United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2011 No. 152

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 12, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KENNY MARCHANT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WHY ARE WE STILL IN AFGHANISTAN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege and the humbling experience of going to Walter Reed at Bethesda. It is a magnificent medical complex, and our young men and women deserve to have that kind of treatment. I was so impressed.

In visiting the wounded and thanking them for their service, I encountered a 22-year-old lance corporal who was wounded during his second tour of duty in Afghanistan. Standing there in his room with his mother, he asked me why are we still in Afghanistan. I looked at his mother and I looked in his face and I said, I don't know. I said there are a few of us in the House trying to get our troops back home before the 2014–2015 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a photograph of a triple amputee, a soldier, with his wife, who has lost both legs and an arm. Yesterday I noted to the doctor who was escorting me around that I saw more double amputees than ever before. I saw some down in the rehab center, and I saw those in their rooms that have not gotten to that point yet because of their severe wounds. He said, Congressman, the number of double amputees is going up every week, every month, and it will continue to go up.

My question to the leadership of the House: Why don't you speak out, both parties, and call on Mr. Obama to bring our troops home before 2015?

It's kind of ironic. I represent the Third District of North Carolina and we got hit pretty hard, like most of the States all of the way up to Vermont, by the hurricane. It was so ironic last week that we passed a continuing resolution that had $2.65 billion for FEMA to help those who have experienced disasters like wildfires in Texas to tornadoes to hurricanes—$2.65 billion—but yet we found $118 billion to spend in Afghanistan and Iraq. Where does that equal itself out? The American people get shortchanged while we send $118 billion to Afghanistan and Iraq. It makes no sense.

That's why it's so ironic that the American people have given all of us in Congress an 18 percent approval rating. And here we will be passing trade bills today to send jobs overseas. That'll be great. The American people are tired and fed up.

But what bothers me more than anything are those young men and women over at Walter Reed who are 20, 22, 25. I met a gunnery sergeant who's in his early thirties, both legs gone, trying to learn to walk.

I hope that the leadership in the House and Senate will join JIM MCGOVERN and many of us in both parties who are speaking out about getting our troops home before 2014–2015. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to those people who are protesting Wall Street, whether I agree with you or not, you have a right to protest. Join us in protesting the war in Afghanistan. We are beginning the 11th year. And as the 22-year-old lance corporal said to me, Why are we still there? I couldn't answer him. I don't know. I don't know. Karzai gets $10 billion a month, and the people who've lost so much in the hurricanes and tornadoes, they get a measly pittance to what Karzai gets.

Please, American people, join us and put pressure on the House and Senate, and let's bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, my close is this: I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for his people today and his people tomorrow. And I ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow. And three times I will ask from the bottom of my heart, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Printed on recycled paper.

JOBS OUGHT TO BE TOP PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague from North Carolina that it is time for us to not just reassess but readjust our policies in Afghanistan, scale it down and bring the troops home.

There's another area of consensus that I hope we can focus on: Most people agree that employment, that jobs, ought to be a priority for this Congress, for the government, for American business. Much of what you hear on Capitol Hill about creating jobs and employment is very, very contentious. Yet what is complex and controversial in Congress is not so hard when you move off the Hill, when you look at what the experts suggest, when you look at what the American people will support, for the shape of a future recovery is emerging in terms of a consensus about what we should do. I think we probably will; the question is when.

First and foremost, it is important that we rebalance our long-term programs and priorities. But in the short term, it is not only important to keep the spending levels where they are, it would be disastrous to cut it further. Chairman Bernanke said just last week that short-term increases can strengthen economic demand with a long-term adjustment to strengthen our balance sheet by reducing the deficit.

One of the first places to start is rebuilding and renewing America. Experts agree we have vast unmet needs; the Society of Civil Engineers suggests $2.3 trillion that should be spent in the next 5 years on repairing our roads and our bridges, extending and enhancing our transit system. There are two dozen cities across America that are looking at reintroducing a modern streetcar which can be done quickly and will spark investment in those communities that have that opportunity.

We have aging and inadequate water systems that leak 6 billion gallons of water a day, enough to fill 9,000 Olympic-sized swimming pools that would stretch from Washington, DC, to Pittsburgh. We have an aging and ineffective electrical grid. We have pipelines that need to be upgraded for safety. There is environmental cleanup, especially expensive Superfund sites that otherwise will continue to put a cloud over the adjacent businesses and governments.

□ 1010

This will create millions of family-wage jobs in the course of the next year. It is important to deal with our health care system, which is creating jobs. But, unfortunately, it's creating jobs now very inefficiently. We pay more for healthcare than anybody else in the world, by far. Compared to what other developed countries produce, we have mediocre results as a whole. Spectacular for some Americans, but overall, Americans die sooner, get sick more often, stay sick longer. By accelerating the health care reforms to provide value instead of volume of health care, we can squeeze more value and the right type of employment that will be sustainable over time and help make Americans healthier.

There is, Mr. Speaker, no question that we need in fact to pay for this over the long term. But the path here is something that most of the American public will in fact agree on, and the experts have a consensus that this is where we start, with tax equity, making sure everybody is paying their fair share adjusting user fees for infrastructure to account for inflation—not anything immediate, but over the course of the next year or two—to be able to have the cash flow to meet our obligations for transportation, for water; reinstituting the Superfund tax that expired in 1995, leaving communities with the toxic legacy.

It's important to consider a financial transaction fee, something that other European countries have—that England has had for over a century—that would in fact give stability to our stock market. This is something that's within our capacity, Mr. Speaker. I hope we do it sooner rather than later.

