

This is always a fundamental question, particularly for those of us who represent rural states.

As a Montanan, it is hard to talk about international trade without thinking about agriculture. Over the years, U.S. agriculture has undergone enormous changes, for reasons that are much broader than globalization. The U.S., as a whole, has changed dramatically. Where we live, where we work, the things we make, the technology we use to make things—all of these have changed since our parents' time.

We need a rural America that is not only stable and prosperous; we need a rural America that is compatible in the long-term with a 21st century characterized by mobility and rapid technological advancement. We need a farm economy that is highly adaptive and aggressively focused on competitiveness.

To accomplish this, we need sweeping changes in several areas. We will need more agricultural research—an area suffering from an appalling decline in federal support. We will need a farm policy that facilitates, rather than simply underwrites, the farm economy.

And we will need a vigilant search for new and growing markets.

Of course, many of these needs are beyond the ken of trade policy, but the search for new markets is not. That is why fundamentally we need a strategy that embraces the global trading system.

For the U.S. to remain a superpower in agriculture, we must see the world as it is, not as it used to be. That means we need to focus our attention on global negotiations that will create real fairness in agriculture trade. I share the concern of many about a trade policy agenda that focuses too much attention on bilateral agreements, at the expense of our broader efforts in the World Trade Organization.

Yet, in the trend toward globalization, the industrial world is moving ahead. We should not allow agriculture to be left behind. Leaving agriculture behind in the 20th century trading regime would be disastrous for U.S. farmers, if for no other reason than they are, on the whole, the most productive and technologically advanced in the world. A globalized economy and its institutions are the only forum in which American farmers' technological advantage is most powerful. American agriculture must move ahead to prosper.

We cannot shut agriculture out of the globalizing process. We cannot settle for the status quo, hoping that it will sustain us indefinitely. As the rest of the world's agricultural producers rapidly develop, we cannot hide behind high tariffs and high subsidies.

The U.S. represents only 5 percent of the world's consumers. Yet, in commodity after commodity, we produce far more than Americans can consume. That is true of beef and wheat, for example. And demand from our own 5 percent will likely grow much more

slowly than demand from the other 95 percent. There are only so many steaks any one well-fed American can eat. But in the developing world, demand for food still has much room to grow. The more their wealth grows, the more that consumption patterns will shift from low-cost, starchy foods to high-value sources of protein such as beef and wheat.

We are faced, then, with a simple choice: Either we try to turn back the clock to a time of inferior technology and a more insular world or we seek greater access to the markets of the other 95 percent of the world. The choice is clear.

As a nation, we have embarked on a policy of opening markets. This is a wise policy and a sound one. The fruit of this effort should be more and higher-paying jobs for U.S. workers, more abundant choices for our consumers, and greater markets for our farmers and ranchers.

Yet, if we are going to sell our products overseas, then we have to engage global markets. And we can't do that in a vacuum. This means negotiating trade agreements and fighting the distortions—such as high tariffs and high subsidies—that other countries use to undermine our competitiveness. In that fight, we have no better ally than Australia.

At the heart of the matter, engaging global markets means opening doors. And we won't succeed in opening doors to other markets if we won't open our own. We can't insist that China, Thailand, Taiwan, and Japan open their markets to our products, if we aren't also willing to open our markets to theirs. And I can't insist that Ambassador Zoellick accommodate my concerns in a free trade agreement, if I am not willing to offer my support in return.

When Ambassador Zoellick announced the administration's intention to negotiate a free trade agreement, many of us harbored concerns that he would negotiate a far different agreement than the one we have before us today. But the protections that American negotiators built into this agreement are strong. And I congratulate the Trade Representative's office for its skill in negotiating such a tough agreement.

Mr. President, I will support the U.S.-Australia free trade agreement. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that this agreement is implemented fairly. And I look forward to working with the U.S. Trade Representative to make sure that all trade agreements are the best possible deal for Montana.

This is the time for engaging our allies and for opening the door to new markets. This is the time for planting the seeds of a greater world trade system. As the American farmer has done down through the centuries, we should labor today for a future of growth.

RECOGNIZING THE PROFESSIONALISM OF MS. CAROL MADONNA

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I recognize the efforts of Ms. Carol Madonna, a Brookings Institution LEGIS fellow, who has been a tremendous asset to me and my office during the past 18 months. Over the past year and a half, Carol has assisted me with fulfilling my responsibilities as a member of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs. She has worked many long hours to address issues of concern to our men and women in the military, veterans, and Federal employees.

Mr. President, Carol Madonna is an excellent example of a dedicated Federal employee. She is always willing to pitch in and provide assistance. She is a very quick learner and an extremely hard worker. She adapts quickly to changing circumstances and is always responsive to situations. From early bird breakfasts with Pentagon officials to late vote evenings in the Senate, Carol was an invaluable member of my legislative staff and a quick study on the diverse and competing priorities that arise in the Senate on a regular basis. Her professionalism and dedication to getting the job done reflects well on the Defense Supply Center-Philadelphia, an agency within the Defense Logistics Agency, where Carol has been employed for the past 22 years.

Mr. President, Carol Madonna has many accomplishments that are worthy of mention. She is most proud, however, of her two sons, Dan Madonna, a teacher in Philadelphia, and Lee Madonna, who is about to receive his Associate's Degree from Delaware County Community College. As much as my staff and I will miss Carol, we wish her well as she joins her family in Philadelphia, and thank her for her wonderful service to the people of Hawaii and this great Nation.

EMPTY WORDS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column "Empty Words" by Frank Gaffney, which appears in today's Washington Times, be printed in the RECORD. I believe that this piece appropriately emphasizes the crucial role continued research plays in maintaining the credible nuclear deterrent of the United States. As more information becomes available regarding covert nuclear programs in North Korea and Iran, the sustainability and credibility of America's nuclear arsenal is of paramount concern.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, June 15, 2004]

EMPTY WORDS

(By Frank J. Gaffney Jr.)

The U.S. Senate gets back to work today after a week of bipartisan mourning of Ronald Reagan and tributes to his security policy legacy. It is fitting that the first orders

of business will be votes on amendments to repudiate two of the initiatives most central to the Gipper's foreign and defense policy success: the maintenance of a credible and safe nuclear deterrent, and protection of Americans against missile attack.

The first effort to reduce last week's Reagan endorsements to empty words will be led by some of the Senate's most liberal Democrats, notably Sens. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and Dianne Feinstein of California. They seek to preclude the United States from even researching new nuclear weapons, let alone testing or deploying them.

Ronald Reagan hated nuclear weapons as much as anybody. What is more, he seriously worked to rid the world of them. Yet, unlike these legislators, President Reagan understood—until that day—this country must have effective nuclear forces. He was convinced there was no better way to discourage the hostile use of nuclear weapons against us than by ensuring a ready and credible deterrent.

Toward that end, Mr. Reagan comprehensively modernized America's strategic forces, involving both new weapons and an array of delivery systems. He built two types of intermediate-range nuclear missiles and deployed them to five Western European countries. And, not least, he recognized our deterrent posture depended critically upon a human and physical infrastructure that could design, test, build and maintain the nation's nuclear arsenal. Without such support, America would inexorably be disarmed.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that, but for Mr. Reagan's nuclear modernization efforts—most of them over the strenuous objections of senators like Mr. Kennedy and John Kerry—we may well not have a viable nuclear deterrent today. Even with his legacy, 15 years of policies more in keeping with the anti-nuclear "freeze" movement's nostrums than Mr. Reagan's philosophy of "peace through strength" have undermined the deterrent by creeping obsolescence, growing uncertainty about its reliability and safety and loss of infrastructure to ensure its future effectiveness.

This is especially worrisome since some of the research in question would explore whether a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) could be developed to penetrate deep underground before detonating. Such a capability would allow us to hold at risk some of the 10,000 concealed and hardened command-and-control bunkers, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) production and storage facilities and other buried high-value targets built by potential adversaries.

If anything, the absence of a credible American capability to attack such targets may have contributed to rogue states' massive investment in these facilities over the past 15 years. One thing is clear: Our restraint in taking even modest steps to modernize our nuclear deterrent—for example, by designing an RNEP or new, low-yield weapons—has certainly not prevented others from trying to "get the Bomb."

There is no more reason—Sens. Kennedy, Kerry and Feinstein's arguments to the contrary notwithstanding—to believe continuing our unilateral restraint will discourage our prospective enemies' proliferation in the future.

Last September, the Senate recognized this reality, rejecting an earlier Feinstein-Kennedy amendment by a vote of 53-41. Five Democrats—Sens. Evan Bayh of Indiana, Fritz Hollings of South Carolina, Zell Miller of Georgia, Ben Nelson of Nebraska and Bill Nelson of Florida—joined virtually every Republican in permitting nuclear weapons research, with the proviso further congressional approval would be required prior to

development and production. The prudence of this is even more evident today in light of revelations of covert Iranian and North Korean nuclear activity since last fall.

The other assault on the Reagan legacy will be led by Democratic Sens. Carl Levin of Michigan and Jack Reed of Rhode Island. They hope to strip more than \$500 million from defense authorization legislation that would buy anti-missile interceptors, the direct descendant of Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

Just last week, former Gorbachev spokesman Gennadi Gerasimov, reminded the world how mistaken those like Sen. Carl Levin, Michigan Democrat, were when they ridiculed and tried to undermine the Reagan missile defense program: "I see President Reagan as a gravedigger of the Soviet Union and the spade that he used to prepare this grave was SDI."

