

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, in which Senators are able to speak.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator seek recognition?

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIBBERMAN). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his indulgence and for giving me a few minutes here before he adjourns the Senate for the Memorial Day recess.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I was listening this morning to the comments made by the distinguished minority leader and others regarding the reconciliation bill that was passed last night by the House of Representatives. I wanted to respond to some of the statements, I think erroneous statements, and some of the misperceptions about the tax portion of the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives last night.

First of all, Mr. President, I am very happy that the House passed the reconciliation bill because it sets this country on the right course. It provides for almost \$500 billion in deficit reduction, which we desperately need after 12 years of a credit card spending spree, much of it wasted on excessive military spending and high interest rates on the burgeoning deficit.

Mr. President, while the Btu tax has received a large share of the debate, we should remember that the tax provisions which only affect those with incomes of over \$115,000 will raise twice as much money as the Btu tax does.

So I was listening to the minority leader earlier today speak about this House bill as a big, big, big tax bill. He kept repeating it was a big, big, big tax bill.

Let us look at the major tax provisions and see who is paying this big, big, big tax bill. I would say at the outset I would agree with the distinguished minority leader that it is a big, big, big tax bill, but most of it is placed on those with big, big, big incomes. There is a big, big, big tax bill to make up for the big, big, big tax cuts for the wealthy that took place under Ronald Reagan.

So let us look at the tax portion of the bill. Those individuals making over \$115,000 a year, and those who are joint filers making over \$140,000 a year will pay a higher, 38 percent rate. It goes from 31 percent to 38 percent. Before 1981, before the big Reagan tax breaks for the wealthy, those rates went up to 70 percent. So the rates are only going halfway back to where we were prior to 1981.

Those making over \$250,000 a year will pay a 10-percent surtax on their in-

come taxes. Some companies pay their executives over \$1 million a year in salaries—you see some of these big corporate executives getting \$5 million, \$20 million a year. I wonder how many hard-working Americans know that the companies can deduct that from their income taxes if they want to pay them \$10 or \$15 million a year. This bill says if a company wants to pay an executive over \$1 million a year, they usually will not be able to deduct that from their taxes any longer.

I say it is about time we do that.

These provisions, raising the rate to 38 percent on those making more than \$115,000 a year, 10 percent surtax on those making over \$250,000 a year, and closing the loophole so that these highly paid executives, the companies cannot deduct that from their income taxes. These provisions will raise over \$115 billion to help reduce the deficit.

Second, requiring those with salaries of more than \$135,000 a year to pay their Medicare payroll tax on their whole salary, rather than just on the first \$135,000, pay on all of their income like most Americans do. Most hard-working Americans pay all year long on every dollar they earn to pay for the Medicare payroll tax. Now, if you make \$500,000 a year, you only pay on \$135,000.

We closed that loophole. That raises another \$29 billion to reduce the deficit.

Corporations earning over \$10 million a year will have their rates go up by 1 percent, from 34 to 35 percent. That raises another \$16 billion a year. That is not mom and pop corporations. These are corporations that earn over \$10 million a year. So their rates go up 1 percent, as I said. That raises \$16 billion.

If we have the Btu tax, that will raise less than half of the above provisions, \$72 billion. These figures are what will be raised over 5 years. So all of this talk about this Btu tax that I hear from the other side of the aisle, and we heard so much about from the other body last night and from the minority leader this morning, the Btu tax, that is less than half of the tax provisions that we raise from provisions only paid by upper-income and wealthy people in this country.

So it occurs to me, Mr. President, that the overemphasis on Btu tax, as an issue, is simply a stalking horse for the real agenda of some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle. And their real agenda is to keep the taxes down on the wealthiest in our country. They want to continue what Ronald Reagan did in 1981. Those making big bucks are not paying their fair share. Hard-working Americans, keep paying the taxes.

