

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will modify his request so I might be recognized following his 15 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I have no problem.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, there is nobody in this country who doesn't want our food to be safe. There is no question, we all rely on the intent that the vast majority of food is safe in this country. There is no question that we have some problems with food safety. But the biggest problem we have is in fixing the symptoms of the problem rather than the problem itself.

I hope America will pay attention to this. Ask yourself why it took the Food and Drug Administration 10 years to give us an egg safety standard and that no oversight committee of either the House or the Senate, through the previous 10 years, held an oversight hearing to ask why it has taken 10 years to get that egg safety standard. It came out 10 days afterwards, coincidentally, to the salmonella infection we have recently seen.

As a practicing physician who has treated Shigella, Salmonella, Yersinia pestis, Campylobacter, and Listeria monocytogenes, which are infectious gastrointestinal bacterial diseases that can come from food, I want it to be safe. What I want more than that is for the organization that is supposed to keep it safe to do its job. The problem with this bill, besides it not being paid for, is it doesn't fix the real problem.

The American public should know, if you go to the grocery store anywhere in this country and buy a pepperoni pizza, the FDA is responsible for food safety. But if you buy a cheese pizza, it is the USDA. How does that make any sense to anybody in America?

What happened on the farms in Iowa, as far as eggs, is the USDA knew there was a problem, but they didn't tell the FDA because the FDA is only responsible for the egg once it gets out of the chicken. Which came first, the chicken or the egg? It was then shipped and was the responsibility of the FDA.

This bill doesn't address any of those problems. As we look to solve a very critical and real problem—and I acknowledge Senator DURBIN's work on this and that of our chairman and ranking member. I had a staff member at every meeting they had raising these same objections. We now have a bill that will cost the American public \$1.5 billion over the next 5 years that doesn't fix the real problem.

The real problem is the lack of focus of the agencies to do their job. It does not eliminate the crossover and lack of consistency. If you buy red meat in the store, you only have to trust one agency. But if you buy an egg, you have to trust two. If you buy a salad or lettuce, you have to trust two. They are not talking to one another. There is nothing in this bill that makes them do that.

What we have done is we have created a lot of new regulations, with a

lot of money, without solving the real problem. The only way we get to the real problem is to have the FDA up here once a week for the next 4 weeks and have the USDA up here once a week for the next 4 weeks, talking about these critical crossover issues.

In the bill, it actually states that nothing in this act or an amendment made by this act shall be construed to alter the jurisdiction between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In other words, there is a prohibition to alter the responsibility so we might have safe food—in other words, to hold one agency accountable, rather than two so one can point the finger at the other. We had a House hearing today on the egg recall, and the fact is that is what happened. USDA knew there were problems. But the FDA didn't know there were problems until after somebody got sick.

So we create a high level of additional regulation, a high level of various inspections—and I am not against inspections. I eat salad like the rest of us. Sometimes I am not accused of being human, but, in fact, I consume the same food everybody else does. I don't want to get sick from it. But we can't continue to pass bills that pile on regulations that cost the American people \$1.5 billion and don't fix the real problem. That is the problem. My objection is it is not paid for.

I will hear the objection that it is an authorizing bill. Oh, really. It is just an authorizing bill. So that means there is not any money going to be spent? Then we aren't passing the bill to do what we want it to do. Because if we say we are not responsible for spending another \$1.5 billion, then there is no problem. It is not spending money. If it is not spending money, it is not going to do anything. But if it is spending money, we ought to decrease the priority somewhere else within the waste of the USDA—which there are billions—and within the FDA, which has tons of properties they are not using that could pay for this bill easily. We ought to eliminate the things that are not working.

So I want our food to be safe. As a practicing physician, I know the public health aspects of this bill. But I refuse to go forward when we continue to make the same mistakes that have given us a \$1.4 trillion deficit and have given us lack of control and oversight of the bureaucracies. The biggest thing is, we are not holding anybody accountable for this because we will pass this. Then, the next time there is a food problem, in terms of contaminated food, we will pass something else. In between times, there will not be the first oversight hearing to say: What did we do that didn't work and show us a result that works. Is it efficient, effective, and did it improve the safety of the food? We will not do that. We will just react and pass another bill.

