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 work to achieve the goal that we are making with regard to the military readiness and the security of our country.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. 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.

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 in those units that are supporting but not directly deployed to Bosnia.

What we are asking, Mr. President, is for an assessment of where we are. We have all talked about the problems we have seen in small instances and different pieces of testimony. What I have done in this sense of the Senate is put it all together. I have taken from the Department of Defense its own authorization, its own budget, its Quadrennial Defense Review, from statements made before one of our two committees that talked about the problems in specific detail.

I think it is time that we in Congress now say we have put it all together and we want a report on the state of our readiness. Let’s look at all of the factors and let’s determine that we have a problem, that we have to determine what to do about it, and let’s go forward and try to work with the administration, with the President, with the Secretary of Defense, and look at the big picture, and the big picture and the goal for all of us is that we would be able to meet the national security strategy of the United States, that we would be able to prevail in two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously. I prefer simultaneously, but, nevertheless, we are not even up to the goal that we have stated, and we want to do what is our responsibility in the U.S. Congress, and that is, ask for the report, let’s study the problem and let’s come with a solution together with the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House.
technical error in the amendment that was previously adopted.

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

The amendment (No. 3391), as modified, is as follows:

On page 34, line 24, strike out all after "$94,600,000" down to and including "1999" on page 35, line 7.

On page 42, line 1, strike out the amount "$2,990,000" and insert the amount "$1,775,000,000".

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

Sec. 8. In addition to funds provided under title I of this Act, the following amounts are hereby appropriated: for "Military Personnel, Army", $3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", $1,000,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Army", $5,377,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Army", $3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", $1,142,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", $1,000,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Marine Corps", $1,142,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", $4,112,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the President may allocate funds available in this Act for "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense", real property maintenance is hereby decreased by reducing the total amounts appropriated in this Act for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", by $3,840,000; for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", by $3,840,000; for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", by $1,000,000; and for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", by $4,000,000.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the amount appropriated under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment", is hereby reduced by $24,668,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from California to speak on the amendment that was offered by Senator HUTCHISON, following the offering of the Bosnia amendment by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think the unanimous consent agreement was to allow me to offer my amendment, and then I will defer to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 3393

(Purpose: To condition the use of appropriated funds for the purpose of an orderly and verifiable reduction of U.S. ground forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina)
immediately following the stacked votes this afternoon, I am happy to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is finally recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242

Mr. President, as one who has watched China for some 35 years now, and been a frequent visitor for the past 20 years, I would like to make a few comments on the record. It is my amendment, which effectively would set up a protocol whereby officials beneath the rank of Cabinet officials could be refused visas to come to this country.

The amendment, while it promotes a worthy goal, goes about it in a completely, I believe, counterproductive way. I do not think there is any Senator in this body who does not condemn the practice of forced abortion, forced sterilization, or any other coercive population control device or measure. We all condemn them. This amendment takes a stand on a principle but it does nothing to help solve the problem it is designed to address, and there is the rub.

We all agree there are certain practices and policies still in China that we oppose. The question we need to ask ourselves is this: What is the best contribution we can make to producing change, real change, in China? I submit that the answer is, we can engage China at all levels, all levels of government, Academia, business, law, and every other kind of social interaction should be energized. We should welcome every chance to interact with the Chinese people and officials as an opportunity to expose them to our values, to expose them to the rule of law, to Democratic values, to individual liberties.

The path set out by this amendment, I believe, is extraordinarily dangerous and it takes us on the opposite path. It is a path of isolation and containment. It cuts ourselves off from the very people we need to help educate and persuade and expose to Western values. And it would surely spark similar countermoves by the Chinese Government to deny visas to U.S. officials, further deepening our isolation from one another, and developing the adversarial relationship that many of us believe need never happen. It could go on and on in a vicious cycle.

Do any of my colleagues seriously believe that any Chinese official would be dissuaded from conducting any human rights action because they would be denied a visa to the United States? I think not. Do deeply believe that if Chinese officials are exposed to U.S. society—this and has ensued. I know it has been criticized, but I see it working. I come from a Pacific rim State where there is a great deal of interaction with Asia. I see our values go across the Pacific. I see them enter the Chinese mainland. I see the changes that have been made.

