

the aisle, as well as my colleagues on this side, because I want to be sure that at the end of the day we have done the right thing for the children of America. If we are not going to leave any child behind, then let's make sure we know what we are voting on that will affect every child.

If we can make that determination to work together, I am confident we can come up with a bipartisan, sensible policy that leads to a budget we can support. In the absence of that, it will be very difficult to do so, and I hope that certainly the people of New York and America understand we are trying to stand firmly in favor of a process that may sound arcane and difficult from time to time to understand but which goes back, as Senator BYRD so rightly points out, to people who were very thoughtful about how to design a process that protected the rights of everybody. It is not just about that, as important as that is; it is fundamentally about the choices we will make for the children and families of America.

I know that people of good faith will find a way to come to a resolution about how we proceed next week. I am looking forward to that. But I do have to say that, in the absence of such an agreement, I for one will have to be asking the hard questions the people of New York sent me here to ask about what specifically will be done to affect the hopes and aspirations and needs and interests of the people I represent.

So I will be guided by three principles:

Will this budget pay down the debt to continue us on a path of fiscal responsibility that protects Social Security and Medicare?

Will we be in a position to recognize that the investments we need to make are important investments that are not going to disappear overnight?

And, at the end of the day, will we have made decisions that will protect America's long-term interests at home and abroad?

Madam President, I hope I will be able to answer affirmatively every one of those questions.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield me just a couple of minutes?

Mr. KYL. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. Without the time being charged to the Senator from Arizona.

Madam President, I merely want to take this moment to thank both of the Senators on my side of the aisle who have spoken this afternoon—the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, and the distinguished Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON—in support of the need for having the President's budget in the Senate before the Senate debates and amends the concurrent resolution on the budget.

They have spoken from their hearts. I have sat and listened to every word, and I am personally grateful for the insights they brought here, their dedica-

tion, their perception of the necessity for our having the President's budget, or at least knowing what is in the budget before the Senate proceeds to it.

Let me also thank them for their desire to work with other Senators on both sides of the aisle, their desire for bipartisanship, their desire to work with our Republican leadership and our Republican Senators. Both of these Senators who have spoken have manifested that very clearly, stated it clearly, and it comes from their heart because they came here to do the work of the people, and they know that the work of the people and of the Nation and our children cries out for bipartisanship, cries out for us working together to meet the needs of this country.

That is what they are here for. That is what they are here to do. I thank them for such a clear enunciation of the need to serve our people and, in so serving, the need to have before us all of the facts and details that we can so we can exercise judgment on both sides of the aisle. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KYL. Madam President, while the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is still here, let me thank him for the remarks he has just made. I, too, listened very carefully to his remarks, as well as to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York.

But I must say that I find this rather bemusing—if I am using that term correctly. People around the country might wonder why there is such an emphasis on, or such a concern for, taking up the budget. After all, isn't it time to take up the budget? Indeed, in the normal course of events in the Senate, we would be taking up the budget about right now. So why is there all this expression about concern about taking up the budget? I suggest it has to do with the old phrase, "You follow the money."

While I came here to speak about another subject, I want to speak for a few minutes about this subject because I think people across this country deserve to know what is really behind all of this talk about taking up the budget. You see, the truth is, until we take up the budget and pass a budget, we can't take up tax relief. Until we take up and pass tax relief, the money that is available here in Washington to be spent by the politicians will be spent by the politicians. So you follow the money. If we never take up the budget, then we can't pass the tax relief. If we don't pass the tax relief, the money that the hard-working families of this country have sent to Washington, DC, will be available for this Congress to spend.

People who like to spend other people's money don't want to see tax relief. They can't stand in the way of tax relief, which is too popular. It is going to pass. But they might be able to stop the budget from being considered, based upon some parliamentary procedures. That, Madam President, is what I think this is all about.

Let me take the four points that have been raised by my friends across the aisle in order:

First of all, that we can't possibly take up the budget yet because we don't have the details of the President's budget. I have in my hand a copy of something called "A Vision of Change For America." The Senator from West Virginia will remember this. It is dated February 17, 1993.

