

It is not as if we do not understand this is a serious problem. Al-Qaida still exists. It has not been destroyed. We know what it has done. We know what it would like to do. We know they continue to plot. It is critical for us not to ignore the threat. Of course, the first step in dealing with it is to do the best possible job we can in monitoring communications between people who would do us harm.

We all agree that congressional oversight is important to the effort, and all of the legislation we have adopted has enhanced congressional oversight. That is a good thing. That is not in question. But you do not have congressional oversight so oppressive that the intelligence folks cannot collect the information they need to collect. We need to be careful that in redrafting FISA we do not actually impede our intelligence collection in the name of congressional oversight.

There are some problems with legislation that came out of our committee, the Judiciary Committee—some big problems—much less so with the bill that passed out of the Intelligence Committee. Even Members who objected earlier agreed, and I think have agreed, we can provide the necessary statutory authorization for the President to act, and I think most would agree we have to have such authorization in place to deal with groups such as al-Qaida. But their concern was we simply wanted to have congressional authority for it, and that is what the act has done.

We have to be careful that in granting the authority we do not attach so many conditions to it that, once again, it is impossible for the intelligence agencies to do the job we have mandated they do. As I said, the bill reported out of the Judiciary Committee, and to some extent even the bill from the Intelligence Committee, does tie down our intelligence agencies with too many limits on how they can monitor foreign intelligence organizations.

What we are really looking at is some of my colleagues' efforts to take away core responsibilities and authority that the President has to protect our Nation in gathering foreign intelligence.

Let me cite a couple of examples. The Judiciary Committee bill makes FISA the "exclusive means"—that is the language—of gathering foreign intelligence absent express statutory authority. That is too narrow. In other words, what it is saying is, if another intelligence-gathering tool is not actually authorized by a statute, then it cannot be used to gather intelligence on a group such as al-Qaida.

One obvious example of this is grand jury subpoenas. They are authorized by rules of evidence, not by a Federal statute. The way the Judiciary Committee bill appears to be written, the United States could not even use grand jury subpoenas to gather information about al-Qaida. Obviously, that is not an intended result—at least I would hope not—but it is one of the things that would have to be fixed if we were

to consider the Judiciary Committee bill.

Another provision is in both bills, and it has been referred to as the Wyden amendment, named after my good friend and colleague from the State of Oregon. But as that provision is written, a warrant would be required for any overseas surveillance that is conducted for foreign intelligence purposes and is targeted against a U.S. person.

Under current law, however, a warrant would not be required for overseas surveillance targeted at a U.S. person if that surveillance is conducted strictly for a criminal investigation. So you have the anomaly where a much lesser standard exists for mere criminal investigations and the tough standard for the intelligence community to try to meet exists for gathering foreign intelligence against terrorists, when you want to be able to gather that intelligence and may need to do so in a very quick fashion in order to prevent an attack.

So the Wyden amendment would create the anomaly whereby U.S. overseas surveillance in the course of, say, drug trafficking or money laundering does not require a warrant, but foreign surveillance against a terrorist does. That is not a wise way to write the statute. It should not be more burdensome to monitor al-Qaida than it is to monitor a drug cartel. So that, obviously, would need to be fixed.

Moreover, many foreign terrorist organizations engage in both terrorism and ordinary criminal behavior such as drug smuggling or money laundering. This provision, unfortunately, creates the perverse incentive for U.S. agents to monitor a group for its criminal activities rather than on account of its terrorist activities. The provision literally makes it easier to monitor a group on account of its smuggling of marijuana than on account of the fact that it is a foreign terrorist organization. These kinds of artificial distinctions, obviously, make no sense and overly complicate the mission that is very difficult to begin with that we have asked our intelligence community to engage in.

