

the member of her class “most likely to save the world.” At her college, Mandeep is the copresident of STAND, an antigenocide group.

Mandeep has so much to offer America. But, unfortunately, she was placed in deportation proceedings earlier this year. Mandeep and her friends responded the way many young people do today—they went to Facebook and asked for help.

The response was amazing: 20,000 people sent faxes to the Department of Homeland Security to save this young lady from deportation. On the day she was scheduled to be deported, she was granted a 1-year stay.

Her first thought was to try to prevent other people from going through what she had just experienced. So just 1 week after her deportation was suspended, she came to the U.S. Capitol, where I had an opportunity to meet her. She spoke publicly about her experience, and she called for the deportations of all DREAM Act students to be suspended.

I met her while she was here and asked her to explain to me why she wants to stay. She said: “I will send you a letter,” and she did. Here is what it said:

I have spent years in the United States, and consider it my only home. My family, friends, and future are in the United States, which is where I belong. My dream is to become a pediatrician so I can treat the most helpless and innocent among us. I hope to serve families in low income communities who are otherwise unable to afford medical care. I wish to remain in the United States so that I can continue to make a positive difference and give back to the community that has given me so much.

Would America be better off if we deported Mandeep Chahal back to India? I don't think so. She left that country when she was 6 years old. In her heart, she is an American. She just wants a chance to prove it and to make this a better nation.

Let me introduce to you one other person whom I have also met, another wonderful story.

Fannie Martinez, brought to the United States from Mexico 9 years ago when she was 13. She lives in Addison, in the State of Illinois, a straight A student in high school. Earlier this year, she graduated summa cum laude at Dominican University in River Forest, IL, with a major in sociology. This month she is beginning to work on a master's degree at the University of Chicago's Harris School of Public Policy.

Keep in mind, these students who are excelling get no help—none—from the Federal Government. If we think college is a burden now for those who borrow the money or are given grants, most of these students have to earn the money if they are going to go through school.

Let me tell you something else about Fannie Martinez. She is married to David Martinez, who has served in the U.S. Army Reserves for the last 8 years. Here is a picture of the two of

them together. David is currently deployed to Afghanistan, putting his life on the line for our country. Yet his worry is not just the enemy in Afghanistan. His worry is that his wife Fannie is going to be deported while he is serving overseas.

Fannie sent me a letter, and here is what she said about her situation:

My husband is constantly worried about my status in this country. He knows that I am always at risk of being placed in deportation proceedings and he is afraid of not having his wife with him once he returns from Afghanistan. The passage of the DREAM Act will give me the confidence to live without fear and frustration. It will allow me and my husband to plan our future without having to deal with the possibility of my deportation and my lack of opportunities. I care about my community—

Fannie wrote—

and I know I can help improve society if I am allowed to live in the U.S. and am given lawful permanent residence.

David Martinez, her husband, is willing to give his life for our country. We should give him and his wife Fannie a chance to pursue their dreams—the American dream.

I don't know that I have ever dealt with an issue that has meant so much to me personally because there isn't a place I go in America—anywhere—that I don't have some young person come up and look me in the eye and say: I am a DREAMer. I am counting on you.

They are counting not just on me, but they are counting on the Senate, they are counting on the Congress, they are counting on our government and our Nation to step forward and realize this is the morally right thing to do and that these dynamic, wonderful young people will make this a better nation.

I urge my colleagues, please, put partisanship aside, support the DREAM Act. It is the right thing to do for the future of our Nation.

I yield the floor and 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam 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. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding the majority still has a few minutes left in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Four minutes.

Mr. REID. I yield that back.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is yielded back.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to H.R. 2832 is agreed to, and the clerk will report the measure.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. REID. On behalf of Senators CASEY, BROWN of Ohio, and BAUCUS, I call up amendment No. 633.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 633.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. REID. Before noting the absence of a quorum, it is my understanding the Republican leader is on his way to the floor to offer an amendment, and I think everyone should understand there will be no business conducted until he shows up.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 626 TO AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 626, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. COATS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 626 to amendment No. 633.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide trade promotion authority for the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement and for other trade agreements)

At the end, add the following:

### TITLE III—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

#### SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011”.

#### SEC. 302. RENEWAL OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 3803) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries—

“(i) on and after the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011 and before June 1, 2013; or

“(ii) on and after June 1, 2013, and before December 31, 2013, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph—

“(i) on and after the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011 and before June 1, 2013; or

“(ii) on and after June 1, 2013, and before December 31, 2013, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).”;

and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “before July 1, 2005” and inserting “on and after the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011 and before June 1, 2013”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “after June 30, 2005, and before July 1, 2007” and inserting “on or after June 1, 2013, and before December 31, 2013”; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “July 1, 2005” and inserting “June 1, 2013”;

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “April 1, 2005” and inserting “March 1, 2013”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “June 1, 2005” and inserting “May 1, 2013”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “June 1, 2005” and inserting “May 1, 2013”; and

(II) by striking “the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011”; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking “June 30, 2005” each place it appears and inserting “May 31, 2013”.

