

been a good idea, but Alex and I—5 feet tall, both of us—had to put on these huge bright orange flight suits that were made for someone much bigger than either of us. I just remember catching her eye and we started laughing at each other and at ourselves. She and I had so many moments such as that together because Alex is very serious about her work, but she doesn't take herself seriously. She is much fun to be around, and she has a fantastic sense of humor, which is good for me because I don't think there is anyone I have spent more time with in my car traveling around Washington State than Alex.

On a particularly stressful or long day on the road, Alex always made sure we had cookies in the car, which I very much appreciated. Once, during a busier day than usual, I remember Alex and I having a conversation about all the fun places we had to pass by in the car as we drove to the next events but never had time to stop and visit.

We resolved to find the time to visit some of those when things got a bit slower, and I haven't forgotten about that. One day Alex and I are going to visit that alpaca farm up in Skagit Valley.

Alex also knew there was nothing I liked more than doing events where I could wear my jeans and tennis shoes, and I know she fought hard to make sure that happened as often as possible; and, Alex, I appreciate that.

Alex always had my back. She was always ready to get done what needed to get done. Back in 2004, I was facing a tough reelection campaign in my State. Alex had a life here in DC, but I went to her and I asked her to move back to the State to help me. I wanted her there, not because she is just good at her job and knows my voice so well—though she certainly is and does—but because she shares values, and I had every confidence that she would know exactly how I would want to tell my story and get my message out to the people in Washington. And Alex, without blinking, said yes. She packed up her bags and boxed up her apartment, she put her pet bunny in the car—I think this may be one of the most well-traveled rabbits in all of America—and she drove all the way across the country to fight by my side in Washington State. I don't know if I could have done it without her.

Alex then, after that election, came back here to DC and spent 6 years as my communication director. Then she did it all over again—uprooting her life, packing up that bunny, and driving all across the State when I needed her out in Washington State again last year. After she finished that job, I asked Alex to come back here to Washington, DC, to serve as my senior adviser and provide me with counsel and advice as I took on new challenges, and I was grateful when she accepted and got to work.

But 10½ years after Alex Glass first started working for me, the moment

came that I knew was always going to come but never looked forward to. Alex knocked on the door of my office and walked in, and before she could say a word I knew exactly what she had come to tell me. I gave her a hug. We talked. There may have been a few tears shed. But I always knew that Alex has the skills, the talent, and the experience to do absolutely anything she wants to do, and I am proud that she has chosen to continue working in public service and has accepted a job at USAID.

Although she is moving on, her amazing work and strong influence in my office will continue. Her words and her ideas have helped shape so much of what I have done and how I have communicated with my constituents. I can't tell you how many Washington State reporters have come over to me to thank me. They told me how helpful Alex was, how responsive and how good she was at connecting the policy debates here in Congress to the struggles of families and communities in our State.

Alex didn't just keep this to herself. She helped build and mentor a strong team in my office that knows what we are trying to do and understands my voice and how I want to communicate with the people I represent.

I have had many members of my staff come and go in my time here in the Senate. Many of them have been outstanding. Every one of them has added value and done good work for me and my constituents. But there are very few I have come as close to as I have to Alex.

Over the last 10 years, Alex, you have been like a member of my family, truly like a daughter to me. You have gone to the mat time and time again for me. You have been through thick and thin with us. You have sacrificed so much for me and my office, and I can't express enough how deeply I appreciate it. I know there is nothing you wouldn't do for me, and I hope you know I feel the same way about you. So on behalf of everyone in my office, all the constituents I represent, I want to thank you for the years of service to Washington State and to the Nation. You have been my voice, my adviser, my confidante and, most importantly, my friend. It has meant so much to me. And although I know it will continue, you aren't going away very far, I am going to miss seeing you in the office and hearing your voice almost every day.

So, Alex, as you start this exciting new chapter in your professional life, remember what Rob and I would say to you when times got tough out in the State: Shoulders up. Shoulders up. You have helped me keep mine up for more than 10 years, and I wish you luck now as you tackle your next challenge with the same heart, gusto, and good humor that you brought to our office every day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:49 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT—Continued

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT—Continued

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1692 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to rise today to speak about the three trade agreements that are working their way over to the Senate. At a time when unemployment is over 9 percent and we have over 14 million Americans out of work, it is past time for us to take up these three important agreements. These agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama are going to create jobs and put Americans back to work. That is why it is so important we move, and move on a bipartisan basis, to get them done.

With 95 percent of consumers living outside of our borders, we need to proactively help American workers, farmers, and service providers sell their products all around the world. The President himself has said that repeatedly. Just last month he came to Ohio and said he wants to be sure more products are stamped with the three proud words "Made in America." I couldn't agree more.

One way to do that is to get these trade agreements done. Finally, we have the opportunity to vote on them. This will help us to gain market access for U.S. workers to about 100 million consumers.

Unfortunately, while these agreements have been sitting on the shelf for over 4 years, our workers, our farmers, and our service providers have lost market share. They have fallen behind because other countries have completed agreements, and their workers and their farmers, their service providers have gained market share that

we should have had. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, by waiting for 4 years to take up these agreements, American workers have lost over \$12 billion in wages.

So I am glad the agreements are here. They should have been here sooner. Again, this, to me, should be a lesson that we learn as a Congress, a Senate. We need to have more agreements, and we need to have them negotiated constantly on behalf of our businesses and our workers.

While we have waited for the President to submit these agreements to Congress for a vote, other countries have moved forward and have gained footholds in other markets. The European Union and Korea, along with Canada and Colombia, have negotiated, completed, and put into force their own trade agreements they started to negotiate after we were done with ours. In other words, we finished our negotiations, they then began negotiations, they ratified their agreements, and they are now in effect taking market share away from us.

We have seen the U.S. market share be reduced in Colombia and in Korea because of these agreements. A good example would be our exports of agricultural products to Colombia. We have seen them drop from 70 percent of the market for corn, wheat, and soybeans to less than 30 percent of the market just since we completed the agreement with Colombia. Because, again, the President did not send these agreements forward for ratification, we have been on the sidelines while farmers in my State and around the country have lost out.

We are falling behind in Korea too. When we started discussing an agreement with Korea, the United States was Korea's biggest trading partner. Since then we have slid down the ladder, with China, Japan, and the European Union jumping ahead of us. According to the U.S. Trade Representative's Office, in just over a decade, our share of Korea's goods imports has fallen from 21 percent of their market to 9 percent of their market, while China's share of the Korean market has increased from 7 percent to 17 percent. We are now at 9 percent; China is now at 17 percent. This has happened, again, since we began negotiations or discussions about negotiations with Korea. By standing still we are still allowing China and our competitors to get a leg up in this crucial Asian market.

According to the President's own metrics, these three agreements together will create over 250,000 new jobs. Conversely, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, if we fail to move forward on these agreements, we would lose 380,000 jobs—again, because we would lose market share that we already have to these other countries that are negotiating agreements while we sit on the sidelines.

The nonpartisan U.S. International Trade Commission says these three agreements will increase U.S. trade exports by nearly \$13 billion each year.

When I was the U.S. Trade Representative, I had the privilege of launching the Korea agreement, actually in a room right next to the Chamber. This agreement is called KORUS. I did so with Korean Trade Minister Kim in February of 2006. At that time, many people said this agreement would be very difficult to negotiate. Some criticized us for launching it thinking this economy was too big, to complicated, that we would not be able to get a meaningful agreement. We took the chance because we saw the incredible potential for trade liberalization, and it would drive greater economic growth in the United States and U.S. job creation—and also because of the importance of the alliance with the Republic of Korea.

It turns out the skeptics were wrong, and we now have before us this week, in the Senate, to vote on the largest free-trade agreement, largest export agreement this Congress has looked at in almost two decades.

Korea is a vital market for U.S. exports already. It is America's seventh largest trading partner, and their economy is now growing by more than 6 percent per year.

KORUS eliminates tariffs on over 95 percent of U.S. exports of industrial and consumer goods to Korea within the first 5 years of the agreement. The agreement's intellectual property rights provisions contain stringent protections for American intellectual property—extremely important to some of our service companies and other exporters. This gives American companies additional access to Korea's \$850 billion services market.

America has a large services trade surplus, actually, in services right now, both globally and with Korea, and this agreement will allow American service companies that are the best in the world to expand and sell more products to a country of more than 48 million people.

KORUS is supported by the United Auto Workers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and many other business and export-related groups. Let me read an excerpt, if I could, from the United Auto Workers' statement earlier this year about the Korean agreement. The UAW said the Korea agreement and related auto provisions "will protect current American auto jobs . . . will grow American auto industry jobs . . . includes labor and environmental commitments, and . . . has important enforcement mechanisms."

The KORUS agreement opens an important market for American farmers and ranchers as well. According to the International Trade Commission, KORUS will expand American agricultural exports by \$1.9 billion to \$3.8 billion per year. In my own State of Ohio, KORUS, along with Panama and Colombia, will increase Ohio's agricultural exports by nearly \$55 million annually—just to Ohio.

KORUS will eventually phase out the 40-percent Korean tariff on U.S. beef

and will immediately eliminate the 5-percent Korean tariff on soybeans, resulting in a \$3 million annual increase in Ohio soybean exports. Soybeans are the biggest export crop in Ohio. In fact, 1 of every 2 acres of soybeans in Ohio is planted now for export.

KORUS also opens the door for American manufacturing jobs. In Ohio over 25 percent of manufacturing jobs now depend on exports. Over \$31 billion of U.S. manufacturing goods were exported to Korea last year. In fact, Korea was our fastest growing export destination in the world, with a 37-percent increase over 2009. When American-manufactured goods are exported to Korea, they face an average tariff now of about 9 percent. With passage of this agreement this 9-percent tariff will fall to zero and in most cases immediately. However, due to this agreement we talked about earlier between the European Union and Korea going into force about 100 days ago, on July 1, EU exports to Korea are now on the rise because 90 percent of their goods can now enter Korea duty free. Again, it is important we move forward, and move forward quickly, to avoid losing more American share which is difficult for us to regain.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer wrote an editorial recently entitled, "Korea Free Trade Deal Will Help U.S. and Ohio."

The piece talked about the benefits of the Korean agreement, particularly for manufacturers and autoworkers. The editorial concluded by saying:

Trade can help drive recovery. This deal with a longtime ally will help.

They are right.

Another important agreement is the U.S.-Colombia trade promotion agreement. Colombia is a growing economy in Central and South America, to which the United States exported over \$121 million in goods last year. This agreement with Colombia is a clear victory for U.S. workers. Due to preference programs that are already in place, nearly 90 percent of the exports from Colombia to the United States have entered our market tariff free. So we largely have a one-way free-trade agreement with Colombia already. Due to these preference programs, this agreement will be a huge benefit to U.S. workers and U.S. businesses, because U.S. exports to Colombia have faced an average tariff of about 14 percent. So, historically, 90 percent of their goods come in duty free while ours face much higher tariffs when they enter Colombia. This isn't fair trade, and this agreement will fix that. It will assure that the one-way trade that advantages Colombian exports instead of American exports is balanced.

The agreement will lower the 14-percent average Colombian tariff to zero, allowing over 80 percent of U.S. consumer and industrial products exported to Colombia to become duty free immediately. The agreement also immediately eliminates duties on about 70 percent of U.S. farm exports, including

soybeans, wheat, barley, flour, and beef.

The Colombia agreement also establishes new transparency rules on nontariff barriers to trade; in other words, not a higher tariff, but other barriers in the country, so-called nontariff barriers, that keep our products out.

Further, it establishes new commitments on the environment and labor, an area on which Colombia is improving and proactively addressing.

The agreement also protects U.S. intellectual property with enhanced protection for copyrighted entertainment products, software, and U.S. trademarks.

Finally, we have an important agreement with Colombia's Latin American neighbor, Panama, another key ally to the United States. Panama is one of the fastest growing economies in Latin America. Last year, \$46 million worth of Ohio goods were exported to Colombia. Panama is a vital strategic partner for the United States, since nearly two-thirds of the Panama Canal's annual transits are either from or to U.S. ports.

Moreover, the ongoing \$5 billion Panama Canal expansion project presents unique opportunities for American exporters such as Rockwell Automation, which employs nearly 3,000 Ohioans. At Rockwell's Twinsburg facility in northeast Ohio, they produce controllers and automation systems that open and close the doors of the Panama Canal's locks and divert the water. They are bidding on more work in Panama. However, they say they are currently working with one hand tied behind their back because their competitors have an advantage in Panama, because we don't have a trade agreement. So this Panama export agreement will help companies such as Rockwell by cutting tariffs, protecting their intellectual property, and giving them more investment certainty.

Upon entry into force, Panama will immediately eliminate its tariffs on over 87 percent of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial goods and on more than half of U.S. agricultural exports. Eighty-five percent of U.S. exporters to Panama are small and medium-sized companies. That is over 7,000 American small and medium-sized companies that export to Panama and will thus benefit from this agreement.

Let me speak about a couple of Ohio products that are exported to these markets. The Step2 Company, headquartered in Streetsboro, OH, is the largest American manufacturer of preschool and toddler toys. They employ over 800 Ohioans. They like to export to Korea and Panama, and they want to take advantage of these agreements. Lincoln Electric's 3,000 employees in Euclid and Mentor export welding products and equipment to Korea, Colombia, and Panama from northeast Ohio. These agreements don't just help Lincoln Electric export more, they also will help Lincoln's customers export more.

Another Ohio company is PRO TEC Coating, a U.S. Steel joint venture company located near Findlay. PRO TEC Coating employs about 250 Ohioans and creates steel that meets the most demanding specifications of U.S. automakers. The Korean agreement will open a big potential market for U.S. auto exports, which will help companies throughout the automotive supply chain to be able to get more business, and PRO TEC Coating is one.

Gorilla Glue, one of my favorite named companies in Cincinnati, OH, my hometown, has over 100 employees and they export their premium line of adhesives and tapes to Panama, Colombia, and Korea. They want this agreement because they will be able to expand their exports and create more jobs in Cincinnati.

While these agreements bring large economic benefits, those responsible for our national security also recognize the geopolitical benefits of building economic ties with key regional allies. In testimony earlier this year before the Senate Armed Services Committee, GEN Douglas Fraser, who is Commander of U.S. Southern Command, described the Colombian agreement as "a very positive, beneficial aspect for our cooperation because of a growing capacity to support the capabilities of the armed forces and law enforcement."

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton strongly support these agreements, noting the importance of an effort that leverages all elements of national power to protect our interests overseas. Secretary Panetta confirmed the role these increased economic ties have on promoting regional security, with Colombia as a prime example of a key ally in a continent with ever changing political dynamics. When it comes to international economics and security, there is no question of the critical role Panama plays. With 20 percent of our trade to Asia passing through Panama, building on this historically strong relationship will signal our commitment to engaging with Central America.

When President Obama submitted these agreements to Congress last week, he said, "The agreements I am submitting to Congress today will make it easier for American companies to sell their products in South Korea, Colombia, and Panama and provide a major boost to our exports. These agreements will support tens of thousands of jobs across our country. . . ."

While these agreements are late, the President is right. These are important job-creating and export-opening agreements. They have strong support from Members of both parties and, more importantly, they are supported by American workers and businesses.

Again, the lesson we should learn here is that we need to give the President the authority he has yet to ask for to negotiate further agreements. Because in these last 4 years while these agreements have been pending,

while the President has not sent them during his administration—and prior to that when President Bush was blocked by the House from moving them forward—we have not been negotiating additional agreements. I am told there are over 100 bilateral trade agreements being negotiated right now. The United States is not a party to any of them. That is not acceptable because we are losing out. Our workers, our service providers, and our farmers are losing out and we will not have the sustained recovery we all hope for unless we engage more in these international markets.

I wish to commend so many in this body who have been patient, persistent, and even passionate in promoting these agreements over the years. When I was U.S. Trade Representative, I worked closely with then Chairman GRASSLEY, with Chairman BAUCUS, with Senator HATCH, and others on the Finance Committee to promote these agreements. Those Senators are to be commended today. We will hear a lot from Senator BAUCUS and Senator HATCH, I am sure, about the importance of these agreements, but I want to underscore the key role they played even early on in ensuring that these agreements could be here before us today.

I commend the staff of the Finance Committee, who have worked tirelessly over the years to ensure that we could be here with this opportunity today. Other Senators played a key role—Senator BLUNT, Senator KERRY, and others whom I should be naming but I am not—to make sure we have this opportunity to move our country forward by enacting these agreements.

Finally, I wish to thank the dedicated staff at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative who make these agreements possible. Again, I had the privilege to lead this nimble and effective agency, comprised of remarkable public servants who relish the agency's mission, which is to knock down barriers to U.S. products so we get a fair shake. They balanced this challenge with aggressively enforcing our international trade laws, which is also part of the mix. We need to both expand exports in open markets and ensure that trade is fair, and that we are enforcing both the international standards and U.S. laws with regard to trade. They do it very well. Without our negotiators' commitments to resolving some of these very complex and sometimes controversial economic issues, we would also not be here today. So I commend them. For all of those professionals with whom I have had the honor to serve and for those who are there now serving under Ambassador Ron Kirk, who has also been a strong promoter of these agreements, I thank you for your efforts.

Finally, I urge my colleagues who are on the fence—and some of them have talked to me—to take a strong look at the economic and geopolitical benefits of these agreements. We don't do much around here that is bipartisan these

days. Yet we have a country that is crying out for it. This is an example of where we can come together as Republicans and Democrats, realizing that for 14 million Americans out of work, we need to move our economy forward. This is a clear example of where we can indeed take steps that are bipartisan, where we have a consensus to be able to create jobs and opportunity in the United States of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to speak for a couple of moments about the three pending trade agreements that the Senate is considering, those with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia. I wish to start by highlighting what I believe the American people are most concerned about right now—certainly the people I represent in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Wherever I go, other than sending us a message that they want us to work together to solve problems they confront in their lives, the No. 1 issue, the No. 1 priority in terms of the work we can and should be doing, and thankfully are starting to move forward on, is a series of steps to improve the job market and to reduce the unemployment rate.

As we have so often said, we have more than 14 million Americans out of work. In Pennsylvania, we were on the way last year of lowering the rate of that number substantially. We went from approaching 600,000 people out of work to going below 500,000. Now, unfortunately, the number has shot back up to above 500,000 people out of work. So the No. 1 issue, bar none, is jobs, and that is why this debate about trade and these agreements is so important.

Jobs are the key consideration for Americans. They should be the key consideration for us, and they are, in short, the biggest challenge we have. So we need to ask a series of questions, and I have at least three major questions about these trade agreements, but all center on that issue of jobs.

We have had a series of debates in the last couple of weeks which I think have been pretty instructive on both jobs and on efforts to achieve bipartisanship. We had a significant period of time we spent on trade adjustment assistance legislation. I was one of the leaders of that, and, thankfully, we were able to pass trade adjustment assistance to help workers who are displaced by unfair trade and, in many cases, have tremendous challenges getting from here to there—getting from a position of joblessness because of unfair trade to training and education and preparation for a new job or a new career.

We also just completed a debate about China's currency policy. We know our recent history proves that when China cheats on its currency, which it has over a long period of time, we lose American jobs. So the Senate

spoke in a loud voice, in a bipartisan way, to indicate that we are overdue. It is long past time to get tough with China. If they are going to cheat, there will be consequences when they cheat on their currency. So we have had some interesting debates, and we have focused on jobs and we have focused on working together.

Finally, let me make a point before I get to the three basic questions I have. The Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, released a report today, and the report is entitled "Nowhere to Go: Geographic and Occupational Immobility and Free Trade." It is dated today, October 12. I commend to my colleagues this report by the Joint Economic Committee. I won't go through the whole report, but here is the conclusion of the report itself:

Given the already high national unemployment rate and depressed home values still evident in most states, policies that seek to liberalize trade may impose even larger costs on—

older workers and workers who don't have a college education, therefore—bolstering the need for additional investments in training or other forms of trade-adjustment assistance.

So when people lose their jobs as a result of unfair trade and because of the ravages of what happens in the international marketplace, what happens to an individual, to a company, and to a community, if they are older workers and if they don't have an education level that is commensurate with allowing them to adjust and to be able to respond to those dramatic changes, they will be much worse off. I think that is why these trade agreements are so important to debate.

We have limited time for debate and we have limited time for full consideration, but I think we are going to have a number of hours to put some questions on the table. The first question I have is will these trade agreements protect and create jobs in Pennsylvania, the State I represent, and across the country?

We know manufacturing is the core or probably the most important part of our job creation analysis. If we are making things, producing goods, engaged in advanced manufacturing, in new manufacturing—that we are seeing all over the country—if we are doing that at high levels and with big job numbers, we are moving in the right direction. But, unfortunately, economic policies and trade policies have inhibited and badly damaged our ability to create manufacturing jobs.

I know in Pennsylvania manufacturing is especially critical to what is still the largest source of jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—that sector of our economy. The benefits to manufacturing jobs, of course, extend beyond individual companies, individual businesses. The economic benefits of a strong manufacturing sector are experienced throughout the economy. They have a ripple effect, multipliers beyond just that company.

In Pennsylvania, according to research commissioned by the Pennsylvania Industrial Resources Centers, for every \$1 increase in demand for products manufactured in this country, that leads to a gain in gross value to the economy overall of \$2.52. So \$1 in by way of manufacturing and \$2.52 in return.

Furthermore, manufacturing jobs create and support middle-income families. We know the wage level is higher and, therefore, those families can benefit tremendously. In 2008, the average annual compensation of a worker in the manufacturing sector was over \$65,000. The average pay for the rest of the workforce was \$10,000 less. Each good-paying job in the country allows for more money to flow back into the economy. We know that.

Given the importance of protecting these critical manufacturing jobs, we must ask ourselves: Will the trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama create jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector? Unfortunately, the answer to that question is no. All we need to do is look at the history. This is not theory. All we need to do is look at recent history.

Trade-related job expansion has been, unfortunately, an unfulfilled promise to the people of Pennsylvania and across the country. In 1993, the United States entered into the so-called NAFTA agreement, North American Free Trade Agreement, which promised to deliver hundreds of thousands of jobs across the United States. Those gains were not realized, especially in a State such as Pennsylvania. From 1993 to 2002, 525,094 workers were certified as displaced under NAFTA, according to the Department of Labor.

Overly optimistic job creation estimates were not the only flawed projection. At that time, leaders suggested that NAFTA would expand demand for American exports. That never came to be. In 1993, the United States had a small trade surplus with Mexico. Let me say that word again: We had a "surplus" in our trade with Mexico. By 2010, just 17 years later, according to Census Bureau statistics, we had amassed a trade deficit of \$66.4 billion with Mexico. Our trade relationship with Canada tells the same story—a widening trade deficit from \$10 billion in 1993 to \$28.5 billion in 2010.

So we know and everyone knows this, that a trade deficit does lead to job losses. In Pennsylvania, we have seen a dramatic decline in manufacturing employment since NAFTA was implemented, losing a total of 308,100 manufacturing jobs. That is one State in that time period; so more than 300,000 jobs lost just in Pennsylvania.

With this experience, we need to take a close look at the government's projections for the pending agreements that are before us right now. While the International Trade Commission predicts our bilateral trade with Korea will improve—that is the assertion—the total U.S. trade deficit is predicted

to get larger which, if past experience is any gauge, will mean job losses, not job gains.

According to the International Trade Commission, the agreement with Colombia means—and I am quoting—

There is likely to be minimal to no effect on output or employment for most sectors in the U.S. economy.

That is according to the International Trade Commission.

About the Panama agreement, the same commission concluded that the impact of the Free Trade Agreement “would likely be small because of the small size of the Panamanian market relative to total U.S. trade and production.”

Simply put, even the always optimistic International Trade Commission does not see these agreements as job-creating measures. That is question No. 1, a direct question on jobs.

Question No. 2: Will this agreement create a level playing field? I would assert the answer is no to that question.

Panama, while a very small economy, has one advantage to lure foreign investment. It remains a tax haven for companies that incorporate within its borders. As recently as 2009, Panama was listed on all major tax haven lists maintained by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the so-called OECD; Global Forum on Taxation; the National Bureau for Economic Research; and the Internal Revenue Service. While the tax information exchange agreement signed since then may address these issues, this same organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, has yet to evaluate whether Panamanian law will allow for effective enforcement pursuant to these agreements. Given the lack of definitive progress, I am concerned that the Panama trade deal remains silent on this very basic issue.

Let me move to the question of what happens as it relates to Colombia on this basic question about a level playing field.

Additionally, as it relates to Colombia, despite efforts to move that country toward a regime that tolerates workers’ rights, Colombia remains one of the most dangerous places in the world for union workers to be working. While it has been greeted with great fanfare, nothing in the so-called labor action plan negotiated between the United States and the Colombian Government—nothing—has required Colombia to establish a measurable system for enforcement of these labor rights prior to ratification or implementation of the agreement. In fact, Colombian companies can skirt many of the provisions in the so-called action plan—for example, by forcing new hires to sign a pledge offering higher salaries based upon a number of conditions, including not joining a union.

Given the weakness of this plan, it is not surprising that violence against union workers remains commonplace in Colombia. Twenty-two union mem-

bers and organizers have been killed in Colombia this year. Six Catholic priests known for working for the rights of the poor have also been targeted for assassination this year, leading the Catholic Bishops Conference of Colombia to call for protection of its clergy. Imagine that: union workers and priests needing protection in a country such as Colombia.

Additionally, a June 8 study by the International Trade Union Confederation condemned the ongoing problems for labor organizers in Colombia.

One simple comparison speaks volumes. In total, 49 union members were murdered in Colombia in the year 2010—49 people. All other countries combined had 41 killings of this kind. I do not think that needs any more emphasis.

