

Mr. President, as this summit comes close, I am pleased that the Congress is somewhat involved. I am actually pleased that these have kind of been four issues that at least the National Security Council has set forth. I hope we have honest, candid talks with the President of China. I hope we say in very understandable terms what our policy is in regard to human rights, in understandable terms what our policy is with regard to trade. We obviously have to open up China so that our trade deficit doesn't worsen.

So we have real problems to resolve. We do not resolve them by simply saying we are going to have "constructive engagement." I think we need to be specific on a relatively small number of things that are important to us and then, by golly, stick with them. If we have an agreement on intellectual property and it is not adhered to, then we need to do something about it. We should not try to run everything that everybody else does in another country, but those things that are important to us I think we ought to stay with. I look forward to the summit. I hope it is a useful one. I hope it contributes to world peace. I hope it contributes to stability in world trade and perhaps most of all the improvement of human rights in that part of the world.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION'S ACTIONS AGAINST RESTRICTIVE JAPANESE PORT PRACTICES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC], Mr. Harold Creel, and the other Federal Maritime Commissioners, Mrs. Ming Hsu, Mr. Joe Scroggins, and Mr. Delmond Won for their resolve in pursuing trade liberalization of Japan's restrictive port practices.

The problem of unfair, restrictive port practices in Japan is a long standing one. The United States carriers and United States Government have asked the Japanese to reform their system for over a decade. The Japanese had refused even to acknowledge that this was a problem, much less to resolve it.

Two years ago, the carriers, weary of the futility of diplomatic and commercial pressure, asked the FMC to address this. This was not a matter of the FMC grandstanding or attempting to justify its existence. In fact, I would note that the same Japanese restrictive port practices were challenged at the World Trade Organization [WTO] by European carriers. To date, the WTO has not acted on the European carrier petition. However, the FMC acted vigorously at the request of United States industry interests to address a long-standing, Japanese-created situation that could not be resolved through more amicable means. In September 1995, the FMC issued orders to gather information on the subject.

In November 1996, the FMC issued a proposed rule, with monetary sanctions to go into effect April 1997.

In April 1997, an agreement between the United States and Japanese Governments resulted in Japanese commitments to achieve certain steps toward reform by July 1997. Accordingly, the FMC postponed the effective date of the sanctions until September 1997.

But then the Japanese failed to meet their April commitments. In September, the Japanese again asked for a postponement of the FMC rule. The FMC refused, and beginning in September, fees of \$100,000 per voyage began accruing. The fees for the month of September, which totaled \$4 million, were due and payable October 15, 1997.

Despite frequent assurances by the Japanese carriers that they would pay the fees, when the October deadline was reached, they refused to do so. Accordingly, the FMC took the next step, which is authorized by statute and specifically spelled out in the final rule: to request that Customs deny clearance of Japanese vessels at United States ports, and to request the Coast Guard to detain the vessels. This action is entirely avoidable upon payment by the Japanese carriers of their now overdue debts to the United States.

The Japanese port practices at issue result in costly, arbitrary, and unnecessary expenditures by United States carriers and prevent them from making their own decisions on whom to hire for stevedoring services, from being licensed to operate their own terminals, and from operating efficiently. These practices are injurious not only to U.S. carriers, but to all U.S. importers and exporters who rely on ocean shipping, and to the American consumer. Japanese port costs are the highest in the world, and American consumers of Japanese goods ultimately foot the bill. Moreover, Japanese carriers are not subject to such restrictions in their operations in the United States.

None of these achievements of the FMC would have been possible were the FMC not an independent agency, separate from the executive branch departments. Only an independent agency, free from political pressure and the host of other concerns which frequently paralyze larger executive branch agencies, could have acted so swiftly and effectively. We must ensure that the FMC continue to retain its independent status.

It is my understanding that United States and Japanese negotiators are coming close to an agreement that would resolve this issue. This issue would not be resolved, but for the actions of the FMC. Bravo, keep up the good work, and ensure that whatever issues the Japanese Government agrees to are enforced for the benefit of the shipping public.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 17,

1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,418,064,201,028.31. (Five trillion, four hundred eighteen billion, sixty-four million, two hundred one thousand, twenty-eight dollars and thirty-one cents)

One year ago, October 17, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,226,593,000,000 (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-six billion, five hundred ninety-three million)

Twenty-five years ago, October 17, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$436,027,000,000 (Four hundred thirty-six billion, twenty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion—\$4,982,037,201,028.31 (Four trillion, nine hundred eighty-two billion, thirty-seven million, two hundred one thousand, twenty-eight dollars and thirty-one cents) during the past 25 years.

RICHARD JOHNSON: 43 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to honor Richard Johnson of Baltic, SD. Richard recently retired after 43 years of service in the Baltic Fire Department—half of the department's 86 years of existence. His friends describe him as a man who can always be relied upon and who never failed to answer the call when an emergency struck his community.

Nearly 20 years ago, a grain elevator exploded in this quiet town in southeastern South Dakota, tragically killing two people, and starting a furious blaze that could be seen for miles. Richard, an assistant manager at the elevator, was the first firefighter on the scene. Fighting large fires is a particular challenge in rural South Dakota, where fire departments depend upon teams of volunteers and often lack adequate supplies of water. On this day, firefighters were called in from all over the region and a pump truck was brought from Sioux Falls to draw water from the Big Sioux River. Together, they worked throughout the afternoon to bring the blaze under control before finally extinguishing it. For all of that long, exhausting afternoon, and for the 3 days of cleanup that followed, Richard was there.

These days tell us a lot about Richard. Quiet and reserved, he never asked for the spotlight, but for 43 years he was always there when he was needed. After all his long years of service, it is an honor to recognize his accomplishments before the Senate. Mr. President, September 26 was declared Richard Johnson Day in Baltic, and he was named parade marshal for the Baltic Homecoming Parade held that same day. As part of the celebration, 14 of the 18 fire chiefs Richard served under during those 43 years came to honor him—a testament to the respect Richard earned during his years with the department.

I wish Richard the best as he begins his retirement, and hope that he has many happy years together with his friends and his family.