(b) TREATMENT OF THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT AND CERTAIN OTHER AGREEMENTS.—Section 2106 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002 (19 U.S.C. 3806) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “, or”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following:

“(2) establishes a Trans-Pacific Partnership.”; and

(C) in the flush text at the end, by striking “the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the enactment of this Act” and inserting “the date of the enactment of the Creating American Jobs through Exports Act of 2011”.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the amendment the majority leader just called up. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program in particular is what I will focus on in my remarks. I want to, first of all, thank the majority leader for his leadership on this issue, helping us get started today. I am particularly grateful for the strong leadership Chairman BAUCUS has provided, the chairman of our Finance Committee. I thank him and his staff for their tireless efforts, not just leading up to today but over a long period of time. He has been such a strong advocate for this program.

For many months Chairman BAUCUS has led the charge to assure that a strong Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is reinstated because it is important public policy for our workers, to get them retrained and to make sure they have the skills needed to compete in such a tough economy. I appreciate his work.

I also appreciate Chairman BAUCUS's work for many years fighting for workers, especially when their jobs are at risk, their livelihoods and their families' economic security. I thank Chairman BAUCUS and so many others. My colleague Senator BROWN of Ohio has been a tremendous leader on this issue as well.

One thing we all understand, whether we are Democrats or Republicans or Independents, is that we are still in the midst, still in the grip of a jobs crisis all across the country. It knows no geographic boundaries, it knows no party. People are worried, concerned that their jobs will continually be at risk. Some, of course, have already lost their jobs—almost 14½ million Americans at last count.

In the midst of that crisis, it is critically important that we take the steps here to make sure those who want to get back into the workforce, those who want to improve their skills or be retrained in some way or another, have that opportunity. We know in the next couple of weeks the Congress will be taking up free trade agreements. But before we do that, before we begin the debate, before we consider those agreements, we have to make sure our workers have the protections they need to deal with the ravages of unfair foreign competition.

There are lots of ways to talk about this program and this issue. Some of them, frankly, get a little academic. The best way for me to understand the importance of trade adjustment assistance is very much consistent with the recent and unfortunate economic history of my home State of Pennsylvania. In our Commonwealth—by way of one example, but it is the best example I can cite because of the numbers of workers affected—in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the 1970s and 1980s, in a short period of time, in less than a decade, we had tens of thousands of steelworkers lose their jobs.

These were folks who worked in steel mills, not just for a couple of years but in many instances decades. They would graduate from high school, go into the steel mill and be virtually guaranteed of a job for the rest of their lives—a good job with good benefits on which they could support their families.

Then we know what happened to those workers and that industry. A lot of their jobs were destroyed in the 1970s and 1980s because of the decline of the steel industry. It is at times such as that, when someone who has worked their whole life and put all of their energies into a job and that job goes away in a matter of weeks or months or a few short years, we have to make sure we are there for them at that moment. One of the ways we can be there for them is with trade adjustment assistance.

I and every Member of the Senate could point to other examples as well, but I remember that horrific history in Pennsylvania where families were destroyed because of the loss of a job.

Our trade policies have hit a lot of American workers very hard. Especially today we are seeing that. I mentioned Pennsylvania's manufacturing jobs as an example. According to an analysis by the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am the chairman, from 1997 to 2010—just 13 years—manufacturing went from 16.4 percent of the gross State product of Pennsylvania down to 12.1 percent. In 13 years, a short period of time, there was that kind of decline in manufacturing jobs, from roughly 16.5 to 12. In total, the job loss in Pennsylvania manufacturing was nearly 300,000 good-paying jobs.

While trade adjustment assistance cannot bring those jobs back, we can take steps to help those workers in a tough time as they transition to new employment, to new skills and to new opportunities. Many displaced workers need considerable training to reenter the labor market. Imagine if any one of us did the same job for years or decades and then had to turn on a dime to adjust to the difficulties in the economy. It takes a while. According to a report by the Joint Economic Committee as well, many of these folks who have lost their jobs are much older than the rest of the workforce. They need to gain a number of skills. Fifty-seven percent of current participants in the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program are 45 years of age or older—57 percent. Trade adjustment assistance can better address the needs of these displaced workers by requiring training and giving additional time for workers to gain the skills necessary to reenter the workforce to prepare to compete in a tough economy, in a world economy.

We know these programs work. We know, based upon the JEC report I cited earlier, 53 percent of those who participated in Trade Adjustment Assistance Programs were reemployed within 3 months; 53 percent were reemployed after 3 months after leaving the program itself. These participants also

found lasting employment, with 80 percent of those workers employed within the first 3 months remaining employed by an additional 6 months.

We know that in 2009, several reforms were made to the program to reflect the realities of the modern workforce and the modern labor market. The amendment I offer today with my colleague Senator BROWN of Ohio would reinstate these reforms, including the following, by way of an economic summary: No. 1, providing trade adjustment assistance benefits to service sector workers; No. 2, covering workers whose firms shift production to non-free-trade agreement partner countries—for example, China and India. We hear a lot of people talking around here about how we have to compete with China and India and keep our workers at a high skill level to do that. This is one way to do that. No. 3, finally, increasing the health care tax credit subsidy to 72.5 percent and hereby addressing one of the most significant costs for those without a job, the cost of health insurance.

