

That job is now. That is our responsibility as a Congress. I urge my colleagues to work with the Senators from Louisiana and Mississippi. Clearly, the need is real, and no one in any way denies that. But there is a responsibility here, a fundamental responsibility, as we literally send billions upon billions of dollars south to rebuild and reshape and refurbish the economies of those States, that those dollars be spent wisely, that those dollars be spent cautiously, and that no one individual benefit in an extraordinary, abusive, or fraudulent way. That is the responsibility of this Congress that I take most sincerely and I know most of my colleagues do.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleagues, Senators ALEXANDER and BINGAMAN, have been to the floor to describe a publication that has now been provided to all 100 Senators. It is by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine, entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future." They have spoken about this report with justifiable pride. They did instigate some of the best scientific minds to ask and answer the question: Are we losing our scientific edge and what would it mean if we did and what do we do to get it back?

Part of this country's long-term opportunity and the opportunity to create a middle class in a country with an economy unlike any other in the world has been technology, science, knowledge, and education. The question is: Are we losing our edge? The answer in this report is: Yes, we are. Then it describes a number of ways to put together an approach that would deal with that. While I think this is very helpful, it is the first chapter of a rather lengthy book, the book about what is happening in our country. It reminds me of the movie "How Stella Got Her Groove Back." Has America lost its groove?

This country has done so much. This is the country that split the atom, spliced genes. We have been inventive.

We have invented everything: Plastics, the silicon chip, radar. We cured smallpox, polio. We invented the telephone, the computer, television. We built airplanes, learned how to fly them. We built rockets and walked on the moon. Particularly in the last 100 years, America has been extraordinary in what it has done. It is standing on one another's shoulders, looking over the horizon and building and inventing and creating. Has America lost its groove? That is not the title of my remarks, but that was the question that was asked. The answer is in the covers of a lengthy report saying, among other things, we have to change our education system. We have to educate more engineers. It says that the Chinese and the folks from India are educating far more engineers than we are, and that is going to have an impact. We need greater teaching of science in our schools. I don't disagree with any of that. This is a significant contribution to a debate that we should have about new public policy.

But none of this means anything unless we also talk about the conditions under which we are exporting America's jobs and, yes, exporting good jobs, scientific jobs, technical jobs to other countries. If you triple the number of engineers educated in America and then discover that in the country of India you can hire five engineers for every engineer you pay in this country—and we continue to see an exodus of jobs out of this country to two countries, India and China—of what value has been tripling the number of engineers in America?

That brings me to the central point of what I wanted to talk about briefly today, or perhaps not so briefly because it is Friday. Nobody seems to be crowding people here on the floor. What I want to talk about is the issue of international trade and a trade policy that perhaps much more than the issue of losing the edge in science and technology, is injuring this country and pulling the foundation out from under the future of all the kids now in college and high school.

Let me describe some of this with some charts. This is our trade deficit. As you can see, this is a sea of red ink. Year after year we see our trade deficit grows worse and worse. It is now at about \$700-plus billion a year. That means for every single day, 7 days a week, every single day we buy \$2 billion more in goods from other countries than we sell. That means, at the end of the year, we have a trade deficit. This year we expect a trade deficit of about \$750 billion. Add to that the roughly \$550 billion in fiscal policy budget deficits—that is the amount that the Federal debt increased in the last year—and you are talking about a Federal indebtedness of \$1.2 trillion. You would think that people would have an apoplectic seizure about that, understanding its consequences. But we just snore through it all, having pleasant dreams and a soft, little sleep.

Nobody seems to care much. You would at least think that those people who are self-defined conservatives, wearing flinty gray suits and steel rim glasses and having the banker impetus that conservatives used to have, would say: This has to stop. A country can't run a \$1.2 trillion indebtedness and expect to have a better future. But there is dead silence.

The only people who talk about this portion of the deficit are Fritz Hollings—he sat here. He is gone. Fritz left—I have been out here. Senator BYRD has from time to time. Otherwise, there is vast silence.