Mr. President, when Richard Nixon went to China in 1972, he was still in the midst of the Cultural Revolution. There has never been a more brutal period in Chinese history than the Cultural Revolution. We have seen those dark days recede. We have seen a new leadership in place.

For the first time, I believe that this new leader now has the face, has consolidated his power, to begin to make certain major reforms. I very deeply believe we are going to see those reforms in the next few years. Already, there is writing here and in China about the order given to the Chinese military to remove themselves from all commercial endeavors.

Surprisingly enough, this, for the first time, has been done with transparency, with their will to do it. I do not think there is any Senator in this body who does not condemn religious persecution that prevents people from freely exercising their own personal religious beliefs. Of course, not. We all agree. This amendment takes a stand on a principle but it does nothing to help solve the problem it is designed to address, and there is the rub.

Additionally, you heard voluntarily the President of China, after many of us have importuned him over a long period of time, in 1991, carrying messages from His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, to the President of China, urging that there be a meeting—for the first time, the President of China has said publicly, with transparency, that if His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, makes a statement that respects the fact that Tibet is a part of China and that independence is not a part of the discussions, that there can be meetings that follow.

This is a breakthrough in rhetoric, but it has not happened before in the 8 years I have been trying to achieve it. That happened while the President was in China. So these changes are being made.

One by one—perhaps not enough—the religious persecution that prevents people, who could cast aside people, who could kill people at will—then revolutionary war heroes, basically people who were uneducated.

This is the first post-revolutionary war leadership that has had some Western education, that has some Western understanding. China closed itself off from the West after the Boxer Rebellion and because of what happened in the opium trade, never wanting any kind of interaction with the West. Now, for the first time, China is open. I believe, to Western values, to Western ideas. I happen to believe it is to our interest. We didn’t settle the enormous intellectual property and piracy problems by saying, if you commit a piracy act, you won’t have a visa to the United States. We settled it by sending over delegation after delegation of officials to let the Chinese Government know what this was all about, to identify and help identify those factories that were producing illegal goods and to follow up and see, in fact, that the Chinese Government was willing to take action to shut them down. It has worked. It will be a bumpy road.
But cutting off visas of officials isn’t the way to handle problems, whether they relate to IPR, whether they relate to technology transfer, whether they relate to other military endeavors or trade matters, I believe.

I must say, I believe this is the first time in the last year that the administration has really made up their mind that what they are going to do is engage China fully and completely at the top level. I believe it is having enormous dividends and that we will see in the years to come a much more open country, a country that has taken steps to make greater reforms.

You have to realize that to those of us who sit on the west coast, the Pacific rim is our world of trade. The Pacific rim has by far exceeded the Atlantic Ocean as the major theater of trade. In my State, approximately over a third of the jobs depend on trade with Asia. We want to have positive relations with Asia, positive relations with the Philippines, with Taiwan, with South Korea, with China, with all of the ASEAN countries as well. Increasingly, we have an opportunity, we believe, on the Pacific, to form a Pacific rim community that is peaceful, where trade flows, where so much of the commerce can be shared. I must tell you, I buy into that dream. I want to see it happen.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, coerced abortion and religious persecution are two practices of the Chinese Communist Government denies take place in China.

Now, would denying visas to Chinese officials in which we have credible evidence that, in fact, they are doing—how would that impede the kind of positive relationship that you want to see?

I again reiterate the questions: How do we reconcile the most recent round of arrests of those who tried to form a democracy party in China when they were detained and incarcerated? And the test of the rocket engines while the Philippines, with Taiwan, with South Korea, with China, all of the ASEAN countries as well. Increasingly, we have an opportunity, we believe, on the Pacific, to form a Pacific rim community that is peaceful, where trade flows, where so much of the commerce can be shared. I must tell you, I buy into that dream. I want to see it happen.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I don’t think it is all good. I am all for growth and all going in one direction. I find the arrest of dissidents in the wake of the President’s visit or prior to the President’s visit as 100 percent wrong.

