

strongly that we need to pass a bill. We will head into the winter with severe dislocations between supply and demand of natural gas. Natural gas prices will increase dramatically. They are already on the rise. That is going to be exacerbated in the coming months. Coming from a northern State where natural gas is a pretty important commodity to us in the cold, with our hard winter climates, this will be a very important issue. We are not going to be able to fix that in the Energy bill in the short run. But we need to tell the American people we have set in place policies that help resolve these issues for the long term and intermediate term. I hope we are able to do that.

I ask the chairman, if I may, I had hoped to be able to make a presentation on the issue of trade. If there are others wishing to speak on energy, I will defer. If not, I would like to proceed perhaps to make the statement on trade, understanding that if Members with amendments are coming back to the floor, they could interrupt me, and I will relinquish the floor so they can clear the amendments. If that is satisfactory to the chairman, I will proceed in that manner.

Mr. DOMENICI. How long might the Senator speak on this issue?

Mr. DORGAN. About 20 minutes, I would guess.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are trying to work out about 5 or 10 amendments. If we get them ready, we will call it to his attention on the bill before us. In the meantime, I am going to have no objection to his proceeding to discuss trade as in morning business.

I ask the Senator if he would permit the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, to speak for a couple of minutes on the issue we have just been speaking on, to wit, the House action with reference to the supplemental. When he yields, I will have no objection to the Senator from North Dakota following him, subject to the understanding that if we need to interrupt him, of course, doing it in an appropriate way, to bring in the amendments, the Senator will have no objection.

Mr. DORGAN. That will be fine. I will relinquish the floor to my colleague from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving me a moment of time to address the stopgap supplemental funding bill that has just come back from the House. I come to the floor as frustrated as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, who spoke to the issue a few moments ago. Senator DOMENICI spoke, as did Senator BURNS of Montana.

It was 100 degrees in Idaho yesterday. For Idaho, that is hot. It has been that way for 3 weeks. We have dried up. We now have forest fires burning, with literally thousands of acres ablaze. We just lost two people in a wildfire in the

middle of the week. Idaho, Montana, Nevada, eastern Washington, Oregon—all of us are afire at this moment.

The supplemental money we put in for the Forest Service and for wildfires, which the House took out, was to replenish last year's accounts from which we had borrowed to fight last year's fires. The accounts we borrowed from were the very accounts that would allow people to go out on the ground for the purpose of rehabilitation, for doing the kinds of things necessary to begin to environmentally improve the land, the 7.5 million acres that burned last year in a phenomenal wildfire scenario.

We are deeply into that already this year. Fires have burned extensively in Arizona, and as the heat has moved up the Great Basin States, along the Rocky Mountain ridge, of course, these fires now continue.

Why the House has done this, I am not quite sure. They say there is plenty of money. There is not because the money was borrowed from the accounts of other areas within the Forest Service. That is a standard practice we have done in the past. But the problem is, by doing what the House did, we are not replenishing the accounts of last year that we borrowed from. We have always done that on a historical basis because one cannot measure or estimate how extensive a fire season will be, how many acres will burn, how many people will be employed. We have literally thousands of people in Idaho right now on the fire lines, as is true in other States in the West, and helicopters are flying, aerial bombers are flying, at this moment.

A phenomenally large number of people are employed to stop the fires, protect the environment, and try to save the habitat, the wildlife and, in many instances, houses, private property, homes that are built up and within the forests of our country, up to and within the forests of our country. We are obviously going to have to address this in an emergency environment.

I am extremely disappointed with what the House has done. I have talked with the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture who heads up the Forest Service, and the chief, and they are just a week away from having to again start borrowing out of the accounts that have not yet been replenished. So their capacity to pay back until we obviously appropriate is limited.

We will continue to fight the fires. The fires will be fought. It is the rehabilitation, it is the restoration, that is funded by other accounts that will largely be denied.

FREE TRADE

Mr. CRAIG. Turning to the Senator from North Dakota, I thank him for the time he has allotted me. I think he is going to be talking about trade and possibly the Singapore and the Chilean free-trade agreements. The Senator and I worked cooperatively together on

a lot of trade issues, and cochair a caucus on the Hill.

