

ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator PRESSLER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS: A RIVER TO CROSS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I returned from a 6-day trip to China, during which time I spent more than 20 hours in meetings with top-level Chinese officials, including 4 hours with the President of the country, Jiang Zemin, Vice Premier Zhu Rongji, and senior Foreign Ministry officials.

We held wide-ranging discussions on a number of important issues in the United States-China relationship, including several issues which have caused the most serious strain between our two countries since relations were established in 1979.

I believe that these talks were informative and constructive for both sides. And I would like to share with my colleagues some of the major elements of those discussions and my observations as a result of this trip. I first met the President of China while I was mayor of San Francisco. In 1979, the first of my 9 years as mayor, I forged a sister city relationship with Shanghai, the first such relationship between an American and a Chinese city.

Jiang Zemin became mayor of Shanghai in 1985. And we became good friends as we negotiated agreements and overseas projects between our two cities. As partners in this endeavor, we vowed to shrink the vast Pacific Ocean that divides us into a small river across which communication, trade and an exchange of ideas could easily flow.

That was 10 years ago. Jiang Zemin is now President of China, and he leads a nation of 1.2 billion people. Over the last 20 years, I have visited China many times and spent a great deal of time studying its people, its culture, and its political dynamism. I have talked with China scholars and read avidly about this complicated country and its rich 5,000-year history.

Few nations rival China's strategic importance to the United States. China is the largest country in the world, one of the largest economies, one of only five declared nuclear powers, and a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council.

The cold war Soviet axis of power has dissolved in the last 5 years, and as Russia struggles with democracy and works to regain its military and economic stability, China's emerging presence will most certainly shape the balance of power in Asia and in the world.

I wrote to President Jiang on July 11 and expressed my deep concern about the state of United States-China relations. Issues that divide the United

States and China today have increasingly prevented a productive exchange of views. And the detention of human rights activist Harry Wu, now an American citizen and resident in my State, had effectively blocked all lines of communication between our two countries.

In my letter, I offered to come to China to discuss the case of Mr. Wu and other matters. President Jiang wrote back and accepted, saying he would welcome my visit to Beijing. My husband and I left on August 17 for Beijing and Shanghai. We met privately with President Jiang for 2 hours and then were joined by Senator and Mrs. JOHNSTON for dinner with the President.

Our discussions with President Jiang were very frank and candid on matters pertaining to relations between our two countries, particularly the issues of Taiwan, the recent visit of Lee Teng-hui, and the detention of Harry Wu.

I delivered a message to President Jiang from President Clinton that he would be most appreciative of any assistance that the Chinese President could provide in the matter of Harry Wu, that Mr. Wu's release would remove an obstacle of communication between the United States and China, and that President Clinton looked forward to meeting with Jiang Zemin to chart a new and mutually beneficial course for Sino-American relations.

President Jiang sent an emissary to me on the morning of my departure from Shanghai with the message that Harry Wu would be released, quite possibly before I left China later that day, which did, in fact, happen just that way. As I left from the Shanghai airport, I saw the Air China flight that was being held for Harry Wu, who was right then on a flight from Wuhan, although I did not know it for sure at that time.

With the status of Mr. Wu resolved, the United States, and President Clinton in particular, now have a historic opportunity to chart the course of United States-China relations into the 21st century.

This will not be an easy road. China and the United States have many differences in culture, in our political systems, in our economic and legal structures. However, what many Americans may not understand is that today we also have many common interests. But the opportunity to bridge our differences and build on our common interests is wholly dependent upon dialogue, something sorely lacking at this time.

At this moment the United States and China have no ambassadors in each other's country, although I understand that this situation will now be partially remedied with the announcement that Ambassador Li Daoyu will soon return to Washington.

One example of the effect of a lack of diplomatic communication is the visit of Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui to the United States in June. Although, as a U.S. Senator, I understood

that there is no more important policy for China than the status of Taiwan as part of China, I and other Senators voted to allow the visit. I never heard from China that what we considered to be a personal visit by an alumnus of an American university would cause such a rift in our relations, and I was stunned by the intense reaction of the Chinese officials.

President Jiang told me that he learned of the decision to allow Lee Teng-hui's visit by reading it in a newspaper. The Chinese were, in turn, stunned by the insensitivity and lack of communication from the United States on what they saw as a major shift in policy toward their country, particularly since they were assured as late as mid-May that U.S. policy would be to refuse such a visit.

In an action that further convinced China that they were seeing an emboldened Taiwan, the day Lee Teng-hui left for the United States, Taiwan held joint military army, navy and air force exercises off the coast of China.

Also, Lee Teng-hui broached a Two Chinas Policy in a speech at Cornell, further inciting Beijing. And no one should think that Beijing did not take this seriously. All of this may have been avoided with consistent and frank dialogue between Beijing and Washington.

Reopening and strengthening diplomatic channels of communication is but one, albeit critical, step in building a new relationship with China. As important as what we seek from China in the way of human rights, open markets and Democratic reform is how we communicate ideals. Americans have a tendency to tell China what to do instead of trying to understand what China needs and how it is to China's interests to do some things. And it is time that we learned that this will not be the most effective method of encouraging change in China.

Much has changed in China since I first visited in 1979. People speak much more freely. Consumer goods from China and all over the world are available more than ever before. The standard of living is up. And privatization of formerly Government-controlled industries is taking hold. When I was there 2 years ago, only 8 percent of the industries were in private hands. Now 20 percent are either in joint venture or private hands, about 40 percent controlled by the central Government, and 40 percent in state cooperatives. A Western-style marketplace in the form of an economic democracy is, in fact, taking place.

The question we must ask ourselves is, Can an economic democracy exist long term without a social democracy following? I believe the answer to that is no. But make no mistake, China today is a Communist country. But by encouraging open markets and privatization of industries, we are exposing China to democracy in a much more effective manner than by calling for it on the front pages of our newspapers or by

making threats we cannot afford to carry out.

The effects of China's move to a free market economy can already be felt in Chinese social life. Shanghai television, for example, has had programs that include a show similar to America's "All in the Family," which ran for 180 episodes, with the Chinese version of Archie Bunker, a stodgy Communist Party official, something I never thought I would see.

Also, there is a "60 Minutes" type Shanghai program that exposes Government institutions to questioning—unique in the context of China's long and complicated history.

I believe we will witness even greater changes in the next decade, which can bring China even closer to the West.

China's legal system and concept of individual rights is still primitive by western standards. I believe that the most consequential influence on the human rights situation in China will be the evolution of an independent judiciary and the development of a new set of civil and criminal laws.

Today in China, judges are not independent, either from individual or party persuasion, and there is no real criminal statute on the books to make it a crime to interfere with a judge. So this needs change.

China has asked for help in the evolution of its legal system. The development of due process of law, which in this country guarantees that no one can be picked up by the Government in the middle of the night and simply disappear, is something that is going to make a huge difference in China, and a new civil and criminal code could go a long way toward meaningful human rights advances.

While I was in China, the China daily front page carried articles saying that China welcomed help in evolving a new system of civil and criminal codes. This could go much further in securing major human rights advances, constitutionally and legally, than any rhetoric in this country.

Those in the West who care should utilize this opportunity in a sensitive way to bring many of the virtues of a western legal system to Chinese attention. I believe it is the most significant thing we can do long term.

There are those in this country, I believe, who are unconsciously pushing Sino-American relations into an adversarial position, reminiscent of the days of the Soviet Union. The world was, in a sense, much simpler then: Two major conflicting powers, with smaller nations lining up in each camp. This was good for weapons sales, it repressed many smaller national and ethnic rivalries which are now emerging in the form of civil wars, and it provided a clear role for China as a major geopolitical buffer.

Those days, however, are gone. China has emerged from these changes as a booming economy with the highest rate of economic growth in the world, gradually reducing centralized control

of its economy and opening its doors to western entrepreneurship and thought.

All one has to do is contrast Russia today and China to see how centralized control in China has been gradually reduced, keeping stability, opening up entrepreneurship, creating an economic democracy and doing it in a much more successful way. So I believe that how America develops its relationship with China is critical for world peace and stability.

Ever since President Nixon traveled to China in 1972, the United States has maintained a one-China policy. It has been the foundation of Sino-American relations. That policy essentially says that there is only one China and Taiwan is part of China, and it recognizes the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China.

This policy was stated in the 1972 Shanghai communique, the 1979 joint communique on the establishment of diplomatic relations, and the 1982 United States-China joint communique. The one-China policy was and is essential to United States-China relations. It remains essential today.

If China has any doubts about our commitment to this policy, our ability to conduct normal relations with China will be severely curtailed. For China, the question of Taiwan is an issue of sovereignty, and we must understand it as such.

Taiwan has developed well, even within these constraints and, in fact, Taiwan interests have the largest dollar amount of investment on mainland China. Communication has been established and a special across-the-straits initiative has been developed under the leadership of another friend and former Shanghai mayor, Wang DaoHan and Tang Shu Bei, former consul general in San Francisco.

The one-China policy has been beneficial for all three parties: China and the United States have been able to pursue a normal diplomatic relationship, while Taiwan has become economically strong and prosperous. Meanwhile, Taiwan and China have both encouraged the development of extensive economic and cultural ties across the Taiwan Straits.

There are many issues still to resolve with China, as we develop our relationship in the post-cold-war era. Consistent and open dialog is key.

President Jiang told me of an old Chinese proverb: When water flows, there will be a channel.

I truly believe that President Clinton now has the unique opportunity to craft a new course which can result in a stable and secure Asia, free of nuclear proliferation, a serious commitment to arms control, and one that sees China takes its rightful place as a leading nation at the world table.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from South Dakota.

FCC/SPECTRUM/PUBLIC BROADCASTING REFORM

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I have made telecommunications policy reform my top priority for the 104th Congress. I am quite proud of the swift progress made to date, including the sweeping Senate passage of S. 652, the Telecommunications Communications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995.

As I indicated before we left for the August recess, as significant and necessary as S. 652 is for our country's economic and social well-being in the 21st century, it is only one item in my overall plan for telecommunications policy reform.

Today, I would like to take a few minutes to briefly discuss two additional areas of telecommunications reform I intend to pursue through the remainder of the 104th Congress: Spectrum reform and public broadcasting reform.

Regarding spectrum policy reform, there was a recent essay by William Safire in the New York Times entitled "The Greatest Auction Ever. Get Top Dollar for the Spectrum."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Safire's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Mar. 16, 1995]

THE GREATEST AUCTION EVER

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—They all laughed at the economist Milton Friedman when he suggested a generation ago that the Federal Government auction off broadcast licenses, instead of giving them away to political favorites.

The last laugh is his; last week, in the greatest auction in history, bidders for wireless places on a tiny fragment of the broadband spectrum committed nearly \$8 billion to the U.S. Treasury.

And that's only the beginning of the taxpayer's bonanza in the sale of our valuable thin air.

Remember all the talk, eight years go, of high-definition television, the Japanese invention that was supposed to force us all to replace our 200 million TV sets? U.S. manufacturers, with antitrusters' blessing, formed a "Grand Alliance" to match the Japanese advance.

Along came an unexpected scientific breakthrough. We leapfrogged the analog (feh!) competition into the brave new digital world. This not only produces a knock-your-socks-off picture but expands each TV channel into five or six wireless channels for video, audio, computer data transmission, telephones and every form of communication short of mental telepathy.

Broadcasters smacked their lips at the bonanza. "Advanced television is not just about pretty pictures anymore," F.C.C. chairman Reed Hundt told Edmund Andrews of The Times, one of the few reporters on top of this story. "It's about the digitization of television and a huge range of new services."

It's as if one old oil well gave birth to six new gushers. Broadcasting lobbyists have descended on Congress and the F.C.C. to insure "flexibility"—that is, to exploit exclusively