So whenever I hear all of this talk about the Btu tax, how tough it is—and it is tough, but it is only half of what we raise from upper income—I am convinced the talk is, in part, a stalking horse for the real agenda. And the real agenda of the minority leader and the

Republicans is to keep the taxes down on the wealthiest in our country.

I know many do not like the Btu tax. I do not much like it myself, quite frankly. I cannot think of anybody that would like a Btu tax. It will cause some real problems in specific areas.

I believe that some changes will be made in this body to deal with those problems with the Btu tax. But I want to remind my fellow Senators, and I think the rest of the country, that this is almost like *deja vu* all over again.

In 1977, President Carter sent an energy bill to the Congress. This Senator happened to be in the other body at the time, the House of Representatives. I remember that I read that very carefully. I thought it was a good energy bill. We worked on it in the House; it passed the House virtually intact, and it came to the Senate, and that was the end of it—it got killed.

I think what happened at that time is that the forces that arrayed themselves against the energy bill at that time really stuck their heads in the sand. If we had passed that energy bill, we would not be importing as much oil as we are this year. About half of the oil we use in this country is imported. Over \$50 billion a year are going out of this country to places like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, and places like that, to buy petroleum and petroleum products. If we passed that energy bill then, we would have more conservation; we would have more alternative energy, such as solar, wind, geothermal, and others, today. We would be importing a lot less oil, and using more natural gas than we are, which is domestically produced.

But, no, we stuck our heads in the sand in 1977. Look what has happened today. We are using more energy than ever before. All that money is still going out of this country every year; \$50 billion are leaving this country to pay for imported oil. I say that it is time that we quit sticking our heads in the sand. This Btu tax is designed to do three things: First, start to cut down on imported oil.

Second, to start producing more of our energy in this country using natural gas, conservation, and all the forms of energy.

Third, to reduce the deficit.

These are all objectives which I support.

So I hope we will not repeat what we did in 1977 and stick our heads in the sand again and say that, no, we can continue to use energy like it is just water. I think it is time we recognize that we have to cut down on our profligate use of imported oil in this country.

We have to take a look at the whole tax package and not just focus on the Btu tax. A family making \$400,000 a year will pay around \$1,100 more per month in taxes. The average family with a \$40,000-a-year income will pay around \$20 a month more in taxes.

Some have said that this bill is going to hurt the mom and pop small busi-

nesses because of the 36-percent tax rate—mom and pop small businesses, such as sole proprietorships. Well, the fact is that the rate only applies if that mom and pop as a family, makes more than \$140,000 a year.

Mr. President, I must tell you that the mom and pop businesses that dot the main streets of our small towns and communities in Iowa are not making \$140,000 a year. They are lucky if they make \$30,000 a year. They are in those stores from early morning until late at night, working hard, serving the people. They are not making \$140,000 a year. Anybody that says increasing the tax rate is going to hurt most small business owners obviously has not read the bill or, again, they are trying to put up a smoke screen for another agenda, the agenda of keeping taxes as low as possible on the wealthiest in our country.

Mr. President, the reconciliation bill is about remedying what some called the riverboat gamble taken in 1981. I did not call it that. Senator Harold Baker, I believe, called it that at the time, a riverboat gamble. Ronald Reagan said we could cut taxes and he was mainly interested in the wealthiest, increase military spending, and cut the deficit at the same time. That was the riverboat gamble.

I, quite frankly, think it was more closely in line with fraud than gambling. It led to a quadrupling of the Federal debt and the largest deficit in history. After years of smoke and mirrors, after years of borrowing and spending, after years of acting like we can continue to import oil like there is no tomorrow, now we have an honest plan to cut the deficit, to make the wealthiest in our society pay just their fair share.

Again, I will repeat that the top rate, prior to the Ronald Reagan tax cut, was up to 70 percent. This bill only brings it back up to 36 percent, up to almost 40 percent with the surtax on those making more than \$250,000, a bit over half of what it was before then.

Mr. President, it is a good plan. Again, some changes have to be made. There are some specific industries that are hurt more by the Btu tax including agriculture. These adjustments have to be made, as we always make them. But if we take decisive action, low interest rates will more than offset the costs that many people and businesses will bear.