We all know, and I know firsthand, the benefits of a strong trade adjustment assistance program based upon what has happened in Pennsylvania over many years.

According to the Department of Labor, from May of 2009 through June of 2011—a little more than 2 years—nearly 10,000 additional workers qualified for assistance due to these essential reforms in Pennsylvania. So the reforms we made in 2009 have helped nearly 10,000 workers in Pennsylvania. If you look at it nationwide, 185,783 additional workers were certified for TAA participation because of those reforms. In total, trade adjustment assistance has assisted nearly half a million people over this time period. Our action this week will ensure that thousands of American workers will be able to count on retraining and other support if they lose their job through no fault of their own.

More and more jobs—and we all know this but it bears repeating—have been sent overseas, leaving workers out in the cold. Nothing they did has caused outsourcing of their job, and yet they are left with the consequences and their families suffer with those same consequences. To get jobs in new industries, workers need new skills. They need to be retrained and introduced to new skills. Trade adjustment assistance helps those workers hurt by foreign trade get back to work, while also ensuring workers have a skilled workforce at the same time.

Finally, let me urge all my colleagues to support this amendment. Trade adjustment assistance has a long and proud history of bipartisan support in the Senate, and I hope we can continue that with this amendment and with this work. Those who have been affected by this know this story better than I or better than any of us, and it is about time we stood with those workers when they and their families are suffering.

I would yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, if it is all right with the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the former Trade Representative, the other distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, be allowed to give his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No.

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

Mr. HATCH. I apologize to Senator BROWN, but Senator PORTMAN was promised he would be able to speak at 11:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought Senator HATCH said that the senior Senator from Ohio, then the junior Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The UC request is for the Senator from Utah, the junior Senator from Ohio, then the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I didn't understand that from my conversations, but I do not object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the TAA amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from Montana, Chairman BAUCUS. Before I get into the specifics, I think it is important to put this debate in context. For years I have been working to ensure that our pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea receive fair consideration in the Senate. Unfortunately, while I worked to get these agreements approved, others placed obstacles in the way. As a result, days, weeks, and months passed. Eventually those months turned into years. Now 4 years later, we are taking out the sixth renewal of trade adjustment assistance in the time these trade agreements languished. To me, it is highly ironic that we not only passed but expanded legislation to help workers who are allegedly harmed by trade agreements five times over the last 4 years, while we have yet to pass a single trade agreement.

This March President Obama made himself perfectly clear: Unless Congress agreed to spend more money for this pet trade priority, he would never send a trade agreement to Congress and U.S. workers would never benefit from these agreements. Basically, the President held U.S. exporters hostage while he squeezed more spending out of Congress.

Despite my deep disappointment in the President's failure to make these agreements a priority, I am pleased we are having this debate today. Earlier this summer the administration tried to jam the domestic spending program into the Korea Free Trade Agreement implementing bill. I strongly opposed this move. I believe it violated longstanding trade rules and seriously jeop-

ardized approval of the South Korea agreement.

I strongly encouraged the White House to reconsider so we could have a robust debate with TAA considered solely on its merits. After all, if there is such a strong bipartisan support for the program, it should not be shielded from a debate and vote in an open forum. It appears the administration realized their position was untenable in the face of unequivocal Republican opposition. Thankfully they chose to heed my advice and today we have an opportunity to consider and fully debate TAA.

If TAA passes the Senate, it should remove what we hope is the last obstacle the President and his party placed in front of FTAs. We will see. To date there is little evidence that the President is finally ready to step up to the plate. It has not been for lack of effort on our part. House leadership made it clear that TAA will be considered in tandem with the FTAs, as the President requested. Chairman CAMP worked with Senator BAUCUS to develop a substantive deal on TAA, as the President requested. Despite my deep reservations about the program, a number of my Republican Senate colleagues stepped up in support of the TAA compromise negotiated by Chairman BAUCUS and Chairman CAMP and even put their assurance in writing to support TAA. Before the August work period, Senators MCCONNELL and REID articulated a process for consideration of TAA and the FTAs, as the President agreed or requested.

Still the administration refuses to provide any real assurance that it will actually send the pending free trade agreements to Congress for a vote. I am very disappointed we still have not heard definitively from the White House that they will send up the three FTAs. As for the trade adjustment assistance amendment before us today, I wish to summarize for my colleagues my concerns with the proposed expanded program, and my objections to additional domestic spending for this program at a time of immense budget difficulties.

First, there is little evidence that the TAA Programs actually work. In fact, the opposite is true. Recent studies by professors at American University have found that the TAA program:

... has no discernible impact on the employment outcome of the participants.

If that is the case, I cannot understand why we would expand this ineffective program.