This is what the Democratically controlled Senate had before it when it considered the budget resolution in that year. We did not have the Clinton budget. There was no Clinton budget.

Like the first year of President Bush, that was the first year of President Clinton. It takes a new President's team a little while to put together the budget, but that has never stopped the Congress from passing a budget in the ordinary timeframe because that is the first thing we have to do. We are pretty well stymied in all of the other things we have to do in terms of reconciliation, in terms of appropriations, until we have adopted the budget.

What is this "Vision for Change for America" that President Clinton sent up? It was not a budget, as he acknowledges here; it was a blueprint, a vision, as he called it, pretty similar to the document the Senator from West Virginia has been referring to that President Bush sent up to Capitol Hill.

It is a blueprint. It is a vision for what he would like to do. There is a lot of information in it. It is not as detailed as the usual budget, to be sure, but there is plenty of information about the general direction he would like to take.

What happened to this "Vision for Change for America"? Did Republicans say: We cannot possibly take this budget resolution up; we have to wait for a detailed budget by President Clinton? Actually, I think some Republicans did say that, but the Democratic leadership said: Forget it; we are going to take up the budget resolution, and this body passed a budget resolution in a number of days—we are trying to determine whether it was 12 or 13. It was a number of days, close to 2 weeks, before the real Clinton budget was sent up here. The Senate acted upon its budget resolution before it ever had the detailed Clinton budget before it.

I do think it is a bit much to argue that it is unprecedented, that it is improper for the Senate to take up a budget resolution when it has not yet got the exact, complete, detailed budget from the President. We know full well the general direction this President's budget is going to take.

The second point is that there are questionable forecasts. I have heard

the phrase twice used here, "looking through a glass darkly." My goodness, we have to make decisions every day based upon what we think is going to happen. We cannot know for certain. As the fine Senator from West Virginia pointed out, we can hardly forecast the weather tomorrow, and that is true.

Yet we make decisions in the Congress, in the Government, in business, for our own families every day based upon imperfect and uncertain knowledge of what is going to happen in the future. We have to do that; otherwise, we would be frozen into inaction. We would never be able to do anything. We do the best we can.

We have been using very conservative budget estimates. The congressional budget estimates are that over the next 10 years, we would have about a \$5.6 trillion surplus and in that President Bush has decided to ask for \$1.6 trillion over a 10-year period to be returned to American taxpayers. That is the size of his tax cut.

That tax cut was proposed during the campaign when the estimated budget surplus was far less. That budget surplus has grown virtually every quarter since then. It is now up to \$5.6 trillion, \$5.8 trillion.

Given the fact that these are conservative estimates, given the fact that we all have to make decisions on imperfect information, it certainly seems to me we ought to at least proceed to take up the budget. My goodness, we will be here all year waiting for exactitude, and nobody, of course, expects that.

The third point I have heard is there is not going to be room for debt relief if we are not careful. That, of course, is not true. I was in a hearing yesterday of the Finance Committee in which we had experts talk about how much debt we could pay down and over what period of time.

Everybody agrees that the debt can be paid down within the 10-year period as far as we can possibly pay it. The only difference is, can we pay it down to about \$500 billion or down to \$1 trillion, somewhere in between there? The experts are in disagreement as to where exactly we can pay it down. It is virtually impossible to pay off more debt than that because it is held by people in long-term obligations and obligations that would cost too much to buy back.

We are going to pay down the debt all we can, and there is just over \$1 trillion left, after we have done the tax cuts, after we have paid off the debt, and after we have paid for everything on which the Government has to spend money, plus a 4-percent rate of growth, more than the rate of inflation. And that is on top of record huge historical increases in spending over the last 2 years, all of which are built into the baseline.

We have the historic spending, greater even than—well, literally any other period in our history, including all but the largest year of spending in World

War II. We have historic spending levels. We are increasing that spending; we are paying off the national debt; we are providing \$1.6 trillion over 10 years in tax relief; and we still have another billion dollars left over. That does not sound to me to be a very risky proposition.