The Senator who is in the chair at this moment is as frustrated as I am about these current free-trade agreements in front of us, because our trade ambassador has stepped into an arena that is frankly none of his business, if I can be so blunt, and that is immigration law. I think the Senator from North Dakota is as frustrated by that as I am. The Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, has crafted a sense of the Senate I am looking at that will speak very boldly to the fact that if the trade ambassador wants to send up other free-trade agreements—Senator SESSIONS and I serve on the Judiciary Committee, we will be blunt about it—we are not going to let them out.

This ambassador is an appointed person, not an elected person. He does not have the right to go in and write immigration law. That is not his prerogative. If he has to discuss it, if he wants it to become a part of a trade agreement, then he must tell foreign countries he will offer legislation to Congress to review for the purposes of adjusting trade law, if necessary, where it fits and where a majority of the Congress can and will support it.

The two trade agreements that are in front of us are very frustrating to this Senator because I think we have a trade ambassador who has overstepped his authority and I think it is time we tell him that in as clear language as we possibly can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

FREE TRADE IMBALANCES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho has described accurately the provision in the free-trade agreement dealing with immigration.

But I must say, and he will agree with me, I am sure, that a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that says, in effect, you better watch it, is the equivalent of hitting someone on the forehead with a feather.

The reason there has to be a sense-of-the-Senate resolution at the moment, if we are to express displeasure, is because we cannot offer any amendments to a free-trade agreement. It is brought to the floor under fast track. This Senate, in its wisdom—or in its lack of wisdom—said we agree to put our arms in a straitjacket so whatever the trade ambassador negotiates anywhere in the world, he can bring it back here and we agree to prevent ourselves from offering amendments. That is fast track.

I do not have any big issues with Chile or Singapore. The free-trade agreement coming to the Senate floor is not even a very big deal with respect to Chile and Singapore, the two countries with whom the agreements are made. The big deal to me is that we have made agreement after agreement in international trade. In each case, this country has lost, and lost big time.

We have lost jobs. We have lost economic strength. We have massive problems in previous trade agreements. None of them are being fixed. None of them get solved. What gets done? Well, new trade agreements seem to emerge on the Senate floor. Rather than fixing old trade agreements and beginning to support this country's interests, what we want to do, according to the trade ambassador, is bring new trade agreements so we can debate and vote on those.

What I want to do this morning is talk a little bit about some of those old trade agreements and talk about what ought to be done rather than debating new trade agreements at this point.

First, it is worth noting what our trade deficit is at this point. This is an article from the Washington Post. It shows the trade deficit the end of last year. It is the highest trade deficit in history. The trade deficit soared to \$435 billion on an annual basis in 2002, and it is worse now, of course.

Nearly one-fourth of the year's deficit in goods trade was with China, which sold \$103 billion more goods to the United States than it bought here.

I will talk about China. It is a story in itself. They ship us all their trinkets, trousers, shirts, and shoes, and they come into our K-Marts and our WalMarts and our grocery stores and we buy all of these things from China. Guess what. China's market is not very open to the products our employees and our businesses produce. They are not buying very much from us.

What does it mean to us? It means we do not have jobs. It means we have people today looking for work who cannot find a job in this country.

Now, it is interesting, there was a story recently about this being a jobless recovery. Of course, we do not have much of a recovery. It is pretty anemic at this point. We have very slow economic growth. So this economy is just sort of bumping along, just hiccupping from day to day, week to week, and month to month without much strength at all. So they say, this is a recovery that is jobless.

Well, they miss the point on that. Oh, there are jobs created by American enterprise. There are jobs created by ingenuity that comes from U.S. firms. It is just that the jobs that are being created are not being created in this country. This is a recovery, all right, an anemic recovery with jobs, but the jobs are not here. The jobs are overseas. More and more, we see jobs in factories that are moved overseas that used to be good American jobs.