I am through passing bills that don't solve the real problems. I am through

spending the next two generations' money, when we can't make the priority choices. The fact that we have refused to say we are going to eliminate something that is very low priority to be able to have a food safety bill, then that tells the American people we are not up to the task of getting us out of our problems.

I know everybody in this body wants safe food—even me. I am not tired of taking the hits for holding up this bill. We can't be perfect on food, but we can be a whole lot better. This bill can solve some of the problems, but it is not complete. It hasn't looked at the levels it needs to straighten out the bureaucracy on food safety. It hasn't eliminated the overlap. Nobody with any common sense says you will have pizzas in the grocery store, one controlled by the USDA and one by the FDA.

It is clueless. It does not fit. The reason the one that does not have any meat on it is controlled by the FDA is because it has a milk product. It has cheese. But the one that has pepperoni on it has cheese too. How did we get there? Where are we going to establish responsibility and accountability with the agencies that are responsible for food safety?

I look forward to working with the majority leader. I will take a less than perfect bill anytime. But I will not take a bill that is not paid for and does not come out of the hides of our children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there is a lot of talk and politics on the floor of the Congress always about something called the American dream. People talk about the American dream. I suppose we reflect on that and think the American dream is about a time the American people have a job that pays well, a job with security, a career with a growth ladder to it, a family, a home, living in a nice community, living on a safe street—the American dream.

We look at the history of this country and discover that beginning early in the last century, we started changing things in America—lifting up people, doing a whole series of things to develop a group of middle-income Americans. We have been enormously successful, perhaps more than any other country in the world. We expanded a middle class.

Now things are changing, and we see that people are upset, nervous, and in some cases angry. We see reports that they worry their children will not have it as good as they have it. They worry about the future.

What is at the root of all of that, and what can we do about all of that? Everyone wants to do well. All of us have hopes and aspirations for ourselves, our children, our families—the American

dream. Someone once asked J. Paul Getty: How is it that you can be successful? Give me the elements of success.

He said: It is very simple. No. 1, go to school and get the best education you can get. No. 2, get a good job and work really hard. And, No. 3, strike oil. That is the advice of J. Paul Getty.

I suppose that works if you are J. Paul Getty. But his advice, of course, makes a lot of sense on the first two points: get the best education you can and get a job and do well, work hard.

The problem is today, in late September of 2010, a lot of people woke up this morning without a job and cannot find one. It is estimated there are about 20 million Americans this morning who woke up unemployed. Most of them put on their clothes and went out looking for work, a triumph perhaps of hope over experience because many of them have tried for a long while and have not been able to find a job. And they are very worried there may not be a job for them in the future.

We had 2.1 million workers in the past two years having to leave manufacturing plants, losing their jobs as manufacturing workers. Those are often the very good jobs. They pay well with good benefits, in most cases. Mr. President, 2.1 million of them have lost their manufacturing jobs in the last 2 years; more than 5 million have lost their jobs since 2000.

What do we do about that? What can we tell the American people when they see their neighbors, their friends, and their relatives searching for a job, having been laid off from somewhere they worked for 15, 20, 25 years? Then they read in the paper that in Stanleytown, VA, a company was started by a man named Thomas Stanley, a young dairy farmer in southern Virginia, who decided he wanted to create furniture that was of superior craftsmanship and affordable still, so he started making furniture. It became Stanleytown, and he employed highly skilled craftsmen, 1,300 people who carried on his vision at a manufacturing plant of 1.7 million square feet.

Then those who make Stanley furniture woke up a couple months ago and read this in the paper:

Stanley Furniture's decision to close its plant in the small town that bears its name fell like a hammer blow on southern Virginia and resounded across an industry increasingly moving overseas. More than 500 employees will lose their jobs this year as the manufacturer shuts down its Stanleytown, VA, plant, where the company has made furniture since 1944.

