

ferverently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senator for his reading of the farewell address of George Washington.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. The first half of the time will be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN; the second half of the time will be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. 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. HUTCHINSON. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, noting that Senator DURBIN is not on the floor, I ask unanimous consent to proceed up to 10 minutes.

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

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I was deeply distressed with the news over the weekend of China's new ultimatum regarding Taiwan and the front-page, above-the-fold story in the Washington Post today. I think the headline summarizes the situation:

China Issues New Taiwan Ultimatum: Delay in Reunification Would Spur Use of Force.

It seems that mainland China cannot stand democracy. It is almost as if they have a visceral antipathy to freedom. I went to Taiwan last month—the Presiding Officer accompanied me on that visit to the Pacific rim—and had the opportunity to visit with the President of Taiwan and numerous officials. One of the things that struck me as we disembarked the plane and I looked off the tarmac was a whole press contingent, more than we had seen in, say, Japan or South Korea; a media contingent—cameras, reporters—shouting questions at us. I thought, even as we walked toward them, democracy has certainly arrived and democracy has blossomed in Taiwan because one of the signal signposts, I believe, of democracy is an independent and a vigorous and aggressive media. That was certainly evident in Taiwan.

One of the first questions shouted to our delegation, the Senator from Wyoming will remember, was: Will China attempt to disrupt our Presidential elections as they did before?

My answer was: I certainly hope not because it did not succeed before and it won't succeed this time.

Four years ago, China launched missiles off the coast of Taiwan, hoping to disrupt a cornerstone of democracy in Taiwan, its Presidential elections. That effort failed both because of American aircraft carriers and the determination of the Taiwanese people not to be intimidated out of their freedom.

Next month, on March 18, the thriving democracy of Taiwan will once again hold Presidential elections, and once again it seems that the Chinese Government hopes to disrupt those elections.

Just yesterday, China issued a new threat to democratic Taiwan. In an official new white paper on Taiwan, the Chinese Government stated that:

If the Taiwan authorities refuse, *sine die*, the peaceful settlement of cross-Straits reunification through negotiations, then the Chinese government will be forced to adopt all drastic measures possible, including the use of force.

In other words, "Negotiate or face invasion" was effectively the ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government.

No longer is the bar set at a declaration of independence or occupation by a foreign power; now it includes refusing to negotiate reunification—a dialog that was broken off by the Chinese Government. This is, in effect, a blank check that the Chinese Government has written themselves, making a subjective judgment on this new, ambiguous standard they have established.

Taiwan is not a military threat to China, and no one in the world believes it is. If it is a threat, it is an ideological threat. A burgeoning Chinese society, less than 100 miles across the Strait, with increasing freedoms of religion, speech, and press—freedoms that are stifled on the mainland—the Chinese Government can't stand this shining contrast to its own totalitarian

system. That is why China is pulling down the threshold for invasion and building up its arms pointed at Taiwan.

I suggest it is no accident that earlier this month the first of four Russian *Sovremenny*-class guided missile destroyers sailed into Chinese waters. I suggest it is no accident this destroyer is equipped with surface-to-surface missiles designed specifically to destroy American Aegis ships and aircraft carriers, America's ships that would come to the defense of Taiwan.

It is no accident that China has ordered *Kilo*-class submarines equipped with torpedoes designed to evade detection. It is no accident that China has deployed short-range ballistic missiles in the provinces just across the Taiwan Strait. It is no accident that China has flown over 100 sorties over the Taiwan Strait, many with Russian-bought SU-27s.

We must not tempt intimidation with ambiguity. We must not tempt aggression with weakness.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1838, the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act.

Opponents of this act have held this out as being somehow bellicose, somehow threatening. I suggest to all my colleagues in the Senate they simply read what the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act says. Our colleagues in the other body passed this legislation by an overwhelming vote of 341-70 earlier this month. The Taiwan Security Enhancement Act will bring greater clarity to our relations with Taiwan and China by increasing military exchanges with Taiwan, by establishing a direct military communications link with Taiwan, and by reestablishing Congress as a consultant in the annual arms sales process—as intended and required by the Taiwan Relations Act—which at least, supposedly, governs our relations with Taiwan.

Just last month, General Xiong Guangkai, the Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army and a former head of Chinese intelligence said, "... we will never commit ourselves to renouncing the use of force." The irony is that this general did not make this statement while he was in China. He said this right here in Washington while he was being hosted by the Clinton-Gore administration.

This reveals the irony of the situation. We have greater military exchanges with a country that points ballistic missiles at us than we do with a democratic ally. The State Department prohibits our senior military officers from meeting with their Taiwanese counterparts. Instead, the focus is on their Chinese counterparts.

Isn't it ironic. I was visiting—I will not mention their names—with leading Army officials, some of whom had served in Taiwan many years ago, and they pointed out to me the irony that while they can hold talks with leading Communist Chinese military leaders, they cannot so much as go to Taiwan

and meet with the military leadership in Taiwan, a democratic entity.

It is only a matter of common sense that in the event of a crisis—a crisis now more likely—we should be able to communicate with the Taiwanese military—the people we may be called to defend.

Opponents of this bill claim that ambiguity is good. But there is nothing ambiguous about the Chinese position. The Chinese White Paper even specifically opposed the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act.

I suggest we should not be ambiguous about our support for democracy in Asia, nor should we apologize to China for helping Taiwan to defend itself.

