

place. After the speeches on clinic violence and the public's disgust, a law was passed - Federal Access to Clinic Entrance Act. It was directed toward this terrorism at clinics. It has helped. Not a great deal, but it has helped. It is a step in the right direction.

Today, I am directing a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, Janet Reno. I say to Janet Reno, I know there is a task force dealing with these issues, but we in Congress need to be told what is being done. We need to see some results and we need to know what more can be done. We need a report.

We not only have to go after those people who have committed these atrocious deadly acts, but we need to figure out a program to stop them from happening in the first place. We can't have the Internet, the U.S. mail, people's homes and businesses violated by these terrorists.

I am asking Janet Reno to give us in Congress some direction, some guidance as the chief law enforcement officer in this country. We want to know what you are doing to stop these acts of intimidation and violence. It is time these 38,000 acts are stopped. We must do something to stop this senseless violence in the land of our liberty.

We must understand that what separates any pluralistic society from anarchy is a recognition that no one has a monopoly on the truth. When this basic precept fails, so does the community. It was thus in Kosovo, Bosnia, and Rwanda, in the Germany of the 1930s and America of 1861.

There have always been people who knew the wishes of their Supreme Being more clearly than others. Some became St. Francis; others burned St. Joan. Some raised cathedrals; others sacked Jerusalem. Some wrote hymns of praise to the Lord; others wrote his name in blood. There have always been people who knew their law was of a higher moral value than the laws of society in which they live.

Some became Gandhi and led marches to the sea; others became Theodore Kaczynski and mailed bombs to people they never met. Some became Henry David Thoreau and refused to make war; others became Timothy McVeigh and made war on innocent men, women, and children. Some became Martin Luther King and marched to Selma; others became James Earl Ray, the lone fanatic with a gun.

As long as any man or woman combines that mistaken belief in a higher law with a conviction that they are empowered to enforce it against their fellow man, so long will the fringe fanatics of the pro-life movement, murder and maim and intimidate in violation of the rights and beliefs of every person dedicated to a just and civil society in America.

All Americans must speak out against this new American terror; to do otherwise is un-American.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Senator CRAIG from Idaho and I, following the

Senator from Montana speaking, intend to have perhaps 15 minutes split between the two of us. I ask unanimous consent we be recognized following the presentation by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Montana needs 10 minutes?

Mr. BAUCUS. I will need 10 to 12 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent following the presentation of the Senator from Montana I be recognized for 15 minutes with the intention of yielding some of that time to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada controls the time.

Mr. REID. I have no objection to that.

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

JAPAN'S MARKET OPERATIONS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, a long list of issues must be addressed in the next round of the multilateral trade negotiations that kick off in Seattle in 4 weeks. Agricultural trade is at the very top. Other issues include further reducing tariffs, repairing the WTO dispute settlement process, removing restrictions on trade and services, increasing opportunities to sell to governments, avoiding measures that restrict the growth of electronic commerce and figuring out how to put a human face on trade law consideration of the relationship between trade and labor and between trade and the environment.

There is another issue that has received virtually no attention at all. Yet it is of critical importance to the United States, to most other nations, and to the world trading system itself. I refer to the problem of Japan, the second largest economy in the world. A country where the markets for our goods and services remain far more closed than they should be.

The sense-of-the-Senate resolution I am introducing today, along with Senator GRASSLEY, urges the administration to pay much more attention to Japan in the next trade round than was the case in the past.

I want the administration to work overtime to ensure that Japan makes commitments that will genuinely open its markets. And the administration must then ensure that Japan meets those commitments. Paper agreements will not suffice. Agreeing to broad principles is unacceptable. Negotiations in the next trade round must lead to clear results in Japan. There must be meaningful, measurable change in the way Japan's markets operate.

Historically, the relationship between multilateral and bilateral trade commitments made by Japan, and then whether there is actual change in Japan's markets, has been tenuous, at best. The American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, in its report "Making Trade Talks Work", documented this

problem of implementation and results.