I am going to move now to a couple of comments as they relate to this level playing field question as it relates to South Korea.

We had a long debate and a good debate and a good consensus on a bipartisan basis as it relates to China’s currency policy. I believe we took a positive step forward in passing through the Senate a bipartisan bill to get tough with China when they cheat on their currency.

All the while, we did not say much about another country that has had currency problems, and that is South Korea. We know they have their own record on currency, and I am troubled by South Korea’s currency manipulation over time. They devalued their currency at least in very specific time periods that we are aware of at least twice—once in 1998 and once in 1988. In fact, the most recent Treasury “Report to Congress on International Economic and Exchange Rate Policies”—a long name for a currency report—this report is dated May 27, 2011. It noted that South Korea intervened “heavily” in its currency market during the financial crisis and has continued uninterrupted since. So it has a history, but we also have current information, current evidence, recent evidence that South Korea has been intervening heavily in its currency market. Treasury urged—urged—South Korea to “adopt a greater degree of exchange rate flexibility and less intervention.” I think we could get a little tougher than that, be a little more direct and maybe have some consequences, but that is the extent that Treasury is willing to go.

So as we debate a trade agreement with a major country such as South Korea, we ought to know something about their currency policies, especially in the aftermath of bipartisan currency legislation as it relates to China.

I am pleased the Senate has passed this currency legislation this past week, and we are all hoping the House of Representatives will move quickly to consideration and passage of the currency legislation. But we should not be entering into a trade agreement

with South Korea at a time when we know their currency policies are at best suspect and I think worse than that.

Finally, let me lead to the last question of the three. The third question I have is: Does the agreement provide new opportunities for manufacturers in Pennsylvania as well as other States to export their goods?

The benefits of the agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama have been, in my judgment, overstated, while the risks have been largely ignored. Rather than opening a new market for Pennsylvania farmers or Pennsylvania manufacturers, I fear the benefits to the United States are likely to be minimal at best.

There are specific reasons the South Korea deal fails to deliver for Pennsylvania exporters as well. First, the most recent benefits are based upon an overly optimistic projection for agriculture. These projections, compiled by supporters of the agreement, assume that a cut in tariffs will immediately equal a growth in market share. We know from past experience that Asian markets, including South Korea, have come up with a host of unjustified non-tariff restrictions to keep U.S. goods, particularly beef, out of their country. These barriers to free trade are likely to limit export potential and are largely unaddressed in the agreement.

There are other troubling clauses, as well, dealing with, in this case, the beef industry. The South Korea agreement will allow American beef packagers to use Canadian or Mexican cattle and then export the packaged Mexican and/or Canadian beef as “American” beef. This policy, while great for beef packagers, undercuts U.S. ranchers.

Another problem with the Korea deal is which goods will qualify for the “Made in South Korea” designation or sticker. Which will qualify for that? And therefore, if they have that, they are allowed to enter the U.S. duty free. Under the rules of origin in annex 6-A of the agreement, 65 percent of the value of many goods, including automobiles, shipped duty free to the United States can come from outside—just imagine this—outside of South Korea and still be considered “Made in South Korea.” That defies description. It is internally inconsistent at best, and it is contradictory for sure. This standard is lower than the European Union agreement, where only 55 percent of content can be foreign and once again places our companies at a comparative disadvantage to international competition. Furthermore, this policy opens the door for products primarily made from Chinese parts to enter the United States duty free. That makes no sense at all.

Earlier I posed these questions. The first I posed was: Will these agreements create a substantial number of new jobs? They will not. If previous agreements are any indication at all, the South Korea, Colombia, and Panama agreements will not create jobs in the

way they are projected to and will, in fact, lead to job losses, especially in manufacturing.

The second question: Will the agreements help create a level playing field? They will not. The agreements fail to address critical issues such as violence against union members, as well as currency manipulation by, for example, South Korea.

The third question: Does the agreement provide new opportunities for American manufacturers to export? Proponents have overstated the benefits. Certain industries and firms are likely to benefit for sure, while others will not.

While it is clear that in its failure to address nontariff barriers to trade, the agreement leaves American firms unprotected on an unlevel playing field.

Finally, based upon this set of questions and, more importantly, the answer to those questions, I will vote against the agreements with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

It is my job as a Senator from Pennsylvania to fight for Pennsylvania jobs, and for too long the needs and the concerns of the jobs of Pennsylvania's workers have been last on the list when it comes to trade agreements. The fact is that past trade agreements have failed Pennsylvania and our workers, and I refuse to support new foreign trade agreements without reasonable debate and adequate answers for the questions that I pose and especially as it relates to jobs and the impact on workers.

Instead of moving ahead quickly with what is a broken model, we need to focus on the biggest picture: formulating a strategy that helps American manufacturers, that leads to job creation, and that creates a stronger middle class. We need a trade policy in the United States of America. We do not have one right now. We need one that is bipartisan in nature.

To make real, sustained progress, Washington needs to have a strategy. We must develop and commit ourselves to a national manufacturing strategy as part of a trade policy that includes job-creating trade agreements, not job-killing trade agreements. Manufacturing is the heart and soul of our Commonwealth and our country. Our future's success depends upon developing policies that allow our people to create jobs and compete in the global production of goods. I know our workers are up to it. If we give them the tools and the agreements and the policies to do just that, they will outcompete anybody in the world, any country in the world.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me begin by concurring with much of what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. I think he is right-on. Like him, I rise today in strong opposition to the unfettered free-trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Let's be clear.

One of the major reasons why the middle class in America is disappearing and why poverty is increasing and why the gap between the very wealthy and everybody else is growing wider is directly related to our disastrous, unfettered free-trade policy. If the United States is to remain a major industrial power, producing real products and creating good-paying jobs, we cannot continue the failed, unfettered free-trade policies that have been in existence for the last 30 years.

We need to develop trade policies—I know this is a radical idea—that work for working people and not just the CEOs of large corporations. What we must do is rebuild our manufacturing sector and once again create millions of good-paying jobs where workers are producing real products made in the United States of America.

Over the last decade, more than 50,000 manufacturing plants in this country have shut down. Let me repeat that. In the last decade, more than 50,000 factories in this country have shut down. Over 5.5 million factory jobs have disappeared.

Back in 1970, 25 percent of all jobs in the United States were manufacturing jobs, often paying workers a living wage, decent benefits, pensions. Today, that figure is down to just 9 percent.

In July of 2000, there were 17.3 million manufacturing workers in this country. Today, there are only 11.7 million.

According to a recent study conducted by a well-respected economist at the Economic Policy Institute, permanent normal trade relations with China has led to the loss of 2.8 million jobs. In fact, the United States has lost an average of about 50,000 manufacturing jobs per month since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001.

I was in the House of Representatives when PNTR with China was passed. I can remember all of the fine speeches from the President on down, Republicans, Democrats: Permanent normal trade relations with China is going to open up that great market, going to create millions of jobs in America. It was not true. Free trade with China ended up costing us 2.8 million jobs. You don't have to be an economist to understand that; all you have to do is walk into any department store in America and buy a product. Do you know where that product is made? It is not made in the United States of America, it is made in China.

We all now understand what that trade agreement was about. It was not to open markets in China for American products, it was to open China so corporations in this country could shut down here, throw American workers out on the street, and move there in order to pay workers pennies an hour. That is what those trade agreements are about. There is no doubt in my mind that—certainly to a much lesser degree because they are smaller trade agreements—trade agreements with

Korea, Panama, and Colombia will continue that same process.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has reported that over the last decade, U.S. multinational corporations slashed 2.9 million jobs. Now the biggest advocate of unfettered free trade, of NAFTA with Mexico, of PNTR with China, of these trade agreements, is corporate America. It is the chamber of commerce, it is the National Association of Manufacturing. They spend huge sums of money on lobbying and campaign contributions in order to make Congress vote for these great trade agreements.

Let me repeat. Over the last decade, these very same corporations that want us to pass these disastrous trade agreements slashed 2.9 million American jobs. Furthermore, what we have learned is that during that same period of time—and here is the kicker—these same corporations have created 2.4 million jobs. The only problem is that those jobs were created in China, Mexico, and other low-wage countries.

What we have here is that key advocates for continuing this disastrous trade policy are precisely the people who have been slashing jobs in America, closing down factories, and hiring people abroad. And I would suggest that Members of the Senate might want to think twice about listening to the advice of people who have been laying off millions of American workers.

Oddly enough, again we have one of the leading advocates for these disastrous trade agreements—it is the chamber of commerce. Well, some years ago, the chamber of commerce, to its credit, was pretty up front. They said outsourcing is a good idea. They recommended to American corporations: Shut down in America and move abroad. It is good for your stockholders.

Do you really want to take the advice of people who believe that outsourcing and throwing American workers out on the street is a good idea? I do not think so.

Today we are hearing all of this talk about how these trade agreements are going to create new jobs. We heard it before. It is the same old movie. The American people understand it is a bad movie. It is an unfactual movie.

During the Clinton administration, we were told by Republicans and Democrats and then-President Clinton that NAFTA would create 100,000 American jobs over a 2-year period. That is what we were told about NAFTA. Well, results are in on NAFTA. Instead of creating 100,000 American jobs, the Economic Policy Institute has found that NAFTA destroyed more than 682,000 American jobs, including the loss of 150,000 computer and electronic jobs.

I do not understand why, when you have a policy that has failed and failed, you want to continue that policy. Football teams that have coaches with losing records get rid of those coaches. When you have a trade policy that has

resulted in millions of American workers losing their jobs, you do not continue that same philosophy.

The issue here is not just Mexico and NAFTA, it is not just PNTR with China, it is obviously what is going to happen with the trade agreements that are before us today, Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that the Korea Free Trade Agreement will lead to the loss of 159,000 American jobs and will increase the trade deficit by nearly \$14 billion over a 7-year period. Why would you want to go forward with those ideas? Why would you want to go forward with a trade agreement that will increase our trade deficit?

President Obama has estimated that the Korea Free Trade Agreement will support at least 70,000 American jobs. But the headline of a December 7, 2010, article in the New York Times says it all: "Few New Jobs Expected Soon From Free-Trade Agreement With South Korea." According to this article, the Korea Free Trade Agreement "is likely to result in little if any net job creation in the short run, according to the government's own analysis."

Let me touch on one particular aspect of the Korea Free Trade Agreement that I find especially troubling and that I think the American people, to the degree they understand this and learn about it, will also find troubling; that is, this particular free-trade agreement will force American workers to compete not just against the low-wage workers in China or Vietnam or Mexico, they are going to be forced to compete against the virtual slave labor that exists in North Korea, the most undemocratic country in the world and a country itself whose government will financially benefit from this, with the dictatorship of Kim Jong Il.

We all know that under current law the United States has an embargo on all North Korean goods—for a very good reason. Workers in North Korea are the most brutalized in the world, have virtually no democratic rights, and are at the mercy of the most vicious dictator in the world. But after the South Korea Free Trade Agreement is signed into law, the United States would have a new obligation to allow South Korean products to come into our country tariff-free that contain major parts made by North Korean workers who make pennies an hour.

According to a January 2011 report from the Congressional Research Service, "There is nothing to prevent South Korean firms from performing intermediate manufacturing operations in North Korea and then performing final manufacturing processes in South Korea." In other words, there is a huge industrial park in North Korea. South Korean companies own that park. Workers there are paid horrendously low wages, and some of those wages go right to the North Korean Government. Products made in that industrial park in North Korea will go to South Korea

and then will come back into the United States as part of that so-called free-trade agreement.

Today, over 47,000 North Korean workers currently are employed by more than 120 South Korean firms, including Hyundai, at the Kaesong Industrial Complex in North Korea.

This facility is located just 6 miles north of the demilitarized zone, with direct road and rail access to South Korea and just an hour's drive away from Seoul.

These North Korean workers officially make a minimum wage of 35 cents an hour, but they actually make less than that.

Instead of paying these workers directly, Hyundai and the other South Korean firms pay the North Korean Government. How is that? South Korean companies—major companies—pay the North Korean Government. They take a piece of the action, which is going to the most undemocratic, vicious dictatorship in the world. The products then go to South Korea, and they are part of the free-trade agreement with South Korea.

In 2007, Han Duck-soo, who was then the Prime Minister of South Korea and is the current South Korean Ambassador to the United States, said this:

The planned ratification of the South Korea-U.S. free trade agreement will pave the way for the export of products built in Kaesong [North Korea] to the U.S. market.

So what we have now is American workers being forced to compete against desperate people all over the world, who are making a tiny fraction of the wages that are paid in America, and forced to compete against countries where there are no environmental standards, where worker unions are not recognized or respected.

But now it gets even worse. American workers are now being forced to compete against the virtual slave labor in North Korea as part of this trade agreement.

What about the Colombia Free Trade Agreement? It is understandable why the CEOs of multinational corporations would like this free-trade agreement. After all, Colombia is one of the most anti-union countries on the planet.

Since 1986, over 2,800 trade unionists have been assassinated in Colombia—more than the rest of the world combined. Think about it for a moment. If we found out that 50 CEOs had been assassinated in Colombia last year instead of trade leaders, do you think we would be on the verge of approving a free-trade agreement with that country? Frankly, I don't think so.

Lastly, let me say a brief word about Panama and the Panama free-trade agreement. Panama's entire economic output is only \$26.7 billion a year or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the U.S. economy. Nobody can legitimately claim that approving this free-trade agreement will significantly increase American jobs.

Then why would we be considering a stand-alone free trade agreement with

Panama? It turns out that Panama is a world leader when it comes to allowing wealthy Americans and large corporations to evade U.S. taxes by stashing their cash in offshore tax havens. The Panama Free Trade Agreement will make this bad situation much worse.

Each and every year, the wealthiest people in our country and the largest corporations evade about \$100 billion in U.S. taxes through abusive and illegal offshore tax havens in Panama and other countries.

According to Citizens for Tax Justice:

A tax haven . . . has one of three characteristics: it has no income tax or a very low rate income tax; it has bank secrecy laws; and it has a history of non-cooperation with other countries on exchanging information about tax matters. Panama has all three of those. . . . They're probably the worst.

Let me conclude—and I will be back on the floor later to amplify on these remarks. I will conclude by saying this: If you go out to any community in America and you ask the people in those communities—especially working people—do you think our current free-trade agreements, such as NAFTA and permanent normal trade relations with China, have worked, and have they been creating jobs in your community or have you seen factories shut down, I suspect that in almost every instance people will say these free-trade agreements are not working for American workers. They are costing us jobs.

That is what the American people understand to be true because it is true. So it seems to me that when you have a history of failed trade policies—policies that have enabled and encouraged large corporations to shut down in this country and move abroad, it is insane to continue that policy if you are serious about creating jobs in America, rebuilding our manufacturing sector, and trying to address the crises facing the middle class today.

We need new trade policies. Trade unto itself is a good idea. Everybody believes in trade. But you need trade policies that are designed to help ordinary working people and not just wealthy CEOs.

I feel very strongly that the policies we are debating today—trade policies with Korea, Panama, and Colombia—are nothing more than extensions of disastrous trade policies of the past. They should be defeated. We should come together and develop new approaches to trade, which will benefit all our people and not just CEOs or multinational corporations.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, Senator SANDERS has raised some questions about our trade policy. I do believe we need to examine our trade policies more carefully. As I have said in the last few days, we need to defend our legitimate interests as a nation, and I have supported legislation that would curtail China's ability to manipulate its currency to gain a trade advantage over us.

Trade agreements are not a religious thing with me. I think some of the free traders are accused of believing it is a religious thing—that whatever you do to further trade, even if we are at a disadvantage, somehow it is still better for us to sign these agreements; that we should just do this and not worry about it—cancer will be cured, peace will occur in the world, we will all be better friends, and things will happen good.

Things do tend to happen good when you have a trading relationship with a nation. I will support all three of these trade agreements. But I believe it is healthy to have Senators examine and make sure that these are the kinds of agreements that advance our national interest. Is this the kind of trading partner we feel comfortable signing an agreement with? Will they honor it? Do we have prospects for improved trade over the years that could help both our countries?

Any business that does business with another business presumes it will be beneficial to them, and the other company that agreed to do business with this other company assumes it will be good for them. Certainly, any kind of contract, any kind of agreement that is a legitimate agreement of value benefits both parties. That is very achievable. It can be achievable in the trade world.

I believe that with regard to Colombia, South Korea, and Panama, we have reason to believe they will be good trading partners. Colombia is the longest democracy in South America. They had to go for over a decade dealing with narcotrafficking, a Communist guerrilla force, and we were able to help them defeat their enemy. They are now prospering. They have elections. The Congress is doing a good job. They are honoring their agreements. The people of Colombia are positive about the people in the United States. I have been there and I appreciate that.

As a native of Alabama and on the gulf coast, it is a direct shot south to Colombia. We have every reason to believe we can have a positive trading relationship with Colombia.

Panama is much smaller, but they have done well. A lot of people doubted their ability to function successfully as a government. I think Panama has been doing very well, and they believe in trade and want to be good trading partners. All of these will have to be watched. South Korea is one of our best allies in the world. We have huge amounts of soldiers there and basing in Korea. We do many things together.

Korea has invested billions of dollars in the United States of America.

The Hyundai plant that makes the Sonata automobiles—one of the most popular automobiles in America today—is in Montgomery, AL. There are 3,000 workers, plus additional suppliers, many of which are Korean companies that have invested here and hired Alabamans—Americans—to work in their plant, and they do this around the country. They are honorable and when they sign agreements, you can expect them, as well or better than most nations, to adhere to it. They are disciplined people with integrity and they are smart and well educated. They are allies—strategic allies.

So in each one of these agreements, it is my best judgment that it will be beneficial to us. For example, with regard to Colombia, under the Andean Trade Agreement, basically, they can import products into the United States with no duty, for the most part. But this agreement is critical to them producing their tariffs on the products that we ship to Colombia. Colombia buys a lot of our products. They are one of the best customers we have in South America. They have a positive view of the United States. I have a very positive view of Colombia.

My thought on these agreements would be that, yes, I think each one of these agreements has been negotiated sufficiently well to ensure that we will have a beneficial relationship. It will help us be more economically strong than we would be if we did not have these agreements. We are in a world economy. It makes no sense to me to think we can just build a wall around the United States and stop trade from occurring. That doesn't make sense to me. But I do believe that each and every trade agreement has to be carefully considered, and I expect the USTR to enforce the laws we pass.

We need to be sure we have the mechanisms in place to assure that those with whom we agree to trade will follow fair trade, will follow the terms of the contract, and will otherwise follow the requirements of a decent trading partner. I believe all three of these countries will do that. I think all three of these countries represent decent governments.

All three of these countries are allies of the United States. With regard to all three of these countries, I believe the signing of these treaties will enhance our economic vitality and will be good for us. I suggest, however, that it is not going to be an overnight boom. Trading is a two-way street. We will have economic advantage, and that is sufficient to me. It will be felt over decades. It has been said by someone—and I see Senator McCain and he can probably remember who said it—that there has never been a war between two countries, both of which have a Mac-Donald's.

Now, I don't know if that is accurate anymore or not, but most of the wars we get into are with countries that are

isolated, backward, and insular. Trade can reduce the chance of war and hostile relations between nations. It can build positive relations.

So from that point of view, Mr. President, I think these trade agreements are agreements I can support. I believe my colleagues, if they analyze them, will reach the same conclusion. We are showing substantial increases in our exports to all three of these countries, and I do believe our exports would increase more with these agreements if they are ratified.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, be next to speak following my remarks.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support ratification of the three free-trade agreements we are debating. They are long overdue, and they are important to job creation in this country. While we have waited around, these countries have concluded free-trade agreements with other countries, much to the detriment of American exports.

The best example I can cite of that is several years ago, 40 percent of the imports of agricultural products into Colombia were from the United States of America, while today only 20 percent of their agricultural imports are from the United States because while we have been waiting, Colombia has concluded free-trade agreements with other nations which have given them access to their markets while we were not able to expand. One of the ironies of all this is, thanks to a rather complicated process that took place during President Clinton's administration, the results of the Andean trade preference agreements meant there were tariffs on U.S. goods going into Colombia but no tariff on Colombian goods coming into the United States.

But why I am here this afternoon, Mr. President, is because what has been unremarked on—and which was outrageous about this whole process we have been through in these times of fiscal difficulties—is that roughly \$1.3 billion is going to be spent on the so-called TAA, trade adjustment assistance. I would like to remind my colleagues the TAA was adopted in order to satisfy many of the concerns of labor and others at the time of the passage of other free-trade agreements, and like other government programs, spending on the TAA has grown and grown and grown and grown.

By the way, this was supposed to be for individuals, and, originally at least, individuals who have lost their jobs as a result of jobs going to the countries which free-trade agreements were entered into.

In 2006, it was \$735 million; in 2007, \$779 million; and in 2008, \$791 million.

But following the so-called stimulus package—and the stimulus was supposed to be temporary—it ballooned to \$1.1 billion.

Additionally, according to the Department of Labor, Congress allocated more than \$975 million to fund other TAA services, including \$575 million for job training. In all, the annual TAA spending for the stimulus expansion totaled approximately \$2 billion.

Three weeks ago, the Congress passed an agreement to reauthorize the TAA through 2014. This paved the way for these free-trade agreements to be considered today. The agreement pares back some of the expansions from the 2009 stimulus and funds the program somewhere between the prestimulus and poststimulus levels. This “compromise,” which, by the way, was negotiated by Republicans in the House of Representatives, will increase the annual TAA spending by at least \$460 million above the prestimulus levels before 2012 and 2013. Therefore, the total cost to taxpayers for the deal to allow these trade agreements to be considered by the Senate will be \$1.3 billion through 2014.

According to the Heritage Foundation, the TAA spending legislation passed by this body 3 weeks ago does the following: No. 1, it keeps the 2009 stimulus expansion for service sector workers. The stimulus, by the way, was supposed to be temporary. TAA was originally intended to provide income maintenance and job training to workers from the manufacturing sector. The stimulus bill expanded eligibility to include workers from the service and public sectors. This expansion expired in February, but the agreement restored TAA eligibility for service sector workers.

No. 2, it restored the stimulus expansion of benefits for job losses that are unrelated to free-trade agreements. The agreement retained the stimulus expansion of providing TAA benefits to any workers who lost their jobs to overseas production, not just TAA-certified jobs that were lost to free-trade agreements.

No. 3, it reinstated the stimulus's 160 percent increase in trade adjustment assistance for workers' job training spending. The proposal cemented the stimulus spending expansion of TAA for workers' job training at \$575 million a year from \$220 million, an increase of \$355 million a year.

No. 4, it continued the stimulus's creation of a new and duplicative job-training program. The agreement kept the TAA Community College and Career Training Program, which will dole out \$2 billion over the years 2011 through 2014.

So this program cries out for significant reform. The previous administration's agency leader called for FAA deficiencies to be addressed for the displaced workers who need the TAA benefits. In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on June 14, 2007, the Deputy Assistant Sec-

retary of Labor called on Congress to take the “opportunity to improve the current TAA program to help workers gain the skills needed to successfully compete in the global economy.” The administration didn't listen and neither did Congress.

Let's look at an example of excess created in the temporary stimulus expansion of the TAA program that taxpayers are still on the hook for. According to a February 2011 study by Senator COBURN entitled, “Help Wanted: How Federal Job Training Programs are Failing Workers,” quoting from the study that Senator COBURN brought to this body:

Taxpayers may have a case of indigestion when they learn, nearly 2 years after the stimulus was enacted, their money is paying lobstermen, shrimpers and blueberry farmers \$12,000 each to attend job training sessions on jobs that they are already trained to do. The stimulus reauthorized the Trade Adjustment Assistance for the Farmers program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a program that provides subsidies to producers of raw agricultural commodities and fishermen so they can adjust to import competition. Under the stimulus, TAA benefits were enhanced to focus more on employment retraining.

Recently, the Department of Labor issued a report on the TAA program which indicated that only approximately 50 percent of the TAA training participants were actually placed in new jobs. While we can be happy for the 50 percent that used the training for new employment, a 50-percent success level is, of course, dismally low. Our obligation should have been to reform and fix the flaws in the program. Instead, we expanded it.

I am a big supporter of America's community colleges. One of the best community college networks happens to be in my home State of Arizona. It has been suggested that the TAA for Community Colleges Program, which was vastly expanded in the stimulus bill, has become nothing but a vehicle to funnel scarce tax dollars to community colleges around the country whether they need the money or not, with no performance reviews, no standards for graduation, and no oversight.

In March 2010, the Senate and House leadership, together with the administration, funded the TAA for Community Colleges Program \$2 billion over 4 years. Just last month—conveniently, right before the end of the fiscal year—the Department of Labor rolled out the money to individual community colleges and consortiums of community colleges. The money started flowing without regard to how well the community colleges did at graduating their students or whether there was sufficient TAA need.

Several of the community colleges have received grants of over \$2½ million of taxpayer funds while having extremely low graduation rates. Shouldn't we ensure that an institution can actually graduate its students before funneling money to it?

For example, Oklahoma City Community College received \$2.7 million.

This institution had a graduation rate of 11 percent. If there was any doubt that the administration was using this program to funnel money to community colleges without regard to need or their ability to help dislocated workers receive training, let me just read from the Department of Labor grant announcement issued last week.

The following is a list of the entities in each State that will be receiving funding. The Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration is continuing to work with these institutions to develop final performance operating and spending plans.

Earlier this year, the GAO released a study entitled “Multiple Training and Employment Programs: Providing Information on Collocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies.” Here is what the GAO reported on Federal employment and retraining programs, including trade adjustment assistance.