In another area the Judiciary Committee stripped provisions from the Intelligence Committee bill that protect from lawsuits those telecommunications companies that have assisted U.S. intelligence agencies. This is very wrong. These companies were asked by the United States to help monitor al-Qaida after the September 11 attacks. Being patriotic Americans who wanted to help the United States in responding to the threat, the phone companies agreed to provide the help, and now they are being punished with lawsuits that damage these companies' reputations and are very expensive for them to respond. These companies helped us after September 11. They are not going to help again if we do not protect them from these types of lawsuits. The Intelligence Committee bill included a provision in the bill to do exactly that. Yet that provision was stripped, as I

said, in the Judiciary Committee. It took away the protection for those who helped monitor al-Qaida. We need to restore that protection for these folks who helped us.

The bottom line is, what is our goal? Do we want to allow our intelligence agencies to be able to use every legal tool at their disposal to track al-Qaida communications or do we want to again tie up our intelligence agencies in restrictions and procedures and then have some future 9/11 Commission—after, God help us, perhaps another terrorist attack—say Congress balled this up and included so many restrictions on intelligence gathering that they were not able to find out this attack was about to occur?

We have to enable our intelligence agencies, not unduly restrict them. Obviously, we need oversight to prevent abuses. That is included in the statutory language, and that is fine. But it does not make sense to impose other restrictions that primarily serve only the purpose of preventing us from collecting good intelligence. There is no excuse, in effect, for making the same mistake twice.

So, in summary, we are going to be dealing with the FISA reform on the floor of the Senate very soon. We need to. The authorization that currently exists expires on February 1. We need to have something in place before that occurs. The bill that came out of the Intelligence Committee by and large will provide the intelligence collection authority that is needed, although there are some problems with it as well. But the provisions that came out of the Judiciary Committee will not work. They will not allow our intelligence collection agencies to do their job properly and, as I said, create the anomalous situation where it is easier to go after intelligence on a criminal enterprise than it is against a terrorist organization. That cannot be.

So I hope my colleagues, when we bring this bill to the Senate floor, will consider the future, the threat of groups such as al-Qaida, and understand it is up to us to ensure our Nation can be protected and not make the same mistake we made before of unduly restricting our intelligence-gathering agencies in fulfilling the mission—the so very important mission—we have asked them to perform.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2405 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement on which we will vote midafternoon today.

The trade policies set in Washington, and negotiated across the globe, have a direct impact on places such as Lima and Steubenville and Cleveland and Hamilton, OH. That is why voters in my State and across the country sent a message loud and clear in November demanding a different trade policy, a new direction in our trade relations.

A new report this month from the Center for Economic and Policy Research says jobs paying at least \$17 an hour—roughly \$35,000 a year—and provide health insurance and provide some form of pension declined by 3.5 million people between 2000 and 2006. If that doesn't underscore and emphasize the decline of the middle class, no statistic does.

Working men and women in Ohio know that job loss—a job paying \$35,000 or \$40,000 or \$45,000 or \$50,000 a year—does not just affect the worker or the workers' families, as tragic as that is; job loss—especially job losses in the thousands—can devastate communities.

Peru and proposed deals with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea are based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, the so-called NAFTA model.

NAFTA's proponents promised the agreement would create new jobs from exports and that U.S. exports to Mexico would exceed Mexican imports by some \$10 billion. NAFTA supporters also promised it would end our immigration issue or problem. More on that at another time.

Today, imports from Mexico exceed exports by about \$70 billion. Instead of a multibillion dollar trade surplus with Mexico, as NAFTA supporters promised, it has gone the other way manifold, with a \$70 billion deficit.

When I was elected to Congress in 1992, the U.S. trade deficit was \$39 billion. Today, after NAFTA, CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and after inclusion in the World Trade Organization, our trade deficit has grown to over \$800 billion. It went from \$39 billion in 1992 to, a decade and a half later, \$800 billion, which is an increase of twentyfold.

What NAFTA is, and what that model of trade is, is simple: A mechanism providing a source of cheap labor for multinational firms.

The NAFTA model includes rules on investment and procurement that favor large companies at the expense of workers, at the expense of small manufacturers in Akron, Toledo, Lima, Findlay, and all over my State, and at the expense of the democratic process.