I believe China has made itself clear on the Taiwan issue. So should we.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

#### TRIBUTE TO JEANNE SIMON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to a great friend who passed away on Sunday. Her name was Jeanne Simon, the wife of my friend and former colleague in the House, my predecessor in the Senate, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois. Jeanne Simon passed away in the early morning hours on Sunday in her home in Makanda, IL, in the southern part of our State.

She had been suffering for several months from a brain tumor, and the end was obvious when I last saw her a few weeks ago. As Paul Simon told me when I called and asked if we could get together: Her spirits are good. He was certainly right. We laughed over dinner and reminisced over old political experiences and had a great time, as we did for over 30 years in similar meetings and dinners.

Jeanne Simon was an extraordinary person. She was one of the first women to serve in the Illinois House of Representatives. She was a graduate of Northwestern Law School and served as an assistant State's attorney when very few women were involved in the profession, let alone as prosecutors.

She met another young legislator when she served in Springfield, IL, a State representative named Paul Simon. The two hit it off and decided to get married in 1960. Jeanne Simon put her legislative and professional career aside to become a wife and a mother and to become a help mate, not just at home but in the political career of her husband, Paul Simon.

President Clinton was wont to say when he was elected: America got two—buy one, get one free—in terms of the First Lady and her contribution to the Nation. We felt the same in the State of Illinois. Whenever we looked at the Simon package, it was Paul and Jeanne Simon and the kids wrapped up in a very attractive package with a

polka dot bow tie. Time after time, election after election, the people in Illinois turned to Paul Simon as Congressman, as Lieutenant Governor, and finally as Senator and bought the package.

Politics is a game of individual statistics. We talk about who won, who lost. In sports we talk about team statistics, but when it came to the Simons, we were dealing with a team statistic. We knew that whenever Paul Simon was there fighting for Illinois and the causes in which he believed, Jeanne Simon was right at his side.

She had special passions and commitments to literacy and to education. She served as chair of the National Commission on Libraries, and one of the last things I ever heard from her was a call late in the session last year: Check on that appropriation for libraries. She was committed to it.

Jeanne Simon was the kind of person, too, whom I trusted in terms of her judgment. She was honest and forthright and you knew when she stood up for a cause it was because she really believed in it.

How many people, men and women, in Illinois political life were inspired and encouraged by Jeanne Simon over the years. She has left a great legacy. I consider myself to be one of the beneficiaries of that legacy. Now that she has passed away, we can reflect on the fact that even as a wife and mother of a great politician like Paul Simon, she left an enduring contribution to the State of Illinois and to the Nation.

Jeanne Simon will be missed, and many in this Chamber who knew her and worked with her on so many important issues will appreciate, as I have, what a great and enduring legacy she left with her life.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

#### BIENNIAL BUDGETING

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, the administration released its budget for fiscal year 2001—its last and its biggest, totaling \$1.8 trillion and proposing a whole host of new programs.

So begins our annual budget process.

From now until September 30, Congress will conduct dozens of hearings and hold countless meetings, while members of both Houses deliver innumerable speeches and spend long hours of debate over every subtle nuance of the Federal budget process.

Over the next 8 months, Congress will consider a budget resolution, a budget reconciliation package and as many as 13 separate appropriations bills—the latter only if we do not combine those appropriations bills into one massive spending bill, as has been the practice in recent years.

By the time Congress adjourns—currently scheduled for October 6—a ma-

ajority of votes taken in the Senate will relate to the budget process.

Indeed, as my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, has pointed out, 73% of the Senate's votes in 1996 were budget-related, 65% in 1997, and 51% in 1998. It is no wonder—each year, it is quite common for the same subject to be voted upon 3 or 4 times during the course of the entire budget process.

Despite the inordinate amount of time and effort that Congress will put into fashioning a budget that will meet our Nation's spending needs in a fiscally responsible way, a veto threat still looms on each of the appropriations bills if spending does not approach what the President wants.

At that point, high-stakes negotiations between the Congress and the President will ensue. In an effort to avoid a Government shutdown—and the blame that goes with it—these negotiations inevitably yield a spending compromise that neither Congress nor the President particularly likes, but both agree is necessary.

It is a heck of a way to run a railroad, but what is really unbelievable is this whole process is repeated each year.

I say enough is enough. It's time to bring rationality to our nation's budget process.

It's a fact that Congress spends too large a portion of its time debating and voting on items related to the Federal budget. Meanwhile, most other Congressional functions are not given proper attention.

We need to reestablish our priorities so we may effectively do the work of the people, make sure that the Federal Government is running at peak efficiency and deliver value, which is quality service for the least amount of money.

I believe we have an excellent opportunity to do that this year.

One of the first bills I cosponsored when I became a Senator was a measure introduced by Senator PETE DOMENICI that would establish a 2-year budget—just like we have in about 20 States including the State of Ohio. I believe enactment of this bill, S. 92, will provide an important tool in the efficient use of Federal funds while strengthening Congress' proper oversight role.

Because Congress produces annual budgets, Congress does not spend nearly as much time as it should on oversight of the various Federal Departments and agencies due to the time and energy consumed by the budget resolution, budget reconciliation, and appropriations process.

Not only is this a problem for Congress, but each executive branch agency and department must spend a significant amount of its time on each annual budget cycle.

Again, as my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, pointed out in his statement on S. 92, the executive branch spends 1