

this body, but there never has been one who cared as much or worked as hard for his home State as TOM DASCHLE. I can list his many and varied accomplishments but I would be here for hours and that would not serve the purpose of this farewell. It was the Greek philosopher Plato who said, "The measure of a man is what he does with power." And it is that test that so clearly shows the character and the humanity and the values of TOM DASCHLE. TOM never used the power that he had attained for self-aggrandizement. He used it to build a better South Dakota, and a stronger America.

He has always realized that our country works best when people have an opportunity to live up to their own potential, when our children are not shackled by poverty and lack of education, when our people who need a helping hand are given one, and when our older Americans are able to live out the balance of their lives with dignity. The truth is, if it weren't for TOM DASCHLE and his untiring work, there are children who would not be educated and families who would not be housed and vulnerable people who would be uncared for.

TOM DASCHLE's priorities and values have been the priorities and values of his strong family and his devout faith.

It was Jesus Christ who said:

Inasmuch as ye have done unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

And no matter what level of accomplishment and power TOM DASCHLE attained, he never forgot the "least of the people" who Christ referenced.

While we will no longer have TOM DASCHLE to lead us in this body, we are both instructed and warmed by the example he gave us during his 26 years in his congressional career. He and his wife Linda have made an extraordinary team and will always be among the closest of friends to my wife Barbara and me. I will never serve with a man I admire more than TOM DASCHLE, and it is with very great sadness that I say goodbye to his presence in this body. But more than anyone I have ever served with, or ever will serve with, he has given glory and meaning to the term "United States Senator."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN LABELING FOR MEATS AND VEGETABLES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in recent days there have been news reports about our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Building deciding that

they would like to get rid of something called country-of-origin labeling for meats and vegetables. This is a law that has been previously enacted by the Congress saying that consumers have a right to know where their meat and vegetables come from. So a Member of the House and the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the House have indicated they would like to find a way, in these waning days, perhaps in the Omnibus appropriations bill, to repeal the requirement to establish country-of-origin labeling for meat and vegetables.

Country-of-origin labeling is now the law of the land. The Secretary of Agriculture has been dragging her feet for some long while in implementing it. While she was dragging her feet, the Congress decided to extend the time for implementation, so that time was extended over the objection of many of us. My colleagues, Senator DASCHLE, Senator JOHNSON, and many others here in the Chamber objected to that. But, nonetheless, it was done last year in one of these omnibus bills.

If those who are making decisions about what to put in omnibus bills these days decide they want to repeal the country-of-origin labeling law in an omnibus bill this year, they will do a great disservice to American consumers. They will pull the rug out from under farmers and ranchers in our country. Why? Because the fact is, we produce the highest quality food in the world.

Consumers want to know where their food comes from. Almost any consumer in this country can take a look at his or her T-shirt or their shoes, and on the label it will say: Made in the U.S.A. Made in China. You will find out exactly where it was made. We know where shirts come from, and we know where shoes come from because it is all labeled. But meat is not labeled. The law requires it to be, but it is not at this point. So the question is, Will this law remain, and will it, in fact, be implemented, or will it not?

We had a U.S. Department of Agriculture report about the condition of meat that has been imported into this country. And I would like to just show a couple of comments from that report. The report was talking about conditions inside a meatpacking plant in Hermosillo, Mexico. That plant in Mexico supplied raw beef to the American consumers. It had never been inspected and was finally inspected once. Here is what they found. They found:

"Shanks and briskets were contaminated with feces."

A U.S. Department of Agriculture official wrote of his tour of the plant:

"In the refrigerator a disease-condemned carcass was observed ready for boning and distribution in commerce . . . Paint and condensation from dirty surfaces were dripping on the meat."

The official found that workers were literally walking on the beef that was going to be approved for export to the United States. They found that a side

of beef approved for processing was infected with bacterial blood infection.

The problem is not limited to the Mexican plants. This is one plant in Mexico. Incidentally, this plant was shut down, then reopened under another name, and to my knowledge has never again been inspected.

Mr. President, by unanimous consent let me ask to show this piece of beef from a supermarket.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, no one knows where this comes from. No Member of the Senate will know where this originated. Did this come from the Mexican plant I just described? Does it come from a French plant that was also inspected and contaminated? Does this come from one of those plants, or does it come from a domestic source in this country in which inspection, we know, is rigorous? Does it come from a domestic source where we have farmers and ranchers who produce the best supply of meat available in the world? Where does this piece of beef originate? No one knows. Consumers deserve to know. They have a right to know.