So if in fact this is a jobless recovery, it is jobless only to the extent that it is jobless in the United States. We have millions of Americans who desperately want a job, they want to go to work, but there are not enough jobs available. Two-and-a-half million people who were working a couple of years ago now are not working because this economy is not producing the jobs here. Too many American corporations are

producing the jobs in Asia and elsewhere. I want to talk a little about that.

Ambassador Zoellick is a perfectly nice person. He is our U.S. trade ambassador. Most people would not recognize his name from a cord of wood, but he serves in a pretty important role. He is the trade ambassador. He goes overseas with his staff and they negotiate trade agreements. These are the agreements by which we trade with other countries. They negotiate behind closed doors. We are not there. Our constituents are not there. These are trade negotiations behind closed doors in which they decide what kind of trade relationship we will have in the future. Then they come back to us with a trade agreement and they say, here is our agreement between our country and China, our country and Japan, our country and European countries.

Then they say to the Congress, because the Congress previously agreed: you cannot change the agreement. We negotiated it in secret, but you have a responsibility to vote on it, up or down, yes or no, with no changes, no amendments. And the Congress was foolish enough to agree.

Here we are. This morning we are talking about a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to say to the trade ambassador: Better watch it. Why? Because he went off to Singapore and negotiated a free-trade agreement with Singapore that said: By the way, in this free-trade agreement having nothing to do with trade, we will insist that a provision will allow 5,400 immigrants from Singapore into the United States under 1-year visas that will be renewed indefinitely.

What are they going to come here for? To work. Will they come to see movies, drive around on Sundays? No, they are coming here for a job, to work. We have millions and millions of Americans who need a job, who are out of work, who are struggling every single day. And this trade agreement says: What we would like to do, in addition to creating the trade circumstances that exist by this agreement with us and with Singapore, we agree 5,400 people from Singapore will come here to work.

Usually, if one disagrees with that—and I certainly do—we would offer an amendment to strip this from the trade agreement. But we cannot in this instance, because of the fast track authority we handed to the executive branch.

If ever you want a description of why it is "dumb" for the Congress to decide to put itself in a straitjacket, this is it. We are going to vote, probably Monday or Tuesday, on a free-trade agreement with Singapore. That free-trade agreement has a provision in it that will have 5,400 people from Singapore coming to this country to take jobs in this country, when we have 8 to 10 million Americans out of work; and we cannot do a thing about it—not a thing.

Frustrated? Sure, as I am sure are many others. Can you do anything? No,

what we can do is say to Mr. Zoellick, the ambassador, with the sense-of-a-senate resolution: You better watch it.

I will vote for it, but it is like beating someone over the head with a feather. It does not mean anything.

Let me talk about what they should be doing instead of creating new fast-track agreements. Instead of rushing off to create new trade agreements, let me make a couple of suggestions.

I will vote against these trade agreements because we ought to be fixing old problems before we create new ones. That is not a judgment about Singapore or Chile. It is a judgment about what I think the obligation of our trade ambassador is. Under Republican and Democrat administrations, they have systematically failed in the obligation to correct trade problems. Let me mention a couple.

Japan has a very large trade surplus with us. We have a very large trade deficit with Japan. Each year, we have a \$50, \$60, \$70 billion trade deficit. One of the products that we would like to export more of to Japan is beef. Fifteen years ago we reached a new beef agreement with Japan. We had negotiators over there negotiating, and they finally reached an agreement. It was front-page headlines in the American newspapers. You would have thought they won the Olympics. They were celebrating and rejoicing and feasting. Big beef agreement with Japan.

It is 15 years later. Where are we 15 years after a beef agreement with Japan, a country with whom we have a very large deficit? Every single pound of American beef going to Japan has a 38.5 percent tariff on it 15 years after the agreement. And that is set to snap back to a 50-percent tariff on every single pound of beef we send to Japan.

Does Japan need more T-bones? Of course. More hamburger? Of course. But every single pound has this extraordinary tariff on it. Why? Because the Japanese are trying to keep it out. They do not want as much as we should be sending at a time when we have a huge trade deficit with Japan.