I want to talk through some of this. I want to tell you about the trade deficit with China because this is almost one-third of our deficit. It is unbelievable what has happened with respect to our bilateral trade relationship with China. I want to also talk to you about China and trade agreements because I think it is at the root of where we are headed. Automobile trade with China is interesting. "Here Come the Really Cheap Cars," says Time magazine.

Chinese pirate companies have long been accused of illegally copying easy stuff such as shoe polish and digital movies. Now General Motors says a Chinese firm knocked off an entire vehicle—and Americans could soon start buying its cars.

Let me tell you a story about Chinese cars. We have this giant trade deficit with China. We have massive numbers of jobs, this giant sucking sound of American jobs rushing to China, to Bangladesh and Indonesia and Mexico but especially China. We negotiate a trade deal with China. This gets to the root of my contention that our trade negotiators are basically incompetent. I don't say that lightly. I say it because it is true. Let me describe the bilateral automobile provisions of trade with China that our country negotiated. We negotiated a bilateral deal and we said: By the way, with respect to the sale and movement of automobiles between China and the United States, here is what we will agree to. We will agree that after a phase-in, any U.S. cars that are sold in China, you can impose a 25-percent tariff on the cars we want to sell in China. And the United States, we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese cars you want to move here.

Our negotiators said to a country with which we have a huge trade deficit: You can impose a tariff that is 10 times higher on American cars we want to sell in China than on Chinese cars they want to sell in America.

Why on Earth would someone agree to that? It is fundamentally unsound. It doesn't make any sense. China has nearly 1.4 billion people. They have 20 million automobiles on the roads. By the year 2020, they will have 120 million cars on the road. That means in the next 15 years, they will add 100 million cars. I can talk about the consequences for oil and energy issues with respect to that, but here is a market with 1.4 billion people for 100 million additional

cars in the next 15 years. It is a country with which we have a large deficit. Our country has said to them: By the way, you charge a tariff that is 10 times higher on U.S. cars we try to sell in China than we will charge on Chinese cars to the United States.

Whoever negotiated that is incompetent and ought to be thrown out of Government immediately. But we can't figure out who did that, so that is what stands.

Here is what is happening on the other side. In China, there is a company called Chery. That is one letter away from Chevy. The Chery company is producing a car called the QQ. The QQ is a car that General Motors says is a rip-off of the production designs, right down to the details, of a car that General Motors was building. So General Motors says the Chinese company has stolen the production design blueprints for a car they now call the QQ.

What are the Chinese about to do? They are about to ramp up a significant automobile export industry, presumably including the QQ, which General Motors says was stolen from them, and we will see Chinese cars on the streets of this country coming in with tariffs one-tenth the rate of the tariffs if we were to try to sell U.S. cars in China—not that there is a big market for U.S. cars in China because China isn't interested in buying too much in terms of American products.

Here is what is happening with respect to bilateral automobile trade with China. It is unbelievably inept for this country to allow this to happen. We should not negotiate trade agreements with countries with which we have a huge deficit and say: Here is another big advantage to sucking jobs out of our country and putting those jobs in China. That makes no sense at all.

The report I referenced a bit ago is a report that talks about science and technology. But it doesn't include the other discussions about the conditions of production around the world. The production, for example, in countries such as Bangladesh and others in which children are employed, in some cases in slavish conditions, locked behind factory doors, working 14 hours a day, 7 days a week. Those are the conditions of production in some areas that U.S. workers are told to compete against. And to the U.S. workers: If you can't compete, you are going to get fired.

Let me describe some examples of that. I have described this at great length because it is such a perfect one, but there are many others. This is Huffy bicycles. Again, I guess repetition is important. Huffy bicycles, they are not made here anymore. They were made by folks from Ohio. They all got fired. They got fired because they were making \$11 an hour making Huffy bicycles, \$11 an hour plus benefits. But that was way too much money, according to the company. So these are all now made in China. You can buy them at Wal-Mart and Sears and Kmart. But

they are not American bikes. They are Chinese bikes. As an aside, the company Huffy has declared bankruptcy so that the people who used to work for Huffy will not get their pensions that were guaranteed by Huffy, and now the American taxpayer, through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, will be picking up that cost.