The country-of-origin labeling requirement passed by the Congress will give them the opportunity to know, but some of our colleagues around here, hailing the call of the big packing plants and others, decide now they want to try to repeal that. Maybe, just once, this place can stand up on the side of farmers and ranchers and consumers, just once, and ignore the call of the bigger economic interests who say: Let's not do this. We clearly should do this.

Labeling is important. Labeling empowers consumers. Labeling protects American producers who are producing the best quality food at the lowest disposable income of any country in the world. So my message to those who are now sauntering around the Chambers watching this Omnibus appropriations bill be put together is this: It would be a very foolish mistake to believe that the Omnibus appropriations bill should, without any debate, carry a provision that would repeal something Congress has already done that will give people the right to understand where their meat and vegetables come from, where the origination point is for the vegetables and the meat that is being consumed by the American people.

If, in fact, the majority party decides to do this—as I indicated, one Member of the U.S. House especially is proposing it. It has been, it is reported, supported by the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the House. If they move in this direction, it will be a very serious mistake, in my judgment.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE DEFICITS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to, on another subject, speak for just a moment about the area of international trade.

Yesterday, the Senate approved an increase in the debt ceiling by \$800 billion. That is the fiscal policy debt, that is the amount of money that is spent over that which is collected in revenues. That means our kids and grandkids assume this responsibility. It is Federal debt.

The budget deficit is the highest in history. This is a completely, thoroughly irresponsible fiscal policy. There is no question about it. Oh, I know people say we have had economic slowdowns or recessions or wars or terrorism and this and that and the other thing.

Look, we have had that for a century. But we have never had the size of the deficits we have now had in times like this. As far as I know, we have never before decided to fight a war with borrowed money and ask generations that come after us to pay for it.

But I want to talk about another debt that is growing, and it is larger than the fiscal policy indebtedness that we have. And that is the foreign debt, which arises from trade deficits. This chart goes back to 1998. I could go further. It shows that we have the largest trade deficits in history, by far. Last month, it was \$54.1 billion, the third highest in history. You can see where it is going. It is growing and growing and growing.

Last month alone, the trade deficit with China—just one country—was \$15 billion. Now, nobody talks about this. Nobody seems to give a rip. Some people apparently think this will have no consequence for this country or its long-term prognosis. But they are wrong. This trade deficit is dangerous and will be debilitating to the country's economy unless we do something about it.

Month after month after month we see these reports. And on this chart, this red ink has everything to do with jobs, which define the quality of life in this country. There is no social program in this country that is as important as a good job that pays well, that gives someone an opportunity to go to work, have some security, have benefits, and take care of their family and have a good life. The expansion of jobs and opportunity in this country will determine what kind of a country we have, what kind of opportunity exists for our kids and our grandkids. And jobs are leaving the country.

Yesterday, I had a call from some American workers. I will not describe the company. They are workers for a company that produces a great product. They want to sell that product in China.

Now China has a \$15 billion monthly surplus with us this past month. They ship us their shirts, their shoes, their trousers, their trinkets. They ship it all to us, and we buy it. But can we get our products into China?

These workers say they've been told that to have their product be sold in China, it has to have a 40- to 50-percent Chinese content, otherwise you cannot

get it in. So, therefore, the workers are concerned that the company is now going to begin processing operations in China. Why? Because China insists on it.

Well, look, that violates the World Trade Organization.

That does not come as a shock, of course. There is a systematic violation all the time, by these countries that decide they want to ship all of their products to the United States, but they want to keep their markets closed to us. That means our good jobs are leaving, not coming.

There are a lot of reasons for it, one of which is we have had incompetent trade negotiators under Republican and Democratic administrations, completely incompetent. They think their job is to negotiate agreements, the more the better, and they don't care what's in them. If they don't get an agreement, they think they fail. So they negotiate an agreement, and give away the store.

We just negotiated a bilateral trade agreement with China. Do you know what our negotiators agreed to? On automobile trade, they agreed to this: After a phase-in, China can impose a 25-percent tariff on U.S. automobiles sold in China, and we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff on any Chinese vehicles sold in the United States. Let me say that again. Our negotiators agreed with China that we would allow them to impose a tariff 10 times higher than the tariff we would impose on them in reciprocal automobile trade.

Now, what on earth would possess negotiations to result in that, with a country with whom we have a very large trade deficit?

We know China is ramping up an automobile industry and an export automobile industry, and we now have a trade agreement with them where our negotiators said it is all right to have an imbalance that is tenfold in reciprocal automobile trade.

What does that mean? To strip all the varnish from it, it means it is all right with our negotiators for American jobs to be obliterated and Chinese jobs created on automobile trade. That might be all right with some unnamed trade negotiator, but it is not all right with me. Whoever negotiated that was fundamentally incompetent.