H.R. 3080, UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. I come to the floor today to talk about the need to pass the three free trade agreements that we will be voting on today. These agreements will mean more export opportunities, access to raw materials at a lower cost for American manufacturing, and make American companies and farmers more competitive in additional markets where they currently face high tariffs. Free trade agreements result in jobs and profits for American businesses.

In 2010, the Second District of Alabama saw 4,927 jobs directly supported by exports. Of the $2 billion in total merchandise exports, $769.4 million was to free trade agreement partners. The Korea, Colombia, and Panama free trade agreements will open up opportunities for businesses all over the Nation, including those in my home State of Alabama.

In regards to the Korea free trade and what it means to Alabama, in 2009 Alabama did $300 million in exports to Korea, making Korea the 11th largest export market for Alabama. According to the Business Roundtable, the agreement that we will be voting on today will make more than half of Alabama merchandise exports to Korea be duty free. The immediate tariff eliminations in this bill gives Alabama exports a $3.1 million cost advantage over similar products exported by competitors who do not have free trade agreements with Korea.

Additionally, agriculture in Alabama will benefit from the Korea free trade agreement. Currently, U.S. agricultural products face tariffs up to 500 percent in South Korea. By eliminating these tariffs, agriculture will see over $20.3 million in additional gains in sales to South Korea. In particular, it is estimated that Alabama's export of poultry will rise to $4.4 million per year, and cattle and beef to $3.7 million per year.

In regards to the Colombia free trade agreement, in 2010, Colombia was Alabama's 21st largest export market, with $154 million in exports. The agreement we will be voting on today will mean an estimated 72.3 percent increase in exports for Alabama to Colombia and 56.4 percent in fabricated metal products.

And finally, Panama is one of the fastest expanding economies in Latin American. In 2010, the United States saw a 7.5 percent growth in exports to Panama. In regards to agriculture, the United States exported more than $450 million to Panama in 2010.

The free trade agreements that we are voting on today are in total expected to increase direct agricultural exports from Alabama by $22.8 million per year, and the increased marketing opportunities will add more than 200 jobs to the Alabama economy. It is unfortunate that these agreements have taken so long to be considered by Congress. They will have a significant impact on our economy. This delay has already put American businesses at a disadvantage with the South Korea-European Union free trade agreement going into effect in July of this year.

American businesses do not need a stimulus or stimulus programs that do not work. I have come to the floor several times to talk about how American businesses are being stifled by overreaching and burdensome regulations. American businesses have also been stifled by the slow-moving administration and ensuring that our businesses have the same advantages as those in other countries. These agreements remove the high tariffs that have been in place in important and expanding markets.

I will continue to work to protect and promote jobs here in the United States and in my home State of Alabama and will be voting ''yes'' on all three trade agreements. I ask my colleagues to do so as well.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of the opposition that I will have to the free trade agreements that we'll be voting on today and to

speak of some of the details about those free trade agreements that seem not to be discussed. We seem to want to talk about how these free trade agreements will be good without understanding the details of what we'll be voting upon.

My opposition to these trade agreements is not based upon any type of partisanship. That negative force called ''partisanship'' that is too much part of our lives here in Washington, I don't deal with. This is not partisanship. This is not some type of blinded protectionism, that somehow we need to close our shores. I'm very aware of the global impact of our modern economy. And it's not based upon any type of ignorance of the potential good that these so-called free trade agreements can present to us. Indeed, I have lived in a part of the country that has suffered immensely from free trade agreements. I worked 27 years in textiles and watched the jobs leave. My district, North Carolina's Eighth District, is still suffering, as it has for the last 10 years, because of the results of free trade agreements.

Indeed, if you look at the facts of our Nation and where we are in our economy, it's hard to say that since free trade agreements have become part of our lives that it has been good for the Nation. We look at our working families. It was reported last week that our working families are now at income levels of the mid-1990s. We've lost so much of our industrial base. We've lost hundreds of thousands of jobs. And we continue to see our trade deficits climb and climb and climb.

Mr. Speaker, we have the world's greatest economy. We need trade agreements, but not these trade agreements. We need for people to come to us and say we would like to play in the United States market, and we should say what terms that we should have for that.

So what are the details of the Korean free trade agreement? We hear that it will create 75,000 jobs. The Economic Policy Institute tells us we will lose over 150,000 jobs. And we'll hear a lot about the jobs that were created, but we won't hear too much about those jobs that were lost, of which 40,000 jobs are estimated to be lost in the textile industry.

We won't hear about how 65 percent of something can be made in another country and brought to South Korea and finished there and then brought into the United States, recognizing that China is the next-door neighbor to Korea. So how much transshipment is going to come out of China, the 65 percent to South Korea?

We won't hear that North Korea will be allowed to send goods to the United States as a part of this trade agreement.

We won't talk about the currency manipulation that South Korea engages in, just like China does.

We won't talk about the tariffs that will stay in place, protecting Korean goods, while we drop ours immediately.

We'll talk about that we can sell more cars in Korea, up to 75,000, if they choose to buy them—there's no guarantees—when we know that South Korea now is selling hundreds of thousands of cars in the United States.

□ 1020

Mr. Speaker, we need trade agreements, but we need trade agreements that work for us. This is not a reflection on the countries. It's a reflection on these old NAFTA/CAFTA-type trade deals that were negotiated years ago in the Bush era that have been dusted off and brought to us and being told to us that this is good for the American worker, this will create jobs. Unfortunately, the history of our trade agreements has been anything but that.

I was with an administration official in North Carolina a year ago, and I was told how good free trade had been for North Carolina. And I said, I can't address that, but I can address that free trade has not been good for my district. I was told that they could show me the numbers, and I told them I could show them the empty buildings, many of which are not even standing now. They've just been torn down, not replaced with jobs. Retrain our people for what, to ship more jobs offshore?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the details of this, look at our economy, and look at the jobs we have lost and say, is this good for America? No, it's not.

