

about the positions he has, but is a person who believes in comity and respect for other views. He understands you can fight for your views and still compromise without compromising your values. I respect Senator KYL for that position.

As has been pointed out at other times, this has been a long, complex, difficult process, but it is one for which I share with Senator KYL that failure is not an option. This country cannot tolerate a continued border system which is fractured, which it is today, and with all the uncertainty that exists, whether it is on the borders, or the exploitation of workers, or in terms of the lives of many of the people who are here. We have tried to fashion a program, and we are going to work together to try to see that it is successful.

I thank the Senator for his comments, and we are looking forward to getting good discussion and debates on these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Arizona. I do not know if there is a greater champion in this body on the rule of law on border security. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for being the master at the art of figuring out how to get it done. As a former mayor, I have great appreciation for that. When I was mayor, if it snowed, and the snow wasn't plowed, the next day I heard about it. I think we are here to fix problems. The system we have today is broken and needs to be fixed.

I thank both my colleagues for their work on this issue. There will be a lot of conversations as time goes on, a lot of debates, but in the end the status quo is not acceptable and we have to fix it.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I want to switch subjects.

I see my colleague from Connecticut in the Chamber.

I rise to engage in a colloquy with truly my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, about an issue facing every American and every citizen of this world—an issue on which he is a true leader in the Senate, and for which he has had great vision, great perseverance, and for which I applaud him. That is the issue of climate change.

There is now a preponderance of evidence from the scientific community that human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, have increased the atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide by 36 percent from preindustrial levels, leading to a dangerous increase in global average temperatures.

The temperatures speak for themselves. According to NASA, 2005 was the warmest year globally on record since readings began in 1880, with 1998 a close second. And 8 of the last 10 years

are amongst the warmest years on record. The effects are increasingly tangible. Since 1979, more than 20 percent of the polar ice cap has melted.

So often in this Chamber we talk about the future. We talk about doing things for our kids. Well, if we care about our kids, and we care about our future, we better care about what will happen if we do not take action soon to reduce greenhouse gas emissions sufficiently to prevent the temperature increases forecasted for this century.

Thankfully, we are a nation of innovators, of entrepreneurs, of individuals with bold initiative. The technologies necessary to stabilize our atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases in time to prevent a dangerous increase in temperature are right at our fingertips—from biofuels and plug-in hybrid vehicles to nuclear energy and carbon sequestration for coal plants, and many more. It is time for Congress to provide the strong market signals necessary to press these technologies forward, which is why I believe Congress should work for an economywide response to climate change with an idea I have championed: provide utilities incentives to increase the percentage of their electricity sales they generate using clean energy sources such as renewables, nuclear, and clean coal with carbon capture technology.

Yet it is not enough for the United States to act alone. China is projected to be the largest greenhouse gas emitter by the end of this year. Climate change legislation must not put America's workers at a competitive disadvantage with the Chinese, and it must not send manufacturing jobs overseas. A greenhouse gas reduction program must not put Americans out of work or drive more hard-working families into poverty.

When I drive on the streets, such as Grand Avenue in St. Paul, and it is minus 10 degrees, minus 15 degrees, and I see that mom sitting at a bus stop waiting to catch a bus, or see that senior, I care about the costs they have to pay for energy. So those are things we have to think about. I refuse to look at this, or any other issue, without considering the effect it will have on those who are trying to support their family or, as I said before, the effect it will have on the elderly, struggling to survive on a fixed income.

Accordingly, I have been working with Senator LIEBERMAN over the last several months on an agreement that allows us to work together on his Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act in a way that meets my concerns about what mandatory greenhouse gas reduction legislation should look like.

Today, we have arrived at that agreement, and I believe together we can work in a bipartisan way to address this very serious issue.

I earlier introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution stating that any comprehensive, mandatory greenhouse gas emissions reduction program en-

acted by Congress should include provisions requiring a process of review of the program if it is found that other countries are not taking comparable action and if the unemployment or the poverty rates are found to be increasing as a result of the program. This sense of the Senate also states such a program should include incentives for utilities that increase their portfolio of clean energy.

I say to Senator LIEBERMAN, I wish to ask to be added as a cosponsor to your Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act and thank you for your cosponsorship of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and finally your commitment to work on EPW to examine my clean energy portfolio proposal in a committee hearing, and to fight during EPW markup of climate change legislation for inclusion of: No. 1, congressional review of greenhouse gas caps, if other countries are not taking comparable climate change action; No. 2, congressional review of greenhouse gas caps, if the unemployment and poverty rates are increasing due to a U.S. greenhouse gas reduction program; and, No. 3, provisions to reward electric utilities that increase the percentage of their electricity sales generated with "clean energy" or energy for noncarbon-emitting sources such as nuclear and clean coal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, for his kind words. More importantly, I thank him for the commitment he has expressed to protecting all of our children and grandchildren from the impacts of unchecked global warming.

Senator COLEMAN, in stepping forward today, has put himself at the vanguard of the next crucial wave of bipartisan support in the Senate for climate stewardship legislation.

I am proud to cosponsor his resolution which, in a very thoughtful way—not an obstructionist way—recognizes two of the most significant reasons why people have hesitated to step forward and do something about climate change. One is the equities here: that no matter how much we do in the United States of America to curb the emission of greenhouse gases—and we must because we are the largest emitter of such gases; we must lead here; it is our responsibility, ultimately our moral responsibility—but no matter how much we assume that leadership role, if other developing nations such as China and India do not do their part, because we all live in the same global environment, the problem of global warming will continue to increase and be more serious for those who follow us here on Earth.

Second is his recognition of a thoughtful way to deal with the concerns people have—even those who desperately want to do something to impede the advance of global warming—as to the impact of what we do will have

on our economy. It is clear Senator COLEMAN has been a leader here, and that is why his cosponsorship of our legislation makes a critical point. There is no conflict between protecting our world and all who live in it from catastrophic climate change and also protecting America's economy, protecting America's consumers, and protecting America's workers. We can, must, and will do both. For those who may have had doubts about our capacity to do that, I think Senator COLEMAN's cosponsorship of the Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act is critically important. The fact is everyone who works with Senator COLEMAN knows he cares deeply about the well-being of low- and middle-income Americans and of America's workers, and he would not be cosponsoring the Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act—stepping forward to take a leadership role in the battle against global warming—if he felt the components of that act would adversely affect our economy.

I am very honored to have earned the support of my friend from Minnesota on this crucial issue. I promise him I will work to ensure he is not disappointed by the outcome of our efforts. In particular, it is my honor to chair a subcommittee on climate change in the Environment and Public Works Committee, and I will work to ensure that the bill we report from our subcommittee and full committee embraces the principles set forth in the resolution my friend from Minnesota has introduced today, and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The good news is I will not be working alone. I believe a bipartisan majority of the Environment and Public Works Committee wants to report to the Senate floor this year comprehensive legislation that reduces greenhouse gas emissions substantially enough and quickly enough to forestall the disastrous climate change so many reputable scientists are warning us of, and that does so in a way that does not weaken the position of the United States economically or otherwise impose hardship on our citizens.

I further say to my friend from Minnesota that before we vote on that legislation in our subcommittee, we are going to be having additional hearings. Senator WARNER, my ranking member, is committed also to seeing that the subcommittee produces legislation this year that deals with the problem of global warming and the challenge of its impact on our world. I want to ensure my friend from Minnesota that one of those hearings will include a witness who can educate the committee and discuss the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota for a clean energy portfolio standard. Personally, I think his idea is a constructive one, a thoughtful one, a progressive one, and deserves serious consideration.

I am eager to explore ways to further encourage electric power producers to increase their use of advanced technologies that can provide reliable, af-

fordable baseload electricity without injecting more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.