We have some companies these days that are not American companies. Oh, they are American in terms of charter. They get a charter, a corporate charter, that allows them to become an artificial person, be able to sue and be sued, and to contract and be contracted with. They have all the rights of people, except they don't die. They can go broke, but they will never die. These artificial people are responsible only to their shareholders.

These companies have decided they would like to have all the benefits of doing business in the United States as American companies, and all the protection that exists from that, except they don't want to have the obligation

of paying taxes in the United States. Therefore, they do business through a mailbox in a tax haven country. They can set up a business in the Grand Cayman Islands or the Bahamas. In some extreme cases, they have even decided they want to renounce their American citizenship to avoid paying their tax obligation to the United States, in what is known as an inversion.

In addition to that, we now have company after company—and all you have to do is open up the Wall Street Journal every day to see it—doing something called outsourcing. That means taking American jobs and moving them somewhere else in the world, where it is cheaper. Instead of doing business in America, paying American workers \$10, \$15 an hour, they can perhaps do it in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Indonesia, or China. I have described at length on the floor of the Senate the fact that Huffy Bicycles decided to do that, and the little red wagons, Radio Flyer wagons—that firm was in America for 100 years. They decided to move production elsewhere. Why? Because they can pay sub-minimum wages. Huffy Bicycles used to pay \$11 an hour to American workers. They got fired because they were too expensive. You can make them for 30 cents an hour in China, and you can work those people 7 days a week and 12 hours a day.

So we have what is called outsourcing. American companies are outsourcing jobs. That is a fancy term that describes the firing of American workers, in most cases, and employing overseas workers to do the same job at a fraction of the price.

What's even more nuts is that our tax code provides incentives for outsourcing. That's right, when a company wants to outsource, when a company wants to shut down their plant in South Carolina or in Ohio, and do that production in China, we say to that company: We have a treat for you. Get rid of your American workers, shut down the plant, move the whole thing to China and you can get a special tax break.

I happen to think that is absolutely nuts. What kind of a country provides a tax incentive for its companies to get rid of American workers and employ foreign workers? What kind of a country's tax system does that? This country's tax system does it. Yes, we voted on that. I offered an amendment to close that insidious loophole, that perversion in the Tax Code. Guess what. I lost in the Senate.

Here's something else. In a recent bill, the Senate Finance Committee, in conference, decided that U.S. companies who have foreign controlled subsidiaries and have not repatriated their overseas earnings to the United States will be able to repatriate that income at a tax rate of only 5.25 percent. Well, I have a lot of constituents who would love to have that tax rate. Wouldn't that be a wonderful thing? If it is good enough for the biggest companies, which outsourced jobs, it ought to be good enough for all Americans.

Ma Ferguson was Governor of Texas once and was involved in a debate about the English-only language back in the 1930s. She had a press conference and held up a Bible and she said, "If English was good enough for Jesus, it is good enough for Texas." It is the good-enough theory, I guess. The 5.25-percent tax rate is good enough for corporations that moved American jobs overseas. Why is a 5.25-percent tax rate not good enough for people named Johnson and Olsen? Why is 5.25 percent not good enough for everybody?

Why is it that this Congress, when it looks at these issues, won't even take a baby step in the right direction? We are hemorrhaging good jobs in this country. This is a race to the bottom. We fought for a century about important things. We fought for a century about the right of workers to organize. It is a very important right in America. It was a similar fight that lit the fuse that caused freedom all over Eastern Europe. Lech Walesa led that fight, the right to organize. People died in the streets on that issue—the right to say that we are not going to have 12-year-old kids working down in a mine, or in a factory. Child labor laws, safe workplace laws—a whole range of issues. We fought for a century to create safe workplaces, child labor laws, minimum wages, the right to organize, all of these issues, which have, in my judgment, made this a better place.

The fact is, there are American companies now that simply pole-vault over the issues and say we don't have to worry about that, about hiring kids. We can hire kids, we can hire 12-year-olds, work them 12 hours a day, pay 12 cents an hour, and we don't have to worry. How do we do that? We hire them overseas, hire them elsewhere. That means those who have to compete in this new world order have to compete with countries that have decided they are going to make it illegal for workers to organize. You have to compete with 12-year-old kids who are paid 12 cents an hour.

If you wonder whether that is happening, I can show you stories. There is one about a woman named Sadisha, who is making tennis shoes for 16 cents an hour. This is an hour and a half of labor in a pair of tennis shoes that comes to our store shelves for \$80 a pair, and Sadisha's pay is 24 cents for making the tennis shoes.

