

people, who have advanced this country, have produced wonderful, breath-taking products, but I think there is a culture in this country, with respect to trade and corporate responsibility, that has gone off the track. In this Congress, we cannot get anybody to talk about trade, except perhaps to come and stand around to talk about the Bahrain trade agreement on a Tuesday. Would it not be wonderful if we were talking about this full-blown crisis of \$2 billion a day to date, \$2 billion that we purchase from abroad more than we sell to abroad, and therefore today someone off the shores of this country owns \$2 billion worth of this country. We are selling this country piece by piece.

A budget deficit in this country is financed in the traditional way, but a trade deficit is financed in a very different way. When we purchase those foreign goods, the trade deficit puts American currency in the hands of foreigners. They then use that currency to purchase real estate, stocks, bonds, to purchase part of this country. Every single day we are selling part of this country with an incompetent trade strategy, a jingoistic trade strategy that chants about free trade that has long ago been discredited. We ought to be describing circumstances of requiring fair trade. As a country, we ought to be a leader in deciding, yes, let us expand trade in open markets, but it must be fair, and if it is not fair then this country is obligated to take the lead to insist on and demand fairness.

Our job ought to finally be to pull others up, not to push us down. What has happened more recently is we are pushing American workers down, pushing incomes down, the standard of living down in this country and seeing jobs exported, opportunity exported, and exporting part of our future. That is not satisfactory to me. I regret we are here talking about this free trade agreement when in fact we should be talking about the center, the bull's-eye of the target dealing with trade that is causing this hemorrhage of red ink and the loss of American jobs day after day after day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that privilege.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO LATE SENATOR EUGENE JOSEPH MCCARTHY

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Minnesotan and great American, former Senator Eugene McCarthy, who passed away last Saturday at the age of 89. Senator McCarthy served two terms in this body, from 1958 to 1970, after serving five terms in the House of Rep-

resentatives. In addition to his very distinguished legislative career, he is perhaps best remembered for his historic Presidential campaign in 1968, in which he deposed an incumbent President.

Eugene Joseph McCarthy was born on March 29, 1916, in Watkins, MN. He graduated from St. John's University in Collegeville, MN, in 1935, and then earned a master's degree in economics and sociology at the University of Minnesota.

After college, he spent 9 months as a novice in a Benedictine seminary. The world pulled him away, however, and he played semiprofessional baseball, taught high school social science, was a professor at his alma mater, St. John's, and then chaired the sociology department at St. Thomas University in St. Paul, MN.

During World War II he worked in a military intelligence division of the War Department. He married a fellow teacher, Abigail Quigley, with whom he had three daughters and a son. Abigail McCarthy passed away in 2001.

In 1948 Gene McCarthy was elected to the House of Representatives from Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District. While in the House, Congressman McCarthy founded McCarthy's Mavericks, which was the forerunner of the Democratic study group that would, in succeeding decades, be influential in developing many important legislative initiatives.

In 1952, he was the first Member of Congress to challenge Senator Joseph McCarthy in a nationally televised debate on foreign policy. That political courage presaged his decision 15 years later to challenge an incumbent President. In 1958, Congressman McCarthy defeated an incumbent Senator to become Senator McCarthy. He was re-elected to the Senate in 1964 with over 60 percent of the vote. Then, in November of 1967, he announced his candidacy for President, challenging the incumbent President of his own party, Lyndon Johnson. In his announcement speech he said:

I am hopeful that this challenge may alleviate this sense of political helplessness and restore to many people a belief in the process of American politics and of American government.

His candidacy ignited a new generation of political activists, many of them young college students who shaved, showered, and went "Clean for Gene." They swarmed into New Hampshire for the first political contest of 1968. There they helped Senator McCarthy transform the political landscape by holding President Johnson to 49 percent of the vote in the Democratic primary, with 42 percent voting for Senator McCarthy. Seldom has a second-place finish been considered such a victory. Two weeks later, President Johnson withdrew his candidacy for reelection. Shortly thereafter, fellow Senator Robert Kennedy and fellow Minnesotan Vice President Hubert Humphrey entered the Presidential contest, two ac-

tions that Gene McCarthy would never forget or forgive.

The Democratic contest became divisive in subsequent primaries, then catastrophic with the assassination of Robert Kennedy, then destructive at the tumultuous national convention in Chicago that nominated Hubert Humphrey, not Gene McCarthy. The nominee and the party did not recover from that disastrous convention and Richard Nixon was elected President in November. The Vietnam war continued for 7 more years.

Gene McCarthy retired from the Senate in 1970 and never again held public office. Some of his later remarks, reflecting his disenchantment and his defiance, along with his acerbic wit, dismayed some Democrats and disillusioned former supporters. Gene McCarthy, however, was always his own man. He once said his definition of patriotism was "to serve one's country not in submission, but to serve it in truth."

He used his pen and his tongue to speak his own truth, regardless of the personal or political consequences. In that respect, he was a true patriot.

After he was decried by Johnson's supporters as a mere "footnote in history," he retorted, "I think we can say with Churchill, 'but what a footnote.'"

You are much more than a footnote, Senator McCarthy. You were a U.S. Senator. You made history and you changed history. You were true to yourself, to your ideals and to your convictions. You were a poet, a philosopher, and a patriot, a great Minnesotan and a great American. May you rest in peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a second before he does yield the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair. I commend my colleague from Minnesota for taking the time to speak about an old friend, a remarkable politician, a remarkable Senator, Gene McCarthy.

In my younger days in Iowa, when they still had a bounty on Democrats in my State and Republicans ran everything, we always had the Democrats from Minnesota come down—McCarthy and Mondale and Humphrey, people such as that. But Gene McCarthy was a very rare, a unique individual. I was listening in the cloakroom to what the Senator from Minnesota was saying about Gene McCarthy. He had a way about him that was like Mark Twain. He had a great sense of humor. He could, like Mark Twain, say very succinctly what it might take others a paragraph to say. That was one of the qualities I always envied about McCarthy. I always thought, Gosh, why can't I say it like that? He had a great way with words.

Like Mark Twain, Gene McCarthy had the ability, with very few words, to puncture the inflated egos of puffed-up politicians. If you were on the other

end of it, you didn't feel good about it. He had a way of doing it without being mean, but when you heard him—and he never attacked anyone but he did it in terms of what they stood for, what they were saying—you heard it and you realized McCarthy was right. He had a refreshing and disarming way about him in his approach to politics. He made his point and he made it well.

I do not know if my friend from Minnesota repeated the quote that was attributed to him in the newspaper that I read the other day, which I thought was McCarthy at his best. He said one time that being a politician is sometimes like being a football coach. You have to be smart enough to know how to play the game but dumb enough to think it's important.

Those of us who think all the things we do here are so grandiose should realize we pass on and others take our place. A lot of the things we do here, we may think are important and they are not that important.

So that was Gene McCarthy. He would say things that made you smile, made you think about things.

I say to my friend from Minnesota, I got out of the Navy in November of 1967 and I returned home to Iowa in 1968. At that point I was not active in politics. But like so many of my colleagues and friends in the Navy, I lost a lot of my friends in Vietnam. Slowly but surely over the 5 years that I was on active duty, I became convinced that the war in Vietnam should not go on, that it was wrong, that we ought to get out of there.

But, of course, I was in the Navy at the time. I couldn't say anything about it. I was a Navy person. So I thought, well, now that I am out maybe I can do something. I was looking for someone to give me advice. I was looking for someone out there who would stand up and take the lead on this—Gene McCarthy. Gene McCarthy was the first politician I ever met who wasn't afraid to say the "emperor has no clothes." And once he did that, people realized, you are right; that this war in Vietnam was nonsensical, that we ought to bring an end to it. He encouraged a lot of young people. And I can still remember, and I will bet the Senator from Minnesota has the same memory. I had one of those daisies on the trunk of my car, a blue and white daisy with "McCarthy" on it. That was in 1968.

I think he brought a lot of young people in and gave a lot of young people encouragement that they could change the system and that they could make a difference.

Through his later years I became a friend of Gene McCarthy. In fact, when I ran for President in 1991, he was running again. So we found ourselves running against each other.

As we were both fading and Bill Clinton was winning everything, he drew me aside one time and said: Do you ever wonder why we are still here and what we are doing?

I said: Yes; I do wonder that sometimes.

He said: Well, we are here because the liberal position needs to be enunciated and fought for regardless of who the nominee is.

I am paraphrasing, but that is the way I remember him saying that.

I just wanted to take the time to commiserate with my good friend, Senator DAYTON, about a wonderful human being, a truly remarkable U.S. Senator, one of the most intelligent individuals to ever grace the floor of the U.S. Senate, and to remember his legacy, the legacy of having the courage of your convictions, of standing up for what you think is right, and once in a while don't take ourselves too seriously.

That was the Gene McCarthy I knew and loved. We will remember him always.

I thank my colleague from Minnesota for taking the time today to remember our good friend and departed colleague.

Mr. DAYTON. I think Senator McCarthy would be very impressed with the extemporaneous eloquence of the Senator from Iowa and very appreciative of his kind words. Of course, Iowa has the first Presidential contest. Back in those days, I would have seen a lot more of Senator McCarthy.

Mr. HARKIN. He would have taken me to task for talking so long. He would have said: You could have said that in 2 minutes.

Mr. DAYTON. I thank my friend.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

RECONCILIATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know that a motion to appoint conferees has not happened yet on the reconciliation bill, but I understand that the majority leader will sometime today be making that motion. It is a debatable motion, and obviously an amendable motion. I think there are maybe four or five different motions to instruct our conferees regarding the reconciliation bill.

I want to take the time now to talk about it, even though I have an amendment, but it is not timely to send the amendment to the desk. But I do want to talk about what that amendment will do and why I am going to be offering it.

Basically, it has to do with funding cuts for food assistance programs.

It has been a challenging year for all of us, especially here in the Senate. There have been many things upon which this Chamber disagreed. We have had some spirited debates and disagreements. The budget debate and ensuing reconciliation bill has been one of the most challenging of these debates.

But there are also times when agreement rather than discord characterize our proceedings.

While I disagreed with the underlying reconciliation bill passed by the Senate, I was pleased and proud of one of the sources of bipartisan agreement that we had both in committee and on the floor. It was the decision by the Senate not to cut food assistance programs for working Americans, for low-income working Americans.

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry considered such cuts. In fact, the President's budget included a proposal to cut the Food Stamp Program by nearly \$600 million. But after careful examination of the Food Stamp Program, after deliberation in the committee, both Republicans and Democrats decided against any cuts to the Food Stamp Program.

I commend today, as I did at that time, our chairman, Senator CHAMBLISS, for listening carefully to committee members' concerns by looking at this and for his conscientious decision not to include any such cuts in the committee-passed measure.

I commend as well many members of both parties who have objected to cutting food assistance programs through the reconciliation process.

There are many reasons food stamp cuts should not be enacted.

First, the Food Stamp Program is the first line of defense in the United States against hunger and food insecurity, providing food assistance to nearly 25 million Americans. It is also one of our largest child nutrition programs. Eighty percent of food stamp benefits—over \$23 billion in 2005—go to families with children.

Another reason cutting food assistance is not appropriate is because the need is growing and not diminishing.

Just recently, a U.S. Agriculture Department study found that 38.2 million people lived in households that were food insecure in 2004, and that the number increased by nearly 2 million between 2003 and 2004.

Since 1999, the number of individuals classified by USDA as food insecure rose by 7 million people. These are significant numbers.

That any American should live in the shadow of hunger at the dawn of the 21st century is shocking and embarrassing. That the number has increased dramatically in the past 5 years is unacceptable.

We have also been reminded of another reason we shouldn't have food stamp cuts. We have been reminded by the numerous hurricanes and disasters this fall of the tremendous role that the Food Stamp Program plays in times of emergency. The Food Stamp Program rapidly provided emergency food assistance to approximately 2.2 million individuals affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma, allowing victims to obtain food assistance within days.

Finally, the Senate Agriculture Committee chose not to cut the Food