Based on our survey of agency officials, we determined that only 5 of the 47 programs have had impact studies that assess whether the program is responsible for improved employment outcomes. The five impact studies generally found that the effects of participation were not consistent across programs, with only some demonstrating positive impacts that tended to be small, inclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts.

So what are we doing? We are going to spend at least \$1.3 billion, part of it on programs that clearly the Government Accountability Office says have not been productive in any way and are small, inclusive, or restricted to short-term impacts.

There are a lot of questions about the TAA Program. Does the TAA Program provide overly generous benefits to a narrow population? According to an analysis from the Heritage Foundation, based on statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the third quarter of fiscal year 2009 only 1 percent of mass layoffs were the result of import competition or overseas relocation.

Is there evidence that TAA benefits and training help participants' earnings? An analysis by Professor Kara M. Reynolds of American University found “little evidence that it [TAA] helps displaced workers find new, well-paying employment opportunities.” In fact, TAA participants experienced a wage loss of 10 percent. The same study found that, in fiscal 2007, the Federal Government appropriated \$885.1 million to TAA programs. Of this amount, funding for training programs accounted for only 25 percent.

In 2007, the Office of Management and Budget rated the TAA programs as “ineffective.” The OMB found that the TAA Program fails to use tax dollars effectively because, among other reasons, the program has failed to demonstrate the cost effectiveness of achieving its goals.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues how we got to our current predicament. It is mid-October of 2011, 2½ years since President Obama took office, and we are just now considering

these important trade agreements that were finalized half a decade ago, all because of the White House's insistence on making a temporary stimulus program—the dubious extension of TAA—into a permanent domestic spending program.

This is how George Will summed it up, writing in the *Washington Post*, on June 8, 2011:

President Obama is sacrificing economic growth and job creation in order to placate organized labor. And as the crisis of the welfare state deepens, he is trying to enlarge the entitlement system and exacerbate the entitlement mentality.

On May 4, the administration announced that, at last, it was ready to proceed with congressional ratification of the agreements. On May 16, however, it announced it would not send them until Congress expands an entitlement program favored by unions.

Since 1974, Trade Adjustment Assistance has provided 104, and then 156, weeks of myriad financial aid, partly concurrent with the 99 weeks of unemployment compensation, to people, including farmers and government workers and firms, even whole communities, that can more or less plausibly claim to have lost their jobs or been otherwise injured because of foreign competition. Even if the injury is just the loss of unfair advantages conferred, at the expense of other Americans, by government protectionism.

This process should be appalling to the average American who is looking for an improving economy, not special favors to certain special interest groups.

Our national debt has reached unsustainable levels. Congress and the American people face some truly painful choices about how to cut our Federal budget. At a time when some are even considering enormous and dangerous cuts to our defense spending as a way to get our fiscal house in order, we shouldn't be throwing more and more scarce money at a Federal program that, as the GAO points out, is duplicative and possibly ineffective.

There is guilt on both sides of the aisle for the extension of this program. It has not had proper scrutiny, it has not had proper oversight. The studies that have been done have shown that it is practically useless—or certainly not useful—and ineffective; and now, as a price for these free-trade agreements, which I strongly support, we will be laying another \$2 billion on the taxpayers of America, unfortunately.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to briefly explain my position on the free trade agreements/trade adjustment assistance package.

I support the free trade agreements, FTAs, with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea, and only wish these agreements had been taken up sooner. The FTAs represent true, bipartisan jobs legislation, and I am pleased they will soon become law. Free trade agreements have proven to be one of the best ways to open up foreign markets to American exporters. These agreements will create tens of thousands of new jobs by boosting American exports to three nations. The FTAs will also strengthen America's interests in two strategically important regions.

I do not, however, support the trade adjustment assistance, TAA, deal that was negotiated as part of the compromise to pass the FTAs. Nor do I think it should have been included in the FTA negotiations.

I have several key objections. First is the enormous costs. Over the next 3 years, the TAA deal adds over \$1.15 billion in new costs to the baseline TAA costs. Together, baseline TAA and these provisions will cost almost \$6 billion for the 2011–2013 fiscal years.

Second, the TAA deal does not represent a true compromise. The proposal was made only by three of the strongest TAA supporters. No critic of TAA was included in the negotiations.

Third, the umbrella of TAA programs deserved greater scrutiny than the process allowed. Instead of a moving a reauthorization with some rudimentary changes, fundamental reform should have been completed. There is little evidence that the TAA programs are actually effective, and, under this deal, we are going to spend billions of dollars on these programs without knowing whether they actually help Americans. Moreover, no work was done to reform the TAA training funding to reflect the fact that there are already over 40 programs dedicated to worker training.

Fourth, the TAA deal represents false reform. Proponents try to take credit for eliminating two grant programs within TAA for communities—programs which were already repealed. Proponents also cite the elimination of the mandatory nature of TAA for farmers/fisheries, which were already defunded for other purposes. Only in Washington would someone try to take credit for “ending” programs that no longer exist or that have no funding.

Proponents also claim that the size of the TAA for firms program was reduced. But that program represents a status quo authorization and is one already targeted by President Obama for elimination. How does level funding and rejecting a repeal recommendation constitute reform?

For these reasons, and others, I voted against the trade adjustment assistance legislation when it was considered a few weeks ago. The FTAs are sufficiently meritorious on their own accord without tying in a poorly designed and operated social welfare program such as TAA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I would like to speak in opposition to these three pending free-trade agreements.

The bills look like they are about this size. These are the actual implementing of the three free-trade agreements. But one of the bills, and not the largest one—the one, in fact, of the three countries we are probably today passing trade agreements with, Colombia, South Korea, and Panama—the smallest by far in terms of its economy

is Panama, and this is the trade agreement with Panama.

I remember all these conservative talk radio people saying: Have you read the bill? Have you read the bill? Have you read the bill? Every time it is a bill they don't agree with, they ask: Have you read the bill? This isn't just to eliminate the tariffs we have with the Republic of Panama. If these agreements were about eliminating tariffs with labor standards—and I know the Presiding Officer from Oregon shares that view about labor standards. If these agreements were about eliminating tariffs and labor standards, they would be about this big. They wouldn't be anything like this. But these are chock-full of special interest deals. It is what this body always does: the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico; the PNTR with China, a different kind of situation but leading to even more problems; the Central American Free Trade Agreement with six countries in Central America and the Dominican Republic. Rules that help the drug companies, rules that help the insurance companies, special interest provisions that help the banks, special interest provisions that undermine public health and undermine safely, that is what these free-trade agreements are about.

I get it. I get it that this is greased. I get it that this will pass with overwhelming numbers. I get it that this White House is only this much better than the last White House in pushing for these trade agreements. These are Bush trade agreements, Korea, Colombia, and Panama. President Obama inherited them, but he doesn't get off the hook because he has improved these slightly. We have a little bit of an improvement with Korea so a few more American cars can be sold into Korea, nothing like the number of Korean cars that can be sold in the United States because we didn't want to be that tough when we negotiated, so we just make slight changes. This President made slight changes, and I have seen this. I was in the House for 14 years, and in my first term in the Senate I have seen this kind of game played by administration after administration. This is technically my fourth administration I have worked with, third at some length, and I have seen this over and over and over again.

When I hear of these trade agreements coming forward, every President says this is going to create tens of thousands of jobs. NAFTA was going to create 200,000 jobs, almost immediately, the first Bush administration said. The Clinton administration said: Yes; that is right. It is going to create more or less 200,000 jobs immediately. Do you know what it has created? It has created a loss of 600,000 jobs under the North American Free Trade Agreement. We gain some jobs; we lose some jobs, but the net is always lost jobs.

How many times is an administration going to come forward and how

many times are we going to believe them? Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. This body continues, as the House of Representatives does—they are a little smarter in the House; they don't pass these with quite the same numbers in the overwhelming margins, but they continue to do the same thing over and over and over.

The American public doesn't like these trade agreements. The American public, in large numbers, under poll after poll after poll—the American people don't like NAFTA, don't like CAFTA, don't like PNTR with China. Why do you think last night, finally, this body stood—63 Members of the Senate, almost 20 of them Republicans, voted to finally stand up on currency and try to create a level playing field in our trade with China? But we don't do it on these other trade agreements. With the lobbying efforts on NAFTA, on CAFTA, on PNTR with China, on the Panama Trade Agreement, on the Colombia Trade Agreement, on the Korea Trade Agreement, the lobbying is overwhelming. Special interest groups line up because they are so excited about passing these free-trade agreements. In the end, we lose jobs every single time.

When I came to the Congress 20 years ago, we had a trade surplus with Mexico and, if I recall, a small trade deficit with Canada. That means we sold more to Mexico than we bought from them. We bought more from Canada than we sold to them. Today, it is tens of billions of dollars' trade deficit we have bilaterally with those two countries.

The China trade deficit 10 years ago, when China got into the World Trade Organization because we passed PNTR in part—that is part of the reason they got in—our trade deficit with China was something like \$80 billion; today, it is almost \$300 billion, more than three times the trade deficit with China. So our answer is, let's do more of it.

So China undercuts our manufacturing. NAFTA takes away American jobs. CAFTA costs us jobs. Yet the geniuses around here, the people—and the majority leader has been wonderful in this, opposing trade agreement after trade agreement because he gets it—the geniuses around this place, in the White House, in the House leadership, in some of the Senate leadership, Senate Republican leadership, and far too many of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, the geniuses around here are saying: Let's pass more trade agreements because it is working.

Give me one other issue where people in this body en masse, in huge numbers, say: This trade policy isn't working so let's try more of it. That is exactly what we have done. We continue to pass trade agreements that look a lot like NAFTA. We continue to pass trade agreements that get us in this situation that cost us jobs.

I am for more trade. Like most Americans, I want to see us trade more

with other countries. But like most Americans, I have a problem with many of the rules that govern our trade policy because these aren't simple—eliminate tariffs. This is a trade policy that time after time favors corporate or investors' interests, and, in some cases, actually undermines our national security and undermines our national interests.

When we see the kind of job loss that NAFTA caused and CAFTA caused and PNTR caused, and these trade agreements with Panama and Korea and Colombia cause, we know this is not good for our national interests.

That is why I object to these trade agreements: They are more of the same broken promises, the same promises about: Oh, yes, it is going to create jobs. The same promise about: Oh, yes, it is going to expand our markets.

It may expand our markets a little bit, but it costs. We may sell some more, but we are buying a lot more from these other countries because the trade agreements simply aren't working.

Trade agreements are permanent. They often handcuff Congress and State legislatures from setting new priorities. North American Free Trade Agreement. I have heard Presidential candidates in campaigns say: Yes, they would work to renegotiate or even repeal NAFTA. Then they raise their right hand, get sworn in to be President of the United States, and they kind of forget they promised that.

These trade agreements undermine "Buy American" policy. How does that work? Because when we pass free-trade agreements, our FTAs, bilaterally or trilaterally with other countries, it doesn't give the same standing to our "Buy American" provisions. Do you think countries around the world don't have buy whatever their country is? You don't think the Chinese give special preference to "Buy China"? You don't think other countries ever give special preference? But we couldn't do that here because that would mean we aren't practicing free trade.

Every country in the world practices trade according to their national interests. But what do we do in the United States of America? What do we do in the Senate? What do they do in the House? What do they do in the White House? They practice trade according to some economic textbook that was printed before these pages sitting in front of me were even born.

These trade agreements lack any meaningful way to withdraw if the promised benefits don't materialize. We passed these trade agreements in Ohio communities from Springfield to Chillicothe to Portsmouth to Ash-tabula to Toledo. These Ohio communities can't understand why they are so buffeted by these trade winds that so often undermine their ability to make a living.

These trade agreements were originally negotiated by the Bush administration. I don't blame President Obama

for that. But to the rest of the country, hearing the Obama administration talk about these trade agreements sounds like a continuation of the incoherent approach to America's engagement in the global economy that we saw with the Bush trade agenda.

Many of us on this floor have criticized the Bush trade policy. The Obama trade policy—I am a Democrat, he is a Democrat. The Obama trade policy is better than it was under the Bush trade agreement. The Obama administration has made these three trade bills a little better—at least Korea a little better than it was—a little better. The Obama administration has actually enforced trade laws when the Chinese cheat on tires, when they cheat on oil country tubular steel, when they cheat on glass, when they cheat on aluminum, when they cheat—not on glass; when they cheat on paper. We have made some progress.

There is a new steel mill in the Mahoning Valley in Youngstown, in large part, because President Obama enforced trade rules, trade laws with the Commission Department of the International Trade Commission. It is interesting, though. When the President went to Youngstown to talk about the opening of the steel mill, he talked about the Recovery Act, and the Recovery Act put some dollars and infrastructure around the steel mill, but he neglected to talk about trade policy, which he had enforced for these agreements. That is all behind us.

But these trade policies ignore the elephant in the room, which is our trade relationship with China. Last night, as I said, the Senate did the right thing on a strong bipartisan vote on Chinese currency. But, unfortunately, some of the opponents of cracking down—unfortunately, I guess. Opponents of cracking down on China's currency manipulation are the same supporters of these trade agreements and, on both issues, respectfully, they miss the point. People have heard the same promises from NAFTA and CAFTA and China PNTR: Businesses promise more jobs from increased exports. Yet no one talks about the increased imports that pale in comparison.

So when I used to hear President Bush, Jr.'s predecessor, Bill Clinton, always talk about look how NAFTA and these agreements are increasing exports, well, they do increase exports, but they increase imports so much faster. It was President Bush, first, who said some years ago that for every billion dollars of trade, either surplus or deficit, it translated into 13,000 jobs. I don't know if that number is exactly correct—it probably is a little less than that now with inflation what a job is worth in dollars. But if \$1 billion in trade surplus creates 13,000 jobs, that means \$1 billion in trade deficits costs us 13,000 jobs.

So when I hear people say: Oh, these trade agreements, they are increasing exports, we have to tell the whole story.

It is akin to a sports reporter on the 11 o'clock news reading the baseball scores and saying: The Yankees scored seven runs tonight. That means maybe they won? Well, it turns out the Indians scored nine so the Yankees lost, which is a good outcome. But the fact is, when we are talking about trade, we don't just brag about exports. We have to look at what the value of the imports was too. We are not talking about that. No one likes to talk about the communities that are left cleaning up after a plant is abandoned, moved to somewhere else. No one likes to talk about the families who are devastated when the plant closes and they lose their jobs. Nobody wants to talk about what happens to our national security when a steel mill closes and the jobs go elsewhere.

To keep up, each month the economy must add 150,000 new jobs, just to keep up with population growth. There are 14 million who are unemployed and another 15 million who are underemployed or who have stopped searching for work. What do Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements have to do with that? We did a great thing last night by standing up to China on currency, but then we are giving it away with trade agreements such as these that cost us jobs rather than increase jobs. I do not get it. A good week? It was not such a good week for international trade and for us creating jobs in this country.

Most people, when they think about trade, think about goods and tariffs, but these agreements are not just about tariffs. If they were just about tariffs, as I said, these agreements would be relatively short, a simple declaration of tariff rates. Instead, as I said, these agreements are hundreds of pages on procurement rules and financial services and investor-state dispute resolution. What does that mean? What it means is a whole lot of corporate lobbyists lobbied the administration—the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the Senate and House committees that work on these things—and struck gold. It means these corporate lobbyists had their way in Washington again, that these corporate lobbyists never lose on these trade agreements. In the end, they almost always get their way, but it so much and in so many ways undermines our public interest and certainly undermines jobs.

These are complex agreements. They do not have to be that complex. But then some of my colleagues say we are falling behind when Brazil and Korea and the European Union sign trade deals. What they do not say is that these are not the same kinds of agreements. If they were just about lowering tariffs in a reciprocal way—but they are not—if they were not the United States giving away the store for a little access, if they were just about tariffs, as I said earlier, and strong labor standards, we probably would have had a voice vote and passed them already.

But these are not the same deals Brazil or the European Union signs with Korea. Let me explain that for a moment.

The European Union-Korea agreement does not have investor-state dispute resolution. Most countries have strong legal systems, and the EU and Korean negotiators decided they did not need to create a new privileged process under the trade deal to resolve disputes. In other words, if Korea has a food safety rule and the European Union has a food safety rule, they do not have to come into conflict because they do not have this dispute resolution that we do in our agreements. Then what happens when it is food safety or product safety? Do you know what happens? The country with the weaker rules wins.

What these trade agreements with the investor-state provisions—something the Europeans and Brazilians didn't do with Korea—with these provisions, it means we are weakening food safety laws, weakening consumer protection laws, weakening the kind of sovereignty that I thought people—particularly conservatives in this body—cared about.

When an investor can challenge a law in Korea or the United States under the special privilege process, outside the normal legal system, it can have the effect of chilling nondiscriminatory safety rules. But having a special privilege system outside the normal legal process is exactly what some companies want in these trade deals. In other words, if a company in the United States cannot find a way—if they are unsuccessful at lobbying the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President, unsuccessful in weakening consumer protection measures or undermining a food safety rule, if they have been unsuccessful doing that directly here, through these trade agreements they are able to do that.

If Panama has weaker rules on investor protections, has weaker rules on financial consumer protection, weaker rules on food safety laws, then, through these trade agreements, it gives these corporate interests a back door to weaken our safety rules.

We fight like crazy around here to have strong consumer protections, to have safe pharmaceutical rules, to have good, strong pharmaceutical safety rules. We fight for those things, but then we are going to allow these trade agreements to undermine that.

These agreements affect investment dynamics and corporate decision-making. They affect how a company makes decisions in 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, so these are important long term for these companies. Yet Congress has a few hours to debate these and vote up or down, with no amendments. These agreements are permanent. They affect the flow of goods and services on a permanent basis across the world for decades to come. These agreements are hundreds of pages, and here we are fitting them into the workweek, voting

them up or down. The vote tonight is at 6:30.

I don't hear Rush Limbaugh, I don't hear the Washington Post, I don't hear others—conservatives on the other side of the aisle say: I can't believe you are jamming this through so fast, which is what they said on health care, which took months and months. They jammed this through in 48 hours, but that is OK because it is a trade agreement, even though it is this long and nobody has read it. I am almost sure that there is not one Senator out of 100 and maybe none in the 435 in the House of Representatives who actually read this bill. And this is the least consequential. This is the Panama trade agreement. This is not Korea, which is much bigger. This is not Colombia, which is significantly bigger. Yet we decided it is OK to fit this because fast track—the way we do trade agreements—has a whole special set of rules.

In my mind, nothing I know of in this body has this special set of rules that trade agreements get. They have to be debated quickly. There is a time limit once they are sent up by the President. There is no hold allowed on a trade agreement. There is no filibuster allowed on a trade agreement. There is no 60-vote threshold. There is a 60-vote threshold on confirming a Federal judge out of Toledo, OH. There is a 60-vote threshold on an Under Secretary of Interior. There is no 60-vote threshold on an agreement of hundreds of pages that will last forever with the Republic of Panama or Colombia or Korea, no 60-vote requirement, no hold, none of the rules of the Senate that might slow this down. Do you know why? Because these are chock-full of special interest provisions that every insurance company and drug company and bank can get their way and get this in permanent law. No scandal there, not with that. We will do it on every other bill but not trade agreements.

Two things, and then I want to close with a story.

Think about what fast-track authority does. I want to pursue that with a little more detail, about how we have these special rules in the Senate only for trade agreements, for nothing else.

First of all, with fast-track authority, in addition to having rules in the Senate that are very different from other rules in order that these pass quickly, we also delegate authority to the executive branch—something we normally don't do. We allow the executive branch to set the substance of the negotiations. The executive branch is only required to notify Congress 90 days before signing the agreement. The executive branch writes the implementing legislation for each trade pact without the committees of jurisdiction having actual markups. In other words, it circumvents the normal committee process. Once the executive branch has submitted the bill, we have to vote for the implementing bill within 90 days. The votes in both Chambers are highly

privileged. Normal congressional floor procedures are waived, including unanimous consent. Debates are limited, and no amendments are allowed. The result is that Congress is given little time. In the present case, the Senate has 4 hours to debate each agreement.

I am amazed. I mean, where are the conservatives in this country who said: Don't give Barack Obama so much power. You just did when you passed this. Why? Because it is a trade agreement. The rules are always different. MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, said his No. 1 goal in 2011 and 2012 is to make sure Barack Obama is a one-term President. We don't want to give him any power, we want to criticize him on everything—except, Mr. President, we would like to give you this, and you do whatever you want on these special trade agreements. Just the hypocrisy here on trade is beyond belief.

Let me close with what I think may tell the story of the importance of how we practice trade around the world. Some years ago, I flew into South Texas at my own expense, rented a car, and with two friends crossed the Texas-Mexican border just to follow up on what had happened with NAFTA. This was the mid- to late 1990s. I wanted to see how NAFTA was working out for the United States and Mexico along the border where there were so many manufacturing plants.

Right near the border, there was an auto plant, a GM plant. This GM plant looked just like a General Motors plant, not much different from Lordstown near Youngstown, not much different from the GM plant in my hometown of Mansfield, which unfortunately is now closed, not much different from any other auto plant. It was modern, the floors were clean, great technology. But there was one difference between the two plants, one major difference: The GM plant in Mexico didn't have a parking lot because the workers were not paid enough to buy the cars they made. That may tell you something.

I didn't do this, but go around the world, and in Malaysia, in the Motorola plant, the workers didn't get paid enough to buy a lot of the Motorola electronics they made. Then go back to Central America and go to Costa Rica, and the workers in the Costa Rica Disney plant were not making enough to buy the toys for their children that they made. Go to China, go almost anywhere in the world in these developing countries where we either have trade agreements or where our trade policy has such impact, where companies in the United States shut down—never in world history have companies in one country, to the degree they do here—they shut down in the United States and move to China, move to Mexico, move to Malaysia, move to Indonesia, and then they sell their products back to the United States.

How do you build a country's wealth when you do that? And the reason they

do is because these workers in Mexico who are building cars, in Malaysia making electronic equipment, in Costa Rica making Disney toys—these workers don't share in the wealth they create. They are not making enough from the jobs they do to buy the things they make.

The beauty of our system and what has made the United States a prosperous country with a strong middle class is—partly because of unions, partly because of democracy—is our workers typically earn enough that they can buy the products they make. In other words, if the workers are creating wealth for the company, for their bosses, they get paid enough, they can extract enough of that wealth that they can have a decent standard of living. Not in Mexico, China, Malaysia, or many of these countries that are part of this free-trade regimen.

Let me take you to one more place on this little tour around the world. Let me take you to a midwestern meatpacking plant. Most of these meatpacking plants were union plants. They had very little turnover. Workers were making very good wages, and they were safe, by and large, because the workers had demanded safety and the U.S. Government had enforced it.

Well, what has happened in the last 10 or 15 years in these meatpacking plants is the union has been busted. Many of the workers are immigrants. They are immigrants who—probably some of them are not legal, but certainly these immigrants who are there are not about to form a union. They do not speak English, sometimes, very well. They are not so certain they are going to be able to stay in this country. They are just not going to speak out. They are hardly ever going to talk back to their boss and will never form a union.

Here is what happened. It used to be in those plants—pardon me if my numbers are not precise here because it has been a while since I thought about this—it used to be in these meatpacking plants that the workers would stand there, they would have the vinyl aprons and a sharp knife because they were processing beef, and the carcasses would be hung on the big hooks, and the carcasses would slowly go by, about 150 an hour, something like that. So these workers would be standing there and they would make their cut as the carcasses went by slowly, 150 an hour. After they busted the union, they sped up the line. When it is 150 an hour, that is about the right speed for them to do this work. They almost doubled the speed of the carcasses as they went by, and two things happened: Workers had to hurry, so they were more likely to hurt themselves because they would aim the knife, and because it was moving fast, they might end up glancing off the bone and cutting their leg. The other thing that would happen is workers were much more likely to drop their knives, quickly pick them up, wipe them on their apron, and go back

to work. Here is the interesting thing. The line had sped up to 300, more or less, an hour. On Thursdays they slowed the line back. Do my colleagues know why? Because Thursday was the day these meatpacking companies were shipping those carcasses, that processed meat, to Europe, and Europe has higher food safety standards than the United States does. So if these workers could work fast, and if they dropped the knife and wiped it off, the meat might get a little contaminated. That is OK for U.S. food safety standards, but the Europeans, who had higher food safety standards, said, We are not buying your beef unless you slow the line down and make it safer.

That is what globalization would be. It is not just workers in Mexico who can't buy the cars; it is not just Motorola workers in Malaysia or Disney workers in Costa Rica who can't buy the products they make; it also undermines our food safety and drug safety and consumer protection.

These agreements are not trade agreements. They are special interest laws that never see the light of day because of the peculiar rules of the Senate.

We should be ashamed of ourselves for passing these agreements, period, and especially passing them under these provisions. I hope the administration learns something from this. I hope the administration decides, on these trade agreements, instead of being on the side of the largest corporations in the country and in the world, which don't always look out for American interests—I hope the administration and the Members of the House and Senate will decide they want to be on the side of American families, of American communities, of American workers, of American small companies that make goods and want to sell all over the world.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, international trade has always been controversial. That has been true since the days of the Smoot-Hawley effort—Hawley, by the way, was an Oregon Congressman—and it continues to be true today. It is important to our country and important to my home State that I made a special priority, when I was given the honor of serving on the Senate Finance Committee, to queue up to be able to chair the Subcommittee on International Trade and Global Competitiveness, because I think it important that we continue our work here in the Senate to keep pushing to keep our trade policy on the right track.

I wish to describe today three aspects of this debate that are indisputable. In other words, we have lots of differences of opinion with respect to past agreements—did they create jobs, did they not create jobs, and how did they affect various parts of the country—and suffice it to say reasonable people can differ with respect to these analyses. But I have been able, as the chair of this subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee—the Subcommittee on International Trade and Global Competitiveness—to dig deeply into this issue.