It is unforgivable. Do you hear complaints from our country about it? No, no one is talking much about it. It is fine with most people around here to run a huge yearly trade deficit with Japan. It is not fine with me. The trade ambassador, it is fine with him. They are so busy negotiating new agreements with new countries that they cannot seem to resolve these issues. A country with whom we have a \$60 to \$70 billion trade deficit ought not apply 38.5 percent tariffs on the products our ranchers want to send to the dinner table in Tokyo.

What about wheat with China? We just did a trade agreement with the country of China, in order for China to join the WTO. China has a \$103 billion trade deficit with us. They send us everything. They send us their trousers, trinkets, shirts, and shoes. They send us everything. Our marketplace absorbs it all. But the fact is, their marketplace is not open to us. What does

that mean? It means jobs move from this country to China. People here are unemployed, out of work, and we are running up this huge trade deficit with China.

Let me mention the agricultural side of trade with China because I care a lot about that. I come from a wheat-producing State. And our trade officials dealing in agriculture on our side recently stated that China has failed miserably to live up to the promises it made when it joined the WTO in 2001. In fact, before he resigned, the top U.S. trade official dealing with agriculture in China said we should file a trade complaint against China, but we are not doing so. Despite a recommendation that we should, we are not doing so for foreign policy reasons. We do not want to upset the Chinese. God forbid we should upset the Chinese.

So we have a \$103 billion trade deficit with China and our jobs are evaporating in this country, moving to China for lower wages. And we do not want to upset them. We do not want to demand their market be open to our products.

Instead of having a trade ambassador working on that problem, we have new trade agreements. I do not understand that at all.

Automobiles and China has always been interesting. Our trade negotiators, a couple years ago, went to China regarding the bilateral trade agreement under a Democratic administration—all the Democrats and Republicans in the White House have the same trade view. But let me give you a description of the bilateral trade agreement on automobiles. China is a country of 1.3 billion people who want substantial additional growth. Our trade negotiators said we agree, after a phase-in, China can have a 25-percent tariff on any automobiles we send into China, and we will have a 2.5 percent tariff on any Chinese automobiles sent to our marketplace. Our negotiators said they agree to a tariff that is 10 times higher on U.S. cars being shipped to China than we would impose on a Chinese car coming to the United States.

Why on Earth, on a bilateral agreement in this sector, would our negotiators ever agree to something like that with a country with which we have a \$100 billion trade deficit? I don't have the foggiest idea.

This is a 1.3 billion person country that will need automobiles at some point in the future, and we say: We will give you a deal. You have a huge surplus with us, or we have a big deficit with you. We will give you a deal. On automobile trade, we will agree you can have a tariff 10 times higher than ours to keep our cars out.

Unforgivably incompetent, I must say. I am not talking about people, I am talking about the policy.

Something also of interest to me—again, I mention China, but I will get to a couple of other countries—is movies. Our country is pretty good at mak-

ing movies, the best in the world. Do you know that before China entered the WTO, China allowed 10 movies into the Chinese marketplace a year—just 10? Not 11, not 12—but 10. That was the limit.

But when they joined the WTO in 2001 there was this giant liberalization of trade by China. Do you know what they do now? They allow 20 movies into the Chinese marketplace. I guess that is all right with us. In fact, I had people in that industry say we have really made progress here, big advantages, double the movies into China—10 to 20. We have such low expectations of our trading partners it is incomprehensible to me.

Let me talk about beef with Europe, turning to Europe for just a moment. The occasions in which I have traveled to Europe and opened the pages of the European newspapers, I hear the concerns of the Europeans about growth hormones in American beef. Here is the way they picture American beef: Two-headed cow. Right? Growth hormones, God forbid you raise two-headed cows and you can't eat them because it will ruin your health.

Of course, none of that is true. But nonetheless they have effectively kept U.S. beef out of Europe.

So we filed a trade complaint and our trade complaint on European beef was upheld. And Europe is supposed to let our beef in. But they have not.