This summer I was surprised to learn from an article in the Wall Street Journal that the Department of Labor is 4 years late on producing a report to Congress intended to demonstrate that the numerous Trade Adjustment Assistance Programs actually improve the employment outcome for TAA participants. Yet today we are considering an amendment to not only reauthorize the program for 3 years but to make many of the benefits retroactive. Before we authorize \$1 billion more in

taxpayer spending, shouldn't we know if the program actually improves the job prospects for TAA beneficiaries?

My friend and colleague from Oklahoma, Dr. COBURN, has made it a priority to identify and eliminate wasteful government programs. In his first report on the subject, the Government Accountability Office identified dozens of programs without any identifiable metrics on whether they actually succeeded in their mission. At a time of crushing budget deficits and increasing debt, Congress could easily start by eliminating these programs that have no proven track record of success and, in my opinion, we would have to put TAA at the top of that list. Consider that we are still waiting on the report from the Department of Labor on TAA's efficacy. I suspect if the facts and data clearly demonstrated benefits to workers participating in the TAA Programs, the report would have been issued years ago. I am sure this report will be issued, but only after TAA has been passed. I cannot support increasing funding for a program without any real evidence that it works. Some will argue more people are using the program, therefore it must be working. I strongly reject that argument. Spending more money and certifying more workers does not mean a program is succeeding. It simply means the program is expanding, and that is my second concern. Like many Federal Government programs, this domestic spending program continues to grow and grow. TAA money now goes to farmers, firms, community colleges, and service workers. Even more troubling, the critical nexus between job loss caused by trade agreements and TAA eligibility has been jettisoned. Today all workers who lose their jobs allegedly due to "globalization" could be eligible. As the global economy and global supply chains become more integrated, I suspect the potential number of beneficiaries and the cost to the U.S. taxpayer will grow enormously.

Third, at a time when we need to severely constrain Federal spending, this program increases it. In 2009, TAA was significantly expanded as part of the President's failed stimulus bill. Most of those increased costs are included in the TAA amendment before us today, but there may be additional hidden costs. Because the income support and the health coverage tax credit are entitlements, there is no cap on future spending. Although the health coverage tax credits are to expire when ObamaCare goes into full effect, I have serious doubts that they actually will. History shows again and again it is much easier to create an entitlement than to end one.

As I said, I suspect this program, like most Federal programs, will cost more than expected, especially after unemployment insurance returns to its traditional 26-week level, which will consequently increase the use of trade reallocation allowances and increase the TAA Program's cost.

Fourth, the program is fundamentally unfair. Suppose one of our fellow Americans loses their job or his job because their factory burns down, another loses their job because his or her company could not compete with a domestic competitor, and a third loses his or her job because of foreign competition. How can we tell two of our fellow Americans "tough luck"? Two can only use the general job training and unemployment insurance programs while the third worker is provided with a host of more training, income support, and health care benefits. This does not seem right to me. Why are we picking winners and losers amongst the other 14 million Americans looking for work?

I am also troubled that although union workers are less than 7 percent of the private sector workforce, union workers receive over a third of TAA certifications. I do not see why we should support this vicious cycle. Unions drive industry after industry into bankruptcy by insisting on restrictive work rules and overly generous compensation and benefits plans, and the taxpayer gets to clean up the mess by providing the now unemployed workers with a new set of benefits far more generous than those received by others. Unfortunately, encouraging vicious cycles appears to be an objective to this administration when it comes to TAA.

Let me share with you another one. By now most of you have heard of a company called Solyndra. It was held up by the President and his administration as an example of the wonders of the stimulus and its ability to transform taxpayer dollars into green jobs. Here is how President Obama described it:

And we can see the positive impacts right here at Solyndra. Less than a year ago, we were standing on what was an empty lot. But through the Recovery Act, this company received a loan to expand its operations. This new factory is the result of those loans.

Well, the President was right about that. The new factory was a result of the taxpayer-provided loans. According to the Wall Street Journal, those very same taxpayer loan guarantees also were a prime cause of Solyndra's bankruptcy. The "taxpayer dollars to create green jobs" alchemy worked about as well as medieval attempts to turn lead to gold.

That is not the end of the story. To ensure the circle of taxpayer losses remains unbroken, the former Solyndra employees have now applied for trade adjustment assistance. That is right. As reported first by Americans for Limited Government, and then confirmed by Investors Business Daily, Solyndra employees have applied to the Department of Labor for trade adjustment assistance.

To recap, the administration provides loan guarantees to a failing company and in the process saddles the taxpayer with over \$½ billion in potential liability. These same loan guaran-

tees precipitate the demise of said company, and this, in turn, justifies the receipt of new taxpayer-funded benefits for the now unemployed workers, benefits that go beyond and cost far more than those the other unemployed people in this country receive.

The administration likes to talk about the multiplier effect of new Federal spending, but I don't think this is what they had in mind. For each initial wasted taxpayer dollar, the government multiplies the losses and manages to waste another quarter. Solyndra tried to make solar panels but ran up their costs far higher than even domestic competitors. Ultimately, with costs above the competition, the company failed. Of course, the failure was blamed on China. If you cannot even outcompete U.S. companies, it wasn't foreign competition that ruined your business, it was simply a failed business model.