Mr. President, I represent a farm State. I am proud to represent that State, and I am proud of our farmers. There has been a lot of talk that this Btu tax is really going to hurt farmers. Well, as originally designed, it would have done so.

One of the key parts of the plan was that petroleum products were taxed at a higher rate, say, than natural gas which is produced more in this country. The tax per million Btu's on petroleum products was about 60 cents per million Btu's. On other forms of en-

ergy, like natural gas, it was about 26 cents per million Btu's.

The House of Representatives cut that increase on petroleum products for farmers. So rather than being taxed at 60 cents per million Btu's farmers are only taxed at a 26 cents per million Btu tax rate for their farm fuel. And, I believe that there will be additional changes that will benefit agriculture in the final version of the bill.

I want to mention that, yesterday, the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute—a joint undertaking by Iowa State University and the University of Missouri—did a study and released it yesterday. They said that, regarding the impact in agriculture on midwest farmers, the increased costs they would pay on the Btu tax would to a significant degree be offset by the lower interest rates that will come about, because we are reducing the deficit.

Farmers want lower interest rates, and this bill is going to give farmers those low interest rates that they need.

Mr. President, now is not the time to repeat what we did in 1977 and stick our heads in the sand one more time on energy. Now is not the time to take another riverboat gamble like we did in 1981 and say we can continue to let the wealthy in our country get by without paying their fair share of taxes and we can continue to run the deficit up.

Now is the time to think about our children and to think about the future we are going to leave them. Now is not the time for smoke-and-mirror programs like Gramm-Rudman that sound very good—oh, they sounded great, but with all this fluff and talk about Gramm-Rudman reductions, the deficit just kept going up all the time.

No, Mr. President. Now is the time to make tough choices, to make the hard decisions, to do what we came here to do, and that is to set this country right, reduce the deficit, cut down on our energy dependence, and provide a better future for our children.

Yes, there are tough choices. No plan is perfect. This plan is not perfect. But we have tried 12 years of trickle-down economics, and it has been a disaster for this country.

President Clinton's plan contains some medicine that does not taste very good, but it is time that we take the medicine so that our children will not have to take medicine that is far more bitter.

Mr. President, I anxiously await, when we come back after our Memorial Day recess, to take up the President's reconciliation bill and have this debate. I think once the American people understand forthrightly and fully what we have set before them, I believe they are ready to make this tough decision and say, yes, we truly have to get the deficit down. It may hurt, but we have to do it for the future of our children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Chair recognizes the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER].

Mr. DURENBERGER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DURENBERGER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1069 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DURENBERGER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES KINNEY

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I rise to pay a belated tribute to an individual who contributed a great deal to the better functioning of the U.S. Senate for 19 years. I am referring to Charles Kinney—whom I met when I first came here—who on May 14 left the Senate to pursue a career with a Washington law firm. Charles is a remarkable man who always dealt fairly and honestly with those of us on this side of the aisle. I trusted him. His knowledge of the Senate and Senate procedure is immense. Never once, since I have known him, have I ever heard any member say that Charles was anything less than cooperative and helpful, not only to the Democrats but to the Republicans, as well.

Charles began his work in the democratic cloakroom in 1974. He continued to work in the Senate while studying for his law degree; like his mentor, Senator BYRD, who took a law degree while he served in Congress, and we know the breadth of his intellect and brilliance.

Later Charles was appointed to be a member of the floor staff and counsel to the policy committee when Senator BYRD was majority leader. He also served as chief judiciary committee adviser to Senator BYRD.

He consistently demonstrated the highest levels of professionalism in his work as chief floor counsel. I am absolutely confident that he will continue his remarkable work in the new challenges he faces in the private sector. He will be missed a great deal by all of us whom he has helped on the floor of this Senate for many of these past years—night sessions, early morning sessions, always working to put together a unanimous consent agreement or to help resolve a difficult situation with that remarkable sense of balance.