Where is it going? It is going to Asia. Those 500 people—I do not know their names. I cannot tell you who they are. I would not recognize their faces because I do not know any of them. But I am sure those 500 people are paying an enormous price in their lives for having lost jobs at a plant in a company that produced a product about which they cared very deeply. Gone to Asia. Why? Were these bad workers? Did they decide it was a job, but just a

job, so they were going to loaf all day and not do their work? No, it was not that at all. In search of low wages, this company decided: We are going to Asia to produce this furniture.

I mention Stanley Furniture. The other day I mentioned a furniture company from Pennsylvania because I had just been to Philadelphia—Pennsylvania House Furniture. It has a very similar story in many ways. Pennsylvania House Furniture, made for a century in Pennsylvania, upper level furniture, fine furniture made by craftsmen, one day it was purchased by La-Z-Boy, and La-Z-Boy decided: We do not want to make Pennsylvania House Furniture in Pennsylvania. We want to take the Pennsylvania wood and ship it to China, have them put it together, and ship it back to America to be sold. They told all the workers: You are done. It is over. The plant is closed.

On the last product of the day, on the last day at work, these craftsmen who made this fine furniture for Pennsylvania House Furniture turned over the last cabinet that came down the line, the last one they had made, and they all signed their names—proud craftsmen working for a company that existed over 100 years, the last piece of furniture ever to be made with American hands. Jobs gone.

The list is endless. This is not a short list. Hershey chocolates, York peppermint patties: "The cool refreshing taste of mint dipped in dark chocolate will take you miles away." In fact, it will take you so far away it will take you to Mexico because that is where they moved those jobs when they shut down the mint Hershey's plant in the United States of America. It will take you miles away. It certainly took away the jobs of those who were working there.

I am not going to go through all these charts because I have done it before. I know what repetition means around this place. But I want to talk just for a moment about the consequences of this to a lot of people whose names we do not know and faces we would not recognize but who are living as victims of something they cannot control. That is the erosion of America's manufacturing base with jobs shipped overseas wholesale and the hollowing out of America's manufacturing capability.

Why does that matter? No. 1, because a lot of people are losing jobs who need jobs in this country. And, No. 2, this country will not remain a world economic power unless we have a world-class manufacturing capability. That is just a fact.

The question is, When will we stand up for this issue and decide we have to do something about the export of American jobs?

Paul Craig Roberts—I have met him—former Assistant Treasury Secretary under President Reagan said:

Outsourcing—

He means outsourcing of jobs—is rapidly eroding America's superpower status. Only fools will continue clinging to the

premise that outsourcing is good for America.

Another quote, if I may, from Dr. Paul Craig Roberts:

In order to penetrate and serve foreign markets, U.S. corporations need overseas operations . . . However, many U.S. companies use foreign labor to manufacture abroad the products they sell in American markets. If Henry Ford had used Indian, Chinese and Mexican workers to manufacture his cars, Indians, Chinese and Mexicans could possibly have purchased the Fords but not Americans.

Because they would not have had the jobs. Pretty prescient. Pretty interesting.

This is a chart that shows Stanley Furniture's workers in the manufacturing plant. But, of course, that was then, and now it has gone to Asia.

I want to show this picture only because the Los Angeles Times needs to know this. I spoke of this subject some while ago and showed a picture of the dancing grapes that represented the advertising campaign for Fruit of the Loom underwear. They left America and are produced elsewhere. The Los Angeles Times wrote a piece saying I was on the floor of the Senate talking about underwear, not describing that I was talking about trade and the movement of jobs overseas. If they write about it again, they might mention I was talking about jobs moved overseas that were performed by American workers to produce Fruit of the Loom.

