

address to be delivered by the Honorable Lee Myung-Bak, President of South Korea.

(For the address delivered by the President of South Korea, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

Whereupon, at 5:03 p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FRANKEN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 20 minutes in morning business.

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

TRADE MEASURES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, this Chamber considered trade measures this week for the first time in about 4 years. First, and most important, the bipartisan currency measure passed by an overwhelming majority, 63 to 35. This action on China's currency is long overdue. This is legislation of which I was the prime sponsor. We had major cosponsors in both political parties: LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, a Republican; CHUCK SCHUMER of New York, a Democrat; DEBBIE STABENOW from Michigan, a Democrat; JEFF SESSIONS from Alabama, a Republican; SUSAN COLLINS, a Republican from Maine; KAY HAGAN, a Democrat from North Carolina; BOB CASEY, Democrat from Pennsylvania. This was a strong bipartisan bill. My junior Senator, ROB PORTMAN from Ohio, former Trade Representative under President Bush, supported the legislation.

Basically it works this way. We know the kinds of job losses in places such as Duluth, MN or Toledo, OH, because China cheats. Pure and simple, they cheat. They depreciate or overappreciate their currency, making a weaker renminbi. That is the name of their currency term. When a company in Dayton, OH, or Youngstown, OH, sells a product into the Chinese market that the people of Xian or Wuan might consider buying, this company is faced with a 25- to 30- to 35-percent currency tax, currency tariff, making the product more expensive, making it much harder for the U.S. company to sell the product to China. At the same time going back the other way, the company in China, or the government in some cases, selling into the U.S. market gets a 25-, 30-, 35-percent subsidy, making it so much easier to sell.

I will give one perfect example, a regrettable example. There is a company

about 20 miles from where I live in Brunswick, OH, owned by the Bennett Brothers whom I met fairly recently in Cleveland, 25 miles outside of Cleveland, called Automation Tool and Die. The Bennett Brothers had a million dollar sale that they thought they were about to fill and at the last minute a Chinese company came in and underpriced them by 20 percent. That was the currency subsidy that Chinese company had. What is fair about that?

I learned today a paper company in Hamilton, OH, right smack in the middle of the home county and home district of the Speaker of the House, announced its closing. One of the main factors was low-cost imports from China.

When it comes to paper, here is what the Chinese do. They buy their pulp in Brazil, they ship it from Brazil to Chinese paper mills—in some sense across two oceans. They mill it, they ship it back to the United States, and yet they underprice us. Even though labor is 10 percent of the cost of paper production, they underprice us because apparently they subsidize water and energy and land and capital, plus they get this 25-percent currency subsidy.

Our trade deficit with China, which has more than tripled in the last decade after China was let into the World Trade Organization, pledging to follow the rule of law but breaking that pledge every day of the year—our trade deficit with China, now \$275 billion for the year, has risen through the economic food chain all the way through advanced technology products. What used to be made in China 10 years ago was similar—the Presiding Officer remembers growing up in Minnesota in the 1950s and 1960s when “Made in Japan” always used to mean something was cheap and sort of badly made. “Made in China” 10 years ago usually meant the cheapest products, the tchotchke kind of products. Today, with “Made in China,” they have worked their way up the technology chain so they compete with our wind turbine component production and they compete on all kinds of high-level kinds of goods.

In addition to paper, steel, aluminum, glass, and cement, all the things that have created the middle class in my State for decades, we are competing with China for jobs in solar and wind and clean energy component manufacturing and in the auto supply chain. We can compete on productivity. We have skilled workers. We have world-class infrastructure—although God knows it needs renovation and modernization. But how do you compete against an automatic across-the-board 25- to 30-percent subsidy?

I thank my colleagues this week for voting for that legislation—63, including the Presiding Officer's support—including the support to manufacturing. We need to pass that bill in the House of Representatives. The Speaker of the House has so far said he is not inclined to bring it up. I think the White House

has so far not supported this legislation, but we know the kind of broad bipartisan support it has and how important it is so we can begin to reenergize manufacturing in this country.

At the same time we took a step back this week, after the China trade currency bill, which was very progressive, important legislation for our manufacturing—we took a step back by passing trade deals with Colombia, South Korea, and Panama that will do more harm than good.

It is kind of amazing. Probably the too often used quote from Einstein where he said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result is exactly what has happened in trade agreements. Go back 20 years—18 years, in 1993, President Clinton—mimicking President Bush, who had negotiated the agreement—said the North American Free Trade Agreement would create 200,000 jobs in our country quickly. We have lost 600,000 net jobs because of NAFTA. That same model of NAFTA with investor-state relations—with investor-state provisions and other things, gave rise to the Central America Trade Agreement and other agreements that cost us jobs. Every time the administration—either party, it doesn't matter—promises these trade agreements will create jobs, they never do. This body, again—Colombia, North Korea, Panama—a strong majority of Senators again bought that line, “Hey, this is going to create jobs,” and it never does.

The same promises, businesses promise jobs will increase exports. They only talk about half of it. They say NAFTA, CAFTA, the Korea Free Trade Agreement, the Panama Free Trade Agreement, Colombia Free Trade Agreement, are going to mean more exports. Talking only about exports is like telling a baseball score and only reporting half of the score. Yesterday, the season obviously mercifully ended for the home team of the Presiding Officer, but it is like saying yesterday the Twins scored eight runs. Good for them, but the Indians scored 12. But they only told you about the Twins' runs. You don't report baseball scores that way. You report scores like the Twins got 12, the Indians only got 8, and it was 12 to 8 or the Tigers won 3 to 2.

With trade, the people who support these trade agreements are the same ones who say it lets us increase the exports. Maybe it is, but imports are increasing much more dramatically.

President Bush once said \$1 billion in trade surplus or trade deficit translated into 13,000 jobs. If you have a \$1 billion trade deficit, if you are selling more than you are buying, that creates 13,000 jobs. If you are buying more than you are selling, if you have a \$1 billion trade deficit, you lose 13,000 jobs. You know our deficit is in the range of \$600 billion. Do the math. Each time we

pass one of these trade agreements—and it will probably happen with Korea and Colombia and Panama—each time we do it, the trade deficit rises. Our trade deficit with China has more than tripled. Before NAFTA we had a trade surplus with Mexico and small trade deficit with Canada. After NAFTA, which was a trade agreement among the United States, Canada, and Mexico, the trade deficit with Canada exploded. The trade surplus with Mexico went from a surplus to a deficit. We know this does not work.

We have a serious jobs crisis on our hands, 14 million people out of work. We hear Senators talking about that all the time—another 15 million underemployed or stopped searching for work. The economy must have 150,000 new jobs each month simply to keep up with population growth. So what do we do? We add a Korea agreement, a Colombia agreement, a Panama agreement, none of which will create jobs. They never do. They promise them, but they never do. That is because these trade agreements do not tell the whole story about how a trade agenda can actually create jobs.

I want trade, I want more trade. I think the American people want more trade, but the American people know these trade agreements don't serve us as a nation. It is impossible. I know you hear this in Duluth, you hear it in Rochester, you hear it in Minneapolis. I hear it in Cincinnati, I hear it in Columbus, I hear it in Zanesville. When unemployment is far too high, our constituents demand that Washington do its job and help folks get back to work.

We tried to do that this week on another issue and that was the President's jobs bill. When I heard Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, say—it is almost a direct quote—my No. 1 goal in 2011 and 2012 is to make sure Barack Obama doesn't get reelected—I never heard a leader in the U.S. Senate to my knowledge in history ever say that was his No. 1 goal. Of course, the Presiding Officer and I will support Barack Obama. That is what happens in politics—you hear the leader of one political party say my No. 1 goal is to defeat the sitting President of the United States. And he rounds up his troops to vote no against any job creation bill that President Obama offers. In fact, he didn't just vote against this bill and led every Republican to do that, he led his Republican troops to say: No, we are not going to let it come to the floor to be debated.

Senator CARDIN was speaking earlier, and I was presiding. He was incredulous in many ways—that the leader of one party would say on the jobs bill, of all things, we are not even going to allow it to come to the floor to debate and offer amendments. Senator CARDIN had several amendments I thought sounded like a good idea. A lot of us have amendments to the jobs bill, and we wanted a chance to offer them. Yet Republicans—because of this dysfunc-

tional rule that we have to have 60 votes to even put up a bill for debate—the Republicans say: No, we are not even going to debate it.

Let me take one part of that bill that is particularly important. The average U.S. public school building is 40 years old. Many are older; some are newer. The average public school building is 40 years old. I know what I preach to my kids. I know what my neighbors preach. I know what we preach as politicians. I know what almost everybody says in this country. We say to our children and the pages—people who are 15, 16, 17 years old—education is the most important goal to pursue, the most important in our country.

What do we do? We send them to crumbling old school buildings that are not easy places in which to learn. It is pretty clear that when the average school building is 40 years old, it is going to cost real money to fix them. Conservative estimates suggest it would cost \$270 billion to maintain and repair them.

With the slowly recovering economy, we know that too many school districts have been forced to cut budgets and lay off teachers, let alone make improvements to our schools. I introduced Fix America Schools Today, the FAST Act, that would help localities make critical repairs to schools. It will support more than 12,000 jobs in Ohio.

I introduced the bill a few weeks ago. Soon after, the President was at Fort Hayes Public School in Columbus, OH, in the central part of my State. The President talked about the FAST Act, about how we should do school renovation as part of his jobs bill.

I would plead with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle—the same colleagues who worked with me on a bipartisan basis to pass the biggest bipartisan jobs bill, the China currency bill of this session—to work on this bill. At least, if they will not let us debate the jobs bill as a whole, let us pass the Fix America's Schools Today, the FAST Act, it will make the kinds of repairs—it will create jobs because workers will rebuild these schools and renovate them. It will create jobs in manufacturing as companies all over my State that make steel, plastic, cement, and brick will go to work to create and make these products, and it will lay the groundwork for prosperity.

We know in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, the United States of America built infrastructure the likes of which the world had never seen. That is why we had that kind of prosperity in this country. When the Presiding Officer and I were in high school and college and were young adults, we had that kind of prosperity brought about because we had the best infrastructure in the world. We have to rebuild and modernize the infrastructure to create opportunities for young people. We need to pass the FAST Act. It will make such a difference for our country in the years ahead.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my home State of Louisiana: international trade. From its founding, Louisiana has been a hub for trade and entrepreneurship. In fact, the French explorer Bienville chose the site for the city of New Orleans in 1718 because, at a crescent bend in the Mississippi River, it is close to the Gulf of Mexico but safe from tidal waves. President Thomas Jefferson later made the Louisiana Purchase in 1813 to increase opportunities for U.S. traders and protect U.S. access to the Port of New Orleans. Ever since then, Louisiana and the Mississippi River have been the gateway to the economic heartland of the United States. For example, 60 percent of all grain exported from the United States is shipped via the Mississippi River. It is also a little known fact that the Port of New Orleans imports more steel than any other port in the country. This crucial port sees more goods leave its docks each day than almost anywhere in the Nation. Studies have found that the Port of New Orleans pumps \$882 million into the Louisiana economy and helps sustain more than 160,000 jobs. The reality is Louisiana's ports are America's ports and the gateway to the world. There are 31 ports in the State of Louisiana and some of the busiest in the world in terms of gross tonnage. Five of the 31 ports in Louisiana, from the Gulf of Mexico to Baton Rouge, are deepwater ports. We are home to 5 of the country's top 13 ports, exporting more than \$40 billion in goods last year alone and making Louisiana the fourth largest exporting State in the country. Louisiana sends everything from sugar to oil to more than 200 countries worldwide. Port Fourchon supports infrastructure that provides 18 percent of the Nation's entire oil supply. The Port of South Louisiana exports more than any other port in the country. When combined with the nearby Port of New Orleans, these ports form the fourth largest port system in terms of volume handled. Today New Orleans hosts an Australian Trade Office, a Mexican Consulate, a French Consulate, and countless honorary consuls. For all of these reasons, I do all I can here in the U.S. Senate to promote exports from Louisiana. These exports mean jobs in my State—from the suppliers, to the manufacturers, to the shipping companies, to the port workers.