last day. There will be a vote, and we can’t stop that vote—whether it be at 1 a.m. or in midafternoon. To me, that is no longer an issue. We have done every-thing we can.

But I say to my colleagues that I think what has been done to the dairy farmers in the Midwest is an injustice. I think it is an injustice in a piece of legislation that, in and of itself, doesn’t represent all that much for America, even though I know everybody will be talking about how great this is. I am certainly going to vote against it.

I also say to my colleagues that I hope we will, next year, think about how we can reform the way we operate. On this, I hold the majority leader accountable—to the extent that I can hold him accountable. And I will figure out every way we can next year, when we come back, to keep raising this issue.

We didn’t get a lot of these appropri-ations bills done. We had a lot of legislation that came to the floor. We weren’t allowed to do amendments. Frankly, I don’t know how anybody in here thinks we can be good legislators when we don’t have the bills coming to the floor. We need to get them out here in the open and have debates that are introduced, have up-or-down votes, and then we move forward. And if we have to work from 9 in the morning until 9 at night, so be it. But instead, we don’t do our work.

Those of us who believe the Senate floor is the place to fight for what we believe in and have the debates are not able to do so. Instead, we have this process where six, seven, eight people decide what is in and what is out, and we have this huge monstrosity called the “omnibus” bill that is presented to us, with none of us has read—or maybe two people have. But none of us has read this from cover to cover. I doubt whether there are more than two Senators who know everything that is in here.

I would like to raise the question. How can we be good legislators with this kind of process? We are not being good legislators. I am speaking for myself. I am not able to be an effective legislator representing Minnesota if we are going to continue making decisions in conference committees and rolling in six, seven, eight major pieces of legis-lation with no opportunity for me as a Senator from Minnesota to bring amendments to the floor. That was done on the dairy compact, and that is what has been done on a whole lot of other decisions. It is no way to legis-late.

I contend that that is no way to legis-late. I contend that this omnibus bill makes a mockery of the legislative process. I contend on the floor of the Senate today, not only because of what happened to dairy farmers in Minnesota but because of the whole way in which this decisionmaking process has worked, that this is unconscionable. I contend that this kind of decision-making process is going to lead to more and more important issues on the part of people in the country.

People hate the mix of money and politics. They don’t like poison politi-cies. They don’t like all the back-at-tack politics my colleagues, Senator Riehl and I would vote “no” on. They are talking about earlier because they believe that is what is wrong. They don’t like what, apparently, some of us relish. They don’t like backroom deals, decision-making that is not open, accountable, and that people can understand and comprehend.

Now, my final point. I am not so sure that some of the major decision-makers, given the sort of deck of cards they had to work with—I don’t know that I want to point the finger at any one person. I just think that that is prob-ably fair. I am making an argument about process, not about a particular Senator. Some of them who were in-volved in this probably did everything they could do from their point of view. They are very skillful. But I will tell you one thing. Minnesota dairy farm-ers came out on the short end of the stick.

I regret the fact that this has been done and stuck into a conference re-port and was not done in an honest way, with open debate on the floor of the Senate, where we could have amendments. I also regret a legislative process where we didn’t get to the bills on time, didn’t have the debate on the floor, didn’t have amendments we could introduce, didn’t have the up-or-down votes, and it all got done by a few people, really, basically, with very lit-tle opportunity for public scrutiny, for democratic accountability.

I am going to vote “no” on this bill. I think I will go on just on the issue of the way in which these deci-sions have been made because, again, I think we have made a mockery of what should be the legislative process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-a tor from Maine is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, be recog-nized for approximately 10 minutes, if that is sufficient, for his own statement.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I think it is.

Ms. COLLINS. I also ask unanimous consent that he be followed by the Sen-a tor from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, for not to exceed 5 minutes, and that I be recognized to transact legislative busi-ness.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

CHINA’S ACCESS TO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Intern-ational Trade Subcommittee in getting ready for the Seattle Round, as well as considering China’s accession to the World Trade Organization, I want to speak on Congress’ power and our responsibility on the whole issue of international trade. It is very clear in the Constitution that the Congress of the United States has the power, as one of the specifically delineated powers of Congress in the first article, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. So the United States has just concluded a bilateral market access agreement with China. It should pave the way for China’s access to the World Trade Organization.

I vom what I have heard about this agreement—and, of course, we only have summaries at this point—it is an exceptionally good one for the United States and especially for American agriculture. I said, when the agreement fell through on April 8, I was fearful that a lot of ground would be lost. I don’t think, from what I know, there has been any ground lost with the re-negotiation. Charlene Barshesky, our U.S. Trade Representative, conducted herself in a highly professional way and negotiated what appears to be an excellent agreement, and she did it under very difficult circumstances.

Now that the negotiations are fin-ished, the job of the Senate and the House of Representatives becomes even more important. Our constitutional re-sponsibility requires that the Senate and the House carefully review the agreement in its entirety, and the ex-tent to which there are changes in law, they obviously have to pass the Cong-ress, as any law would, and be signed by the President.

It is a responsibility every Senator takes very seriously because it is as-signed to us by the Constitution. And because the Congress has a unique and close relationship with the American people, we must also keep faith with the people who sent us here to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

That is why it is critical that everyth ing that was negotiated.

I want to put emphasis upon that statement.

That is why it is important that the Congress of the United States know everything that was negotiated—every-thing in every detail, and every interpretation—so there can be no surprises, no private exchanges of letters, no private understandings about the key meanings of key phrases in the agreement, and no reservations whatsoever that are kept just between negotiators.

In other words, if Congress is going to legislate these agreements and secure these agreements, Congress has a