

that will level the playing field for America's exporters. It will open the new export market for American products, including Montana beef, wheat, and barley, and it will bolster a close ally in a troubled region.

Expanding trade and supporting Colombia are important priorities. That is why the administration should have handled this agreement the right way. Had the administration sought the right answer, it would have worked harder to support my top priority: American workers. Had the administration not rushed forward with the easy answer, we could have had trade adjustment assistance in place before considering this agreement. We need expanded and effective trade adjustment assistance for America's workers. That is clear. That means ensuring that America's service workers—not just its manufacturers and its farmers—receive the help they need.

Service workers make up 80 percent of our workforce. They have helped to build and support the knowledge-based economy that is the engine of America's growth. They work hard. They deserve our support in return.

Expanded and effective trade adjustment assistance must also cover workers whose jobs have been shipped offshore, not just as a result of trade agreements but others as well. It must raise the health care tax credit to make it affordable and accessible, and expanded and effective TAA—trade adjustment assistance—must double the training funds available to our workers.

Were the administration serious about this agreement, it would not have resorted to the easy procedural answers either. In high school civics class, they teach that the Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate foreign commerce. Congress entrusted this power temporarily—and, I might add, importantly, conditionally—to the administration under something called trade promotion authority; that is, Congress did not write a blank check. By submitting the agreement now and against Congress's will, the administration abuses the power Congress granted it. By forcing Congress to consider this agreement now, the administration offends the trust of Congress and violates the compact that is the essence of fast track; that is, trade promotion authority.

When Congress extended trade promotion authority—or, as people call it, fast track—they did so on the condition that the administration would consult with Congress about the text of proposed agreements before it sent them up. Congress set up an informal markup process to apply before the administration formally sent up the legislation. That informal procedure is very important. It was to be conducted, again, before the administration formally sent up its legislative language. The administration has now completely bypassed that process. Now Congress has no opportunity to affect

the language of the proposed agreement. This administration has said: It is my way or the highway.

Procedural checks and balances are the cornerstone of the congressional-executive relationship. It is the cornerstone of trade promotion authority. Democratic and Republican administrations have both respected this cornerstone. But today, this administration shattered this cornerstone. By so doing, they further diminish our trust.

By sending up the implementing bill today; that is, before consultation in the right way, the administration has failed to deliver the right answer for Colombia's workers. Colombia's workers must know that they can safely pursue equality and justice in the workplace, free from the violence that has plagued Colombia in the past.

The Colombian Government has made great strides in this area. The enforceable labor provisions in the United States-Colombia trade agreement are a critical step to ensuring further progress. We must make sure the Colombian Government takes these obligations seriously. They must show that these obligations are not just paper promises.

The normal congressional fast-track process of hearings and formal markups—which the administration has short-circuited—is an important time for Congress to air concerns, exercise its leverage. It allows Congress to ensure that the Colombian Government is committed to prosecuting labor violence. These hearings are important to accomplish that objective. It gives us real leverage to seek commitments from the Colombian Government and the administration to create a work environment in Colombia grounded in law and backed by action. It also allows Congress the chance to help the Colombian Government, through funding provisions included in the implementing bill, to create an environment where those who seek a better life through employment can flourish. Short-circuiting the process and forcing a premature vote on a trade agreement does nothing to help Congress accomplish these goals.

The President's unprecedented handling of the United States-Colombia Free Trade Agreement raises extraordinary questions about how we can move this agreement forward. For America's workers, for the relationship between Congress and the President, for the Colombian people, Congress must now find answers. Finding the right answer has never been easy. By submitting this agreement as it did and when it did, the administration has sought the easy answer, but in the end, the administration has simply made it harder to find the right answer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. 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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last week, I tried and failed to introduce an amendment which essentially would set minimum standards, minimum Federal standards for—I see the chairman of the committee has just come in, so if I might wait for a moment and see what he wishes to do. May I note the absence of a quorum for a moment, please.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business until the managers of the legislation wish to proceed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMPHIS TIGERS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana especially.

There is sorrow in our Bluff City on the Mississippi River and across Tennessee today because the noble University of Memphis Tigers lost last night to Kansas in the finals of the NCAA National Championship basketball tournament. But there is also reason for great pride. The ebullient John Calapiari and his team gave Memphis a new source of pride and the sport a season to remember, winning more games than any college basketball team ever has. Years from now, fans will be talking about the magical Douglas-Roberts, the indomitable Dorsey, the ubiquitous Anderson, the reliable Dozier, the explosive Rose, and the super sub Taggart. They have given fans a great year. They have helped unify Tennessee's largest city. They should hold their heads high as we look toward next year.

HOUSING

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, yesterday I made a few remarks about an amendment Senator KYL and I have offered to an Ensign-Cantwell amendment, and today I wish to place in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a couple of documents.

In May 2007, I requested that the Energy Information Administration conduct a study of Federal subsidies of electricity, including a comparison of subsidies for different fuel types. Last week, I received a 250-page study in response to my request.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following: a copy of my May 17, 2007, letter to the EIA Administrator, Guy Caruso; a copy of the April 2, 2008, cover letter from Mr. Caruso that arrived with the EIA's 250-page study; and finally, a table titled "Federal Subsidies of Electric Power" that is based on information that was included in the executive summary of EIA's study.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2007.

Hon. GUY CARUSO,
Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CARUSO: I am writing to request that the Energy Information Administration (EIA) conduct an analysis of federal subsidies of the electricity industry, including a comparison of subsidies for the different fuel types (e.g., coal, natural gas, petroleum, nuclear, wind, solar, etc.). I am interested in learning—for each fuel type—both (1) the overall annual cost of those subsidies, and (2) the annual cost per unit electricity generated (e.g., cost per kilowatt-hour). My staff is familiar with the EIA report Federal Financial Interventions and Subsidies in Energy Markets 1999: Energy Transformation and End Use and understands that this new analysis will serve as an update of significant portions of this prior analysis with a focus on subsidies available to electricity and primary fuels used in electricity generation.

To expedite its completion, the analysis should be limited to subsidies provided by the federal government, those that are energy-specific, and those that provide a financial benefit with an identifiable federal budget impact. Broad policies or programs that are applicable throughout the economy need not be considered. The analysis should include the following types of subsidies: tax expenditures (such as deductions, credits, and loan guarantees); direct expenditures (such as direct grant programs and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program); federal research and development programs targeting electricity and its fuel inputs; and federal electricity programs (such as support for the Bonneville Power Administration).

The report should include an estimate on the size of each subsidy over a recent, representative year. Where there has been a significant change in the amount or scope of a particular subsidy since the 2000 report, it would be useful for the report to provide an explanation for the change. If a valid methodology can be developed, a forecast of subsidy impacts would be very informative as well. To be most helpful, I would appreciate it if the report could be completed by November 30, 2007.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Jack Wells of my staff.

Sincerely,

LAMAR ALEXANDER.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, April 2, 2008.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER: In response to your letter of May 17, 2007, I am providing the enclosed analysis of Federal subsidies and support for energy markets, with emphasis on the electricity industry. The analysis includes a comparison of per unit subsidies for the different fuel types used to generate electricity. I hope you will find this analysis to be of assistance.

Should you have any questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Scott Sitzler, Director of the Office of Coal, Nuclear, Electric and Alternate Fuels.

Sincerely,

GUY F. CARUSO,
Administrator,
Energy Information Administration.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES OF ELECTRIC POWER

	(\$/Megawatt-Hour)
Coal	0.44
Refined Coal	29.81
Natural Gas & Petroleum Liquids	0.25
Nuclear	1.59
Biomass (and biofuels)	0.89
Geothermal	0.92
Hydroelectric	0.67
Solar	24.34
Wind	23.37
Landfill Gas	1.37
Municipal Solid Waste	0.13
All Renewables (subtotal)	2.80
All Sources	1.65

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask through the Chair whether there is more time or whether the Chair would like to reclaim the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am not managing this part of the bill. I think Senator DODD is talking to Senators. They are working out some provisions, so if he wants to proceed until they work it out.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, perhaps I will proceed with my statement on morning business, and then, when we return to the bill, I wish to call up the amendment.

Is that agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask how much time the Senator from Tennessee would like to speak. If it is a short amount of time—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if it is agreeable with the other Senators, I ask unanimous consent for 4 minutes, to be followed by the Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Reserving the right to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Everybody is trying to extend morning business while we are waiting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has requested unanimous consent to speak for up to 4 minutes as in morning business.

Mr. DODD. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ WAR UPDATE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today General Petraeus comes to the Senate. I suggest that we listen to the General. When he reported to the Senate last September, some Senators were unwilling to listen. One even said that she thought that in order to believe the reports from Iraq it required a willing suspension of disbelief.

Let us remember what has happened since then. I can remember last August visiting with General Petraeus in Baghdad. I handed him a paper that said: It is time for a new strategy in Iraq. I had been urging President Bush and the Senate to adopt the Iraq Study Group recommendations. In my view, what General Petraeus has done since that time has been to adopt the Iraq Study Group recommendations with some amendments.

We are acknowledging that it is time to shift the mission from combat to support, province by province. We are acknowledging that there will be a long-term presence of the United States in Iraq, but as General Petraeus said, it is steadily diminishing. We are acknowledging that this is an important step-up in diplomatic and political efforts.

As General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker speak today, the questions we should ask are: What progress are we making down this new path to bring this war to a successful conclusion? Second, now that there is widespread agreement that there has been success since last summer with an American-led military surge, what are the prospects for an Iraqi-led political and diplomatic surge, letting the Iraqis invite their neighbors to embassies in Baghdad, reconciling their differences among themselves, and paying for more of their own bills?

So instead of suspending our disbelief, let's listen to the General and to Ambassador Crocker, acknowledge the progress they are making and make it easier for them to progress on the diplomatic and political fronts.

I thank the managers of the bill for their courtesy.

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

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

The 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.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?