Senator, if there is one thing I have learned about the Chinese, they can be ham-handed in how they function. They can be their own worst enemies in how they handle, because they function under a different, I think, value system in this regard. Sometimes, I believe, it is overreaction. I have read things and I sit back and say, why did this have to happen?

Now, let’s talk for a moment about forced abortion. I think it is an abysmal practice, it is a barbaric practice. China says they do not countenance and they do not want to permit it. That is the official government policy. Are there occasions where, in this vast country, forced abortion is committed, do I believe? I believe there are instances and I do believe, in fact, committed. I also believe, though, that by pointing this out continually, we will see some changes.

I think it has to be understood that China still has over 100 million people of which, some living in caves, some living in the most impoverished circumstances, particularly in western China. It has to be understood that China is a nation of 1.2 billion people, growing rapidly.

When I first went to China in 1979, what I was told was, what we have for one person must be extended to five people. I have seen since that time the quality of life improving for people. I have seen the easing of restrictions. I have seen the opening of the society. I have seen the stress on education. I have seen the opening of the society. I have to think that is healthy for the society. I think if we engage that society, if we talk with people on an equal footing, that China without humiliating China but treat China with equality, that we will see major positive changes in the future.

So I appreciate the opportunity to have this dialog. I respect your values. I realize that you are trying to do in this regard. I just happen to believe, based on my knowledge, my understanding, and my experience with China and the Chinese people, I believe it would be highly unproductive.

I just wanted an opportunity to come to the floor and have that opportunity to state my views. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Last evening I had asked the majority leader just for 5 minutes at some time during the period when he was propounding the consent request. I am glad to cooperate with the floor managers on when would be the most appropriate time to do so, but since we are starting off on an amendment, I don’t want to interrupt the debate on the amendment, and I am glad to indulge my同事 of how much time the Senator from Massachusetts is yielded 5 minutes to speak, in morning business or whatever, and then establish that the Senator from Michigan would be recognized to proceed with the consent request.

Mr. ABRAHAM. If the Senator from Massachusetts would be happy to propose a unanimous consent agreement by which the Senator from Massachusetts is yielded 5 minutes to speak, in morning business or whatever, and then establish that the Senator from Michigan would be recognized to proceed with the consent request.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts be permitted to speak for 5 minutes at this time, to be followed by the Senator from Michigan to then resume discussion of my amendment.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

As the Senator knows, the Judiciary Committee, of which we are both members, is starting hearings at this time as well. I appreciate his kindness in permitting me to address the Senate at this time.

PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we begin the August recess, the American people should understand that the Republican leadership is still bent on blocking meaningful HMO reform. I believe that Senator Lott owes it to Congress and the American people to schedule a full and fair debate as the Senate’s first order of business when we return in September, but he has refused to do so and could be behind the unreasonable restrictions on fair guidelines for the Senate’s debate.

The Republican leadership in Congress deserves the failing grades it is getting for fumbling the issue on HMO reform. At least since last January the press reports began noting that Oscar-winning actress Helen Hunt in “As Good as it Gets,” who electrified audiences with her attack on HMOs, it has been clear that a tidal wave of support is building to end the managed care abuses and stop HMOs from profiting in ways that jeopardize patients’ health or their very lives.

The GOP’s HMO line of defense continues to be to block any strong legislation, refuse to allow fair debate, and to give the HMO industry antireform TV ads a chance to bite. The genie is out of the bottle, and that cynical strategy will fail. If the majority leader has not already done so, I urge him to see the film during the recess. I have a videotape of the film here. I ask a page to deliver it to the majority leader.

I urge the leader to see the film in a theater so he can judge the audience reaction and be more convinced of the genuine public outrage that exists over the abuses of HMOs and managed care. It is long past time for the Congress to end these abuses. Too often, the managed care is mismanaged care. No amount of distortion or smoke screens by insurance companies or GOP campaign ads can change the facts. A real Patients’ Bill of Rights can stop these abuses. Let’s pass it now before more patients have to suffer.

All we want is a chance, in the time-honored tradition and the regular order of this body, to have a full and complete debate on this issue. We have had 5 days of debate and discussion on agriculture, with 55 amendments. We have