So I am pleased to join the majority leader, the Republican leader, and others of my colleagues who have taken the opportunity to wish the best of luck and express a sincere gratitude to

a person who has contributed so much to this institution.

He leaves a significant mark here, a very positive one. I really wish him well—he is a splendid, splendid young man—and his family, also.

CONFIRMATION OF PAMELA HARRIMAN AS AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to remark on the confirmation of Pamela Harriman as Ambassador to France. Unfortunately, I was unable to come to the floor to speak in favor of the nomination when Pamela Harriman was considered, and would now like to congratulate the President on this appointment, and also to congratulate Ms. Harriman herself.

The relationship between our Nation and France will be well served by this remarkable woman. I, like so many others, have been fortunate to have been the beneficiary of this delightful lady's kindness and generousness and graciousness. She has been to me a wonderful and supportive friend at a time when, I can assure you, I needed some friends. She will grace our Embassy in France with energy, skill, and elegance, not to mention a healthy dose of good common sense.

I am particularly pleased with this appointment because France deserves our very best. And that is Pamela Harriman. France was our ally before we had even become a nation. Indeed, France helped us to become one. Our countries have been on a parallel course every since, tied tightly together. Both of our republics were created through revolution in the late 18th century. We have fought two world wars as allies. In short, there are few bilateral relationships in the world with as much to bind them as ours with France. It is a relationship that deserves to be tended well, and I am pleased that the President has demonstrated his commitment to it with this fine appointment.

She will do well. We know of her biographical background. And now she returns to the city in which she studied at the Sorbonne in Paris many years ago.

Her public service began with extraordinary trials, working at the ministry of supply and with women's voluntary services in London during the war years of 1941 and 1942. She spent most of the war serving as assistant secretary of the Churchill Club in London, an organization of American and Canadian servicemen and officers.

Ms. Harriman has shared her exceptional insights and grasp of history with us in many important publications, including "Our Moscow Blindness" in a 1992 edition of the Washington Post, and the president "Turkey Deserves Priority Attention" printed in the New York Times in 1988. On December 7, 1991, the 50th anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, she published an

evocative piece in the Washington Post describing Winston Churchill's reaction to the Pearl Harbor assault—he understood that event, although tragic in the near term, meant the entry of the United States into the World War, ensuring the eventual defeat of Hitler and the survival of Great Britain. Pamela Harriman has shared many fine works with us describing the life and thoughts of Winston Churchill. It is not surprising that in recent years she has been drawn to support others who excel in public life.

My wife Ann and I have the highest regard for this splendid woman.

Again, I commend the President for this fine appointment and the Senate for confirming her.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, what is the situation with regard to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are conducting morning business at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is there a time limit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may speak for an unlimited amount of time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I will just take a few more minutes, Madam President.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED "DEFICIT-REDUCTION PLAN"

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I wish to speak in reference to the President's proposed deficit reduction trust fund. In view of the recent action taken by the House to approve the President's tax plan, it is worth examining whether such a trust fund will truly ensure that these new taxes are used for deficit reduction only.

Madam President, my colleagues have already reminded us of how the Democratic Party reacted when President Bush suggested a deficit reduction checkoff option for taxpayers. Senator BOB SMITH of New Hampshire tried to advance that proposal on the floor of the Senate, and was ridiculed for his efforts.

I will try not to discuss the President's suggestion in the same tone of voice in which my colleagues on the other side responded to President Bush last year. I debated this issue on the floor at that time and I remember how I felt, listening to our President being mocked—it was as though sarcasm and derision dripped from the words of Democratic Senators. I half expected to hear speakers begin to recite "Forgive them, Lord, they know not what they do" as they shook their heads in sadness at the folly of the poor, old, wandering Republicans.

So I will try not—and I just did—to resort to sarcasm and mockery in my remarks. But I remember that was the element and the essence of the remarks at that time.

