

United States, and next month, the Administration will make its final decision as to which items will be sold.

According to the Washington Times, Taiwan has requested approximately 30 different weapons systems from the United States this year. Though the official list is classified, a recently released Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff report discussed Taiwan's current defense needs, mentioning some of the items that it is interested in acquiring. I would like to highlight just a few of these items.

According to this Senate report, Taiwan has, once again, expressed its need for four Aegis destroyers—a request that was repeatedly denied by the Clinton Administration. These destroyers would, according to the Foreign Relations Committee report, provide Taiwan “with an adequate sea-based air defense and C4I system to deal with rapidly developing [Chinese] air and naval threats.” Because final delivery will take 8 to 10 years, however, Taiwan will need an interim solution to deal with these threats. Thus, it may be necessary to sell Taiwan four used Kidd-class destroyers, which do not have a radar system as capable as Aegis, but are more advanced than what Taiwan currently possesses.

Additionally, the report indicates that Taiwan has stated its need for submarines. It currently has only four, while China has sixty-five. They could prove particularly important should Taiwan need to defend itself against a Chinese blockade of the island.

Taiwan also needs our help to deal with the growing imbalance of air power across the Taiwan Strait. According to the report, Taiwan's Air Force has indicated its need to be able to counter China's long-range surface-to-air missiles, and to counterattack its aircraft and naval vessels from long distances. In order to counter China's surface-to-air missile sites that can threaten aircraft over the Taiwan Strait, Taiwan has expressed interest in obtaining High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM). Taiwan reportedly would also like to purchase Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM), and longer-range, infra-red guided missiles capable of attacking land targets.

The United States should approve all of Taiwan's requests, provided they are necessary for Taiwan to defend itself, and provided they do not violate technology transfer restrictions. Section 3(b) of the Taiwan Relations Act states, “The President and Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of such defense articles and services based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan . . .” (Emphasis added) Taiwan clearly needs to upgrade its capabilities in several key areas and should act to address these shortfalls.

We must also deal with a broader question. Since the approach adopted

by the Clinton Administration clearly did not move China in the right direction, how can we positively influence China to act responsibly and eschew military action against Taiwan?

One way is to be unambiguous in our dealings with China. During the cold war, Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher took a principled stand against the Soviet Union, which contributed to one of the greatest accomplishments in history: the West's victory without war over the Soviet empire. The time has come for the United States to take a similarly principled, firm approach to our dealings with China. We should hold China to the same standards of proper behavior we have defined for other nations, and we should work for political change in Beijing, unapologetically standing up for freedom and democracy.

We should begin by assuring that the United States is not susceptible to blackmail by China—to freeze the United States into inaction by threat of missile attack against the United States. In this regard, we need to work toward the development and deployment of a national missile defense system. The United States currently has no defense against a ballistic missile attack from China, or any of the countries that it has assisted in developing a long-range missile capability. Missile defense will allow us to abandon the cold war policy of mutually assured destruction.

China has threatened that NMD deployment will lead to destabilization and to an arms race with that country. I disagree. As former Secretary of Defense William Cohen testified to the Senate in July of last year, “I think it's fair to say that China, irrespective of what we do on NMD, will in fact, modernize and increase its ICBM capability.”

And this is why president George W. Bush is correct to remain firm in his decision to deploy an NMD system as soon as possible.

Secondly, we need to maintain strong U.S. military capabilities in Asia and improve ties to our allies in the region. As Secretary of State Colin Powell recently said about these relationships, particularly with Japan, “Weaken those relationships and we weaken ourselves. All else in the Pacific and East Asia flows from those strong relationships.”

The United States can promote democracy, free-markets, and the rule of law by standing by our democratic allies in Asia, like Japan and Taiwan. The preparedness of Taiwan's defense forces is questionable. Increasing this preparedness will decrease the chances that the United States will need to become involved in a conflict in the Taiwan Strait, or that such a conflict will occur in the first place. As I mentioned earlier, not only do we need to sell Taiwan the necessary military equipment

for defense against China, our defense officials and military personnel need to be able to work with their Taiwanese counterparts to ensure that they know how to use the equipment. Without this training, the equipment we provide will be far less useful.