During our hearing on the South Korea Trade Agreement, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Marantis testified that the purpose of the TAA Program is to help workers manage the transition to globalization and help workers train to be able to take advantage of the opportunities presented in the new economy.

Well, according to President Obama and Vice President BIDEN, green jobs such as those found at Solyndra were supposed to be the jobs of the new economy. Now that the new economy venture failed, those very same workers are going to be retrained, at taxpayers' expense, for other jobs in the new economy. Government, under the President's green agenda, picks winners and losers and then pays off the losers when it makes the wrong picks. Pardon the American taxpayer for jumping to the conclusion that this plan doesn't make sense.

Let's not forget that a handful of States receive the lion's share of TAA money. Again, this is unfair on its face and represents a distorted allocation of Federal resources.

President Reagan did not graduate from an Ivy League college and he was not the editor of any law review, but the man understood how the economy grows and what types of programs waste precious government resources. This was his assessment of TAA:

The purpose of TAA is to help these workers find jobs in growing sectors of our economy. There's nothing wrong with that, but because these benefits are paid out on top of normal unemployment benefits, we wind up paying greater benefits to those who lose their jobs because of foreign competition than we do to their friends and neighbors who are laid off due to domestic competition. Anyone must agree that this is unfair.

That was President Reagan.

I certainly do, as do most of my constituents, think the last thing this economy needs is another big spending program.

Another important point is that TAA fuels the fire of virulent antitrade propagandists. TAA supporters say the program keeps faith with American

workers and helps build support for trade. I think just the opposite is true. Unions and other antitrade zealots gleefully use TAA data to make the case that trade causes outsourcing and job loss. After all, the number of trade-dislocated workers is certified by the government.

As the program is expanded to include more and more people and entities, including community colleges, firms, farmers, and fishermen, the myth that trade is bad for the American worker finds ready fodder and continues to build. Instead of helping build the case for trade, TAA certifications are used to show that trade is bad. In the end, TAA is really just a government subsidy for an antitrade propaganda.

Many of those dedicated to fighting a market-opening trade liberalization agenda and who are hostile to a thoughtful and ambitious trade policy cite each TAA certification and each TAA benefit conferred as further evidence that trade and trade agreements are bad for America. These same groups use TAA certifications and TAA workers to attack the companies that laid those workers off as outsourcers, even attempting to name and shame the CEOs of those companies. For goodness' sake, why should we expand a program that arms the harshest trade critics with more fodder for their ill-informed and relentless attack on trade?

Finally, TAA should move with TPA. Despite what many of my colleagues and many so-called trade experts say, TAA does not move with trade agreements. In fact, historically significant expansions and reforms to TAA have moved with omnibus trade legislation that included grants of trade negotiating authority to the President.

There is a myth that TAA has always received strong bipartisan support. Again, the historical record does not bear this out. A simple review of a very helpful history of TAA provided by CRS this August shows just how controversial TAA has always been and continues to be and confirms that TAA reforms traditionally move with TPA.

Inexplicably, this President doesn't want TPA trade promotion authority—and the White House is actually encouraging Leader REID and Democratic Senators to vote down a TPA amendment Leader MCCONNELL will offer. Leader REID and Chairman BAUCUS and the White House have also apparently asked the business community to oppose an amendment on TPA as well, despite the fact that the business community has uniformly supported the granting of trade negotiating authority to every President, regardless of party.

This is all baffling to me. But I agree with Leader MCCONNELL that the President needs TPA whoever the President is—as soon as possible, and I can't imagine any President not wanting that authority. As I suspect the Democrats will vote down granting their President trade negotiating authority, I must also be inclined to vote against this TAA amendment.

Much has been said about TAA and that it is the price for free-trade agreements. But we are paving new and dangerous ground by holding three trade agreements hostage to expanded TAA. Each time we have tried to move these agreements, a new roadblock has been erected. And while we dilly and dally, our trade competitors take more of our market share around the world, and American businesses and farms lose more money and more jobs.

There has to be a better way. I urge the President to reconsider his trade priorities. Instead of expending his political capital on expanding the Federal Government, he should liberate the U.S. worker by accepting our offer to provide him with the authority to open new markets to U.S. exports. Our economy is in dire straits, unemployment is sky high, and Federal spending is out of control. We need the President's leadership, and we need it now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, let me start by thanking the senior Senator from Ohio for his generosity in allowing me to speak now. I also commend Senator HATCH, who has been a leader in expanding exports and therefore creating jobs for many years, and again he is standing today talking about the importance of us moving forward on a progrowth trade agenda, including giving the President the ability to have trade promotion authority. That is what I wish to talk about today.

Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, introduced an amendment to the underlying legislation saying that, along with trade adjustment assistance, for the same 3 years there also be trade promotion authority given to this President, which all of his predecessors have had. That makes sense. The legislation in the amendment is actually identical to legislation I introduced my first week here in the Senate on a bipartisan basis with Senator LIEBERMAN to provide the President with trade promotion authority. It is incredibly important.

