regarding theater missile defense cooperation with allies in East Asia: "The US Congress has gravely violated the fundamental norms of international relations, interfered in China's internal affairs and seriously hurt the feelings of the Chinese people."—Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Tang Guiqiang, "Beijing Rains fury on Defense Umbrella," South China Morning Post, October 30, 1998

When asked if U.S. insistence on theater missile defense for Japan, South Korea and possibly Taiwan could cause irreparable damage to US-Sino ties, he replied, "If the

U.S. is bent on its own way on this issue, it will not, to put it lightly, be conducive to the development of legitimate self-defense needs of relevant countries." When further questioned about the TMD for Taiwan, he stated, "In the case of Taiwan, my God, that's really the limit. It constitutes a serious infringement of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It also represents a deliberate move on the part of the United States to provoke the entire Chinese people. Such a move will bring severe consequences."—Ambassador Sha Zukang, Director-General of the Chinese Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, Interview with Defense News staff writer Barbara Opall-Rome, February 1, 1999.

"The US global strategy in Europe is to contain Russia's revival and in Asia to contain China's growth, and is to preserve US hegemony in the world . . . [NMD is a] hangover from the Cold War . . . [the political cost of its deployment will be] tremendous for the United States."

"The rest of the world is wondering if the United States could break the treaty it signed, shouldn't other countries do the same? In other words, the United States will set an example for others to dump other arms-reduction agreements if it presses forward with NMD."—Remarks by Luo Yuan, Director of the Second Office of Strategy Studies, Chinese Academy of Military Science, "Experts: US plan could start new arms race," China Daily, August 16, 2000.

In reference to a national missile defense system: "We believe this idea of the United States will inevitably support a new round of arms race and will compromise international peace and stability. This issue is by no means a dispute between China and the United States, but between the United States and the international community."—Remark from Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, "Asian Forum Ends in Chorus of Criticism of U.S. Missile Defense Plan," Washington Post, July 30, 2000.

"China's government is standing up to U.S. attempts to set up both a national anti-ballistic missile system and a theater of war anti-ballistic missile system. Attempts [by the U.S.] to make Taiwan join the creation and unveiling of a theater of war anti-ballistic missile system are a serious interference into China's internal affairs and will necessarily be seriously repulsed by the Chinese people."—Remark by Chinese Defense Minister Chi Haotian, press conference, January 17, 2000.

"For its own defense needs, if the United States wants to develop a [theater missile defense] system, that's its own business. What we don't want to see is TMD covering Taiwan. That would . . . damage U.S.-China . . . relations."—Remarks by an unidentified senior Chinese official quoted in the Washington Post, January 27, 2000.

Placing TMD in Taiwan "seriously infringes on China's sovereignty and territorial integrity and will certainly meet with strong opposition from the Chinese people."—Remark from Chinese Embassy spokesman Cui Jianjun, "Chinese Warn U.S. on Defense; Missile Umbrella Would Aid Taiwan," The Washington Times, March 6, 1999.

"The inclusion of Taiwan into the theater-missile defense system will severely harm the stability of the region, and finally threaten bilateral relations."—"Chinese Warn U.S. on Defense; Missile Umbrella Would Aid Taiwan," Washington Times, March 6, 1999.

ARMS CONTROL

"Any amendment, or abolishing of the [ABM] treaty, will lead to disastrous consequences. This will bring a halt to nuclear

disarmament now between the Russians and Americans, and in the future will halt multilateral disarmament as well."

"We are not rejecting the concept of missile defense completely, such as air defense to protect troops. But it is the advanced systems, in space and elsewhere, that are the problem. These are a violation of the ABM Treaty. These may disturb or destroy the strategic balance."

"[The] United States . . . has been teaching the international community that the ABM Treaty, though bilateral, is a cornerstone for strategic stability, that it's a precondition for further nuclear disarmament. Now suddenly they are attempting to amend it and threaten to abolish it. We have no words for this. Should we assume that the United States monopolizes all the truth in the world? This cannot be the case, I believe. So this will erode U.S. authority and credibility."—Excerpts of Remarks by Sha Zukang, Chinese Director-General of the Arms Control and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, press interview, November 10, 1999.