I believe there are three indisputable positions with respect to the agreements we will be voting on tonight that the Senate ought to take into consideration that are at the core of why I will be voting later this evening in favor of the agreements.

The first position is there is a huge appetite all around the world for American goods and services. We are the gold standard. People around the world want to buy Brand USA. They want to display it. They want to feature it. There is no question that we have an opportunity to feed this huge demand for American goods and services. I think we ought to go forward and tap this opportunity. The bottom line is if we don't take this opportunity to burnish this Brand America and get our goods and services around the world, we can be very sure that somebody else will be right there, and it is most likely to be China. That is point No. 1. I think it is indisputable.

Point No. 2 is the challenge today in global markets is to capture the entire supply chain. That means everything from raw materials to component parts to the finished good. When I talk about this opportunity to capture the global supply chain, what it means to me in Oregon, and I think it means the same thing in North Carolina or South Dakota—I see my friend and colleague, who is the ranking member on the trade subcommittee, and it has been a pleasure for me to work with him—and I think all over the United States, capturing this supply chain in the global economy means the same thing, and that is what we ought to do—what I say at home in Oregon and I am sure my friend in South Dakota says exactly the same thing, let us grow it in Oregon, let us make it in Oregon, let us add value to it in Oregon, and then let us ship it somewhere. It is a huge opportunity we have in front of us to tap this global supply chain where, once again, if we walk away from this kind of opportunity, we can be very certain that China will be right there to fill the void.

The third issue involves the question of tariffs. I have heard people say, well, these agreements have lots of other things in them, lots of other provisions that are unrelated to tariffs. There is no question that is accurate. But at the end of the day, if American import tariffs are in low and American goods are faced with very high tariffs when they

arrive into foreign markets, that is a very substantial advantage for our trading partners. As I highlighted yesterday in the Senate Finance Committee, when we want to send our beef, Oregon beef, to Korea, we sometimes face a 40-percent tariff. When Korea sends their beef to us here in the United States, it can be as low as 4 percent. That is a tenfold difference.

I could go through a whole host of other products.

Oregon wine faces a tariff in Korea that is fifteen times higher than wine that is imported into the U.S.

Value-added wood products. I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Carolina, cares an awful lot about wood products. Well, the fact of the matter is, if we want to send finished wood into Korea—not the raw materials. We all know what we want to do, again, is add value to wood products, a key component of the Pacific northwest's economy, of the southern economy. We want to add value to it. Well, the fact is, the tariffs are four times as high for finished wood products in Korea as they are here in the United States.

These are indisputable facts: the question of the tariffs, the question of the global supply chain, and the Brand USA opportunity I have described as this huge appetite for American goods and services that exists around the world that I think we will be making a grave mistake to pass up an opportunity to level the playing field by dismantling foreign trade barriers to U.S. goods and services, whether they are tariffs or otherwise. The free trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama provide us an opportunity to level the playing field for U.S. producers who would like to feed the appetite for American goods and services in Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

There are a lot of other issues associated with the votes we are going to have to cast. I feel very strongly about the trade adjustment assistance program because I want to make sure, in an economy that is constantly changing, our workers have a trampoline, in effect, to get the training and the skills they need to succeed, which may mean moving into new careers. People think the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is just about workers. This is a crucial program for employers, and that is why it has so much support among employers. Employers need workers with the types of skills that enable them to be competitive in global markets, and trade adjustment assistance helps in this regard.

By the way, one of the concerns business is continually citing, and increasingly so, is the mismatch they often face where they need workers who have one sort of skill but the workers in their community do not have what they need. So, with the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, we can close that skills gap, we can do more to ensure businesses can get the type of workers they can rely on to be efficient

and competitive. So, the idea that trade adjustment assistance is just for workers is a mistake. It is a major plus to our employers. Oversight over trade adjustment assistance is going to be one of the things that the subcommittee on trade, which I chair, is going to zero in on.

Worker issues: Another one we will be looking at on the subcommittee involves issues relating to workers rights under the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. There, our concern is violence—demonstrable, serious violence against Colombian union members and the impunity the perpetrators of such violence have enjoyed.

This situation does seem to be getting a bit better. The Santos administration understands the concern. There is an agreement with Colombia on an action plan on labor that sets in motion a series of steps the Colombian Government is taking to provide workers with more adequate labor rights and protection from violence. But there is a lot more to do, and I intend to conduct meaningful oversight over the labor situation in Colombia and Colombia's adherence to its commitments to the Obama administration. As far as I am concerned, that is going to start as soon as these agreements have been voted on. Senator STABENOW, Senator CARDIN, and Senator MENENDEZ will be joining me, and we are all going to be doing more to make sure the Obama administration provides the Congress with annual reports on the labor situation in Colombia and the impact of the labor action plan that was reached by the Obama administration and the Santos administration.

I have mentioned trade adjustment assistance. I have mentioned labor rights. I want to close in terms of future work that is related to this topic by talking about China because certainly these trade agreements and the ability to tap the opportunity, particularly in our country, for family wage employment through more exports is going to require tougher enforcement of our trade laws and, particularly, the Obama administration getting serious about enforcing the laws on the books.

We have had a series of investigations looking at cheating—cheating, Madam President. I use that word specifically. I guess you could call it merchandise laundering because some foreign producers, when they are faced with U.S. trade remedy laws, like anti dumping and countervailing duties, instead of doing the right thing and coming into compliance, decide to ship their U.S.-bound merchandise through another country in order to falsify the country of origin import documents. This is going to be an even more important challenge when the trade agreement with Korea goes into force. Fortunately, we have bipartisan legislation in order to stop this type cheating, to strengthen the enforcement of our trade laws. It is going to be even more important to pass that effort to eliminate this kind of cheating because

with respect to the agreement and Korea, Chinese suppliers have a long history of laundering their goods through Korea in order to avoid U.S. trade laws by suggesting the Chinese merchandise is from Korea.

On the question of cheating, we have documented the problem in our hearings of the Finance Subcommittee on International Trade. And we have a bipartisan bill with, I believe, four Democratic Senators and four Republican Senators. It's called the Enforce Act and we are ready to move it forward. I was very pleased, in the discussion in the Finance Committee, Chairman BAUCUS and Senator HATCH, the ranking minority member, said this effort to fight these practices, this kind of cheating—which potentially could get worse unless you strengthen enforcement—Chairman BAUCUS and Senator HATCH said it was going to be a priority for them, and they wanted to make our antichecking legislation a must-pass effort before the end of this year, that they would attach it to a must-pass piece of legislation.

I could go on.

Even today, the administration is going forward with the anti-counterfeiting trade agreement, or ACTA, without doing it with the approval of the Congress. I think that is a mistake. I think that may be misreading of the law that the executive branch can do it of its own accord, and many legal scholars agree. We are going to tackle that in the days ahead because those issues are important now. They will be even more important, given the expansions of trade and commerce when these agreements are approved.

So there is a lot to do to keep the country's trade agenda on track. Level the playing field for U.S. producers. Ensure we have a competitive workforce. Advance labor rights, and enforce the trade laws to combat unfair trade. At the end of the day, if we miss one opportunity to do more to market our brand around the world in order to enable Americans to make things here and grow things here and continually add value to them, dominate that supply chain—which I think is going to be the overriding issue for global competitiveness in the days ahead—if we walk away from those issues, and enabling U.S. producers to export—to feed the foreign appetite for our goods and services—we are walking away from the opportunity for American workers to get the good-paying jobs in the private sector that they need.

In my home State, international trade is a very significant barometer of our economy, with estimates even being that one out of six jobs in Oregon depends on international trade, and the trade jobs pay better than do the nontrade jobs. I want America to be the leader in seizing the opportunities that exist to sell goods and services in foreign markets. I want Oregon producers of high-value goods and services to benefit from our efforts here in the Senate to level the playing field in

global markets. These trade related jobs that we can help create—I call them red, white, and blue jobs—these are the kinds of jobs I want for this country that I know the Presiding Officer wants, where we do allow American productivity and American ingenuity to continually innovate and compete.

There are other issues. I know the Presiding Officer cares a great deal about tax policy, global tax policy. Senator COATS and I have a bipartisan tax reform proposal. We look forward to working with the Presiding Officer on that issue.

But today is a chance to expand our opportunity to get the American brand, the USA brand for goods and services, in markets that are growing, in markets that you can bet China wants.

I know this is controversial. Trade policy always is. But I think, for our workers to get the chance to get our goods and services into growing markets—growing markets that China wants—that my colleagues support the trade agreements that are before us today.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I, too, rise in strong support of the pending trade agreements with America's allies, Colombia, South Korea, and Panama.

These agreements hold great promise for American farmers, manufacturers, service providers, and American consumers. I would echo my colleague from Oregon, who chairs the Subcommittee on Trade on the Finance Committee; that is, these trade agreements position American businesses to capture more of that supply chain to enable us to create jobs here at home and to grow the economy, to generate economic activity out there that otherwise we would not see happening. At a time when we need to focus our efforts on measures that will promote economic growth and job creation, these agreements are exactly the type of legislation we ought to be considering.

There is broad consensus these agreements are going to benefit our economy. The Obama White House estimates that enactment of these three trade agreements will boost exports by at least \$12 billion, supporting over 70,000 American jobs.

The Business Roundtable estimates that passage of these trade agreements will support as many as 250,000 American jobs. These are not only jobs at large businesses but increasingly at smaller companies that are accessing international markets.

As an example of that, more than 35,000 small and mid-sized American

businesses export to Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, and these firms now account for more than one-third of U.S. exports to these countries. Passing these three trade agreements will provide export opportunities to American businesses of all sizes, creating good-paying jobs here at home.

The benefits to U.S. agriculture from passing these agreements are especially compelling. These three agreements are estimated to represent \$3 billion in new agricultural exports that will support 22,500 U.S. agricultural-related jobs.

My State of South Dakota is a good example if you look at the export potential for U.S. agriculture represented by these agreements. According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, these agreements will add \$52 million each year to South Dakota's farm economy. South Dakota is projected to gain \$22 million from increased beef exports, \$25 million from increased exports of wheat, soybeans, and corn, and \$5 million from increased pork shipments each year.

America's market is already largely open to imports from many of our trading partners. In fact, almost 99 percent of agricultural products from Colombia and Panama, for example, already enters the United States duty free. Without trade agreements to ensure similar treatment for our exporters, American businesses will continue to face high tariff and nontariff barriers abroad.

Consider just one example, the market for agricultural products in Korea, which is the world's 13th largest economy. Korea's tariffs on imported agricultural goods average 54 percent compared to an average of 9 percent tariff on their imports into the United States. So passage of the Korea Free Trade Agreement will level this playing field. Think about that. Fifty-four percent for our exporters to get into the Korean market, 9 percent tariff for their exports coming here. That is a huge discrepancy that will be rectified by passage of this agreement.

Korea's market for pork products in particular underscores how removing barriers to trade can benefit U.S. farmers and ranchers. U.S. pork exports to South Korea have increased 130 percent from January to July of this year because Korea temporarily lifted its 25 percent duty on pork imports due to an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Korea.

During this period, the Korean market surpassed Canada to become the third largest export destination for U.S. pork producers after Japan and Mexico. Korea's tariff on pork imports is expected to return but would be permanently eliminated by 2016 under the terms of the United States and South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

We know when we eliminate barriers to U.S. exports, American producers will compete and win in the global marketplace. However, if we fail to act and continue to delay implementation of these agreements, the cost to our

economy will also be substantial. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce study warns that failure to enact the three pending free-trade agreements could threaten as many as 380,000 American jobs and the loss of \$40 billion in sales. The cost of inaction on trade is high because today we live in a global economy where American producers rely on access to foreign markets.

Consider that in 1960, exports accounted for only 3.6 percent of our entire GDP. Today exports account for 12.5 percent of our entire GDP. Exports of U.S. goods and services support over 10 million American jobs. When America stands still on trade, the rest of the world does not. Today there are more than 100 new free-trade agreements that are currently under negotiation around the world. Yet the United States is only party to one of those negotiations; that is, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

If we do not aggressively pursue new market-opening agreements on behalf of American workers, we will see new export opportunities go to foreign businesses and foreign workers. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we have experienced under the current administration. The three trade agreements we are considering today were signed over 4 years ago, and this administration had more than 2½ years to submit them to Congress for consideration but failed to do so.

Instead, the President chose to sit on these agreements and not send them to Congress for nearly now 1,000 days. We cannot quantify precisely the cost of this unfortunate delay, but we know it put American exporters at a competitive disadvantage in the Colombian, Korean, and Panamanian markets. For example, on July 1 the European Union-Korea trade agreement went into effect. In just the first month after this agreement took effect, EU exports to Korea jumped nearly 37 percent, while U.S. exports to Korea rose by only 3 percent.

Let's be clear about what this means. Korean consumers are choosing to buy German, French, and British cars, electronics, and agricultural products rather than American-made products because those European products now have a price advantage. This would have been entirely preventable if we had acted on the U.S.-Korea trade agreement sooner. Likewise, the Canada-Colombia agreement went into effect on August 15 of this year. This is resulting in an advantage for Canadian goods such as construction equipment, aircraft, and a range of other industrial and agricultural products. Colombia is now reporting that since the Canada-Colombia trade agreement took effect, there has been an 18.3-percent increase in Colombian imports of Canadian wheat.

Much as with Korea, U.S. businesses are finding themselves disadvantaged because the President waited so long before sending these agreements to Congress. Unfortunately, the negative

impact of the Canada-Colombia agreement on U.S. exporters is just a continuation of the lost export opportunities we have seen over the past few years as these trade agreements have lingered.

Just a few years ago, American wheat producers dominated the market in Colombia with a 73-percent market share, as of 2008. Today we are facing a situation where U.S. wheat producers are likely to be completely shut out of the Colombian market if we do not act. Hopefully, by passing this agreement today and by swiftly implementing the U.S.-Colombia trade promotion agreement, our wheat producers will be able to recover much of their lost market share. But they should never have been placed in this position to begin with.

In 2010, for the first time in the history of U.S.-Colombia trade, the U.S. lost to Argentina its position as Colombia's No. 1 agricultural supplier. Now, consider the story of three of the major crops that we grow in South Dakota: soybeans, corn, and wheat. The combined market share in Colombia for these three U.S. agricultural exports has decreased from 78 percent in 2008 to 28 percent as of 2010, a staggering decline of 50 percentage points in our market share.

U.S. corn sales to Colombia fell from 3 million metric tons in 2007 to 700,000 metric tons in 2010. This is the high cost of delay while our trading partners pursue new regional and bilateral trade agreements. There has also been the cost of duties that have been paid on U.S. exports while these agreements are waiting. U.S. companies have paid more than \$5 billion in tariffs to Colombia and Panama since the trade agreements with these nations were signed more than 4 years ago.

Let's consider the cost of delay to just one American company, Caterpillar. We all know Caterpillar is a leading producer of large construction and mining equipment and a major U.S. exporter. Caterpillar exports 92 percent of its American-made large mining trucks. Caterpillar's large truck exports to Colombia face a 15-percent duty which adds about \$300,000 to the cost of each of these trucks exported to Colombia.

I mean, how does that work? Think about that. Every truck that Caterpillar sends into the Colombian market, it is an additional \$300,000 on top of the cost of that piece of equipment for the tariff that has to be paid. Just imagine the advantage that Caterpillar could have had for the last several years over its Japanese and Chinese competitors if the House of Representatives—at the time was controlled by the Democrats back in 2008—had not refused to consider the Colombia agreement when President Bush submitted it or if the current administration had acted sooner, and that is just one example of countless others out there with American businesses.

So I am glad we are here today. I expect all three trade agreements to pass

with what I hope is broad bipartisan support. I hope we also have learned an important lesson. We cannot afford to delay when it comes to international competition in trade. I hope the White House has learned an important lesson as well rather than submitting to Congress divisive measures where there are fundamental disagreements, such as new tax increases. This administration should identify measures such as these trade bills that will spur our economy and where there is broad bipartisan agreement.

The President sent his American Jobs Act to Congress exactly 1 month ago today. Yet we only, just last night, voted on whether we should consider this bill—a vote that did not get a single Republican vote, and it did not get every Democratic vote either. Contrast that approach with these free-trade agreements which were submitted to Congress by the President on October 3, just 9 days ago. Within about a week and a half, these trade agreements will have passed the relevant committees in the House and the Senate with large bipartisan votes and will be on the President's desk awaiting his signature.

Clearly, reaching across the aisle on measures where both parties can find agreement is a much more effective approach. So I would urge my colleagues to support these job-creating trade bills based upon their merit. I would also urge my colleagues to support these bills to send a message that when this administration is willing to send us commonsense, progrowth legislation, we are ready and willing to pass it.

We can only hope our votes on these trade agreements will set that precedent. I look forward to voting for these long overdue agreements on behalf of American businesses and consumers. I look forward, hopefully, to being able to act on what are truly progrowth job measures in the coming weeks and months.

We have an economy that continues to struggle with over 9 percent unemployment. Month after month we continue to see a lot of Americans who are without jobs, and this is one example of something we can do to address that concern. But there are lots of other things out there we can be doing as well if we are willing to identify those things on which there is agreement and those types of policies that actually do create jobs that are about getting Americans back to work and not about making some sort of a political statement.

I hope this will set a pattern and a trend that will be replicated in the future and that we can do some things that are good for our American economy and for American jobs.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak on final passage of the implementing language for the South Korea, Colombia and Panama free trade agreements. I support passing these three agreements. I supported them as they made the long and arduous journey from the negotiating table,

through the Senate Finance Committee and now to the Senate floor. As has been stated by my colleagues, these agreements are far overdue. Our government and industries have long shared with Congress the positive job impact these trade deals would have on the American economy. In the case of both Korea and Colombia, other nations have not hesitated to adopt similar agreements and I just hope that inaction by the White House has not resulted in U.S. manufacturers and agricultural producers losing market share that can be difficult, if not impossible, to regain.

I can say that Wyoming will benefit directly from these agreements. Disodium carbonate, also known as soda ash, is Wyoming's largest export to South Korea. This agreement would immediately remove, upon ratification, the 4 percent tariff on U.S. soda ash exports to that country. This will not only increase U.S. exports of soda ash to Korea by millions of dollars annually but will also increase job opportunities in and around Green River, WY where natural soda ash is found.

Wyoming's agricultural producers also stand to gain with the passage of these agreements. In the case of Korea, we know that a strong market for beef will be opened which will help Wyoming ranchers increase the value of their cattle heading to the sale barn. The standards in the Korea agreement will also set the stage for future negotiations in gaining market share for U.S. beef in other Asian markets. Consumer tastes are changing all over the world and our trading partners in Asia offer the largest potential market for American produced meat products. Colombia will do the same for Wyoming's wheat growers by reducing trade barriers and helping that country meet its growing demand for grain products.

I stand today in support of these important free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Not only are these nations our economic allies but strategic allies as well. These agreements solidify our relations with these countries and help promote U.S. job growth through our export markets. It is finally time Congress pass these agreements and fulfill the commitments we have made to our trading partners.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I join with my good friend from South Dakota and the comments he made about the disadvantage we have created for ourselves in the last 3 years by not moving forward with these trade agreements long ago. But we are going to move forward today.

Jump-starting America's economy is going to require bipartisanship. If we are going to compete in a global economy, it means we are all going to have to work together to help create economic opportunities for Americans who are looking for work, help to create those private sector jobs that are the difference in a prosperous economy and an economy that is struggling.

Last night the motion to open debate on the President's so-called jobs bill was amended by his own party and was defeated then by a bipartisan vote in the Senate. That is not the kind of bipartisanship we need. We need bipartisanship moving forward not bipartisanship walking away.

The bill was defeated because it does not make economic sense—as the President said in August of 2009—to raise taxes on job creators. In fact, the administration, by its own accounting, said roughly 80 percent of the people who would be impacted by the surtax imposed by the bill that was set aside last night would be defined as businesses, the very businesses that need to create jobs in an economy where that should be the No. 1 priority.

The President's first \$800 billion stimulus plan failed to stimulate. It did not create the private sector jobs we needed and, simply, my view of the \$450 billion we were talking about yesterday was that it was more of the same. But today is not more of the same. Today is a bipartisan opportunity to move forward with a bipartisan bill to help jump-start our economy.

If there is low-hanging fruit in job creation, it is exporting products to markets that want to buy them. This is not about labor conditions in Colombia or whatever might happen in Korea or Panama. This is about products that American workers make and whether they can get into those markets.

I would also say that for well over a decade now Colombian products have come into our country without a tariff under something called the Andean Free Trade Agreement. Well, so this can't be about Colombian labor. It must be about American labor and what we can do for American workers. We can open markets for American products, and that is what we are going to do today, I hope, as we move to agree to these trade bills.

These trade agreements would mean an additional \$2.5 billion per year in agricultural exports. Every billion dollars' worth of agricultural exports means an estimated 8,000 new jobs in Missouri. In Missouri, the trade-related jobs grew more than three times faster than other employment from 2004 to 2008.

I recently asked Missourians on Facebook and Twitter to share some of their personal stories about how they thought these trade agreements would impact their lives. Glen Cope, a young full-time farmer from Aurora, MO, noted:

Agriculture is not drawing young people to stay on the farm. . . . because it is difficult to make land payments based on what little we get for the products we produce—Versus the inputs—and this has been the case now for generations.

Glen called on Congress to help farmers by creating “more demand for our products if we are going to get young people to stay and take over the farm.”

Their parents and grandparents have produced food for our country and for much of the world for a long time. Glen

Cope's generation can continue to do the same.

Chris Chinn, who runs a family farm in Clarence, MO, in northeast Missouri, told me if these trade deals pass, her family “could receive almost \$11 more for every hog they sell.” Now, she noted, while \$11 may not sound like a lot, it sure seemed like a lot when they were losing \$20 for every hog they sold from 2007 through 2010. That makes the difference in whether that family stays on the farm.

Chris urged Congress to pass these agreements because “this increased revenue will help us meet expenses and help us ensure our family farm will be there to pass on to my kids, who will be the sixth generation of farmers in our family.”

Barbara Wilson noted that “agriculture fuels the economy in our small town of Mexico, Missouri.” She told me that the passage of these free-trade agreements would lead to an “increased demand for our corn and our soybeans,” and she stressed that “when the agricultural economy is good, the economy in our small town benefits.” That means increased jobs in all sectors of that small-town economy.

Brian Hammons, president of Hammons Products Company in Stockton, MO, told me that “significant government-mandated trade barriers are hurting” his attempts to compete and develop markets for American black walnuts, which are harvested by hand in Missouri and other Midwestern States. Brian noted, if these trade deals passed, “our company can buy more black walnuts from thousands of people in Missouri and 11 other States, providing cash to those rural areas. And even more importantly, the increased production activity from processing those nuts would allow us to provide more employment for people in our rural Missouri community.”

These are just a few of the farmers and job creators in Missouri who are calling on Congress to pass these free-trade agreements.

I look forward to voting for these agreements tonight. I hope a huge majority of my colleagues will join me in voting for the South Korea agreement, the Panama agreement, and the Colombia agreement. We will send a message to the world that we intend to compete in a world economy. If we are given the chance to compete, American workers can compete with anybody. These trade agreements provide an opportunity to do that.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the three pending trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

Let me say at the outset that I am in favor of free trade, if that term is allowed its true meaning. I have great confidence in the American worker and American businesses to compete and succeed in the global marketplace if given a free and level playing field. For generations, our country has shown

that hard work and ingenuity are the engines of progress and economic prosperity. The innovations that have shaped our 21st century economy were, in great measure, conceived and produced here in the United States. And in return for allowing other countries to benefit from our hard work and innovation, America was rewarded with a strong middle class.

Unfortunately, however, in a post-NAFTA world, being the best is no longer good enough. Instead, we have engaged in a race to the bottom, where to succeed you have to be the cheapest. And so, through our trade policy, we have too often put our workers at a real disadvantage.

Indeed, since 1994, when NAFTA went into effect, manufacturing sector employment across the country has fallen by over 5 million jobs, including over 42,000 in my State of Rhode Island. Contributing to these staggering losses are our trade agreements with Mexico, Central American and Caribbean countries, as well as the entry of China into the WTO.

That is why I cannot support the three trade agreements that are before the Senate today.

The Korea Free Trade Agreement is especially troubling for Rhode Island, particularly with respect to its treatment of textiles. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission's report, the textile industry is expected to lose jobs because of the favorable tariff reductions. Korean manufacturers would receive under the agreement.

Rhode Island has a long history in textiles. In fact, the modern textile industry in this country can be traced back to Slater Mill in Pawtucket, RI, in 1793. Textiles were an important part of the State's economy throughout the Industrial Revolution and into the 20th century. But many of the business owners I have been talking to have told me how hard it has been for them, shrinking, laying off workers, and watching as factory after factory closed their doors around them.

I am working with what's left of the textile industry in Rhode Island—a small group of companies that are making really great products. Darlington Fabrics in Westerly, for example, makes performance athletic-wear, including products for our military. Coated Technical Solutions, based in Newport, works with coated fabrics for things like inflatable boats and tarpaulins. Northeast Knitting makes specialized medical fabrics, and Hope Global exports shoelaces.

I have heard from some textile companies that their sole competition comes from manufacturers in South Korea. These foreign competitors will disproportionately benefit from the tariff reductions in the Korea FTA. This is just another in a long line of examples of how our trade policy has failed American manufacturers.

With respect to the Colombia agreement, Colombia has a history of violence toward trade unionists, with 51

labor members murdered last year alone. Although the Obama administration negotiated a labor action plan with the Colombian government, there are no guarantees that its provisions will be enforced, and in fact, indications are that the violence has continued.