Finally, the fourth point that has been raised by our friends on the other side is we have to come together in a bipartisan spirit, and that, I gather, is why the Democratic leadership has worked so hard to get every single Democrat to oppose the budget resolution in an absolute 100-percent partisan vote. That is bipartisanship?

Every Democrat can decide to oppose this budget resolution on the basis that they do not like it. That is totally fair. They will probably all conclude that is why they are not going to vote for it, and I certainly respect that. But I think it is a bit much to talk about a spirit of bipartisanship when we already know that for several days this week, the Democratic leadership has been working very hard to get an absolute, 100-percent partisan vote against the Republican budget resolution. That is not bipartisanship.

That is the condition we are faced with right now. Why wouldn't Senators want to take up the budget? What is really behind this? As I said, follow the money. We cannot cut taxes until we take up the budget, and that, in fact, is why some Senators do not wish us to take up the budget.

Paul Harvey has a saying at the end of his broadcast in which he says: "And that's the rest of the story." If we are direct and clear-eyed about this, this is the rest of the story. It has nothing to do with whether we should take up the budget, whether we have enough information to take up the budget, whether it is time to take up the budget, whether we will have all week long to debate the budget, to offer amendments to the budget. All of that will be quite possible.

It all has to do with partisan politics to delay taking up the budget so that we delay taking up the issue of tax relief because there are a lot of folks who do not want the degree of tax relief for which President Bush has called.

I see my distinguished friend from West Virginia wants to intercede with a comment which he will pose in the form of a question, and I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am struck with amazement, if I might say. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding. But when he charges the Democratic leadership with having spent all these days trying to get a solid vote against this resolution, I ask the question: What on Earth has the Republican leadership been doing this past week?

I am sorry that this discussion is taking a very partisan turn.

I say that with all due respect to the very distinguished Senator. I didn't come here to speak in politically par-

tisan terms. I have been talking about the need for both sides of the aisle to have the President's budget in front of us before we vote.

May I say to the distinguished Senator, I don't determine my vote on what the leadership on this side says or what the leadership on that side says. So let me debunk his mind with respect to that.

Let me get to the earlier point of the distinguished Senator when he spoke of the "Vision of Change," when he was reacting to my comments regarding "A Blueprint for New Beginnings," this outline of what the Bush administration is proposing. It is a mere outline. The distinguished Senator from Arizona reminded the Senate that in 1993 the Senate operated on the basis of this document entitled "A Vision of Change for America."

The difference, may I say to my friend, and he probably already knows this, the difference in 1993 and now is that this document in 1993 contained more detail than does this document on which we are going to have to base our judgment, apparently, in the forthcoming debate next week.

Furthermore, in that instance, the Budget Committee had a markup and reported to the Senate a concurrent resolution on the budget. That is not the case here. The Budget Committee of the Senate has not had any markup this year. In 1993 the Budget Committee had a markup. It sent to the Senate a document, a resolution, that came out of that committee and was the result of that committee's deliberations, both Democrats and Republicans. Further, in that instance, CBO had enough information to provide an analysis of Clinton's 1993 budget.

We need a CBO analysis for this budget. We don't have it here. We had it then. We had a markup by the Budget Committee that year; we were denied a markup in the Budget Committee this year. We were denied that opportunity. We had a CBO analysis in 1993; in this instance we don't have. Furthermore, in that instance we were following the true purposes of the Budget Reform Act in that we were seeking to reduce the deficits; in this case we are going to increase the deficits in all likelihood if we enact a huge tax cut purely on the basis of projected surpluses.

And finally, in that instance, not a single Republican in the Senate, not a single Republican in the House of Representatives, voted for the budget. So, if my friends on the Republican side are going to hold this document up and say, look what we did back then, the Senate went ahead and acted on the basis of that document. That is the role model, I assume they are saying. Look at what you did, you Democrats; you did it without the President's budget in 1993.

But they fail to remind listeners that not a single Republican voted for that document, and that that document is the basis for the surge of surpluses that

we now enjoy. The budget in 1993 took us out of the deficit ditch and made possible the surpluses of today, and yet not a single Republican in either House voted for that document. And here we are today, the Republicans are extolling the 1993 budget.