Here is what happened to Huffy. These people that made Huffy bicycles were making an honest living, enjoyed their work, did a good job, by all accounts. But now they were replaced. They were fired. The new employees make 33 cents an hour producing these bicycles in China. They work 7 days a week, and they work 12 to 14 hours a day. That is how your Huffy bike is produced. The folks who worked in Ohio are having to find other things to do because they made way too much money, \$11 an hour.

We built this country believing that the middle class ought to be able to rise up and get educated and find a good job and be paid well. Now we are told that is a disadvantage. If you are paid well, the company says: Employing you is a huge disadvantage to us. We would sooner employ somebody whom we can pay 33 cents an hour. So we have Huffy bicycles. People say: That is manufacturing. We are going to lose those jobs because it is going to go to people in Bangladesh or China or other areas.

This is a Palm pilot. The last note on that Palm pilot was from a wonderful young woman who did everything you should do. She was an African-American woman who got advanced degrees and did everything one should do. She went into the job market and found a job in Silicon Valley in technology working on the Palm Pilot. But her last job dealing with the Palm Pilot was to train the person from India who was going to take her job. That is right. They brought the replacement over, and then they sent her to India to train the replacement.

Here is what she said on her Palm Pilot on her last day of work, this woman who did a good job, advanced college degrees, did everything you should do. The last message was: "My job's gone to India." Why? Because they could hire folks there for a fraction of the cost. It is about driving down wages. It is about profit, and it is about not caring about American workers.

The message is, if you are making \$11 an hour building bicycles or you are working at Palm pilot, you are making too much. You should be paid Chinese wages. Or wages in India or Sri Lanka or Bangladesh.

Samsonite. Most of us have packed for trips with Samsonite. They sent 1,000 U.S. workers packing. Those jobs went to Mexico. Then when Mexican labor got too expensive, they sent those jobs to China and to Vietnam.

We have all seen the Maytag repairman on television waiting for something to do. Apparently he waited too

long: 1,600 Maytag U.S. jobs gone to Mexico and then Korea.

Fruit of the Loom. We all have seen these television commercials when they get three guys to dress up—kind of goofy guys dressed up like red grapes, green grapes, and even an apple. Fruit of the Loom guys, 3,200 jobs gone.

I know on the day it happened, it was in the Washington Post that they were shutting down all their factories. I said it is one thing to lose your shirt, but Fruit of the Loom is gone, now we've lost our shorts.

The list, of course, is an endless list. The example I have used before is Fig Newton cookies. That was an all-American cookie. Now, if you want Mexican food, go to Monterey, Mexico, because that is where they make Fig Newton cookies.

Etch-a-Sketch? We have all played Etch-a-Sketch. Wal-Mart decided that Etch-a-Sketch had to be sold for under \$10, \$9.99. Therefore the Etch-a-Sketch company had to move to China to hire Chinese workers in order to keep Etch-a-Sketch at \$9.99. All those workers lost their jobs. The list is almost endless. They don't make one pair of Levis in America. What is more American than a pair of Levis, except they don't make one pair of Levis in America. Gone; they are all gone.

We have all these people sitting around in this Chamber who voted for all these trade agreements—NAFTA, CAFTA, SHAFTA. We have all these acronyms for trade agreements. We have people who voted for all of them. Why? Because they think it is free trade and free trade is what leads to prosperity in our country.

The question is, when you have the examples I have used with respect to trade deficits, one wonders how anyone can take a look at this and continue down the same road. If this is what this trade philosophy buys us, how can we continue it? Who will have the jobs in this country? Where will the jobs exist that produce a middle class and sustain a middle class with people coming out of college and high school expecting to find decent jobs when those jobs are being moved elsewhere at a record pace?

If they say to you, No, this is about producing factory products, pencils and erasers, it is not true. We are now seeing medical technology jobs going elsewhere. We are seeing engineering jobs go elsewhere. We are seeing technology jobs going elsewhere.