The investor-State rules of the Peru Free Trade Agreement and these other proposed deals will allow corporations to enforce their rights under the agreement in a private trade tribunal. These are decisions where a corporation can sue a foreign government if that corporation doesn't like its foods safety rules or if it doesn't like its workers compensation system or its consumer protection laws. A company outside of

the United States can sue our Government when, for instance, our Government protests the import of toxic toys from China or protests contaminated toothpaste or dog food or any of the consumer protection food safety rules that protect our families and our children.

Now, here is what the investor-State rules mean. If Peru tries to make improvements to its food safety, health, and environmental laws, large corporations have a mechanism now for challenging it in a private tribunal. This isn't a government making the decision, it is a private tribunal, with generally anonymous people and trade lawyers who almost always decide in support of weakening trade protection laws and decide in support of whatever generally corporate interests are in those countries and make that decision accordingly.

That is not bothersome enough. If Peru passes strong consumer protection laws or a strong food safety law or a strong generic drug law to bring prices down for its consumers, an American company can come in—a drug company, a toy manufacturer, a food processor—and sue the Government of Peru, saying we don't like these laws, and a private tribunal will make the decision. That already has happened under NAFTA, and I can give examples. It also works the other way. A company in Peru can challenge consumer law, a food safety law, a protection for our families law, if you will, in this private tribunal.

Meanwhile, for other parts of the FTA with Peru, such as labor and the environment, we rely on this administration to enforce it. There is a history of this administration unwilling to use the existing enforcement mechanisms available to us—not just in terms of domestic policy, where this administration has weakened environmental laws and consumer protection laws and food safety laws, and they have done it internationally. Almost one of the first acts President Bush did in 2001 was all about the Jordan Free Trade Agreement. The Jordan FTA was once held as a standard in labor provisions. It passed in 2000 during the Clinton administration. I was as critical of President Clinton as I am of President Bush. It is not a partisan thing, but today the vote may look like that. The Bush administration turned the other way while human trafficking was rampant in Jordan.

In Jordan, workers from Bangladesh come in, their passports confiscated, and they work with fabric transshipped from China. So they bring fabric produced by textile companies in China—companies with no labor standards, little environmental standards, and no real protection for workers—they bring in the textiles from China and they bring the workers in from Bangladesh. Those workers work sometimes 20 hours a day, often without breaks. These textiles are assembled into apparel in Jordan in sweatshops and ex-

ported to the United States, without duty, I might add, without tariffs.

President Bush's first U.S. Trade Representative, Robert Zoellick, sent a letter to Jordan's Trade Minister in early 2001, saying the United States would not use the FTA to enforce certain provisions, including the labor chapter. Even though Jordan had strong labor provisions, the administration said we are not going to enforce them.

The Jordanian Government has taken steps to fix its human trafficking problem but not because of the enforcement tools available in the trade agreement; it is only because of the pressure from world opinion.

There is more work to do in Jordan. Last week, it was reported that workers at a Jordanian factory, working under a subcontract, are being threatened with forced deportation after striking to protest the imprisonment of six coworkers.

The National Labor committee, which has done extraordinary investigative work in Jordan, reports that the factory owner threatened to also cut off workers' food and water. This is the kind of country we pass trade agreements with which clearly has no regard for its workers, although in this case they were imported workers from somewhere else.

Remember, factories in Jordan get duty-free access to the U.S. market under the Jordan FTA. How can we not be surprised at similar stories in Peru, Colombia, Panama or South Korea?

Workers and consumers get short shrift. Slave wages are OK, unsafe working conditions are OK, unsafe products and food are OK, contaminated food is OK. With a total lack of protection in our trade policy, we are importing not just the goods but the lax safety standards. We are not just importing toxic toys from China, with lead-based paint covering our Frankenstein mugs at Halloween time, we are importing the values of those countries. If we are going to outsource jobs to China, Peru or Mexico or Bangladesh, they are going to send products back into the United States under production standards we would never allow in this country. We once did, but we would never allow those standards today, with the workers, the environment, the safety, and all of that. We are importing Chinese values, those kinds of values.

With the total lack of protections in our trade policy, the Peru Free Trade Agreement, similar to NAFTA, which it follows, puts limits on the safety standards we can require for imports.

