That is the most thoughtless bunch of nonsense I ever heard. That is not an adequate description of the views of trade we ought to embrace. There ought not be anyone who is worried about standing up on the floor of the Senate and saying: Look, I stand up for this country's interests. I stand up for the interests of people who work in this country, who produce textiles, who work on the manufacturing floor, and who produce automobiles, who work in the fields and produce grain or livestock. We stand up for them.

Our government is not ensuring a level playing field. We have stacked the deck with bad international trade agreements, ineffective trade negotiators and bad agreements, one after the other. Now we are told, let's implement fast-track authority again so we can have a new agreement. I say to those who demand fast-track authority, please fix a few of the old problems and then come back and we will talk about new agreements. Fix some of the old problems first.

Will Rogers once said that the United States has never lost a war and never won a conference. He must surely have been thinking of our negotiators. I have suggested many times that our negotiators wear jerseys, like they do in the Olympics. Next time they sit around a table with China, Japan, Europe, Canada, and Mexico, they could look down at their jersey and be reminded that they represent the United States. They represent workers, businesses, investors, and others who have decided that, in a global economy, they want a fair shake. Nothing more more, just a fair shake.

I am flat sick and tired of seeing negotiators go abroad and negotiate a trade agreement that ties America's hands behind its back.

The first 25 years after the Second World War our trade was all foreign policy. We were bigger, better, stronger than anybody in the world, and we could outperform anyone with one hand tied behind our back. So what we did is we granted trade concessions all around the world because it was foreign policy to be helpful to foreign governments. That was the first 25 years after the Second World War.

The second 25 years have been different because we suddenly had tough, shrewd international competitors. Too much of our trade policy has been softheaded foreign policy. And it is not working.

We have a large, growing trade deficit, the largest in human history—a large deficit with China, a large deficit with Japan, a large deficit with Europe, a large and growing deficit with Canada and Mexico. This is not working.

We used to have a small trade surplus with Mexico and then we had a new trade agreement with Mexico and turned it into a big deficit. We had a moderate deficit with Canada. We got a new trade agreement with Canada and doubled the deficit. Of course, with China and Japan, it has been a miserable failure. Our trade relationship with them has failed to really break down the barriers and open up their markets.

So my message is not that I want us to put walls around our country. I don't believe in that. My message is not that we should create special protections for American producers. I don't believe in that. I believe in fair, free, and open competition. My message is, I demand, on behalf of the workers and producers of this country, that trade agreements represent fair trade conditions. If the rules are fair, if the conditions are fair, then we ought to be able to compete. I know we will compete and do well anywhere in the world under those circumstances.

This issue is an issue, at its roots, that has to do with jobs and economic opportunity and growth. When we give commencement speeches at high schools and colleges, we look out onto that sea of faces of young men and women, the best and brightest in our country, and we see people who are entering the workforce. The question is, What kind of an economy will they join?

We have people around this country bragging about their states being low-wage states. That is nothing to brag about. We need good jobs, good careers, good salaries, and good opportunities for the future. Manufacturing jobs have always been a base of good jobs that pay well and have good benefits, but our manufacturing industry is rapidly being decimated by trade agreements that are unfair to American workers and American businesses.

So I simply wanted to say today that we are going to have a vigorous and significant debate on this issue. It is long overdue. I welcome the opportunity to have trade promotion authority on the floor. Those who bring it should understand it will not be easy to get it. Those of us who have amendments to offer will be here offering many amendments.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am chairman of an appropriations subcommittee. Last fall we asked Governor Ridge, who is the Director of Homeland Security, to come and testify on matters dealing with homeland security issues. In my subcommittee, we fund the U.S. Customs Service and others.

Governor Ridge determined that he could not do that and would not do that. Other committees have experienced the same reaction from the Governor. I think the administration is making a mistake. I think Governor Ridge is an excellent public servant. I enjoy working with him, but he really does need to come and testify before congressional committees. I think it will benefit him, it will benefit the Bush administration, it will benefit the Congress and the American people.