I have described often Radio Flyer—a little red wagon made in Illinois for over 100 years by an immigrant who put together a company—that almost every child has experienced. Almost every American child has ridden in a Radio Flyer little red wagon. But they are not made in America anymore. They have gone to China.

Huffy bicycles, gone to China; left Ohio, gone to China. Not made for \$11 an hour by an Ohio worker, as was the case, but made now by Chinese workers who make 50 cents an hour, working 7 days a week, 12 to 14 hours a day.

I have often mentioned, and will mention again, that all of these folks, on the last day of work, when they walked out to the parking lots after having been fired so their jobs could be moved to China, left pairs of empty shoes in the parking lots saying: Yes, you can move our jobs, but you will never replace us. They are never going to replace these workers.

This represents a photograph of a company called HMC. Not everybody is moving overseas. There are some manufacturers—and I want to pay attention to what the owner of HMC said recently. They make high-tech gearboxes, high-tech machinery. HMC—made in America and enormously proud of it.

Let me mention what the president and CEO of HMC said:

Offshoring in search of higher profits is a mistake . . . because it ignores manufacturing's larger purpose in U.S. society.

This is from the CEO of an American manufacturer. Further he says:

It's my belief that every American citizen, not only me, should feel strongly about maintaining one of the most important cultures we have, and that is manufacturing.

Good for Mr. Robert Smith, wherever he is. Good for Mr. Smith, president and CEO of HMC, believing that manufacturing is important in this country.

What does all this mean? Our economy is in some significant trouble for a couple of reasons. No. 1, for about a decade and a half or two decades, we have pursued a different trade strategy—a trade strategy in which we have refused to stand up for our economic interests.

For the first 25 or 30 years after the Second World War, it was just understood that we were the biggest, the best, the strongest—we were American. Whether it was trade competition or any other competition, we could beat anybody in this world with one hand tied behind our back. Much of what was imported were trinkets that were inexpensive trinkets that were pretty worthless. We made products that were made in America, products that lasted, products that worked, products on which you could count.

But in the second period following that first quarter century after the Second World War, things have changed. We have largely had concessional trade practices. It used to be we just did outright foreign aid to help other countries. Not anymore. We have for the last 20 years or so done concessional trade practices to help other countries. We have said: We will do a trade agreement with you that is unfair to us because we are bigger and stronger and better than you are. So here is a trade agreement. We have done that time after time. Therefore, we now have very large trade deficits.

Let me show the consequences of a trade agreement.

We have trade agreements with Korea. Here is the issue of automobiles with Korea. Last year, because we had a deep recession, we were not buying as many cars. Last year the Koreans put on boats and sent to this country 467,000 cars made in Korea—467,000 Korean cars. Those are Koreans who go to work in the morning to a job. They are making cars. They are pleased as punch they make cars because they sell them in Detroit, Bismarck, and Denver.

Here is what we were able to sell in Korea: not 467,000 cars, Korea allowed us to send 6,000 cars to Korea.

One might say: Is that an accident? Of course, it is not. It is exactly what the Korean Government wanted. They want the jobs in their country. They want to make the cars in their country and send them here, and they do not want our workers making cars we send to Korea.

If you wonder about that, I have another chart that shows what you will confront on the roads in South Korea. If you drive down the road in South Korea, what you will see are a lot of vehicles, and you will see almost no

foreign vehicles. Ninety-eight percent of the cars on the road in Korea are made there. They are made and manufactured in that country. Now, is that an accident? That is exactly what the Korean Government wants. They do not want foreign cars, and they do all kinds of things to keep them out. They want jobs for their people.

So we now have a trade agreement with Korea that we have not yet ratified or voted on in the Senate, and they didn't address the automobile issue. It is unbelievable to me. Why would they do that? How about standing up for our interests, for our workers?