If we relax basic health and safety rules to accommodate Bush-style, NAFTA-modeled trade agreements, then I am afraid we should not be surprised to find lead paint in our toys and toxins in our toothpaste. We have seen recall after recall after recall: contaminated toothpaste, contaminated apple juice and dog food, toxic toys with lead levels thousands of

times higher than we would accept in this country. Yesterday, in Cleveland, I had a meeting and a rally with a couple of mothers who have small children—Sonia Rosado and Sara Correra. They are alarmed and concerned about what to buy their children. They asked: What toys can we buy that we know are safe?

Due to trade agreements, there are more than 230 countries, and more than 200,000 foreign manufacturers exporting FDA-regulated goods to American consumers.

Before NAFTA, we imported 1 million lines of food. The FDA regulated about \$30 billion imported food goods. Now we import 18 million lines of foods and at least \$65 billion imported food goods. The FDA doesn't inspect 50 percent of these or 20 percent or 10 percent; they don't even inspect 1 percent of imported foods. They inspect six-tenths of 1 percent. That means for every 1,000 food shipments that come to the United States, they inspect 6. For every 150, they inspect 1. It is a pretty lethal combination, when you think about buying products, whether it is processed food or toothpaste or toys from a country such as China or a country such as Peru, that don't follow the same food safety standards or protection standards we do. You have American companies hiring subcontractors in Peru or China, and those subcontractors are told over and over that you have to cut costs, cut corners, and maybe do whatever you have to do to cut costs. Well, that means putting lead in toys because lead-based paint is cheaper, easier to apply, shinier, and looks a little better sometimes. Then we have these products come into the United States and we don't inspect them in any significant number.

So with this trade policy—and Peru is another extension of our trade policy with China and another extension of our trade policy similar to the North American Free Trade Agreement, the NAFTA model—we are doing it again. It is a lethal combination. It is a trade model that chases short-term profits for the few, at the expense of long-term prosperity, long-term safety, long-term health for the many. It is a model that works for a few and doesn't work for overwhelming numbers of Americans.

Look at our trade deficit: \$800 billion, almost \$3 billion a day. Look at our manufacturing job losses: 200,000 in my State alone for the last 5 years. Look at wage stagnation: The middle class no longer gets a raise in many cases. Look at imported product recalls: Week after week, sometimes day after day, the Consumer Product Safety Commission says take that off the market, we can't keep selling that. Look at forced labor and child labor and slave labor: We know that is going on in China. We say: Well, their products may be a little cheaper. It helps us with profits. Companies are doing pretty well. We will accept that stuff.

Look what it does to communities. When a plant closes in Gallipolis or a

plant closes in Springfield, OH, families face huge tragedies—neighbors who don't work at those plants, but neighbors see police forces cut, teachers laid off, fewer firefighters ready to take care of them in an emergency. The tax base is eroded, public services decline. They all go together. We are setting ourselves up for more.

The President says he wants Congress to approve new trade deals with Peru, which the Senate will do today, unfortunately, with Colombia, with Panama, and with Korea. Secretary Gutierrez called yesterday for a vote on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement soon after the Peru vote. I invite the President—I would love to see the President come to Portsmouth, OH, on the Ohio River, or sit down with a machinist in Lake Erie or Toledo, or sit down with a tool and die maker, a tool and die shop owner in Akron. Their productivity is up. These workers are doing better and better in terms of productivity. That is a testament to their hard work and their skills, but our Nation's workers too often don't share in the wealth. They are making more money. They are making more profits in the history of our country, particularly since World War II: As productivity goes up, so do wages go up. No more. Workers are more and more productive as they compete on a very unlevel playing field with low income, very underpaid, sometimes slave labor, forced labor, child labor workers in other countries. They are more and more competitive, but their wages stay flat.

The President wants these trade deals, and in 2002 Congress gave the President the authority to negotiate and to sign and seal these trade deals. All Congress gets to do is vote yes or no. No amendments. No particularly extensive debate. You have to vote yes or you have to vote no. You can't make any changes.

