

officials and police who have been holding assemblies, lectures, PTA meetings, and classroom discussions to get the word out about cheese heroin.

A public service announcement, made in Dallas by local students, is currently airing throughout the area, and a hotline number has been taking a large number of calls for those seeking assistance to keep their loved ones from succumbing to this cheese heroin. Hopefully, their efforts will stop cheese in its tracks and maybe protect the rest of us around the country.

The Greater Dallas Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse established a task force that is responsible for this effort. The key to this task force's success is that it incorporates all sectors of the Dallas community. Engaging and involving all sectors of our local communities is one of the best solutions to keeping our children from abusing drugs. That is why I formed, about 10 years ago, an organization called the Face It Together Coalition—we call it FIT for short—in my effort to combat drug abuse in my own State of Iowa. My goal with Face It Together is to bring to the same table parents, educators, businesses, religious leaders, law enforcement officials, health care providers, youth groups, and members of the media to promote new ways of thinking about how to reach and educate Iowans about the dangers of drug abuse. With everyone working together, we will make a difference in our communities. Moreover, together we can build healthy children, healthy families, healthy communities, and a healthy future.

In closing, I believe we have a moral obligation to ensure that our young people have a chance to grow up without being accosted by drug dealers at every turn, and particularly when they are in elementary school. We need as a country to create a strong moral context to help our kids know how to make the right choices. Research has shown time and again that if you can keep a child drug free until the age of 20, chances are very slim that they will ever try or become addicted. That is the task we face. We owe it to ourselves and the future of our country to protect our kids from drugs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, consistent with our policy of going back and forth across the aisle, I ask unanimous consent following the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, that I be recognized for up to 10 minutes and that I be followed by the junior Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

PATRIOT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his leader-

ship on drug abuse issues that he has shown for so long in this institution. We are all appreciative, in Ohio and Iowa and Oklahoma and everywhere else in this country.

We have heard a litany of stories in the last year or so about the steady stream of dangerous imports, especially from China. We have seen contaminated seafood, we have seen defective tires from China, we have seen dangerous ingredients in toothpaste and vitamins and pet food. In the last 24 hours, we have seen a continued problem with a huge number of toys being recalled that were painted with lead-based paint. Lead paint has been abandoned for almost three decades in this country. We know that lead in paint is a potentially terrible thing for children in terms of the development of their brain, especially for young children.

In USA Today this week is an article that sums up what we have allowed to happen, and why this is no surprise, as we have built this trade relationship with China. I would like to read a couple of paragraphs. We went from barely a \$10 billion trade deficit with China in 1992, the year I ran for the House of Representatives, which has grown by a factor of almost 25, to \$250 billion today. At the same time we were buying so much from China, we understood China is a country with no real rules, no environmental laws that are enforced well, few food safety, toy safety, worker safety rules and regulations. As a result, it should come as no shock to Americans that so many of these products imported from China are defective or dangerous. Let me read this:

Nearly all the recent alarms raised about Chinese products point fingers solely at the Chinese, neglecting entirely how China's success as an exporter is, in large part, the product of roughly a trillion dollars of foreign investment and limitless expertise that floods into the country in order to escape some standard or other at home.

First, of course, are labor standards. Chinese factory workers earn roughly 65 cents an hour, about $\frac{1}{40}$ what their American, Western European and Japanese counterparts do. Export companies—and the long chain of companies that supply them—commonly save money by subjecting [Chinese] workers to cramped dorms, long work weeks and often brutal shop bosses, which would be utterly illegal in the United States workplaces.

American business knows what it is doing, as it has offshored its jobs to China and offshored so many American jobs to China, so much of its work to China. Unfortunately, so much of what has happened is due to trade law and tax law. In essence, we are encouraging our businesses to outsource because of the incentives we provided them in the rules that have been written by the global economy, by U.S. trade law, by tax law. We can continue that or we have a choice. We can do something very different. What we offer this week is very different.

Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY in the House, with Congresswoman SUTTON from Ohio and several other Members

of Congress, TIM RYAN, also from Ohio and in the Senate, Senators DURBIN and OBAMA from Illinois, are offering legislation to set up what we call Patriot Corporations. Those are companies that play by the rules, they hire American workers, do most of their production in the United States, they pay their taxes. As I said, they do most of their production in the United States. They provide pensions and they provide health care for their workers. Those companies that do that should be rewarded. We will designate them "Patriot Corporations." They will get a lower tax rate and they also will have a better opportunity to get Government contracts.

Instead of going the way we have gone; that is, giving all kinds of incentives for American corporations to outsource jobs, giving all kinds of incentives for those companies to move overseas and avoid taxes—instead of allowing that, we, instead, should offer to American companies that play by the rules, those companies, again, that provide decent health care, pensions for their workers, do their manufacturing and work in the United States—we should reward them with the designation of "Patriot Corporation." Those companies that are loyal to their workers, loyal to their communities and loyal to their Nation should be rewarded. We should be loyal to them.

That is the choice we face, continuing this outsourcing tax and trade policy that costs us jobs, and we end up bringing in all kinds of unsafe products—whether they are food products at our breakfast table, whether they are toys that can potentially hurt our children. We have that choice; we either continue this policy or we designate corporations that play by the rules as Patriot Corporations.

As I said, if they are loyal to their workers and loyal to their communities and loyal to our Nation, we as a government should be loyal to them and treat them accordingly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

JUDGE TIMOTHY D. DEGIUSTI

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this morning we did a great thing in the confirmation of Tim DeGiusti to the Federal court. Understandably, we are short of time this morning because of what is happening at the White House, but let me finalize a couple of ideas and some comments I was going to make.

First, when you have someone who has the highest rating, whether it is from Martin Dale Hubbell or the American Bar Association, which this candidate did and does, and he also as a military lawyer is familiar with courts-martial procedures—there are a lot of people out there with these qualifications. This individual goes far beyond that. It is interesting that

while he is a Republican, our Democratic Governor in Oklahoma, Gov. Brad Henry, is a very strong supporter of this now-confirmed nominee. Also, my predecessor, David Boren, who is now President of the University of Oklahoma, was a very strong supporter of this individual. I quoted him a few times during this process, as to how outstanding this candidate is.

I would like to share an experience I had 41 years ago. A man named Ralph Thompson, who is currently a senior status Federal judge in Oklahoma in the same Western District in which his son-in-law has been confirmed this morning, and I, and another person named David Boren, 41 years ago, were elected to the Oklahoma House of Representatives. I remember it so well because in February of 1967, 40 years ago this year, we all three came to Washington, DC, for the first time. That is, State legislators Ralph Thompson, Dave Boren, and of course myself. David Boren's father was a Congressman so he had a pretty good entree into the Capitol. I remember so well the three of us were walking around the Capitol at night—my first time ever being in the Capitol area of Washington. I remember, after walking through Statuary Hall and all these great features we have in our Capitol, that we kind of professed to each other, we decided one day—Ralph Thompson and David Boren and I—we said we would like to be Members of the Congress, either in the House or in the Senate. But Ralph Thompson said: Or a judge in the U.S. district court.

As it turned out, David Boren was a Member of the Senate; I am a Member of the Senate; and Ralph Thompson became—I believe he will go down in history as maybe being the outstanding Federal district judge in the history of Oklahoma. I have heard so many people talk about that.

I knew Ralph so well at that time—keep in mind, this is 40 years ago—and his beautiful wife Barbara, whom I might add has been Mother of the Year and received every possible honor you could have. Lisa, Maria and Elaine—they cranked out three little girls, and Elaine was the girl who later married Timothy DeGiusti. Get the connection? You have a great judge and then you have a son-in-law who is going into the same Western District of Oklahoma to replace him. It is an unusual situation. But this is one of these wonderful things that can happen in this country of ours. I am so happy this is behind us now and it happened prior to the August recess.

AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me mention something else I think is critical. I have heard ugly rumors that the President of the United States might end up vetoing what we call the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act. Let me say I don't understand. I am coming from a conservative per-

spective. I am ranked by the American Conservative Union, No. 1 out of 100 most conservative Member. Yet I am saying to you there are two things we ought to be spending money on in this country. One is national defense and the other is infrastructure.

We have a crisis in our infrastructure. The big bill on transportation infrastructure we passed a year ago is going to do nothing more than maintain what we have now, and it is anticipated in 20 years we will increase our traffic by 50 percent. What are we going to do?

The same thing is true with the Water Resources Development Act. We have not had a reauthorization in 7 years. It should happen every other year.

When you say I don't care if this thing is \$10 billion or \$20 billion, the amount is not significant because it is not spending money, it is authorizing. If we authorize something—hopefully, we will pass this bill today. If we authorize something, it may never be appropriated or it may be appropriated 10 years down the road. So it does not have any remote effect on the budget today.

I think it is dishonest for people to say this is somehow a spending bill and therefore we should vote against it. That is not true at all. I have the history of this body right here in my hand, and I have given several presentations on this recently. I say to my friend from Montana, who is new in this Chamber, this discussion has been going on between appropriators and authorizers since 1816.

In 1867, they realized they needed to segregate the functions of authorization and appropriations so they established the appropriators, the Appropriations Committee. That was a good thing. But what happened on that, which has been the case for a long time, the appropriators slowly took over a little bit at a time so they ended up authorizing their own appropriations. That is what we don't want.

Let me give an example. In the Senate Armed Services Committee, on which I am honored to sit, we go through all types of items, such as missile defense, as an example. We will have the boost phase and the mid-course phase and the terminal phase and we will have maybe two systems on each one. They are not redundant, but there are many people who say: Wait a minute. Maybe we should do away with that system because we can save this much money.

But take the midcourse. We had the Aegis System and then we had the THAAD system in the terminal phase. These are not redundant because they take care of an incoming missile from different areas with different technologies. You would not know that if you are just an appropriator because you don't have the staff to go in and study and get into the details. But we authorize, in the Senate Armed Services Committee, because we do have that expertise.

I say the same thing is true in my other committee that I used to chair. It was the Environment and Public Works Committee. As it applies to this particular bill, the WRDA bill—we have a set of criteria and evaluated equally all these projects. There will be many projects that have been authorized that I will come on the floor and oppose vigorously when appropriations time comes. But at least we will know they have gone through a process and they meet certain criteria. That is what is important. If you take that away, that is the first line of defense, doing away with superfluous types of earmarking.

This is the only part of that system that offers discipline in the whole appropriations process. That is what this is all about. That is why the WRDA bill is so significant. Yet people who are liberal, conservatives, Democrats, Republicans who come together and realize we have an infrastructure in this country that has been sadly neglected, and we are going to have to do something about it, our opportunity will be today and I hope we can do the responsible thing and pass it.

Then, during the August recess, you are going to hear this person, who is rated the most conservative Member of this body, out talking all over the Nation why this is the conservative approach to logically authorize these projects and then determine which ones are worthwhile.

At least we know these have met a certain criteria.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. INHOFE. I will yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I am so pleased that my ranking member, Senator INHOFE, the distinguished ranking member—and was the distinguished chair of the EPW Committee—has taken to the floor to state the case.

You know, we fight so much, debate so much about so many issues, but this is one, I would say to my friend, where we have come together because we recognize that to have a great country, you have to have infrastructure that is capable, that is going to meet the needs of our people.

I would say to my friend, is it not true that even though you and I might not agree with every single project—as my friend pointed out, this is the authorizing bill, and we did have criteria here. We did work with Members. I would say to my friend, isn't it true that we were the first committee that actually followed the ethics rules that were not even law? We filled out our conflict of interest forms, we presented the bill, and this bill was 7 years in the making.

I just want to say to my friend, when he goes home and when he speaks about this, does he expect to have a good, receptive audience? I think my friend will. As I go to California, I am going to do the same thing.