So, Mr. President, the reason I came to the floor of the Senate is that there is now on the calendar a piece of legislation that would at least begin the process of trying to even up some of the trade issues. We actually, strangely enough, give a tax benefit for U.S. companies who decide they are tired of manufacturing in America. If a company says: Let's get rid of those workers. Let's lock up that manufacturing plant. Let's send the jobs to Senshen, China, and manufacture there. Then we will ship those bicycles and wagons and trailers and trucks and garage door openers back, and we will sell them to Americans. That is what we will do. And our country says: You know what. That would be good. Why don't you do that—fire your workers, get rid of your manufacturing plant, go to China, and I tell you what we will do. We will give you a tax break for doing it.

We have voted four times in the Senate to eliminate that tax break. I have offered that piece of legislation four times. On all four occasions I have lost the vote. We are now about to vote again in the coming days. Maybe at last—at long last—when 20 million Americans can't find work, maybe we will see if we plug the drain just a bit on these jobs that are moving out of this country at a rapid pace to be located in low-wage countries around the rest of the world. Maybe now is the time. Maybe people here will say: You know whose interests I stand up for? The workers in my State, American workers, people who are producing good products that say made in America.

When I speak this way, there are some who will say: Well, you are being a protectionist. You want to change things. You are being a protectionist. You are a xenophobic isolationist stooge. You don't get it at all. It is a new world order. We have all these countries who can do things cheaper than we can do them, and you don't seem to understand that. So you are just a protectionist.

Well, let me plead guilty to wanting to protect our country's economic interest. I would hope every desk in this Chamber would be occupied by someone with similar instincts and wanting to stand up and protect the economic interests in this country.

I am not interested in withdrawing from the world. I am saying, however,

that after a long struggle and doing the things that are necessary to improve things, as we have done in the struggle for workers' rights, the struggle for safe workplaces—and people were killed over those struggles. I described in the first book I wrote about James Fyler who was shot 54 times. You know why he was shot 54 times in Ludlow, CO? Because he believed people who went underground and dug for coal ought to be able to work in a safe workplace and be paid a decent wage, and for that he was killed.

We have struggled for a century to raise standards, to get safe workplaces and decent wages. Now, all of a sudden we are told it is a new world order. We should compete with workers who are going to work 7 days a week, 12 to 14 hours a day, for 50 cents an hour. If we can't compete with that, tough luck.

That is what they told all the folks at Huffy bicycles. They said: If you can't compete with the Chinese prices, you are out of luck because that is our standard. The list is endless. Just about every kid has played with Etch A Sketch. Everybody knows what Etch A Sketch is, a toy made in America. It was the principal employer of a town in this country. But no more. Walmart told Etch A Sketch: You won't be marketing at Walmart unless you meet this price, and Etch A Sketch has gone to China. All those people who were proud of making a children's toy are now not working.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have been listening with fascination to the Senator's speech because there is nobody who comes to the floor and better explains jobs, trade, trade policy, and tax policy and what it does to our communities and our workers.

The Senator mentioned two very well known American companies, and both happen to be from my State—Huffy bicycles and Etch A Sketch, which is a company called Ohio Art in Bryan, OH. That is exactly what happened. Walmart came to Ohio Art and said: We want to sell Etch A Sketch for less money than we are selling it for now. So they had no choice.

But let me ask the Senator, it seems to me that there has not been anytime in recent history where U.S. companies have put their business plans together in this way: Instead of manufacturing something, cutting costs, and treating their workers decently and contributing to the community—which American companies have done for generations and is why we have such a strong middle class—it seems that the business plan for so many large American companies is to move their production offshore, obviously getting less expensive labor, avoiding environmental and worker safety rules, and then selling the product—well, first lobbying Congress to change the rules, as they did with PNTR for China, but moving their

production out of the country, offshore, producing it, and then selling it back into the home country.

That is a curious business plan that many American companies follow. I hear those companies say to me: Well, we have no choice but to go offshore for the cheapest production because our competitors are doing that, even though they lobbied Congress to help change the rules. I mean, it is a bit cynical but a curious business plan that you leave behind the community that built you up and you move somewhere else and then you sell the products back to the country in which you were founded.