You think that doesn't happen? It does. I can tell you stories about the kids in India who were making carpets, who came to this country and testified before the Congress about the conditions in which they worked. The people they worked for took gunpowder and lit the gunpowder on the children's fingertips to create scarring, so these little kids could be employed to sew these carpets. And the carpets were sent to our store shelves so we could buy them, and congratulate ourselves on the low prices.

Is there an admission price to the American marketplace? Is there? Are

there some basic set of standards, or is this a race to the bottom to have us compete with that sort of situation?

I held a hearing not too long ago with some young women from Honduras working in a sweatshop making designer shirts, for a very prominent American label. They were working under incredibly abusive conditions. The story is the same all over.

People talk about this being free trade. Look, this is simply a sea of red ink, a trade deficit that is weakening this country, and we have not paid any attention to the rules of trade that would begin to stop this. We had better wake up and decide that our interest is to be protective—and, yes, I use that word even though it is a pejorative word these days—protective of the economic interests of this country. We must do that.

I spoke of Lech Walesa. Let me describe his speech to a joint meeting of the Congress, one of the most remarkable moments I recall in my service here.

He told us about a Saturday morning in a shipyard in Gdansk, Poland, when, having been fired as an electrician in that shipyard, this unemployed electrician was leading a strike against the Communist government demanding rights for the labor movement in Poland.

He said they grabbed him that Saturday morning and began to beat him. The Communist secret police grabbed him and beat him severely and threw him over the barbed wire fence at the edge of the shipyard. He laid there, having been beaten severely, face down, bleeding in the dirt. He said he wondered while laying there, this unemployed electrician having been beaten severely, what to do next. Well, he picked himself up, and climbed right back over the barbed wire fence, right back into the same shipyard, to continue the fight. Ten years later this unemployed electrician was announced at the door of the U.S. House of Representatives as the President of his country, the President of Poland.

This was not an intellectual, not a scholar, not a diplomat, not a soldier, but an unemployed electrician with uncommon courage. He said this to us: We didn't have any guns. The Communists had all the guns. We didn't have any bullets. The Communists had all the bullets. We were armed only with an idea, a powerful idea: People ought to be free to choose their own destiny. And then he said: Ideas are more powerful than guns.

There was a lot of applause that day, and appropriately so—applause of courage, the progress towards freedom and labor rights in Poland. But around here, we seem to have short memories. We are trading away our hard-won rights.

The first baby step we should have taken in this Congress we decided not to take. I offered an amendment, and it was defeated, to stop the perverse and insidious tax breaks that incentivize

American jobs going overseas. Let's not reward companies that move our jobs overseas. Stop it; stop it now. It is a baby step to decide to shut down that tax incentive.

We did not get it done this time. I lost that vote. But I am relentless, and I will again be on this floor the minute we return in January demanding once again an opportunity to debate and to vote on this issue. This is about American jobs. It is about hope and opportunity in this country. It is about expanding this great American experiment, and this issue, I assure you, will not go away.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

ZELL MILLER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple of comments regarding the departure of one of our colleagues, Senator ZELL MILLER. I have had the pleasure of working with Senator MILLER for the last several years and I think the world of him. He comes from a great line of fantastic Senators from the great State of Georgia.

When I was first elected, I served with Senator Sam Nunn and Senator Mack Mattingly. Both were very good friends. Both were outstanding Senators. Senator Paul Coverdell, a very good, close friend of mine, served in the Senate for a little over a term and, unfortunately, had a very sudden illness and passed away. ZELL MILLER was appointed to take his place.

I remember thinking at the time that Paul Coverdell was a great loss to the Senate. I believe that today. He had a great future in the Senate. He was actually elected to the Senate leadership, which was very unusual for his first term in the Senate. Paul Coverdell was one of my closest friends. I really did mourn his loss.

I did not know his replacement appointed at that time, ZELL MILLER, but I got to know him very quickly. I grew to know him, respect him, and admire him as a patriot and as a Senator. He did a fantastic job in service not only to his state of Georgia but, frankly, to this country. He made a valued, positive, and considerable impact on the Senate and, frankly, on our country. I will talk about that for a second.

I remember he was a real leader in passing the Homeland Security legislation. That was very tough legislation. It passed by a very narrow margin. We did that in his first year in the Senate.

He supported efforts to enact tax reform. I was chairman of the Committee on the Budget in 2003, and we passed a budget, frankly, by one vote. ZELL MILLER's vote helped make it happen. We had about 80 something amendments to the budget during consideration of the budget process. ZELL MILLER was with me on every one. He cosponsored the budget. He was my principal cosponsor of that budget.