Today, there are published reports the U.N. Security Council has been briefed by its inspectors that ballistic missiles and WMD components were slipped out of Iraq before Saddam Hussein was toppled. Such weapons, like some of the thousands of other short-range missiles in arsenals around the world, could find their way into terrorists hands and be launched at this country from ships off our shores.

Can there be any doubt but that Ronald Reagan—faced with today's threat of missile attack and the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction—would have been any less resolute in building missile defenses and maintaining our nuclear deterrent than he was in the 1980s? If last week's praise for his visionary leadership two decades ago was not dishonest rhetoric, it should inspire, and guide us all now.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2002

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, since the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, BCRA, became law, many of its detractors have mistakenly argued that it is ineffective and unworkable. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Washington Post, an article from the Wall Street Journal, and an article by Anthony Corrado, a visiting Fellow at The Brookings Institution, be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. As these articles describe, BCRA is having exactly the effect intended. Furthermore, as Mr. Corrado points out, BCRA did not serve as the death knell for America's political parties; their fundraising remains strong.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 2004]

REPUBLICAN 'SOFT MONEY' GROUPS FIND BUSINESS RELUCTANT TO GIVE
(By Thomas B. Edsall)

Republican operatives attempting to compete with Democratic groups for large sums of unregulated presidential campaign funds have run into a number of roadblocks, including reluctance on the part of many corporations to contribute to new independent groups.

The Federal Election Commission last month cleared the way for liberal groups to continue raising millions of dollars of unrestricted contributions, and now GOP groups that have held back are joining in. But in a sign of the problems GOP leaders are encoun-

tering, one of the key Republican groups, Progress for America, failed in its bid to recruit James Francis Jr. to become chairman.

Francis ran the Bush 2000 campaign's "Pioneer" program, which produced 246 men and women who each raised at least \$100,000. PFA organizers sought out Francis because his close ties to the administration would have lent enormous clout and prestige.

"It gets down to, 'What does it look like?' And it might not look like I was independent," Francis said, adding that he could have complied with laws requiring total separation from the Bush campaign, but critics would still have raised questions.

Meanwhile, election law lawyers said corporations are showing significant reluctance to get back into making "soft money" donations after passage of the McCain-Feingold law that went into effect on Nov. 6, 2002.

Unlike political committees regulated by the FEC, "527s"—named for the section of the tax code that governs their activities—have no restrictions on the sources or amount of contributions, and some have received gifts of \$5 million or more. Republicans, encountering corporate unwillingness to give to GOP 527s and seeking to capitalize on the Bush campaign's unprecedented fundraising success, urged the FEC to clamp down on the these groups' activities.

"I would say that on the whole the corporate business community has been very reluctant to support 527s," said GOP lawyer Jan W. Baran.

Kenneth A. Gross, an election lawyer, said he has told his corporate clients "to proceed with caution." Prospective donors of soft money should be sure to get affirmative statements that the organization asking for money will not coordinate activities with federal candidates in violation of the law, and that the organization will abide by the rules governing political communications, he said.

Overall, pro-Democratic 527 organizations have raised at least \$106.6 million, according to PoliticalMoneyLine, three times the \$33.6 million raised by pro-Republican groups in this election cycle.

The Democratic advantage disappears, however, when these figures are added to the amounts raised by the national party committees and the presidential campaigns. Then the GOP pulls far ahead, \$557.6 million to \$393.6 million.

Lobbyist and former House member Bill Paxon, who is vice president of the Leadership Forum, a Republican 527, acknowledged that the GOP 527 effort will not be able to match the Democrats'.

Paxon said donations in the \$25,000 to \$50,000 range have started to come in from at least a dozen corporations, including Pfizer Inc., Union Pacific Corp., Bell South Corp. and International Paper Inc. In 2002, those four companies gave far more to Republican Party committees, more than \$2.6 million.

"We don't expect to be posting huge numbers at the end of this filing," covering the period through the end of June, Paxon said, "but we have laid the groundwork."

Democrats have set up at least seven new 527 organizations. These groups are on track to raise \$175 million to \$300 million for "independent" issue ads and get-out-the-vote activities.

Financier George Soros, Progressive Corp. Chairman Peter B. Lewis and Hollywood writer-producer Stephen L. Bing have each given more than \$7 million to such groups as the Media Fund, America Coming Together and MoveOn.org, which are working to defeat President Bush.

Privately, organizers of the Republican 527s said they have been banking on an outpouring of corporate support to defray start-up costs and to get their programs up and