When I talk to workers in Marion or Mount Vernon or Dayton or Mansfield about fast track—this kind of unusual rule that we operate trade agreements under in the House and Senate—they ask: What is the point of Congress being involved at all? All we do is say yes to the President.

The reason the President wants fast track is it silences opposition, it cuts out debate, and pushes through these unpopular trade deals. We all know in this body—every single Republican and every single Democrat in this body—that these trade agreements—NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR with China, trade agreement with South Korea, trade agreement with Colombia, trade agreement with Peru and Panama—if they came to a vote in the United States among 300 million Americans, they would be soundly defeated. We all know that. Many of us ran campaigns last year, in our elections a year ago, talking about these trade agreements and what they mean.

The current system is not sustainable. People in Ohio and throughout

this country will not stand for more of it. Labor unions, environmental groups, church groups, development groups are not out lobbying for the Peru Free Trade Agreement. People don't come up to me at schools or in church or in factories or in small businesses or walking down the street or when my wife and I go to the grocery store, and say: Hey, you ought to pass another trade agreement because they are working well. Our trade deficit only went from \$38 billion to \$800 billion in 15 years. They are really working. More jobs created; more manufacturing.

Of course, they are not asking us to vote for these trade agreements because they simply aren't working. Why would we do another trade agreement when NAFTA didn't work, when CAFTA didn't work, when PNTR with China doesn't work, when these other trade agreements simply don't work?

I think Americans want trade. I want trade. We want trade. We want plenty of it, but under rules that raise standards and ensure our experts have a lasting and sustainable market for consumers. Trade can be a development tool, but the way this administration pursues trade is not promoting sustainable development. We want trade with countries that will be a lasting market for American goods—a market for American goods, not just a source such as Jordan has become, such as China is, such as Peru is becoming—not a source for cheap labor. The American people want a pro-trade, pro-development, pro-working families, forward-looking approach.

We have a choice. We can work with the countries we want to trade with, make sure they play fair, make sure they can purchase our products, make sure the standards of living go up in those countries over a long period, or we can continue to walk myopically, nearsightedly, blindly into even more of the same trade deals. We can continue free trade on the cheap, or we can respect the progress America has made over the last century: our hard-fought labor laws, our food safety laws, our consumer product laws that protect children, that protect our families, that give us one more reason to be proud of our great country; or we can do what the President wants and what the leadership from the Republican Party in this Congress wants. We can take two steps—we can take two steps back from this progress to accommodate lax labor and safety standards.

This Congress has a choice too. We can pass legislation to combat unfair currency, or we can continue to let China cheat. We can bolster trade enforcement, or we can rely on the administration's discretion to enforce our trade laws. We can assist workers laid off to unfair trade, or we can continue to look the other way.

We have heard voters in Ohio and around the country call for big changes to trade policy. We are hearing consumers demand accountability for the

unsafe imports that are on our store shelves. Looking into the eyes of Sara and her children yesterday, looking into the eyes of Sara yesterday, of her friend Sonia, and seeing the look she had about why isn't the government on our side on this—it does matter. We are hearing consumers demand accountability for the unsafe imports that are on our store shelves.

Passing a trade agreement with Peru is not the change Americans demanded last year, that Americans continue to demand now, and that America will continue to demand in the years ahead.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. 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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3688, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3688) to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 90 minutes of debate equally divided.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words as to why I am strongly opposed to the Peru Free Trade Agreement. Some of the points I made last night, but I think they need reiteration. The untold story of the economy in the United States is that the middle class is shrinking, poverty is increasing, and the gap between the rich and the poor is growing much wider. I am not going to stand here and tell you trade is the only reason the middle class is shrinking, but I am going to tell you it is a major reason, and it is an issue we have to deal with.

Mr. President, since George W. Bush has been in office, 5 million Americans have slipped out of the middle class and into poverty, 8½ million Americans have lost their health insurance, median household income for working-age families has gone down by nearly \$2,500, over 3 million good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost, 3 million Americans have lost their pensions, wages and salaries are now at their lowest share of GDP since 1929,

and we are in a situation now where the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans earn far more income than the bottom 50 percent.