I think it goes without saying that we live in an increasingly interconnected world where the movement of goods and services and people across borders is part of our economy. It is very much an economy where the United States is connected to our global competitors. We are moving forward around the globe on various arrangements, export agreements at a rapid pace. Yet I am sorry to say the United States is simply not a part of that because we do not have trade promotion authority.

These agreements that are being negotiated open markets for workers and farmers and service providers to be able to expand exports, again, of goods and services.

By the way, there are over 100 of those bilateral agreements being negotiated today. Guess how many the United States is party to. None, not a

single one. The reason is that we don't have the ability through trade promotion authority to have the United States at the table negotiating to open these markets for our workers and our farmers and our service providers.

There is one agreement on which we are negotiating, a regional agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I support the continued negotiation there, but, frankly, it is not a bilateral agreement that is likely to reduce barriers significantly.

The United States is getting left behind. We lost trade promotion authority in 2007. It expired. At that time, President George W. Bush came to the Congress and asked for it to be renewed. Then a Democratically controlled Congress said: No, we don't want to give you the ability to negotiate these agreements that help, as Senator HATCH has said, expand jobs in this country.

President Obama's administration has not asked for the authority. In fact, as Senator HATCH has just indicated, they don't seem interested in having it, which is unbelievable to me—that you would not want the ability to negotiate with other countries to knock down barriers to help our workers, our farmers, and our service providers here in this country. But that is where we are right now.

Before the 2007 expiration of trade promotion authority, the United States was active and involved in agreements that knocked down barriers to our exports. There were three agreements negotiated now 3 and 4 years ago, and these were agreements with Panama and Colombia and Korea. Those are the three agreements that have been talked about a lot on this floor over the last day because the trade adjustment assistance we are talking about is related to those three agreements. We need to get them done. They have been languishing for too long. Obviously, the United States, not being able to negotiate anything in the interim period, has fallen behind, but at the least, we should move ahead and ratify these three agreements. The President's own metrics tell us these three agreements alone will generate 250,000 new jobs in this country. Look, with unemployment at over 9 percent, we need those jobs, and the jobs tend to be better paying jobs with better benefits.

What has happened in the interim while we have not moved forward with these agreements? Well, Korea has started a negotiation with the European Union since our agreement was finalized and completed that agreement and now made that agreement effective in July of this year. Exports from the European Union to Korea increased 36 percent in July alone. Our exports to Korea during that time period, by the way, increased less than 3 percent.

What is happening? We are losing market share. We are losing jobs while we sit back and allow these other countries to negotiate. Remember, over 100

agreements are being negotiated, and we are not parties to any of them.

The same thing is happening in Colombia. Since we negotiated the agreement with Colombia, Colombia started negotiating with other countries, including Argentina and Brazil, and guess what has happened. They have completed that agreement, it has gone into effect, and, again, our market share has diminished. We used to provide about 71 percent of the agricultural exports, including corn, wheat, and soybeans, to Colombia when we completed the agreement. Today, that market share is down to 26 percent. That means farmers in Ohio, Montana, Utah, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere are being disadvantaged by our trade policy.

We have to move forward with these agreements. Instead of having increased exports from Seoul, Bogota, Calgary, and Munich, they should be coming from Cincinnati and Cleveland and Columbus and Dayton. Interestingly, Korea and Colombia have now started negotiating an agreement with themselves. Again, we are not moving forward because we are not part of these agreements because we do not have trade promotion authority.

I think these three agreements that I hope the President finally sends to the U.S. Congress for ratification are examples of the kinds of agreements that we could have been negotiating over the past 3 or 4 years and that we should start negotiating tomorrow, by this Senate and the House, giving the President the trade promotion authority he needs to be able to have those negotiations and to open those markets for U.S. products.

The reality is that trade promotion authority is vital for any President to have. Why? Because if you don't have trade promotion authority, the other countries will not sit down at the table and bargain with you. It is a pretty simple concept. If you want to get the best deal from another country, you have to have trade promotion authority because here in America, after we negotiate an agreement at the executive branch level, it has to come to Congress, and other countries don't want to renegotiate an agreement with the U.S. Congress that would be full of amendments and changes. So in order for us to ensure we can get the best deal, we have to give the President trade promotion authority.

Every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has asked for this authority and received it. It is unbelievable to me that this President does not want that. I believe he must want it—any President would—and he should ask for it, and we should provide it to him. This amendment does exactly that.

Congress has given TPA authority to Democrats and Republicans alike. It is not a partisan issue. So a Republican Congress has given it to a Democratic President and vice versa.

I stand as a Republican telling my colleagues that I would like to give it

to President Obama. The underlying amendment we are talking about provides trade promotion for 3 years, so it would be for the remainder of the President's term and, if he is reelected, for the next couple of years or, if a Republican is elected, for that person. It should not be about party; it should be about our country.

The President has been talking in the last couple of weeks about the fact that he wants products stamped with three words: "Made in America." I couldn't agree with him more. He is saying they should be exported all around the world? How is that going to happen? It is going to happen by opening these markets, by leveling the playing field for us as Americans so we can compete and win.

