obligations and stop wrongly protecting its air service markets before a new treaty can be discussed.

Other countries faced with that same decision overwhelmingly have chosen progress. Over the past 2 years, over 20 nations have signed more liberal aviation accords with the United States. No wonder. The economic benefits flowing from an opening of air service opportunities can be enormous. Our recent phased-in open skies agreement with Canada dramatically makes this point. Since that signing, the United States-Canada aviation market has generated an additional 1 million passengers and a remarkable $2 billion in economic activity on both sides of the border. In terms of enhanced consumer choice, nearly 50 city-pair markets have received first time scheduled service and another 14 city-pair markets have received additional competition. These benefits will surely grow as the remaining barriers are phased out. In fact, the United States Department of Transportation estimates from 1995 through 2000, the cumulative economic benefits of this accord to both countries will be $15 billion.

In contrast, some countries such as France have chosen protectionism thereby foregoing the economic benefits of further liberalization. While air service markets around France have grown significantly in recent years as those countries have opened their markets, the French air service market has been stagnant. In fact, last year combined passenger traffic at the two major Paris airports fell nearly 1 percent. Is it any wonder Air France has accumulated losses totaling $3.3 billion since 1990, and continues to have operating costs among the highest in the world? As the French experience unmistakably shows, in today's global economy a protectionist air service policy is economic folly.

Fortunately, most countries are rejecting the protectionist path. For instance, most recently 18 member economies of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] organization voted specifically to add aviation to the list of core industries designated for liberalization, and the European Union has been given a limited mandate by member States to negotiate an open skies agreement with the United States. Nevertheless, there are major United States trading partners in addition to France, such as Japan and the United Kingdom, that continue to resist change.

Madam President, in Japan's case the reasons are evident. For nearly two decades cost inefficiency has caused Japanese carriers to become less competitive and to lose their market share even on Asian and Pacific routes that are not open to significant competition. Japan's chief aviation policy makers at the Ministry of Transportation [MOT] have responded to the challenge negatively, creating operational obstacles for U.S. carriers and demanding increasingly restrictive limitations on its originally open 1952 Air Transport Agreement with the United States.

And therein lies the heart of the problem confronting the United States delegation in the aviation talks. The issue is both philosophical and economic. Japan is convinced its airlines cannot compete for Asian markets whose annual passenger volume is expected to triple—and account for more than half the world's traffic—by 2010. The United States, on the other hand, has to be concerned that, as the Economic Strategy Institute concluded recently, the loss of its competitive aviation presence in the booming Asia-Pacific market would cost this country $5 billion in trade receipts annually and hundreds of thousands of United States jobs. Incredibly, the MOT's approach—in contradiction to the Japanese Government's stated goal in virtually all other sectors—is to eliminate competition from highly cost-efficient United States airlines. In pursuit of this short-sighted policy, the MOT has threatened sanctions to penalize carriers that are only exercising their rights. Thus, Japan is caught in a trap. The restrictions it has imposed over the years have prevented its airlines from becoming more efficient, and now the MOT believes it has to protect them if they are to compete in Asia.

Nonetheless, to the United States, the MOT's intransigence poses a series of inescapable dilemmas. It cannot ignore Japan's refusal to abide by the 1952 agreement without setting a very dangerous precedent for all of our other international agreements. It cannot concede more treaty modifications or restrictions without surrendering the few rights left to United States carriers and accepting Japanese control over the United States presence in many United States/Asian aviation markets. It cannot stand passively by while Japanese carriers expand service in those very same markets to which United States carriers are wrongly denied access. And, ultimately, the United States cannot yield to Japan's protectionist policy without abandoning its long-standing commitment to the principle that open competition in a free market environment is the only way to advance the best interests of consumers, countries, communities, and carriers that together shape a global and interdependent economy.

Thus far, United States negotiators are standing firm in defending that critically important principle despite intense pressure exerted by Japan directly and indirectly. As the talks proceed, our representatives deserve our complete support. We can hope only that their efforts will lead to Japan's realization that protectionism is inevitably an obsolete trading weapon capable of serving no one but of causing great harm.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1903. An act to designate the bridge, estimated to be completed in the year 2000, that replaces the bridge on Missouri highway 74 spanning from East Girardeau, Illinois, to Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the ''Bill Emerson Memorial Bridge,'' and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The message also announced that the Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Resolution 459, appoints to Funeral Committee of the late Hon. Bill Emerson the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CLAY of Missouri, Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia, Mr. GEPHARDT of Missouri, Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON of Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER of Missouri, Mr. HANCOCK of Missouri, Ms. DANNER of Missouri, Mr. TALENT of Missouri, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MONTGOMERY of Mississippi, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER of California, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. WOLF of Virginia, Mr. KANJORSKI of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNULTY of New York, Mr. POSHARD of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. LINCOLN of Arkansas, Mr. CHAMBLISS of Georgia, Mrs. CUBIN of Wyoming, and Mr. LATHAM of Iowa.

At 2:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3525) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the Federal jurisdiction over offenses relating to damage to religious property.

At 8:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in