In short, I see no reason why we should put American jobs at risk to benefit a country that cannot provide its citizens the most basic rights that we offer to ours. The Colombia free trade agreement is a bad deal for Americans, and it may be a worse deal for Colombians.

Panama has its own labor abuses, but its status as a tax haven is perhaps most troubling. Approximately 400,000 multinational corporations are registered in Panama, many of which have license to conduct business without reporting or paying taxes. While the Obama administration stepped in and negotiated a tax information exchange agreement, this agreement lacks the transparency required to assure compliance.

The benefits of a trade agreement with Panama barely register by any economic measure. I believe it would be a mistake to encourage trade with a country that offers little to the United States but that so brazenly facilitates the breaking of our tax laws.

I will object to these agreements until we make a wholesale revision of our trade policy and put enforcement at the forefront. Representing a State that may have suffered the most from unfair Chinese competition, I can't support more of these agreements until I see serious and sincere enforcement. We should refrain from passing further free trade agreements until we can ensure that American workers and businesses are protected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I always enjoy the Senator's remarks. However, I cannot quite agree with the thrust of his statement.

In my view, the current trade policies in this country are a disaster. The evidence is very clear that they have cost us many millions of jobs and to continue that same unfettered free-trade philosophy, in terms of trade agreements with Korea, Panama and Colombia, makes absolutely no sense at all. When we have a policy that is failing, we change it; we don't continue it.

Let us be very clear. I think most Americans understand that our economy today is in disastrous shape. Our middle class is disappearing. Recent statistics have told us poverty levels are at an alltime high, and the gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider.

In my view, one of the reasons—not the only reason—for the collapse of the middle class has to do with the loss of millions of good manufacturing jobs,

attributable to these disastrous trade policies. If we are serious as a nation in wanting to rebuild the middle class, lower our poverty rate, what we have to do is move forward in a new direction in trade, based on fair trade principles, and end this unfettered free trade, which has been such a disaster for American workers.

Over the last decade, we as a nation have lost 50,000 manufacturing plants in our country. I will repeat that because that is such a staggering number that it needs to be said over and over. Fifty thousand manufacturing plants in this country have shut down over the last 10 years alone. We have lost, during that same period, 5.5 million factory jobs. Many of those jobs were good-paying jobs. They were jobs that provided people with good wages and good benefits. Those jobs are gone and, in many cases, have been replaced by Walmart and McDonald's-type jobs, with low wages and minimal benefits.

To give us a sense about how significant the decline of manufacturing in this country is, the reality is, in 1970, 25 percent of all jobs in the United States were manufacturing jobs. Today, that number is just 9 percent. In July of 2000, there were 17.3 million manufacturing workers in this country. Today, there are only 11 million manufacturing workers. In my small State of Vermont—which is not as big as Ohio or Michigan and has never been one of the great manufacturing centers in the country, but even in a small State such as Vermont, what we have seen is a huge decline in good-paying manufacturing jobs, which have certainly impacted our middle class.

Mr. President, 10 years ago, we had approximately 45,000 manufacturing jobs in Vermont. Last year, we had 31,000 manufacturing jobs in Vermont. We have lost about one-third of our manufacturing jobs. I should tell everyone that 7,800 of those jobs were lost as a result of the trade agreement with China and another 1,300 were lost as a result of NAFTA.

The key issue is whether we continue our disastrous trade policy, which includes NAFTA, permanent normal trade relations with China, and CAFTA. Do we add on to trade policies that have failed? For the love of me, I cannot understand why anybody would want to do that.

The facts are very clear: Our current trade policies have failed, have been a disaster for working families. According to a recent study conducted by well-respected economists at the Economic Policy Institute, permanent normal trade relations with China led to the loss of 2.8 million American jobs—2.8 million American jobs. I remember because I was in the House when that debate took place. I heard the same thing then as I hear now—Members of Congress getting up and talking about all the new jobs that were going to be created. It wasn't true then and it is not true now.

How could we defend a trade policy based on the same principles as PNTR

with China when that policy cost us 2.8 million jobs in the last year alone?

Then we have NAFTA. Many of us remember the rhetoric around NAFTA. My goodness, we were going to open the entire Mexican economy for products made in the United States of America. We were going to be selling it in Mexico. Does anybody in America believe that policy has worked—that NAFTA has worked? The facts are very clear. Again, according to the EPI, they found that NAFTA has led to the loss of 680,000 jobs. So the simple reality is—and one doesn't have to be a Ph.D. in economics to figure this out—that if a company has the option of hiring somebody in a low-wage country at 50 cents or 70 cents an hour and they don't have to deal with unions or with environmental standards, why would they not go to those countries? The answer is they would go. The answer is they have gone.

That is what these trade policies are about—not selling American-produced products abroad but creating a situation where companies can shut down in America, move factories abroad, and bring those products back into this country tariff free.

We have quote after quote after quote from Members of Congress who got up on the floor during the NAFTA debate, during the China debate, and told us about all the jobs that would be created. I keep hearing that rhetoric, when, in fact, nothing said in the past has proven to be true.

Let me quote my good friends—and they are not good friends—from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They tell us this, and this is the discussion about Korea, Panama, and Colombia:

This is foremost a debate about jobs. At a time when millions of Americans are out of work, these agreements will create real business opportunities that can generate hundreds of thousands of new jobs.

But wait a second. Is this the same Chamber of Commerce that, on July 1, 2004, according to the Associated Press, said this—this is the headline: “Chamber of Commerce leader advocates offshoring of jobs.”

Here is what the article stated about the Chamber of Commerce, a strong advocate for these trade policies:

U.S. Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Thomas Donahue urged American companies to send jobs overseas as a way to boost American competitiveness. . . . Donahue said that exporting high-paid tech jobs to low-cost countries such as India, China and Russia saves companies money. . . .

Let's see, the Chamber of Commerce is leading the effort for these trade agreements, but they tell us the outsourcing of jobs is a good thing. Maybe we want to think twice before we accept the advice of the Chamber of Commerce.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has reported—and this is very interesting, not only as information unto itself but about the politics of this whole trade agreement. We have the Chamber of Commerce and we have

every major multinational corporation in the country telling us how good this unfettered free trade policy is. But now we have the U.S. Department of Commerce reporting that over the last decade, U.S. multinational corporations slashed 2.9 million American jobs.

Let's digest that. Large corporations and multinationals come in here and say the trade agreements are great and will create American jobs. At the same time, over the last decade, they have slashed 2.9 million American jobs.

Here is the other side of the story. The truth is, these same multinational corporations that are telling Members of Congress to vote for these trade agreements—the truth is, they are creating jobs. The only problem is, the jobs they are creating are not in the United States of America; they are in China and other low-wage countries.

Over this last same period, the last decade, while they laid off 2.9 million American workers, these same multinational corporations created 2.4 million new jobs abroad. So they laid off 2.9 million American workers and created 2.4 million jobs in China and other low-wage countries.

That, in a nutshell, is what these trade agreements are about—enabling corporations to shut down in America, move to low-wage countries, and bring their products back into our country. The results are very clear. We don't need a great study done by the Department of Commerce or the Economic Policy Institute; all we have to do is walk into any department store in America. When we buy a product, we know where that product is manufactured. It is not manufactured in Vermont, it is not manufactured in California, and it is often manufactured in China, Mexico or other developing countries.

That has been the whole goal of these trade agreements—shut down plants in America, move them abroad, hire low-wage workers there, and bring the products back into this country. The idea that we would be extending this concept to Korea, Panama, and Colombia makes no sense to me at all.

Since the year 2000, 2.8 million American jobs have been eliminated or displaced as a result of the increased trade deficit with China. After all the talk on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House, at the editorial boards of major newspapers and by leading politicians about how the China Free Trade Agreement would create jobs in America, it is very interesting to hear what these corporations had to say a few years after the trade agreement was passed. In other words, before it is passed, they will tell us about how we are going to create all these jobs in America. The day after it is passed, their line changes. The China Free Trade Agreement was passed in the year 2000. A couple years later, Jeffrey Immelt, the CEO of General Electric, was quoted on this subject at an investor meeting, just one year after China was admitted to the World Trade

Organization. This is after the Chinese-American free-trade agreement. This is what Mr. Immelt said:

When I am talking to GE managers, I talk China, China, China, China, China.

That is him, not me—five Chinas.

You need to be there. You need to change the way people talk about it and how they get there. I am a nut on China. Outsourcing from China is going to grow to \$5 billion. We are building a tech center in China. Every discussion today has to center on China. The cost basis is extremely attractive. You can take an 18 cubic foot refrigerator, make it in China, land it in the United States, and land it for less than we can make an 18 cubic foot refrigerator today, ourselves.

This is the head of General Electric, who, by the way, I guess is President Obama's great adviser on creating jobs in America. So that was 2 years after the China agreement was signed.

And on and on it goes. It is not just Mr. Immelt, it is major corporation after major corporation. Before the agreement, it is jobs were doing great in America. After the agreement, it is all of the advantages of outsourcing.

Let me tell you how bad the situation is. By the way, I think most Americans know that not only is it a disaster for our economy that we are not producing the products we consume, but it is really an embarrassment. I will cite an example. Last year, during the holiday season, I walked into the Smithsonian's very beautiful American History Museum. It is a great museum, and I urge everybody who comes to Washington to visit. I walked into the gift shop of the Smithsonian museum, owned by the people of America, paid for by the people of America, and do you know what their gift shop had? Most of the products in the gift shop were not made in America. It turns out they were made in China or made in other low-wage countries around the world. I went to a section where they had little busts of Presidents of the United States—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Barack Obama—and when you turned them over, do you know where these busts of Presidents of the United States were made? Yes, you guessed it—in China.

We have since been having some discussions with the Smithsonian. They are in the process of changing their policies. And we are working with other people as well. But that is how bad the situation is, that busts of American Presidents, sold in a museum owned by the people of the United States of America, talking about the history and culture of America, are made in China. That is just one example of how pathetic this whole situation is. And on and on it goes.

By the way, when we talk about trade, we often focus on blue-collar jobs and manufacturing jobs, but it is also increasingly information technology jobs and white-collar jobs. Just think for a moment that during the past 4 years the cumulative trade deficit with China in advanced technology—not talking about sneakers but advanced technology products—totaled more than \$300 billion. Last year,

our trade deficit with China on advanced technology products was a staggering \$92 billion—in 1 year alone.

I just bought one of these very nice iPhones. It is very nice. Do you know where that product is made? It is made in China. And the iPad is made in China, and the iPod and the BlackBerry and IBM computers and Dell computers and the Microsoft X-Box and big-screen TVs. None of these American inventions we pride ourselves on inventing, none of the technologies we pride ourselves on developing—and Steve Jobs recently passed away, a great businessperson—none of these are made here. Where are they made? More often than not, they are made in China.

Let me quote from a December 15, 2010, article in the Wall Street Journal:

One widely touted solution for current U.S. economic woes is for America to come up with more of the high-tech gadgets the rest of the world craves. Yet two academic researchers estimate that Apple's iPhone—one of the best selling U.S. technology products—actually added \$1.9 billion to the U.S. trade deficit with China last year.

So we develop these products, but we can't manufacture them here because these companies prefer the low wages in China. And on and on it goes—not just blue-collar jobs but white collar jobs as well.

Today, we are not talking about China and we are not talking about Mexico. We are talking about Korea and Panama, and we are talking about Colombia, but it is the same old story. The chamber of commerce is back again suggesting the creation of all of these jobs, until the day after the agreement is signed, and then they will be talking about how they can throw American workers out on the street.

It is interesting that poll after poll shows that, to say the least, the American people do not have an enormous amount of respect for the U.S. Congress and they see Congress as living in a very different world than working-class people are living in.

I don't know of any example where that schizophrenia is greater than in terms of trade. I don't know what it is like in Rhode Island, but I will tell you what it is like in Vermont when you ask people what they think about these trade agreements with China. When you ask constituents if they think they are creating jobs in America, they reply: What, are you nuts? Of course they are not. And the polls tell us that. In a September 2010 NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll, 69 percent of Americans said they believe "free trade between the United States and other countries cost the U.S. jobs." I think every group in America except the Congress seems to get that point. But then again, the Congress is surrounded by lobbyists and campaign contributors who come from big-money interests, and they like these unfettered free-trade agreements.

Let me say a word or two about Korea. The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that the Korea free-

trade agreement will lead to the loss of 159,000 American jobs and will increase the trade deficit by nearly \$14 billion over a 7-year period. Why would we want to go forward in a trade agreement that will cost us jobs?

President Obama has estimated that the Korea Free Trade Agreement will "support at least 70,000 American jobs." But the headline of a December 7, 2010, article in the New York Times says it all: "Few New Jobs Expected Soon From Free-Trade Agreement with South Korea." According to this article, the Korea Free Trade Agreement "is likely to result in little if any net job creation in the short run, according to the government's own analysis"—our government's own analysis. That analysis was done by the U.S. International Trade Commission, which projects our overall trade deficit will increase, not decrease, if the Korea Free Trade Agreement is implemented. This is our own International Trade Commission. So what are we doing? What are we doing?

Let me touch on one aspect of the Korea Free Trade Agreement that deserves a lot of focus, and I fear very much it is not getting it; that is, the Korea Free Trade Agreement will force American workers not just to compete against low-wage workers in South Korea but also to compete against the virtual slave labor conditions that exist in North Korea, a country which is certainly one of the most undemocratic countries in the world. To add insult to injury, not only are our workers going to be competing against slave labor in North Korea, some of the proceeds from this free-trade agreement are going to the dictatorship of Kim Jong Il, certainly one of the more vicious dictators in the entire world.

What that is about is that a number of companies in South Korea, including Hyundai and many others, own companies that are doing business in a large industrial area in North Korea. This agreement will allow products made in North Korea to go to South Korea and then come back into the United States.

I know there has been a little confusion on this, but there shouldn't be. Let me quote from a January 2011 report from the Congressional Research Service, and I hope everybody who plans on voting for this free-trade agreement with Korea hears this:

There is nothing to prevent South Korean firms from performing intermediate manufacturing operations in North Korea, and then performing final manufacturing processes in South Korea.

For example, as much as 65 percent of the value of a South Korean car coming into the United States could actually be made in North Korea if this trade agreement goes into effect.

Today, we have almost 47,000 North Korean workers currently employed by more than 120 South Korean firms, including Hyundai, at the Kaesong Industrial Complex in North Korea. What an agreement. What an agreement. Slave labor in North Korea manufacturing

products that go to South Korea and then come into the United States of America. Meanwhile, the dictatorship of North Korea gets a significant piece of the action on top of the pennies an hour the North Korean workers get.

In 2007, Han Duck-soo, who was then the Prime Minister of South Korea and is now the current South Korean Ambassador to the United States, said:

The planned ratification of the South Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement will pave the way for the export of products built in Kaesong [North Korea] to the U.S. market.

Isn't that wonderful. Isn't that wonderful. Bad enough for workers in our country to have to compete against people in China and in Vietnam—people making 20 cents, 30 cents, or 40 cents an hour—but now we are asked to compete against slave labor in Korea. And that is the treaty people will be voting for today.

Mr. President, I think a lot of folks have mentioned, in terms of Colombia, the assault on trade unionists there. Since 1986, some 2,800 trade unionists have been assassinated. Less than 6 percent of these murders have been prosecuted by the Colombian Government. Last year alone—last year alone, in a small country—more than 50 trade unionists were assassinated in Colombia. That is up 9 percent from 2009. I ask, if in Colombia 50 CEOs of companies were killed last year, were murdered last year, do you think people here would be voting for a free-trade agreement with Colombia or would they say: Why would we want an agreement with a country that is so unlawful, that is so brutal, where so many CEOs are being killed? But it is not CEOs, it is just trade union leaders, so I guess it is OK to have an agreement there.

I would also say that President Obama had a different view on Colombia when he was a candidate for President in 2008. In October of 2008, candidate Barack Obama said:

The history in Colombia right now is that labor leaders have been targeted for assassination on a fairly consistent basis and there have not been prosecutions.

Candidate Obama in 2008 was right in opposing this trade agreement. Unfortunately, as President, he is wrong to support it right now.

Let me say a word about the Panama Free Trade Agreement.

Panama is a very small country. Its entire annual economic output is only \$26.7 billion a year or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the American economy. So I think no one is going to legitimately stand here and say that trading with such a small country is going to significantly increase American jobs. Then why would we be considering a trade agreement with Panama? What is going on there? Well, it turns out Panama is a world leader when it comes to allowing wealthy Americans and large corporations to evade U.S. taxes by stashing their cash in offshore tax havens. And the Panama Free Trade Agreement would make this bad situation much worse.

I am a member of the Budget Committee, as is the Presiding Officer, and we have heard testimony time and time again that our country is losing up to \$100 billion every year as corporations stash their money in postal addresses in the Cayman Islands, in Bermuda, and in Panama. This trade agreement makes that situation even worse.

According to Citizens for Tax Justice:

A tax haven . . . has one of three characteristics: It has no income tax or a very low-rate income tax; it has bank secrecy laws; and it has a history of noncooperation with other countries on exchanging information about tax matters. Panama has all three of those. . . . They're probably the worst.

That is according to Citizens for Tax Justice.

The trade agreement with Panama would effectively bar the United States from cracking down on illegal and abusive offshore tax havens in Panama. In fact, combating tax haven abuse in Panama would be a violation of this free-trade agreement, exposing the United States to fines from international authorities.

At a time when we have a 14-trillion-plus national debt and at a time when we are frantically figuring out ways to try to lower our deficit, some of us believe it is a good idea to do away with all of these tax havens by which the wealthy and large corporations stash their money abroad and avoid paying U.S. taxes. The Panama trade agreement would make that goal even more difficult.

I want to say another word on an issue that I think is important as we look into the future. The proposed Korea Free Trade Agreement threatens both the 340B drug program, which requires drug companies to provide discounts on covered outpatient drugs purchased by federally funded health providers, such as community health centers and other safety net providers, and the ability of Medicare Part B to hold down the prices of outpatient drugs. The Korea Free Trade Agreement would potentially allow Korean drug manufacturers to challenge the pricing under these programs on the grounds that the prices are not market driven—in other words, forcing prices up in this country. That is something that was pushed, by the way, by our trade representative, not theirs. In essence, the pharmaceutical industry's lobbyists, with complete indifference to the plight of millions of the most frail and vulnerable Americans, have succeeded in inserting provisions into the Korea Trade Agreement that would allow Korean companies to maximize their profits by challenging the cost control measures under the 340B and Medicare Part B programs.

But, unfortunately, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Right now, the pharmaceutical lobby—and they are a very powerful lobby—and the U.S. Trade Representative are negotiating a new trade agreement, the so-called Trans-

Pacific Partnership, that I fear very much will make a bad situation in terms of drug access for the developing world, for poor people all over the world, much worse than it already is. Their aim, yet again, is to maximize drug company profits at the expense of the most vulnerable populations by tying the hands of health authorities here and in other developed and developing countries abroad who seek to provide access to low-cost generic pharmaceutical drugs for their citizens.

In negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership, our government is actively pushing intellectual profit laws for medicines that are more restrictive than we impose even here in the United States, with the effect of making it far more difficult to get generic drugs on the market in those countries. One of them, Vietnam, is a good example. Vietnam obviously is a very poor country. Vietnam has received more than \$320 million from the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, PEPFAR, created under President George W. Bush and continued under President Obama since 2004. The function of this program is to make sure the poorest people in the world who have diseases such as AIDS are able to get the drugs they need at a price they can afford to pay, and that means making generic treatments available.

The PEPFAR program has actually had significant success. As somebody who is not a great fan of President George W. Bush, this is an area where he actually did something quite positive, and that program is credited with saving millions of lives in 15 developing nations over the last 7 years. In the face of one of the most severe humanitarian crises in modern history, the United States put billions of dollars into doing something about it, and we are doing that today.

So why, in the face of this success by one arm of our government, would another arm work to pull the rug out from underneath it? Yet that is what the U.S. Trade Representative's Office is doing now.

In other words, on the one hand what we are trying to do is the right thing, the humanitarian thing, to make sure that poor and sick people around the world are able to get the medicines they desperately need to stay alive at a price they can afford to pay; and, on the other hand, another part of the U.S. Government is saying, wait a second. We have got to protect the interests of the drug companies and make sure they can make as much money as possible so they can charge and force poor countries to pay outrageously high prices for drugs even if that means many people die because they can't afford those drugs. So this is a contradiction. This is what our new trade policies are about.

I will be back on the floor at some point in the not too distant future to be talking about this very important issue, but let me conclude by saying

this country is in the midst of the worst economic crisis since the 1930s; the middle class is disappearing; poverty is increasing; millions of Americans have seen a decline in their standard of living; the gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider. That is the reality of the American economy today.

One of the reasons for the collapse of the middle class is the loss of millions and millions of good-paying manufacturing jobs, and one of the key reasons—not the only reason but one of the key reasons—we are losing millions of manufacturing jobs is disastrous trade policies designed to allow American corporations to shut down here, move to low-wage countries, hire people there for pennies an hour, and bring their products back. That is a policy I suppose you could say has worked if you are the CEO of a large corporation. You make a lot more money paying people 50 cents an hour than \$20 an hour. You make a lot more money working in a country where there are no environmental standards rather than in a country where you have to have some standards protecting air and water.

That is what our trade policy has been, and it seems to me to be enormously foolish for us to continue this failed policy of NAFTA, of CAFTA, of permanent normal trade relations with China, and extend them to Korea, Panama, and Colombia. I urge my colleagues to stand up to the big money interests which want us to pass these trade agreements, stand up for American workers, and say: No. Trade is a good thing, but it has to be based on principles that protect ordinary Americans, working people, not just the CEOs of large corporations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in the wake of another very sobering jobs report. Unemployment remains stalled at 9.1 percent; 14 million Americans are out of work; another 9 million have been forced into part-time jobs because they simply cannot find full-time employment. These challenging economic times demand that Congress and the administration put aside partisanship and work together in earnest to address the prolonged jobs crisis.

Many of the decisions that will come before Congress in the next few months will be difficult ones, including those that must be made to restore fiscal order to our Nation's books. But there are bipartisan measures that we know will create and preserve jobs now. We must work together to advance them.

One such measure before us today is the free-trade agreement with South Korea. As President Obama stated last week, this agreement "will make it easier for American companies to sell their products in South Korea and provide a major boost to our exports."

South Korea is our country's seventh largest trading partner. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that implementation of this agreement would increase our gross domestic product by \$10 billion to \$12 billion, and annual merchandise exports by \$10 billion. The ITC further estimates that the agreement will reduce the U.S. trade deficit with Korea by between \$3 billion and \$4 billion.

An analysis of the Korean agreement conducted by the staff of the ITC at the request of the Senate Finance Committee concludes that the agreement could create up to 280,000 American jobs, including more than 650 jobs in my home State of Maine. Just this week there were announcements of 130 jobs lost at a paper mill in Maine and 65 jobs eliminated at a call center. So these new jobs, potentially 650 new jobs, would be welcome indeed.

South Korea is the fifth largest international market for Maine's products. Last year, the value of Maine exports to South Korea reached nearly \$100 million, including \$31 million in chemical products, \$29 million in wood pulp, \$15 million in civilian aircraft and engine parts, \$7 million in electrical machinery, and \$5 million in coated paper and paperboard.

Upon implementation of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, more than 95 percent of Maine's exports to South Korea would be duty free. Let me repeat that. More than 95 percent of our exports from Maine to South Korea would be duty free. That means the elimination of these barriers to Maine's exports would expand markets for Maine's manufacturers and agricultural producers, and that translates into saving jobs and creating jobs.

Korea is the fourth largest and fastest growing market for American frozen potatoes, a major industry in my State. In 2009, the U.S. share of the Korean market was 81 percent, compared to 2 percent market share for the European Union. But with the implementation of the European Union-Korea Trade Agreement this past July, the European Union frozen potatoes now enter the Korean market duty free. That obviously gives European Union growers a significant competitive advantage over American exporters, who face an 18-percent tariff for shipping their products into Korea. The U.S.-Korea agreement would eliminate this tariff immediately, leveling the playing field for our producers.

According to the Maine Potato Board, which has endorsed this agreement, passage of this free-trade agreement is expected to translate into a \$35 million annual increase in U.S. frozen potatoes exports to Korea. More important, in the long term it will allow American potatoes to be the product of choice in the Korean market because, as the Presiding Officer well knows, Maine potatoes taste better than those grown by the European Union countries.

In all seriousness, we do need to eliminate these discrepancies in tariffs

that give our competitors an advantage over our American producers. Exports are essential to a strong industrial manufacturing base throughout our country and in the State of Maine.

I want to read an excerpt from a letter I recently received from the plant manager of the General Electric Energy Plant in Bangor, ME. The plant manager had this to say about the potential impact if this free-trade agreement were approved:

He wrote as follows:

GE's continuing ability to pursue expanding international opportunities for our aviation, energy and financial services exports is critical to our more than 700 workers in the State of Maine. In fact, 100 percent of the new steam turbine units coming out of our Bangor facility this year and next will be exported.

That just shows how critical that export market is to maintaining those 700 jobs in Maine.

The Bangor plant has, in addition, recently started producing components for gas turbines. To this end, we have invested roughly \$30 million in Bangor, to expand capacity. These gas turbines [under current law] face tariffs of 8 percent in Korea. . . .

If the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement is passed, the GE plant manager in Bangor told me the tariff on the gas turbines produced at the Bangor plant would drop from 8 percent to 0, and that obviously would make those GE products and GE's employees in Maine all that much more competitive.