So we said: All right, Europe, you are not letting our beef into your marketplace and you should, the WTO says you must, we won the case, and since you are not going to abide by the decision, we will play hardball.

Do you know what we did? We said: All right, we are really going to whip you into shape, we are going to take tough, no-nonsense enforcement against you. We said: We are going to impose tariffs on your truffles, goose liver, and Roquefort cheese. That will scare the devil out of a country, won't it? Take action against truffles, goose liver, and Roquefort cheese. Is there a reason people think we are wimps in international trade? I think so. It is bizarre.

When the Europeans want to get tough with us, they pick sectors like steel and textiles. That sounds robust, doesn't it? But we are going to go at them on goose liver.

Shame on us. We ought as a country to decide we are going to protect our marketplace, not against competition, but against unfair competition, that we are going to demand of other countries, if our marketplace is open to them, their marketplace be open to us. I am not a protectionist. I don't believe we ought to put walls around our country. I believe our consumers are advantaged by expanded trade. But by the same token I believe very strongly that trade ought to be fair.

It is not fair trade with respect to the Chinese and the circumstances I mentioned. Let me mention Korea, just for a moment. I talked about China and

Europe. Let me talk about automobiles in Korea.

Do you know in the last year we sent automobiles to Korea, about 680,000 Korean automobiles came into this country—Daiwoos, Hyundais—Korean automobiles. They are probably wonderful cars. I don't know, I have not driven them. But 680,000 Korean cars came into the United States.

Do you know how many U.S. cars we got to Korea? We sold 2,800 cars to Korea. They shipped us 680,000; we sent them 2,800. Do you know why? Because Korea doesn't want American cars in its marketplace and they put up barriers and impediments to keep them out.

What are we doing about that? Nothing. We don't do anything about anything. All we do is go negotiate a new agreement and bring it to the Senate and say, Oh, by the way, we have stuck some extraneous things in and if you don't like it, tough luck, because you can't offer amendments.

Does anyone care about the imbalance in Korean automobile trade? They sent us 680,000 cars and we only get 2,800 to Korea. Does anybody care about that?

There is an interesting example about the Dodge Dakota pickup, just recently. In February of this year, DaimlerChrysler started to sell the Dodge Dakota pickup in Korea. The pickup is made in Detroit, by the way. Korea doesn't manufacture pickups like the Dakota, so DaimlerChrysler thought it had pretty good potential in Korea and the company started marketing to small business owners. It was initially quite successful. It got orders for 60 pickup trucks in February and another 60 in March.

Guess what happened? In March an official with the Korean Ministry of Construction and Transportation decided Dodge Dakota pickup trucks represented a hazard. He said some people were even putting optional cargo covers on the vehicle and that might be dangerous if passengers rode in the back, so he announced that cargo covers on pickups on Dodge Dakotas were illegal, and drivers of the pickups would be fined if they put on a cargo cover. And the Korean newspapers had huge headlines: "Government Ministry Finds Dodge Dakota Covers Illegal." Guess what happened. Korean consumers got the message. They canceled 55 out of the 60 orders they had placed for March.

The Korean Government has done this time and time and time again, to shut down our exports of automobiles to Korea.

On the subject of trade with Korea, I could tell you if you try to send potato flakes to Korea from this country you will find there is a 300 percent tariff on potato flakes used to make confection food.

I could go on for some length at the barriers we face sending America's products overseas into markets that ought to be open to us because our

markets are open to them. But we as a country don't seem to think too much about that, we are so busy doing new agreements.

I have a chart here that shows where we are with trade deficits. With almost every country in the world, we have very significant trade deficits. And ironically, the U.S. trade ambassador has been negotiating with the very few countries with which we have surpluses, like Singapore and Australia. I expect those will soon turn to deficits, given our proclivity to negotiate trade agreements that don't work for our country.

Let me talk just for a moment about Canada. We face wheat coming into this country from Canada, sold by an entity that would be illegal in this country, called the Canadian Wheat Board. It is a state-controlled monopoly that would be illegal in the United States. Yet every day we have Canadian wheat shipped into our country at what we allege are prices below the cost of acquisition, dumping in our country. It is unfair trade. It has been going on for a decade and you can't stop it. You just can't stop it. It is enormously frustrating for our farmers because it takes money right out of their pockets.