IBM, Big Blue, General Motors. General Motors had a meeting that was little reported, but it was a meeting that was held in Detroit. It was on April 7, 2005. A man named Beau Anderson, who is the top purchasing agent for General Motors, called together all the top suppliers to General Motors. He told 380 executives from those suppliers that General Motors has to cut costs and you ought to consider building your car parts in China.

The effect of that, of course, is General Motors saying to their suppliers:

We want your jobs to go to China. Why? To save money and cut costs. It was interesting that 2 months after that, General Motors announced a plan to cut 25,000 jobs. At the same time, they move out their biggest selling brand on television and wave the American Flag and say: This is an American revolution. No, it is not an American revolution, not if you are telling all your suppliers to move American jobs to China. That is not an American revolution.

Or what about Big Blue, IBM, a good American company? These are all good companies. It is just that the culture has changed. I wonder if they say the Pledge of Allegiance in the boardroom because their fealty is to the stockholders and profits and not so much caring about American jobs.

IBM officials Harry Newman and Tom Lynch were in the process of laying off 13,000 U.S. workers and also some workers in Europe and hiring 14,000 workers at the same time in India. Here is an excerpt of the presentation the two IBM officials made. They said:

The good news is, we have not been cited in the press for a lot of what we are doing here. A couple of years ago, we went to Mexico with our PC—

That is personal computer—business as a cheap source of labor. Now Mexico doesn't look as cheap as some other markets.

And then they say to the managers how to break the news to the IBM employees who will be laid off:

Don't be transparent regarding the purpose or the intent. The terms "onshore" and "offshore" should never be used.

In other words, they wanted to get rid of these American employees but did not want to talk straight to them. And, oh, yes, the last thing they said in their memo to IBM employees is: Workers should be told as they are laid off, so they can hire these engineers in India, that this action in no way is a comment on the excellent work they have done over the years.

Really? I thought if you did good work, if you contributed to the company's interests that you probably would not be someone who is fired or lose your job. In 2003, the Washington Post reported that more than one-half of all Fortune 500 companies were outsourcing software development overseas. One-half of the Fortune 500 companies are now moving software development jobs overseas.

Let me talk for a moment about the reason that many companies are finding it advantageous to pole-vault from the United States to other countries and employ these workers. You can employ workers without the restrictions you have in our country. If you want to open a manufacturing plant in China or Bangladesh, for example, you do not have to worry about these things that are a nuisance here, such as the minimum wage. There is no minimum wage, or at least not any that is adhered to. You don't have to worry

about worker safety. You don't have to worry about working in a safe work plant, about dumping chemicals into the air or water, and, by the way, you sure don't have to worry about somebody joining a labor union. You can fire them or, better yet, jail them, according to the Chinese authorities.

I can offer some examples of the names of people who are now sitting in Chinese jails. What was their transgression? Trying to organize workers to decide they should not have to work 7 days a week, 12, 14 hours a day for 30, 40, and 50 cents an hour. They tried to organize those workers and now they find themselves in Chinese prisons.

We have been through all of that in this country. This is not something that is new to us. We, for a century, worked through these issues. Most people won't know of James Fyler. James Fyler, I once said, died of acute lead poisoning. I should not have done that. He was shot 54 times. James Fyler was shot 54 times. You know what he was doing? He was leading a labor strike in 1914 of coal miners objecting to working conditions, compensation, and hours. It is not just James Fyler who lost his life. Children working in the silk mills in Patterson, NJ, what was their demand? Eleven-hour days and 6-day workweeks. That is what they wanted. They wanted a 6-day workweek with 11 hours a day. That is what the kids wanted in Patterson, NJ.

In 1877, 10 coal miners were hanged in Pennsylvania. In 1903, Mary Harris Jones led a strike to demand a 55-hour workweek. In 1911, a fire at the Triangle Shirt Waste Company killed 147 people—women and mostly young girls locked in a 10-story building in sweatshop conditions. So we have been through all of this. In 1932, five U.S. autoworkers were beaten to death in Dearborn, MI, by Michigan police and goons when they went on a hunger march against Ford Motor.

