

1999, but in the 2 previous years as well. In fact, 12th grader use of marijuana is at its highest since 1992. In addition, 23 percent of the high school seniors questioned in the past 3 years, reported that they had used marijuana in the past 30 days. Sadly, the study also found that the percentage of 10th graders who reported use of marijuana increased from 39.6 percent in 1998 to nearly 41 percent in 1999. Hardly news to find comfort in.

Marijuana remains a gateway drug for even worse substances and this next chart shows overall illicit drug use among high school seniors. You can see in this second chart that, in 1999, nearly 55 percent of 12th graders reported using an illicit drug in their lifetime. What that "lifetime" means is that 55 percent of 17-year-olds have at least tried marijuana or other dangerous, illicit drugs. That's an appalling figure. You can also see that this number is the highest it's been since 1992. With the Office of National Drug Control Policy's recent blitz of ads through the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, these high numbers are truly disappointing. It seems though, as the news gets worse, the press releases get happier. But it's still double-speak.

Another upsetting finding was the increase in the use of the "club drug," Ecstasy. Use of Ecstasy among 10th graders increased from 3.3 percent in 1998 to 4.4 percent in 1999. In addition, use among 12th graders increased from 1.5 percent in 1998 to 2.5 percent in 1999. The increase in the use of these so called club drugs, such as Ecstasy, is particularly disturbing. This is so, because club drugs are frequently referred to as recreational drugs and are perceived by many young people as harmless. On December 23 of this past year, we were given a glimpse of the sheer magnitude and severity of the market for Ecstasy, when Customs officials seized 700 pounds of Ecstasy. These 700 pounds would have been enough to provide 1 million kids each with a single dose. Unfortunately, Ecstasy is quickly becoming the drug of choice among our young people. And it too is a gateway to wider drug use. Parents need to take a harder look at what their children are being exposed to.

Last session I gave a floor statement on one particular club drug, that is frequently used in sexual assault cases, called GHB. I am pleased to learn from this year Monitoring the Future study that in next year's survey, young people will be questioned about use of GHB. But the issue is not this drug or that drug but the climate that encourages use and recruits kids into the drug scene. We must work to reverse the trend to normalize and glamorize drug use that has taken root in recent years.

There is an encouraging decline in the use of inhalants among 8th and 10th graders. And, use of crack cocaine among 8th and 10th graders is down slightly. In addition, 12th graders reported a significant decrease in the use

of crystal meth from 3 percent in 1998 to about 2 percent in 1999.

As we begin not only a new year but a new millennium, we are faced with the difficult challenge of making the 21st century safe for our young people. Although we have made some progress, these study results leave our young people facing an uncertain future. We cannot be satisfied with unchanging trends in teenage drug use. We have not seen a significant decline in drug use among our country's young people since 1992. In fact, what we have seen are dramatic increases. This fact makes me pause and wonder what we have been doing for the past 8 years. Whatever it is, it has failed to make the difference we need to be seeing. We need to move toward significant decreases in use. We need coherent, sound, accountable efforts. We must not neglect our duties in keeping our young people drug free. We are not in any position to let our guard down. We need policies and strategies that make a difference.

WHY CHINA SHOULD JOIN THE WTO

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senate will soon make a very important and historic decision about whether to grant permanent normal trade relations status to China. This decision would pave the way for China's accession to the WTO. China's likely accession to the WTO is one of the most pivotal trade developments of the last 150 years. It is also perhaps the single most significant application of the most-favored-nation principle, or nondiscrimination principle, in modern trade history.

I believe we should approve permanent normal trade relations for China. I also strongly believe China should be admitted to the World Trade Organization. Because this is such an important matter, I would like to address this issue today in a careful and thorough way.

I have two main points. First, The Core principle of the WTO, the principle of nondiscrimination, or most-favored-nation treatment, is the only way we have to keep markets open to everybody.

We should seek the broadest possible acceptance of this basic principle of non-discrimination in trade. History shows that when countries trade with each other on a nondiscriminatory basis, everyone wins. History also shows that free and open trade is one of the most effective ways to keep the peace.

Second and lastly I also support China's entry into the WTO because it is in our national self-interest to have a rules-based world trading system that includes China.

Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about my first point, that everyone wins when we have non-discriminatory trade, which gives us a better chance to keep the peace.

Most-favored-nation treatment, or what we now call normal trade relations, started with Britain and France in the 1860s. These two nations negotiated free trade agreements based on the most-favored-nation principle of nondiscrimination, which later became the cornerstone of the GATT, and, in 1993, the WTO.

The results of these early international trade treaties was spectacular. It began a new era of free trade that led to a great increase in wealth around the world. Unfortunately, this hey-day of free trade didn't last long. It ended in about 1885, when Europe turned inward, and retreated from the free-trade principle.

Just 30 years after Europe abandoned the nondiscrimination principle in trade, the war "to end all wars" ravaged most of the continent. Events following the First World War also massively disrupted international trading relationships. Many countries pursued beggar-thy-neighbor trade policies, including harsh trade restrictions.

When the Great Depression set in, many countries adopted extreme forms of protectionism in a misguided attempt to save jobs at home. The worst of these misguided laws was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, which was enacted into law by the 71st Congress.

The act started out with good intentions. Its aim was to help the American farmer with a limited, upward revision of tariffs on foreign produce. But it had the exact opposite result. It strangled foreign trade. It deepened and widened the severity of the Depression. Other countries faced with a deficit of exports to pay for their imports responded by applying quotas and embargoes on American goods.

Mr. President, I went back to the historical record to see what happened to United States agricultural exports when other countries stopped buying our agricultural products after we enacted that tariff. I was shocked by the depth and severity of the retaliation.

In 1930, the United States exported just over \$1 billion worth of agricultural goods. By 1932, that amount had been cut almost in half, to \$589 million. Barley exports dropped by half. So did exports of soybean oil. Pork exports fell 15 percent. Almost every American export sector was hit by foreign retaliation, but particularly agriculture.

As U.S. agricultural exports fell in the face of foreign retaliation, farm prices fell sharply, weakening the solvency of many rural banks. Their weakened condition undermined depositor confidence, leading to depositor runs, bank failures, and ultimately, a contraction of the money supply.

Mr. President, I'm not saying that if we hadn't abandoned the non-discrimination principle we wouldn't have had a depression. But it wouldn't have lasted as long. It wouldn't have hit as hard. It wouldn't have destroyed as many lives.

President Roosevelt attempted to correct this mistake with a major shift

in policy in 1934 with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This legislation authorized the President to negotiate trade liberalizing agreements on a bilateral basis with our trading partners.

But the damage was done. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was too little, too late.

Although 31 bilateral agreements were signed, the outbreak of the Second World War completely shattered any hope of a more cooperative international trading environment. I don't think it is a coincidence that another World War closely followed the Depression. If political tensions were not inflamed by severe economic pressures, and made worse by unnecessary and destructive trade disputes, perhaps the history of the first half of the 20th century would have been different.

Free trade alone may not keep the peace. But it makes it a lot harder to go to war.

At the end of World War II, the United States led the effort to once again construct a world trading system based on the Most-Favored-Nation principle of nondiscrimination. We succeeded with the launch of the GATT, in 1947.

Now, once again, we have a world trade system that increases our collective wealth through nondiscriminatory free trade. We also have a world trade system that helps keep the peace. The fact that the cold war never ignited to a hot conflict is due in large part to the success of the GATT in forging closer economic ties at a time when world political tensions were escalating over other issues.

Mr. President, we finally got it just about right. But we still don't have a world trade system that includes the world's most populous nation, and one of its most dynamic economies. China's absence from the global trade forum matters because we still have not managed to rid the world of political tensions and destabilizing trade disputes.

We could still easily lose it all, just as Europe did in 1885, and as we did in 1930. Increasingly, many of these disputes and tensions will involve, or at least affect, both China and the United States. There are a few Members here who may remember the pressures on the world trading system we had in the early 1970s. Back then, we had a major world recession and two major oil price shocks.

These pressures led to the so-called "New Protectionism," when countries increasingly resorted to non-tariff barriers to trade, such as quotas, voluntary export restraint agreements, industrial and agricultural subsidies, and orderly restraint agreements. The heightened tensions brought about by the "New Protectionism" were potentially very destabilizing.

It was only with the conclusion of the Uruguay round of global trade negotiations in 1993 that we finally reversed the dangerous course of this "New Protectionism," and got free trade back on track. Our experience in

the 1970s, when we could have easily lost most of our progress in opening new global markets, demonstrates why it's so important to expand and strengthen the world trade system as much as we can.

China was not a GATT member in the 1970s. The disciplines were much weaker. Important sectors like agriculture weren't covered. Dispute resolution was largely unenforceable.

Today, that is all changed. Disciplines are stronger. Disputes can be settled and effectively enforced. For the first time, we now have rules that cover agriculture. And now China is ready to end a fifty-year period of going its own way on trade policy.

Mr. President, rules and disciplines are meaningless unless they are widely accepted and broadly applied. We cannot have an effective, open world trade system that excludes China. It's as simple as that.

There is one more reason why China's entry into the WTO is in our vital national interest. For the first time in history, China would be bound by enforceable international trade rules. I would like to briefly explain why this development is so important.

Because of the economic reforms of the 1990s, China's leaders have sparked an economic renewal that has led to growth rates of 7–10 percent every year of the last decade, easily dwarfing the growth rates of our own super-heated economy. As a consequence of its new prosperity, China is buying a great deal of everything, especially agricultural products.

But because about one-third of China's economic activity is generated and controlled by state-owned enterprises, if often manipulates its markets in a way that harms its trading partners. Take just one example well known to the soybean farmers in my own state of Iowa. In 1992, China's soybean oil consumption shot up from about 750,000 metric tons to about 1.7 million metric tons. Keeping pace with this increased new demand, soybean oil imports also more than doubled.

In order to keep up with surging domestic demand, China imported more soybeans and soybean meal, much of it from the United States, and much of that amount from Iowa. When China's soybean imports hit their peak in 1997, soybean meal in the United States was trading at an average base of about \$240.00 per ton. This means our farmers were getting between \$7.00 and \$8.50 per bushel for their soybeans. Everyone was better off. China's consumers got what they wanted. America's soybean growers prospered. This is the way trade is supposed to work.

But suddenly, China's state-run trading companies arbitrarily shut off imports of soybeans. Soybean meal that was selling in 1997 for \$240.00 per ton in the United States plummeted to \$125.00 per ton by January 1999. Soybeans selling for \$8.00 per bushel in 1997 fell to \$4.00 per bushel by July 1999. You can imagine what happened on the farm.

With the loss of that income, combined with other factors, farmers were unable to pay their bills. Many lost their farms. Many are still struggling to recover.

Mr. President, what happened in China shows what occurs when protectionism, trade barriers, tariffs, and government-run controls take the place of free markets. Trade is distorted. Consumers abroad have less choice. American farm families suffer. It also demonstrated how important China's entry into the WTO is for America's farmers.

With a new bilateral market access agreement in place, and with meaningful protocol agreements that should soon be in place, China won't be able to use state trading enterprises to arbitrarily restrict and manipulate agricultural trade—and trade in other products—once it enters the WTO.

Let me say one final word. When we trade with other countries, we export more than farm equipment, soybeans, or computer chips. We export part of our society. Part of our American values and ideals. This is good for the WTO. It is good for China. It is good for the United States. And I believe it will help keep the peace.

Mr. President, we seldom get a real change in Congress to make this a better and safer world, but this is one of those rare moments. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting China's admission to the WTO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

DISMANTLING THE COLUMBIA-SNAKE HYDROELECTRIC SYSTEM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last Friday, Oregon governor John Kitzhaber announced his support for a radical Clinton-Gore administration proposal to begin dismantling the Columbia-Snake hydroelectric system by removing four hydroelectric dams in southeastern Washington. That same day, in Seattle, campaigning for president, Bill Bradley also announced his support for this proposal.

Is support for destroying the Columbia hydro system now a litmus test for the Democratic Party and its candidates for public office? I hope not, because the importance of salmon recovery and the value of our Northwest hydro system is too important to every family and community in our region.

The Clinton-Gore administration—most prominently through Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt—has aggressively advocated dismantling dams. Specifically, the administration has devoted significant agency resources to study removal of the four Snake River dams in Washington. Even the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has publicly endorsed dam-breaching. Several other agencies list it as a serious "option" to recovery Pacific Northwest salmon.