Mr. KYL. I think the Senator from West Virginia would concede I have been quite liberal in yielding to him to answer that question.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has. I wanted to help set the record straight.

Mr. KYL. I know that, and I appreciate the Senator helping to set the record straight. Let me set it exactly straight, however.

Mr. BYRD. I am waiting.

Mr. KYL. President Clinton's vision of America was transmitted on February 17, 1993, 145 pages long, outlining the details of the fiscal 1993 spending stimulus package and tax increase plan, plus the other visions of President Clinton.

President Bush's "Blueprint for New Beginnings," of which the Senator from West Virginia has a copy, was transmitted on February 28, 2001. The document is 207 pages long and outlines a 10-year budget plan with \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts.

The Senator from West Virginia might say my document is more detailed than your document. I think that is a matter of judgment. My document is longer than your document. It covers a longer period of time.

The fact is, neither are budgets in the pure traditional sense, the Senator from West Virginia would acknowledge. Both are the best the administration could do within the short period of time they had, and in both cases the majority party in the Senate sought to take up a budget resolution prior to the submission of the budget by the President.

The Democratic-controlled Congress in 1993 not only reported a budget resolution on a party-line vote—and I will stop for a moment and say the Senator from West Virginia is exactly correct, not a single Republican supported it but every Democrat did support it. So I don't know which side you blame for being partisan.

Mr. BYRD. I am not blaming either side.

Mr. KYL. It was a partisan vote.

Mr. BYRD. I am not blaming either side.

Mr. KYL. Thank you. I thought for a moment you were suggesting Republicans were partisan for sticking together but Democrats were not partisan for sticking together. The fact is, at that time the Democrats were in charge of the Senate. It passed Senate and House floors on party-line votes—budget resolutions based on the document, completed conference on the two budget-passed resolutions, completed and passed on party-line votes, budget resolution conference based upon this "Vision of Change" document and, most importantly, Congress did all of this by April 1, 1993, a full week before

President Clinton submitted his detailed budget plan.

The 107th Congress now is working to adopt a budget resolution in the Senate following the submission of President Bush's blueprint, and that is no different than what was done in the 1993 democratically-controlled Congress.

The point I am trying to make is that all of this debate about procedures—is it the real budget? Is it just a blueprint? Have we ever done this before? Is it partisan? All of that is a smokescreen. It is a smokescreen to hide the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to delay the consideration of the budget in order to delay the consideration of tax relief so that possibly something will come up so the tax relief won't pass to the degree that President Bush wants it to pass.

Just to make it crystal clear, I would never suggest that the Senator from West Virginia would feel himself bound to follow his party leadership. I suggest that it is the Senator from West Virginia who is helping to lead his party. I know in this case he believes strongly about this. We believe just as strongly. I do not think that it is too much to ask the Congress to take up the budget at the time it does every year, pursuant to the budget resolution, and consider that budget so we can get on with the other business of the Congress and the other business of the nation, to take up the questions of appropriations for all of the spending programs we need to fund, to take up the question of tax relief for hard-working Americans, and to do all the other things the American people sent us back here to do.

To try to get bogged down in a bunch of parliamentary or procedural wrangling, I suggest, doesn't do the people's business.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I had asked for an hour to present to the Senate another very interesting set of comments.

However, given the fact that we have begun an actual conversation on the Senate floor, something somewhat rare, I am delighted to continue to use the time that was allocated to me under the unanimous consent agreement to continue this debate and, under it, not only have Republicans speaking, but also to have Democrats speaking, with the stipulation that when we are all done with this I have an opportunity to present my other remarks in full, which really will not take a full hour but at least I ask I have that opportunity at the time.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, what we are seeing here is not a very illuminating discussion between two Senators. This is precisely what the President, I think, had in mind when he said he would like to see an end to the quibbling and to the bickering and the partisanship in Washington.

I came to the floor today suggesting that the Senate would be much better

off if we had the President's budget in front of us before we vote. Then I said even if we can't have the President's budget, surely the administration has the details, the information it can submit to the Senate. Let us see what is in it. I did not come here with any intent to engage in quibbling, or partisanship.