For Maine's wood pulp producers, Korea is already the second largest international market they have. Exports to Korea account for nearly 17 percent of the total production coming out of the pulp mill in Woodland, ME. In an e-mail to my office, Burt Martin, a director of the pulp mill in Washington County, had this to say about the importance of the Korean market to his business operation in Maine. He wrote:

Free trade with Asian countries means that we have an operating pulp facility in Woodland, ME. . . . Koreans are good paying customers—high revenue—and they are an important part of our markets.

Maine's blueberry growers also will benefit from the phaseout of tariffs on wild blueberry products. While I would have preferred to see the tariffs on blueberries eliminated immediately, the way they are on many other products I mentioned, the tariff reductions that would come about as a result of this agreement will help our blueberry growers compete in an increasingly important market.

An agreement will also unlock new market opportunities for Maine's iconic lobster industry. Live lobster exports to Korea currently face a 20-percent tariff. Under the agreement, this tariff would be phased out over 5 years, making it far easier for Maine to compete in the marketplace in Korea.

Fairchild Semiconductor in Portland, ME, is another strong supporter of this agreement. The manager of Fairchild cites the benefits of "tariff elimination, regulatory improvement,

stronger intellectual property protection and simplified trade clearance procedures, measures that help streamline customs procedures and help U.S. companies cut down on the costs of doing business" as advantages that would be brought about by this agreement.

The bottom line is, exports to Korea support Maine jobs. Passage of this agreement is critical to ensuring not only that we can expand export opportunities, but also that we do not lose market share in one of the world's largest economies because our foreign competitors are more aggressive in their pursuit of trade liberalization agreements.

On balance, I believe the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement is good for America and good for the State of Maine, and I will vote for it. I am convinced the elimination of tariffs will create jobs and help us save jobs at this critical time in our economy.

I also plan to vote for the agreement with Panama, a country with which the United States had a \$5.7 billion trade surplus last year. But I cannot support the free-trade agreement with Colombia. This was a difficult decision for me to reach, and I have given it considerable study and thought. But, unfortunately, the violence against labor unions continues at an unacceptably high rate in that country.

I do appreciate and recognize that the Colombian Government has taken steps to improve in this area, but I think it is simply too soon to declare the Labor Action Plan a success. I think more time is needed to assess progress in this area, and I wish the President had brought forth the two agreements I can support—those with South Korea and Panama—and held back on the Colombian agreement until we have a better sense of the direction of the country and where we are going in making progress with the Labor Action Plan.

The benefits of free trade are not spread evenly over all sectors. With any trade agreement there is a potential that some U.S. workers and industries may be harmed. That is why I have looked at each agreement individually over the years. I have supported some, and I have opposed others. Frankly, the criteria I apply is whether the agreements benefit the people of my State and the workers of this country. It is also why I have been such a strong supporter of a robust trade adjustment assistance program, and I have also strongly supported tough enforcement of trade laws to protect U.S. workers against unfair trade practices. I have testified before the ITC in cases involving the paper industry where there has been illegal dumping. I have also been a cosponsor of the bill we just passed yesterday to crack down on currency manipulation by the Chinese Government.

But if the United States does not adopt policies to expand trade opportunities in a fair way, we will lose out on market opportunities, and that means

we will lose out on the creation of jobs. The jobs that would be created or sustained at home will, instead, be created and sustained in other countries that are aggressively pursuing trade agreements.

With nearly 95 percent of the world's customers living outside of our borders, we simply must seize opportunities to expand our exports, to look for new markets for our products. Our competitors in Europe, Canada, and other nations are actively working to tear down barriers to trade and promote their exports. We must do the same for our industries and for our workers.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about one of the greatest job-creation measures this body has considered in a long time.

The three long-awaited trade agreements with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia that the Senate will soon receive will create more real, long-term jobs than any stimulus approach advocated by the President.

While many of us are concerned about the role of government in job creation—an issue that will continue to be debated by this body—we can all agree that it is imperative to create a fair and efficient platform on which businesses can grow. The trade agreements before us will do just that.

Some economists believe that we are doing perpetual harm to our manufacturing, agricultural and export sectors by not passing these agreements. For instance, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has previously calculated that delaying the passage of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement alone may have resulted in the direct loss of more than 20,000 jobs in the United States.

Our trading partners have looked elsewhere for goods and services to power their growing economies. When Canada and Colombia completed their trade agreement in August, within 15 days there was an 18-percent increase in wheat exports from Canada to Colombia.

The U.S. Trade Representative completed negotiations in 2006 with Colombia for the agreement we will soon have before us. Nearly 5 years of delays on this agreement alone have caused us irreparable damage.

While America was once the envy of the world for our trade agreements, we are now losing ground.

According to some estimates, the South Korean Free Trade Agreement has the potential to create 280,000 jobs in America alone. South Korea once called the United States its largest trading partner. We have since lost that distinction to China.

We are not simply creating jobs by passing these agreements, we are invigorating America's economy.

The Panama agreement will pack a significant economic punch for the United States. While it is a smaller country than South Korea or Colombia, the International Trade Commission estimates that U.S. grain and

meat exports to Panama will increase 60 percent.

In the past several years, my State of Georgia has experienced a 327-percent increase in exports to Panama. While these exports have increased despite the tariffs exporters are burdened with, a fair and free trade agreement will allow these firms to export duty-free, increasing the capital available to them and giving them more opportunity to grow.

This agreement will have major implications for Georgia's agricultural producers. In fact, all three of these trade agreements will give major benefits to Georgia's agriculture sector.

With the South Korea agreement, we will see gains in poultry, eggs, beef, cotton, and pecan exports as tariffs on these items are phased out. We will see the same benefits with the Columbia pact, and that agreement will also eliminate peanut tariffs over the next 15 years.

I am proud to say that agriculture is not the only sector where Georgia will see gains. I would like to highlight a couple of local companies that stand to benefit from these agreements.

Sasco is a third-generation family-owned business based in Albany, GA. Sasco produces and distributes worldwide more than 1,200 chemical products, but it faces a 5-percent tariff in Colombia.

For Sasco to remain competitive in South America, it must be able to export duty free. While the company's president, Mark Skalla, continues to seek partnerships and contracts in the region, the delays he has experienced are hindering Sasco's expansion.

Payne Hughes, CEO of Thrush Aircraft, a manufacturer of agricultural aircraft in Georgia, says he has already seen big gains in Panama and Colombia, where these markets continue to grow. As these countries' economies expand, American business will be able to take advantage of the increased needs for our quality products.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has calculated that for every \$1 billion in agriculture exports, some 8,000 U.S. jobs are created and supported. Every \$1 billion in manufacturing exports supports nearly 7,000 U.S. jobs.

The large-scale manufacturers in Georgia, including General Electric and IBM, will also see major benefits that translate to growth and job creation.

As we continue to look for areas where we can enhance American competitiveness, increase job creation, and boost economic development, free-trade agreements are a sure-fire way to make big gains. They are, quite simply, good for American business.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I support the approval of free trade agreements for one simple reason: they create jobs across America. And they especially create jobs in my home State of Texas.

Last year, Texas companies exported lots of products to South Korea, Co-

lombia, and Panama, including chemical and energy products, heavy machinery and electronics, cotton and grain crops, and many others. Unfortunately, all of these products faced trade barriers in these countries through foreign tariffs amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. These free trade agreements will level the playing field in America's favor by eliminating foreign tariffs. Each of these trade agreements also strengthens a key strategic relationship for our country. And so I would like to say a word or two about each one.

The Korea Free Trade Agreement is of strategic importance because it reminds the world that America is a Pacific nation, and that America will continue to deepen our relationships with our allies and not abandon East Asia to China or anybody else. The Korea Free Trade Agreement is the most significant on the table in terms of U.S. exports. South Korea is the most prosperous nation to sign a free trade agreement with the United States since Canada and Mexico in the 1994 NAFTA. Currently, Korean tariffs on U.S. products can be as high as 13 percent. The White House estimates that the Korea Free Trade Agreement will generate up to \$11 billion in new U.S. exports and 70,000 U.S. jobs.

And a lot of that economic activity will be in Texas. Texas exported \$6.4 billion in products to South Korea last year—second only to California. Our State's leading category of exports to Korea is computers and electronics, which include integrated circuits, magnetic tape, and navigational equipment. Texans also export a variety of chemicals and machinery to Korea.

The Colombia Free Trade Agreement will solidify our relationship with a crucial ally in a volatile region of our own hemisphere. Colombia has been a leader in the fight against drug trafficking and narcoterrorism. Colombia has also resisted the regional ambitions of Venezuela's Hugo Chavez. The White House estimates that the Colombian Free Trade Agreement will generate \$1 billion in new U.S. exports and thousands of U.S. jobs.

In Texas, my state exported \$4.4 billion in products to Colombia last year more than any other state. Those products include petroleum products, coal, chemicals, electronics, and agricultural products. Texas ranchers will especially welcome this agreement as beef currently faces the single highest tariff in Colombia at 80 percent and this trade agreement will reduce that tariff to zero. Also cotton, wheat, and almost all fruits and vegetables will become duty free immediately.

The Panama Free Trade Agreement is important because Panama is conducting one of the largest public works projects in history: expanding the Panama Canal. This project will cost \$5.25 billion and provide many opportunities for construction firms and heavy equipment manufacturers in the U.S. Construction equipment and infrastructure

machinery used in such projects accounted for \$280 million in U.S. exports to Panama in 2010. The agreement will end tariffs on these exports, providing U.S. firms an almost immediate 5 percent price advantage on procurement contracts.

Texas exported \$1.8 billion in products to Panama last year—more than any other State. Texas top exports to Panama are petroleum, coal, chemicals, and computers and other electronics.

It is clear why Congress should approve these trade agreements. What is not clear is why it has taken us so long to act. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement was signed in November 2006. The Korea and Panama agreements were signed in June 2007. Why has it taken more than 4 years to act on them?

The answer is that the leadership of Congress changed in 2007, and that leadership has been listening too much to union bosses and other special interests. Every time we seem to be close to approving these agreements, these liberal special interests have come up with a new set of demands. On May 10, 2007, the Bush White House and Congress agreed on new and more stringent labor and environment provisions. This action was supposed to allow approval for four trade agreements; however, only a pact with Peru was approved at that time. The Obama administration could have submitted the three remaining trade agreements at any time since January 2009. But new conditions kept coming.

In November 2010, we learned of new conditions regarding taxation policy in Panama. In February 2011, we learned about new conditions placed on the Korea deal regarding auto emissions standards. In April 2011, we learned about new and strikingly detailed conditions bordering on micromanagement—on the Colombian judiciary and law enforcement agencies.

And in May 2011, we learned about new demands for a little-known program called trade adjustment assistance, including the demand to dramatically expand trade adjustment assistance to cover nations the U.S. has not signed agreements with.

The time is up for demands from Washington special interests. The time is now to make U.S. jobs and U.S. exports our priority. Let's send a message of friendship to the people of South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. And let's send a message to U.S. exporters that real jobs legislation is on its way.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

These agreements will eliminate tariffs and nontariff barriers to U.S. exports and protect intellectual property and investment with three key trading partners.

At a time when the national unemployment rate stands at almost 10 per-

cent—and tops 12 percent in my home State of California—I believe it is vital that we promote job growth by securing new opportunities for U.S. manufacturers, farmers and service providers in expanding foreign export markets.

These three agreements are a good place to start.

They are critical to the President's goal of doubling exports over 5 years, which could create 2 million new jobs. This is from a L.A. Times editorial of August 12, 2010.

It is simple: export growth as a result of these trade agreements will mean more jobs.

And we have no time to lose. Other trading partners have signed or are in the process of negotiating free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama.

The European Union has already signed free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. The EU-South Korea agreement came into effect in July.

Korea now has or is negotiating 13 free trade agreements involving 50 nations.

Canada concluded a trade agreement with Panama in 2010 and will gain preferential access to Colombia's market in August 2012.

Argentina and Brazil already have preferential access to the Colombian market.

We cannot afford to let our exporters lose market share to our competitors.

If we are left out, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce reports that we could lose up to 380,000 jobs and \$40 billion in exports.

The best estimate is that these agreements will, in fact, create jobs.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, these agreements will create at least 70,000 U.S. jobs.

U.S. exports to South Korea will increase by \$11 billion and raise U.S. GDP by \$12 billion.

The Colombia trade agreement will increase U.S. exports by more than \$1.1 billion and increase U.S. GDP by \$2.5 billion.

U.S. exports to Panama grew by 41 percent in 2010 to \$6.1 billion and will continue to rise with passage of the free trade agreement.

The Business Roundtable puts the number even higher at 250,000 jobs created with passage of the three agreements.

Let me speak to the effects these agreements would have on my home State of California.

As one of the 10 largest economic engines in the world with a \$1.9 trillion economy, California is a leader in U.S. and global markets with products ranging from agriculture to high-tech products and manufacturing.

In 2008, approximately 60,000 California companies exported products abroad, with manufactured goods exports supporting 738,000 California jobs.

South Korea, Colombia and Panama already represent growing markets for

California exporters. In 2010, South Korea was California's fifth largest export market with exports totaling more than \$8.1 billion, up from \$5.9 billion in 2009. In 2010, Colombia was California's 34th largest export market with exports totaling \$408.7 million—a 24-percent increase over the previous year.

In 2010, Panama, with a growth rate of 7.5 percent, was California's 42nd largest export market with exports totaling \$252 million.

Passage of these agreements will provide important openings for California exports which will help create jobs.

According to Business Roundtable, more than 66 percent of California exports to Colombia will be duty-free after passage of this agreement, saving \$27.2 million for California businesses and farmers, and more than 80 percent of California exports to South Korea will be duty free following implementation of the agreement, saving exporters \$66 million.

In Panama, California high-quality beef, other meat and poultry products, soybeans, wines and most fresh fruit and tree nuts will become duty free upon enactment.

According to the California Chambers of Commerce Council for International Trade, California manufacturers will also gain significant access to the \$5.25 billion Panama Canal expansion project as the agreement eliminates the 5 percent duty on construction equipment and infrastructure machinery. The project will ultimately reduce transportation costs for California exports.

Make no mistake, South Korea, Colombia and Panama represent significant opportunities for all U.S. exporters.

South Korea is our 7th largest trading partner, our 8th biggest export market and the 15th largest economy in the world.

The agreement represents the largest free trade agreement since the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA.

While Colombia and Panama have smaller economies, they are both emerging trading partners. In 2010, U.S. exports to Colombia grew by 34 percent to \$12 billion, while exports to Panama grew by 41 percent to \$6.1 billion.

Again, export growth will lead to job growth.

Some critics of these agreements argue that benefits gained by lowering tariffs and nontariff barriers to U.S. exports will be offset by benefits gained by our trading partners.

The fact is, our trading partners already have substantial access to the U.S. market while our exports continue to face significant barriers.

Currently, the average Korean applied tariff on U.S. non-agricultural products is 7 percent. In contrast, the average U.S. tariff on Korean non-agricultural imports is 3.7 percent.

The average Korean applied tariff on U.S. agricultural products is 52 percent. The average U.S. tariff on Korean agricultural products is 12 percent.

Approximately 90 percent of Colombian exports and 98 percent of Panamanian exports enter the United States duty free under existing trade preference programs.

In contrast, over 90 percent of U.S. exports to Colombia face tariffs averaging 12.5 percent, and less than 40 percent of U.S. exports to Panama enter duty free with industrial exports facing an average tariff of 7 percent and agricultural exports facing an average tariff of 15 percent.

So, these agreements will only serve to enhance U.S. competitiveness by leveling the playing field for our exporters and give them opportunities our trading partners already enjoy here in the United States.

And I know our manufacturers, farmers and service providers can compete and succeed against anyone.

Let me briefly discuss the key benefits of these agreements.

Upon enactment of the agreement with South Korea, approximately 95 percent of bilateral trade in industrial and consumer products will become duty-free within 5 years of the enactment of the agreement, including industrial and consumer electronic machinery, most chemicals, motorcycles and certain wood products. Most remaining tariffs will be eliminated within 10 years.

More than half of current U.S. agricultural exports to Korea will become duty free immediately, including wheat, feed corn, soybeans for crushing, hides and skins, cotton, almonds, pistachios, bourbon whiskey, wine, raisins, grape juice, orange juice, cherries, frozen French fries and pet food.

Approximately 80 percent of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial products to Colombia will be duty-free upon the enactment of the agreement. Most remaining tariffs will be removed after 10 years.

Both parties will grant certain farm products duty-free treatment immediately upon enactment of the agreement including high-quality beef, cotton, wheat, soybean meal, apples, pears, peaches, cherries and processed food products.

Colombia will phase out quotas and over-quota tariffs on standard beef, chicken leg quarters, dairy products, corn, sorghum, animal feeds, soybean oil and rice within the next three to 19 years.

Over 87 percent of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial products to Panama will become duty free upon enactment of the agreement, with the remaining tariffs phased out within 10 years.

Panama will provide immediate duty-free access for more than half of U.S. agricultural exports including high-quality beef, poultry products, soybeans, cotton, wheat, fruits and vegetables, corn oil and many processed foods.

I understand the concern some of my colleagues have about the effects free trade agreements may have on domestic jobs.

While I firmly believe that past free trade agreements have an overall posi-

tive impact on the economy and job growth, there is no doubt that some Americans have lost jobs due to increased trade.

That is why I remain a strong supporter of the Trade Adjustment Assistance, TAA, Program, which has helped these American workers transition to new opportunities in emerging job markets.

TAA has proven to be a wise investment by ensuring that workers who lose their jobs remain productive and tax-paying members of our society, free of government assistance.

I am pleased that we voted to renew this critical program before the vote on the three trade agreements.

Now, I would like to address specific concerns raised about the agreements with Colombia and Korea.

Critics have argued that, given Colombia's weak labor laws and violence against labor leaders and union organizers, it should not be rewarded with a free trade agreement.

First, under the terms of the free trade agreement, Colombia has agreed to: reaffirm its obligations as a member of the International Labor Organization, ILO, and adopt and maintain in its laws and practice core labor rights and ILO labor standards; refrain from waiving or otherwise weakening the laws that implement this obligation in a manner affecting trade or investment; effectively enforce labor laws related to the fundamental rights, plus acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health; and ensure that workers and employers will have fair, equitable and transparent access to labor tribunals or courts.

All labor obligations are subject to the agreement's dispute settlement procedures.

Colombia in April also agreed to an action plan related to labor rights to prevent violence against labor leaders, prosecute antilabor violence and protect internationally recognized worker rights.

Among other things, this plan requires Colombia to: create a specialized Labor Ministry to improve the enforcement of labor rights; criminalize actions or threats that could affect fundamental workers' rights including the right to organize; eliminate the backlog of requests from union members for protection; expand the scope of a protection program for union leaders to additional labor activists and union organizers; assign 95 police investigators to support the prosecution of crimes against union members; double the number of labor inspectors by hiring 480 inspectors over the next 4 years including 100 new inspectors in 2011; and seek the assistance of the International Labor Organization to implement and enforce these pledges.

Colombia has met the first two deadlines for implementation of the action plan and I look forward to the successful completion of the remaining commitments.

There was also great concern about the auto provisions in the original 2007 U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Currently, South Korea maintains an 8-percent tariff on U.S. autos. The United States maintains a 2.5-percent tariff on Korean autos and a 25-percent tariff on Korean trucks.

Under the 2007 agreement, South Korea and the United States agreed to eliminate their respective duties on priority passenger vehicles immediately, to phase out their duties on other cars over 3 years and to phase out their duties on trucks over 10 years. In addition, South Korea agreed to eliminate the discriminatory aspects of its special consumption and annual vehicle taxes; not impose any new engine displacement taxes and to maintain non-discriminatory application of its existing taxes; and address several other non-tariff barriers to ensure that they do not impede the market access of U.S. autos.

The U.S. auto industry and labor unions argued that the United States should not expand Korean access to the U.S. market until U.S. manufacturers are able to significantly increase their market share in South Korea and South Korea makes more concrete assurances that it will dismantle non-tariff barriers.

President Obama responded to their concerns and secured additional concessions from Korea that will expand U.S. access to the Korean auto market.

Under the terms of the December, 2010 agreement the U.S. will keep its 2.5-percent tariff on Korean imports until the 5th year following enactment of the agreement while Korea will immediately cut its tariff on U.S. autos in half—from 8 percent to 4 percent—and fully eliminate the tariff in the fifth year; and the U.S. will keep its 25-percent tariff on trucks until the 8th year and eliminate it by year 10 while Korea will keep its original commitment to eliminate its 10 percent tariff on U.S. trucks immediately.

The agreement also contains new provisions to eliminate nontariff barriers to U.S. auto exports to Korea and increase protection against surges of Korean auto imports in the U.S.

I applaud the administration for listening to the concerns of U.S. automakers.

These additional provisions strengthen the overall agreement and will provide new benefits for U.S. autos in an expanding foreign market and create more jobs. Due to President Obama's efforts, the United Auto Workers union and U.S. automakers now support the Korea agreement.

In these difficult economic times, our constituents are sending us a clear message: they want Congress to focus on jobs.

In this effort, we should leave no stone unturned.

Expanding access for U.S. exports to the growing markets of Korea, Colombia and Panama will help create new jobs and increase economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to support these agreements.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I support all three pending free trade agreements, FTAs. They will be good for our country and good for Virginia. They will create jobs by opening markets for high quality American products.

Trade with Korea was worth \$379 million to Virginia in 2010. Colombia was worth \$80 million and Panama was worth \$30 million. The Commonwealth stands to benefit from expanded opportunities for agriculture, chemicals, information technology, services, and other key sectors.

The success of FTAs for Virginia can be seen in the 13 other agreements entered into over the past decade. The 2004 U.S.-Singapore FTA enabled Singapore to become the fastest-growing market among the major buyers of Virginia's goods, rising from \$300 million to over \$1 billion last year, mainly in computers and electronics.

All told, Virginia did \$17.1 billion in exports last year, including \$14 billion in manufactured goods, \$1.2 billion in agriculture, and a host of other products.

Nonetheless, it is very important to me that we do more as a country to make sure the benefits of trade agreements and international commerce are more evenly distributed across this country.

In the past, some States have done really well under trade deals. Others have not. Most of Virginia has been lucky to be on the winning end of trade. But there are areas, like southside Virginia, that have not seen the same benefits from earlier trade deals.

That is why I am a strong advocate for onshoring initiatives and greater economic engagement between foreign-owned companies and rural America. I have joined my Virginia colleague, Representative FRANK WOLF, in sponsoring bipartisan legislation called America recruits, which would support new inbound investment into the United States.

The United States is one of the few countries without a national policy of supporting the recruitment of new companies. As a former Governor, I can tell you that this hamstring the States when they compete head-to-head with foreign countries that can match or exceed support for individual State recruitment efforts.

Looking forward, I hope the President and the Administration will be ambitious in working to complete the nine-country Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, as soon as possible.

I commend our Trade Representative for the ongoing work on TPP. It is an innovative new type of trade deal, which aims for a high-standard, broad-based regional free trade agreement with Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam.

It is critically important that we not lose sight of the fact that many of our competitors, ranging from Canada and

the European Union to China, India, and Brazil are signing market access agreements and trade deals as quickly as possible. They understand the value of securing favorable terms for their goods and services in an increasingly globalized world. We cannot sit back and do nothing when 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States.

Therefore, while new trade agreements and efforts to remove market barriers are crucial, I conclude by urging Congress to reauthorize Trade Promotion Authority, TPA, which expired 4 years ago.

TPA is often just referred to as "fast track" authority to pass trade agreements. But it is much more than that. TPA sets the direction of U.S. trade policy and guides the work of our trade negotiators.

We need to have clear national objectives for trade and economic engagement. We need a greater focus on development and maintenance of global supply chains. We need strategies to address intellectual property issues and emerging concerns about the effects of state-owned enterprises as we focus on expanding market opportunities for U.S. goods and services.

Trade is a key aspect of U.S. competitiveness. It is difficult to get completely right, but it is important to acknowledge our progress. The U.S. House of Representatives has just passed the three free trade agreements this evening. I hope the Senate will do the same in the next few hours so that we can continue to work together in support of an international economic agenda that benefits the United States to the greatest extent possible.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to welcome the imminent arrival of free trade agreements that are long-overdue in this Chamber. Our Nation grew to be the leader of the free world through trade and commerce, and we must not lose sight of the fact that safeguarding our access to world markets is essential to maintaining our economic preeminence.

These free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama which I look forward to supporting this evening, represent real measures that will produce jobs and provide better opportunities for our manufacturers to sell their goods abroad. Given our faltering economy and the continuing high rate of unemployment, it is significant that today we can vote to implement policy that will put Americans to work and let our businesses compete on a level playing field with foreign competitors. Gaining access to hundreds of millions of consumers across the globe will have a monumental effect on our local economies.

For years, most goods from Colombia and Panama have entered the U.S. duty-free, and it is about time that the President submitted these agreements to Congress so that American businesses can enjoy equal treatment. Despite having successfully negotiated

treaties on his desk, the President stood by as other countries signed free trade pacts with these nations, forcing American exporters to watch as international competitors benefited. As the global economy continues to evolve, the submission of these agreements for congressional consideration is an important step to spur further trade and contribute to the growth of our economy at a time when it is so badly needed.

During these challenging economic times, American businesses should not have to face trade barriers, such as high tariffs, which put them at a competitive disadvantage. Since 1997, New Hampshire's exports to Colombia have increased by nearly 1,300 percent, nearly 200 percent to Panama, and by 324 percent to South Korea. However, U.S. exporters pay billions of dollars a year through tariffs on industrial goods. After these free trade agreements go into effect, 95 percent of those tariffs will be eliminated, meaning that American businesses will benefit by expanding payroll and consumers will benefit by lowered costs for goods and services.