"This decision by the United States [deployment of an NMD system] goes against the trend of the times and is detrimental to international arms control and disarmament efforts. It will have an extensive and profound negative impact on the global and regional strategic balance and stability in the 21st Century. The Chinese side expresses serious concern."

"The Chinese side expresses serious concern over this [U.S. deployment of NMD]. China believes that the development, deployment, and transfer of anti-missile systems with strategic defense potential will not enhance security or curb missile technology proliferation. On the contrary, it will only undermine security, and spur missile technology proliferation. Moreover, it violates the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The ABM Treaty is of great significance for safeguarding the global strategic balance and stability and for maintaining the momentum in the nuclear disarmament process. It should be observed strictly."

"This [the UN General Assembly resolution on the ABM Treaty] demonstrates the international community's near-unanimous opposition to or disapproval of the attempts by relevant countries to revise the ABM Treaty or to develop anti-missile systems. China urges relevant countries to take a serious approach toward the strong appeal from the international community, think carefully before making any move, and abandon the aforementioned programs for developing anti-missile systems."—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Zhu Bangzao, press conference, January 13, 2000.

"The creation of such a system is strictly prohibited by the ABM. Russia and China have suggested that the United States is motivated by the ambition to gain unilateral superiority in the military sphere and in security issues. The realization of such a plan would undermine the security of not only Russia, China and other countries, but also the security of the US itself and global strategic stability in the world. That is why China and Russia resolutely oppose the plan."

"The collapse of the ABM would lead to a resumption of the arms race. Such a situation is not in the interests of any country. Those countries, which support the US' proposal to modify the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, would be held responsible for undermining international stability and security and for all the consequences of that decision."—Excerpts from the joint statement of Russian President, Vladimir Putin, and Chinese President, Jiang Zemin, July 21, 2000.

When asked if China is setting the stage to recant on commitments to the Chemical Weapons Convention, he replied, "What we object to is the existence of the Australia Group, a smaller, more stricter group of nations with its own legal provisions that have created a de facto split among to the Convention. This has caused confusion, has undermined the Convention, and has affected the normal international trade of chemicals. This problem is compounded by the seemingly irresistible inclination of certain countries to impose their own standards or even their own domestic legislation onto other countries, thus giving rise to unnecessary international disputes."

"There are only two ways I see to rectify this situation: One is to do away with the Australia Group and the other is to do away with the Chemical Weapons Convention."—Ambassador Sha Zukang, Director-General of the Chinese Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, Interview with Defense News staff writer Barbara Opall-Rome, February 1, 1999.

"China will never be involved in any arms race at any level. However, it has to consider necessary means to defend its national security."—Remark by Sha Zukang, Chinese Director-General of the Arms Control and Disarmament Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, reported by Beijing China Daily, January 14, 2000.

"In pursuit of its own strategic interests and military superiority and in disregard of the authority of the already concluded international arms control legal instruments, a certain country attempted to rectify the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. In light of this dangerous tendency, China, Russia and Belarus co-sponsored the draft resolution of Preserving and Observing the ABM Treaty which was adopted by an overwhelming majority in the Committee of Disarmament and International Security and the UN General Assembly respectively. China's efforts to safeguard world peace and security garnered the extensive support of the international community."—Excerpt of article by Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, posted on the official home page of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 14, 2000.

"We have always maintained that, as a country with powerful military strength, the United States' development of missile defense systems in violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty does not benefit global and regional strategic balance and stability. I would like to point out once again that the 54th UN General Assembly has passed, by an overwhelming majority, a resolution on preserving and abiding by the ABM Treaty, which shows that the international community almost unanimously opposes or does not approve of attempts by relevant countries to amend the ABM Treaty and develop anti-ballistic missiles. We urge relevant countries to take seriously the strong call of the international community, to think carefully before acting, and to abandon the aforementioned anti-ballistic missile plan."—Remark by Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Zhu Bangzao, press conference, January 20, 2000.

"A certain country . . . practices expediency and double standards toward arms control and disarmament agreements, even trying to weaken or abolish relevant treaties."

"The CTBT has been trampled on and faces an uncertain future."