In the Uruguay round, Japan did not have to make the kind of significant changes that were required of many other major trading countries. Including the United States. Even where Japan agreed to open its market, such as the rice market, the out-of-quota tariff rate is still in the range of 500 percent. That is not a misquote. It is Five Zero Zero, 500 percent tariff on rice coming into Japan from the United States. I am worried that in the next round, the Japanese Government will be able to minimize the commitments they make. And then, in a uniquely Japanese way, they will be able to minimize the implementation of those commitments and obligations. In earlier trade rounds, Japan agreed to the GATT Government Procurement Code. But the United States found that we had to negotiate special bilateral agreements with Japan in order to get genuine access to their government market. We negotiated multiple arrangements on computers, supercomputers, telecommunications equipment, medical equipment, and satellites. Even with these arrangements, access to Japan's market has still been a major problem in many of these areas. The GATT system has not worked well here. In the Uruguay round, we were so focused on other problems, especially in Europe, that we missed a lot of opportunities with Japan. I am concerned that the same thing may happen again. I certainly do not want to take away from the focus on agriculture and other priorities we have for the next round. But I want to be sure that we do not let Japan off again.

Japan seems now to be working overtime to protect its trade-distorting policies in agriculture, forestry, and fishing. The Advanced Tariff Liberalization efforts would have been further along but for Japanese opposition at APEC. Now, Japan is trying to hide its protectionist policies behind the banner of the "multifunctionality" of agriculture. That is, they claim that farming plays an important role in a country's social and cultural fabric, trade liberalization cannot interfere. Of course, farming is integral to the social fabric of many nations, including our own. But that is not an excuse for trade protection and making other countries pay those domestic social costs.

At the same time, Japan is playing a leading role in criticizing United States trade laws and in working with other countries to challenge our antidumping and countervailing duty laws in the next round. Some speculate that this is just another attempt to undercut American initiatives in the new round. Japan could, and more important Japan should, take a leadership role in a number of areas. After all, few countries in the world have benefited more than Japan over the past half century from an open world trading system.

Japan could take significant steps to make its regulatory system more transparent and less burdensome. They could table a broad based services liberalization proposal that would encourage others to follow. Japan could lead the effort to put more transparency into the government procurement agreement. It could lead on electronic commerce. And, of course, it could deal with those agriculture policies that are at the top of the agenda.

This resolution calls on the administration to focus on Japan in the next round, to set out specific expectations for the changes desired in Japan, to ensure that Japanese commitments made in the round will truly lead to change in the Japanese market, to work with other major nations to ensure that these changes occur, and to consult closely with Congress and the private sector, including manufacturers, agriculture, service providers, and NGOs, throughout the negotiations.

I hope my colleagues will join me in helping ensure full participation by Japan in the round and in ensuring that we will benefit from Japan's commitments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE UPCOMING WTO TRADE SUMMIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to come to the floor today along with my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, to discuss objectives we have for the upcoming WTO trade summit in Seattle, WA. We want that trade summit, the initiation of a new round of trade talks, to be as productive as possible for this country and especially for this country's family farmers and ranchers.

In recent years, we have seen the results of our trade negotiators negotiating trade agreements in secret around the globe and developing the conditions under which we trade goods and services. Family farmers and ranchers largely have discovered they have been given short shrift and not treated very well. In fact, their remedies to attempt to confront unfair trade arrangements were taken away. They discovered that in many cases the competition they face in the marketplace for agricultural goods was unfair competition. They discovered foreign markets were still closed to them, with little promise of them being opened.

We decide this time that the round of trade talks that will begin with the WTO in Seattle would be different. So Senator CRAIG and I convened a caucus, the WTO Trade Caucus for Farmers and Ranchers. We called our colleagues in the House, Congressman Simpson and Congressman Pomeroy, and, with the four of us as cochairs, created an organization in Congress that has nearly 50

Senators and Congressmen, to try to establish, a set of objectives that will be helpful to family farm interests in this country for our trade ambassador and our trade negotiators to follow.