Madam President, there is a great temptation to note the irony and even humor in our President's proposing a deficit reduction trust fund some weeks ago.

At least, when President Bush proposed earmarking taxpayer funds for such purpose, he displayed an awareness that taxes could only reduce the deficit if they were not spent. Thus, he proposed a mechanism for keeping them from being spent.

If President Clinton proposed any new changes in Federal revenues or Federal expenditures specifically in conjunction with this deficit reduction trust fund, I am not aware of it. I think it is fair to say that the effectiveness or lack thereof of the President's deficit reduction plan will not be altered one penny by the creation of this trust fund. If the creation of a special trust fund will reduce our Federal deficit, it will be a true revolution in the arenas of finance.

Personally, I know that my wife Ann and I would love to use this idea for our own personal finances, but I suspect the words, "don't try this at home" might well apply.

"Don't try this at home" is what we should do to test things we do here, because, if your salary does not change at home and your expenditures do not change at home, you will be hard pressed to reduce your personal debts by calling some of your money a debt reduction trust fund.

Madam President, if you do set some of the money aside and designate it as a deficit reduction trust fund and this induces you to spend less money, then certainly you will achieve your desired ends. But that is the key, is it not? Sure. You have to cut your own spending to pay off your debts. It is true for governments as it is for individuals. Remember, we can still blame President Reagan, President Bush, or the Democratic Congress—whoever you want—but we are headed into the bow-wows.

If Hillary Clinton—and I give her high credit, an impressive person in government—if we do nothing in that area, it is going to cost us another \$700 billion in 5 years. And we will have to do something. Right now this issue of health care is costing us, at the end of this year, \$900 billion.

While we talk about messing around with \$20 million here, \$80 million there, the big bucks are just sucking us up. Entitlement programs have gone up 24 percent. We ought to be commending people like SAM NUMN and PETE DOMENICI for their strengthening of America Report. We ought to be commending JACK DANFORTH and DAVE BOREN because they are the only ones talking about how to save this country from absolute fiscal insanity. And that is do something with the entitlements programs.

Why call them that? Call them what they are—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. And they are sucking us up. So, I commend those who are attempting to meet the President's proposals, but there is only one way to reach them and that is to do something with those programs. A deficit reduction trust fund will not get us there. It

will not reduce the deficit. If we do not actually need to enforce spending cuts to reduce the deficit and could do it simply by saying certain of our money is in a trust fund, I do hope someone in this Chamber will assist me in applying this splendid idea to my own tattered personal finances. I suspect there are millions of Americans who are similarly eager to exploit this remarkable new method of deficit reduction as well, even though it does not look like the old cookie jar.

THE WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE

Mr. SIMPSON. Finally—I appreciate the courtesy from the Chair—I just want to speak very briefly, 3 minutes, so we may repair to our homes and our constituents at town meetings and let them rain their remarkable commentary upon us during the recess. That is good, I like town meetings. They have torn all the hair off my head, but I am still going back for more, always.

I want to speak on the controversy involving the White House travel office. Some days ago, in an article in the Washington Post, there were disturbing revelations about how the White House had been operating in that arena. If this story is accurate, it seems that White House staff bypassed Attorney General Janet Reno and instead invited the FBI Director of Public Affairs to the White House.

After this meeting, the FBI officer issued guidance to the Bureau's press officers in the production of a statement that the FBI had "sufficient information to determine that additional criminal investigation is warranted" of the White House travel office. This statement, I must remind my colleagues, was part of the evidence cited by the White House in its justification of the dismissal of the entire travel office staff.

Based on what we know to date, it is not conclusive that these White House staffers were attempting to politicize the FBI's procedures. However it is, I think, indicative of a disturbing series of consequences and coincidences. It is coincidental that, after a visit to the White House, the FBI issued a statement saying that additional criminal investigation is warranted.

Also coincidental is the fact that White House counsel William Kennedy requested an FBI investigation of the White House travel bureau 3 days after the President's friend Harry Thomason complained to the White House about not having a piece of the White House travel business.