"People cannot but ask: Do we prefer the common security for all or the absolute security enjoyed by a single state at the expense of all others?"—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Ambassador Hu Xiaodi, speech to the 66-nation Conference on Disarmament, January 27, 2000.

"In an attempt to seek absolute security for itself, a certain country is stepping up its

research, development and deployment of sophisticated anti-missile systems, even at the expense of violating the international legal obligations to which it has committed itself."

"This move [U.S. violation of the ABM Treaty] will undoubtedly inflict severe damages on global strategic balance and stability, undermine the international security environment, make it difficult to carry on the international non-proliferation regime and may even trigger a new . . . arms race."

"For this, the international community cannot but express deep apprehension."

"China will never be a superpower or seek hegemony."

"I hope that others will not overestimate Chinese influence on North Korea."—Remarks by Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Wang Guangya, Speech to the 36th Munich Conference on Security Policy, February 6, 2000

"All these facts have demonstrated that China adopts a clear-cut policy against the proliferation of WMD. This policy will remain unchanged in the future."

"[The U.S.] takes advantage of its economic and scientific strength to develop a national missile defense system, in an attempt to disrupt the global strategic balance, and to seek absolute security and hegemony for itself."

"It is a widely known fact that during the Cold War years, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty constituted a cornerstone of global strategic stability, paving the way for the limitation and reduction of offensive strategic weapons between the United States and the former Soviet Union. Despite the drastic changes in the international situation following the end of the Cold War, the crucial role of the ABM Treaty to international security remains unchanged. Pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, any substantive amendment to this treaty will undermine global strategic stability."

"It is true that what the ABM Treaty maintains is 'the balance of terror' and can only offer relative security—not an ideal situation." "[A]ny violation of this treaty is bound to give rise to strong opposition from other countries, and will inevitably have severe negative impacts on international cooperation in arms control and non-proliferation."

"Everyone is equal before the law. And treaty obligations should be honored."

"Yet one country takes a cynical view on arms control and nonproliferation treaties and their legal obligations undertaken therein."

"The fundamental way to prevent the WMD proliferation lies in the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of such weapons."—Excerpts of Remarks by Chinese Director General of the Department of Arms Control and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sha Zukang, interview with Beijing Review, February 21, 2000

TAIWAN

"Our policy on Taiwan is a consistent one. That is, one, peaceful unification, one country-two systems. However, if there were to be any foreign intervention, or if there were to be Taiwan independence, then we would not undertake to renounce the use of force."—Remark by Chinese President Jiang Zemin, exchange with reporters prior to discussions with President Clinton, September 11, 1999

This threat, reportedly on the front page of almost every newspaper in Asia, was aimed at turning Taiwanese voters away from opposition candidate Chen Shui-bian: "Do not just act on impulse. Otherwise you will regret it very much and it will be too late to repent."—Chinese Prime Minister Zhu

Rongji, "Bully in a China Shop," The Wall Street Journal, March 17, 2000

. . . the sale of U.S. technology to Taiwan for a smaller-scope theater missile defense system would "lead to serious confrontation" because it would be tantamount to restoring a military alliance between Taipei and Washington. "This is of supreme national interest. It will be defended at any cost."

"Instead of enhancing your security, your security policy will be further compromised. The United States will play the role of a fire brigade. Rushing from one place to another to extinguish fires."

Asked if China would reconsider its commitment to nuclear disarmament and a halt in sensitive weapons sales, Sha responded, "To say the least, our enthusiasm and our participation in all of those regimes, particularly in cooperating with the United States, our mood, let me say, would be severely dampened."