We have been through all of this. Our country decided that in America we want to have child labor laws, we want to have fair wages, we believe that workers contribute to a company, we believe people ought to have a right to organize, and we believe workers ought to have the right to work in a safe workplace. We have been through it all. And now the way to avoid all of that is to fire your American workers and move the jobs to China or some other country.

In fact, unbelievably—and I will not name all the names today, although I should; I am writing a book at the moment and I will name all the names in the book—unbelievably, this Senate supports a tax provision that rewards companies that shut down their American manufacturing plants and move jobs overseas. We voted on that, I believe, four times on amendments I offered. I have lost all four of the amendments. On all four occasions, this Senate has expressed itself by saying, We believe it is appropriate to provide tax incentives to American companies that

shut down their American plants, get rid of their American workers, and move the jobs overseas. That is unbelievable to me, but it is true, and all the names of the folks who voted that way—they know who they are—we will vote on it again, and we will continue to pay for it, we will reward it.

The question is what kind of a country is going to exist here 5 and 10 years from now as this line of dramatic increases in red ink continues.

One of the interesting characters I have met in my life is Warren Buffett, the second richest man in the world. He lives in Omaha, NE. He is as plain as an old shoe. I am sure he doesn't mind me saying that. He is the second richest man in the world, and you wouldn't know it. I don't know how you act as the second richest man in the world. Whatever it is, he doesn't act it. He is an interesting, provocative thinker.

What does he say about all this? Warren Buffett is one of the few major business figures in this country who says this is nuts; this is dangerous. He said we are heading toward a sharecropper society in this country in which other countries own the assets of America because every single day \$2 billion goes to some other country. We buy \$2 billion more from those countries than we sell to those countries. They hold American assets with which they can buy American stocks and bonds, and they can buy American real estate.

We are selling America piece by piece, and Warren Buffett is the only business leader I am aware of who speaks out on this subject. I am sure at some displeasure of other business leaders in this country.

I know some will listen to all of this and say it is the same old anticorporation rant. I want corporations to do well. I recognize big isn't always bad and small isn't always beautiful. You are not going to build a 757 airplane in a garage someplace in a small town. We need economies of scale. We do need larger enterprises for that. But I also believe there ought to be some courage to stand up for the economic interests of this country and, once it is decided the gate is open for companies to decide anywhere in the world they want to hire workers for pennies on the hour and get rid of their American workers, we ought to understand the consequences of that for our country.

The solution is not to train triple or quadruple the number of engineers in our country. While I would think that is probably a useful thing, that does not solve our problem. Having trained engineers who are unemployed is relatively worthless. What we need are trade agreements that stand up for our country's economic interests and, regrettably, those trade agreements at this point don't exist.

I wish to point out that nobody wants to talk about these issues, least of all the Labor Department. This is

from the Associated Press. It says, "Labor Department Withholds Trade Reports." And just before we voted on the Central American free trade agreement, the Department of Labor, we discover, had kept secret for more than a year Government-commissioned studies that supported those of us who were opponents of this new trade deal. It talks about the fact that in the Central American countries there are just horrible labor conditions.

I wanted to show you a picture that shows the face of Central American labor. This is a young—I believe this boy is 11 years old in the sugarcane field in Honduras in this particular case. That is the face of labor in Central America.

The report in question was kept secret by the Department of Labor for a year. Why? Because they didn't want those of us in the Chamber who opposed the Central American free trade agreement to have that information.

If you wonder what the face of unfair trade looks like, this is an example. These are teenage girls whose hands are bound by ropes. I believe this is in Bangladesh. These pictures were taken by a journalist who was there. These young girls raised some objections to the working conditions in their factory in Bangladesh. The working conditions were unbelievable: 12- to 14-hour days, 7 days a week. And so they decided to protest. These are young kids who are held virtually captive. By the way, the product of their work comes to the United States and Europe for sale.

But let me show you the rest of the photographs that have been taken in Bangladesh. Here is a young woman shot in the stomach, part of the same group. Here are the pictures by the same photographer of the beatings.

What is this all about? It is about young kids, kids as young as 10 and 12 years old being put in factories in intolerable conditions working 12, 14 hours a day, 7 days a week without a break saying, Wait a second, this is killing us. And what is the result? The result is a trained police force comes in and decides to beat them mercilessly.

That picture is self-explanatory. That man is dead, shot dead because he believed that those labor conditions were intolerable and believed people ought to have a right to some self-termination.

We talk a lot about freedom these days. What about the freedom for these kids in Bangladesh? What about some knowledge by American consumers about the conditions of production for all these cheap products? It is something nobody wants to talk much about, but it is something one of these days this Congress and this country are going to have to deal with.

This economy is not doing well. Most of us know that. Oh, there was a spurt of some income-tax receipts and the spurt of those income-tax receipts recently was caused by a perverse business decision by this Congress, and those who voted for that will know of

that as well. That decision was, let's decide for all those companies that have moved their jobs overseas and that are making money overseas move to America at some point and repatriate their profit and pay taxes, let's decide for them that we will give them a 5¼-percent tax rate. Nobody else in the country has that. Nobody. But for those who moved their jobs overseas and they repatriate their income, we will let them pay 5¼ rather than 35 percent.

What about my Uncle Harold? Why shouldn't he pay 5¼ percent? Why shouldn't the rest of the people pay 5¼ percent income tax? No, that wasn't good enough for all Americans, just the big interests that moved their jobs overseas.

I didn't support it. I thought it was outrageous, unbelievable to do this, but this Congress did it. It is pretty accommodating to big economic interests, and so we had votes and I voted against it; many voted for it. And so we have had a repatriation of income and had some small increase in income tax because of that. That is temporary. So now people say, Well, the deficit is less this year than last year. This year is still the third highest deficit in the history of this country. And it is going higher. It was less this year because of this perversion of rewarding companies that moved their jobs overseas. In fact, the Federal debt increased in the last year by over a half a trillion dollars. The trade debt increased, or will increase, this year by over \$700 billion. That is \$1.2 trillion in total indebtedness. We are way off track, just way off track.

Is there alarm or concern about it? No, not really I guess. We get hit with a hurricane. Well, the payment for that is very much like the war in Iraq. We get a budget from the President at the start of the year and it says, OK, we are in Iraq, we have 140,000 American troops in Iraq, it is costing a great deal of money, it is costing about \$5 to \$6 billion a month in Iraq and Afghanistan and guess what, my budget requests zero funding for it. Zero. This wouldn't pass eighth grade arithmetic.

So now every year the President sends us a budget with zero funding. So OK, we pass a budget because we understand later on the President will come back to this Chamber and say, oh, by the way, there is another expenditure to be approved outside the budget for emergency funding. It can add to the debt and nobody should care about that. And so then we get an emergency funding request for \$50 billion, \$40 billion, \$70 billion, and that is the way it goes. No one is willing to stare truth in the face. But we are in significant trouble here, headed toward a result that is not a good result for this country.

The question for all of us is, When will we be straight? When will this Congress and this President be straight with the American people? Being straight with the American people means to get the fiscal house in order

and to solve this trade mess. If we don't, we are burdening our kids with massive amounts of debt, unparalleled in the history of this country.

Is there evidence that the President is interested in this? No. Very little, very little at all. Is there evidence that Congress wants to deal with this?

Well, it is interesting. You go back to the year 2001 when the expectation was there had been a turnaround, things were looking better, not necessarily with respect to trade but with respect to the budget, we were going to have surpluses and all of a sudden the prediction was surpluses for 10 straight years and the President said to the Congress: You know what the predictions are for 10 straight years. Let's provide really big tax cuts. Some of us said: You know, maybe that is not the conservative way. Maybe we should be conservative. What if something happens? What if the surpluses don't materialize? The expectation of surpluses for 10 years, what if they are not there? What if something happens? Oh, don't worry, be happy, let's have big tax cuts.

And so those who got the biggest tax cuts were those with the biggest income. If you were a millionaire, I am telling you, in 2001 you should have had a lot of celebrating to do because you got the largest tax cuts you had ever seen.

So we had tax cuts and then all of a sudden we have a recession. Then we have a war in Afghanistan. We have the terrorist attack of 9/11, a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq. Then we have the proposed surpluses turning to big deficits, following which we have massive natural disasters. Now we have continuing costs of \$5 to \$6 billion a month in Iraq and Afghanistan and we have been hit with Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. The President says we can deal with all that.

If we just took back the tax cuts for those with over \$1 million a year in income, just that, and should probably do it this afternoon, if we just took back the tax cuts, the tax cuts given to those with a million a year or more of income, we would raise about \$32 billion a year.

Use that to reduce the deficit. I am for that. Is that picking on millionaires? No. They have the highest growth in income in the last decade. They didn't need a tax cut, especially a tax cut that we have charged and added to the debt because the surplus didn't exist.

But, Mr. President, we cannot possibly begin to put this country back on track unless we address both issues of the fiscal policy that is dangerously off track and a trade policy that is not only incompetent and "fundamentally dumb" with people chanting on street corners about free trade when the evidence is all around us that has abysmally failed. If we don't address these things, we don't have much of an economic future.

There is not a Republican or Democratic way to address them. There is a

right and a wrong way to address them. And you can't start until the country has the will, until the Congress and the President have the will and exhibit the leadership to address them.

McCullough spoke about John Adams in that book "John Adams" as they were trying to put this new country together. Adams is traveling a lot, especially in Europe, and he writes to Abigail. And that is why we know a lot about John Adams. Back then he would say to Abigail as he was traveling: From where will the leadership come? Where will the leadership come from to help form this new country of ours? Where will the leadership emerge?

Then in a later letter he would sort of say lamentingly, there is really only us to provide the leadership. There is just us. There is me; there is George Washington; there is Thomas Jefferson; there is Ben Franklin; there is Mason; there is Madison. Well, in the rearview mirror of history they were only a few of some of the great talent in human history who framed quite a remarkable country and a Constitution that says "we the people."

But every generation of Americans has to ask the same question: From where will the leadership come? Who will emerge as the leaders to help put this on track? That is especially the case now. Who will emerge as the leaders to begin standing up for the economic interests of this country and to say that we can't continue these kinds of trade deficits, we can't continue shipping good American jobs overseas because people who make \$11 an hour are paid too much? Where will the middle class in America be? Will we have a middle class if \$11 an hour is the wage that is too high? Are we going to be willing to stand up for the economic interests for our country? Are our trade policies designed to raise other countries or push our country down? The answer to that, quite clearly, is push down wages and opportunities.

You read every day in your local newspapers about what is happening to pensions and benefits for workers across this country and, for that matter, wages.

If I might close with just the Palm Pilot message from the young woman from Silicon Valley. I think it says it all. I mean you lose your job in this country. You go to school; you get an education; you go to work for a technology company; you build Palm Pilots, help design them; and the last message on this young woman's Palm Pilot was "My job's gone to India." Guess what. She trained her successor as well. That is what the company required her to do at her last job. So the next time people say it is only about manufacturing jobs and it is really advantageous for us if we can find someone to make shoes and shirts and pants and clothes and trinkets and trousers in China or Bangladesh because it is cheaper for us to go to a big box retailer and pay that money, when they say that, understand it is not just

about those jobs. Yes, it is jobs, but it is about jobs going to India and somebody who made Palm Pilots. It is about engineers going to India. It is about a massive loss of American jobs, 3 million in the last 4 years, and much, much more to come, given the trade agreements we have had and given the trade agreements that are now being negotiated.