With the highest growth rate in the Northeast and the fourth highest growth rate in the country, New Hampshire in particular stands to benefit from these agreements. New Hampshire exported \$4.4 billion worth of merchandise in 2010, a major component of our State's approximately \$60 billion total GDP. We have 15,000 New Hampshire jobs supported by exports, which represents a quarter of our manufacturing sector. The improved access to foreign markets brought about by these agreements will allow our industries to continue to grow and contribute to the economic environment that has made New Hampshire an attractive place for entrepreneurs to come to build their businesses.

We need these free trade agreements because we need to commit to economic policies that will create jobs and grow our economy.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the three pending agreements that the Senate will be considering later today.

But before I address these agreements, I first want to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

Three weeks ago I joined a bipartisan group of colleagues in passing an expansion of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program to support workers in Minnesota and across this Nation who have lost their jobs or seen their hours reduced as a result of global exchange.

I made clear then that I believed it was essential that we act on trade adjustment assistance before turning to the pending agreements and—with the House passing this legislation today—that is exactly what we have done.

As chair of the Senate subcommittee on export promotion, I have long been

a proponent of increasing U.S. exports and helping U.S. producers reach new markets overseas.

Ninety-five percent of the world's customers live outside our borders. So it is without exaggeration that I say our future prosperity hinges on our ability to reach those customers.

As we continue to work to move our country out of this current economic downturn, we must take every available step we can to increase the competitive edge of American producers, farmers, and workers in the global economy.

I will therefore be voting for both the South Korea and Panama agreements. While these agreements are not perfect, after hearing from Minnesota farmers and businesses, I believe they can help open new overseas markets for Minnesota producers and increase U.S. exports.

The South Korea agreement is projected to increase U.S. exports to South Korea by an estimated \$10 billion and increase U.S. GDP by \$11 billion.

The agreement will have key benefits for my home State of Minnesota. Of Minnesota's top 10 exports to South Korea—such as machinery and electronics, medical equipment, and animal feed and meats—9 are expected to gain under the agreement.

Many of those gains are expected to be in our State's agriculture industry, where South Korea is the fifth largest trading partner for Minnesota farmers. This agreement will reduce tariffs on dairy, corn, soybeans, pork, and other food products, allowing our Minnesota producers increased access to Korean markets.

The Korea agreement will also eliminate tariffs on processed food, helping to increase exports and promote job growth for Minnesota's processed food producers like General Mills, Schwan's, and Hormel.

The Korea agreement will also benefit the workers in our state's strong medical device industry. South Korea is currently the fifth largest market for U.S. medical equipment exports.

Under the pending agreement, South Korea will immediately eliminate tariffs on 43 percent of medical equipment exports and eliminate tariffs on 90 Percent of the remaining medical equipment products in 3 years.

Finally, I support the Korea agreement because it includes unprecedented provisions to defend intellectual property rights, promote transparency in Korea's trading and regulatory systems, and ensure full and equitable protection and security for American investors in Korea.

Unfortunately, too many foreign nations engage in illegal trade practices, and too often they get away with it.

I have long said that in order to ensure a level playing field for U.S. businesses and workers in an increasingly competitive global environment, we need enforceable standards in our agreements and we need to hold other

nations accountable to those standards.

Over the years, I have consistently fought to expose these illegal behaviors and worked hard to support several Minnesota industries such as our coated paper producers, steel producers, honey producers, and alternative energy producers. And just this week the Senate came together on a bipartisan basis to crack down on China's currency manipulation that is undermining our businesses and workers.

As we move forward, I will continue to do everything I can to ensure that the standards included in the Korea agreement—and all other agreements—are strongly and fairly enforced.

I would also like to briefly discuss the Panama Free Trade Agreement.

Like the Korea agreement, I believe the Panama agreement will promote U.S. exports and strengthen market access for Minnesotan and U.S. companies.

The United States already runs a trade surplus with Panama. Through the immediate elimination of tariffs on 88 percent of U.S. exports to Panama, and the elimination of remaining tariffs within 10 years, that surplus will only increase.

The Panama agreement presents new opportunities for Minnesota manufacturers and their workers and, like the Korea agreement, also promotes greater transparency and enforcement in Panama.

Finally I will oppose the Colombia agreement which does not do enough to address the country's endemic corruption and violence directed toward labor.

Increasing U.S. exports will bring many opportunities to our businesses and workers, and implementation of the Korea and Panama Free Trade Agreements, as well as the Trade Adjustment Assistant Program, will help our Nation stay competitive in the global economy.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the trade agreements pending before the Senate.

I first want to note how pleased I am that a full extension of trade adjustment assistance will be sent to President Obama for his signature. This important program provides much-needed job training, health care, and income support to workers whose jobs are affected by trade.

As we seek to grow our economy and increase exports we must take steps to train American workers and provide them with continued job opportunities.

I am supporting the free trade agreement with South Korea because of its impact on California's economy. This agreement is not perfect, but on balance I believe it will benefit California.

South Korea is California's 5th largest trading partner. California companies export more than \$7 billion in goods there every year. This agreement will reduce tariffs and other trade barriers for California businesses that export goods to South Korea, resulting in

greater productivity in my State. In addition, the South Korean economy is advanced, with per capita GDP equal to \$30,000 year and a well-developed middle class, which will provide a substantial market for all types of U.S. exports.

The South Korea Free Trade Agreement also includes strong intellectual property rights that protect U.S. patents and trademarks and copyrights for films and other recorded works. These provisions are very important for California's entertainment sector. The agreement also reduces tariffs on U.S.-made machinery and high-tech products, increasing export potential for California industries.

The agreement also includes carefully negotiated rules for automobiles, to protect our auto industry from unfair treatment. I am pleased that the United Auto Workers were able to support the final version.

The free trade agreement opens the Korean market to the large number of agricultural products we produce in California. In February 2011, I wrote to the administration to urge better market access for two important California products: rice and fresh oranges. While I am disappointed that California rice is not part of the FTA, I was pleased that the Obama administration will continue working to expand market access for California rice and for California citrus. As the agreement is implemented I will continue to press for fair treatment for all California agricultural commodities.

I am also supporting this agreement because South Korea is a close friend and strategically-important ally for the United States in East Asia. Strengthening our trade relationship will bring economic and national security benefits to both nations, and will help to ensure that the U.S.-Korea relationship remains strong in the future.

The South Korea FTA is supported by the California Chamber of Commerce, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, the Motion Picture Association of America, the California Association of Port Authorities, the California Manufacturing and Technology Association, the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, the California Farm Bureau Federation, the Wine Institute, the Coachella Valley Economic Partnership, the California Table Grape Commission, the California Walnut Commission, the California Strawberry Commission, the California Fig Advisory Board, the California Dried Plum Board, and the Western Growers Association, among many other groups.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Relations subcommittee responsible for human rights, I cannot support a free trade agreement with Colombia. In short, Colombia's human rights record is appalling.

More than 2,800 union members have been murdered in Colombia in the last 25 years, including 51 last year, and many more so far in 2011. The conviction rate for union murders and other

violence is shockingly low, and the Colombian government continues to support policies that deny workers the right to join unions and bargain collectively.

I am pleased that under a labor rights action plan negotiated between the Obama administration and the Colombia government that steps are being taken to provide more protection for union members and to investigate crimes, but I have major concerns that these reforms do not go far enough to provide real changes for workers in Colombia.

This summer trade unionists from Colombia came to the United States to discuss the environment for working people in their country. Their stories are chilling.

A Colombian port worker described how he is one of the few union members at the ports because so many trade unionists have been fired for joining unions. He talked about how the unsafe working conditions have caused dozens of deaths at ports, how those who are injured on the job receive no compensation from their employer, and how older workers are routinely fired.

A math and science teacher discussed how teachers who participate in organizing efforts have their salaries withheld, and that the threat of violence against teachers with union ties forces many to flee their homes and their jobs to protect their families.

Human Rights Watch recently released a report that concluded that Colombia has made “virtually no progress” in securing convictions for killings that have occurred in the last 4 years. Until Colombia’s labor and human rights record shows significant long-term improvement, I cannot support a Free Trade Agreement, especially when U.S. producers stand to gain little from market access.

When the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, was approved, we were told that the U.S. would run a trade surplus with Mexico and gain hundreds of thousands of jobs. But instead, our trade deficit with Mexico increased to almost \$100 billion, displacing an estimated 682,900 U.S. jobs.

The economic situation in Mexico when NAFTA was passed is similar to the current climate in Colombia—a very low per capita GDP and a large percentage of the population living in poverty. A free trade agreement with Colombia under these conditions will result in the displacement of U.S. manufacturing jobs and few consumers for U.S. exports, just like what happened with Mexico after implementation of NAFTA.

I also oppose the free trade agreement with Panama.

For many years, Panama has failed to implement international tax standards. It has been a haven for those who seek to avoid their tax obligations. More than 400,000 multinational corporations register businesses in Panama, a nation with a population of 3.4

million people. That is one corporation for every seven persons. Although the recent Tax Information Exchange Agreements entered into by Panama are a step in the right direction, I will continue to have significant concerns about Panama’s tax policies until they have fully implemented an accountable system.

I hope that Panama will eventually develop a well-functioning tax system and cooperate with the international community, but I cannot support a Free Trade Agreement until a higher standard is reached.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, since World War II the United States has traded away American jobs in the name of foreign policy by entering into bilateral and multilateral trade agreements.

With a 9.1 percent national unemployment rate, 14 million Americans looking for work, and 10.6 percent unemployment in Rhode Island, there are no more jobs to give. As such, I cannot support these trade agreements with Korea, Colombia, and Panama that the Senate is considering today.

I am not convinced these trade deals will result in net job growth for the United States. The International Trade Commission’s analysis of the agreements finds negligible changes to aggregate employment and output. Analysis from The Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Korea FTA would lead to a loss of 159,000 jobs—much of this in the manufacturing sector. It must be stressed that, according to these analyses, any potential job gains associated with increases in American exports will be offset by job losses resulting from increased imports to the United States.

Moreover, as a recent economic study has shown, my State is one of the most susceptible to labor-intensive imports. And as the International Trade Commission’s sector analysis of these free trade agreements found, industries that are based in Rhode Island align with those foreign industries that will have the most access to U.S. markets. I am very concerned that Rhode Island businesses will feel the brunt of this import pressure while realizing little of the potential gains from exports.

It is likely that U.S. job losses associated with the Korea FTA will be disproportionately felt in Rhode Island, particularly in the textile sector. The nature of the agreement and the change in tariff schedules pick clear winners and losers. U.S. agriculture and passenger vehicles will be winners, while manufacturing industries central to my State like textiles will be losers. I have heard from Rhode Island businesses opposed to the Korea agreement for this very reason.

I, also, have serious reservations about the Colombian and Panama agreements. These agreements will have a relatively small impact on the U.S. economy, but present basic questions of accountability. Colombia has one of the highest rates of anti-union

violence in the world. Panama has its own duty free zone and there are concerns about whether there are enough resources being dedicated to deter illegal transshipment of goods, which could lead to other nations taking advantage of our trade agreement with Panama by skirting customs and violating “rules of origin” requirements. Additionally, despite Panama’s recent tax information exchange agreement, questions remain about the degree to which transparency and bank secrecy laws will continue to be obstacles to enforcing U.S. tax law.

Both Colombia and Panama have made efforts to correct these issues. However, the results of these efforts are not clear and more work remains to be done to ensure that accountability is built into the system.

I do want to stress that my opposition to these agreements is not meant to undercut the good work of our partners and allies in Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Korea is one of our most vital partners in Asia and a democracy that shares our values. Colombia is an important Latin American ally that has made enormous progress in strengthening the rule of law and combating extremist organizations and drug traffickers. And the United States has a singular relationship with Panama that has progressively strengthened over time.

However, at this time, I think we should stop and pause and think about our domestic needs and how to get our economy back on track. The United States needs to enter into trade agreements that will unequivocally benefit Americans workers—these trade deals do not. So, I will vote against the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and continue working to find a better way to promote bilateral trade that will lead to job growth here at home.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, our country continues to struggle with the aftereffects of the housing bubble and the economic mistakes of the previous decade. There has been a great human cost to this economic slump—families forced out of their homes, shameful increases in child poverty, and a shrinking middle class.

President Obama has offered a number of steps to help heal our economy and put people back to work. One such plan includes a doubling of U.S. exports within five years. Exports are good for America and good for American jobs. They strengthen our manufacturing and agriculture sectors and in turn create good paying jobs. Quite simply, to help create more jobs here at home, we need to be able to access new markets and eliminate trade barriers for U.S. exporters.

At the same time, we must ensure that we engage not just in free trade, but fair trade—trade that upholds our values on labor, human rights, and environmental protections, fair treatment of U.S. products, and supports transparent markets.

That is why in my time in Congress I have always considered each potential trade agreement on a case by case basis.

This year, it was clear to me that we could not approve further free trade agreements if the trade adjustment assistance programs were not extended. We can't expand free trade without helping workers who may be displaced because of trade agreements. I strongly support and voted to extend the benefits under trade adjustment assistance. Since 2009, TAA has provided assistance to 447,235 workers—119,772 in Illinois—displaced due to trade agreements. It has provided training for workers as they transition to a new career, help with income, and health care tax credits to ease the transition.

Overall I believe in trade. I believe trade creates jobs. Illinois is the country's sixth largest exporter. Exports grew 19.6 percent from 2009 and totaled over \$50 billion in 2010 and supported 540,000 jobs. In 2008 alone, nearly 17,000 companies exported goods from Illinois locations. Iconic Illinois companies like Caterpillar, John Deere, and Boeing rely on trade to grow their business and support workers in Illinois and across the country. Other industries, including Illinois agriculture, have used trade to expand markets and feed more and more of the world. Motorola, ADM, Illinois Tool Works, Navistar, Abbott, Fortune brands and many others rely on trade to help grow business here at home.

I also believe trade keeps America engaged in the world. It gives us economic and diplomatic leverage around the world. Too often in recent years we have sat on the sidelines while countries with emerging markets sign bilateral trade agreements with our competitors in the EU and elsewhere—too often at America's loss.

Last year, U.S. exports supported 9.2 million good paying American jobs. Every \$1 billion in new exports supports 6,000 additional jobs here at home. The free trade agreements now being considered by Congress similarly offer the potential to open new markets for agricultural, consumer and industrial exporters.

The South Korea Free Trade Agreement alone is estimated to support 70,000 additional jobs by opening up Korea's \$560 billion market to U.S. companies. South Korea is Illinois' 16th largest export market. We exported \$788 million in goods and services in 2010. Illinois Pork Producers will gain improved access to a market that is constantly growing. With this trade agreement, 66 percent of tariffs on agricultural products will be eliminated immediately, allowing us to better compete with imports from Europe. Chemical manufacturers accounted for an average of \$97 million per year of Illinois' merchandise exports to Korea between 2008 and 2010. This deal will mean that 50 percent of U.S. chemicals exports by value will receive duty-free treatment, immediately creating op-

portunities for Illinois exporters. And many of those exports were moved through the Port of Chicago, which supports and strengthens our transportation infrastructure.

Profile Products is a company based in Buffalo Grove, IL, with offices and plants in five other States. This company makes products that help establish turf and accessories to control erosion on sports fields, golf courses, and landscaping. It has been exporting to South Korea for over 15 years. The company faces tariffs up to 14 percent. Passage of the South Korea FTA would eliminate tariffs on the company's exports to South Korea, allowing the company to grow and to hire more American employees.

The Panama Free Trade Agreement also provides opportunities for several Illinois companies and industries. As Panama continues with the \$5.25 billion expansion of the Panama Canal, Illinois companies like John Deere and Caterpillar will see almost all tariffs eliminated for equipment and infrastructure machinery with this trade deal. Ninety-two percent of large mining trucks shipped from Caterpillar's Decatur, IL, location are exported. Eighty-two percent of Large Track Type Tractors shipped from the East Peoria, IL, plant are exported. With the elimination of tariffs on exports into Panama, Caterpillar's American jobs are more secure.

Passing these two free trade agreements with growing free market democracies is an important step in meeting the President's goal of doubling exports in five years, creating more American jobs, and staying engaged in the global community.

On the third proposed agreement—the one with Colombia—I have wrestled with whether this is the time to support such a step. Colombia is a strong American ally in an often turbulent region. It will remain our strong friend and partner.

Last year, as chairman of the Senate Human Rights and the Law Subcommittee, I held a hearing that examined the human rights situation in Colombia.

Colombia has made progress on protecting human rights, activists and indigenous populations and providing reparations and returning land to those who have been displaced during the decade long civil war. Colombia has worked with the U.S. to develop and implement the "Action Plan Related to Labor Rights" in an attempt to address issues that have allowed more than 2800 union members to be murdered since 1986.

But the action plan is not included in this trade agreement and, given the history of violence and human rights abuses, I worry that its omission leaves us without an enforcement capability to ensure it is followed to completion.

While Colombia's steps to mitigate human rights abuses should be noted, the trend remains troubling. In 2010, 51 unionists were murdered and many

cases have not been brought to justice. Too often perpetrators of violence do so with impunity. So far this year, 22 unionists have been killed in Colombia—10 since the action plan on labor rights was agreed to. Too often workers who try to unionize are fired and blacklisted. Some continue to receive death threats.

There are other examples, including the baseless prosecutions of human rights defenders, and the "false positives" cases, where innocent civilians were executed by the military and passed off as rebel fighters killed in combat.

Simply put, these problems remain unacceptable. More needs to be done. The Colombian government needs to utilize every available resource to ensure that unionists, indigenous populations, and their allies are protected. Colombia also needs to ensure that victims are treated fairly, human rights violators are brought to justice, and that laws are enforced.

I support trade with Colombia and hope such an agreement is in our near future, but I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that my vote for this Colombia Free Trade Agreement would indicate my approval that enough has been done to stem human rights abuses in Colombia. It hasn't.

Mr. President, seeing no one seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN SANCTIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I know we will soon be voting on these trade agreements, but I have an issue that I think has immediacy in nature and needs to be brought up now. It is something I have been pursuing for some time.

We have heard FBI evidence of an alleged plot by Iran and its elite Quds Force to assassinate a foreign diplomat on U.S. soil—an extraordinary act of international terrorism that demands, at a minimum, immediate enactment of the most robust sanctions against Iran possible. Were it not for the vigilance of the American intelligence community, the FBI, and all our law enforcement and intelligence agencies working together, this plot could have not only taken the life of Saudi Arabia's Ambassador to the United States but potentially hundreds of innocent Americans here in Washington.

Think of the Machiavellianism of taking out the Saudi Ambassador at a downtown Washington restaurant and what that would mean in terms of lives lost and the inevitable response it would provoke from the Saudis and from the United States.

In the coming weeks, we will hear the exact details of this incredible plot

and the extent of the involvement of members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. We know the Revolutionary Guard in Iran is at the highest levels of the Iranian Government. That is why I specifically targeted the Revolutionary Guard in the Iran sanctions legislation that is now law. The new legislation I call on my colleagues to support and which now has 76 bipartisan cosponsors will consolidate our original sanctions law.

Iran's actions demand that we move this legislation in the Congress as we simultaneously go to the United Nations, to the international community, and bring to bear whatever pressure we can to convince the Chinese and the Russians to agree to tighter sanctions against Iran.

The fact is—clearly—we must do all we can to end Iran's exportation of terrorism, which has already taken lives around the globe from Lebanon to Argentina, is responsible for attacks on coalition forces in Iraq, our own soldiers in Iraq, and now threatens innocent Americans in our Nation's Capital. I, for one, am not shocked at the revelations we have heard in the last 24 hours. I have known what this regime is capable of, what it intends, and what it will do to achieve its goals. The time has come for this Congress to take the first step in responding to this egregious plot to conduct an assassination in a downtown Washington restaurant.

Since I took Federal office in 1993, then in the House of Representatives, I have raised, for some time, this issue of Iran and its ambitions. I have vociferously and passionately advocated my concern on behalf of the Jewish people in the State of Israel to protect them from the threat of a radical Iranian regime. Now that threat has been directed here, toward American soil, where even American citizens could have died in a plot that defies the imagination in its brashness, boldness, and irrationality.

What specifically do we do? Our first act must be to immediately respond with tougher sanctions that isolate Iran politically and economically—sanctions that will freeze the assets of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps members and allies and shut down the IRGC's sources of revenue, expedite the imposition of sanctions, force companies to decide whether they want to do business with the United States or Iran, and ensure that the United States is an Iranian oil-free zone by banning imports of refined petroleum made with Iranian crude.

To that end, along with Senators LIEBERMAN, KYL, GILLIBRAND, CASEY, KIRK, and COLLINS, we have introduced in the Senate the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Sanctions Consolidation Act of 2011. It is a bill which recognizes that if Iran's principal goal is to acquire weapons of mass destruction and apparently conduct brazen attacks on American soil against international officials, then it must be the policy of the United States to prevent the Is-

lamic Republic of Iran from acquiring the capability to threaten its neighbors and to threaten nations around the world.

The time has come to take that first step and move this legislation.

This legislation closes the remaining loopholes in our sanctions policy. In essence, it is perfecting the sanctions policy we helped pass in the Senate. It insists on a comprehensive diplomatic initiative within the United Nations to qualitatively expand the U.N. Security Council sanctions regime against Iran so Iran cannot find a financial safe harbor or a willing partner anywhere in the world. It imposes immigration restrictions on senior officials from Iran, North Korea and Syria and their associates who seek to enter our country, and it complements those sanctions by reaching out to the Iranian people—facilitating democracy assistance and developing a comprehensive strategy to promote Internet freedom and access to information inside Iran. These sanctions will help deter the threat Iran poses to U.S. national security because of its suspected nuclear weapons program and will have an impact on Iran's ability, through the Revolutionary Guard and its intelligence arm, to carry out another plot such as the one we have uncovered.

What have we learned in the last 24 hours? We have learned that the Iranian regime is a growing threat not only to its neighbors, not only to the region, but to the world, and potentially to our own homeland. We have learned it is in the interest of the world to apply maximum pressure to the Iranian regime. We have learned we must tighten the screws on the Iranian regime to genuinely advance the cause of stability and peace in the Middle East and, clearly, around the world.

These sanctions are an essential means to that end. We need the ban on trade with Iran to be strong, significant and, as humanly possible, airtight—a ban that does not have Americans subsidizing the very regime that seeks to harm us by purchasing gasoline and diesel that are made of Iranian crude.

Iran's actions have made it a rogue nation that must be dealt with in the strongest terms. We cannot wait for another plot such as this to be uncovered. We cannot take the chance that the next one will not be uncovered. Passing the new sanctions I have proposed with, as I said, 76 of our colleagues here is a start, and we cannot, as a nation, falter. The time to act is now.

I applaud the White House for its quick action this week in imposing new sanctions against the people responsible for the planned attack on the Saudi Ambassador and other targets in Washington. I appreciate the administration's effort to implement and multilateralize sanctions on Iran. This administration has done more to isolate Iran than any prior administration, Republican or Democratic, in-

cluding their quick response this week designating individuals involved in the plot as well as today's sanction of Iran's Mahan Air.

The news this week, however, has confirmed our worst fears that Iran will not hesitate to advance its interests regardless of the political cost. Iran, given its history of exporting terrorism against coalition forces in Iraq, in places such as Argentina, in Lebanon—and its continued drive to advance its nuclear weapons program, despite being slowed by U.S. and international sanctions—clearly, with the alleged plot uncovered this week, remains undeterred.

It is time to take the next steps—to isolate Iran politically and financially. We must enact sanctions now, to exert the unyielding pressure of the U.S. Government against the Iranian regime, and bring to bear the condemnation of the international community so that the regime fully understands the world will not tolerate such actions if carried out.

These sanctions will prevent us from having to face that situation in the future. They are in our national security interest. They are in the interest of Iran's neighbors, in the interest of the region, and they are in the interest of the security of every nation that wishes to be secure in its borders, safe from the terrorist acts of a rogue state. That is what is at stake. That is why I look forward to a hearing we will be having tomorrow in the Banking Committee on the effect of the sanctions legislation we already have. I believe that hearing will deduce testimony that clearly shows that because of the sanctions legislation we already passed in the Congress, signed by the President that, in fact, we have made a significant dent in Iran's commercial activities. But it has not ceased or desisted from its march to nuclear weaponry. And, obviously, by this latest plot, it has not ceased or desisted from its willingness, even on U.S. soil, to carry out such an assassination. Therefore, the time to act is now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. MANCHIN are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the three free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea that will be before us shortly here in the Senate. Few States need these agreements more than the State of Illinois.

This week, I released a report on the State of Illinois's debt. We now have the worst credit rating in America. Our State has fallen to 47th for a healthy business climate, with only half of the State's pension and health care promises actually funded.

Instead of continuing our State's debt spiral, these agreements will help the bottom line of Illinois exporting employers who hopefully will create thousands of new jobs without adding to the borrowing of our State or any new taxes.

Since 1997, Illinois exports to Colombia have increased by 164 percent, and exports to Panama have increased by 196 percent. Collectively, the three nations represented more than \$1 billion worth of Illinois export sales in 2010.

We will see the benefits of these agreements across a wide spectrum of jobs—from high-tech companies to manufacturers to farmers.

Illinois-based Caterpillar, in Peoria, which in 2010 exported \$13 billion worth of products to other countries, will see tariffs reduced by hundreds of thousands of dollars on goods through these free-trade agreements. The Panama Canal expansion project alone represents a \$300 million opportunity for Caterpillar. The trade deals are particularly important for Illinois-based Navistar, which has one of the best named truck brands in Colombia and Panama.