Mr. KYL. I hope the Senator from West Virginia doesn't mind if anyone disagrees with his assessment that we shouldn't take up the budget. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. NICKLES. Regular order, Madam President.

Mr. KYL. The regular order is I have the time, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. May I say I came here hoping I could speak out for the rights of both sides of the aisle; the rights of Republican Senators, the rights of Democrats; the rights of the majority, the rights of the minority, to have before us the President's budget, which we need in order to exercise a reasoned judgment. That is what I came here for. I am not interested in bickering, arguing about partisanship.

I will be just as happy if we concentrate on the need for the President's budget for the edification of both sides. I want to stand up for our rights, for the Senator's rights—the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I ask the Senator from West Virginia, were you willing to stand up for the—

Mr. NICKLES. Regular order, Senators are having discussion. They are supposed to go through the Chair. I believe the Senator from Arizona has the floor. I believe he can only yield for a question.

Mr. KYL. I would like to yield to the Senator for a question if he would care to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I will be glad to ask a question.

Mr. KYL. When Republicans, in 1993, objected to the consideration of the budget resolution on the grounds that President Clinton's "Vision of Change" was not a real budget, did the Senator from West Virginia stand up for their rights to wait until the President submitted a complete budget? Or did the Senator from West Virginia vote with the majority on a purely partisan vote to pass the budget resolution and, in fact, to pass the final budget resolution, all prior to the time President Clinton submitted a budget?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I was thinking of Cicero's statement when he said, "Let us not go over the old ground."

Mr. KYL. That was then; this is now.

Mr. BYRD. Wait. Let's just wait. I like your smile, but I don't like the interruption of Cicero's quotation. But the Senator is being very liberal to me in letting me speak on his time.

Cicero said:

Let us not go over the old ground. Let us, rather, prepare for what is to come.

The Senator wants me to ask him a question? I will ask that question.

Mr. KYL. No, I want the Senator to answer the question.

Mr. BYRD. I answered the question, didn't I?

Mr. KYL. Was the answer yes?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Yes, I voted for that budget.

Mr. KYL. Thank you.

Mr. BYRD. I was one of—I don't remember the precise number, but I was one Senator who voted for that budget in 1993, and not a single Republican voted for it in the Senate or in the House. Yet, it was that budget that put this country on the course of having surpluses rather than deficits.

Now, did the Senator want me to ask a question or answer a question?

Mr. KYL. No, I think the Senator answered the question. The Senator was willing to vote for a budget resolution prior to the submission of the complete budget by the President in 1993, but he criticizes Republicans for doing precisely the same thing in the year 2001.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator from Arizona just yield for a question?

Mr. KYL. If I might, since the Senator from Oklahoma was here earlier and had sought recognition, I would like to yield to him first.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator has an hour under his control. I wish to make a speech on campaign finance.

Mr. KYL. Then, Madam President, perhaps what I should do is ask how much time we have remaining so I can give the remarks I was originally prepared to give and then yield to those others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 and one-half minutes remaining.

Mr. KYL. I think that will be sufficient to give the other remarks I have, unless the Senator from North Dakota wishes to engage me in a lengthy colloquy, in which case I would want to ask for a little bit more time.

Mr. CONRAD. No, I will be very brief. Was the Senator aware that in 1993 there was sufficient detail from the President to have the Joint Tax Committee and the Congressional Budget Office estimate the cost of the President's tax proposals? That is totally different from this year. In this year, we have insufficient detail from the President for the Joint Tax Committee and the Congressional Budget Office to give us an independent estimate of the cost of the President's proposals.

Mr. KYL. That is a question. Let me answer by saying apparently the Joint Tax Committee believes it has enough information, because it has given us an estimate of the cost, both to the House and the Senate. In fact, it gave a very uncomplimentary estimate of the part of the tax relief which I am putting forward. I might argue with what they have come up with, but apparently they believed they had enough information to do it.