In the last number of years, technology has exploded and worker productivity has increased. Yet in the midst of all of that, the middle class is struggling desperately to keep their heads above water, and poverty is increasing.

I think the question this Senate should be spending a lot of time on answering is why that is happening. Why is it that everything being equal, our kids will have, for the first time in the modern history of the United States, a lower standard of living than we do? Why is it that a two-income family today has less disposable income than a one-income family did 30 years ago? In the midst of all this globalization, all of the explosion of technology, all of the increase in worker productivity, there is more and more economic desperation in the United States, and the only people who are doing very well are the wealthiest 1 or 2 percent of the population.

Now, I think there is a real problem when you have unfettered free-trade agreements which essentially allow corporate America to throw American workers out on the street, move to China, move to other low-wage countries, pay people their 50 cents an hour, \$1 an hour, and then bring their products back into this country. One of the great crises we are facing is we are not building manufacturing plants in the United States and putting people to work at good wages with good benefits. Not only are we losing blue-collar jobs, we are losing white-collar information technology jobs. And millions of parents all over this country are wondering what kind of jobs are going to be available for their kids.

The fact is, these free-trade agreements have not worked. I don't know how many times and what people need to understand that. Just take a look at NAFTA. I remember, because I was a Member of the House during that debate, that the supporters of unfettered free trade told us over and over that NAFTA would increase jobs in the United States. But according to the Economic Policy Institute, NAFTA has led to the elimination of over 1 million American jobs.

Now, why would you want to follow a paradigm, a trade policy approach which has failed in the past? If it has failed time and time again, why would you keep doing the same thing? A manager of a baseball team who has losing records year after year gets fired. That is what happens. The team changes its approach.

Right now, we have a huge trade deficit. It is a growing trade deficit. We are losing good-paying jobs. Pressure on wages is to push them down into a race to the bottom. That is a failed trade policy.

Supporters of unfettered free trade told us that NAFTA would signifi-

cantly reduce the flow of illegal immigration into this country because the standard of living in Mexico would increase. Well, guess what. They were wrong. It didn't happen. As a result of NAFTA, severe poverty in Mexico increased. It didn't go down, it increased, and 1.3 million small farmers in that country have been displaced, with real wages for the majority of Mexicans having gone down. All of this has led to a 60-percent annual increase in illegal immigration from Mexico during the first 6 years of NAFTA alone.

What is happening in Mexico and in the United States and in many other countries today because of unfettered free trade is we are seeing a huge increase in the gap between the people on top and everybody else. I will give just one example. In Mexico today, a poor country, a gentleman named Carlos Slim has just surpassed Bill Gates as the wealthiest person in the world, worth over \$60 billion, in a poor country. Incredibly, because of unfettered free trade and near liberal type of economic policy, Mr. Slim is worth more than the poorest 45 million Mexicans combined. One man has more wealth than the bottom 45 percent, which happens to be 45 million Mexicans. That is one of the manifestations of unfettered free trade.

And the situation is the same with China. I remember the debate about China—we have a great market in China. If we open permanent normal trade relations with China, it will create all kinds of jobs. Nobody believes that is true. We have a huge trade deficit with China, a trade deficit that is growing. People today are doing Christmas shopping. When they go to the stores, the products they will find from A to Z are made in China, not made in the United States. I can tell you that in my small State of Vermont, we have lost 25 percent of our manufacturing jobs in the last 6 years—not just due to trade, but trade has played an important role.

All over this country, people are wondering why corporate America is not reinvesting in Pennsylvania or Vermont or the rest of the country. Well, you know why. They are investing billions and billions of dollars in China, hiring people there at pennies an hour, and then they bring their products back into this country. And people are wondering: How do you become a great economy? How do you lead the world? How do you have good jobs for your kids if we are not producing the goods that our people purchase?

You will remember, Mr. President, that 20, 25 years ago, the largest employer in the United States was General Motors. They produced automobiles. They paid people good wages, they had good benefits, and there was a strong union. Today, the largest employer in the United States is Wal-Mart, with low wages, minimal benefits, and vehemently antiunion.

What I also don't understand, in terms of this trade debate, is who the