One day some while ago I went to the Canadian border with a man named Earl in a 12-year-old orange truck.

He and I went to the Canadian border with about 200 bushels of durum wheat. All the way to the Canadian border we met 18-wheel semi-trucks loaded with Canadian wheat being shipped into this country. When we got to the Canadian border, we couldn't take a small amount of durum wheat in a 12-year-old orange truck into Canada. They stopped us cold. We couldn't move. At the same time, we had all of these semi-trucks coming into this country loaded with wheat. Unfair? You are darned right it is. In fact, Canadian wheat is dumped into our country below the cost of production. Yet we are not able to get satisfaction.

Regrettably, the same is true in almost every circumstance. Instead of trying to resolve these issues for our producers, for our employers, and for our employees in this country, we have this free trade fever to negotiate all of these new agreements, and we are correcting none of the problems in previous agreements.

Those who speak as I do, we are often referred to as "protectionists." The papers will not print op-ed pieces by someone like me on this subject. They will print reams extolling the virtues of this trade policy that comes from Republican and Democratic administrations, but they will never print an op-ed piece by someone who speaks as I do about the need to enforce trade laws.

The view of most around here is that there is a globalization going on and that there are some of us don't get it; we are the xenophobic, isolationist stooges who simply can't see over the

horizon; that they know better; and, if we understood all of this, we wouldn't be critical of it.

But the question that is fundamental to me is this, Should we not require that trade be fair?

Let me give an example of what I mean by "fair."

Our trade relations are unfair in so many different ways. Is it fair, for example, for a worker in a manufacturing plant in the State of Georgia to compete against a 14-year-old young man or a 14-year-old young woman working 14 hours a day, being paid 14 cents an hour in a manufacturing plant in Bangladesh or Indonesia to produce a product that is then sent to our marketplace to sit on a store shelf in a small town in Georgia? Is that fair competition for the company in Georgia that makes the same product, that pays the minimum wage, that prevents the dumping of chemicals and sewage into the water and air, that makes sure they have a safe workplace because they understand those are requirements in this country, because there are prohibitions against child labor and prohibitions against working people 100 hours a week?

Is it fair competition to allow into that store and onto that store shelf for the consumer a product made by somebody who works 14 hours a day and is being paid 14 cents an hour?

This is a true story. A worker in Bangladesh is paid 1.6 cents for every baseball cap she sews, which is then sent to a store in this country to sit on the shelf and is sold for \$17.

Is there a company in this country that can compete with that? I don't think so. Is it fair trade?

Let me give you an example, if I might. The story is entitled "Worked Till They Drop." It tells of a woman named Li Chunmei. Unfortunately, it is not a very unusual story.

Li Chunmei was 19 years old. She worked in a toy factory in China. They made stuffed animals for the U.S. marketplace. Let me read from the article.

On the night she died, Li Chunmei must have been exhausted. Co-workers said she had been on her feet for nearly 16 hours, running back and forth inside the Bainan Toy Factory, carrying toy parts from machine to machine.

Long hours were mandatory, and at least two months had passed since Li and the other workers had enjoyed even a Sunday off.

It had been two months since she and other workers had a Sunday off.

The factory food was so bad, she said, she felt as if she had not eaten at all.

"I want to quit," one of her roommates, Huang Jiaqun, remembered her saying. "I want to go home."

Her roommates had already fallen asleep when Li started coughing up blood. They found her in the bathroom a few hours later, curled up on the floor, moaning softly in the dark, bleeding from her nose and mouth. Someone called an ambulance, but she died before it arrived.

The exact cause of Li's death remains unknown. But what happened to her last November in this industrial town in south-

eastern Guangdong province is described by family, friends and co-workers as an example of what China's more daring newspapers call *guolaoshi*.

The phrase means "over-work death," and usually applies to young workers who suddenly collapse and die after working exceedingly long hours, day after day.