Illinois agriculture also reaps a windfall from the pending free-trade agreements. Trade deals are expected to create about \$2.5 billion in new agricultural exports and over 22,000 jobs nationwide. Expanding export markets for Illinois farmers and the increased demand for agricultural products and equipment manufactured in Illinois will allow employers such as ADM in Decatur, John Deere in Moline, and, as I mentioned, Caterpillar in Peoria to reinvest in their companies and to hire more citizens of our State. Illinois farmers and ranchers are expected to see about \$90 million in increased direct exports as a result of the Senate's approval of these trade deals.

These deals represent the direction the Senate should take overall on job creation—no tax increase, no borrowing, but opening new markets for American-made products.

I think next the Congress should build on this bipartisan job-creating vote and move to reduce regulatory burdens on small businesses and reform the Tax Code so U.S. businesses can better compete globally.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, over the past several weeks, the Senate has focused closely on international trade. We have debated trade adjustment assistance, a bill to penalize China's currency policies, and our pending free-trade agreements. These have been robust debates. It is an appropriate capstone that we will soon be approving our trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea.

The reality is, these agreements should have passed long ago. Although completed over 4 years ago, they were first blocked in the 111th Congress by a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. They were then delayed by our own President, who devised excuse after excuse for not acting to implement them.

This spring, after the excuses related to the agreements themselves were addressed by our trading partners, the President made a new demand. This time it was trade adjustment assistance spending. The President made it clear that if this domestic spending program was not expanded and approved, he would abandon our allies in Colombia, Panama, and South Korea and cede these growing markets to our foreign competitors.

It took Congress months to untie this substantive and procedural Gordian knot that President Obama and his administration created.

Throughout this long period of delay, U.S. workers and exporters were denied the benefits of these agreements. At the same time, these allies began to doubt the commitment of the United States to our friendship, as well as our ability to deliver on our promises.

I am concerned that going forward the President will put even more new conditions on his support for trade and trade agreements. I certainly hope not. As a nation, we cannot afford to hold our international economic competitiveness hostage to unrelated demands for more spending or to a liberal social agenda. If our economy is going to grow and our workers prosper, then we need to do better.

Trade is good for the United States. Today, the United States is the world's largest economy. Contrary to the views of many Americans, the United States exports more in goods and services than any other country. It is imperative that the United States continues to open foreign markets. After all, 95 percent of the world's population lives outside of the United States. Economists estimate that almost 83 percent of growth over the next 5 years will take place outside of the United States. Simply put, most of our future customers are located in foreign countries.

U.S. exporters face foreign barriers that limit our ability to sell U.S. goods and services in foreign markets. Often, tariffs on our exports tend to be much higher than our own tariffs. U.S. trade agreements level the playing field. They reduce or eliminate tariffs and other barriers to U.S. exports.

The math is pretty simple. Lower tariffs and fewer barriers mean more exports, and more exports mean more jobs. But we cannot reduce these tariffs or eliminate barriers without the right tools. In my mind, renewing trade negotiating authority is the key to our future success. I was, frankly, dismayed when our colleagues across the aisle, just a few weeks ago, rejected an amendment to provide their own President with the authority to negotiate new trade agreements. We call that trade promotion authority. We all know the authority to negotiate trade agreements expired years ago. Since then the United States has been sitting on the sidelines while other nations negotiate agreements all around the world.

There is no doubt about it, even with the approval of these three free-trade agreements, the United States is already far behind. It is my understanding that there are 209 free-trade agreements around the world. The United States is a party to just 12 such agreements, with 17 countries. We should be expanding the number of our free-trade agreements and the number of our free-trade partner countries.

Everyone knows if you are not in the game, you cannot win. Right now, the United States is not in the game. While it is true the President is in the process of negotiating an agreement to create a Trans-Pacific Partnership, we all know the chances of it actually succeeding are almost nonexistent without trade negotiating authority.

Let's keep in mind that trade negotiating authority has been the norm rather than the exception for much of this past century. Congress first authorized reciprocal negotiating authority in 1934 to help pull the U.S. economy out of the Great Depression. That authority was renewed 11 times between 1934 and 1962. In 1974, the Congress first authorized the President to negotiate tariff and nontariff barriers and bring them back for congressional consideration on an expedited basis, without amendments. Every President since 1974 has sought that authority from Congress.

President Ford argued that the legislation "enables the United States to play a leading role in . . . multilateral negotiations."

President Carter said the legislation "solidifies America's position in the international community."

President Ronald Reagan extolled the virtues of TPA, noting that when properly used, it "manifestly serves our national economic interests."

President George H.W. Bush noted that extension of TPA was "in the vital national interest of the United States and absolutely fundamental to our major foreign policy objectives."

President Clinton argued strenuously for TPA, making the case that "the legislation will give us the authority to increase access to foreign markets . . . if we don't seize these opportunities, our competitors surely will. An 'America last' strategy is unacceptable."

President George W. Bush successfully made the case that TPA was critical to opening markets around the world. Once he achieved its renewal, he made opening foreign markets a key priority of his administration. To give credit where it is due, if it wasn't for President Bush's leadership in seeking TPA and negotiating agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, we would not have any agreements to consider today.

Unfortunately, President Obama, while touting the importance of exports, has been virtually silent on the need for TPA. Instead of leading on TPA, this President has consistently ducked the issue, avoided the debate, and let America continue to fall further behind.

This America-last—or, as some put it, leading-from-behind—strategy is unacceptable. We need a strong vision of leadership in the global economy. We can start by approving these three free-trade agreements. The fact is, tariffs on our exports to Colombia, Panama, and South Korea are much too high. These agreements will eliminate these tariffs. But the benefits of each agreement go far beyond tariff elimination. The agreements also guarantee fair access for U.S. service providers, reduce unfair barriers to our agricultural exports, provide high levels of protection for our intellectual property rights, and ensure high levels of investment protection. In short, each of these agreements helps U.S. workers compete and win in these growing markets.

Make no mistake, if we don't take advantage of these new markets, other countries will, and it is the U.S. worker who will lose. We cannot afford to allow nations to race ahead while our workers stay behind.

I urge my colleagues to join with Senator BAUCUS and me in supporting each one of these trade agreements. Their approval can be the first good step toward reigniting a vigorous international trade agenda that puts America first and enables the United States to once again lead the world in opening markets and expanding economic growth.

In that regard, I pay tribute to my colleague on the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS. He has done a great job in working on this issue. He has been a wonderful partner to me and a wonderful leader on our committee. When it comes to trade, he certainly deserves a lot of credit for helping to push this through. I am grateful to be able to work with a quality person like him.

I also would like to acknowledge a few of the many people who made these agreements happen. First, I would like to thank the talented members of the Bush administration who were instrumental in negotiating these agreements. Of course, first there is our colleague, Senator ROB PORTMAN, U.S. Trade Representative for President George W. Bush; Ambassador Susan C.

Schwab, U.S. Trade Representative; Warren Maruyama, General Counsel; Ambassador John Veroneau, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative; Rob Lehman and Tim Keeler, Chiefs of Staff to the U.S. Trade Representative; Karan Bhatia, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative; Justin McCarthy, Special Assistant to President Bush for Legislative Affairs; and Andy Olson, Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Legislative Affairs. I would also like to recognize the hard work and commitment of USTR's professional staff, especially Wendy Cutler, Bennett Harman, Michelle Carrillo, Maria Pagan, and Leigh Bacon—without their efforts we would not have achieved conclusion of these historic agreements.

Next, I would like to thank my staff—they have been relentless in pressuring the administration to send these long-completed FTAs to Congress so we can pass them in order to create American jobs and grow the American economy. This is a huge success and I am happy to share it with them. In particular, I would like to thank the Staff Director of my Finance Committee staff, Chris Campbell; my Chief International Trade Counsel, Everett Eissenstat, both for serving as a chief negotiator for the Colombia and Panama agreements while at USTR and for his efforts in implementing the agreements here on Capitol Hill; International Trade Counsels Paul DeLaney, Greg Kalbaugh, David Johanson, Maureen McLaughlin, and Ryika Hooshangi; Staff Assistant Rebecca Nasca; and Legislative Counsel Polly Craighill. I would like to also thank prior Finance Committee trade staff including former Chief Counsel Stephen Schaefer, International Trade Counsel David Ross, and Claudia Poteet. The multi-year effort to pass these FTAs succeeded because of their hard work, expertise, and tenacious pursuit of the public interest.

Senator BAUCUS had a good staff helping him as well. I would like to thank them for their hard work and long nights that went into making this happen. I would like to thank Russ Sullivan, majority Staff Director of the Finance Committee; Chief Trade Counsel Amber Cottle; International Trade Counsels Ayesha Khanna, Michael Smart, and Gabriel Adler; and professional staff member Chelsea Thomas. Their work is to be commended.

We can all be proud of these accomplishments and I look forward to the President signing these agreements into law.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I yield the floor at this time.

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

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back, with the exception of 15 minutes, to be equally divided between Senator BAUCUS and the Republican leader, with Senator BAUCUS controlling the first 7½ minutes; that upon completion of their remarks, the Senate proceed to votes on passage of H.R. 3080, H.R. 3079, and H.R. 3078 as provided under the previous order; that there be 2 minutes, equally divided, in the usual form between the votes; and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief because we are at a point, finally, where we are passing these three trade agreements.

The Colombia, Panama, and South Korea Free Trade Agreements will increase U.S. exports by \$13 billion, boost gross domestic product by more than \$15 billion, and support or create tens of thousands of American jobs.

These agreements will provide an economic boost at a time when our country sorely needs it. But the value of these agreements goes well beyond dollars and cents. In recent years, critics of the United States have argued we have surrendered our leadership role on international trade. They claim our government, with its divided powers and narrow and changing partisan majorities, is incapable of forming a consensus for expanding trade, let alone a consensus on other political matters, including reducing our national debt.

Today, we have the opportunity to prove our critics wrong. These agreements were negotiated by a Republican President, improved by a Democratic President, and will be supported by strong bipartisan majorities in the House and in the Senate. They demonstrate the best of American values—open markets, transparent regulation, and respect for labor rights and the environment. They set the standard by which all trade agreements will be judged, and they put to rest any doubt the United States will engage its global partners to establish trade rules that are both free and fair.

By approving these agreements, we will also bind ourselves even more closely to three of our most important allies, and we will demonstrate to countries around the world that the United States is a good and dependable partner.

One decade ago, Colombia was on the brink of collapse. Armed conflict raged, drug traffickers flourished, violence against workers flared, and the economy stagnated. The United States pledged its support for Plan Colombia. With that plan, we provided more than \$7 billion to Colombia to fight drug trafficking, spur development, and protect human rights.

With our assistance, Colombia has achieved amazing progress. It is healing from the wounds of conflict. It has demobilized 50,000 former combatants, stemmed the flow of illegal drugs and the violence associated with it, and it is reducing labor violence and strengthening worker rights. If we approve our free-trade agreement with Colombia, we will help Colombia solidify and build on these gains, and we will reap for ourselves the benefits of our significant investments in this important country.

Panama has been a friend and ally since its early days as a nation. In the early 20th century, the United States built the Panama Canal, which remains the world's greatest commercial hub. We helped the Panamanian people restore democracy in 1989 after 20 years of military rule.

Today, Panama is among the fastest growing countries in the Western Hemisphere. It is both the crossroads of international trade and a global financial center. It is also a close partner in the fight against the illegal drug trade. With the Panama Free Trade Agreement, we will further strengthen our relationship for decades to come.

South Korea is a strategic ally in a region clearly vital to U.S. national interests. Despite living under the constant threat of a dangerous and erratic neighbor, South Korea has become the 15th largest economy in the world. Last year, it served as President of the G20 group of countries.

This trade agreement we have concluded with South Korea is our largest bilateral agreement in nearly two decades. It will ensure our commercial relationship is as strong as our 60-year security partnership.

These free-trade agreements will deliver significant economic benefits to the American people. Let us renew a bipartisan consensus on trade, reaffirm U.S. leadership in the global economy, and cement our ties with three important partners. Let us approve our free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea.

I might add, before I yield to the Republican leader, that the order of the agreements is, first, on Panama, then South Korea, and then Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we are on the verge of doing something very important for our country tonight, and we are going to do it on a bipartisan basis. I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, for the role he played and for the constructive efforts by Senator PORTMAN and Senator BLUNT to help us get to this evening. But I wish to single out for special praise our leader on this issue, Senator HATCH, the ranking member of our Finance Committee, who has been a stalwart on behalf of free trade over the years.

I think it is appropriate to take a moment before the vote to note the im-

portance of what we are doing. The first point to make about these agreements is that they will help American businesses create new jobs in the United States. The second point to make is there is strong bipartisan support for all three of these agreements. In other words, anyone who says that two parties can't agree on anything isn't telling the whole story.

Consider this: On the very day Democrats and Republicans were planning to come together to vote in favor of these trade agreements, Democrats spent the entire morning talking about what a shame it is that it never happens—that we never get together. Clearly, this vote is getting in the way of their political message, and that message is kind of absurd to watch.

Frankly, I think it would be a lot less confusing for anybody watching at home—not to mention a lot better for job creation—if our friends on the other side would agree to work with us more often on a bipartisan basis, as we have done on the bills before us. Our friends on the other side may think it helps them politically for Americans to think we don't cooperate, but what I am seeing is that the vote we are about to take shows that is simply not true.

We could get a lot more done up here if the President and our friends who control the Senate would move away from the left fringe and stop insisting on partisan bills that are designed to fail. If they agreed to that, then this Democratically led Senate would be a lot more productive.

Here is why these trade agreements are so important. First, they lower the barriers to selling American-made goods to consumers in other countries. On a variety of agricultural and manufactured goods, those tariff barriers are completely and totally eliminated, and increasing exports is crucial to growing the economy in States such as Kentucky, where nearly one-fifth of manufacturing workers depend on exports for their jobs.

It isn't just manufacturing that will benefit. America's service and technological sectors—where we are global leaders—will gain greater access to these foreign markets and strong assurances that the legal environment will not change to disadvantage U.S. firms. So passing these trade agreements will mean more U.S. exports and more U.S. jobs.

The total value of exports just from my own State of Kentucky currently totals more than \$19 billion. With these trade agreements, that number will only grow, increasing demand for Kentucky-made goods even more. What is more, the vast majority of Kentucky companies that export goods overseas—80 percent of them—are small- and medium-sized businesses.

So the question is, Do we want small businesses in Kentucky and other States finding new customers for their goods in these growing economies or do we want to cede those customers to other countries that are only too

happy to exploit the advantages they had before today?

These agreements are good news for American businesses looking to expand the market for their goods, and they are good news for all the American workers who benefit when those businesses are able to compete on a level playing field with workers in other countries.

While we have waited to pass these agreements, America's competitors overseas have increased their share of the markets in Panama, in Colombia and in South Korea and operated without the barriers American job creators have faced prior to tonight. Today, we are leveling the playing field, and when the playing field is level, we know American workers and American businesses and farmers will come out on top. They just needed us to clear the way.

Personally, I have never voted against a free-trade agreement, and I hope we will consider others in the near future.

Now that we have finally finished the business of the last administration's trade efforts, President Obama needs to think about what the trade agenda of his administration is going to be moving forward. Will he let America fall behind our competitors or will he embrace a proactive free-trade agenda that he knows will help create jobs here at home and project American influence around the world? For our part, Senate Republicans are ready to work with him on an even more robust trade agenda, one which involves reauthorizing a stronger TPA and which helps him help the economy in a bipartisan way, just as we are doing tonight.

This is a very important vote. It shows that the two parties can, in fact, work together to help American businesses create jobs, and I hope it leads to a lot more of the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 3080, H.R. 3079, H.R. 3078, having been received from the House, are each considered to have been read three times.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on the passage of H.R. 3080.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) would vote "no."

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Akaka	Franken	Menendez
Alexander	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Ayotte	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Hatch	Murray
Begich	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Hoeven	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hutchison	Paul
Blunt	Inhofe	Portman
Boozman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Isakson	Risch
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Roberts
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Carper	Kerry	Sessions
Chambliss	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Conrad	Landrieu	Toomey
Coons	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lee	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Levin	Vitter
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Webb
Durbin	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McCaskill	Wyden
Feinstein	McConnell	

NAYS—15

Blumenthal	Harkin	Reid
Brown (OH)	Leahy	Rockefeller
Cardin	Manchin	Snowe
Casey	Merkley	Tester
Hagan	Reed	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—2

Coburn	Sanders
--------	---------

The bill (H.R. 3080) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 3079.

The Senate will be in order.

Who yields time? The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we are now voting on the Panama TPA to provide lucrative new opportunities for American farmers. It will level the playing field for American exporters and do a lot of stuff.

Let me say this. Basically, we accept virtually all Panama's products duty free—virtually. Panama has significant duties on products going into Panama. This is a free-trade agreement. It is a freebie. I urge Members to vote for it so now we can export more products to Panama. Vote for this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I rise to speak against this agreement. This, my friends, is the Panama trade agreement. There are 1,600 pages. If we want to get rid of tariffs and level the playing field, we would pass about three pages of tariff schedules and build in labor rights so that all of us would pass this by a voice vote.

This is 1,600 pages of rules to help insurance companies, to help drug companies, to undercut America's sovereignty. It is based on the same NAFTA trade model that doesn't work with investor-state relations. The same promises we hear in every trade agreement—the Clinton administration and the first Bush administration promised

200,000-plus jobs for NAFTA. We lost 600,000 jobs.

Vote no on Panama. It is more of the same. It doesn't work for America and small businesses, and it doesn't work for our workers.

I ask for a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Ohio showing us the big, long stack. Those are all the tariffs Panama is going to get rid of and reduce so we can sell more products to Panama. I appreciate the Senator pointing that out to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Graham	Menendez
Ayotte	Grassley	Moran
Barrasso	Hatch	Murkowski
Baucus	Heller	Murray
Bennet	Hoeven	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Hutchison	Nelson (FL)
Blunt	Inhofe	Paul
Boozman	Isakson	Portman
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Pryor
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Risch
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Cardin	Kerry	Rubio
Carper	Kirk	Schumer
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Sessions
Coats	Kohl	Shaheen
Cochran	Kyl	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Snowe
Conrad	Lautenberg	Thune
Coons	Leahy	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Vitter
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Webb
Durbin	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McCaskill	Wyden
Feinstein	McConnell	

NAYS—22

Akaka	Hagan	Rockefeller
Begich	Harkin	Sanders
Blumenthal	Inouye	Stabenow
Boxer	Manchin	Tester
Brown (OH)	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Casey	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Reed	
Gillibrand	Reid	

NOT VOTING—1

Coburn

The bill (H.R. 3079) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 3078.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we are now on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. I am not going to take a

lot of time. I think most Senators know how they are going to vote.

Let me say I have visited Colombia. I am extremely impressed with the progress Colombia has made. Colombia was a failed state, a failed country about 10 years ago. With America's Plan Colombia and the assistance we have given, the narcotraffic is dramatically down, the labor killings are dramatically down. Clearly, we don't want one labor member killed or anyone killed in Colombia. But the fact is there is tremendous progress in Colombia. Colombia is so important to America's geopolitical future and to South America. If we cut and run, Colombia is going to run away from the United States. We will not be trusted. They will go to other countries, including Venezuela, China, and so forth.

I urge my colleagues who are on the fence—who are on the fence—to vote for this because that is a vote for the future. The glass is half full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time? The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, this is the same story. This is Panama's agreement, but Colombia's is even longer—hundreds and hundreds of pages of rules.

I admire the Colombian people. They are our allies, but the Colombian Government not so much. Colombia remains the most dangerous place in the world to be a trade unionist. There were 23 trade unionists killed in 2011, and 51 were killed in 2010. What is happening to them is working. Over the past 20 years, unionization rates in Colombia have been cut in half.

When you threaten trade unionists, when you actually murder them, of course, unionization rates are going to go down. The Labor Action Plan commits the Colombian Government to get better, but what we are doing by a "yes" vote is rewarding promises, as we always do in trade agreements. But we are doing nothing to establish and enforce concrete results.

If you care about human rights, if you care about workers having the ability to freely organize and collectively bargain, you will vote no on the Colombian trade agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Graham	Moran
Ayotte	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hatch	Murray
Baucus	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Hoeven	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Hutchison	Paul
Blunt	Inhofe	Portman
Boozman	Inouye	Pryor
Brown (MA)	Isakson	Risch
Burr	Johanns	Roberts
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Chambliss	Kerry	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Kyl	Thune
Conrad	Landrieu	Toomey
Corker	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Webb
Enzi	McCain	Wicker
Feinstein	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—33

Akaka	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Begich	Hagan	Reed
Blumenthal	Harkin	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Sanders
Cardin	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Levin	Snowe
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Tester
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—1

Coburn

The bill (H.R. 3078) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I think this is a great day. It shows America is moving forward, is forward-leaning, forward-looking. I thank the countries with whom we have reached these agreements. They, too, have shown courage. I hope this is a good model we can pursue in the future.

In that vein, I would like to thank some people who worked extremely hard on this agreement. They are members of my staff, beginning with my chief trade person, Amber Cottle; Mike Smart, Hun Quach, Chelsea Thomas, Gabriel Adler, Rory Murphy, Danielle Fidler, Sarah Babcock, and Jane Beard.

I also very much thank the staff who works for my good friend and colleague, Senator HATCH, beginning especially with Everett Eissenstat. We have been a real team, and I believe very strongly that not much is accomplished in this body if you try to go it alone, if you try to do it by yourself. Rather, much is accomplished with teamwork and working together, and I thank very much my team, and very much I thank the team from Senator HATCH. It is nice to see Everett over there nodding his head. He knows teamwork really works.

Mr. President, I thank you, also, very much.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. 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.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT DANIEL DAVID GURR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to Sgt Daniel David Gurr of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Sergeant Gurr was assigned to the 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion, 3rd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force. He was killed by small arms fire while on patrol in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Gurr was only 21 years of age, but as a testament to his character and reputation, hundreds attended his memorial service and hundreds more lined the procession route to where he was laid to rest.

Sergeant Gurr always wanted to be a marine. In fact, his friends and family from Vernal, UT, remember a young man who could hardly wait until his senior year at Uintah High School before enlisting in the Marine Corps. But even during his school years, his personality and character exemplified what it means to be a marine. Sergeant Gurr was the captain of his high school soccer team and was always there for his teammates. By all accounts, whether in high school or as a noncommissioned officer, he was a leader and loved by many.

Sergeant Gurr had a profound sense of duty and deep commitment to freedom and liberty. All he asked for was the opportunity to dedicate his life to the service and safety of others. His dedication and leadership were clearly apparent to the marines who advanced him to the rank of sergeant, a truly impressive accomplishment for a 21-year-old.

As we grieve the loss of one of this country's finest, let us celebrate Sergeant Gurr's life. His selfless and noble actions will never be forgotten.

I know I am joined by the entire Senate in extending heartfelt condolences to Sergeant Gurr's family. Elaine and I will certainly keep them in our prayers.

CORPORAL RAPHAEL R. ARRUDA

Mr. President, today I also wish to honor CPL Raphael R. Arruda of Ogden, UT.

Corporal Arruda was an Army reservist assigned to the 744th Engineer Company, 416th Theater Engineer Command. As a combat engineer tasked with finding improvised explosive devices, Corporal Arruda never shied away from driving the lead vehicle on operations. Out in front protecting his fellow soldiers was where he was when an explosion took his life. Adding to this tragedy, Corporal Arruda's mother had died 10 days before, and the corporal was but days away from his 22nd birthday.

Corporal Arruda was raised in Brazil until the age of 12. His family immigrated to the United States and settled in South Ogden, UT, where Corporal Arruda graduated from Bonneville

High School in 2008. While in high school, he joined the Army Reserves and left for basic training only days after graduating from high school. After basic training, he attended Weber State University for a semester and planned to continue his education upon his return.

Upon learning about Corporal Arruda's life, I was struck by what his family and friends had to say about him. Andrey, his brother and also an Army reservist, said Corporal Arruda was the "life of the party." His fellow soldiers said the corporal was "the guy who pushed everyone and made everyone laugh." It is a special leader who has the unique ability to motivate others while simultaneously making them feel at ease.

Corporal Arruda was a brave and selfless soldier. His family now bears a heavy burden. However, I hope they will take comfort in knowing that I am joined by the entire Senate in extending our condolences over the loss of Corporal Arruda and his mother. My wife Elaine and I will have them in our prayers.

REMEMBERING MIKE PUSKAR

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, only a few people in your lifetime stand out as people of the highest caliber, people who truly care about making the world a better place not only for the present generation but also for the next generation and many generations to come.

My dear friend Mike Puskar was one of those rare people. My wife Gayle and I consider ourselves extremely lucky to have even known a man of his caliber, let alone be dear friends with him for many years.

Mike passed away on Friday after a long battle against cancer.

I first met Mike in the early 1980s before the start of a football game in the then-gravel parking lot at the WVU stadium, a place we both truly loved. The generator in his motor home was not working, and, luckily, the generator in my brother's RV that I was using did work. So Mike plugged into our RV that day, and we were plugged in thereafter.

Mike was a man whose friendship was unconditional. It was not about whether you lined up exactly with his beliefs. He supported you as a person.

Mike dedicated his life to helping others and to making a real lasting impact in West Virginia. He had a tremendous heart and a strong sense of giving. Mike truly epitomized the word "friend" at every level.

We can see Mike's handprint everywhere—at West Virginia University, at Mylan Park, and in charitable organizations throughout West Virginia that serve those in need.

Mike loved to build things—whether it was his company or the waterfront in Morgantown. He gave the largest gift in the history of West Virginia University because he truly believed in making our State, our schools, and our hospitals the best in the country. In fact, that gravel parking lot where we