We do have an estimate this year, whether it is right or wrong. We had an

estimate back in 1993. We have an estimate this year. We are going to have to live with it one way or the other. But I don't think that should be a basis for suggesting it is improper at this point to take up the budget resolution. I think what we have established is that just as with the change of President in 1993, when you have a President in the year 2001, it is unrealistic to expect there would be the same degree of detail in the budget they send up in their very first year as there is for the remainder of their term.

But the fact has not stopped Congress from acting on a budget resolution at the time of year when it should do so, that we will be doing that, and that hopefully we will have an entire week next week for a continuation of this debate for proposals of amendments. I suspect we will be going very late at night next week as we consider all the different ideas different Senators have before we finally act on the budget.

I hope, to conclude the remarks here, this could be done in a bipartisan fashion and it will not be a purely partisan vote. One would hope that. We will see how it develops.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator further yield just for a brief question?

Mr. KYL. I would like to get on with what I started a half hour ago, if I may.

Mr. CONRAD. May I be permitted a brief question?

Mr. KYL. I think, as the Senator from West Virginia has said, I have been more than liberal in yielding to my colleagues. I really would like to get on to what I came here to talk about.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, we have not seen an estimate from the Congressional Budget Office nor the Joint Tax Committee of the cost of the President's plan, except for pieces of it, the estate tax provision of the Senator from Arizona, and two pieces of it from the House. But we don't have an estimate of the President's full plan.

Mr. KYL. What we have, of course, is the estimate of those portions of the President's tax plan that have been put forward by Members of the House and Senate, and that is ordinarily what is reviewed and what we get estimates of. That is plenty enough for us to move forward on it at this point.

I know the Senator from North Dakota appreciates that we in the Senate operate on that basis as a routine matter.

I appreciate the opportunity to have this exchange. I think it may illustrate some of the tough sledding that we have to do as we move forward with the consideration of the President's budget, with the Senate budget resolution, with our tax relief legislation, and the other business that we have.

CHINA'S MILITARY POLICY

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I rise today to express concern about the direction of Chinese military policy vis-a-vis the United States.

America's relationship with China is one of the key foreign policy challenges facing our nation in the 21st Century. It is hard to understate the importance of our relationship with China. It is the world's most populous nation, has the world's largest armed forces, and is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. Its economic and military strength has grown a great deal in recent years, and is projected to continue to grow significantly in the coming decades. And most significantly, it is intent on gaining control over Taiwan, even by military force if necessary.

For some time now, I have been concerned that, out of a desire to avoid short-term controversies in our relationship with China that could prove disruptive to trade, we have overlooked serious potential national security problems.

As Bill Gertz noted in his book, *The China Threat*, the former administration believed that China could be reformed solely by the civilizing influence of the West. Unfortunately, this theory hasn't proven out—the embrace of western capitalism has not been accompanied by respect for human rights, the rule of law, the embrace of democracy, or a less belligerent attitude toward its neighbors. Indeed, serious problems with China have grown worse. And continuing to gloss over these problems for fear of disrupting the fragile U.S.-China relationship, primarily for trade reasons, only exacerbates the problems.

We must be more realistic in our dealings with China and more cognizant of potential threats. As Secretary of State Colin Powell said in his confirmation hearing:

A strategic partner China is not, but neither is it our inevitable and implacable foe. China is a competitor, a potential rival, but also a trading partner willing to cooperate in areas where our strategic interests overlap . . . Our challenge with China is to do what we can do that is constructive, that is helpful, and that is in our interest.

I believe it is in our best interest to seriously evaluate China's military strategy, plans for modernization of its People's Liberation Army, including the expansion of its ICBM capability, and buildup of forces opposite Taiwan. Let us not risk underestimating either China's intentions or capabilities, possibly finding ourselves in the midst of a conflict we could have prevented.

I would like to begin by answering a seemingly obvious question: Why isn't China a strategic partner? Among other things, China is being led by a communist regime with a deplorable human rights record and a history of irresponsible technology sales to rogue states. Furthermore, Beijing's threatening rhetoric aimed at the United States and Taiwan, as well as its military modernization and buildup of forces opposite Taiwan, should lead us to the conclusion that China potentially poses a growing threat to our national security. While it is true that