IN SUPPORT OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fair trade agreements that we will vote on later today. I commend the Obama administration for their work in ensuring that our businesses and workers get the best agreement possible to grow the economy and create jobs.

While these agreements have been in the works for years, our country has benefited from the improvements garnered by our U.S. Trade Representative, Ron Kirk, and his team. This is particularly evident in their refining of the South Korean agreement so that our farmers and automobile manufacturers get a fair deal. Of course, each trade agreement is different, and they all have to be evaluated on their merits. Details matter.

Overall, these agreements will help increase U.S. exports by an estimated $13 billion, adding $10 billion to our annual gross domestic product and creating nearly a quarter million jobs, including many in my district in upstate New York; and we'll do that without adding a single dollar to the deficit. In fact, these fiscally responsible agreements will help cut the deficit.

Our farmers, in particular, stand to gain significantly from these agreements, opening up nearly $30 million in new business a year for our farmers in New York. These agreements are enthusiastically supported by our New York State Farm Bureau and by my Agricultural Advisory Panel, comprised of farmers from across the 10 counties and 137 towns I represent, a congressional district with over 1,000 family farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we have the smartest, hardest-working farmers in the world. Their issue is profitability. We help farmers when we attack the impediments to growth, which include taxes, regulations, health care costs, and energy costs. We help farmers when we have access to quality infrastructure—not only roads and bridges, but also access to high-speed broadband. And we help farmers when we expand markets to help them sell their goods. These agreements enhance our farmers' profitability.

Supporting our farmers is supporting the American way. Our family farmers represent the best of our country. And this is also a national security issue—no farms, no food. We must ensure our family farms can compete, or we risk losing them and relying on imports with the attendant food security risks. That's not what my constituents want; that's not what our country wants, which is why we need to pass these agreements.

Now, in addition to helping our farmers, the independent, nonpartisan U.S. International Trade Commission estimates key U.S. manufacturing sectors are also poised to gain. This includes the increase of U.S. exports of motor vehicles and parts by about 50 percent; metal products by over 50 percent; chemical, rubber, and plastic products by over 40 percent; and machinery and equipment by over 30 percent. This will directly help companies in my district, who are already relying on exports, with expanding markets for selling their products, companies like B&B Forest Products in Greene County, Momentive in Saratoga County, EFCO Products in Dutchess County, and Hudson River Stove Works in my home county, Columbia.

What's often missed in these conversations about trade are some of the key points. Right now, over 90 percent of the products coming from Colombia and Panama are already duty free, when less than 40 percent of our goods currently go duty free to these countries. Our goods to South Korea suffer under tariff rates about four times higher. With passage of these fair trade agreements, we will address these imbalances. These agreements will add to our GDP, strengthen existing jobs, and create new ones.

Let's recognize what's at stake, and let's not fool ourselves. If we fail to pass these fair trade agreements and do nothing, we will fall behind. In South Korea, we have seen our beef industry lose more and more of the share of that country's business year after year since the 1990s. South Korea is poised to increase agricultural trade with

Australia and the European Union. If we don't pass these agreements, we will continue to fall behind while other countries gain. Same with Colombia: in 2007, our farmers accounted for 44 percent of the agricultural business in Colombia. By 2010, that number fell to 21 percent.

These agreements are about the future. As Americans, we've enjoyed an unprecedented quality of life because we make things other people can't and we make common goods better than anyone else. That's still the case. In my district, we make the world's most advanced wafers in the semi-conductor industry and some of the most advanced medical devices.

We are poised to continue our tradition of excellence in this country if we make the right choices. And, today, making the right choices means working in a bipartisan way with the Obama administration and enacting a key provision of the President's jobs plan. It means passing these fair trade agreements before the House this week.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills and help get America back to work.

RECOGNIZING LAS VEGAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce as it celebrates its 100th anniversary on October 21 and marks a century of success in working to help build and sustain southern Nevada's business community.

I'm a proud member of the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce. And as someone who grew up in southern Nevada and who represents her hometown of Las Vegas here in Congress, it has been remarkable to see firsthand so many of the outstanding achievements of the chamber and its thousands of members and how they—we—have shaped our community throughout the years.

From designing some of the very first tourism campaigns for Las Vegas, to helping pass major small business legislation in recent years, the chamber has always played a key part in facilitating the growth of Las Vegas and in supporting the business community in southern Nevada—today's economic engine of the great Silver State.

I have had the pleasure to know and work with many of the chamber's leaders and participants from its member businesses who serve the families of my community every day and who serve the nearly 40 million visitors drawn to Las Vegas each year. The Las Vegas Chamber's centennial marks a milestone for an organization that had its humble beginnings a century ago in a dusty railroad town—now known around the globe as the ''entertainment capital of the world.''

Many of the chamber's early leaders were instrumental in getting legislation passed to create the first highways being built to and from Las Vegas, making the city more accessible to northern Nevada, southern California, Arizona and Utah. Chamber leaders advocated for the building of Hoover Dam. This modern marvel still operates today, creating electricity for millions of homes and businesses, drawing millions of tourists for recreational opportunities at Lake Mead, and creating thousands of jobs for the region.

Chamber leaders were early supporters of the aviation industry in Las Vegas, bringing the first airfield to Las Vegas in the 1920s, establishing McCarran Airport's current location. Later, the chamber worked to secure financing for a modern airport built in 1960. These early leaders recognized the need for air travel to keep Las Vegas accessible, competitive, and relevant; and their support led to McCarran Airport growing to become one of the busiest airports in our Nation.

The Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce was instrumental in creating the modern method of promoting Las Vegas through the initiation of the Live Wire Fund. Created in 1944, the Live Wire Fund eventually led to creative marketing campaigns and the initiation of the Las Vegas News Bureau to promote Las Vegas tourism and hospitality to the Nation and to the world. What happens in Las Vegas stays in Las Vegas.

The chamber has always been and remains the voice of business in southern Nevada. With over 80 percent of the jobs in the United States created by small businesses, it is my commitment to continue to honor the business people of Nevada by working towards a fairer business environment where ''Made in America''—and especially ''Made and Sold in Nevada''—drive the philosophy of our business mindset.

□ 1030

This will create jobs, put people back to work, and continue to provide the kind of opportunities on which our Nation was founded. The Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce has embodied these business ideals for a century, and I look forward to being a part of the great things they do in their 101st year and beyond.

In recognition of the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce's success, and they are here today in number on Capitol Hill, in helping to make Las Vegas a brand recognized around the world, and for their unwavering commitment to local businesses, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce for their 100 years of service and in wishing this organization and its members another century of extraordinary success.

FREE UP AMERICA'S RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. The President's jobs bill has a surprising number in it for rebuilding our infrastructure. Most Americans would be surprised that that number is only $27 billion. Divide that between States, and you barely have enough to put some tar and chips on the roads. And yet, as the President is out touting this jobs bill and talking about our crumbling infrastructure, it just isn't going to do the job.

How about this number? $129 billion to build roads and buildings and water projects? Unfortunately, that number is not being spent in the United States; rather, that $129 billion is the number that Americans pay in foreign aid to OPEC countries to build their roads, their palaces, their buildings.

Now, unfortunately, that money goes to more than just their infrastructure. It also goes to countries like Iran that fund their nuclear weapons programs threatening Israel and the neighboring countries. It goes to Iran to fund their assassination attempts against Saudi Ambassadors. Iran used it to fund terrorist weapons and IEDs to kill our soldiers. We pay for both sides in the war on terror, and much of that comes through buying foreign energy.

In the meantime, our roads are crumbling, our bridges are rusting and corroding, our locks and dams are decaying, our water and sewer pipe lines are collapsing.

And listen to the cost. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the numbers are staggering: $935 billion are needed to fix our roads and bridges; $87 billion for aviation; $12.5 billion for our locks and dams; $255 billion to fix our drinking water; $75 billion for energy infrastructure; $50 billion for inland waterways; $50 billion for levees; $265 billion for transit. Where is the money going to come from?

What is being proposed are long-term and permanent taxes, about 30 years worth of more debt and borrowed money from China for a small $27 billion to do this. It's not going to do the job, and raising taxes and creating warfare between classes is not going to do it.

Here's what can do it. We have, off of our coast, about 85 to 115 billion barrels of oil, trillion cubic feet of natural gas, trillions. We have massive amounts of money off our coast. Unfortunately, the administration says no, we can't use our money. We have to continue to borrow from China, increase debt or raise taxes. Those approaches to rebuilding America will not do.

What we need to do is free up American resources, use our resources, use our funding to rebuild America. And think what comes out of this. From the royalties, the leases, and from the income taxes that come from hiring, yes, millions of people to involve with civil engineers and operating engineers, laborers, architects, steamfitters, welders, people who work on the rigs, you

create $2 trillion to $3 trillion worth of revenue over the next 20 years.

What we need to be doing is making a commitment to invest that money in American infrastructure, American resources, American funds for American infrastructure.

Think of what this also does for our manufacturing. When you create that kind of demand for steel and concrete and that kind of demand for equipment to be purchased over a long time, this is a real jobs plan. We don't need to be going back hat in hand to other countries and saying, please let us borrow more from you. We don't need to be having class warfare. We don't need to be saying, let's just attack people who make a certain amount of money. We don't need to be saying, let's take all the revenue that comes from taxing these corporate jets for 10 years and use it to fund the government for a lousy hour and 45 minutes. Those may be great talking points, but they are not a jobs plan.

America wants to work and America wants us to use our resources. America wants to stop funding both sides in the war on terror. We can do this. And it doesn't take some sort of super plan to do this. It just says, America has all the resources.

I call upon my colleagues to continue to push for ways that we can free up American resources, stop saying no to American jobs, stop simply using political rhetoric to block these things, but really create this mechanism by which we can pay for rebuilding America.

We can do it. We have the resources to do it. We have to have the way and we have to have the will.

INITIATIVES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Recently I had the honor of being reappointed to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, a committee on which I served during my first two terms in Congress. Consequently, caucus rules require me to, in turn, step down from the Small Business Committee, where I've proudly served for the past 5 years.

As I leave the Small Business Committee, I wanted to take a moment to discuss a few of the important initiatives on which the committee has played a meaningful role during that time. Some of the most important initiatives have been to support the brave men and women who have served our Nation in uniform. The Small Business Committee, over the past 5 years, has led the way in helping small business owners deal with the loss of key employees during long-term overseas deployments, and has helped incentivize the hiring of our military veterans.

Committee successes include the enactment of my legislation to increase business opportunities for veterans and reservists, and support business owners who employ them. This bill was signed into law by President Bush in 2008 and has since helped countless veterans and employers.

We also successfully enacted laws to help returning veterans access job training programs and learn entrepreneurial skills to help them transition back into the workforce.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I was able to convene hearings that gave voice to all sides on pending issues in Congress, including bringing more than a dozen people from western Pennsylvania before the committee to make sure that their voice was heard and their point of view understood during the critical early stages of the legislative process.

Our subcommittee held hearings that brought to light the unintended consequences of the Consumer Product Safety Commission's lead regulations on small businesses and home-based toy manufacturers. We also held hearings that raised concerns about the effect that various health care reform proposals might have on small employers, and the devastating impact that skyrocketing gas prices can have on businesses and consumers.

When CMS proposed a flawed Medicare competitive bidding program that would harm medical equipment suppliers and negatively impact patient access and quality of care, our subcommittee heard the concerns of small businesses across the country. And when necessary, our subcommittee also convened field hearings to discuss important issues, such as a hearing we held in western Pennsylvania to discuss ideas on how to increase access to capital for small businesses.

When flooding impacted businesses in western Pennsylvania, we brought the SBA to Aliquippa to personally inspect the damage and improve the SBA's response. And as gas prices continued to climb and the Nation looked for solutions to our energy crisis, I joined our former colleague, Mary Fallon, now Oklahoma's Governor, to cochair a field hearing in Tulsa to hear directly from the oil industries their explanation of why gas prices were so unacceptably high and what we can do to help bring them down.

Our subcommittee also led the way in twice passing through the House my bill to expand access to private capital investment through the SBIR program. And we held the first hearing in either Chamber of Congress on the controversial credit card interchange fee, an issue that since has grown into a top priority for businesses, consumers, and banks.

We worked in a bipartisan way to successfully advocate for repeal of the onerous 1099 reporting requirements included in the health care reform law. All in all, quite a record of bipartisan success.

As I leave the committee, I want to thank Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for her help and support during my time on the committee, and I look forward to continuing to work on small business issues through my new committee assignments in the months ahead.

□ 1040

RECOGNIZING MATT PORTER, 2011 RECIPIENT OF NATIONAL DOWN SYNDROME SOCIETY'S DAN PIPER AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Matt Porter of State College, Pennsylvania, the 2011 recipient of the National Down Syndrome Society's Dan Piper Award.

Dan Piper was a young man born with Down syndrome who spent much of his life advocating on behalf of himself and others with Down syndrome. He, sadly, passed away on September 1, 2002. In order to celebrate Dan's life, the Dan Piper Award was created to recognize and celebrate an individual with Down syndrome that has made similar contributions to Down syndrome awareness and advocacy.

Today, I'm pleased and proud to recognize one of my constituents, Matt Porter, as the 2011 recipient of this great honor. I have met Matt Porter on several occasions. Most recently, I joined him and others at the Centre County Down Syndrome Society's annual Buddy Walk. My introduction to Matt, however, was sometime before that when he visited my Washington office in mid-February with his brother, Andy. Matt was visiting congressional offices to raise awareness for the Down Syndrome Society and to advocate on issues most pressing to those who are living with Down syndrome.

Matt's personality and attitude towards life embody the spirit of the Dan Piper Award. Much like Dan, Matt's accomplishments have opened so many doors to those with Down syndrome. I find Matt to be an inspiring individual, and I commend him on the hard work with his employment, participating in the Special Olympics, volunteering in the community, and advocating on behalf of others with Down syndrome.

We all stand to learn a lot from this young man's example and character. Congratulations, Matt Porter.

HAVE 10 YEARS IN AFGHANISTAN MADE AMERICA SAFER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I feel like I have a case of déjà vu. Two years ago, I stood on this floor, on the eighth anniversary of our invasion of Afghanistan, and asked: Have our 8 years, 791 American deaths, and billions of U.S. dollars spent in Afghanistan made America safer?

Today, I stand in the same place asking the same question. Now, 10 years have passed, 1,800 American lives have been lost, and we have spent almost half a trillion dollars, and I have to ask again: Have 10 years in Afghanistan made America safer? Sadly, just as I concluded 2 years ago, I must conclude again today, they have not.

We went into Afghanistan under the mantle of protecting America's national security. The perpetrators of September 11, al Qaeda, were in Afghanistan, and we had to go after them. But just as was the case 2 years ago, al Qaeda is no longer primarily in Afghanistan. In fact, only 50 to 100 al Qaeda operatives are estimated to be operating in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda's primary hub is still located across the border in tribal areas of Pakistan. And other al Qaeda cells are operating around the world in Yemen, North Africa, and through affiliated groups in Southeast Asia and Uzbekistan.

Threats to America are not from Afghanistan but from ungoverned spaces around the world and even right here on American soil. A review of recently foiled terrorist plots shores up the widespread origins of U.S.-centered terror attempts. The Times Square bomber is a Pakistani American who received training in the Waziristan region of Pakistan. The explosives hidden in ink cartridges and destined for an American synagogue in my own district in Chicago were planted by a Saudi militant and shipped from Yemen. The Christmas Day airline bomber was a Nigerian, inspired by Anwar al-Awlaki, who was based in Yemen. And another devotee of al-Awlaki was the Fort Hood shooter, Nidal Hasan, an American citizen born in Virginia.

Not one of these terror plots originated in Afghanistan, and yet still we maintain close to 100,000 U.S. troops on the ground there. Every major U.S. victory the U.S. has had in the fight against terrorism has come not on the ground in Afghanistan but through targeted attacks such as those that killed Osama bin Laden in Pakistan and the recent strike that killed Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen.

There have been at least 45 jihadist terrorist attacks plotted against the U.S. since 9/11, and each one of them was foiled not by our mass ground forces in Afghanistan, but through a combination of intelligence, policing, and citizen engagement.

According to terrorism expert Erik Dahl of the Naval Postgraduate School, ''When it comes to domestic attacks and securing the homeland, what works is really good, old-fashioned policing—law enforcement, tips from the public, police informants.''