Mr. President, I conclude by again thanking my friend from Minnesota and asking unanimous consent—and I do so with great gratitude to him, as I believe his leadership here is significant—that the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. COLEMAN, be added as a cosponsor to S. 280, the Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act of 2007, which Senator MCCAIN and I introduced earlier this year.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I thank my dear friend from Connecticut for his remarks, his commitments. Let me say, first, I am proud to be working with him as cosponsor of S. 280, the Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act of 2007.

The Senator from Connecticut approaches this issue, which is an important issue—it is a real issue; we have to deal with it—in a way which he is known for in this Senate, which is in a thoughtful, constructive way, a way which takes into account the concerns and the impact upon employees, upon consumers, and, perhaps most importantly, upon our kids and grandkids in the next generation. For that I thank him and say it is a privilege to work with him—a man of great character and great dedication.

Mr. President, with that I yield the floor.

U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the trade policies set in Washington and negotiated across the globe have a direct impact on places such as Toledo and Steubenville, on Cleveland and Hamilton. That is why voters in my State of Ohio and across the country sent a message loudly and clearly in November demanding a new direction, a very different direction for our Nation's trade policy.

Working men and women in Ohio know that job loss doesn't just affect the worker or just the worker's family; job loss—especially the kind of job loss we have seen in the last 5 years, the kind of manufacturing job loss—when we see that kind of job loss in the thousands, that job loss devastates communities. It hurts the local business owner, the drugstore, the grocery store, the neighborhood restaurant. It hurts communities. It hurts schools. It hurts police forces. It hurts fire departments.

Two weeks ago, leadership in the House of Representatives and in the White House announced a new outline for trade policy, one that included labor and environmental standards. The fact that the Bush administration was willing to negotiate at all, the fact that they were willing to pay even lip service to labor and environmental standards, underscores the November elections' importance.

Every Member of Congress, in the Senate and in the other body, the House of Representatives, is now on notice that we will be held accountable for our trade votes—accountable to workers, accountable to business owners—accountable for our trade votes and accountable for American trade policy when we go home. However, since the announcement made by the Bush administration and some congressional leaders in the House about labor and environmental standards, backpedaling by the administration and sidestepping by supporters of the deal indicate that we may be in for another round of more of the same in our trade policy.

The administration already has hinted at side deals for labor standards instead of putting those standards in the central, core part of the agreement. They are talking now about not reopening negotiations with Peru and not reopening negotiations with Panama but instead adding a little sidebar, a little letter, a little statement of support for environmental labor standards but not actually putting them in the central core of the agreement. If that is the case, if these labor and environmental standards are not in the agreement but in a side letter of some sort, then really, frankly, nothing new is being offered. It is the same old jalopy with a new coat of paint.

Voters in my State demanded real change, not symbolic gestures.

What is even more disturbing about the new outline is it appears to rely in good faith on the administration to enforce standards. Given this administration's abysmal record on enforcement of labor standards and environmental standards, not just in trade agreements but enforcement of those standards in our domestic economy, we know what this administration—we know its failed environmental policies. Given this administration's abysmal record on enforcement, relying on blind trust isn't just foolish, it is downright irresponsible.

The Jordan Free Trade Agreement passed by the House—I supported it and many others did; it passed in both Houses overwhelmingly—the Jordan Free Trade Agreement was once held up as a standard in labor provisions. It had strong labor and environmental standards in it. It passed in the year 2000, but come 2001, with a new President of the United States, George Bush, and a new U.S. Trade Representative, Bob Zoellick, the Bush administration simply turned the other way while rampant human-trafficking plagues that nation of Jordan. Shortly after the Jordan agreement was enacted, the new USTR, Bob Zoellick, sent a letter to Jordan's Trade Minister saying the United States simply wouldn't enforce the labor provisions. So even though we passed a trade agreement with labor standards inside the core agreement, this administration, this same crowd who now says they will enforce labor standards and