

can walk down to Union Station, go to any train station in America, and pile on with a bag. You can get off at any station and leave your bag on the train. Nobody will know the difference.

We have an absolute responsibility in the Senate to be rapid in resolving this question of train security just as we are trying to resolve this question of airline security.

A lot of these ideas have been around for a long time. We have always had the ugly head of bureaucracy raising its objections for one reason or another against common sense. We are not even looking for the amount of money that almost every poll in the country has said the American people are prepared to spend. Ask anybody. Ask any of the families in New York, or in Washington, or any part of this country who suffered a loss on September 11, what they would be willing to pay on any ticket to guarantee that they knew their loved ones were safe. We are talking about a few dollars per ticket to be able to guarantee that we have the strongest capacity and never again have an incident in the air, certainly because we weren't prepared to do what was necessary.

There is no more urgent business before the Senate today. I hope the Senate will quickly restore itself as it was in the last few weeks to be able to discard ideology, discard politics, and discard sort of the baggage of past years to be able to find the unity and the common sense that have guided us these days and which have made the Nation proud. We need to do what provides the greatest level of security in our country, and that means a Federal system of screeners, and most of those people responsible for access to our aircraft and other forms of travel.

I yield the floor.

MILLIKEN JOINS HALL OF FAME FOR TEXTILES

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, on September 10, Roger Milliken, a distinguished American, was inducted as a charter member of the Textile Hall of Fame in Lowell, MA.

Roger Milliken has long been a leader in the textile industry and his induction as a charter member of the Textile Hall of Fame was well-deserved. But Roger Milliken is far more than an outstanding American industry leader. He is a true patriot, and his love of country constantly manifests itself in countless ways.

Roger Milliken's genuine commitment to the health of the American economy is unfailing and unyielding. It is typical of his nature and his fidelity to his country that he used the occasion of his induction into the Textile Hall of Fame to sound a warning about the continuing erosion of the U.S. manufacturing base—and the hollowing-out of the U.S. economy—by the displacement of solid manufacturing jobs in America to low-wage paying countries all over the world.

You see, Roger Milliken has steadfastly supported keeping American manufacturing strong but too often, his wise counsel has gone unheeded by the so-called "trade experts."

But make no mistake, in the name of globalization, our trade policy is, in fact, encouraging overproduction, as subsidized foreign industries flood the global market and bring prices in this country below the cost of domestic production.

The economic threat has been eating away at our manufacturing base slowly but surely. In this year alone, the malignancy will result in the loss of 1 million American manufacturing jobs. In the U.S. textile industry, more than 600,000 jobs have been lost since NAFTA and the Uruguay Round's Agreement on Textiles and Clothing became effective in 1995.

Sadly, precious little attention is being paid to the real victims of this trade policy: the small towns and medium-sized cities throughout America devastated by plant closings and job losses. The textile and apparel industry in the South is only one part of the tragedy. The same can be said of the auto industry, the steel industry, and even the high-tech semiconductor industry in California.

Roger Milliken's eloquent statement on behalf of American manufacturing rings clear, and it merits the attention of the Senate. I therefore ask that excerpts from the Milliken statement—entitled "The Wealth of Nations: U.S. Manufacturing in Serious Trouble" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WEALTH OF NATIONS: U.S. MANUFACTURING IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

(By Roger Milliken)

Today almost all of the manufacturing industries in the United States are in serious trouble. I would like to take this time and this place to light a fire of debate on the serious consequences of that statement on the future of our country. . . .

Thanks to Thomas Edison's invention of the electric light, our industry learned in World War I that textile machinery could run at night as well as during 12-hour day-time-only shifts.

At the end of that war, we found ourselves with 18 million spindles in place north of the Mason-Dixon line and 18 million spindles south of the Mason-Dixon line, all of which could be run around the clock. Our production capacity had been doubled.

Seventy years later, 1990, after a long period of fair competition, we found ourselves with 18 million modernized, surviving spindles in the South and 800,000 in the North, producing more products and higher quality than the 36 million spindles after World War I.

Today we are told that during that period the U.S. went from an agrarian economy to an industrial economy and that we are now similarly transitioning to an information-based economy.

As I see it, the main thing wrong with that comparison is that in the first transition our country did not lose either the farms or the products of those farms. In fact, agricultural production increased as new technologies

were introduced. Today, our country continues to produce a surplus of agricultural goods.

During the current transition, the U.S. is losing both its manufacturing plants and the products manufactured in them, as well as the jobs they provide—thus putting at risk our leadership position as the strongest manufacturing economy in the world.