Li worked for 16 hours, running back and forth on the factory floor, and had not had a Sunday off for 2 months—not even a Sunday off. I don't know the wages Li made, but I can tell you that I have gone to some of those places in the world. There are circumstances in which 12-year-old kids are working 16 hours a day and are being paid 14 cents an hour. It is not, in my judgment, fair trade. If they take the product of their work, send it to our store shelves, and tell American workers and businesses, Compete with this, it is not a standard with which we ought to aspire to compete.

We ought not be racing to the bottom on the question of workers' standards, on the question of child labor, and on the question of basic fairness and wages. We ought not be racing to the bottom. Yet that is what we are being set up to do with some of these trade agreements.

Let me say again that this trade ambassador and others have a responsibility to be solving trade problems created by past trade agreements and not presenting us with new trade problems in new agreements.

My main interest today is not Chile or Singapore. My interest is that this country has the largest trade deficit in human history, and this country is suffering a mass exodus of jobs that used to be held by Americans, which are now moved to plants and factories where they can pay pennies on the dollar for an hour's wages. My concern is that the rules of trade have not kept up with the galloping globalization of trade.

The winners are not, as some would have us believe, poor people in other countries who now have jobs. There are plenty of studies and evidence showing that in the last 20 years of globalization, the poor have not improved their lot in life.

These trade agreements are about raw profits. These profits have increased because those who produce those toys—in this case, from a toy factory in China—don't have to pay a decent wage. But it has not improved the lot and life of those who work 16 hours a day—teenage kids—and don't have a Sunday off for 2 months.

My question is very simple to this trade ambassador and others: Why will you not begin to solve some problems, demanding on behalf of the workers of this country and demanding on behalf of the businesses of this country—yes, from Japan, from China, from Korea, from Europe, and others—demanding fair trade rules and understanding there is an admission price to the American marketplace?

This marketplace of ours we fought for, for 100 years. When I say "fought

for," there were men and women who died in the streets of this country fighting for the right to organize as workers. We have had major battles in this Chamber on the issue of child labor, on the issue of minimum wage, and on the issue of safe workplaces and polluting streams and the air shed. We fought those battles, and this country has come to grips with the understanding that you shouldn't put 12-year-old kids in factories and work them 16 hours a day and pay them 12 cents an hour. We don't do that because it is not right. It is not right either to ask American workers to compete with unfair trade practices.

Unless this country starts to stand up for its interests, we will not soon have a manufacturing base left and we will not have family farmers available in the future.

I know when I speak this way, there are those who take a look at it and say: Oh, again, another protectionist.

Again, I believe expanding trade is beneficial to this country, but only if it is done under circumstances in which the rules are fair to those of us in this country.

We ought never, ever be concerned about standing up for our interests. If we have trade agreements, trade ought to be mutually beneficial. Too often in the past our trade agreements, with country after country after country, have not been mutually beneficial.

We had a trade surplus with Mexico; did an agreement with Mexico, and turned it into a big deficit. We had a modest deficit with Canada; did an agreement with Canada, and turned it into a huge deficit. It has been the same with Europe, the same with the GATT legislation. All of it has been a colossal failure, in my judgment. The biggest trade deficit in human history: \$1.5 billion every single day, 7 days a week. That is what we purchase from abroad more than we ship abroad. And it means we are moving America's jobs overseas at an accelerated rate.

The question is, who will be the consumers in the future? If Americans do not have access to good jobs, who will be the consumers in the future for these cheap imports into this country?

We better come to grips with these trade issues, and soon. I am going to come to the Chamber on Monday and speak more about trade when we have the vote on the Free Trade Agreement.

But let me again say, as I conclude, the reason we are having this vote this way is because this Congress, imprudently, in my judgment, decided to tie its hands with something called fast track. It says: Oh, yes, let's offer up our hands, put handcuffs on them so we cannot offer any amendments.

