

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak as in morning business.

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

APPROACHING THE CLINTON-JIANG SUMMIT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, next week Chinese President Jiang Zemin will arrive for his first State visit, the first State visit by a Chinese leader in 12 years. As this visit approaches, I rise to discuss our China policy and the things we might hope to see from this event.

Let me begin with the broad goals of our Asia policy. I think they are clear. First, a peaceful Pacific. Second, open trade. Third, joint work on problems of mutual concern like environmental problems and international crime. And fourth, progress toward respect for internationally recognized human rights.

Generally speaking, our Asian policy has helped move us toward these goals. We have a permanent military force in the Pacific which, coupled with strong alliances with Japan and South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, and Australia, has helped to keep the peace for 20 years. While we have a lot of work ahead on Asian trade, our work has produced over \$100 billion in export growth, an increase of 70 percent. That is since 1991. We are beginning to adopt a more systematic approach to the region's growing environmental problems, and can cite the democratization of the Philippines, Thailand, Taiwan, and South Korea as human rights success stories.

Where does China fit in? China is the largest country in Asia, the fastest growing economy, the largest military power, and the Asian nation with which our relationship has been most volatile during this decade. If we can establish a stable, workable relationship with China, all of our goals will come closer to realization. If we cannot, both Americans and Chinese, and other Pacific nations, will suffer a great deal.

Next week's summit offers us a chance to make a start. Following it must be a work program focusing on a very practical agenda. And as we approach the summit, I think we can help ourselves by putting the issues we must address in three broad categories. They are: mutual interests, areas of dispute, and issues we will face in the future.

First are the areas where we have mutual interests.

Regional security is one case. We must work with China to maintain peace in Korea. Both countries want to avoid a conflict over Taiwan. We need to ensure that Japan does not feel pres-

sured to become a military power. On weapons proliferation, if India and Pakistan develop nuclear missiles, China will suffer from it a lot more than we would.

Environmental issues are another matter. We both need to ensure sustainable management of fisheries and to address air pollution and acid rain problems caused by the boom in Chinese power production. We also must work much closer together to do our best to protect biodiversity and prevent large-scale climate change. One concrete proposal that will help in this area, if the public reports that China has agreed to our proposals on nuclear proliferation are accurate, is opening up civil nuclear technology sales.

A number of domestic Chinese issues also fall into this area. Helping China establish a broad rule of law will contribute to our human rights goals.

Labor safety is a second case where we could contribute to China's own efforts to improve factory safety and improve the lives of many ordinary Chinese; and helping Chinese farmers take advantage of cleaner pesticides, modern agricultural technologies, and an up-to-date infrastructure is a third.

We also clearly have some disputes with China. We should not make them the whole focus of our relationship, but neither should we try to duck them.

At times we will need simply to understand one another's positions and agree to put off disagreements into the future.

Taiwan policy has been handled reasonably well in this manner for the past few decades. Perhaps with some adjustments in detail, we should continue that policy.

Likewise, China has recently expressed some unhappiness with our stationing of troops in Asia. They need to understand that the issue is between us on the one hand and Japan and Korea and our allies on the other. It is not on the table for discussion.

In other areas we should expect to do better. We seem to be doing well in nuclear proliferation. It is my hope that the President will seal that achievement by certifying China as in compliance in the nuclear area, and open up civil nuclear power trade with China. On missiles and chemical weapons, we see less thus far. And while I do not regard sanctions as a tool appropriate for every issue on the table with China—and I do not believe Congress should be passing broad new sanction laws—these are areas where we should use targeted sanctions if necessary. We did this last spring in the case of the sale of chemical weapons precursors involving a Nanjing company. If it happens again, we should use tougher penalties.

Trade is another example. Despite the optimism of United States business, since 1980 our exports to China have grown more slowly than our exports to any other major market, whether it be Canada, Japan, Europe, Mexico, or ASEAN. Meanwhile, we have been tremendously generous to

China, keeping our market to Chinese goods more open than any other in the world.

This is not acceptable. It is wrong when Chinese shoe companies can sell to Montana but Montana wheat farmers cannot sell to China. We should expect China to be as fair and open to us as we are to them. And we should offer an incentive to do that. Specifically, we should make MFN status permanent when China comes up with a good WTO package. But we should also be clear that we cannot wait forever.

Our 5-year bilateral trade agreement negotiated in 1992 is about to be completed. And if the pace of the WTO talks does not pick up soon, we should use our retaliatory trade law, section 301, to win a broad successor to it.

On human rights, while we should seek common ground and recognize where China is doing better, we should also not shrink from bringing up the tough issues. The time is past when these questions could be considered strictly domestic concerns. We should bring up individual cases of political prisoners, ask for talks with the Dalai Lama and Red Cross access to Chinese prisons. If the Chinese want us to stop sponsoring resolutions at the U.N. Human Rights Commission, they need to show some understanding of our concerns and the world's concerns on these issues.

THE ISSUES: LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

A third set of issues may be the most important of all, especially as we approach a state visit and a summit. These are the issues we will face in the years ahead, and where mutual understanding beforehand is crucially important.

The most important of all will be Korean unification. I recently visited North Korea. Hunger is widespread and chronic. Economic life in Pyongyang is at a standstill, with broken down streetcars in the middle of the road, empty streets and darkened buildings. And officials there offered no proposals for change other than planting more trees to prevent erosion.

This cannot continue forever. Whether it results from a violent collapse, peaceful if belated reform, or even a desperate attack on the south, change is sure to come on the Korean Peninsula. There will be no belligerent, autarkic regime on the Korean Peninsula.

And as Koreans sort out their own future, we will have to make some very serious security and economic decisions in a very short period of time. They will involve American troop movements and a crisis on the Chinese border. And we need to ensure beforehand, through intensive discussions with China, Russia, Japan, and South Korea, that our policies do not bring us into unnecessary disputes or conflicts with China or any of Korea's neighbors.

We can all think of other issues. They include the effects of very rapid financial flows on fast-growing regions,

the potential of newly developed technologies to spur terrorism and organized crime. And the vulnerability of the new states on China's western border to civil war and religious fanaticism, which we hardly think about but which the Chinese Defense Minister told me last winter was, together with Korea, the most serious security issue China faces today.

IF THINGS GO WRONG ANYWAY

One final point. China policy does not exist in a vacuum. We should do our very best to make this relationship work. But we cannot predict the course China will take. And so, as we think about China policy, we must also think about broader Asian policy.

If we manage our alliances with Japan, South Korea, Southeast Asia, and Australia well; preserve our commitment of troops in the Pacific; and protect our own economic and technological strength, we will be able to handle whatever lies ahead.

CONCLUSION

But I believe we can do better than that. I have met this year with a number of Chinese officials, including the President as well as senior military officers and trade officials. And I think the Chinese on the whole are pragmatic people who understand the importance of this relationship to their own country. And I believe they are interested in working with us to set it right.

So as this summit approaches, we have a great opportunity to set our relationship with China on the right course to create a stable, long-term relationship that contributes to our goals: peace, prosperity, environmental protection, and human rights. It is a great chance, and we must not miss it. Because the issues dividing us may be many and complex. But the basic choice is simple. China will be there for a long time. So will we. And both governments can either try their best to get along, or all of us can suffer the consequences.

It's just about that simple, and that important.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

DRUG-FREE IOWA MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as chairman of the International Narcotics Control Caucus, sometimes

called the drug caucus of the U.S. Senate, I periodically report to the Senate on trends in the use of drugs and the dangers thereof that go on in our society.

This month of October in my State of Iowa is called Drug-Free Month. I want to bring my colleagues' attention to this fact and the reason for it. Iowa has only 2.8 million people. As you know, it is largely a rural State. Des Moines, our largest city, numbers fewer citizens than one of the suburbs of some of our Nation's big cities. There are more people in the Los Angeles area or Chicago than in all of my State of Iowa. We are a closely knit community, proud of our commitment to families and the virtues of self-reliance, hard work and personal responsibilities.

These facts, however, do not mean that Iowa is isolated from the mainstream or provincial in its thinking. This also does not mean that Iowa is free of the problems that beset States with larger cities and more people. We, in Iowa, unfortunately, see our share of gang violence and teen drug use. Indeed, Iowa shares in the growing drug problems among the young, the same that troubles the rest of the Nation. The fact that this problem reaches beyond our larger States and beyond our big cities into our rural heartland should tell us something about the far-reaching nature of our national—and I emphasize national—drug problem.

According to recent numbers from my State of Iowa, as many as 11 percent of our high school seniors are regular users of marijuana. This number is up dramatically from just a few years ago. This number is growing as more kids at even younger ages no longer see using heroin as risky or dangerous. In the last few years, the number of regular users has grown steadily, whether it is in Iowa or across the country. In addition, we know from experience and research that as marijuana use goes up, so does drug use of other varieties.

We now have a major problem in my State of Iowa in methamphetamine. This problem has exploded in just the last few years, paralleling the trend in the West and the rest of the Midwest. Reports of treatment episodes for meth problems in my State of Iowa soared over 300 percent between 1994 and 1995. The trend continues. Just as troubling is the effort by the criminal gangs to site the labs that produce and sell this poison to our kids in Iowa. This is something that we are seeing through the West and Midwest, and the problem is moving eastward.

The lab problem is a double whammy. The labs produce a dangerous drug that poisons the hearts and souls of our kids and then they create a very dangerous environmental hazard requiring cleanup wherever the labs are found. Cleanup is risky, dangerous, costly. Many of our local fire and police departments lack the resources or the training to deal with the problem of cleaning up meth labs.

This problem and the trends that I have noted are not unique to Iowa.

They are indicative of what is happening across the country. They are happening because we have lost our fear of drugs. We have let our guard down. Into that environment drug pushers and drug legalizers have stepped in to do their own song and dance. They are making gains; we are losing ground. And it is the kids who are paying the price.

Two very important concerns are being missed. The first is the serious nature of the growing drug use among kids. The second is the growing tendency to regard this trend with complacency, or worse, to go along with the drift into a de facto legalization of dangerous drugs. The last time we as a country did this we landed ourselves into the midst of a major drug epidemic. We were just beginning to dig ourselves out from the 1970's and 1980's. Now it seems the earlier lessons are forgotten.

There is no way to put a happy face on what is happening. It is not hard to describe. It is not difficult to understand. It is not beyond our power to do something about it. Yet what is happening is happening right under our very noses, and to date what we are doing about it is not working. This is what is happening:

Between 1992 and 1995, marijuana use among kids aged 12 to 17 has more than doubled—from 1.4 million to 3.1 million. More than 50 percent of the high school seniors have used drugs before graduation; 22 percent of the class of 1996 were current users of marijuana. LSD use by teens has reached record levels. Evidence indicates that the current hard-core addict population is not declining.

Hospital emergency room admissions for cocaine-related episodes in 1995, the last year for which there is complete information, were 19 percent above the 1992 levels. Heroin admissions increased almost 60 percent. Drugs of every sort remain available and of high quality at cheap prices while the social disapproval has declined, especially among policy leaders and opinion makers.

Hollywood and the entertainment industry are back in the business of glorifying drug use in movies and on TV. There is a well-funded legalization effort that seeks to exploit public concerns about health care issues to push drug legalization, most often under the guise of medical marijuana.

Opinion polls among kids indicate that drugs and drug-related violence are their main concerns. They also make it clear that drugs are readily available in schools, and the kids as young as 9 and 10 years are being approached by drug pushers in school or on the way to school.

This is only part of what is happening. Taken together, what these things indicate is that we are experiencing a rapid increase in teenage drug use and abuse. This comes after years of progress and decline in use. These changes are undoing all of the progress