worse than during the Bush years when the United States trade deficit with Japan reached all-time highs? Look at the facts.

During the first 3 years of the Bush administration, the United States trade deficit with Japan reached over $133.5 billion. During the first 3 years of the Clinton administration, our trade deficit with Japan has soared to over $185 billion. That is $50 billion worse, according to my math, and a 39-percent increase. Wishing a problem away certainly will not make it so, and Japan knows it. Our Nation gains nothing by denial.

Facts again: During the Bush years, the 4 years, the total trade deficit with Japan reached over $183 billion, an all-time record. President Clinton has racked up that amount in just his first 3 years. In fact, during the Clinton watch, the trade deficit with Japan has rung in at all time record highs each year, $60 billion in the red in 1993, $65.7 billion in the red in 1994, and $60 billion in the red in 1995. We cannot project what the United States-Japan trade deficit will be this year, but all indicators are that the total for the 4 years of Clinton's time will easily be over $230 billion to the deficit side of the ledger.

Let us take a look at the automotive sector, which still accounts for over half of the deficit with Japan, more exports coming over here, fewer of our imports going into their market.

Remember when President Bush journeyed to Japan late in his Presidency and became ill at the official dinner held during the automotive trade rift? This is not a new problem. I personally have been working on opening Japan's market to United States goods for over a decade. I can tell Members Japan's auto market largely remains closed. They continue to believe we are not really serious.

United States auto manufacturers still have less than 1 measly percent of Japan's auto market, yet Japan holds upwards of one-third of our market. Think about this. With our low interest rates, the value of our dollar against the yen has fallen 40 percent since 1990, which means that our products are 40 percent cheaper in Japan. Yet we gained only one-third of 1 percent additional market penetration in Japan in 1995.

While we were able to sell about 58,000 cars there last year, Japan has sold over 100 times that amount in our country over the last decade. When I ask my local auto people, how are you doing, they smile and they look down.

In a recent survey of United States auto parts suppliers to Japanese customers, two-thirds of our suppliers say they are working hard to crack Japan's market with roughly half of those responding saying they are currently achieving either limited success, sporadic success or no success at all in really opening that market.

Can you imagine, in the second largest marketplace in the world, if we could get trade reciprocity with Japan, the amount of jobs we could create in this country, in shipping, in distribution, in manufacturing, in parts, et cetera? Compare the limited success of United States auto and auto parts manufacturers to crack Japan's market to the administration's exaggerated claims.

Friends, let us stop the denial. You cannot look at these numbers and not know that trade is going one way and not the other. We have scaled an ant hill in our efforts to open Japan's market. Now all that is left is the mountain of red ink to scale.

MORE ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, a great Democrat who came from my State, perhaps one of the most articulate spokesmen for the Democratic Party over the last 30 or 40 years, Hubert Humphrey, once said that if you love your God, you must love his children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the tragedy of the partial birth abortion issue and what the President has done with his veto. I rise to congratulate the National Conference of Catholic Bishops because I think they have, in very strong words, expressed on behalf not only of Catholics but I think of millions of Americans that have conscience of both political parties the outrage of this grisly procedure and the action of the President by vetoing it, keeping it legal here in the United States.

This is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democrat issue. It certainly is not just a Catholic issue. I think it is an issue about our basic humanity and how we treat the most vulnerable among us.

I would like to read for the RECORD a letter from a gentleman in Texas. For those who may be watching, I would be happy to make available to them a copy of this letter as well as a letter from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, because they are both extremely powerful letters. I think all Americans should have an opportunity to read them.

□ 1745

I want to read this for the record, Mr. Speaker:

Hon. BILL CLINTON.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Wednesday evening, when I learned that you had vetoed the partial birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry, but mostly I felt betrayed. Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the nation feel now.

As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the primary campaign in Texas in 1992 and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the rights of individuals and to forge an era of the new Democrat, an era that would avoid the extremism of either side.

I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who have no voice. But Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of the innocent little children and literally sentenced them, thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end, to their deaths.

Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life. The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive, but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted to ''protect the safety of the mother,'' when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure was necessary to save the mother's life. You know full well that the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society and 73 Democrats in the house if it did not. Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And it is certainly inconsistent with your positions that you have taken.

Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy reflected your deep concern for those who perished, especially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday for countless equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of the children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you chose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceive are crucial to your reelection.

In the past three years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions, of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, of drugs and disease.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the full text of this letter in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

EL PASO, TX,
April 12, 1996.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
President of the United States, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Wednesday evening when I learned that you had vetoed the partial-birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry. But mostly, I felt betrayed.

Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the nation feel now. As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the primary campaign in Texas in 1992, and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the rights of individuals and to forge an era of the New Democrat. An era that would avoid extremism of either side. I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who had no voice. But Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of innocent little children and literally sentenced them (thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end) to their deaths.

Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life. The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive—but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted to ''protect the safety of the mother'', when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure necessary to save a mother's life. You know full well the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society and 73 Democrats in the House if it did not. Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And, it is certainly inconsistent with other positions you have taken.

Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy reflected your deep concern for those who perished, especially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday for countless, equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you chose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceived are crucial for your re-election.

In the past three years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, of drugs and disease. You have pleaded with them to have respect for human life. But with this veto, you did the opposite. And we, as party officials, have been put in the untenable position of having to live with that decision.

Mr. President, I cannot and will not support this action. Therefore, I cannot in good conscience support your candidacy.

As I contempleted this matter over these past days, I was reminded of the words of the late President Kennedy when he said, ''Sometimes party loyalty asks too much.'' Thus, it is with regret and sorrow that on this date, I have submitted my resignation as a member of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee and Chair of the Mexican-American Caucus. I have informed our State Chairman, Bill White. While I do not intend to actively support of vote for any Republican or Independent candidate. I will be asking other Democrats to consider withholding their support of your candidacy while continuing to support Democrats for other offices.

Very truly yours,

JOSE R. KENNARD,
State Committeeman, District 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed how many of my fellow colleagues here this afternoon had been speaking about the outrageous and repugnant veto of the legislation overwhelmingly passed in both Houses of the U.S. Congress regarding partial-birth execution-style abortion.

During the debate I tried to get pro-life Members on both sides of the aisle in the oldest party of America, the great Democratic Party, and the grand old party over here, I tried to get them all to use this expression execution-style because the attack to the child, and it is a child that is almost always viable, can survive outside the womb even if it is what we called disabled, that the attack is similar to the Cosa Nostra, or organized crime, attack, sometimes with a .22 pistol, to keep down the sound to the base of the skull. This is a common assault, whether it was with sword, ax, or during the Chinese revolution, Stalin's purges, or Hitler's henchmen.

For example, at the trench at Babyar in the Ukraine, or many of the labor camps with sick people, Japanese warlords directed soldiers executing our men and our Filipino allies on the Bataan death march 54 years ago.

This execution to the base of the skull, it was used in the Balkans all this last 4-year period of horrible ethnic cleansing and human rights violations, a bullet or a knife to the base of the skull.

And here in debate in one of these two houses was a woman, no less, an elected woman, talking about defending that this was important to the life of the mother. And somebody got up who served in this House honorably for 8 years, Senator BOB SMITH, and said, wait a minute, if it is for the life of the mother, why is the abortionist holding the baby in the birth canal? Why is he interrupting the birth process? This is conversely to what you are saying, endangering the mother's life. It is truly infanticide.

And I think that to let people know how unprecedented it is, as it says in a front-page story in the Washington Times, and I have not looked at the Post today and the New York Times to see whether they buried it, but it is a front-page story about all eight U.S. Catholic cardinals hitting Clinton on abortion, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and then read as much as I can of the bishop's letter and submit the rest, ask unanimous consent to submit the rest, for the RECORD, and I will return to the floor, as I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will many times on this.

This has got to rip apart Stephanopoulos' so-called Catholic plan to win the election in 202 days.

Mr. HUNTER. I do not want to take much time from my friend.

Mr. DORNAN. You are not taking it from me, but from eight cardinals; go ahead, though.

Mr. HUNTER. In that case, I feel better.

But let me just thank him, thank BOB DORNAN, for all the great work that he has done on behalf of unborn children and the fact that you are carrying this fight, as you have carried it for many, many years on the House floor, and I agree with you that the President has gone too far, that he stepped too far even for people who are able to look the other way on this issue in his party, and I hope that it is going to pull people off of this bandwagon that the President is putting together for his 1996 presidential campaign.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, you know our colleague, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, has been here. He is a classmate of yours, for 16 years almost, but he has this angelic face. I almost said he looked like an acolyte, and, therefore, he can stand where you are at this mike or down in the well and say tougher things than most of us can say.

He has been calling Clinton for 3½ years the abortion President. Nobody has ever jumped up and taken down his words, and I have refrained from doing that until this moment. But this shows, beyond all shadow of doubt, that Mr. Clinton is not a new Democrat, he is not a moderate Democrat, he is not even a run-of-the-mill liberal like many of our honorable friends on the other side of the aisle who are proud of their liberal philosophy, believe in a larger Federal Government than we do, basically to help the poor, to help children.