As stated in the Defense Department's report:

The change in the dynamic equilibrium of forces over the long term will depend largely on whether Taiwan is able to meet or exceed developments on the mainland with programs of its own. Its success in deterring potential Chinese aggression will be dependent on its continued acquisition of modern arms, technology and equipment, and its ability to integrate and operate these systems effectively . . .

President Bush recently stated that China, our “strategic competitor” needs to be “faced without ill will and without illusions.” Our long-term goal is to live in peace and prosperity with the Chinese people, as well as to promote democratic transition in that country. China's far-reaching ambitions in Asia, coupled with efforts to modernize and strengthen its military force, however, require the United States to exercise leadership. There is no doubt that China will and should play a larger role on the world stage in the coming years. The challenge before us is to deal with this emerging power in a way that enhances our security by dealing candidly and strongly with some of the troubling facts and trends. It is time to take a more clear-eyed approach to dealing with China.

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

---

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KYL. Madam President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Nos. 24 through 30, 32 through 35, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

#### AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be major general

Brig. Gen. James D. Bankers, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Marvin J. Barry, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. John D. Dorris, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Patrick J. Gallagher, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Ronald M. Segal, 0000

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Thomas A. Dyches, 0000  
 Col. John H. Grueser, 0000  
 Col. Bruce E. Hawley, 0000  
 Col. Christopher M. Joniec, 0000  
 Col. William P. Kane, 0000  
 Col. Michael K. Lynch, 0000  
 Col. Carlos E. Martinez, 0000  
 Col. Charles W. Neeley, 0000  
 Col. Mark A. Pillar, 0000  
 Col. William M. Rajczak, 0000  
 Col. Thomas M. Stogsdill, 0000  
 Col. Dale Timothy White, 0000  
 Col. Floyd C. Williams, 0000

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Martha T. Rainville, 0000

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Dennis A. Higdon, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. John A. Love, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Clark W. Martin, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Michael H. Tice, 0000

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Bobby L. Brittain, 0000  
 Col. Charles E. Chinnock, Jr., 0000  
 Col. John W. Clark, 0000  
 Col. Roger E. Combs, 0000  
 Col. John R. Croft, 0000  
 Col. John D. Dornan, 0000  
 Col. Howard M. Edwards, 0000  
 Col. Mary A. Epps, 0000  
 Col. Harry W. Feucht, Jr., 0000  
 Col. Wayne A. Green, 0000  
 Col. Gerald E. Harmon, 0000  
 Col. Clarence J. Hindman, 0000  
 Col. Herbert H. Hurst, Jr., 0000  
 Col. Jeffrey P. Lyon, 0000  
 Col. James R. Marshall, 0000  
 Col. Edward A. McIlhenny, 0000  
 Col. Edith P. Mitchell, 0000  
 Col. Mark R. Ness, 0000  
 Col. Richard D. Radtke, 0000  
 Col. Albert P. Richards, Jr., 0000  
 Col. Charles E. Savage, 0000  
 Col. Steven C. Speer, 0000  
 Col. Richard L. Testa, 0000  
 Col. Frank D. Tutor, 0000  
 Col. Joseph B. Veillon, 0000

## IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Robert M. Carrothers, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Robert M. Diamond, 0000

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Eugene P. Klynoot, 0000

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Paul C. Duttge, III, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Perry V. Dalby, 0000  
 Brig. Gen. Carlos D. Pair, 0000

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Jeffery L. Arnold, 0000  
 Col. Steven P. Best, 0000  
 Col. Harry J. Phillips, Jr., 0000  
 Col. Coral W. Pietsch, 0000  
 Col. Lewis S. Roach, 0000  
 Col. Robert J. Williamson, 0000  
 Col. David T. Zabecki, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Robert G.F. Lee, 0000

## IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Naval Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

Rear Adm. (1h) Kenneth C. Belisle, 0000  
 Rear Adm. (1h) Mark R. Feichtinger, 0000  
 Rear Adm. (1h) John A. Jackson, 0000  
 Rear Adm. (1h) John P. McLaughlin, 0000  
 Rear Adm. (1h) James B. Plehal, 0000  
 Rear Adm. (1h) Joe S. Thompson, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be vice admiral*

Rear Adm. James C. Dawson, Jr., 0000

## NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

## IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations (5) beginning LAUREN N. JOHNSON-NAUMANN, and ending ERVIN LOCKLEAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nominations (2) beginning EDWARD J. FALESKI, and ending TYRONE R. STEPHENS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nomination of WILLIAM D. CARPENTER, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nominations (48) beginning ANTOIN M. ALEXANDER, and ending TORY W. WOODARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nominations (82) beginning PHILIP M. ABSHERE, and ending ROBERT P. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nominations (208) beginning WILLIAM R. ACKER, and ending CHRISTINA M. K. ZIENO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force nominations (599) beginning ROBERT C. ALLEN, and ending RYAN J. ZUCKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Air Force Nominations (1511) beginning FREDERICK H. ABBOTT, III, and ending MI-

CHAEL F. ZUPAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

## IN THE ARMY

Army nominations (550) beginning KENT W. ABERNATHY, and ending ROBERT E. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nomination of BRIAN J.\* STERNER, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (3) beginning WILLIAM N.C. CULBERTSON, and ending ROBERT S. MORTENSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (2) beginning MARK DICKENS, and ending EDWARD TIMMONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (4) beginning JOSEPH N.\* DANIEL, and ending PHILLIP HOLMES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (7) beginning JOE R. BEHUNIN, and ending RANDALL E. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (3) beginning ROBERT G. CARMICHAEL, JR., and ending LARRY R. JONES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (4) beginning JAMES P. CONTREARAS, and ending ROBERT D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (2) beginning CHERYL E. CARROLL, and ending SUSAN R.\* MELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (66) beginning JEFFREY A.\* ARNOLD, and ending CHARLES L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (309) beginning CARA M.\* ALEXANDER, and ending KRISTIN K.\* WOOLLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nominations (12) beginning HANSON R. BONEY, and ending WILLIAM D. WILLETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Army nomination of Joel L. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 2001.

Army nominations (3) beginning JAY M. WEBB, and ending SIMUEL L. JAMISON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 2001.

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations (2) beginning JOSEPH D. APODACA, and ending CHARLES A. JOHNSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Marine Corps nominations (293) beginning JOHN A. AHO, and ending JEFFREY R. ZELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Marine Corps nominations (117) beginning WILLIAM A. AITKEN, and ending DOUGLAS P. YUROVICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nomination of Edward Schaefer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Navy nominations (12) beginning ANTHONY C. CREGO, and ending TERRY W. BENNETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 2001.

Navy nominations of James G. Libby, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 2001.

Navy nomination of Anthony W. Maybrier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

PEACE TALKS ON NAGORNO KARABAGH

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I want to offer my hope for the continued success of the Nagorno Karabagh negotiations. On April 3, the presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia will meet in Key West, FL, to continue their dialogue on the Nagorno Karabagh region, an area that is essential for the continued stability of the Caucasus.

President Heidar Aliyev of Azerbaijan and President Robert Kocharian of Armenia started a direct dialogue in 1999 and have met over a dozen times in an attempt to bring peace and stability to the South Caucasus. Their upcoming talks in Key West are a continuation of the most recent set of meetings that included French President Jacques Chirac. My hope is that the United States, France, and Russia—working directly with the two presidents—can increase the potential for resolving the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, March 29, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,770,774,722,962.15. Five trillion, seven hundred seventy billion, seven hundred seventy-four million, seven hundred twenty-two thousand, nine hundred sixty-two dollars and fifteen cents.

One year ago, March 29, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,733,452,000,000. Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-three billion, four hundred fifty-two million.

Five years ago, March 29, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,117,786,000,000. Five trillion, one hundred seventeen billion, seven hundred eighty-six million.

Ten years ago, March 29, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,465,189,000,000. Three trillion, four hundred sixty-five billion, one hundred eighty-nine million.

Twenty-five years ago, March 29, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$600,421,000,000. Six hundred billion, four hundred twenty-one million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,170,353,722,962.15. Five trillion, one hundred seventy billion, three hundred fifty-three million, seven hundred twenty-two thousand, nine hundred sixty-two dollars and fifteen cents during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA WRESTLING TEAM'S NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of a wonderful victory by the 2001 NCAA Wrestling Champions, The University of Minnesota. Because this is the Golden Gophers' first national championship in wrestling, this team victory is worthy of special note.

As colleagues may know, I follow college wrestling closely. Having seen a good deal of wrestling in my life, I can say that the performance by this year's Golden Gopher team was nothing short of spectacular. Throughout this season, members of the team showed a level of determination and skill that became the pride of the people of my state and captured the respect of college wrestling fans across the country. In gaining the national championship on March 19, the team scored 138.5 points and earned an NCAA-record 10 All-Americans.

College wrestling is a consummate American sport. It centers around matches in which individuals face off and are recognized for their strength, speed, and versatility, just as we celebrate individual achievement in other aspects of American life. However, wrestling championships are not won by individuals, they are won by teams. Just as this country thrives based on the contributions of all its citizens, college wrestling teams rely upon teammates of all weights for points if they are to gain a championship.

I do want to take this opportunity to make the point to my colleagues that we should be concerned about recent problems of amateur wrestling in the United States. According to a recent report from the Government Accounting Office, 40 percent of the nation's college wrestling programs have disappeared in the past two decades. As someone who was given the opportunity to develop personally through the challenge of wrestling and as a former student-athlete who gained access to a first-rate education thanks to

a wrestling scholarship, I am concerned about those who, increasingly, are not able to pursue wrestling during their college years. It is important to many Americans that the United States be competitive in all Olympic sports such as wrestling. Furthermore, amateur athletics has provided a way up and a way out for many young Americans. We have a responsibility to do what we can to revitalize a wonderful sport at the college level.

That can be a discussion for a later day, Mr. President. Today is a day to celebrate the accomplishment of a superb team, The University of Minnesota Golden Gopher wrestlers.●

THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF HAROLD BURSON, FOUNDING CHAIRMAN, BURSON-MARSTELLER

• Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, last month marked the 80th birthday of Harold Burson, the founding chairman of one of the world's leading public relations firms, Burson-Marsteller. This milestone, celebrated with good health and good humor by Mr. Burson along with his family and many friends, is especially noteworthy to the people of Tennessee because he is one of our most distinguished native sons. Harold Burson was born in Memphis on February 15, 1921. Despite a lifetime of accomplishment and honors on a global scale, he has never forgotten his Tennessee roots. Likewise, Mr. Burson's lifetime of professional achievement has earned him the deep respect of his fellow Tennesseans.

I ask that a series of letters written in tribute to Mr. Burson on the occasion of his 80th birthday be printed in the RECORD.

These letters from President Bush and others demonstrate that Harold Burson's contributions have meaning not just to folks in Tennessee, but to all Americans.

Thanks to the legacy of Harold Burson, public relations is a more respected and honored profession. Those of us who have the privilege of holding public office know that public opinion is at the heart of our democratic process. Harold Burson has helped create a profession that has brought credibility and integrity to the practice of influencing public opinion. People who have worked with Mr. Burson and have had him as a mentor are leading the public relations industry today and will do so in the future. Thanks to Mr. Burson's good health and robust spirit at the age of 80, his legacy is still being written.

When the last century was coming to a close, PRWeek, an industry publication, named Harold Burson the most influential figure in public relations in the twentieth century. The publication cited Mr. Burson's career as a counselor, advisor and mentor, and described him as "the most complete PR professional in history."