When we open these markets, we expand exports dramatically.

Think about this: Countries with which we currently have trade agreements which comprise less than 10 percent of the global GDP—think about it. We do not have an agreement with China or the European Union. It is about 10 percent or less of the global economy. Yet that is where we send about 41 percent of our exports.

These agreements are good for us, which is why the Colombia agreement, the Panama agreement, and the Korea agreement, in my view, will be able to pass this floor easily because the facts are there, if the President will just send them. By giving the President trade promotion authority, we could go on and, indeed, make good on his promise to have more products stamped with those three words, "Made in America," sent all over the world.

It is a little bit ironic to me that the underlying bill we are talking about, the TAA, the trade adjustment assistance, is attached to the generalized system of preferences, GSP. It is not legislation I oppose, but it is legislation that opens the United States more to products from other countries. So here we are talking about opening up the United States more with the GSP bill, and yet we are not willing to put in place measures to open up other markets more for the United States of America through trade promotion authority. How does that make sense? But that is where we are.

To my colleagues, I will say, if we are not engaged in opening markets, we are falling behind. America needs to get back in the game again. We need to take a leadership role in global trade. That means giving this President and all future Presidents the ability to negotiate, just as all of their predecessors have had. I strongly urge my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to give to this President the same authority other Presidents have had of both parties. Our economy and the future for our children and our grandchildren depend on it.

Again, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his generosity, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kind words. I appreciate his support, his public support—he did not speak specifically on the Casey-Brown-Baucus amendment, I do not believe; I had to step out for a moment, but I know he has said positive words about restarting, if you will, trade adjustment assistance, and with some expansion, not quite as good as it was 2 years ago, but still a very important program.

I appreciate Senator PORTMAN's words and his support of expanding it, and I hope he joins with some other Republicans in actually supporting the Casey-Brown-Baucus amendment.

I particularly thank Chairman BAUCUS for his strong support of trade adjustment assistance. Senator CASEY, especially, has pushed for this for, well, almost a year now, when in December we did everything but beg our colleagues to renew this program that helps workers who are unemployed through no doing of their own.

In early 2009, we had written a very good trade adjustment assistance: If you lose your job because of a trade agreement, or if you lose your job because of trade, even if it is a service job—it used to just be manufacturing—you will get two things: One, you will get trade adjustment assistance so you can continue with your life and not get foreclosed on, you can continue to provide for your kids, and you can have a little bit of money to get retrained.

I met a woman in Youngstown not too long ago who lost her manufacturing job to trade. She got TAA. She used that money to go to nursing school at Youngstown State University, and she was in school with her daughter who was also getting a nursing degree. You think: That is exactly how TAA works. There are those examples, I am sure, in Philadelphia and Harrisburg, and I will bet you there are even examples in Provo of trade adjustment assistance working in that way. That is why it is so very important.

At the same time, the language we wrote also gives help for people to continue their health insurance. I was at a place in Columbus not too long ago that specializes in helping people get back on their feet and get work. To hear someone tell a story: First, they lose their job. They do not get much assistance. Then they lose their health care. Then they have to talk to their 12-year-old son and 14-year-old daughter about moving because they lost their home.

Does nobody here—I should not say "nobody" because a lot of my colleagues do care, but does nobody here care about somebody who has to sit down with their kids and say: Sorry, honey, we are going to lose our home because of foreclosure because we lost our jobs and we are not getting retrained and finding any work? That, to me, is what this is all about.

I want to talk a little bit about trade adjustment assistance beyond what I said, but I also want to talk about



some of my colleagues' statements about trade and what it has done for this country, to this country. I hear all the theories. Every country in the world practices trade according to its national interests. The United States of America practices trade according to an economics textbook that is 20 years out of date.

In my first year in the House of Representatives, the Congress passed the North American Free Trade Agreement, something I know if Senator CASEY had been here he would have voted against it. I voted against it. I remember the promises, the promises from the free-trade-at-any-cost crowd, that NAFTA would create hundreds of thousands of jobs. They said it with NAFTA. They said it with PNTR with China. They said it with the Central American Free Trade Agreement: If you pass this, it is going to mean more manufacturing and more high-tech jobs and stronger communities. Look what it has meant.

Go to Springfield, OH, go to Ash-tabula, go to Lima, go to Mansfield, go to Zanesville, go to Chillicothe, go to Xenia. Look at these medium-sized cities of 30,000, 40,000, 50,000, 60,000 people, and look at what has happened to them. Often in smaller communities—the Senator from Montana, the Presiding Officer, knows this—a husband and wife both work at a plant.

In Jackson, OH, I was walking a picket line with some workers who were locked out, and then the plant ultimately closed. For a number of the people I saw, the husband and wife both worked at this manufacturing plant, each making about \$12 or \$13 or \$14 an hour. They were middle class with their combined income. When this plant moved overseas, their family income was wiped out.