I have one last point. Right now Ambassador Portman is negotiating a new trade deal in a place called Doha. I am assuming they are negotiating in Doha because they can't do it in New York or Paris or London or places such as that; the streets would be full of demonstrators because people are fed up with these kinds of agreements. So they are negotiating in Doha behind closed doors in secret and our negotiator has, in my judgment, just put a cherry on top of whipped cream on the sundae here in terms of incompetency. He said everything is on the table.

That means for everybody who is unfairly dumping in our country, we are willing to trade it away; it is on the table as they trade away our anti-dumping laws. That is the protection we are supposed to have in trade law against those who would commit unfair trade practices against us. We are willing to trade that away, the anti-dumping and the countervailing duties. It is all on the table.

This is unbelievable to me. This country needs a spine, a backbone, and a willingness to stand up for its own economic interests, and this has now been the case for some long while.

Mr. President, I will again offer amendments dealing with trade. I will offer the amendment which has been defeated now four times that rewards tax breaks, companies that ship American jobs overseas and hope, perhaps, that if not enough see the light perhaps more will feel the heat. One day perhaps there will be a majority who will step forward to stop this insidious practice to provide tax breaks for companies that ship American jobs overseas. If we can't take the first baby step, there is little hope to keep good jobs in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE. The Senator from Ohio.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

##### ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS KENNETH C. SOUSLIN

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a young soldier who was taken from us far too soon. Army pfc Kenneth C. Souslin from Lexington, OH, lost his life on December 15, 2003, while serving our Nation in Iraq. He was 21 years old at the time of his death.

Kenneth—Kacey to his family and friends—was born on October 10, 1982, to loving parents, Kenneth and Cecelia. Growing up as the youngest of five

boys, he quickly learned the importance of developing his own identity—and it was one of fearlessness, dedication, duty, and compassion. From a young age, he was devoted to his family and to his faith. Sean Davis, who knew Kacey since the 5th grade, remembers how he would sprint across the cafeteria to give his mom a hug whenever she came to their school.

At Lexington High School, Kacey was well-liked by all. His father said that Kacey "did not know an enemy. He was outgoing . . . not scared of anything." As a member of the drama club, he acted in several plays, including "Second Chance" and "Country Gothic." Drama teacher, Ray Gerrell remembers how well Kacey performed, despite a speech impediment. He said that Kacey "did wonderfully. . . . He gave 100 percent."

Though he loved being on the stage, Kacey also had a shy side. English teacher, Sally Giefer, considers Kacey's Junior Prom as one of her favorite memories of him. She recalls this about that dance:

[Kacey] was so shy. He hid in the bathroom for 45 minutes. I had his friends get him out and told him that we needed to dance. He replied that he didn't know how and I said that there are no rules to dancing and we went and had fun. The next year, Kacey had grown so much. He asked my husband for permission to dance with me.

Following high school graduation, Kacey enlisted in the U.S. Army to see the world, experience new cultures, and meet new people—all while earning money for college. His family had already taught him the value of service through their own selfless examples. Kacey's father served in the U.S. Air Force in Thailand, and his brother, Bryant, served for 4 years in the Navy and then enlisted in the Air Force Reserves.

Kacey reported to boot camp at Fort Gordon, GA. There, he never complained and was known as a hard worker. Lexington High School Principal, Jim Goode, recalls that when Kacey returned with his recruiter to the high school wearing his Army uniform, he was full of confidence. Kacey gave him such a firm handshake that afterward, he had to pull his fingers apart.

Kacey was assigned to the 440th Signal Battalion, 22nd Signal Brigade, V Corps, stationed in Darmstadt, Germany. He arrived in Iraq in September 2003 and was stationed north of Baghdad.

Army Private First Class Souslin loved to serve and defend our Nation.

He was a good soldier.

He was a proud soldier.

He was a dedicated soldier.

Soon after Kacey's death, Sergeant Jan Wendling of the Mansfield, OH, Police Department, wrote a letter to the Editor of the Mansfield News Journal newspaper expressing condolences to his family and friends and to remind us all about the gratitude we owe to all the men and women serving in our military. The following is an excerpt from that letter: