

To go back to the original \$700 billion bailout, if you do the math, there are 140 million taxpaying families in the country. Divide that by \$700 billion and that is \$5,000 a family. We are talking huge amounts. And should we pass this global warming tax increase that would be comparable to over \$300 billion, it would mean \$3,000 a family. And that is every year.

I think we need to overcome the problem that we have in following the media off this plank and look at the science and let the science tell us what to do. If we do that, we will find with everything I have talked about over the last 35 minutes is in fact true.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, this Chamber will confirm in the coming days a new U.S. Trade Representative. Mayor Kirk's confirmation represents an opportunity for American trade policy to break from the false choice between free trade and fair trade.

As our economy struggles with massive job losses, a shrinking middle class that we have seen during the entire Bush years, and a housing crisis brought on by wrong-headed policy, the housing crisis that undermines the pursuit of the American dream, our trade policy must be part of our response to the new realities of the global economy.

Mayor Kirk inherits a position traditionally focused on status quo trade policy, and expanding that policy with more of the same status quo trade policy that gives protection to large business, protection to big oil, protection to big drug companies—and even with new rights and new privileges—a status quo trade policy that suppresses the standard of living for American workers, and at the same time hurts workers in China and India and Mexico; a status quo trade policy that does nothing to curb the cost of climate change or the degradation of the environment; and a status quo trade policy that has yielded an \$800 billion—more than \$2 billion a day—trade deficit.

For 8 years the Bush trade policies were wrong. They are wrong now. They

should not continue this way in the future. Our trade deficit has reached annually, thanks to Bush trade policies and thanks to lax trade enforcement, a wrong-headed, unregulated, free-trade policy, which has allowed toys with lead paint, contaminated toothpaste and other products, and weakened the health and safety rules for our trading partners and our own communities.

We want more trade but not like this. Bush trade policies have devastated communities in my State, in towns such as Tiffin, Chillicothe, and Lorain, and done damage to your State in places such as Flint and Detroit and Hamtramck. Job loss does not just affect the worker or the worker's family, as tragic as that is for them, job loss, especially job loss in the thousands, devastates communities. It depletes the tax base. It means the layoff of police and fire personnel and schoolteachers. It hurts local business owners—the drug store, the grocery store, the neighborhood restaurant.

Massive job losses prevent middle-class growth. The Senator from New York, who is in the Chamber, talked about how the middle class in the last 10 years has shrunk. The middle class has shrunk in pure numbers. It has shrunk in income, in buying power. The middle-class people in this country have seen their incomes go down in part because of the Bush trade policy and partly because of tax policy and in part because of the economic policy generally.

Massive job losses prevent middle-class growth, as manufacturing jobs that once anchored a community are gone, but they demoralize a community. Ohio has seen the loss, during the Bush years, of more than 200,000 manufacturing jobs; nationwide, 4.4 million manufacturing jobs, 26 percent, more than one out of four manufacturing jobs in our country that simply disappeared.

We know in Michigan and Ohio and across the industrial heartland of this country and in every State, American manufacturing can compete and compete with anyone in the world if it is a fair fight. But the deck is stacked against us when our Government does not enforce our own trade laws that level that playing field.

Foreign competitors take an unfair advantage, and it is stopping American manufacturers from reaching their potential. We can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines. We must establish a manufacturing policy in this Nation that helps businesses stay here, that helps communities thrive, that rebuilds middle-class families in communities in my State.

It starts with reforming our trade policy. I am pleased to hear Mayor Kirk's emphasis on trade enforcement. Too many of our major trading partners are breaking the rules through massive currency imbalances, tax and capital subsidies, and through unfair labor and environmental practices.

In recent years, the Trade Representative has shown, to put it bluntly, a

terrible record in response to public demand for strong trade enforcement. The Trade Representative that has occupied that office for close to a decade simply does not enforce our trade laws. All five of the public petitions for trade enforcement actions filed during the Bush administration, each concerning currency manipulation or labor exploitations by China, every one of those five public petitions was denied by the U.S. Trade Representative.

In some cases those petitions were denied on the day they were submitted, as if the administration even bothered to read them. Wrong-headed economic policy, job-killing trade agreements have also fueled increasing income disparity at home and abroad. I traveled some years ago, after NAFTA passed—a trade agreement that has hurt our Nation—I traveled at my own expense to McAllen, TX, across the border, with a couple of friends to Reynosa, Mexico. I met a husband and wife who worked for General Electric. They lived in a shack about 15 by 20 feet, dirt floor, no running water, no electricity. If it rained hard, the dirt floor turned to mud.

If you walked through the neighborhood, you could see where people worked in that neighborhood because these shacks were made out of building materials from the companies they worked for or the companies that supply the companies for which they worked.

These two workers worked for General Electric Mexico, 3 miles from the United States of America. If you go to one of those plants where those workers worked, those plants looked a lot like an American plant. These workers made about 90 cents an hour and lived, as I said, in squalid conditions, as hard as they were working, 6 days a week, 10 hours a day.

I visited an auto plant nearby, and this auto plant looked exactly like an auto plant in Michigan or Ohio, except perhaps it was more modern. If you walked into the auto plant, things were clean, the technology was up to date, the workers were productive, working hard.

There was one difference between the auto plant in Reynosa, Mexico, and the auto plant in the United States; that is, the auto plant in Reynosa, Mexico, had no parking lot because the workers could not afford to buy the cars they made. That is what our trade policy has wrought.

You can go to Malaysia and go to a Motorola plant. The workers cannot afford to buy the cell phones they make. You can come back to this hemisphere and go to Costa Rica to a Disney plant and the workers cannot afford to buy the toys for their children, the toys they make, or you can go back across the sea to China and the workers in plant after plant after plant cannot afford to buy the material, buy the products they make.

Simply put, in this country, because of a strong union movement over the

years, that is another debate and another question, how the Employee Free Choice Act will help in building the middle class in this country, workers who worked hard and were productive, shared in the wealth they created.

As productivity went up, then workers' wages went up. As workers made more profits for their boss, as workers made money for their company, those workers shared in the wealth they created. It is the American free enterprise system. It is what Americans have stood for. It is why the middle class in this country, until recently, has been as strong as it has been.

I am glad to see the Obama administration will approach trade differently, will consider what goes on in Reynosa and what goes on in Malaysia and Costa Rica and China. The Obama administration will take a different direction on trade.

I am glad to see Mayor Kirk's emphasis on enforcement. That means correcting our imbalanced trade relationship with China. Enforcement also means using the tools of a trade agreement to correct labor abuses. I remember when the Jordan agreement overwhelmingly passed Congress. This agreement was held up—at the end of the Clinton administration—as a standard in labor provisions. But in 2001, the Bush administration backtracked, essentially turned the other way, as those labor standards and labor provisions were being ignored by the Jordanian Government. In fact, it even turned the other way when reports came out that there was human trafficking plaguing the citizens of Jordan.

As human rights groups revealed overwhelming evidence of labor violations and human trafficking, the Bush administration simply did not enforce trade agreements. At the time, the USTR sent a letter to Jordan's trade minister saying the United States would not enforce the labor provisions. So why should the Jordanian Government do it when they knew they did not have to?

Those days of turning away from our responsibilities are over. In November 2008 voters in my State, as they did in Michigan, as they did around the country, demanded real change, not symbolic differences in policy. The Panama Free Trade Agreement, negotiated under fast-track rules by President Bush, is more of the same failed model, trade model, and we are hearing stories now that it is time for this Senate and the House to vote on the Panama Free Trade Agreement. It is a little agreement. It is not too bad. It does not really do any damage.

Well, it does do damage. It is the same failed trade model that we saw with NAFTA, the same failed trade policy, the same model as the Central American Free Trade Agreement, the same kind of trade policy and trade mechanism and trade model as we saw with PNTR with China.

I hope the administration does not simply push up a Bush trade agree-

ment, change its shape a little bit, put some new handprints on it, and make some changes at the margin. I hope the administration will reshape these trade agreements, reshape our trade policy. We need to stop the pattern where the only protectionism in trade agreements is protectionism for the drug companies, protectionism for the oil companies, and protectionism for the financial services companies, many that have created the economic turmoil we now face.

I illustrated one time during a trade debate not too long ago that if we really were concerned about trade agreements, if we were really concerned about doing trade in the right way, of just simply eliminating the tariff reforms, trade agreements would be one page. It would simply say: Here is the schedule that eliminates trade tariffs.

But what we have seen in our trade agreements in the last 10 years is trade agreements that look something like this: This is not exactly the real trade agreement, but they are usually hundreds and hundreds of pages. And NAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, do you know why they are not just one page or two or three pages of repealing tariff schedules? The reason is because it is all about protections. You have protections for drug companies, you have protections for oil companies, you have protections for banks, you have protections for insurance companies.

That is what these trade agreements have all been about. They accuse us of protectionism. These trade agreements are bailouts for their wealthy friends, for their corporate buddies, for their big campaign contributors. These protections to my friends at the USTR's office during the Bush administration were all about protecting oil, protecting financial services, and we know what that has brought us.

Panama, the proposed trade agreement with Panama, includes terms that shift extraordinary power to corporations. Panama has a reputation as a banking secrecy jurisdiction and a tax haven. Panama was among 35 jurisdictions identified by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development 9 years ago as a tax haven.

The GAO reported a number of corporations, U.S. corporations, created subsidiaries in Panama for tax purposes. Now, why would we want to pass a trade agreement with a nation that has encouraged U.S. companies to move their earnings to their country to avoid U.S. taxes?

Why would we reward a country that makes a lot of money by enticing these corporations to come to their country? We will help you avoid your taxes? Why do we reward a country like that? Why do we want more of that, especially when we know and when we look at what has happened with corporate salaries. If we look at what has happened with the banks, and they know we do those kind of things, it simply does not make sense.

In addition, investments derived from illegal activities—namely, drug dealing—have also been known to exist in Panama. Several sources indicate that Panama serves as a tax haven for as many as 400,000—mostly, not all, United States—companies, and Panama has refused to sign a tax disclosure agreement with the United States. This is not just Panama saying, come visit us, come move some of your executives and, on paper, move some of your work to Panama. But then, to avoid taxes, we don't even make them disclose what those companies are and the taxes they have evaded. Such an agreement would deter tax cheats from evading taxes through Panama and would enable the IRS to verify that income subject to tax in the United States has been properly reported.

Offshore tax evasion is an enormous problem. We have heard Senator DORGAN talk about what has happened in the Cayman Islands. It is an enormous problem that would be potentially aggravated by the free trade agreement itself and also by Panama's continuing refusal to enter into a disclosure agreement with the United States. Why would we complete a trade deal which includes these extraordinary protections for corporations with a country that has secrecy issues? The old model for trade agreements no longer works.

As Mayor Kirk begins his work at USTR, as we confirm him in the next few days—and I hope we will—we can create an alternative framework that rewrites trade rules for globalization, trade rules that protect our national interests and strengthen our workers and communities.

We are all accountable in this body for trade votes, how our votes affect American workers, how our trade policies affect Lima and Zanesville and Dayton and Middleton and Portsmouth and Hamilton. We are all accountable for trade votes. Most of us want trade. We want more trade, but we want it under a different set of rules. Fidelity to a broken trade system will not put our economy back on track and workers back to work. The small business owner or manufacturer in a machine shop or tool and dye company in Akron or a local machine shop in Dayton or workers and business owners around the country don't want more of the same. It is time to rethink trade policy. We want trade, more of it. But we want it under a different set of rules that works for workers, for communities, and for the country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
RESEARCH

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support of expanded embryonic stem cell research and to thank President Obama for reversing the Federal limitations imposed on stem cell research by the previous administration. I also thank my colleagues Senators HARKIN, SPECTER, FEINSTEIN, HATCH, and REID, for their ongoing leadership on this issue.

Research on human embryonic stem cells began in 1998 and is still only in its infancy. In this short time, researchers have made great strides in stem cell research, discovering the scientific potential of embryonic stem cells and their ability to treat and cure diseases that affect patients and families across our country. Unfortunately, however, the true potential of embryonic stem cell research has not yet been realized. For the past 8 years, Federal funding has been limited to the study of embryonic stem cell lines derived before August 9, 2001, significantly hampering the ability of researchers to effectively study the full potential of these cells. Political issues, funding considerations, and the limited pipeline of talented researchers specializing in this new field have slowed the development of a robust research community focused on stem cell investigation.

Stem cells could be a boon to medical research and treatment in a variety of ways: as replacement cells for those cells that have been lost or destroyed because of disease; as tools for studying early events in human development; as test systems for new drug therapies; and as vehicles to deliver genes that could correct defects. The more that is learned about embryonic stem cells, the better scientists can assess their full therapeutic potential and that of other stem cell types.

This research is so critical to the scientific understanding of diseases, therapies, and cures that impact millions of Americans. Embryonic stem cells could lead to treatments for diseases that afflict up to 100 million Americans, including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, spinal cord injuries, and so many other debilitating conditions.

Now, I have always been a supporter of stem cell research and have long recognized the importance of this critical research to the scientific community. However, stem cell research became personal for me in 2007 when my oldest granddaughter Elle was diagnosed with diabetes. But my family is not alone in either struggling with the disease of juvenile diabetes or recognizing the importance of stem cell research to a potential cure for the disease. Mimi Silverman of Bedford, NH, speaks eloquently about what it is like to be the parent of a diabetic. Her daughter Abby, who is now 30, was diagnosed with diabetes at the age of 7. Mimi knows about the toll that diabetes takes on the entire family and she

talks about the psychological effects on her family, not knowing what each day will bring. She describes the disease as a ticking timebomb in which there is always uncertainty and underlying apprehension.

A few years ago, Abby, Mimi's daughter, was 2 weeks away from getting married. She was living alone in Minneapolis, 1,500 miles away from her fiancé and her family. She was alone in her apartment and because of diabetes, she fell unconscious. Luckily, her fiancé called. He realized that Abby was incoherent and he was able to contact the apartment manager to unlock the door and get her help. But had her fiancé not called when he did, in all likelihood, Abby would not be alive today. Mimi is now a leading advocate in New Hampshire in support of stem cell research.

Laura Clark, from Antrim, NH, is 25 years old. Five years ago she was in the final year of her nursing studies at the University of New Hampshire. Unfortunately, she was in a tragic car accident on the way to the movies. As a result of the collision, Laura's neck was crushed and after two weeks in intensive care and 11 weeks in rehabilitation, Laura recovered but is now quadriplegic. While her spirit is strong, her life has changed dramatically. The accident not only affected Laura, but of course her family was affected as well. Her mother Kathy quit her job to stay home to take care of Laura, and her younger sister, who was in high school at the time, was not able to go on to college. Laura doesn't give up the hope that some day, as a result of stem cell research, a scientist will discover a way to help her regain her independence.

Stem cell research holds the potential to help Elle, to help Abby, and to help Laura, and so many others in New Hampshire and across this country. I thank President Obama for recognizing the importance of this issue and for providing an opportunity for us to reverse the stem cell policy that has slowed the pace of medical research and hindered the development of therapeutic treatments for medical conditions ranging from diabetes and spinal cord injuries to Parkinson's and Alzheimer's. I now look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and the new administration to ensure continued support of stem cell research. Through increased funding and ensuring that moral and ethical guidelines for research are established in this growing field, I am hopeful that the scientific community will continue with crucial stem cell innovations that will positively affect the lives of those three young women whom I talked about and so many people across this country.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, last week when considering H.R. 1105, the

Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009, I filed technical corrections to the table of congressionally directed spending items contained in the explanatory statement offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives which accompanies the bill H.R. 1105.

I wish to add the following technical correction to the joint explanatory statement that accompanied H.R. 1105:

On page H2368 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 2009, the words "Perkins Career and Technical Education Act" should read "Higher Education Opportunity Act" and the Senate requesters associated with this item should be changed to "Conrad; Domenici; Dorgan."

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Fiscal Year 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act, which President Obama signed yesterday, contains \$36.6 billion in discretionary budget authority for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which is the same amount approved by the Appropriations Committee in July 2008.

This represents a \$1.6 billion decrease from former President Bush's budget request of \$38.2 billion. I repeat—this legislation is \$1.6 billion below what former President Bush recommended in his budget.

It is a \$3.8 billion increase from the fiscal year 2008 enacted level, not counting supplemental funds, and \$968 million above the fiscal year 2008 level including fiscal year 2008 supplemental and fiscal year 2009 bridge funds.

The State and Foreign Operations portion of the omnibus does not contain any congressional earmarks. It does, as is customary and appropriate, specify funding levels for authorized programs, certain countries, and international organizations like the United Nations and the World Bank.

I want to thank Chairman INOUE, President Pro Tempore BYRD, and Ranking Member COCHRAN for their support throughout this protracted process. And I want to thank Senator GREGG, who as ranking member of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee worked with me to produce this bipartisan legislation that was reported by the Appropriations Committee with only one dissenting vote.

It was imperative that we enacted this legislation. The alternative of a year-long continuing resolution would have been devastating for the operations of the State Department and our embassies, consulates and missions around the world, and for programs that support a myriad of United States foreign policy interests and that protect the security of the American people. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle were encouraged that Senator Clinton was nominated for and confirmed to be Secretary of State. If we