It happens over and over in small towns. It happens in Dayton and it happens in Cleveland and it happens in Columbus and Philly and Pittsburgh and Harrisburg. It happens in small towns and big cities.

Then we see this free-trade-at-any-cost crowd come to the Senate floor and say: If we only had trade promotion authority, we could do more of this because it works so well. Free trade has worked so well for our country.

Why have we lost these hundreds of thousands of jobs? Do you know why? Because the business plan in this country, the business plan, never in world history—I do not think we have seen this ever in world history—is where a business plan for a company is to shut down production in Steubenville, shut down production in Toledo, move that company to Shanghai, move that company to Mexico City, make those products, and sell them back into the United States. So their business plan is to shut down manufacturing in this country, go overseas, hire cheaper workers, in places where there are weaker environmental laws, non-existent worker safety laws, and sell

the products back into the United States.

That is what our manufacturing policy has been. That is why this whole idea of Korea and Colombia and Panama—as if Mexico and Central America and China were not enough—this whole idea of free trade at any cost is bankrupting our country. That is why wages during the last 10 years, during the Bush administration and since—since 2001, wages in this country have gone down. We have lost jobs in this country, almost. We have not grown jobs in this country. It is about what we had in 2001, with a much larger population.

Wages down, job growth flat, and the trade policy is working? So our answer is, let's do more of it, as if NAFTA and CAFTA and PNTR were not enough? Let's do more trade agreements? Let's send more jobs overseas? Also, we can practice trade according to what the Washington Post and the New York Times and the rightwing papers and the leftwing papers and the Harvard economists and the economic elite in this country say? Also, they can follow what they learned in economics 101, taught with a textbook that is 20 years out of date? It is not working for our country.

I was talking on the phone today with a retiree in eastern Ohio, and she had just been with her son who was about to be deployed at his base. She and her husband went and visited her son. He is a marine. She went to the commissary, and do you know what. She bought a hat that said "Marines." I think it said "Marines." She bought a hat. She bought a bunch of stuff at the commissary. Where was it made? Guess. It was not made in Helena. It was not made in Harrisburg. It was not made in Columbus. This is insane. We have American flags that are made abroad. We have products in commissaries that are made abroad. We have products Senator SANDERS spoke out against sold here in the U.S. Capitol that are made abroad. Why? Because we have a trade policy that is morally bankrupt, politically bankrupt, economically bankrupt, and it is not working for our country.

That is why this whole idea of trade promotion authority so we can do more of the same makes no sense at all. But it is also why we need to pass the Casey-Brown-Baucus amendment. When we made the reforms to TAA in 2009, 185,000 additional trade-affected workers became eligible in every State. Mr. President, 227,000 workers in 2010 alone participated in TAA. They got trained for new jobs that employers are looking to fill. I think we all know that we have, even in these bad economic times, jobs that remain unfilled because they cannot find workers with the right skills. This will help to fill that gap. We should all be for this.

According to the Peterson Institute, before the recession hit, between 2001 and 2007, two-thirds of TAA participants found jobs within 3 months of leaving the program. Ninety percent

stayed at these jobs for at least a year. It is a program that works. It helps people get health care. It helps people stay in their homes. It helps people get new skills so they can work.

The last comment I will make: I have said enough about the bankruptcy of American trade policy, its moral bankruptcy and economic bankruptcy alike. Our trade deficit in 2010—I do not like to come to the floor and use a lot of numbers—if this is not reason enough, in 2010 our trade deficit was \$634 billion. You do know what that means. That means, basically, every day we buy almost \$2 billion more worth of goods made abroad than we sell abroad—almost \$2 billion a day.

If one-tenth the attention was paid to the trade deficit as we pay to the budget deficit, this would be a better country. We would see more manufacturing in places such as Cleveland and Columbus and Dayton.

Our trade deficit with China was \$273 billion in 2010. Ten years before—before PNTR—our trade deficit with China was \$68 billion. It went from \$68 billion to \$273 billion in one decade. That works so well that we should do more of it? President Bush said \$1 billion in trade surplus or trade deficit translates into 13,000 jobs, a \$1 billion trade surplus means 13,000 additional jobs, \$1 billion trade deficit means 13,000 fewer jobs.

So our trade deficit with China last year was \$273 billion. You do not have to be good in math to know that translates into a lot of jobs. Making products sold at the Capitol, making products sold at commissaries, making products sold all over—until we figure this out and pass trade agreements that are actually in our national interests, we are simply, pure and simple, betraying our national interests and betraying the middle-class families and the families in our country that aspire to be middle class.

I support the Casey-Brown-Baucus amendment and thank Chairman BAUCUS again for his work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS— S. 1094

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to pursue a unanimous consent request on something that is critical to families in my home State of New Jersey, which has the highest rate of autism, but is also critical to families across the country who have a loved one who faces—in the spectrum of autism and other developmental issues—the need to get the help, so their child, their loved one, can fulfill their God-given capabilities.

Last Tuesday morning, a full week ago from today, I sent this bill before the Senate for unanimous consent, and that unanimous consent was cleared on the Democratic side, but it has not been cleared on the Republican side,