When asked if a decision to deploy missile defenses would also affect China's existing arms control treaties, Sha responded, "To say the least, it would seriously dampen our interest . . . We have not yet reached a stage to say we will forget our commitments . . . yet."—Remarks by Chinese Director General of the Foreign Ministry's Department of Arms Control and Disarmament Sha Zukang, "China: Missile Shield Threatens Arms Control," Washington Post, July 13, 2000

A U.S. shield against ballistic missiles would "aim to absorb Taiwan into the American sphere of protection, which we consider a gross interference into China's domestic affairs."—Remark by Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji in Rome, "US Ready to Discuss Objections to its Missile Defense Shield," Agence France Presse, July 6, 2000

In reference to TMD: "The system would aim to put Taiwan in a sphere of protection. This would be blatant interference in Chinese affairs."—Remark by Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji, "Taiwan May Get Anti-missile Technology," Washington Post, July 9, 2000

"If a grave turn of events occurs leading to the separation of Taiwan from China in any name, or if there is foreign invasion and occupation of Taiwan, or if Taiwan authorities indefinitely refuse to peacefully resolve the cross-strait unification problem through negotiations, then the PRC government will only be forced to adopt all possible drastic measures, including the use of force, to safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and fulfill the great cause of China's unification."—"The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue," English version published by Xinhua, February 21, 2000

Washington "bears unshakeable responsibility for the tension in the Taiwan Straits" and it was vital the US stopped arms sales to Taiwan.—Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, Agence France Presse, March 16, 2000

The Chinese military made the statement that it would "spare no effort in a blood-soaked battle" to protect China's territorial integrity and that China would not be tricked into negotiations with Taiwan leaders who secretly opposed rejoining the motherland.

Prime Minister Zhu Rongji stated that China "will not sit idly by and watch and serious separatist activity."

General Zhang Wannian, a top military leader, echoed this thought stating, "The two sides of the strait cannot remain perpetually divided," and "Taiwanese independence means war."—"China Army Renews Threat Against Taiwan," New York Times, March 7, 2000

"Taiwan Independence means war and splitting (with the mainland) means no peace."

"Anyone who pays no heed to this important information from us and insists on Taiwan independence will push Taiwan into the abyss of war and bring disaster to the Taiwanese people."

It warned those who "underestimate the strong determination of China's government and the People's Liberation Army to safeguard national territorial integrity and put at stake the happiness of 23 million Taiwanese people that the great strength of the PLA will solve the Taiwan problem."

"The consequence will be worse than anything imaginable. We are not willing to see that."—Editorial in People's Liberation Army Daily, Agence France Presse, "China keeps up war-rhetoric as Taiwan prepares changing of guard," April 15, 2000

"If the Taiwan authorities indefinitely refuse to peacefully settle the reunification issue through dialogue, the Chinese government will be forced to adopt all possible drastic measures, including military force."

Proposals to extend a theater missile defense system to Taiwan are "a gross interference in China's internal affairs and a grave threat to China's security . . . no country maintaining diplomatic relations with China should provide arms to Taiwan or enter into military alliance of any form with Taiwan."—"White Paper issued by China's State Council, as reported in Chicago Tribune, February 22, 2000

"Beat them till they hurt, beat them till they obey, beat them until they're scared! Beat them until the Taiwan separatists admit total defeat!"—An article carried on the state-run Yangcheng Evening News' web site said this to describe China's option of striking Taiwan with missiles and warplanes, "China Goes to War with Words Against Taiwan," AP, July 26, 1999

"We must make it crystal clear. No matter who comes to power in Taiwan, Taiwan will never be allowed to be independent. This is our bottom line. This is also the will of the 1.25 billion Chinese people."

Dismissing widely held views by foreign military analysts that China lacks enough aircraft, missiles and ships to attack Taiwan, Zhu said, "By such calculations, Hitler would long ago have conquered the whole world. The Chinese people will use all their blood and even sacrifice their lives to defend the unity of our motherland and the dignity of the Chinese nation." Zhu accused U.S. political leadership of delaying China's unification with Taiwan, declaring, "They always have taken China as their imaginary or potential enemy and have always wanted to use Taiwan, which in their view is an unsinkable aircraft carrier, to oppose China."—Remarks from Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji, "Chinese Premier Warns U.S. Over Taiwan, PNTR Vote," National Journal's Congress Daily, March 15, 2000

"A handful of American politicians, who are holding a Cold War mentality, have pushed the House to pass the act in an attempt to provide a legal basis for the buildup and expansion of military contacts and exchanges between the United States and Taiwan."

The Taiwan Security Enhancement Act is "a complete violation of the three Sino-U.S. joint communique, a serious encroachment on China's sovereignty, a gross interference in China's internal affairs, and an attempt to make 'two Chinas'."—Remarks by Chinese Ambassador to the United States Li Zhaoxing, ChinaOnline, February 3, 2000

"Although a handful of U.S. legislators claim that the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act was aimed at 'protecting' Taiwan's 'security,' their real motive is to split China, and prevent China from becoming stronger . . . some U.S. lawmakers have ignored International Law and tried to make legislation on the 'security' of another country's

territory, and this has fully exposed the arrogance of the U.S. hegemonists.”—Editorial in the *People’s Daily*, as reported by ChinaOnline, February 3, 2000.

“The move [Taiwan’s effort to join the United Nations] constitutes a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the U.N. Charter, a distortion of the nature of the U.N. and a gross interference in China’s internal affairs.”—Remark by Zhu Bangzao, Spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry, “China Objects to Taiwan Leader’s U.S. Visa,” *New York Times*, August 5, 2000.

“If we were to take military action, it should be sooner rather than later.”—Jiang Zemin, “Act soon if force is needed, says Jiang,” *South China Morning Post*, March 28, 2000.

“At the special Politburo meeting called on the evening of the election, what the senior cadres were debating was not whether some degree of force would be used against Taiwan, but when.”—“Military pressure builds over Taiwan,” *South China Morning Post*, March 29, 2000.

“The [recently-acquired] Sovremenny destroyer is equipped with eight SS-N-22 missiles, which can carry nuclear missiles.”—Beijing Jiefangjun Bao, March 22, 2000 (Emphasis added).

“The new Chinese-made super Kilo-class diesel attack submarine was quietly put into service recently with the South China Sea Fleet for the mission of combat readiness against Taiwan.”—“Chinese-made Kilo-class attack submarine goes into service, starts undertaking combat readiness task,” *Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao*, April 4, 2000.

“A-Category Group Armies in Nanjing and Guangzhou War Theaters Have Been Equipped With Naval Vessels To Enhance Sea-Crossing and Landing Operations Capability”—*Hong Kong Ming Pao*, April 10, 2000.

“In order to deal with the military crisis that might occur in the Taiwan Strait, the Central Military Commission has decided to set up a Fujian Joint Operational Headquarters. On 11 February the headquarters for the first time directed the “routine military exercise” of using submarines to block the Taiwan Strait.”—*Hong Kong Sing Tao Jih Pao*, February 17, 2000.

“The Taiwan authorities actually have only two roads to take: The first is to identify with the one China principle, peaceful reunification, and one country, two systems; the second is to force Beijing to resolve the Taiwan issue by military means. There is no third road, nor is it possible for the confrontation to go on for a long time.”—Zhang Wannian, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, July 6, 2000.

“In the process of settling the Taiwan issue, we will do whatever we can to bring about peaceful reunification. But, in the event that any serious incidents to split Taiwan from China under any pretext occur, that a foreign country invades Taiwan, or that the Taiwan authorities refuse for an indefinite time to settle the issue of cross-strait peaceful reunification through talks, then we will be forced to take all possible drastic measures to accomplish the great cause of the motherland’s reunification.”—General Zhang Wannian, the PLA’s highest-ranking officer, a vice chairman of the Central Military Commission, and a Politburo member, “The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue,” February 21, 2000 (English version published by Xinhua).

“A possible interference by the United States has already been taken into account in our military preparations; in fact, we have taken into account all possibilities in our preparations. If the United States really interferes in the matter, the question is how far the United States can go in its interference. The Taiwan side should also get a

clear idea of this issue. Making a big country like China as its opponent, the United States will surely lose more than it gains. The United States suffered losses in every war it fought in Asia in the past, and I believe it will surely learn from all its bitter lessons. Even if the United States or U.S.-led U.N. troops are involved in the matter, in no way will the United States afford a loss in the war; putting all other things aside, a slight increase in its casualties will lead to domestic pressure that will prove too much for it to bear. What is more, we also have other strategies to use in such a war, for example, a China-Russia alliance is also a move that can touch the United States on its sore spot. Therefore, we are not afraid of the involvement of the United States or any other foreign forces, for we are assured that we can win the war in the end.”—Unnamed PLA general, “Discussing Taiwan Strait Crisis with a General,” *Ta Kung Pao*, May 15, 2000.