Mr. DORGAN. I would say to the Senator from Ohio that it is a business plan these days for too many companies. Not all, but too many. There are some companies—and I just described a company, a CEO, and I was giving him credit because what he said is important—a company called HMC. It is a company that manufactures very high-tech products in this country. He says:

It's my belief that every American citizen, not only me, should feel strongly about maintaining one of the most important cultures we have, and that is manufacturing.

The fact is, we are in a situation where a lot of companies have decided they would like to produce elsewhere, hire other workers, but they would like American consumers to buy their products. The question in the longer term is, Who is going to buy those products if American consumers don't have jobs? I mean, that is the question.

I have talked a little about China. I am chairman of the Congressional Executive Commission on China, and I just chaired a hearing for 2 hours about the issue of piracy and counterfeiting and so on in China. One of our witnesses described something I had written about in my book as well; that is, American businesses should know their intellectual property is not secure in China. It will be stolen.

I am not a big fan of them—in fact, I have fought the pharmaceutical company pretty tough on the floor of the Senate—but Viagra, made by Pfizer, was quickly reengineered in China and just sold without any respect for property rights or intellectual property rights. In fact, the witness over at the hearing this afternoon said the Chinese, once they reengineered Viagra and sold it on their own basis, had a new twist on it. They were putting it in soft drinks and hot dogs. So it was kind of interesting to hear this guy, who is an expert in intellectual property rights, describe his view.

He finally said, by the way, Pfizer has won a case against the Chinese for reverse engineering of Viagra. But this discussion is not about that, it is about jobs in virtually every industry in this country. There are service industries that can never leave, of course. You can't take a taxicab driver's job and move it to China or India because they have to drive a cab up and down an American street. But Alan Blinder and

others have said we are talking about the potential of tens of millions of additional American jobs leaving unless there is a strategy to understand that our participation in the global economy is designed to raise up others, not push down our standards. It is designed to be in our economic self-interest to try to keep Americans employed in good jobs that pay well.

So we have a lot to do. I mentioned, Senator BROWN, that we are likely to have another vote in the Senate in the coming days on the question of shutting down this unbelievably ignorant provision in tax law that says if you leave America and get rid of your workers and padlock your plant and then go produce the jobs in China or India and then sell back here, we will give you a tax break for doing that. We would like to reward you for doing that. The other side of that is that a lot of American business men and women who started their companies here don't intend to go anywhere. They are here and they are proud of it and they are not leaving. They are going to hire their friends and neighbors in their communities, and they are going to make the best products possible. They are going to stick a made-in-America label on it. But they are disadvantaged. It is not just the workers but those American business owners who are now having to compete against the one that was across the street and then went to China and now has a lower tax rate because our Tax Code says that is fine.

I hope at long last that maybe we will have enough people here with the courage to say: It is not fine with us. It is not fine with people who are unemployed in this country. It is not fine with business men and women who are disadvantaged because of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the Senator yield once again?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

I would add that a major manufacturer that leaves from Minneapolis or leaves from Cleveland or from North Dakota is a company that has the resources to do that, and that company has a multitude of component manufacturers in its supply chain and that large company that leaves may be its biggest customer. Perhaps it is a big assembly plant that leaves to go to China. The component manufacturer that sells to that auto assembly plant has all of a sudden lost its biggest customer. It is not big enough to move to China, so it loses 30 percent of its customer base.

So it is not just the company that moves and what that does to American workers and companies and communities, it is also those multitude of component manufacturers. In the auto industry, for instance, there are way more people working in the supply chain than there are in the actual assembly plant. So in the wake of a

major company moving overseas, we see devastation in the entire supply chain of component manufacturing. I am sure you saw that with Huffy bicycle. There is the manufacturer that made the steel, that stamped the fenders, that made the tires and the spokes that were taken to Huffy—I think to Celina, OH, in those days—to assemble. So all of them lose.

