all of the private interests in the Interior Columbia Basin, all of the Members of Congress who represent any part of that basin, but the continuance of which is demanded by the President as the price of signing an appropriations bill for the Department of Interior.

I held a field hearing on this subject in Spokane, WA, with unanimous or near unanimous opposition to the program as it is being conducted at the present time. Both the bill that I am in charge of and the bill that has already passed the House of Representatives dramatically changes and minimizes that program.

At the behest of this administration, however, a Seattle Congressman put up an amendment to restore the program to its present pristine size. Every Member of the House of Representatives representing any part of the Columbia Basin voted against that amendment, and yet the administration continues to demand all of the interference of private agriculture that it entails.

No. 9, the Department of Agriculture budget—welfare over farmers. Two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture earmarked for food and for welfare programs. The essential research conservation and on-the-ground farmer programs get lost in the shuffle. Only when there is a crisis does the Secretary of Agriculture pay any attention to it.

For 3 consecutive years, the administration’s request for farmer programs have decreased while the amount requested for food and nutrition programs has increased. No one disputes the importance of those food and nutrition programs, but we cannot very well feed America without providing the funding and infrastructure necessary to enhance the production of the most healthy, abundant, safe and inexpensive crops in the world.

No. 8. Columbia-Snake River dams. The President’s Council on Environmental Policy of the Department of the Interior had made it quite clear that major dam removal is very high on their agenda of courses of action for the Columbia and Snake Rivers. The Columbia Basin in eastern Washington, in eastern Oregon, and in Idaho, was literally a dust bowl until the introduction of irrigation. Without it, those States would not lead the country in apples, pears, beef, asparagus, and potato production.

The Columbia Basin is a cornucopia for the Nation’s food supply. Dam drawdown or removal would shut down agriculture in the region. In addition, of course, the rivers provide the avenues of transportation to get those agricultural products to market, a transportation system that would be destroyed by dam removal.

No. 7, China trade policy—Washington wheat farmers seem not worth helping by this administration. For more than 20 years, China has refused to import Pacific Northwest wheat because of unfounded, nonscientific phytosanitary reasons. They call it “TCK smut.” TCK smut has never been detected in Washington wheat. It does exist, however, in the fields of our wheat-growing counterparts—Canada, France and Germany; but China imports many of those.”

The administration seeks a new set of trade relations with China. The President went to China. The President, in order to keep peace with China, even, if not much, as mention trade barriers, ignoring the plight of our wheat farmers in the Pacific Northwest. His first priority should be to get that barrier lifted.

No. 6, repeated efforts to eliminate agricultural research. For the past 2 years, the administration has recommended zeroing out all of the national regionally based agriculture research programs. These programs conduct research necessary to all food-producing regions of the country. The administration has continued to do so. Even eliminating these programs is ludicrous. Obviously, cotton research cannot and should not be conducted in eastern Washington; and red delicious apple research is not conducted in Mississippi. These regional programs have bolstered our already strained land grant education university programs. They are absolutely essential, and yet the administration would wipe them out.

No. 5, no movement on fast-track trade authority. Fast-track is essential to establishing trade relations with Chile. Currently, the United States exports face an 11-percent tariff in that country, giving our competitors a 11-percent advantage. Yet, because of objections from members of his own party, the President has abandoned the cause of fast-track trade authority.

No. 4, the agricultural labor shortage—not our problem. The administration has been on record to believe that there is an agriculture labor shortage and is opposed to the Guest Worker Program to address this issue that has already passed the Senate of the United States. In the face of that fact, the General Accounting Office estimates that over one-third of our Nation’s migrant workforce is illegal. By doing nothing, the Clinton administration is making lawbreakers out of law-abiding agriculture employers and proposes to do nothing about it.

No. 3, sanctions against Pakistan. Sanctions are killing our agriculture industries. With more than 40 percent of the world’s population under U.S. sanctions, the American farmer is locked out of many markets. The President instantly imposed sanctions on Pakistan as a result of its nuclear tests, and only as a result of action by Congress have those sanctions or the effect of those sanctions been at least partially removed with respect to Pakistan.

No. 2, the Endangered Species Act and private property rights. The Endangered Species Act impacts eastern Washington farmers and many others more than any other environmental regulation, and yet the administration, rather than assist in reasonable amendments to the Endangered Species Act, insists on ever more rigid enforcement and ever more interference with the ability of farmers to grow the food and fiber that the Nation needs.

No. 1, Al Gore. President Clinton has officially tagged the Vice President as the administration’s environmental leader. He is the promulgator of most of the policies that I have already discussed and has constructed environmental roadblocks and headaches for farmers from Washington State all across the United States to Florida. No one knows the land better than America’s hard-working farm families. The District of Columbia, the administration, and Al Gore should not be dictating to America’s farmers how to till, harvest, irrigate, employ, and manage their farms. Al Gore and his administration need to focus on foreign trade and agricultural research, not on locking up private property and over-regulating the family farm.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PENDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ed Fienga from my staff be allowed on the floor during the debate on the defense appropriations bill.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PENDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 329

(Purpose: To achieve the near full funding of the Army National Guard operation and maintenance account that the Senate provided for in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 (H. Con. Res. 28), as agreed to by the Senate, and to offset that increase by reducing the amount provided for procurement for the F/A-18E/F aircraft program to the amount provided by the House of Representatives in H.R. 4163, as passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.)
Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, my amendment would allow the National Guard to almost fully fund its operation and maintenance, or O&M account, for the coming fiscal year. This year’s Defense Department budget request left the National Guard with a $634 million budget shortfall, including a $450 million shortfall in the Guard’s O&M account. This request fell on the heels of a $743 million shortfall for the current fiscal year. I think these shortfalls are wrongheaded and unacceptable.

Fortunately, both Houses of Congress have acted more responsibly in funding the National Guard. Even with the improvements from both Houses, though, the Senate appropriations bill we are currently considering leaves the Guard’s operation and maintenance account short $225 million short. The House bill leaves an even greater gap of $317 million. My amendment would add $220 million to the National Guard’s O&M account, leaving just a $5 million shortfall to that account.

According to the National Guard, shortfalls in the operation and maintenance account compromise the Guard’s readiness levels, capabilities, force structure, and end strength. Failing to fully support these vital areas will have a devastating indirect effect. The shortfall puts the Guard’s personnel, schools, training, full-time support, and retention and recruitment at risk. Perhaps most importantly, however, I know firsthand that it is eroding the morale of our citizen-soldiers, as I have had the opportunity to visit some of the armories in Wisconsin and have heard this concern firsthand.

With that in mind, 26 State adjutants general—a majority of the adjutants general in this country—have contacted my office to voice their support for this amendment. The leaders of the National Guard units in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, and my own home State of Wisconsin support my amendment. I would like to thank them for their dedication and support, and I hope we decide to heed their call for support of the National Guard.

Mr. President, in spite of the National Guard’s budget concerns, the administration continues to deliver insufficient budget requests given the National Guard’s duties; yet, the administration increasingly calls on the Guard to handle some very wide-ranging tasks. These shortfalls have an increasingly greater effect given the National Guard’s increased operations burden. This is as a result of new missions, increased deployments, and training requirements, including the missions in Bosnia, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

As I am sure my colleagues know by now, the Army National Guard represents a full 34 percent of total Army forces, including 55 percent of combat divisions and brigades, 46 percent of combat support, and 26 percent of combat service support; yet, the Guard only receives 9.5 percent of Army funds.

To offer a comparison with the other Army components, the National Guard received just 14 percent of requested funding, as opposed to the Active Army’s 80 percent and Army Reserve’s 81 percent. I think it is time we move toward giving the National Guard adequate and equal funding. This amendment aims to provide full funding for the National Guard, and the National Guard is the Nation’s only constitutionally mandated defense force.

Not only have we failed to invest fully in the National Guard, we have failed to invest fully in the bargain defense that the Active Army Reserve has to offer the Department of Defense. That should not come as a surprise, however. DOD has never been known as a frugal or practical department—from $436 hammers to $640 toilet seats to $2 billion bombers that don’t work and the Department doesn’t seem to want to use. The Department of Defense has a storied history of wasting our tax dollars. Here is an opportunity to spend defense dollars on something that actually works, that is worthwhile, and enjoys broad support on both sides of the aisle.

In this regard, the National Guard fills the bill. According to a National Guard study, the average cost to train and equip an active duty soldier is $17,000 per year, while it costs only $17,000 per year to train and equip a National Guard soldier. The cost of maintaining Army National Guard units is just 23 percent of the cost of maintaining active Army units. It is time for the Pentagon to consider costs about lack of funding and begin using their money a little more wisely and efficiently.

Finally, my amendment doesn’t terminate any program, nor does it create unsupported cuts to existing programs. This amendment merely follows the recommendation of the other Chamber. Early this year, the House overwhelmingly supported DOD authorization and appropriations bills that provided $2.6 billion to procure 27 Super Hornet aircraft. I think, and the General Accounting Office thinks, that is actually far too much money for a plane that provides only marginal benefits over the current, reliable Hornet. But it is better than the $2.8 billion for 30 Super Hornets that the bill contains. I think we should follow the prudent lead of our colleagues in the other body on this issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the House National Security Committee’s report on its fiscal year 1999 DOD authorization bill, which specifically addresses the Super Hornet, be printed in the Record for this hour.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

F/A-18E/F

The budget request contained $2.787.8 million for 30 F/A-18E/F aircraft and $104.4 million for advanced procurement of 36 aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

Based on the results of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the committee notes that the Department has reduced the total procurement objective from 1,000 to 548 aircraft and has also reduced procurement in the next four fiscal years (LRIP) from 248 to 224. The committee notes that the Department plans to request increases of six aircraft per year for each of the next five fiscal years until a production rate of 48 aircraft per year is attained in fiscal year 2002. However, for fiscal year 1999, the requested increase from fiscal year 1998 is 10 aircraft.

The committee is also aware that the Department has increased the number of low rate initial production (LRIP) aircraft in fiscal 1999 to 42 aircraft, as approved in 1992 by the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB), to its current plan of 62 aircraft. The Department’s Selected Acquisition Reports indicate that both its initial plan of 42 LRIP aircraft and its current plan of 62 LRIP aircraft were predicated on a procurement objective of 1,000 aircraft. The committee notes that were the Department to comply with the 10 percent LRIP guideline contained in section 2406 of title 10, United States Code, 55 LRIP aircraft should be sufficient.

During the past year, the committee has followed the Department’s challenges in solving an uncommanded problem that occurs at altitudes and angles of attack in that portion of the flight envelope where the F/A-18E/F performs air combat maneuvers. The Department’s Director of Operational Test and Evaluation recently testified that the most promising solution to this problem—a porous wing fairing—causes unacceptable airframe buffeting. However, the final solution to the problem may include other combinations of aerodynamic alterations to the wing surface. According to the Director, the root cause of the problem and modifications to the porous wing fairing are still being investigated, and the wing fairing configuration flown during developmental testing does not incorporate the production representative wing fold mechanism. Additionally, the Director stated that the Department would not have a complete understanding of the impact of the modifications until the wings were being tested in the air. In light of the significantly higher increase in production proposed for fiscal year 1999, the apparent excess number of LRIP aircraft...
Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to quote the chairman of the House Military Procurement Subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER. Speaking of the National Security Committee’s Super Hornet procurement decision, Representative HUNTER said, ‘‘We think it’s a rational, responsible reduction, a balanced reduction.”

Mr. President, it is time we prioritized this Nation’s defense needs. The National Guard provides a wide range of services, from combat in foreign wars to first responders in local Dwight D. Eisenhower’s emergency, all at a fraction of the cost of the Active Army. The National Guard needs and deserves our full support. And it is for that reason that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I intend to quote the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for presenting this amendment. I would have to speak against that.

It is true that the budget request submitted by the administration for the National Guard had a shortfall for O&M, and the Guard would have the amount of about $770 million. On our chairman’s initiative, we placed an amount of $320 million to make up for that shortfall.

In addition to that, the administration had zero dollars for procurement of new equipment based upon the philosophy that if the regular services, the Regular Army, purchases equipment, some of the leftovers may go for the Guard. We did not concur with that. We appropriated $320 million for the Guard to get new equipment.

Having said that, Mr. President, I believe it should be noted that every service, every component of every service, is faced with shortfalls. There is a shortfall in the Navy, O&M. They would like to have more steaming time. They want their ships to be out there for maintenance, $95 million to augment the Guard and Reserve personnel accounts.

We have added for the Guard and Reserve operation and maintenance funds an additional $225 million. Finally, we added $450 million to the Guard and Reserve procurement account.

I have to tell the Senator we have exceeded the requests in many instances. We added almost $1 billion in the zero budget for the Guard and Reserve priorities.

Furthermore, the F/A-18E/F is just entering production. The Senator’s amendment will seriously disrupt the production program, and substantially increase the unit cost, if the Senate approves this amendment. To me it does not make common sense to increase the cost of the F-18, the Navy’s top priority planes which we must buy to meet the Navy’s previously approved program requirements. We have helped the Guard and Reserve. I do not think we should punish the Navy in order to help them any more.

If the Senator wishes to make any comments, I yield to him for those comments. I intend to make a motion to table his amendment. But before I do that, I ask unanimous consent that, on any votes that are laid aside in order to join the priority list that is already in existence under the Guard and Reserve the common procedure of a minute on each side be the procedure for this bill: That there be 2 minutes equally divided on any vote that occurs on this bill on the O&M and 2 minutes for a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me say of all say that the Senators who have spoken in opposition to this amendment are not only very sincere in their support of the National Guard but they have demonstrated in committee a serious concern about insufficient funding. They have gone a long way to make sure that we have less of a shortfall than was originally occurring. That is encouraging. However, as was admitted by those opposed to this amendment, we still have a $225 million shortfall in the O&M account at the National Guard. This is a serious shortfall.

I am not suggesting that we remove this funding from vital areas, but this is about priorities within the defense budget that is not a trivial amendment. Although I would prefer that we not move forward with the Super Hornet airplane, I am suggesting here is a dramatic reduction in those planes. I am simply suggesting we take what has already been passed in the House; that is, instead of having 30 of the Super Hornet, we procure 27—3 fewer. For three fewer of these planes, we could fully fund the National Guard O&M account.

This is not an attempt, as the Senator from Alaska, suggested, to seriously disrupt the production of the Super Hornet. Very candidly, Mr. President, I would prefer to do that, because the General Accounting Office has pointed out that the Super Hornet is not substantially better than the current plane. It is going to cost $17 billion more than the current plane. That is a huge amount of money, and it is not a dramatic reduction in those planes. All this amendment does is say let’s adopt what the House did, which is 27 Super Hornets instead of 30, and use the money that is saved to fund the National Guard, or virtually fully fund the National Guard O&M account.

Mr. President, these shortfalls for the National Guard are serious. I have had the opportunity to visit armories in Oak Creek, WI, and Appleton, WI, and spend a fair amount of time speaking to the officers and the guardwomen and guardsmen who are trying so hard to do the job that they are expected to do, constituting 34 percent of our entire Army’s sources and resources. They are having morale problems. Otherwise, why would 26 adjutant generals in this country write in support of this amendment? They are very concerned.

Mr. President, my amendment is simply about priorities. It is a modest reduction in the number of these Super Hornets that are going to be procured, and in return for something that is far more vital at this point. And that is fully funding the O&M account for the National Guard.

Mr. President, in light of the fact there will be a motion to table at some
point. I strongly urge my colleagues to put these modest resources in the National Guard, which supports our Army and which exists in our communities in every one of our States, rather than three more airplanes that, frankly, have not been proven to be substantially better to the current planes that have done a good job in the Gulf war and other situations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there is no further debate on this matter, I would like to table the Senator’s amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I now ask that that amendment be set aside.

Is the standing order that all of the votes we ask for the yeas and nays on prior to 2 o’clock will be automatically set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3398
(Purpose: To limit the use of funds pending establishment or operation of the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if it is in order, I would like to send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. KYL. And ask for its immediate consideration.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] proposes an amendment numbered 3398.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the establishment or operation of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency until the Secretary of Defense takes the following actions:

(A) Establishes within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy and designates an official to serve as the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency with only the following duties:

(1) To develop for the Department of Defense policies regarding the appropriate export control policies and procedures that are necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(b) To supervise activities of the Department of Defense relating to export controls.

(c) As the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency:

(i) to administer the technology security program of the Department of Defense;

(ii) to facilitate and ensure, international transfers of defense-related technology, goods, services, and munitions in order to determine whether such transfers are consistent with United States foreign policy and national security interests and to ensure that such international transfers comply with Department of Defense technology security policies and positions;

(iii) to ensure (using automation and other computerized techniques to the maximum extent practicable) that the Department of Defense role in the processing of export license applications is carried out as expeditiously as is practicable consistent with the national security interests of the United States;

(iv) to actively support intelligence and enforcement activities of the Federal Government to restrain the flow of defense-related technologies, goods, services, and munitions to potential adversaries.

(2) Submits to Congress a written certification that:

(A) the Defense Security Technology Agency is to remain a Defense Agency independent of all other Defense Agencies of the Department of Defense and the military departments, and

(B) no funds are to be obligated or expended for integrating the Defense Security Technology Agency into another Defense Agency.

(b) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy may report directly to the Secretary of Defense on the matters that are within the duties of the Deputy Under Secretary.

(c) Not later than 10 days after the Secretary of Defense establishes the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on National Security and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report concerning the establishment of the position. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of any organizational changes that have been made or are to be made within the Department of Defense to satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (a) and otherwise to implement this section.

(2) A description of the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the export control activities of the Department of Defense after the establishment of the position, together with a description of how that role compares to the Chairman’s role in those activities before the establishment of the position.

(d) Unless specifically authorized and appropriated for such purposes, funds may not be obligated to relocate any office or personnel of the Defense Technology Security Administration to any location that is more than five miles from the Pentagon Reservation (as defined in section 257a(f) of title 10, United States Code).

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask of the distinguished chairman whether this would be an appropriate time to discuss briefly the amendment or whether we should lay it aside and move to other business. What would be the chairman’s pleasure?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I just delivered a copy of the Senator’s amendment to the minority and other committees affected. He is at liberty to make such comments he wishes to make, but we will not be able to have final consideration of the matter until we have heard back from Senator Inouye and his people outside of the Aisle, and the Governmental Affairs Committee is also considering this issue.

Mr. KYL. What I might do then, Mr. President, since we want to handle this in a way agreeable to the chairman, if there is no one else to present an amendment right behind, I will go ahead and describe the amendment but do it briefly and then, when the chairman is ready to proceed with other business, lay it aside and handle it in that fashion, if that is agreeable with the chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. Fine.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR
Mr. KYL. Mr. President, in that event, let me first ask unanimous consent that two fellows from my office, John Rood and David Stephens, be granted floor privileges for the debate on this matter.

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

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will describe this amendment briefly.

Frankly, this came out of the revelations concerning the alleged transfer of certain technology to the Chinese Government as a part of the process of launching American satellites on Chinese rockets, the so-called Loral-Hughes matter. But it really goes beyond that. It is a question of whether or not the Defense Department has in process an adequate way of reviewing the requests for export licenses and the conditions attached to those licenses to ensure that national security is not jeopardized.

That role has in the past been played by an agency of the Defense Department called the Defense Technology Security Agency. It goes by the name of DTSA for the people who understand it. The point of this memorandum is to ensure that DTSA will continue to have a prominent role in the evaluation of export licenses and the kinds of conditions that would be attached to them.

In fact, we ensure as a result of this amendment that the role is prominent by restoring the position of the Deputy Under Secretary for Technology Security Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and thereby ensure, as I say, a prominent role for this agency. The Deputy Under Secretary would have access to both the Under Secretary of Policy and the Secretary of Defense himself.

This is important, Mr. President, for the following reasons:

No. 1, DTSA is the single agency in the Government reviewing the national security implications of an item for export.

No. 2, DTSA coordinates input from the services, military branches, the Joint Chiefs and the defense agencies;

the Government reviewing the national security implications of an item for export.
No. 3, DTSA routinely supports the Department of State in its investigations of these matters;
No. 4, creating a Deputy Secretary of Technology Security will ensure that the Department of Defense is represented at sufficiently high levels at the interagency meetings that occur to discuss these export licenses.
And, finally, providing the Deputy Under Secretary with the authority to interact with the Secretary of Defense will enable the Deputy Secretary to bring items of immediate concern directly to the Secretary to discuss with the Secretary of Commerce and the President.
The Department of Defense is the only agency with the expertise, the personnel, and the ability to assess the impact of exports on the national security of the United States, and this ought to be our No. 1 concern. The Persian Gulf of Oil, commodity, could well have served the purposes of the United States maintaining a technical edge on the battlefield. Maintaining that edge in the future is dependent upon keeping sensitive technologies out of the hands of potential adversaries.
Questions regarding the appropriate role of the Department of Defense in considering exports of dual-use items have obviously been of concern for a number of years. But, as I said, the alleged transfer technology to the Chinese Government has really elevated this concern to the point that there are those of us in Congress who want to ensure that the Department of Defense continues to have an important role here.
Early in the 1990s, Congress examined the problems with export control and how it was possible that American companies, with the knowledge of the Department of Commerce, could have contributed to the Iraqi arms buildup, as we know occurred. We learned, for example, that between 1985 and the imposition of the U.N. embargo on Iraq in August of 1990, the Department of Commerce sold to Iraq export licenses for dual-use goods. Some of these sales involved technologies that very probably helped the Iraqis develop ballistic missiles, nuclear, and chemical weapons. In some cases, Commerce approved the sale over strong objections from Defense or without even consulting the Department of Defense at all.
In 1994, the Export Administration Act was reauthorized in 1996 dissolved, leaving no overarching legal forum to guide the export control policies of the United States. Export controls were at that point directed by Executive order. And this resulted in relaxed control over non-treaty-related equipment and technologies. The GAO has documented potential problems with changes that occurred in 1996 and with the Department of Commerce retaining the primary responsibility for oversight of important national security equipment or technology.
Let me just give a couple of examples here. On September 14, 1994, the Department of Commerce approved an export of machine tools to China. The tools had been used in a plant in Ohio that produced aircraft and missiles for the U.S. military. Some of the more sophisticated machine tools were diverted to a Chinese facility engaged in military production, possibly cruise missile production.
Under current referral practices, the majority of applications for the export of categories related to stealth are not sent to the Department of Defense or the Department of Interior. Without such referrals, it cannot be ensured that export licenses for militarily significant stealth technology are properly reviewed and controlled.
A third example: Commercial jet engine hot section technology was transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1996. Defense officials are concerned about the diffusion of technology and the availability of hot section components that could negatively affect the combat advantage of our aircraft and pose a threat to U.S. national security concerns. So the Defense Department must have an active role and a strong position in advising the President about the national security implications of exported other important dual-use technologies. In order to do this, the Secretary of Defense must have the best advice available. This amendment will ensure that Secretary Cohen and all subsequent Secretaries have that advice.
Mr. President, at the appropriate time I hope we can engage in further discussion of this to ensure that the national security of the United States is not impaired.
At this time, unless there is anyone else who would like to discuss it, I am happy to have the chairman or the ranking member move to other business.
Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask this amendment be set aside for later consideration so we may have consultation with other committees and Members involved in this subject. We did not have this on our list and have not distributed it until just now. I ask unanimous consent it be put aside until other Members have a chance to review it.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have had a brief debate. The manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, has moved to table the Feingold amendment. I want to add my comments to the debate on that issue.

This is an amendment which I strongly oppose and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose it. This is part of a continuing campaign of harassment against the Navy's No. 1 program, the F/A-18E/F, this amendment has had a long, and to date totally unsuccessful, history. We all know the problems in the court systems when individuals flood the courts with frivolous lawsuits. We, in providing procurement funds for the Navy, have had a string of what I consider to be less than good-faith, responsible amendments directed at this program.
The amendment before us purports to cut funds from a Navy procurement program and earmark them for the National Guard operations and maintenance fund. As a long-time and strong supporter of the National Guard, I recognize the limited funding the Guard, and I think the National Guard, to fund the Guard component of the total force. But I do not believe that pitting one service against the other, raiding the Navy's No. 1 procurement program, is the way to fill that funding requirement. No, this amendment is not a step forward for good government. It has been proposed for no other reason than as a reckless assault on a program which has successfully cleared every production hurdle with room to spare. It has been advised by General Edward Philbin, Executive Director of the National Guard Association of the U.S., that NGAUS is not supporting this program because, among other things, it would simply create problems between the National Guard and the Navy. This, to me, is a very unfortunate step when, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, all services are facing shortfalls. We have to address the Inadequacy in funding Guard National Guard operations and other services. But I can tell you that this amendment is totally uncalled for.
The F/A-18E/F is the Navy's No. 1 priority procurement program. If you ask the Secretary of the Navy or any of the fleet carrier strike-fighter aviators what will enable the Navy to be viable in the 21st century and beyond, they will tell you it is the Super Hornet. Yesterday the CNO was in my office with one of the fine young men who fly the F/A-18. They reemphasize this is their No. 1 program. They cannot afford to take cuts in the program such as proposed on the House side, or particularly as proposed in this amendment. As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this amendment. As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this amendment.
the F/A-18E/F. He failed. Since then, he has continued what appears to be a vendetta against the program, and now his intent is slowly to drain the money from the aircraft by continuing a plan to reduce the number of aircraft and the funding available, to make a full-rate production decision nearly impossible.

When you talk with the people in the Navy who know what their needs are, who know what the future of naval aviation will insist, and they will tell you that this is the airplane that they must have. If we want our men and women in naval aviation to carry out the missions we demand of them, then we have to provide them the modern, up-to-date, efficient aircraft technologically superior, that the E/F F-18 gives us.

I remember full well several years ago when the distinguished ranking member of this committee, the Senator from Hawaii, said, “We don’t ever want to see fighting men and women into a battle evenly matched. We want to send them in with the technological superiority, the training, and the capability and resources to make sure they win.”

Mr. President, that is what the 18E/F gives us. It gives us that technological superiority. It gives us the ability to make sure we have the best chance possible of bringing our naval aviators home safely, having accomplished their mission.

The F/A-18E/F has already been scrutinized in the Quadrennial Defense Review. It has been scrutinized by the National Defense Panel. It has undergone GAO study after GAO study. It has been tested by pilots at the Patuxent River Naval Air Station and the Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake. It has accumulated 2,749 test flight hours, over 1,800 flights, and numerous aircraft carrier landings. It has never had a catastrophic mishap. I wish all of our tactical air programs could meet these standards. It has test fired just about every weapon the Navy might need it to carry. It is on time, it is on budget, and it needs to get underway.

I ask my colleagues, if they have any question about the value of this plane, ask somebody who flies one. Ask somebody who has had the opportunity to fly it. Ask somebody who we are sending in harm’s way, asking them to fly a fighter aircraft on a mission, ask them how important it is to carry such aircraft into battle. We want our aviators to be prepared. We want them to have the best they can have. If we have any question about the value of this aircraft, ask somebody they know in naval aviation.

Mr. President, ask somebody who we are sending in harm’s way to ask them how important it is to have an airplane that can carry out the missions we demand of them.

Mr. President, this amendment is about giving the Super Hornet program its due. This amendment is about giving the Navy’s aviation fleet an edge. This amendment is not about diminishing the Navy’s aviation fleet. It is about giving the Navy the ability to carry out the missions we demand of them.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Guard, as I do. I urge my colleagues to vote against tabling my amendment. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri states that my amendment is a “reckless assault” on the Navy’s Super Hornet program. This could not be further from the truth.

My amendment to increase funding for the National Guard is simply that; an amendment to correct most of a dangerous undervaluing for the National Guard’s operations and maintenance account. To raise as little controversy as possible in finding an offset to the funding increase, I chose a proviso already agreed to by the other chamber. Not to fund procurement of 27 Super Hornets in FY99, the body authorized funding for the identical amount.

In speaking to the reduction, Chairman of the House Military Procurement subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER said, “We think it’s a rational, responsible reduction, a balanced reduction.”

Does this mean Chairman HUNTER is recklessly assaulting the Super Hornet program? Is Chairman HUNTER diminishing the value of the Navy’s aviation fleet? Is Chairman HUNTER questioning the value of the Super Hornet? I don’t think Chairman HUNTER was, or ever will be, accused of any of those things. That’s why, Mr. President, I bogged it down. I bogged it down to make you, my colleagues, think about all of those things. It’s a plain mischaracterization of my amendment.

This amendment is not about gutting the Super Hornet program. This amendment is about not reducing one service against another. This amendment is not about diminishing the Navy’s aviation fleet. This amendment does not question the value of the Super Hornet.

Mr. President, this amendment is about an adequate level of funding for the National Guard and priorities in our armed forces. This amendment is about giving priority to the National Guard’s readiness levels, capabilities, and force structure strength. This amendment is about bringing the Guard’s personnel, schools, training, full-time support, and retention and re-recruitment to adequate levels.

This amendment, is about ending a slide in the morale of our citizen-soldiers. Finally, my friend from Missouri states that the National Guard Association of the United States does not support this amendment. I’m sure he will very forcefully tell them why I now stand accused of all of those things. It’s a plain mischaracterization of my amendment.
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(F) Since 1984 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenics policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

S.R.C. 9003. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue any visa to any national of the People's Republic of China, including any official of the Communist Party or the Government of the People's Republic of China and its regional, local, and village authorities (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary finds, based on credible information, has been involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies resulting in a woman being forced to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or resulting in a man or woman being forced to undergo sterilization against his or her free choice.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue any visa to any national of the People's Republic of China who has caused or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices:

(1) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(2) Imprisoning, detaining, or persecuting religious leaders for expressing their religious beliefs.

(3) Imposing restrictions on religious activities.

(4) Imposing restrictions on religious denominations.

(5) Imposing restrictions on religious publications.

(6) Imposing restrictions on religious meetings.

(7) Imposing restrictions on religious associations.

(8) Imposing restrictions on religious organizations.

(9) Imposing restrictions on religious schools.

(10) Imposing restrictions on religious charities.

(11) Imposing restrictions on religious hospitals.

(12) Imposing restrictions on religious cemeteries.

(13) Imposing restrictions on religious shrines.

(14) Imposing restrictions on religious altars.

(15) Imposing restrictions on religious artifacts.

(16) Imposing restrictions on religious clothing.

(17) Imposing restrictions on religious symbols.

(18) Imposing restrictions on religious music.

(19) Imposing restrictions on religious dance.

(20) Imposing restrictions on religious drama.

(21) Imposing restrictions on religious theater.

(22) Imposing restrictions on religious films.

(23) Imposing restrictions on religious radio.

(24) Imposing restrictions on religious television.

(25) Imposing restrictions on religious internet.

(26) Imposing restrictions on religious documentation.

(27) Imposing restrictions on religious education.

(28) Imposing restrictions on religious research.

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to a national covered by subsection (a).

(d) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to a national covered by subsection (a).


(g) The Chinese Taoist Association.

(h) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices:

(1) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(2) Imprisoning, detaining, or persecuting religious leaders for expressing their religious beliefs.

(3) Imposing restrictions on religious activities.

(4) Imposing restrictions on religious denominations.

(5) Imposing restrictions on religious publications.

(6) Imposing restrictions on religious meetings.

(7) Imposing restrictions on religious associations.

(8) Imposing restrictions on religious organizations.

(9) Imposing restrictions on religious schools.

(10) Imposing restrictions on religious charities.

(11) Imposing restrictions on religious hospitals.

(12) Imposing restrictions on religious cemeteries.

(13) Imposing restrictions on religious shrines.

(14) Imposing restrictions on religious altars.

(15) Imposing restrictions on religious artifacts.

(16) Imposing restrictions on religious clothing.

(17) Imposing restrictions on religious symbols.

(18) Imposing restrictions on religious music.

(19) Imposing restrictions on religious dance.

(20) Imposing restrictions on religious drama.

(21) Imposing restrictions on religious theater.

(22) Imposing restrictions on religious films.

(23) Imposing restrictions on religious radio.

(24) Imposing restrictions on religious television.

(25) Imposing restrictions on religious internet.

(26) Imposing restrictions on religious documentation.

(27) Imposing restrictions on religious education.

(28) Imposing restrictions on religious research.

(S) The Chinese Buddhist Association.

(D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.
media in our country spoke of within a week of the President’s return is testimony to the failure of our policy of appeasement.

As this chart is on the floor of the Senate with that headline, “Chinese Resurrection stands,” it stands as, I think, irrefutable evidence that the current policies failed to bring about the desired changes, the changes that we all desire in China.

They resumed arrests. A policy of appeasement works, but it is not working today. Today, we as a body, have the opportunity to move beyond rhetoric into real action with the amendment that I have offered.

The amendment is composed of two parts: one dealing with forced abortions and one dealing with religious persecution in China. This will have brought most of the House-passed measures last year—the Chinese freedom policy measures sponsored by my good friend and colleague, Chris Cox—this amendment to be introduced these now to a vote in the Senate. I am glad by the way, the Nuremberg Tribunal on Representatives last November.

I am also glad that an amendment passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives last November by a vote of 415–1—415–1.

Now, what does the amendment do? It condemns religious persecution and forced abortion in China. The amendment would make admission to the U.S. the condition, the wherefore of the United States foreign policy would prohibit the use of American funds, appropriated to the Department of State, the USIA or AID, to fund the travel of the State Department in any bilateral or multilateral forum, the issues of individuals in prison, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government. I understand. In fact, I am sympathetic to that argument.

Mr. President, since the founding of China—Our aim is not just registration, but our diplomats, in every bilateral and multilateral forum, the issues of individuals in prison, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government. I understand. In fact, I am sympathetic to that argument.

I never thought that most-favored-nation status was the best tool that we had, and yet when we come with a proposal like this, one that I have visited with Senator WELLSTON about, and according to my colleagues, when we come with one that denies visas and denies travel and per diem, then the least we can do is require registration of the Chinese Government. I understand. In fact, I am sympathetic to that argument.

And lastly, concerning religious persecution, this amendment would make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of the United States foreign policy with respect to China.

And according to my colleagues, the amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals whereabout, those involved in forced abortions, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

And according to my colleagues, the amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals whereabout, those involved in forced abortions, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

And according to my colleagues, the amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals whereabout, those involved in forced abortions, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

And according to my colleagues, the amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals whereabout, those involved in forced abortions, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

And according to my colleagues, the amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals whereabout, those involved in forced abortions, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

This amendment would make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of the United States foreign policy with respect to China.
Catholic believers, but most obviously among Buddhist believers and the followers of the Dalai Lama. The repression ranges from ransacking homes in Tibet in search of banned pictures of the Dalai Lama to the closing and destroying of countless Buddhist shrines last spring. So the repression is real. And religious faith of all persuasions is in revival in China, but it is in revival in the face of intense persecution by the Chinese Government.

I want briefly to speak of the practice of forced abortions that are going on in China today. I believe that this is a practice that is indefensible by any civilized human being. In their effort and attempt to reach a 1 percent annual population growth, the Chinese authorities, in 1979, issued regulations that provided monetary bonuses and other benefits, as incentives, and economic penalties for those who would have excess children. They subject families in China to rigorous pressure to end pregnancies and to undergo sterilizations. And while the Communist Chinese Government today says that coercion is not an approved policy, they admit that it goes on. They provided the State Department any evidence that they are punishing the perpetrators of that terrible practice of coerced abortions and forced sterilizations in China today.

Even more tragic is their effort to eliminate those they regard as "defective." China's eugenics policy, the so-called natal and health care law, requires couples at risk of transmitting disabling congenital defects to their children to undergo sterilization.

So the practices continue in China; the abuses continue in China. This amendment is the very least that we can do in clear conscience. I have faith that my colleagues are going to support this amendment. I think it is something that is so essential that we do. This practice of coerced abortions—and, may I add, the practice of persecuting believers, religious believers—is morally reprehensible and indefensible.

It is clear, as well, that the desired changes that the policy of so-called constructive engagement has sought has failed.

I once again point to this headline in the Washington Post, which was, in various forms, the front page story all across this country this month: "Chinese Resume Arrests"—that in the wake of our President's visit to China. So please look at the temperate tone of these amendments. Realize that the substance is simply denying visas, travel expenses, if you will, American-taxpayer-subsidized travel, in recognition of those who the State Department, the Secretary of State, has credible evidence indicating that they are involved in these inhumane practices.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment when we vote this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I am very proud to join with my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas, in offering this amendment. Let me say, second, that my colleagues do not all agree on all issues—that may be the understatement of the year—we do have a common bond in our very strongly held views and, I think, passion when it comes to human freedom and our common respect for human rights.

At the beginning, I would like to just start out by doing two other things before speaking right to the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Linn Schulte-Sasse, who is an intern with our office, be allowed to be on the floor during the debate on this appropriations bill.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think my colleague from Arkansas will agree with me, it would be important, given this topic, given this debate, given this discussion, to mention Aung San Suu Kyi from Burma, who wanted to go to a meeting. That repressive junta Government would not let her go. She spent 5 days in her car, refusing to leave, before she could go to this meeting. She never could get to the meeting and took refuge at home. It reminds us, again, of the repression of this regime.

I hope that these junta leaders understand that all of us in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, abhor their actions. From my point of view, we can’t do enough as a country to isolate that repressive Government.

The core value that brings my colleague from Arkansas and the Senator from Minnesota together here today is freedom. I think that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.

I am concerned that the administration’s "carrots only" policy has not worked well enough when it comes to accomplishing this goal of promoting freedom in human rights. I believe that the limited steps that the Chinese Government has taken to lessen political persecution have not been effective. I believe that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.

I am concerned that the administration’s "carrots only" policy has not worked well enough when it comes to accomplishing this goal of promoting freedom in human rights. I believe that the limited steps that the Chinese Government has taken to lessen political persecution have not been effective. I believe that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.

I am concerned that the administration’s "carrots only" policy has not worked well enough when it comes to accomplishing this goal of promoting freedom in human rights. I believe that the limited steps that the Chinese Government has taken to lessen political persecution have not been effective. I believe that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.

I am concerned that the administration’s "carrots only" policy has not worked well enough when it comes to accomplishing this goal of promoting freedom in human rights. I believe that the limited steps that the Chinese Government has taken to lessen political persecution have not been effective. I believe that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.
is the way the Government monitors the membership in religious organizations.

According to the State Department’s reports, Chinese officials have conducted a special campaign against all unauthorized activities by non-Christsians. This included police detaining people, beating, and finesing members of the underground Catholic Church in Jiangxi Province, and raiding the homes of bishops. That is what is happening in this country.

There has also been carried out a major purge of local officials in certain heavily Muslim populated areas, and targeted again “underground” Muslim activities. The Government has banned the construction or renovation of 130 mosques, and arrested scores of Muslim dissidents.

In Tibet, human rights conditions remain grim, and have gotten worse this past year. Tibetan religious activists face “disappearance,” or incomunicado detention for practising prayer, and brutal treatment in custody.

Finally, this amendment, second part, demonstrates the abhorrence of the United States over the practice of forced abortion and sterilization. It targets officials involved in compelling Chinese women to undergo abortions and sterilization and bans their travel to the United States of America. Chinese population control officials, working with employers and work unit officials, subject women to sterilization procedures. They subject women who conceive without Government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to shun economic sanctions, including unpayable fines—in one province, twice a family’s gross annual income—to loss of employment, and in some cases to the use of physical force.

Some people argue that we cannot influence China, that the country is too large, too proud, and that change takes too long. Religious persecution, forced sterilization, forced abortion, people trying to speak out on behalf of their own human rights, all of these citizens have thanked us for helping to keep them alive by following our efforts on behalf of human rights in China, the citizens, that we support.

I yield the floor. Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii. Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I realize that standing and speaking in opposition is not the way some of my colleagues and my constituents. I also realize that my chairman will rise to table this amendment at the appropriate time. But I believe that something has to be said as to why some of us oppose this amendment.

Mr. President, we are blessed to be able to live in a great country. We just celebrated the 222nd anniversary of our birth. We have had a very illustrious and a glorious history. Yet, there are many chapters in our history that we would prefer not to discuss; we would prefer to just pass them over. The countries that we are speaking up against in Southeast Asia and Asia do not have a 222-year history. Yes, they have been there for 4,000 or 5,000 years, but keep in mind that most of these countries have been under the yoke of some European power until just recently. Indonesia, until the end of World War II, was under the control, and therefore a colony of, Holland. China has been under various countries. The Japanese have been there; the British have been there; the French, the Russians—and Americans. North Korea had been under the control of the Japanese up until World War II. The Philippines was our colony until the end of the war.

Our country is blessed with resources—all of the minerals that we need, all of the chemicals we need to make us the No. 1 high-tech country in the world, the most powerful military country in the world. These other countries are still struggling. I don’t think we can expect these nations who are going through the evolutionary stage of just 50 years, as compared to our 222 years, to impose and demand that our will be carried out.

We should remind ourselves that, the people of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States have said that slavery was constitutional. That wasn’t too long ago. And there are many fellow Americans who are still showing the effects of slavery to this day. Well, we pride ourselves on human rights, but hardly a day goes by when we don’t see statistics that we are failing. For example, I am vice chairman now of the Indian Affairs Committee. The things we are confronted with on a daily basis in this committee are sickening. For example, the unemployment rate in the Nation is less than 5 percent. The unemployment rate in Indian reservations today is over 50 percent. In some reservations, it is as high as 92 percent. Yes, there are reservations that are doing well—doing very, very well. But most of the 550 tribes are not doing well.