Before that, a 3-month-old memo from the President's 25-year-old cousin suggested she be placed in charge of the travel office's operation. Only after this memo, coincidentally, did an FBI investigation of travel office procedures commence.

Again, that is the chronology reported by the Washington Post.

I am particularly disturbed by the information about how Attorney General Janet Reno was apparently bypassed. All Americans were relieved to hear, at her confirmation hearings, Janet Reno's assurances to Congress that the Justice Department would not be politicized. I believe her. I really do believe her. I believed her then. I believe her now. This is an extraordinary public servant. I have come to know her, and I hope I will have many more opportunities to come to know her better.

She stands tall in more ways than one. And when she said to us, "The buck stops here," that is a shocking statement for this city where, if you want to have a friend, you better buy a dog.

The administration was most happy for her visibility at that the time in that vital role. So it is curious a Cabinet Member of the highest integrity such as Attorney General Reno would have been bypassed here unless the perpetrators knew that were she informed, she would blow the whistle on the whole bizarre affair.

There are many questions that are still unanswered about this travel travesty, but Americans deserve to know the truth. I join with our leader in his call for a congressional hearing on the controversy. I know Senator BIDEN, as my chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will give that his every attention. But I can certainly say I think the President is being ill-served by some. This is obviously gratuitous advice from me as a Member of the other party, but I do not want to see him fail.

I think Mack McLarty, his Chief of Staff, is a splendid man, and I think he is doing his best. But I think they are still in a campaign mode up there. The sooner they get out of the campaign mode and decide it is governing time, I think, the sooner we will make some real progress. Turn the campaign folks loose, turn the night-tracking poll people loose. Let them go. Let them go rest for a while so the poor President does not have to get up every morning and take the night tracking poll and go tell people what he thinks they want to hear. That nearly killed George Bush—it did.

Once you get into that mode as President of the United States, polling the people of America every night and thinking that you are giving them what they want, you will fail. And I have seen it occur.

It is time to govern, time to do the hard decisions. We all know what we have to do—all of us, Democrat and Republican alike. So I hope we will be about that.

I hope we will be about that. I hope that these things will come to pass in weeks to come and that our leader will continue to work with Senator MITCHELL, as they do remarkably to do the Senate's work, even though they both, indeed, represent highly partisan positions.

But that is the Senate. I respect GEORGE MITCHELL, and I respect BOB DOLE. I respect my assistant leader, WENDELL FORD. I enjoy working with them all. I wish them all a good recess, as well as the occupant of the Chair.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RENEWAL OF CHINA'S MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADING STATUS

Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the President's decision to renew China's most-favored-nation trading status. I am pleased to see that President Clinton has adopted President Bush's thoughtful approach for another year—directing the course of change by maintaining a dialog and keeping the lines of communication open as we attempt to provide positive reinforcement for reform in the People's Republic of China.

I do believe that each of us is very deeply concerned about the known human rights violations that exist in the People's Republic of China. We are also gravely concerned about China's transfer of sensitive missile and nuclear weapons technology and many Members have expressed additional reservations about other critically important matters.

These concerns are very real, and I would be deeply disturbed if the administration were not taking steps to deal with them in a most aggressive and appropriate manner. I do believe that our responsibilities are best met when we use the appropriate nonconfrontational tools to deal with the problems of human rights, arms proliferation, and the trade deficit.

My decision to support most-favored-nation status comes down to one very simple concern: How would we maintain or increase our influence, and dialog with China—a country representing one-fifth of the world's population—if we were to withdraw a trade status which we give to 162 other countries on the face of the Earth? What do we gain from cutting off our nose to spite our face? Slamming the door on China would also be slamming the door on ourselves.

If we are going to deal with the global issues of the day, such as the environment and nuclear and conventional arms proliferation, we must include in those discussions the People's Republic of China. Without including the most populous nation on the Earth, many of these critical international problems simply cannot be effectively dealt with. It is as basic and simple as that.