Mind you, we are not simply focusing on the issue of family farmers. We want our trade talks to be fruitful to our country and our economy as a whole. But we believe very strongly, representing rural States, that family farmers have been hurt by recent trade agreements and that ought not be the case. Trade arrangements and trade negotiations ought to help our producers, not hurt them. So our caucus—again, nearly 50 Senators and Congressmen strong—Republicans and Democrats working together, established a set of objectives. Those objectives we have used in meetings with the trade ambassador and with the Secretary of Agriculture and others, and many of us will in fact go to Seattle the first week of December and be present at the initiation of these trade talks, trying to press the case that this time family farmers and ranchers across this country must not be given short shrift in the trade talks.

I would like to go through a couple of charts that describe the seriousness of the situation we want to confront with this trade agenda. Here is a chart that shows what has happened to our trade deficit. We are beginning a new round of trade talks at a time our trade deficit is going through the roof, \$25 billion in a month in trade deficits. That is very serious. That is the highest trade deficit anywhere in history, by any country, any place, any time.

What is happening with imports and exports? This chart shows that imports keep going up, up, and up, while exports are basically a flat line. That is, of course, what is causing our trade imbalance.

Just on agricultural trade alone, in the last couple of years, we have had a very healthy surplus in agricultural trade that has shrunk, and shrunk, and shrunk some more. This is a chart that spells out the difficulties family farmers now face—the rather anemic ability to export to other countries. We are not exporting as much as we used to, and there is a substantial amount of increased imports in food products from abroad.

Finally, let me take it from the general to the specific, to say one of the burrs under my saddle has always been the trade with Canada. It is fundamentally unfair. This chart shows what has happened with our agricultural trade balance with Canada. The United States-Canadian trade agreement and NAFTA turned a healthy trade surplus with Canada in agricultural commodities alone into a very sizable deficit. That is the wrong direction. In durum wheat, in the first 7 months of this year compared with the first 7 months of previous years, which themselves are an all-time record, you will see once again we continue a massive quantity of unfair trade coming in from Canada.

I simply tell my colleagues this to explain that we have serious challenges in this trade round. The caucus that we have established created some objectives on behalf of farmers and ranchers, under the heading of Fair trade for agriculture at the WTO conference:

Expand market access. Too many markets around the world are closed to American farmers and ranchers who want to compete. Expand access, eliminate export subsidies. Those are trade-distorting.

The fact is, we are barraged with export subsidies in multiples of what we are able to do. We ought to eliminate export subsidies—the Europeans, especially, are guilty of massive quantities of export subsidies.

Discipline state trading enterprises. These are sanctioned monopolies that would not be legal in our country. The Canadian Wheat Board, especially, engages in unfair trade.

Improve market access for products of new biotechnology.

Deny unilateral disarmament; that is, do not give up the tools to combat unfair trade; and do not give up the domestic tools to support family farmers.

We have a substantial list on our agenda. Rather than go through all of this, I want to yield to the Senator from Idaho in a moment, but let me also say the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming, is also involved in this caucus, as are many others, Republicans and Democrats, working together for a common purpose, and that common purpose is to say: Farmers and ranchers around this country work hard, and they do their level best. They raise livestock and grain and they do a good job. They can compete anywhere, any time, under any condition, but they cannot compete successfully when the rules of trade are unfair.

That, sadly, too often has been the case, and we intend this time in this WTO round to see that is no longer the case. We want these negotiations to bear fruit—bear grain, actually, now that I think about it, from my part of the country, but fruit for others. We want these negotiations to work for our family farmers and ranchers.

Bipartisan work in Congress does not get very much attention because there is not much controversy attached to it, but there are many instances in which we work together across the aisle. This is one. A bipartisan group of 50 Members of the House and Senate are working together for a common objective: to improve conditions in rural America as a result of the upcoming WTO round of trade talks. I am very pleased to have been working with my colleague, Senator CRAIG, from the State of Idaho. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank Senator DORGAN for outlining the intent of the effort underway by the Senator, myself, and 49 other colleagues. It was Senator BYRON DORGAN who approached me on the idea of creating a