When you look at health statistics, they are worse than Third World countries. They are worse in cancer, worse in respiratory diseases, worse in diabetes. And this happens in these United States. And if some other country should condemn us for this, we would stand up as one and say: It is none of your damn business.

Mr. President, the question before us is. Do we contain and do we isolate China—a nation with a population of over one-fourth of the world’s population? They have problems, as much as we have problems. The question is, do we ignore them? Do we assume they may someday acquire all the technology that they need to become a terrible world power? Or do we try to engage them and, hopefully, by practice and by model, convince them that our society makes sense.

We seem to have done pretty well in doing this with the Soviet Union. We are told that the cold war is over now, that the power the Soviet Union had that was a reality that was gone after December 7—on February 19, 1942—an Executive order was issued declaring that Japanese Americans were not to be trusted. Therefore, they had to be rounded up, with 48 hours’ notice, and placed in 10 camps throughout the United States—no due process. No crimes were committed. Studies were made, investigations done, and there was not a single case of sabotage, not a single case of un-American activity. In fact, men volunteered from these camps to form a regiment, which I was honored to serve in, and we became the most decorated Army unit in the history of the Army. The United States is finally going to close that chapter.

But these things have happened to us. As a personal matter, I resented that when, on March 17, 1942, my Government said I was to be declared 4C.

In case people are not aware of what 4C means, it is a Federal government’s declaration that you are physically fit, mentally alert. Therefore, you are qualified to put on the uniform of the United States; 4F, something is wrong with you, physically or mentally; 4C is special designation for enemy alien. That was my designation.

So when one speaks of the history of the United States, there are chapters...
that we don’t wish to look at, because, if we start looking back to these chapters, you will find that we have gone through this painful evolution.

So I am telling my colleagues that this is not a simple amendment. It is an amendment that requires deep thought on our part. I hope that we leave it up to those who we rely upon in our State Department to do the best. We can always watch what is going on. Yes, they have forced abortion, and I am against religious persecution. We try to convince ourselves that there is no religious persecution in the United States. But I am certain we know that there is.

Mr. President, I will be voting to table this amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I respond to the comments, because I have such utmost respect for the Senator from Hawaii, and his distinguished career, and all that he represents.

But I just want to clarify the perspective of the authors of this amendment. The issue is not imposing American values. Frankly, we don’t and we can’t impose anything on another nation. But what we can say is that the values are important.

I think it is terribly wrong to try to make a moral equivalency argument and say that examples of religious persecution that may exist in the United States can in any stretch of the imagination be compared to the wholesale religious oppression that exists in China today.

We simply don’t have headlines in the Washington Post saying that there were “10 detained in Arkansas” because of their religious beliefs. We don’t have that in this country, and we shouldn’t. If we did there would be an outrage, and if we did we should be condemned by other nations in the world.

So the issue is not imposing American values. The issue is whether or not we as a body and we as a nation want to reflect certain fundamental beliefs and fundamental rights.

I add that these are not American values that we speak of. These are not American values that this amendment is addressing. These are human values. They are universal.

It was not the U.S. Supreme Court that I quoted in condemnation of forced abortion. It was the Nuremberg War Tribunal that said forced abortion is a crime against humanity.

To be in disagreement with these values. We cannot excuse a nation by saying they are new at this thing of freedom. No. In fact, it is not that the communist rulers of China don’t understand freedom. It is that they understand freedom all too well, and they are determined to repress it.

The issue in China is control, and the Chinese Communist Government is determined to use whatever means necessary and whatever means at their disposal to insure that they maintain control, even to the point of persecuting those who might say there is a power above and beyond the power of the Chinese Government.

I say to my distinguished colleague from Hawaii that the issue is not isolation. It is certainly not isolation. There is no way that we could, even if we wished to, isolate the largest, most populous nation in the world. It is, though, as a country and as a people are going to stand for something other than profits. That is what this amendment is about. That is why I believe, I have faith, that my colleagues in the Senate will support an amendment that really reflects the best not only of American values but human values.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take 2 minutes, because I know my colleague wants to move forward.

Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii is the best of the best Senators. I don’t like to be in disagreement with him. I am certainly not in disagreement with his analysis about our own history. There is nobody who can speak with more eloquence and more integrity about injustices in our country toward minorities and violations of people’s human rights than the Senator from Hawaii. There is no question about it.

But I also believe, as my colleague from Arkansas has ably pointed out, that it is also important for other countries, and it would have been an important relation for our country to speak out.

When I think about South Africa, I think about what President Mandela said. One of the things he said over and over again, was when the people in the United States took action, it was when we put the pressure—not just symbolic politics—that things began to break open, and finally we were able to end the awful system of subjugation of people because of the color of their skin.

When I think even about our relations with the former Soviet Union, we were tough on these human rights violations.

I really believe that this amendment is just a very modest beginning which says, look, when you have people who are directly guilty of religious persecution, and when you have people who are directly guilty of forced sterilization, forced abortion—and we even had waivers for the Presidents. But what we are saying is then let’s take this into account. They ought not to be given travel visas to our country.

This is moderate, I say to my colleagues. This is but a step forward. But it is an important message about what our values are all about, what we are about as a nation. And it supports the people in China.

This really is an important amendment. I hope that our colleagues will vote for it and will give it overwhelming support.

Mr. STEVENS, Mr. President, before I respond, I again would like to request that senators come forward, and let us see their amendments.

Earlier today I said of the 46—it is now 47 amendments that we know of—that we had agreed to accept 23 of them.

My staff informs me that the difficulty is we can’t accept them because we haven’t seen the final version of them. We hope that those will be produced here so we can dispose of the amendments that we will want to accept expeditiously with very short comments from Members.

We are going to have over 50 amendments. We are going to finish this bill by tomorrow. I advise Members and staff to be very careful to see their amendments.

Mr. President, I have to confess to my friends, both of them who have spoken in favor of this amendment that this Senator is at a loss to understand section 9012, which says that no funds can be used to pay the travel expenses and per diem for the participation in conferences, exchanges, programs, etc., of any national from the People’s Republic of China who is the head or political secretary of any Chinese Government-created or approved organization. And it lists the Chinese Buddhist Association, the Chinese Catholic Association, the National Congress of Catholic Representatives, the Chinese Catholic Bishops’ Conference, the Chinese Protestant Three-Self Patriotic Movement, the China Christian Council, the Chinese Taoist Association, the Qingshui Islamic Association, and then a series of civilian and military officials and employees of Government to carry out the specific policies that are listed, such as promoting or participating in policies or activities which hinder religious activities, or the free expression of religious beliefs.

I am at a loss to understand that section. Perhaps the Senator would explain that to me.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The officials that are listed of the various religious organizations that the Senator listed in the amendment are, in fact, Government employees, and Government agents.

They are those at the head of these associations. These are the registered churches that are used as tools and the agents of the Chinese Communist Government in the repression of those various groups. It does not refer to the pastors, the ministers, the priests of local congregations, but the heads of these associations which, in fact, work for the Communist Government and are those that are perpetrating the very persecution against those groups.
So while there are millions of Chinese today underground in unregistered churches, mosques, synagogues and temples, there is also the so-called Patriotic Church, the recognized church by the Government which is strictly controlled, names, addresses of worshipers to be turned into the Government. Messages that are proclaimed are closely censored by the Government. That is why those officials would be included if, in fact, the Secretary of State and credible evidence that they were practicing perpetrating religious persecution.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sad to say to my friend I don’t understand that section to have that limitation, but in any event, it is a very controversial subject to be added to the Defense appropriations bill. In conferring with Members yesterday, it was the position that we took at the time that we were going to do our utmost to keep controversial subjects that would lead to extended debate off of this bill. The only way to do that is, once we have had a short explanation of it in courtesy to the presenters, was going to be the consent to move to table any such amendment, not just this one but any such amendment.

Therefore, on the basis of the policy that we have announced, I move to table the Senator’s amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The amendment was agreed to.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is set aside and the vote will occur after 2 p.m. today.

Mr. STEVENS, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent at the request of Senator THOMAS that a letter signed by himself and Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BIDEN, Senator KERRY, Senator SANTORIUM, Senator HAGAN, Senator GRAMS, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator ROBB, and Senator LIEBERMAN, and an excerpt from Newsweek be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material referred to should be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

* * *
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DEAR COLLEAGUE: When the Senate returns to consideration of the DOD Authorization bill, S. 2057, we expect a series of amendments to be offered concerning the People’s Republic of China. These amendments, if accepted, would do serious damage to our bilateral relationship and halt a decade of U.S. efforts to encourage greater Chinese adherence to international norms in such areas as non-proliferation, human rights, and trade.

In relative terms, in the last year China has shown improvement in several areas which the U.S. has specifically indicated are important to us. Relations with Taiwan have stabilized, several prominent dissents have been released, enforcement of agreements on intellectual property rights have been stepped up, the revision of Hong Kong has gone smoothly, and China’s agreement to devalue its currency helped stabilize Asia’s economic crisis.

Has this been enough change? Clearly not. But today I want to ask how do we best encourage more change in China? Do we do so by isolating one quarter of the world’s population, by denying visas to most members of its government, by denying it access to any international concessional loans, and by backing it into a corner and declaring it a pariah as these amendments would do?

Or, rather, is the better course to engage China, to expand dialogue, to invite China to play a larger role, in order to expose the country to the norms of democracy and human rights and thereby draw it further into the family of nations? We are all for it, there’s no dispute about that. But the question is, how do we best achieve human rights? We think it’s through engagement.

We urge you to look beyond the artificially-crafted titles of these amendments to their actual content and effect. One would require the United States to provide the possibility of any international concessional loan to China, its citizens, or businesses, even if the loan were to be used in a manner which would promote democracy or human rights. This same amendment would require every U.S. national involved in conducting any significant business in China to register with the Commerce Department and agree to abide by a set of government-imposed “business principles” mandated in the amendment. On the Senator’s trip to China, the raft of radical China-related amendments threatens to undermine our relationship, which is the most crucial to advance vital U.S. interests. Several of the amendments contain provisions which are sufficiently vague so as to effectively bar the United States from entering into any lease, purchase or loan agreement to the United States to every member of the Chinese government. Those provisions not only counteract many of our international commitments, but are completely at odds with one of the amendments which would prohibit the United States from funding the government of China, and that of the Chinese officials in any State Department, USAID, or U.S.A.I.D. conference, exchange program, or activity; and with another amendment which urges agencies of the U.S. Government to increase programs between the two countries.

Finally, many of the amendments are drawn from bills which have yet to be considered by the committee of jurisdiction, the Foreign Relations Committee. That committee held a hearing on June 13, and they are scheduled to be marked-up in committee on June 23. Legislation such as that which would have such a profound effect on U.S. foreign and national security policies is a Committee responsibility. The amendments should not be subject of an attempt to circumvent the committee process.

In the short twenty years since we first officially engaged China, that country has opened up to the outside world, rejected Maoism, initiated extensive market reforms, witnessed a growing grass-roots movement towards increased democratization, agreed to be bound by major international non-proliferation and human rights agreements, and is on the verge of dismantling its state-run enterprises. We can continue to nurture that trend toward change, or we can capitulate to the voices of isolation and containment that these amendments represent and negate all the advances made so far.

We hope that you will agree with us and choose engagement. We strongly urge you to vote against the amendments.

Sincerely,

Craig Thomas, Chairman, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Frank H. Murkowski, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; Chuck Hagel, Chairman, Subcommittee on the Department of Defense, Committee on Foreign Relations; Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Ranking Member, Committee on Foreign Relations; John F. Kerry, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Gordon Smith, Chairman, Subcommittee on European Affairs; Committee on Foreign Relations; Rod Grams, Chairman, Subcommittee on International Operations, Committee on Foreign Relations; Charles S. Robb, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Near East/South Asian Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Feinsteins, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on International Operations, Committee on Foreign Relations; Joseph L. Lieberman, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology, Committee on Armed Services.

[From Newsweek, July 6, 1998]

HELP “INDEPENDENT SPIRITS”—A GULAG

VETERAN APPRAISES CLINTON’S MISSION

(By Wang Dad)

President Clinton is taking a lot of heat for his decision to visit China in spite of the serious human-rights problems there. I spent seven years in prison in China for my activities. The Tiananmen Square massacre, I certainly share the view that the Chinese government must change its ways. But I also think the American president can accomplish some positive things by his visit.

It’s critically important to have a broad range of contacts with China. The West should not try to isolate the communist regime or limit contact to political change. Washington needs to maintain dialogue on many fronts at once: economic, cultural, academic, anything that helps build civil society, which is key to democracy. China is a developing country. My country needs independent intellectuals, independent economic actors, independent spirits.

Economic change does influence political change. China’s economic development will be good for the West as well as for the Chinese people. China needs Most Favored Nation trade status with the United States, and it should fully enter the world trading system. The terms of that entry must be negotiated, of course, but in any case the rest of the world must not break its contact with China.

President Clinton’s visit to Tiananmen Square did not look like a sacrilege to the Chinese. He didn’t stand in the middle of the square, but along the side, outside the Great Hall of the People. All foreign leaders go there. Clinton was right later to mention the events of June 4, 1989. He must continue to stick up for such political prisoners as Liu Nianchun, imprisoned in 1995 for three years; Li Hai, a former student at Peking University sentenced to nine years in 1994. All were convicted on trumped-up criminal charges. These people must never be forgotten. Nor should the routine arrest and harassment of other dissidents, which continued last week.

It’s hard to say exactly what Chinese leaders think about Clinton. The scandals in Washington allegedly implicating Chinese officials are a serious problem. But one thing is clear: China’s leaders always view American presidents as competitors. They believe that the United States doesn’t want China to grow prosperous, not even skeptical of its motives. That made Clinton’s task in China more difficult still. I wish him well.

Mr. STEVENS, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I keep asking and requesting that Members come forward with these amendments. I have asked now the leadership to clear a unanimous consent request that all amendments have to be filed by 4. I know it is not cleared yet, but I am again requesting that and letting people know somehow or other we are going to get these amendments. It may be that I will just have to move to go to third reading, we will have a vote to go to third reading and cut them all off.

For those people who want to go home, I will give them an avenue to get home, and that is let’s just vote on this bill. But if people won’t bring the amendments to us, we are going to have to take some drastic steps here to limit the number of amendments we can consider. I know that it is an extraordinary procedure, but these are extraordinary times. I would like at least to have the amendments we have said we would accept. Twenty-three Members out there with amendments I said we would accept, and they have not brought them over. I plead with the Members to think about proceeding with this bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3409
(Purpose: To express the Sense of Congress that the readiness of the United States Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States is eroded from a combination of declining defense budgets and expanded missions, including the ongoing, open-ended commitments of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. Hutchison] proposes an amendment numbered 3409.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

Sec. ___. (a): Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1989, the national defense budget has been cut in half as a percentage of the gross domestic product.

(2) The national defense budget has been cut by over $120 billion in real terms; (C) The U.S. military force structure has been reduced by more than 30 percent; (D) The Department of Defense’s operations and maintenance accounts have been reduced by 40 percent; (E) The Department of Defense’s procurement funding has declined by more than 50 percent; (F) U.S. military operational commitments have increased fourfold; (G) The Army has reduced its ranks by over 630,000 soldiers and civilians, closed over 700 installations and training areas, and cut 16 divisions from its force structure; (H) The Army has reduced its presence in Europe from 250,000 to 65,000 personnel; (I) The Army has averaged 14 deployments every four years, increased significantly from the Cold War trend of one deployment every four years; (J) The Air Force has downsized by nearly 40 percent, while experiencing a four-fold increase in operational commitments.

(2) In 1992, 37 percent of the Navy’s fleet was deployed at any given time. Today that number is 57 percent; at its present rate, it will climb to 62 percent by 2005.

(3) The Navy’s F-18 Super Hornet, a $60 million aircraft, has a six-year production run of 350 aircraft, 125 of which were built for the carrier-based fleet, and will have a production run of 350 aircraft, 125 of which were built for the carrier-based fleet, and will be in production until 2014, meaning that the Navy will not only be unable to expand its fleet, but will be forced to operate with an increasingly outdated fleet.

(4) The Air Force faces critical personnel shortages in combat units, forcing unit commanders to borrow troops from other units just to participate in training exercises.

(5) An Air Force F-16 squadron commander testified before the National Security Committee that his unit was forced to borrow three aircraft and use cannibalized parts from four other F-16s in order to deploy to Southwest Asia.

(6) In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.

(7) Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the U.S. military to deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goals for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.

(8) In fiscal year 1997, the Army fell short of its recruiting goal for critical infantry soldiers by almost 5,000. As of February 15, 1998, Army-wide shortages existed for 28 Army specialties. Many positions in squads and crews are left unfilled or minimally filled because personnel are diverted to work in key positions elsewhere.

(9) The Navy reports it will fall short of enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000 personnel.

(10) In 1997, 35 percent of National Guard units were not combat ready; (11) Ten Air Force technical specialties, representing thousands of airmen, deployed away from their home station for longer than the Air Force standard 120-day mark in 1997; (12) On ten Air Force front-line units are not combat ready; (13) Ten Air Force technical specialties, representing thousands of airmen, deployed away from their home station for longer than the Air Force standard 120-day mark in 1997; (14) The Air Force fell short of its reenlistment rate for mid-career enlisted personnel by an average of six percent, with key war fighting career fields experiencing even larger drops in reenlistments.

(15) In 1997, U.S. Marines in the operating forces have deployed on more than 200 exercises, rotational deployments, or actual contingencies.

(16) U.S. Marine Corps maintenance forces are only able to maintain 92 percent ground equipment and 77 percent aviation equipment readiness rates due to excessive deployments of troops and equipment;
The ongoing, open-ended commitment of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia has required a number of non-deploying units to compromise their principle wartime assignments;

- Defense appropriations are not keeping pace with the expanding needs of the armed forces.
- Report Requirement.

1. Not later than June 1, 1999, the President shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committees on Appropriations, a report on:
   - The military readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States. The President shall include in the report a detailed discussion of the competition for resources service-by-service caused by the ongoing commitment to the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, including those that are supported but not directly deployed to Bosnia. The President shall specifically include in the report the following:
     - An assessment of current force structure and its sufficiency to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States;
     - An outline of the service-by-service force structure expected to be committed to a major regional contingency as envisioned in the National Security Strategy of the United States;
     - A comparison of the force structures outlined in subparagraph (A) with the force structure described in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, as a representative and recent major regional conflict;
     - A discussion of the U.S. ground force level in Bosnia that can be sustained without impacting the ability of the Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States, assuming no increases in force structure or defense appropriations during the period in which ground forces are assigned to Bosnia.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of Congress regarding the readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces to execute the national security strategy of the United States. So many people are now talking about the hollow military that we seem to be going into, and I think it is time that Congress address the concern that all of us have that we may be driving our military down to the point that we will not be able to respond if something happens where we are needed anywhere in the world. So, I take the following findings:

- The national defense budget has been cut in half as a percentage of the gross domestic product;
- The U.S. military defense budget has been cut by over $120 billion in real terms;
- The U.S. military force structure has been reduced by more than 30 percent;
- The Department of Defense’s operations and maintenance accounts have been reduced by 40 percent;
- The Department of Defense’s procurement funding has declined by more than 50 percent;
- U.S. military operational commitments have increased fourfold.

It is clear the Army has reduced its ranks by over 630,000 soldiers and civilians, closed over 700 installations at home and overseas and cut 10 divisions from its force structure;

- The Army has reduced its presence in Europe from 215,000 to 65,000 personnel;
- The Army has averaged 14 deployments every four years, increased significantly from the Cold War trend of one deployment every four years;
- The Army has downsized by nearly 40 percent, with a four-fold increase in operation commitments.

In 1992, 37 percent of the Navy’s fleet was deployed at any given time. Today that number is 57 percent; at its present rate, it will climb to 62 percent by 2005.

The Navy’s current fleet structure has fallen short of its needs, and the Air Force has become 120 days behind its current projected ground force levels assigned to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia are unchanged;

- The Army faces critical personnel shortages in combat units, forcing unit commanders to borrow troops from other units just to participate in training exercises.
- In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.
- Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goal for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.
- The Navy reports it will fail short of its enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000.
- One in ten Air Force front-line units are not combat ready.
- The Army’s total aviation readiness is 53 percent, with the Air Force 53 percent, and the Navy 65 percent.

The Air Force has downsized by nearly 40 percent, while experiencing a four-fold increase in operation commitments.

- We know the Air Force is more than 800 pilots short, and we know that our current force structure is below 85 percent, and captains and majors are filled at 73 percent.
- At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squad were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified.

- In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.
- Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goal for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.
- The Navy reports it will fall short of enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000.
- One in ten Air Force line units are not combat ready.
- The Air Force’s total aviation readiness is 53 percent, with the Air Force 53 percent, and the Navy 65 percent.

Mr. President, all of us, including the distinguished Senator from Kansas who is a former marine, know that “nearly” has been inserted into our national security strategy. Our strategy used to be that we would have the ability to prevail in two major regional conflicts simultaneously. Today, we are saying “nearly simultaneously,” yet none of us who have studied these issues believe that we are ready, today, even for this ramped down mission. To execute the National Security of the United States, the U.S. Army’s five later-deploying divisions, which constitute almost half of the Army’s active combat forces, are critical if the United States is to prevail in two major regional conflicts. According to commanders in these divisions, the practice of under-staffing squad and crews that are responsible for training, and assigning personnel to other units as fillers for exercises and operations, has become common and is degrading unit capability and readiness.

In the aggregate, the Army’s later-deploying divisions were assigned 95 percent of their requirements at the beginning of fiscal year 1998. In one specific case, the 1st Armored Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate; however, its combat support and service support specialties were filled below 85 percent, and captains and majors and were filled at 73 percent.

- At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squad were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified.
- In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.
- Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goal for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.
- The Navy reports it will fail short of its enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000.
- One in ten Air Force line units are not combat ready.
- The Air Force’s total aviation readiness is 53 percent, with the Air Force 53 percent, and the Navy 65 percent.

- In one specific case, the 1st Armored Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate; however, its combat support and service support specialties were filled below 85 percent, and captains and majors and were filled at 73 percent.
- At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squad were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified.
- In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.
- Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goal for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.
- The Navy reports it will fail short of its enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000.
- One in ten Air Force line units are not combat ready.
- The Air Force’s total aviation readiness is 53 percent, with the Air Force 53 percent, and the Navy 65 percent.
Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will support me in this sense of Congress. It is just the beginning of our responsibility to address what we see as the problems in our military and that we would then be able to take the report and take the necessary steps to correct the condition that we are making with regard to the military readiness and the security of our country.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas for her presentation. It is my hope we will be able to accept that amendment. I have referred it to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and we are hopeful that we can reach that conclusion later.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999—AMENDMENT NO. 3385

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on another subject, will expire at 2 o'clock on the items to be voted on included in the Treasury and general government operations bill. I offered amendment No. 3385 regarding recomputation of some Federal annuities. I point out that this option is not mandatory. The only way future retired employees can take advantage of this provision is if they make a payment into the Federal retirement system.

Several times in recent years, Congress has denied COLA adjustments for Federal employees. In some years, only Members of Congress were denied COLAs. In other years, other employees were affected.

I believe the right thing to do is to adopt this concept. It allows the employee or the survivor of the employee who has passed on to ask for recomputation of the high-three concept based upon an assumption that the retiree had received the cost-of-living adjustments that were given to retired annuitants in the period when those were denied to Congress or other Federal employees.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. I will have a minute to talk about it when the amendment comes up for a vote, as we start voting at 2 o'clock. I wanted this in the Record at this point.

I thank the Chair.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from California would like to speak on the Hutchinson amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Not on this amendment, Mr. President, but the Hutchinson amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The Hutchinson amendment that I made a motion to table, the one pertaining to China.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Although I made a motion to table, I think it is in order until 2 o'clock that they may be able to speak.

AMENDMENT NO. 3409

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am prepared to leave the floor, but I have two things.

First, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ABRAHAM be added as a co-sponsor of amendment No. 3409.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Secondly, I ask the manager of the bill if he still wants me to offer the other amendment that I was to offer, or would he prefer to go forward with Senator FEINSTEIN, and I can always do that after the votes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I did request the Senator from Texas offer her Bosnia amendment so it will be the pending amendment after the votes this afternoon. I appreciate that she did that at this time. I urge she save the statement to be made until after the Senator from California, who has been waiting to make comments on the China amendment which I have already moved to table.

AMENDMENT NO. 3391, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a technical correction to amendment No. 3391 previously adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified. It is strictly a