

an emotional reaction—a decision rendered too quickly, initiated out of fear fueled by the terrible disaster in Oklahoma City. I ask you to reconsider a decision made amidst such emotion, and replace it with one of reasoned courage.

By ordering the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue by May 17, 1996, you have the power to undo a costly mistake, return the avenue to the people, and guarantee that its closure will not mark its first anniversary.

Sincerely,

ROD GRAMS,
U.S. Senate.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Schiffer, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during my remarks.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON CHINA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 100 years from now, I have no doubt that when historians look back, the remarkable rise of China as a world power will be considered one of the most important international events in the latter half of the 20th century. Even more than the tragic war in Bosnia, more than the fragile attempts at peace in the Middle East, more than the collapse of the Soviet Union, I believe that China's ascendance as a great power and its impact as such—and the content and quality of the United States relationship with China—will shape the direction of global history in the Pacific century.

In recent months, Sino-American relations have reached perhaps their lowest level since President Nixon's historic trip to China in 1972. Our relationship has been plagued by tensions in nearly every area in which we interact—trade, nuclear nonproliferation, concerns about Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Tibet to name just a few. But most often the Sino-American relationship has been buffeted by clashing visions of human rights. And it is that which I wish to speak about today.

Last month, the State Department issued its annual report on human rights which contained a highly critical section on China. Having read the report and the attendant media coverage that interpreted its contents, I wish to address what I perceive to be a number of grave misjudgments and, frankly, a double standard in American foreign policy when it comes to China.

Let me begin with some examples of that double standard. The liberation of Kuwait following the Persian Gulf war is viewed as a triumph of freedom and a high point in recent American foreign policy. Yet, how many Americans are aware of the fact that upon their return the Kuwaitis expelled thousands of Palestinians and denied repatriation of thousands more who had fled during the war for their suspected—and I say suspected—support of Iraq. Before the war, there were over 400,000 Palestinians in Kuwait. Now there are 33,000, according to the Human Rights Watch/Middle East.

What happened to them, and who cares? At times, it seemed that there was more attention in the American press given to the number of wives of certain members of the Kuwaiti royal family than of how many Palestinians were expelled in political reprisal.

There has been, however, some media coverage and American criticism of Russia's brutal suppression of Chechnya's move toward independence. The Russian military decimated the city of Grozny with tremendous loss of life among civilians and the Chechnyan rebels alike. And the battle goes on today. Conservative estimates are that 30,000 people have been killed. Yet, our President just visited Russia, and our relations with Russia have never been better.

The cover story in the April 22 Washington Post puts America's blind eye in perspective: "Clinton, Yeltsin Gloss Over Chechen War."

... [the two leaders] declared their admiration for each other and brushed off criticism of Russia's war against Chechen separatists.

Our relationship with the former Soviet Union is of such unquestionable importance that, muted criticism aside, American support of the Russian President has never really been in question. So how can China's importance be any the less?

Recent tragic events in Liberia, where an unknown number of people have been killed, is only the latest slaughter to emerge from that continent. Not long ago, the news media recounted the massacre of hundreds of thousands of Tutsi and Hutus in Rwanda, and the regime of Gen. Sani Abacha in Nigeria continues to suppress political dissent with lethal force. And yet, each of these countries enjoys the most-favored-nation trading status with the United States.

Even some of our closest allies have deeply flawed human rights records.

In Egypt, a legitimate effort to crack down on Islamic extremists has at times crossed the line into abuse, such as extended detention without charge, torture, and even summary executions.

In Brazil police just 2 weeks ago killed 19 people who were protesting the slow pace of land reform.

Turkey, a close NATO ally, has made considerable progress on human rights in recent years, but freedom of expression is still suppressed, torture is still

widespread, and there have been numerous documented cases of the excessive use of force against the Kurds in recent years, about which we are all familiar.

I do not mean to suggest that human rights should not occupy an important place in our Nation's foreign policy. In each of the cases cited above we have, rightly, protested to the governments involved and worked with them to improve their human rights records.

The status of human rights in the countries I have just mentioned is or has been questionable, yet our relations with them do not fluctuate wildly based on human rights violations. We are able to recognize that the United States also has other important interests that must be taken into account, and we must constantly weigh these interests and values as we try to construct an effective foreign policy.

No one, for example, would suggest that we cut off relations with Kuwait, Russia, Egypt, Brazil, or Turkey based solely upon their record of human rights abuses. The United States simply has too many security, diplomatic, economic and other interest at stake to contemplate such a course of action.

And yet, that is exactly the case with what is probably our most important bilateral relationship in the world today.

Fundamental to the instability in the relationship between the United States and China is the lack of any conceptual framework or long-term strategy on the part of the United States for dealing with China. Instead, U.S. policy has been reactive and event-driven, responding to whatever happens to be the current revelation—generally about human rights. Each time we lurch from crisis to crisis, we call into question our entire relationship with China.

A whole host of events has contributed to the current deterioration in Sino-American relations, but it is important to recognize the role played by the media in this process.

I recognize that the Chinese government does not treat the international press well. But virtually everything we read, hear or see in the American press about China is negative. Yes, there is much that happens in China that is worthy of scrutiny and criticism, but there is also much that is positive as well, and it is largely ignored. The real danger in this is Americans know so little about China. They know only what they read and, particularly since Tiananmen, most of it is negative.

The most blatant example of this unbalanced reportage of China was evident when the State Department released its human rights report last month. I read the newspapers. The coverage of the section on China was 100 percent negative.

Then I read the report itself, and I am deeply troubled by what can only be described as America's blind eye when it comes to China.

Let me read you some of the press coverage following the release of the

State Department's Human Rights report.

China's economic reforms have failed to alter the government's pattern of systematic disregard for basic human rights, according to the State Department's annual report . . . —Washington Post (3/6/96).

The State Department outlined Wednesday what it described as a nightmarish human rights situation in China. . . —Dallas Morning News (3/7/96).

The U.S. report released Wednesday found Chinese authorities guilty of widespread and well-documented human rights abuses—San Francisco Examiner (3/7/96)

China Dismal on Human Rights, U.S. Admits—Chicago Tribune (3/7/96).

Reading these articles, one could only conclude that there have been virtually no changes or improvements on human rights in China in decades, save for a modest increase in the standard of living among some.

But anyone who has any knowledge of China can see that in fact dramatic changes have taken place in that country over the course of the last 20 years, and that those changes, by their very nature, have opened the door to major improvements in human rights.

Let me read you sections of the unbound version of the State Department's report supplied to the Foreign Relations Committee that were not widely reported on:

On page 3 it notes that:

In many respects, Chinese society continued to open up: greater disposable income, looser ideological controls, and freer access to outside sources of information have led to greater room for individual choice, more diversity in cultural life, and increased media reporting.

On page 13 it says that:

Economic liberalization is creating diverse employment opportunities and introducing market forces into the economy, thus loosening governmental monitoring and regulation of personal and family life, particularly in rural areas.

On page 9 it notes that, "Chinese legal scholars and lawyers acknowledge the need for legal reform," and notes that development toward a system of due process—the most fundamental guarantee for human rights is due process of law—a system of due process and other legal reforms are under way.

For example, an experimental trial system tested in 1994 has now been approved for use in Shanghai and for most civil cases. The new system introduces an adversarial element into trials by giving attorneys more responsibility for presenting evidence and arguing facts.

On page 5 it says:

In December 1994, China enacted a new prison law designed, in part, to improve treatment of detainees and respect for their legal rights.

Farther down on the same page it says:

In February, the National People's Congress passed three new laws designed to professionalize judges, prosecutors, and policemen.

On page 2:

In October the Ministry of Justice promulgated implementing regulations for 1994 legislation that allows citizens to sue govern-

ment agencies for malfeasance and to collect damages.

Where do we see any of this reported? We do not.

Page 3:

The Government has also drafted a lawyers law that would clarify the nature of the attorney-client relationship, improve professional standards, separate most lawyers from state employment, and improve the ability of citizens to defend their legal interests.

The report also cites some positive development in religious freedoms in China. On page 19, it says:

After forcefully suppressing all religious observances and closing all seminaries during the 1966 to 1976 cultural revolution, the government began in the late 1970's to restore or replace damaged or confiscated churches, temples, mosques and monasteries and allowed seminaries to reopen. According to the government, there are now 68,000 religious sites in China and 48 religious colleges. The government has also adopted a policy of returning confiscated church property.

Where is any of that reported?

On page 17, the report cites the growth and development of two specific areas of a freer press:

Despite official admonitions, China's lively tabloid sector continued to expand in 1995. Radio talk shows remained popular and, while generally avoiding politically sensitive subjects, they provided opportunities for citizens to air grievances about public issues.

The report characterizes a nascent movement toward democracy in China on page 24:

Direct election for basic level or village government is legally sanctioned for all China's 1 million villages. Foreign observers estimate that more than one-third of China's 900 million rural residents—which is three times the population of the United States—have already participated in elections for local leaders. . . Successful village elections have included campaigning, platforms and use of secret ballots. . . There were credible reports that candidates most favored by the authorities were defeated in some local, village elections.

Where is this reported?

And although the Chinese Government, like any government, is reluctant to accept criticism of its human rights record, on page 25, the report notes that:

Since 1991, the government has promoted limited academic study and discussion of concepts of human rights. Research institutes in Shanghai and Beijing, including the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, has organized symposia on human rights, established human rights research centers, and visited other countries to study human rights practices in those nations.

Some may view these changes as modest and limited in scope, and perhaps they may be, but one has only to look back 30 years to the Cultural Revolution to understand how enormous these changes truly are.

We must understand these changes in context: China is a nation which has been ruled by man for 5,000 years, by emperors in the most despotic system, by the national government in the most despotic manner. Changing to the rule of law will not happen overnight or even in a decade, but it is happening.

Thirty years ago—just 30 years ago—20 to 30 million people died during the Cultural Revolution and Great Leap Forward. Millions lost their jobs, their families and were falsely imprisoned. The human rights and political situation in China has changed dramatically for the better over the last 20 years.

When I first went to China in 1979, shortly after the end of the Cultural Revolution, no one would talk freely. You could not have a political conversation. It was a totally centrally controlled government. Now all of that has changed.

So change in a country as huge as this, as different as this, where the urban eastern cities are very different from the isolated western areas, does not happen overnight, and sometimes it is even difficult to evaluate it on a year-to-year basis.

As I think recent history and this State Department report indicates, China is changing and Americans need to recognize this. They need to know it and they need to encourage China's continued modernization.

I should note for those in this body who consider themselves to be friends of Taiwan, as I do also, that the Taiwan whose democracy we celebrate in 1996 was not so very long ago considered to be one of the most egregious violators of human rights, during which we kept all contact with Taiwan.

Beginning on February 28, 1947, thousands of political dissidents were killed and imprisoned by the nationalist government on Taiwan in a matter of weeks—the infamous "2-28 incident."

In 1948, a state of emergency was declared allowing the President to rule by decree, and from 1950 to 1987, Taiwan was ruled by martial law. During this time, it is estimated that over 10,000 civilian cases were tried in military courts. Citizens were subjected to constant surveillance, individual rights and freedoms were compromised, and political opposition was silenced.

To our credit, during this same period, the United States engaged Taiwan politically and economically, working to encourage the growth of democracy. Today, Taiwan is a democracy.

To be sure, China has a long way to go, but China is growing so rapidly—with a 10-percent annual growth in gross domestic product. Today, China, as an export power, is where Japan was in 1980, the 11th largest exporter in the world, and it is growing much more rapidly than Japan was growing.

To this end, the report also contains a number of constructive suggestions that I feel we should seek to develop as we encourage China to modernize. I believe we should work with the Chinese to develop national legislation governing organ donations, so as to bring to an end any question about current policies, but work with them, engage with them, discuss with them, counsel with them.

We should encourage the Chinese to let the International Committee of the Red Cross monitor prisoners to assure

that their rights, under these new Chinese laws just now going in place, are not being abused. We should encourage the Chinese to allow the establishment of truly independent Chinese non-governmental organizations to monitor and discuss the human rights situation.

I also add to this list the development of a legal system that guarantees an independent judiciary, due process of law, and new civil and criminal codes. This will do more in protecting and advancing human rights than any other single thing the United States can do, and the Chinese have asked for help in this regard.

In releasing the report, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy and Human Rights, John Shattuck, stated at the press conference on March 6:

There is no question that economic integration enhances human rights.

As Secretary Shattuck also stated, isolating China will not enhance human rights—just the opposite. The continued improvement in the economic well-being of China's citizens is critical to the continued growth of human rights. And continued trade with the United States is critical for the continued development of China's economy.

I do not mean to suggest that the free market by itself will improve human rights records. Assistant Secretary Shattuck once again was so right when he said—and I quote—

Economic growth is not in and of itself the ultimate sufficient condition for the full flowering of human rights.

We must also pursue other forms of engagement with China.

So it is in this context that I urge my colleagues to read in full the State Department's human rights report on China, but to do so not with a jaundiced eye and a focus only on those areas that still require improvement, but with a sense of appreciation for how far in 20 short years China has come, and with continued United States engagement, how much farther China can go in the next 20 years.

That is our challenge today. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, under the previous order I am to be recognized during morning business for a period of 90 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that during this period I be permitted to yield portions of my time to other Members without losing my right to the floor.

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

DRUG USE IN AMERICA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, over the last several months we have heard a growing crescendo, so to speak, about a new national epidemic. And

make no mistake about it, Mr. President, the United States is once again revisiting a drug epidemic.

This epidemic took hold of our Nation in the 1960's and 1970's. By 1979, Mr. President, somewhere in the neighborhood of 55 percent of our youth—importantly here—age 17 to 21, were involved in drugs, an alarming crisis for the Nation. From 1979 to 1992, this usage was cut in half.

For all the naysayers that said you could not do anything about drugs—wrong. This Nation did. It cut drug use in half. It took it down to 24, 26, 27 percent. But in 1992, as I am sure will be alluded to here repeatedly on the floor, something went wrong, something changed. Policies changed, and drug use took off like a rocket. It is now approaching the 40 percent level.

Over the weekend there was a lot of discussion about drug abuse because the President had a much heralded press conference in Miami this morning. But, Mr. President, this is one we cannot win with press conferences. This is one that will be exceedingly difficult to turn into some political gambit for the 1996 Presidential campaign.

Somebody will have to be responsible for what happened between 1992 and 1996. And what happened is a very ugly picture.

Over the various talk shows this quote surfaced. "This President is silent on the matter. He has failed to speak." That was Senator JOSEPH BIDEN, Jr., of Delaware. Or we have Mr. RANGEL, Congressman RANGEL, who has previously said, he has never seen a President care less about drugs. That is Congressman RANGEL. These are Members of the President's own leadership, party.

The point is, that there are ramifications for the policies we have set, Mr. President. In his first 3 years in office, President Clinton abandoned the war on drugs. He slashed the staff of his drug office 83 percent, he decreased the number of Drug Enforcement Agency agents, cut funding for drug interdiction efforts and abandoned the bully pulpit. I will mention this again. But out of 1,680 statements by the President, the word "drugs" was only used 13 times in the first 3 years. We turned away from the message that drugs are very harmful.

You know, Mr. President, President Reagan and President Bush deserve a lot of credit. They engaged this war as the Nation would expect them to, and indeed they contributed to saving millions of lives and harm to millions of families all across the land because they engaged the battle.

Yes, she was made fun of at the time, but Nancy Reagan, our First Lady, when she said, "Just say no," it made a difference. Who knows the number of families that were spared the devastation of drugs just because she led the way. She is going to be remembered very favorably for the role she played in our drug dispute.

I see, Mr. President, I have been joined by the distinguished Senator

from Michigan, who has been a leading advocate in the drug war. I now yield up to 10 minutes of my time.

Is that enough, I ask the Senator?

Mr. ABRAHAM. That would be fine.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I first thank the Senator from Georgia for having come here today to help lead this discussion. I think the role he is playing in trying to focus public attention on problems in the area of crime and drugs is to be commended. We are grateful to have leadership like that on these issues because we have not had enough of it, either in the Congress or particularly in the administration.

So today I will talk a little bit more specifically about some of the problems we are contending with as a society as they relate to the broadly defined topic of drug use in America.

After steadily declining for a number of years, through the administrations of Presidents Reagan and Bush, drug use has been skyrocketing in recent years. It is increasing at a very alarming rate. According to the 1994 "Monitor of the Future" study, drug use in three separate categories—use over lifetime, use in past year, use in past month—has shown a remarkable surge during the last 2 years, for young people in particular.

Lifetime drug use went from a high in 1981 of about 65 percent to a low of just over 30 percent in 1992. Recently, though, the trend has been in a different direction. In both 1993, and again in 1994, after over a decade of uneven, but steady, decline, drug use has shot up again. It has shot up not just among high school seniors either, Mr. President.

According to the 1995 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, drug use among children from as young as the age of 12 through 17 years of age, went up by 28 percent from 1993 to 1994. That is not just percentages we are talking about. It is human lives, Mr. President.

To make it a little more specific, and to really, I think, dramatize the alarming changes we are talking about, these statistics indicate that in 1994, 1 million more children between the ages of 12 and 17 were using drugs than had been the case in 1993.

Mr. President, I would like to state very clearly that the decisions people make to abuse drugs or any other similarly abused substance of any type is an individual decision. This is not a partisan decision. This is not a decision that can be blamed on any one individual in Washington.

I think what is critical and what we need to assess is the response that we, as Government leaders, are making to this alarming increase. I think that is where we have to take focus here