GLOBALIZATION'S FATAL FLAWS

Our founding fathers, specifically Alexander Hamilton, understood the importance of manufacturing. The second act of the First Congress imposed tariffs on manufactured goods from abroad. This encouraged our new nation, and its people, to develop our own manufacturing base rather than merely exporting low-value raw materials to our former colonial masters and importing back from them the high value-added finished goods. . . .

Now as our country stands alone as the world's last remaining superpower, we in textiles and almost all of U.S. manufacturing find ourselves at risk of losing what our forefathers fought so hard to create. This is neither necessary nor wise.

. . . At the current rate, we may end this decade with as few as seven economically viable manufacturing industries remaining in America.

A recent survey of manufacturing revealed that 36 of our 44 existing manufacturing industries had an adverse balance of trade and had cut substantial numbers of jobs this year. The hemorrhage continues.

All U.S. manufacturing employment is shrinking at a pace which will eliminate 1 million high-paying, middle-class jobs this year alone. This is four times what we lost in the year 2000. Actual employment levels in our vitally important manufacturing sector have already fallen to levels last seen in 1963.

We are in an era of so-called globalization, and everyone talks about the new economy. We have been lured into thinking that the negative aspects of these trends are both unstoppable and inexorable.

Isn't it our leaders' responsibility to ensure that this country and its people survive this period of stress and prosperity?

A fatal flaw of the current idea of globalization is the lack of recognition that subsidized global production creates a strong incentive to create overproduction that outstrips global demand.

A further flaw is the lack of recognition that in emerging economies the people and manufacturing production workers are not paid enough to buy what they make. Instead, the fruits of their labor are subsidized and shipped to the United States, which serves as the market of first and last resort.

In the process, our standard of living is undermined, and both political and economic instability is increased. . . .

Mounting consumer debt helped fuel the boom of the 1990s. Despite strong productivity growth, the 80 percent of our country's wage earners and their families who work for others have not seen an increase in their real income over the past 20 years.

As increase in purchasing power stagnated because of the massive shifts of good, well-paying jobs to low-cost emerging economies, we continued our growth of consumer spending, but we did it on credit. Consequently, the American consumers have been spending more than their earnings at the expense of savings. The result is that we are consuming a billion dollars more in manufactured goods each day than we produce. These facts are a prescription for social, political and economic unrest.

Our manufacturing base is being eroded as dollars are diverted from wealth creation to wealth consumption. If economic history has

any lesson for us, it is that a nation's well-being is determined by what it produces, not by how much it consumes.

ALTAR OF FREE AND UNFETTERED TRADE

While technologies always present new opportunities and challenges, globalism is not a new idea. It was born around the time of Columbus, and most of world politics has been about how to control it ever since. Past and present administrations in Washington seem to think globalization is something new for which the lessons of history are irrelevant.

George Santayana is quoted as saying, "Those who can't remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

A Spanish leader in 1675 bragged about Spain's trade deficit, asserting "all the world's manufacturing serves her and she serves nobody." However, when its gold and silver ran out, Spain found that its industrial development had withered; it had only debts to show for its orgy of manufactured imports and consumption. That Spanish empire collapsed, and those countries who had expanded their manufacturing capabilities by selling to Spain were the new world powers.

Thus it also was with the later demise of the Dutch empire and subsequently the great British Empire, "upon which the sun never set."

Beguiled by the siren songs of banking, insurance, shipping and services, they ultimately surrendered their world pre-eminence as nations. The Spanish, Dutch and British had all neglected their nations' manufacturing bases.

Could this happen to the U.S.A.? Or more to the point, is it happening?

I believe the process is already under way, and if we continue sacrificing our manufacturing base on the altar of free and unfettered trade, we will go the way of others.

I believe it is happening because our leaders in Washington remain unconcerned about our near three trillion dollars of accumulated debt flowing from the dramatic growth of our adverse balance of trade. In the span of the last dozen years, we have gone from being the world's largest creditor nation to being its largest debtor nation. And no end and no limits are in sight. . . .

Lester Thurow, of MIT fame, in his book "The Future of Capitalism" (1996) said: "If there is one rule of international economics, it is that no country can run a large trade deficit forever. Trade deficits need to be financed, and it is simply impossible to borrow enough to keep up with the compound interest. Yet all the world trade, especially that on the Pacific Rim, depends upon most of this world being able to run trade surpluses with the United States that will allow them to pay for their trade deficits with Japan. When the lending to America stops, and it will stop, what happens to current world trade flows?"

BANKRUPTING RACE TO THE BOTTOM

I believe that in a world where the American standard of living, as well as power, is being daily challenged, our political leaders in Washington must defend the economic base upon which Americans depend for their security and their livelihoods.

Our leaders cannot expect to keep the public trust if they abdicate their responsibilities to the electorate by making decisions to placate bankers and Wall Street-pressured corporate managers who exhibit diminishing national concerns.

Everyone forgets that when Adam Smith called his seminal work on economics "The Wealth of Nations," he was arguing against the notion that trade was the source of national wealth when, to the contrary, he was arguing that domestic manufacturing was the true source of national wealth.

In his hierarchy of economic activity, agriculture came first because of the need to feed the people; a strong domestic manufacturing base was second as the core of national growth; trade was rated third in importance, and was to be used only to acquire resources or luxuries not available at home.

Smith understood that those nations who focus on trade to the neglect of domestic manufacturing industry may be enriching themselves but may also be doing the country great harm.

"The beginning of wisdom on trade, and indeed all economic policy, is to understand that the purposes of a national economy are to enrich all its people, to strengthen its families, its communities and thereby stabilize society. The economy should serve us, not the other way around."

My friend the late Sir James Goldsmith understood this imperative. He also understood that the U.S. economy—and the world economy itself—cannot be returned to a sustainable course unless we redress the recent massive global imbalances between consumption and growing overproduction. He recognized that only one basic approach to globalization could accomplish this goal.

He proposed that the United States make clear to its trading partners, and its own multinational companies, that if their products are to be sold in the United States, they must be made substantially in the United States.

As Sir James argued: "America should use its matchless market power to ensure that foreign and American corporations become good corporate citizens of the United States. They should bring us their capital and their technologies and invest in the U.S.A. This would require them to hire workers in the U.S., pay American wages, pay U.S. taxes, preserve the environment, ensure human rights, and compete on the level playing field that does exist among the 50 states. . . ."

They should be reminded that since the American market is by far the most important in the world, entry is not a right, but a privilege. In other words, there should be a price and a reward for doing business in the United States—making meaningful, long-term contributions to America's continued security and prosperity, and preserving the global environment.

Only then can we make sure we are engaging our people in a race to the top, in living standards; economic stability; quality of life; and personal security—not in a bankrupting race to the bottom. . . .

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, just for purposes of making an announcement, there have been a number of Senators who have contacted Senator DASCHLE and myself asking about next week's schedule. We will have a Tuesday morning vote. So everyone should understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

THE AVIATION SECURITY BILL

Mr. DURBIN. First, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of S. 1447, the Aviation Security Act.

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

AFTER SEPTEMBER 11

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, since September 11 there has been such a flood of emotions in America over the events of that day. I think all of us have been transformed by the experience and transformed by some of our fellow Americans and what they have said and what they have done.

Some of the things that have been written are extraordinary. In just one moment, I am going to submit for the RECORD one that I think is exceptional, a piece from the BusinessWeek magazine of October 1, 2001, by a writer named Bruce Nussbaum entitled, "Real Masters Of The Universe." I will not read the entire article, but I will submit it for the RECORD. I would like to quote a few sentences from it. He said some things with which I agree and I think help to put our experience into some perspective:

A subtle shift in the American zeitgeist took place on Sept. 11. It's hard to define, and it may not last. But on the day of the World Trade Center cataclysm, the country changed. Big, beefy working-class guys became heroes once again, replacing the tele-genetic financial analysts and techno-billionaires who once had held the Nation in thrall. Uniforms and public service became "in." Real sacrifice and real courage were on graphic display.

Maybe it was the class reversals that were so revealing. Men and women making 40 grand a year working for the city responding—risking their own lives—to save investment bankers and traders making 10 times that amount. And dying by the hundreds for their effort. The image of self-sacrifice by civil servants in uniform was simply breathtaking.

For Americans conditioned in the '90s to think of oneself first, to be rich above all else, to accumulate all the good material things, to take safety and security for granted, this was a new reality. So was the contrast of genuine bravery to the faux values of reality TV shows such as Survivor.

He concludes:

Tragedy has the power to transform us. But rarely is the transformation permanent. People and societies revert back to the norm. But what is the "norm" for America? Where are this nation's true values? Have we stripped too much away in recent years in order to make us lean and mean for the race to riches? It is hard to look at the images of the World Trade Center rescue again and again. At least once, however, we should look at what the rescuers are teaching us, about what matters—and who.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From BusinessWeek, Oct. 1, 2001]

REAL MASTERS OF THE UNIVERSE

(By Bruce Nussbaum)

A subtle shift in the American zeitgeist took place on Sept. 11. It's hard to define, and it may not last. But on the day of the World Trade Center cataclysm, the country changed. Big, beefy working-class guys became heroes once again, replacing the tele-genetic financial analysts and techno-billionaires who once had held the nation in thrall. Uniforms and public service became "in." Real sacrifice and real courage were on graphic display.