So now Ambassador Zoellick brings us the Singapore Free Trade Agreement, which says we will allow 5,400 citizens from Singapore to come to this country to take jobs. We have some folks who don't like that, so they are going to do a sense of the Senate resolution. Oh, my God, that is going to

make Ambassador Zoellick shake in his boots. It is like hitting him in the forehead with a feather. Sense of Senate: You better not do that again.

The fact is, nobody in this Chamber can do a thing about it because this Chamber decided long ago it would not allow itself to offer an amendment. It is fundamentally at odds with our constitutional responsibilities, in my judgment. But enough Members of this Senate decided to embrace that foolishness and we are now stuck with a circumstance where this agreement will say 5,400 folks from Singapore can come here and take 5,400 American jobs, at a time when we have 8 to 10 million people who are looking for work. Boy, that doesn't add up, where I come from.

I intend to speak at greater length on Monday and try to get some of this trade frustration off of my chest, at least, and see if we can't try to push people—if not pull them—into beginning to stand up for this country's economic interests. No, we don't want an advantage, we just want to stand up for our economic interests and demand fair trade on behalf of American workers and American businesses.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, Senator STEVENS, and other colleagues from the West to protest what the House is about to do in the urgent supplemental bill.

Mr. President and colleagues, and all Americans who are listening, you have to understand what is happening. The Senate passed an urgent supplemental bill to deal with shortfalls in funding where America is facing disasters.

No. 1, our Federal Emergency Management account, which responds to disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, and even a terrorist attack, is in danger of running out of funds within a matter of days. As of July, they were down to \$89 million, and we acted swiftly to send a bill to the House that would include \$1.6 billion to replenish the account.

Also, the West is enduring wildfires of unbelievable magnitude because of a combination of fire and drought. Again, as fellow Americans, we joined with our western Senators to put money in the Federal checkbook to deal with these wildfires.

We also included funds to deal with the shortfall in the committee that is investigating what went wrong in the Columbia disaster.

Guess what. We also added \$100 million to deal with the shortfall in

AmeriCorps that occurred because of bureaucratic mismanagement, so that volunteers would not be penalized and they could come into our school-based programs.

Well, guess what is happening now in the House. This very minute they are debating a rule that, No. 1, limits debate and prohibits amendments. If the rule passes, the House will take up a bill that will essentially strip-mine the urgent supplemental the Senate passed. The House only wants to pass almost half of what the President says he needs for FEMA, and take out all of the other programs.

My message to the House is: Don't do it. Don't pass that rule. It is an embarrassment to you and to the people in desperate need. If you pass the rule, for gosh sakes, don't pass the bill.

I cannot believe the House of Representatives will pass us a take-it-or-leave-it supplemental that takes out help for FEMA, takes out help for wildfires, will not let the NASA commission go on, and essentially pokes AmeriCorps volunteers in the eye, when we are ready to harvest their idealism and put them to work in Teach America and other education programs.

House of Representatives: Don't go out for a 5-week break without helping these desperate situations.

What is an urgent supplemental? An urgent supplemental says when the Federal Government runs out of funds in key programs, because of unintended consequences, we, somewhere in the spring, pass legislation to deal with that. That is what we are supposed to be dealing with now. It is urgent, it is supplemental, and it is desperately needed.

I express my disappointment that the House of Representatives has blocked emergency funding for disaster assistance for wildfire assistance, for AmeriCorps volunteers.

We saw this coming. Who spotted it? Our very able chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, Senator COCHRAN, and Senator BYRD saw this emergency disaster coming. In April of this year, Senator COCHRAN and Senator BYRD asked President Bush to help with emergency funding for FEMA disaster relief. They rightly calculated FEMA would be down to \$89 million at the end of July, just when we are heading into high hurricane season, and there would be the possibility of other natural disasters. And God forbid we have to have the money if there is another attack on the United States of America.

They asked for the money in April. Silence from the White House. Silence from the White House. Silence from OMB. Silence—where the clock was ticking, as the money dwindled down.

The President did send Congress a request on July 7. He did say FEMA would run out of money. So the Senate acted very quickly with the President's request, led by Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD, the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations