

THE AGING MAOISTS OF BEIJING

(By Michael Kelly)

It has been 12 years since the leader of the People's Republic of China has honored the United States with a visit, and in the meantime relations between us have become—as they say—strained. It has seemed at times almost as if the aging Maoists of Beijing were trying to flaunt their disdain for American values and American interests. There was the ever-ending campaign of torture and imprisonment against advocates of political and religious liberty. There was, despite Richard Gore, the continued occupation and subjugation of Tibet. There was the unpleasantness at Tiananmen Square. There were the arms sales and the nuclear assistance to nations unfriendly to the United States. There was the missile-rattling off the cost of Taiwan. There was the finely calculated humiliation of Warren Christopher. There was the cool, unblushing dismantling of democracy's infrastructure in Hong Kong. Finally, it appears, there was the attempt to subvert our very own democratic system by illegally funneling PRC cash into the 1996 elections.

Now comes Jiang Zemin, president of China, unapologetically. On the eve of his week-long American journey, Jiang gave careful interviews to *The Washington Post* and *Time* magazine. He told the reporters that the slaughter of democracy's hopefuls at Tiananmen had been necessary for China's economic boom (you can't make an omelet without rolling a tank over a few hundred eggs); that Taiwan must accept "the principle that there is only one China," which is to say rule by Beijing; that Chinese democratic activists such as Wei Jingsheng and Wang Dan were languishing in prison "not because they are so-called political dissidents but because they violated China's criminal law"; that the good-hands people of Beijing would continue to hold Tibet in their cossetting grasp; and that the United States must accept that China has its own standards of what constitutes a proper respect for democracy and human rights. "The theory of relativity worked out by Mr. Einstein, which is in the domain of natural science," the old despot lectured, "I believe can also be applied to the political field."

Quite so, say the Einsteinists in the Clinton administration who are driving the China policy they call "engagement." Under the rules of this engagement, the United States has during the past five years answered China's slights and slurs with shows of affection. The Commerce Department has had its way in maintaining trading status for China as a most-favored nation. The State Department has kept its complaints about the oppression of democrats and Christians to a discreet murmur. The president himself has most graciously entertained the friends of Mr. Johnny Chung and Mr. John Huang. The approval for an official visit by Jiang Zemin was the greatest engagement gift yet. The trip, which will begin with Ziang laying a wreath for the slain of 1941 in Pearl Harbor, is planned as an elaborate exercise in propaganda, and it is intended to serve both to ratify China's post-Tiananmen diplomatic rehabilitation and to solidify Ziang's domestic political status.

And yet, the nervous suitors at the White House fret, there must be something more we can do, something really grand. Indeed, it develops, there is. Jiang's government would like to buy some of the new-generation nuclear reactors that have been jointly developed by the American nuclear industry and the government in an \$870 million research project. The moribund nuclear industry is desperate to sell to China, and it has lobbied the administration heavily. The nuclear industry has, of course, large sums at its dis-

posal, and this president is always willing to grant potential or actual big-money donors what he has called "a respectful hearing," so there is naturally a desire at the White House to see the sales go forward.

But there is a problem: China's impressive record in spreading the advance of the bomb—a record that includes the export of nuclear technology and materiel to Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and India. In 1985, as Washington prepared for the last Sino-American summit, the Chinese were found, in violation of recent promises, to be assisting the Pakistani nuclear program. As a result, Congress passed a law barring implementation of the Nuclear Cooperation Agreement signed by president Reagan and the then-Chinese President Li Xiannian, to permit nuclear trade with China until the President certified that China had stopped aiding the spread of the bomb.

Such certification has never been given because China has never changed its behavior. Gordon Oehler, the CIA's senior official responsible for monitoring mass-weapons proliferation, has testified to Congress that China has provided Iran with large numbers of anti-ship missiles that are considered a direct threat to U.S. naval forces in the Persian Gulf. Oehler, by the way, resigned this week amid reports that he had been under pressure from administration policymakers over his unwelcome assessments.

The administration insists that China has—just in the nick of time for a gift grand enough for a summit—changed its ways. It points to two promises: one in 1996 to stop aiding Pakistan's nuclear program; the other last week not to sell any more anti-ship missiles to Iran. So, that's that, the White House argues, it's time to certify China as a respectable member of the nuclear club at last and get on with the business of the United States, which is business. As for human rights—if everything goes to their satisfaction next week, the Chinese hint they might be willing to let Wang Dan out of jail for a while.

This is policy so wrongheaded that it isn't even interesting. It is possible that the Chinese are suddenly serious about nonproliferation. And it would be nice to provide some foreign business for the nuclear industry, so it doesn't die from a lack of business at home. But the Chinese have broken or bent most of their previous promises on issues of nuclear exports, and their new promises are untested.

We are engaged for the moment. A responsible president must not attempt to certify what he cannot know to be so; a responsible Congress must stop, by a veto-proof two-thirds majority, a president who puts the interests of Beijing and Westinghouse ahead of national security. Let's verify before we trust. And let's get something in return a little less pathetic than the release of one well-beaten man from his prison cell.

Mr. HAGEL assumed the chair.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I noted that the White House recently released a strategy for climate change talks. The President said the United States would not assume binding obligations until developing countries agree to participate meaningfully in the climate-change issue. White House officials said they expect requirements for developing countries would be fleshed out in negotiations.

This is what concerns me, Mr. President, "fleshed out in negotiations." The senior Senator from West Virginia and the occupant of the chair, Senator HAGEL, authored a resolution that has been supported in this body by an overwhelming vote of 95 to 0. The Byrd-Hagel resolution said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States.

Mr. President, it is my contention that the President is glossing over the issue of developing-country participation.

The Berlin Mandate says "no new commitments for developing nations." Has the President repudiated the Berlin Mandate? Otherwise, how in the world can President Clinton simply state that this is something that can be taken care of in negotiations when the Berlin Mandate clearly says no new commitments for developing nations? Our President only says "meaningful commitments for developing nations." I wonder what meaningful really means.

At this time, we are somewhat at the mercy of our negotiators on this matter. We have seen comments in the RECORD from various members of the Senate praising the President's plan, stating that they are encouraged by the policy announcements and pleased with the White House plan. Another member said that the President's position should satisfy demands of the Byrd-Hagel resolution as expressed in this body.

Those demands are not met, Mr. President, because Byrd-Hagel says developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. That is the test.

Another Senator indicates this is a green light that speaks to our Nation's commitment to reducing greenhouse gases. I am a bottom line person, a nuts and bolts kind of guy. How are we going to get there from here? How will we reach the goal the President expressed, which is to go back to emissions levels of 1990 by the years 2008 to 2012?

Let's do the math.

Fifty-five percent of our U.S. energy production is coal. What is happening to coal? If a new climate treaty is signed, there will be reductions in coal use. EPA's new air quality standards on ozone and particulate matter are likely to decrease coal use. EPA's tightened air quality standards on oxides of sulfur and nitrogen will put more emphasis on coal reduction. EPA's proposed regional haze rule will put more pressure on coal as will any new EPA mercury emission rules.

So there is going to be more pressure to reduce use of the resource supplying 55 percent of our electricity.

What about nuclear?

Well, the President threatens to veto our nuclear waste bill. There have been no new orders for new plants in the United States since 1975. There is the potential inability to recover stranded

costs of nuclear plants in electric restructuring, so nuclear use is likely to fall.

Nuclear is the largest carbon-free generator of power. The President didn't even mention it in his plan.

Let us go to our next contributor—10 percent of our energy comes from hydroelectric. Yet, there are considerations in the administration to tear down dams. An example that has been discussed is the Glen Canyon Dam. If we tear down Glen Canyon, we would drain Lake Powell—252 square miles. That is a lake that provides the water for Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas. It would eliminate sources of carbon-free electricity for 4 million consumers in the Southwest. We would scuttle a \$500 million tourist industry.

What about gas that supplies 10 percent of our power? Gas also emits carbons, but not as much. Demand would increase, prices would increase, and shortages might result.

Some people say we will pick up the slack with wind and solar. I like wind and solar, but you can't always count on it. It is kind of interesting to see the Sierra's Club announcement the other day opposing wind farms. They refer to them as "Cuisinarts for birds." So they are opposed to that.

So the point is, Mr. President, how do you get there from here if the administration does not consider nuclear or hydroelectric? In his speech, the President specifically excludes hydro from renewable energy.

What about the rest of the world? Let me tell you what one of our witnesses said at a hearing yesterday. Mr. Bill Martin, former Deputy Secretary of Energy, said the world is likely to increase its dependence on coal primarily due to energy demand in China. This dependence is likely to result in the doubling of sulfur dioxides in Asia and at least a 30-percent increase in global CO₂, in 1990 levels, by the year 2000. To reach a sustainable energy with respect to carbon, the world will have to triple natural gas production, increase coal efficiencies through clean coal technology, triple renewables, triple nuclear power to a worldwide total of 1,000 gigawatts and increase energy efficiency by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, these are the real terms and conditions in the world that we are living in. Nuclear energy, renewables and energy efficiency emerge as the only viable source to date that are emissions-free and offer some energy independence to nations which adopt them.

The point I want to make here, Mr. President, is that nuclear and hydro, a big part of the solution, are not addressed in the administration's proposal on how to reduce emissions to the 1990 level by the year 2008 to 2012.

The witnesses at the hearings we held yesterday said you cannot get there from here. You cannot physically do it unless you triple nuclear and the renewables, including hydro.

Let me conclude with one other thing. The President says we can do

this without a carbon tax. The Department of Energy says you need a carbon permit price of \$50/ton. There is no difference. There are no free rides. Somebody has to pay it. If it is a carbon tax, it is \$50 a ton, and it goes to the consumer. If we set up some kind of a market in emissions, somebody like the Board of Trade starts trading permits, they are estimated to equate to \$50 a ton. Somebody is going to have to pay for that, and that is the U.S. consumer.

Let me conclude with just one observation as we address China, as we address the question of whether we should sell nuclear reactors and technology to China.

China has the availability of nuclear power reactors from France. They have it from other nations. Canada is selling; Russia is selling. And certainly they are a nuclear power.

Do we want China to burn more coal? We already have a prohibition against assisting China in the development of the world's largest hydroelectric project. It is called the Three Gorges Dam. The Eximbank will not assist.

Let me tell you how big Three Gorges is. That plant would produce 18,000 megawatts, equal to 36 500-megawatt coal plants. So that is how China will address some of its energy demands from carbon-free hydropower. But we are prohibited from participating. And we are prohibited from participating in their nuclear power program.

So I think, Mr. President, we have to be realistic. As the administration comes down with its plan, again, I suggest to you that the President has glossed over the issue of the developing countries' participation.

I suggest and remind my colleagues of the Byrd-Hagel vote that was 95 to 0. It said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. And the Berlin Mandate says, no new commitments for developing nations.

So I conclude by saying the President only says "meaningful commitments for developing nations." And I say "meaningful" means what?

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, October 23, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,424,897,442,383.46. (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-four billion, eight hundred ninety-seven million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents)

One year ago, October 23, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,229,624,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-nine billion, six hundred twenty-four million)

Five years ago, October 23, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,061,912,000,000. (Four trillion, sixty-one billion, nine hundred twelve million)

Ten years ago, October 23, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,384,077,000,000

(Two trillion, three hundred eighty-four billion, seventy-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$3 trillion—\$3,040,820,442,383.46 (Three trillion, forty billion, eight hundred twenty million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents) during the past 10 years.

AN EMMY FOR KEVIN WALLEVAND: LAND MINE DOCUMENTARY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President. A bright young reporter, Kevin Wallevand, who covers news in Fargo, ND for WDAY television, has made my State, and me, awfully proud. Kevin's documentary, "The Quilt: Hope from the Heartland," has been awarded an Emmy, television's highest award.

In North Dakota, we have always known that Kevin is a talented reporter, writer, and producer. Now, his documentary about the dark side of human nature that allows exploding land mines to do the work of war; and the bright side of human kind, the compassion people show toward one another in the aftermath of war's tragedies, has earned him national acclaim.

Kevin Wallevand has produced a moving story about a rural community where women create by hand a beautiful, colorful quilt in the hope that it will warm and cheer someone less fortunate than themselves. The resulting quilt begins its travels near the North Dakota border on the Buffalo River, and ends its journey along a river in Angola, Africa where a homeless family—bodies ravaged by exploding land mines—clutches the quilt for warmth and safety.

Sadly, we learn that the family's story is not an isolated one. Kevin takes us into the hospital beds of other villagers who have fallen victim to landmines—who are displaced and anticipating the help and the arrival of thousands of quilts, blankets and other donated items from American volunteers.

Hundreds of churches, like the one in Kevin's story, and other humanitarian groups have taken it upon themselves to give a little comfort and a little hope to landmine victims. Now we, as a country, owe it to them to prevent this instrument of war, which targets innocent people long after the peace agreement has been signed, from ever being used again.

Like Kevin, I have seen first hand the tragic human costs of landmines. While serving in the House of Representatives, I visited a clinic in Central America where landmine victims who had lost hope, along with a leg or an arm, were fitted for artificial limbs. I witnessed how important it was to support this program which could turn their lives around. When I returned, I worked to get funding so that other landmine victims might be able to get prosthetic limbs and I'm proud to say I helped get it done. Kevin must have