ANTI-U.S. STATEMENTS

In reference to the relationship between Russia and China: “The partnership is an effort to oppose hegemony and supremacy, and one single country dominating the world.”—Remark by Zhao Huasheng, Director of the Russian Studies Department at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies, “Putin Visits China in Hope of Strengthening a Strategic Axis,” *New York Times*, July 17, 2000.

“U.S. a Threat to World Peace.”—“China Demonizes,” title of editorial from PRC state-owned *China Daily*, as reported by *Washington Post*, July 17, 2000.

“On June 22, 1999, the *People’s Daily* fed a general anti-American campaign related to the accidental bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade with a long, hysterical piece accusing the United States of ‘acting like Nazi Germany’ by leading the NATO campaign to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo.”—“China Demonizes,” *Washington Post*, July 17, 2000 (article excerpt).

In reference to the relationship between Russia and China: “The partnership is an effort to oppose hegemony and supremacy, and one single country dominating the world.”—Remark by Zhao Huasheng, Director of the Russian Studies Department at the Shanghai Institute for International Studies, “Putin Visits China in Hope of Strengthening a Strategic Axis,” *New York Times*, July 17, 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wyoming.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN BRUCE VENTO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate to speak about Congressman BRUCE VENTO from Minnesota, the Fourth Congressional District, who passed away today.

BRUCE VENTO was a fierce advocate for justice and a true representative, in the best sense of that word, of the people of the 4th District. He was generous and good-humored, with a seriousness of purpose that energized his work and inspired others. A gentle teacher and great friend, we were all ennobled, challenged and made greater by his

presence among us, and will be less for his absence. The model he offered, of a life of public service for the common good, beckons us forward, toward the light, and for that we are grateful.

From working to protect our nation’s vulnerable homeless, to fighting to protect and preserve earth’s natural treasures from the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness to South American Rain Forests, BRUCE’s legacy will last many generations. His leadership resulted in enactment of hundreds of conservation-related measures through the years, and protected millions of acres of our nation’s parks, forests and wilderness areas. Close to home, when we look at a map of Minnesota we literally are looking at an image created in part by BRUCE VENTO. Our state’s parks and green spaces are as healthy as they are in large part because of BRUCE’s work over these many years.

Sheila and I will miss him terribly, and our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an AP story by Frederic Frommer from today, a piece in the *Minnesota Star Tribune* by Greg Gordon, and a piece from Tom Webb from the *Pioneer Press*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press]

MINNESOTA REP. BRUCE VENTO DEAD AT 60

(By Frederic J. Frommer)

WASHINGTON (AP).—Minnesota Rep. Bruce Vento, a 12-term liberal Democrat who championed environmental and homeless causes, died Tuesday after a bout with lung cancer.

Vento, who was diagnosed in February, died at 12:20 p.m. at his home in St. Paul, Minn., surrounded by his family, spokesman Rick Jauert said. He had malignant mesothelioma, a rare type of cancer caused by inhaling asbestos fibers.

Vento, who was 60, announced in February that he had cancer and would not seek reelection. His treatment included the removal of one lung, chemotherapy and radiation, but doctors discovered more cancer last month.

As a young man, Vento worked as a state-paid laborer in several St. Paul-area facilities that he claimed exposed him to asbestos fibers. Two weeks ago he filed a lawsuit against 11 companies that allegedly supplied or installed asbestos products at those job sites.

Vento made his most significant legislative contributions on environmental issues, which he called his “true passion.”

“I have been a member of Congress for the past 24 years, dedicated to making the federal government work for the people, to do for our community and state—and, yes, even internationally—that which we cannot do for ourselves,” Vento said in February. “The federal government can and should make a difference.”

When Democrats controlled the House, Vento was chairman of the Natural Resources subcommittee on national parks, forests and lands for 10 years, pushing for more money for national parks and other environmental priorities.

“I think Bruce Vento has been one of the most impressive and effective congressmen in modern Minnesota history,” said former