

educational excellence will take time. There is no simple solution and gimmicky short-term fads, like those offered by this Administration, will not lead to long-term success. The Republican party is dedicated to a sustained long-term effort to assure that every child in America receives not just an education, but a quality education. In our global economy, it is no longer good enough to be adequate. We must be outstanding.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

BIOTECHNOLOGY AND TRADE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words today about biotechnology and trade. As a working family farmer, I see the effects of this debate nearly every week at the grain elevators in my hometown of New Hartford, Iowa.

With the benefit of this personal experience, and as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee's International Trade Subcommittee, I have addressed the issue of biotechnology and trade in many ways.

Last October, my Trade Subcommittee looked at the biotechnology issue during hearings on agricultural trade policy. Last fall, I brought Charles Ludolph, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Europe, to Iowa to hear the concerns our corn and soybean growers have about the European food scare over GMO products. Last December, I addressed this issue at the WTO Ministerial Conference Meeting in Seattle.

And I have continued to have high-level discussions about trade in genetically modified foods with the European Commission. I recently had another meeting in this city with David Byrne, the EU Commissioner for Consumer Health and Safety Protection. This was a very informative meeting. If followed a lengthy session I had with Commissioner Byrne in Seattle.

In our Washington meeting, Commissioner Byrne and I discussed recent developments affecting trade and biotechnology within the European Union.

It is with this deep background, and my long-standing concern about biotechnology and trade, that I would like to report to the people of Iowa and America that I still have great concerns about what we are seeing in Europe, and now in Japan.

For nearly 30 years, Europe's governments have been telling their people that modern agricultural technology is

dangerous. First, it was the pesticide scare of the 1970s. Even though we have added eight years to our life spans since we started widely spraying modern pesticides on our crops. Then it was growth hormones in meat. Even though European scientists have confirmed the safety of these hormones. Now it's genetically modified foods. Even though not one person has ever caught so much as a cold from eating a genetically enriched product.

Now we learn that just last week, Japan's Ministry of Health and Welfare is getting set to require mandatory safety tests on genetically modified foods before they can be imported into Japan. This will dramatically and adversely affect our farmers, who ship about \$10 billion worth of products a year to Japan. Every year, Japan relies on United States production for 80 percent of its corn imports.

Japan is taking this action even though genetically modified products produced in the United States must be approved by a food regulatory agency that the world looks to as the model for what a food safety agency should do.

And both the Japanese and the European Union governments know that genetically modified foods are only approved for sale after thousands of field trials and rigorous testing.

So what's going on?

Mr. President, I am convinced that a good part of these developments can be explained by a desire to restrain trade. Non-tariff trade barriers we've been fighting to eliminate for 50 years. Agricultural producers in Europe, and in Japan, can't grow corn, or soybeans, or many other products more efficiently, at better prices, than we can. So they look for other means to counter the competitive edge we enjoy.

After the United States and our trading partners agreed to the Agreement on Agriculture, one of the Uruguay Round Agreements, it is more difficult now to use quotas, tariffs, and subsidies to favor domestic producers.

So fear is used instead.

Mr. President, it was a Democrat President, Franklin Roosevelt, who said, "The only thing we have to fear is, fear itself." As far as biotechnology is concerned, the only thing Europe, and now Japan, have to offer is fear. It's how the Europeans have protected their domestic agricultural markets from American competition for 30 years.

Just look at the comment by Germany's environment minister, Jürgen Trittin, when the European Commission proposed a redrafting of the legislation governing the admission of genetically modified products into the EU. Just as they planned it, this new European Union legislation has the effect of slowing the approval of new U.S. genetically modified products in Europe to a trickle. The German minister

was elected. He hailed this legislation as a "de facto moratorium."

And if it's not the case that the Europeans, and now Japan, are using fear as a new trade barrier, why is it that these governments, and the antibiotechnology activists who are so worried about the impact of genetically modified foods, seem completely unconcerned about biotechnology in medicine? Is it because they really know that medical uses of biotechnology are completely safe?

I don't want to give the impression that all of this consumer fear has been whipped up just to restrain trade. There is always legitimate concern about new technology, especially in food.

But in my view, the unprecedented safety record of our food regulatory system completely eliminates this concern.

And it appears that Europe's governments have overplayed the extent of consumer concern. A recent poll of 16,000 Europeans by the European Commission's own Environment Directorate found that Europe's citizens are less concerned about GMOs than they are over other environmental issues. When asked to rank their chief environmental concerns on a list of nine issues, GMOs finished ninth, in last place.

There is also another dimension to this issue you don't hear the antibiotech activists talk about. That is the fact that we can now prove that biotechnology is the most powerful tool for good that our researchers have ever had.

Right now, some 400 million people currently suffer from Vitamin A deficiency, including millions of children who go blind every year. A new genetically-enhanced form of rice containing beta-carotene, called "golden rice," will mean these children will not be cruelly robbed of their sight.

Another form of "golden rice" included genes to overcome the chronic iron deficiency suffered by 2 billion people in rice cultures. Women have always been subject to extra risk from birth complications because of anemia.

What are the terrible risks in our food approval system that would justify blinding children, or subjecting Asian women to birth complications? The answer is simple: there are none. There is just the politics of fear.

Because biotechnology is such a great force for good, this must change. What can we do about it? I don't have all the answers. But I do know this. We have got to talk about finding a worldwide solution. And we can only do that if the United States leads.

Right now, the Quad Countries—the United States, the European Union, Japan, and Canada—lack a coherent vision for how to address the biotechnology issue. This is largely because the senior Quad partner, the