In smaller communities, as the Senator knows, a manufacturing plant oftentimes has a husband and wife both working at the same plant, making \$12 to \$15 an hour. Their whole lives are upended because all of a sudden they have lost both jobs in their family.

Thirty years ago, 30 percent of our GDP was in manufacturing and only 11 percent was in financial services. That number has flipped now, and look where it got us. Only 11 percent of our country's GDP is now as a result of making things. We know how to make things in this country, and we are losing that ability. Without a real manufacturing policy—more than a strategy but a policy—like every other country has, we are going to see a decline in the middle-class long term.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. Well, I thought it was interesting that when the Senator from Ohio and I worked hard on putting together the Economic Recovery Act to try to put a net under this economy and stop it from collapsing—and we were probably close to having a complete collapse. Despite the folks who come to the Senate floor who say no jobs were created, the CBO says 3 million jobs were created or saved. But when we put that together, Senator BROWN from Ohio and I and others wrote something called a "Buy American" provision, and people nearly had apoplectic seizures here. They were doing cartwheels in the Chamber, so upset and concerned and nervous about what this would do, if with our money, in order to employ our people, we decided to buy our products. How selfish is that, they would say.

It was exactly the right thing to do. Why would we try to stimulate economic recovery in America by buying goods from China or Japan? So what we tried to do is to say that there should be a preference with these funds to buy American. But even that was unbelievably controversial. We got it done, and I am pleased we did.

While the Senator is here, I wanted to make the point that the Huffy bicycle story is almost the perfect storm of everything that is wrong. These are workers in Ohio who made \$11 an hour plus benefits and then they all got fired. I have described about their leaving their empty shoes in the parking lot on the last day of work and so on. But the Huffy bicycle was sent to China. I described the conditions under which they are now made. This brand still exists. It is still sold in major American stores, Wal-Mart and Kmart and so on. But once it was sent to China, it declared bankruptcy and then

the Chinese bought the brand. The bankruptcy meant that not only did the workers in Ohio lose their jobs, the Federal Government here, under the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, assumes the pension of the fired workers, and China ends up with the brand. We still buy the bicycles but the people are out of work and we are stuck with the pensions.

It is almost a perfect storm of what is wrong with what we are doing in this country. The question is, when will it ever change? The minute we talk about it the Senator from Ohio will be called—well, he's one of those protectionists. He has a narrow head; doesn't understand the breadth and depth of this new global economy. They say that about me and all of us who say this doesn't add up.

We have to stand up for this country's economic interests. We don't need to put a fence around America. We don't need to decide there is not a world economy—there is a global economy. We need fair rules and to stand up for our economic interests, and that has not been the case; it has not.

The question is what do we do about that. At least you can take a baby step in the right direction. One of my regrets, serving in this institution, is that I may well leave this institution without having succeeded, at least on this issue. I have been proud to participate in a lot of things that have been successful in advancing public policy but this has meant a lot to me. I think America is losing its capability, its energy, its manufacturing base. People are losing hope, with nearly 20 million of them out of work. I think it is very important for us to understand we have to address this issue.

There is no social program in this country as important as a good job that pays well. That is a fact. We have to find ways to put people back to work in this country. People say innovation—I am all for innovation. But we innovate, we create the product, but they manufacture it somewhere else and the jobs are gone. It is very important for us to rebuild our manufacturing capability in this country.

I said at the start we will not long remain a world economic power unless we have world class manufacturing capability. The American people need to see some hope from this Chamber. At least one step, one ray of hope would be if we decide in the coming several days to enact legislation that is now, I believe, rule XIV'ed at the desk, that we likely will have debate on—and I will be here during that debate—that will say finally, at long last, we will stop, put an end to this insidious provision in the IRS code that says if you move your American jobs to China we want to reward you with a tax break. That has to end. It has to end, the sooner the better.