I did want to say, however, as we construct homeland defense, I think the administration's recommendations are good ones. I support them. I have commended President Bush for his prosecution of the war against terrorism. I think his recommendations in this budget dealing with homeland security are some thoughtful and good recommendations.

But there is one recommendation that is now floating around, being advanced by Governor Ridge and others, that I will not support. That is a recommendation to merge the Customs Service with the Immigration Service. Let me describe why I think that would be inappropriate.

There is a discussion going on about merging a number of agencies of the Federal Government into one larger agency. We are not going to solve the problems of any agency by simply creating larger bureaucracies. That doesn't solve any problems of government.

We had an embarrassing circumstance a couple of weeks or so ago in which the Immigration Service issued visas to Mohammed Atta and one of the other terrorists who flew the airplanes into the World Trade Center and murdered thousands of people.

We need to solve those problems at the INS. I must say Mr. Ziglar, who runs the INS, a friend of mine and acquaintance of most of the Senate, has inherited an agency that had a lot of problems, no question about that. I know he is struggling mightily to deal with them. I wish him well and I want to help him to do that. But he inherited an agency that wasn't able to track anything on its computers. It couldn't track down someone who overstayed a visa. I think Mr. Ziglar has a lot of work to do, and I want to help him do that.

But visiting the problems at the INS that Mr. Ziglar inherited on the Customs Service makes no sense at all. The Customs Service runs pretty well. We have some problems there as well, but it is an entirely different agency, which deals with the facilitation of trade and the prohibition of illegal goods from coming into the country. It is the second largest revenue raiser for the Federal Government next to the Internal Revenue Service. So I don't want to visit upon the Customs Service the problems of the INS or any other Federal agency, and I don't believe you solve the problems with respect to these issues by creating larger government and bigger bureaucracies.

So again, I would encourage Governor Ridge to come testify before Congressional committees, and discuss matters such as these. The idea of merging Customs and the INS is one that I just cannot support.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. 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.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 1:22 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DODD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I take a few moments today to recall the days of yesteryear.

I came to this body in January of 1959, after having served in the other body, the House of Representatives, for 6 years. When I came to the Senate, I came into the midst of a chamber that was made up of men and one woman, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. These men were ''tall men, sun crowned, who live(d) above the fog in public duty and in private thinking,'' men like Richard B. Russell of Georgia. Senator Richard Russell had never married, but he had a bride. His bride was the Senate. There was none other like him.

In my service in the Senate, this man from Georgia, Richard Brevard Russell, was the uncrowned leader, as far as I am concerned, of the Senate. There were men like Lyndon Johnson, Everett Dirksen, Lister Hill of Alabama, John McClellan, William Fulbright, Norris Cotton, and I could go on; John Pastore of Rhode Island, Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming. They are all gone now.

I look about me today and I see the desks and the chairs. They were here then. Then one after another, as I look about me, I can see those Senators, Wayne Morse, Wallace Bennett, Jacob Javits, and Herman Talmadge.

I stand alone in this Chamber as in a great banquet hall where men have come and gone, fallen like winter's withered leaves. There is only one other Senator today who was here when I came here: STROM THURMOND.

The Senate is a far different place, far different from what it was when the Senator who is presiding over this Senate today, Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD, was a page boy; a different Senate. Yes, it is a different time. But the memories of those men and that woman who gave her ''Declaration of Conscience,'' Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, are still in my heart.

I begin now to make a few remarks about one of those Senators whose names I have mentioned, the late Senator Herman Talmadge. We heard the distinguished Senator from the State of Georgia yesterday, Mr. ZEL MILLER, speak of the passing of Herman Talmadge. As a colleague of the late Herman Talmadge, I say these few words in memory of him.

Mr. President, there was once a saying in the state of Georgia that ''if you were not a Talmadge man, you were a communist.''

That saying spoke so well of the high regard, the esteem, and the respect that the people of that proud southern State, which was one of the original 13 States, possessed for the Talmadge family and why the Talmadges were such a politically prominent family for so many years.

The Talmadge dynasty began in 1926—I was a little boy in a 2-room school house in southern West Virginia that year—when Eugene Talmadge was elected Commissioner of Agriculture. He was later elected Governor of Georgia to an unprecedented four terms.

It continued with his son, Herman Eugene Talmadge whose death we mourn today. Herman Eugene Talmadge served the State of Georgia first as Governor, 1948–1955, and then as a United States Senator, 1957–1980.

He had been in this body 2 years when I came and when the father of the Presiding Officer today, the late Thomas Dodd, came to the Senate with me. We came together from the House where we had previously served together.

During the Talmadge tenure, other powerful political leaders emerged in that great state, and obtained state and national offices. These included Senator Richard Russell, who sleeps peacefully today under a southern sky in a lonely cemetery in Georgia. I stood in that cemetery, at the grave of the late Senator Richard Russell.

Then there was President Jimmy Carter. I served as majority leader in this body during the years of his Presidency. Then there was Senator Sam Nunn, whom we all know, remember, and respect, and for whom we have an enormously high regard.

But the Talmadges were always there!

Some maintain that the Talmadge reign ended in 1980 when Senator Herman Talmadge lost his bid for reelection. But I can't help but believe that it did not end until this past Wednesday night when this sharp-witted man of simple values, who spent so much of his life in public service and who did so much to make his State and our Nation better, passed away. His passing should serve to remind all of us how much we need people who are dedicated to public service.

Herman Eugene Talmadge's public service began during World War II. Now listen to this: he was serving in the Navy when Pearl Harbor was attacked. He immediately requested combat duty, and participated in a number of important naval engagements during the war, including the invasion of Guadalcanal and the Battle of Okinawa. He was present at the Japanese surrender in Tokyo Bay.

Upon the death of his father, Herman Talmadge became Governor of Georgia, and his administration is regarded as one of the most progressive administrations in the history of that great state of Georgia.

In 1957, he took a seat in the Senate. I can see him standing over there, a man of few words. He was like John Pastore. Those two men were among the sharpest witted Senators with whom I have ever served.

In 1957, Herman Talmadge began an extraordinary career, which included serving as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, where he became known as the ''champion of American agriculture'' because of the imprint he left on almost all farm legislation that was passed during his tenure as chairman. He authored legislation to expand and improve the School Lunch Program. He helped to develop the Food Stamp Program. As chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a crusader for rural development, Senator Talmadge established a rural development subcommittee and led the enactment of the Rural Development Act of 1972.

He was a member of the Senate Finance Committee—there was a sharp brain on a great committee, the Senate Finance Committee. I have never seen men or women in this Senate whose brains were more sharp than that of Herman Talmadge.

He was also very active on welfare legislation long before it became a popular issue to promote, and he authored a provision giving tax credits to private businesses to provide job training. There was a pioneer!

Talmadge was always a powerful proponent of programs calculated to get people on their feet, and to give them the means with which to secure their future and the future of their children. He was just as adamantly opposed to programs he felt perpetuated cycles of dependency, ''You gotta have more people pulling the wagon than riding,'' he was fond of saying. He could say it crisply, succinctly, right to the point.

Senator Talmadge came to national attention in 1973, when he was appointed to serve on the Watergate Committee. According to an article on him in the Georgia Historical Quarterly, Senator Talmadge:

> . . . thought the Watergate investigation was one of the most important events in the history of the United States [because] it demonstrated how a republican form of government [This is not a democracy, it is a republic; it is a republican form of Government] could correct the conduct of public officials and alert others not to make the same mistake.

It was during the Watergate hearings that the American people were able to observe for themselves the penetrating, get-to-the-heart-of-the-matter style of Senator Talmadge, and I am sure they were impressed.

Despite Senator Talmadge's productive and historic achievements in the Senate, his life was not without adversity. While serving in this Chamber,