Let me end by saying there is plenty in this country that needs fixing but there is a lot to work with because there is plenty right in this country as

well. I have spoken previously about the New York Times 1-inch story about a man named Stanley Newberg. Stanley Newberg, with his father, left his country in Europe to flee the persecution of the Jews, landed in New York, went peddling fish with his dad, went to school, an immigrant kid, went to college, became a lawyer, went to work for an aluminum company, managed the place, finally bought the place, then died. When they opened his will he left his \$5.7 million to the United States of America, he said, with gratitude for the privilege of living in this great place. What a wonderful thing to hear. What a wonderful thing to do. It is a wonderful reminder, it seems to me, how important this place called America is in the heart of many people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

THE DISCLOSE ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to speak in strong support of the DISCLOSE Act, which would close the glaring campaign finance loopholes that have been opened by the Citizens United ruling. This Supreme Court ruling was a true step backward for our democracy. It overturned decades of campaign finance law and policy. It allowed corporations and special interest groups to spend unlimited amounts of their money influencing our democracy and opened the door wide for foreign corporations to spend their money on elections right here in the United States.

The Citizens United ruling has given special interest groups a megaphone they can use to now drown out the voices of average citizens in my home State of Washington and across the country. The DISCLOSE Act would tear that megaphone away and place it back in the hands of American people, where it belongs.

I am extremely disappointed that Senate Republicans continue to block this critical legislation. This is a very personal issue for me. When I first ran for the Senate back in 1992, I was a long-shot candidate with some ideas and a group of amazing and passionate volunteers by my side. Those volunteers cared deeply about making sure the voices of Washington State families were represented. They made phone calls, they went door to door, they volunteered hours of time, they talked to families all across my State who wanted more from their government.

We ended up winning that grassroots campaign because the people's voices were heard loudly and clearly. But, to be honest, I don't think it would have been possible if corporations and special interests had been able to drown out their voices with an unlimited barrage of negative ads against candidates who did not support their interests. That is exactly why I support this DISCLOSE Act. I want to make sure that

no force is greater in our elections than the power of voters across our cities and towns, and no voice is louder than citizens who care about making their State and country a better place to live.

The DISCLOSE Act helps preserve those American values in a lot of ways. First of all, it shines a very bright spotlight on the entire process. The DISCLOSE Act will make corporate CEOs and special interest leaders take responsibility for their acts. When candidates put up campaign commercials on television, we put our faces on our ad and tell every voter we have approved the message. We don't try to hide what we are doing. But right now corporations and special interest groups don't have to do that. They can put up deceptive or untruthful ads with no accountability and no ability for the public to know who is trying to influence them.

The DISCLOSE Act also strengthens overall disclosure requirements for groups who are attempting to sway our elections. Too often, corporations and special interest groups are able to hide their spending behind a mask of front organizations because they know the voters will be less likely to believe their ads if they knew the motives behind the sponsors. The DISCLOSE Act ends that. It shines a light on this spending and makes sure voters have the information they need so they know what they can trust.

This bill also closes a number of other loopholes that have been opened by the Citizens United decision. It bans foreign corporations and special interest groups from spending in our U.S. elections. It makes sure that corporations are not hiding their election spending from their shareholders. It limits election spending by government contractors, to make sure taxpayer funding is never used to influence an election. It bans coordination between candidates and outside groups on advertising so that corporations and special interest groups can never sponsor a candidate.

This DISCLOSE Act is a common-sense bill. It should not be controversial. Anyone who thinks voters should have a louder voice than special interest groups ought to support this bill. Anyone who thinks that foreign entities should have no right to influence U.S. elections ought to support this bill. Anyone who agrees with Justice Brandeis that sunlight is the best disinfectant should support this bill. And anyone who thinks we should not allow corporations such as BP or Goldman Sachs to spend unlimited money influencing our elections ought to support this bill.

Every 2 years we have elections across this country to fill our federally elected offices. Every 2 years voters have the opportunity to talk to each other about who they think will best represent their communities and their families. Every 2 years it is these voices of America's citizens who decide