Not only is our military action in Afghanistan not making us safer, but research indicates it could actually be making us less safe. As counterinsurgency expert David Kilcullen points out, rather than reducing the number of terrorists, the U.S. presence in Afghanistan could actually be spurring new terrorism as locals band together to resist foreign occupation.

It's called accidental guerrilla syndrome.

Further, a report issued last year by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative TIERNEY, revealed the U.S. military is funding the multibillion dollar protection racket. A good portion of a $2.16 billion transportation contract is being paid to corrupt public officials, warlords, and the Taliban to get needed supplies to our troops. We are funding the very insurgency we are fighting.

We went into Afghanistan to make America safer, but, for several years now, we have known that our enemies are no longer concentrated in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda is an enemy without borders, and so now we must have a strategy without borders. The question now is: Will we adjust our strategy to reflect today's circumstances, or will we continue to live in the past, repeating this destructive cycle of sending dollars and troops to a mission no longer central to American security?

We have to end our military presence in Afghanistan now, because I don't want to stand in this same spot a year from now with another case of déjà vu.

DRILLING EQUALS JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, with the free trade agreements being debated this week, some of my Democratic colleagues have been talking about our trade deficit. However, if they really want to reduce the trade deficit, they'd help me end the President's de facto moratorium on offshore drilling.

You see, if oil were a country, it would be our biggest trading partner. Oil makes up 65 percent of our trade deficit. And it's simple: Drilling equals jobs. It equals American jobs.

You see what I have here is a parking lot to one of the heliports down in my district. In 2004, the parking lot was full. Last year, the parking lot was empty. And you don't have to worry because that parking lot, when we're drilling offshore, is this full 365 days a year.

Here is a port in my district which supplies over 30 percent of the oil and gas that fuels this Nation. You can see the boats in 2004 in the busy port; and today, it's empty.

If we really want a jobs bill, this is it. In the past year, deepwater permit issuance is 39 percent below the monthly averages observed over the past 3 years; and shallow water permits, permits that were supposedly never impacted by the moratorium, are off 80 percent over historical averages. As a result of this de facto moratorium, 11 offshore rigs scheduled to drill in the gulf have relocated to countries like Brazil, Nigeria, Egypt, Congo, French Guiana, and Liberia.

Now, what does this say about American policies when businesses prefer the regulatory certainty offered by Egypt over the bureaucratic uncertainty off our own shores? And while 11 rigs might not seem like a lot, each drilling platform supports 200 to 300 workers every month. Additionally, each exploration and production job supports four other positions. Therefore, 900 to 1,400 jobs per idle rig platform are at risk if production does not resume as soon as possible.

□ 1050

Wages for those jobs average $1,800 per week, so the potential for lost wages is more than $5 million to $10 million per month, per platform.

Drilling equals good-paying jobs.

According to the Obama administration's own estimates, the 6-month ''official moratorium'' on drilling cost up to 12,000 jobs. However, the long-term impacts of the de facto moratorium could be significantly higher. A study by Louisiana State University predicts, if the de facto ban on deepwater drilling were sustained for 18 more months, we could lose 36,000 jobs nationwide, 24,000 of those along the gulf coast region alone. If the administration would accelerate the permit issuance instead of continuing this de facto moratorium, we could create a quarter of a million jobs in this country, and we could increase the GDP by $8 trillion over the next 10 years.

As I said, the solution is actually very simple—at no cost to the taxpayer and with the ability to bring revenue into the Federal Government.

It's simple, Mr. Speaker: Drilling equals jobs.

LIBERTY, JUSTICE, AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk on two subjects: one, liberty and justice and, number two, our economy.

On the first, as cochair of the House Ukrainian Caucus, I stand today and join my voice to the citizens of the free world who stand in solidarity with freedom lovers in Ukraine seeking liberty and justice for all. It is with the deepest concern that we raise strenuous objection to the political decision by Ukraine's Pechersk court that sentenced former Ukrainian Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko to prison this October 11. The court's ''guilty'' verdict sentences her to 7 years in prison, bars her from holding office for 3 years, and effectively stops her from participating in Ukraine's upcoming elections.

Ukraine's actions should also call into question Ukraine's accession to the European Union. I join with the members of the Ukrainian Congress of America in supporting immediate congressional hearings on what has transpired in Ukraine. I urge our leadership

to allow the passage of a resolution expressing U.S. objection to the actions of Ukraine's politically driven judicial system that seem to have more to do with politics than justice.

In furtherance of these objectives, I place on record on behalf of the Ukrainian Caucus the official statement of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents over 1 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, equally incensed at what has occurred. From their statement, the Ukrainian Congress states:

They call upon the Government of the United States to take appropriate measures to support democracy and human rights in Ukraine. They urge the United States Government to restrict visas and freeze assets of the current antidemocratic regime and to hold congressional hearings on sanctions and future foreign assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me, to join our caucus; to speak out and to act then on behalf of the advance of democracy and justice in post-Soviet Ukraine.

I also wish to address today the U.S. economy. We've heard a lot about the trade agreements that are going to come before us today dealing with so-called ''free trade'' for South Korea, for Colombia and Panama. I wish to place some information on the record.

I've served in Congress awhile now, and fought against the NAFTA trade model back in the nineties when they said it would create jobs that would result in trade surpluses. Advocates promised we would have all this extraordinary economic growth and new jobs in the United States. Then after NAFTA was passed, we saw the beginning of these hemorrhaging trade deficits with Mexico, with Canada and, indeed, with the world. In 1997 and '98, when the China permanent normal trade relations, which I might add are anything but normal, kicked in, America went into an even greater trade deficit. Each billion dollars of trade deficit represented a loss of thousands upon thousands of lost jobs.

So, as we look at the period that we've been living through over the last 20 to 25 years as these so-called free trade agreements locked down, with every single one, America goes deeper and deeper into trade deficit, which kills the economic growth in our country. Now, today, we're being delivered three more: South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

When we look back at CAFTA, which was passed in the early 2000s, what happened? Did we get trade balances with those countries? No. We got more U.S. job loss.

Sure, there were a few industries that made out like bandits. Okay. that's fine, I'm glad that some industries can export, and generally, agriculture is able to sell a little bit more, but the overal net is negative. The net is negative. That translates into lost jobs. We've lost over 7 million jobs in this country because these agreements are not fair trade agreements. They really don't result in trade balances for our country, nor job creation. They yield job losses—coast to coast.

Let's just take a look at what happened with Mexico alone. Back when NAFTA was passed, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. The same people who are arguing for these agreements today said, Don't worry about NAFTA—jobs are going to be even better. We said, No, no. It's not going to be better because there's not a real rule of law. There is no respect for the peasant class in Mexico, and the agricultural adjustment there is going to be horrendous.

In fact, it is at the basis of the exodus of Mexican farmers and peasants into our country. That is what is fueling illegal immigration—the lack of a resolution to what occurred during NAFTA when the agricultural adjustment was not allowed to occur in a humane way in Mexico. What a pity to go to the communities and to see how people are living there, disrupted from their land, and then in our country to see the jobs outsourced from the United States down there or from the United States to almost anywhere—China, et cetera—to the low-wage havens with no rule of law. Every year, the trade deficit with Mexico has grown greater and greater. Remember when we began with NAFTA, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. That has disappeared and gone very negative translating into lost jobs.

Now just take a look at Korea. They say this deal is going to make trade better. Well, do you believe that? We already have a trade deficit with Korea, and this agreement isn't going to solve it because Korea already sells over a half a million cars in this country, but we only sell a few thousand cars there now. This agreement will not change these numbers and will result in more lost jobs in our country. This agreement contains no requirement for reciprocity.

I ask the Members to vote ''no'' on the agreements dealing with Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

UCCA CONDEMNS TYMOSHENKO SHOW TRIAL VERDICT

NEW YORK, NY.—The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the representative organization of the over one million Americans of Ukrainian descent, is outraged and strongly condemns the Pechersk court's sentencing of Yulia Tymoshenko.

The October 11th guilty verdict, which sentences the former prime minister to 7 years in prison, and bans her from holding office for three years, displays the selective and political motivations of the current regime and leaves no doubt that the court's decision was dictated by the government to remove one of the top opposition leaders from taking part in upcoming elections.

From the start, the UCCA, along with the international community, deemed the various court proceedings to be biased, not meeting international standards and selective in persecution of opposition leaders and former government officials. Thus, today's guilty verdict not only demonstrates the ongoing anti-democratic and authoritarian tendencies of the regime, but also severely threatens the country's European aspirations, specifically the expected ratification of an association agreement with the European Union.

President Yanukovych's use of criminal law to serve his own political end, must not be tolerated! The UCCA calls upon the government of the United States to take appropriate measures to support democracy and human rights in Ukraine. We urge the United States government to restrict visas and freeze assets of the current anti-democratic regime and to hold congressional hearings on sanctions and future foreign assistance to the government of Ukraine.

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I want to talk today about two people opposed to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement:

Alejandro Jose Penata—a teacher, a union organizer, a spokesperson for fairness for his fellow educators in a country where getting a decent education can be difficult to impossible. Also, I want to talk about Ana Fabricia Cordoba—an advocate for the displaced, an advocate for returning stolen land to those from whom it was taken.

Ana and Alejandro were part of a vocal and committed and brave group of Colombians willing to stand up for what they believed in. They stood up for the dispossessed, for peasants, for trade union members, and for those who want to join trade unions. Like many Colombians, they were tremendously concerned about a free trade agreement that reflected the interests of large corporations but not of those workers and farmers and poor people they fought for every day.

Ana and Alejandro, if they could, would be with us today to voice their opposition in person to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, but they can't voice that opposition because they were both murdered in Colombia. Ana was shot dead on a public bus. Alejandro was tortured and hung with barbed wire. These are tragic facts, uncomfortable facts, unacceptable facts, but they are not isolated facts.

Sadly, the faces of Ana and Alejandro are the faces of Colombia today. Nowhere in the world is it more dangerous to be a union organizer, fighting for the wages and rights of working people than in Colombia. Twenty-three trade unionists were killed this year. Fifty-one were killed last year. And over the last several years, hundreds more have been threatened, driven out by violence or have simply disappeared. In 2010, more trade unionists were murdered in Colombia than in the rest of the world combined.

In Colombia, there is an organized, intensive campaign to prevent working men and women from working together to fight for better wages and working conditions, and it seems to be working.

So why would the United States want to endorse this behavior and reward the companies, working with the government, that have unleashed this violent assault on workers' rights?

□ 1100

That, after all, is what a trade agreement is really about, a partnership. This is not a partnership the United States of America should enter into.

I'm voting ''no'' on the Colombia free trade agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Colombia free trade agreement.

I believe the facts are simple. Voting for the Colombia free trade agreement is a vote for violent union busting, for driving people from their land, for setting the American working man and woman up to compete on an unlevel playing field that will cost us jobs and livelihoods. I know that it is difficult to look at these pictures and hard to accept the reality of the danger to people who speak up in Colombia.

But we cannot ignore the facts, and in Colombia, trade union activists are targeted for assassination and murder. That's not an easy fact to accept, but it's a fact. Approving the free trade pact with Colombia says that the United States can live with this fact. It brings the blood of union activist victims from Bogota to Washington. That blood won't be easily washed away.

Let's think about the movements for freedom happening from Cairo to Damascus to Tripoli. We applaud them. We congratulate the protesters.

When the union leaders in Wisconsin, Ohio, and Puerto Rico stand up for their rights against oppressive State governments, my Democratic colleagues, they applaud those workers. When angry Tea Partiers bash our government and talk about individual rights, my Republican colleagues applaud them.

Well, today we have a chance to do more than applaud. We can side with the people who are standing up for freedom in Colombia. I suggest that everyone in the House who has ever celebrated, applauded, or supported a popular, pro-democracy movement in the U.S. or abroad think long and hard before they vote ''yes'' on the Colombia free trade agreement.

Because what we see is what we get when it comes to free trade in Colombia. We get a partnership with a country where speaking your mind is a death sentence. I want free trade, but I'm for an agreement that builds commerce while protecting commerce, environment, and the rights of farmers and men.

This is not that agreement. This is an agreement that turns a blind eye to violence and oppression and injustice.

So I ask my colleagues to do what Alejandro and Anna who were murdered cannot do: say ''no'' to FTA with Colombia.

GRIDLOCK EXISTS IN UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I stand once again to make a plea to our spiritual leaders throughout the United States to be heard and to speak out against the gridlock that exists here in the United States Congress.

I do this feeling very comfortable since we open up our session with a prayer and as everyone can see and many have taken for granted, it says: ''In God We Trust.''

Clearly, the protesters have caused quite a bit of inconvenience for my colleagues and the constituents in New York, but the fact remains that they speak out for a frustration that most all Americans have. Uncertain as to what the future holds for them, many have lost their jobs, their savings, pulled their kids out of school; and they are frustrated that we in the Congress hardly talk to each other because of the depth of polarization.

And yet beyond the politics of it all, whether it's Democrats or Republicans, when you think about it, this recession can only be stopped and unemployment lowered by a combination of two things, the reduction of our spending and the raising of revenue in order to increase not only the confidence that people have but the necessity of having economic growth so America can regain its status among civilized nations.

Yet we find very little movement here because there's some that have already embarked on the 2012 campaign. They do that even though millions of Americans are suffering painfully, seeking relief now and not waiting until the end of next year.

It seems to me, whether we are dealing with the Koran or whether we are dealing with the Bible or the Torah, one thing is abundantly clear, that those who believe in a superior force would know that one of the things that we have a moral obligation to do is to take care of the vulnerable among us.

This great Nation now has broken all records in terms of our middle class actually being shrunk as people are forced into poverty. One out of every five kids in the United States of America is born into poverty, and we find that a smaller number of people in our country are controlling nearly half of the wealth.

There's something wrong with that equation, and certainly this is the time to fill that vacuum. For those who believe there's no direction to the protesters, there may not be direction, but they certainly expect that their government should be there for them. Their government is gridlocked. Our spiritual leaders could encourage them not just to pray, but to become active, find out who the Members are that represent them in the Congress, ask them to be voting on these bills that can create economic growth or can create jobs.

And so whether you're Protestant or Catholic or Jews or gentiles or Mormons or Muslims, this is the time that America needs you. This is why our Forefathers have never written out religion. While it cannot dictate which religion, if any, you should have, certainly we do have freedom of religion.

And as the protesters have a constitutional right in order to speak out to release their frustrations, I think we have a spiritual responsibility to take those parts of the proclamations that they're making, the protestations that they're making, and those parts that take care of trying to get the vulnerable to get a fair shake out of this economic disaster we find ourselves in, let us take care of our aged, our sick, those that are in poverty.

Let Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare be something that's not a gamble, but something that the American people can depend on.

Let the churches and the synagogues and the mosques and the temples be open so people can express themselves, and let this Congress attempt to be more civil in recognizing that we have a responsibility that goes beyond the election. We have a responsibility to the American people. So I conclude my remarks and make my plea.

HONORING GENERAL DUNCAN J. McNABB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to pay tribute to a leader and a warrior, General Duncan J. McNabb, commander of the United States Transportation Command. General McNabb is retiring after honorably serving this great Nation for over 37 years with a distinguished career.

General McNabb graduated from the United States Air Force Academy in 1974. As a command pilot, he has more than 5,600 flying hours in transport and rotary wing aircraft. In addition, General McNabb has held command and staff positions at squadron, group, wing, major command and Department of Defense levels and is considered the finest mobility and logistics expert in the Department of Defense.

I have had the pleasure of working with General McNabb from 2005 to 2007 when he assumed command of the Air Mobility Command at Scott Air Force Base in the congressional district that I am privileged to represent and, again, when he returned to Scott Air Force Base to be the commander of USTRANSCOM in 2008.

USTRANSCOM is a critical part of our military operations. It provides the coordinated transportation, distribution and sustainment, which projects and maintains our national power. As a global combatant commander, General McNabb has made supporting the American warfighter his top priority.

□ 1110

Under General McNabb's leadership, USTRANSCOM has moved over 1.5 million passengers and over 4 million short tons of cargo in supporting Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraq Freedom. To put this in perspective, this is the equivalent to moving the entire population of southwestern and southern Illinois and all of their household belongings halfway around the world. America truly has a military deployment and distribution system that is unmatched anywhere in the world.

Under General McNabb's command, USTRANSCOM has provided humanitarian relief to hurricane victims in the United States, earthquake victims in Haiti and Japan, and flood victims in Pakistan, just to name a few. The medicine, supplies, equipment, and personnel that USTRANSCOM has delivered in the wake of these and other natural disasters ultimately saved lives and eased human suffering.

In addition to conducting some of the largest military moves since World War II and providing unparalleled humanitarian relief, General McNabb has made it a priority to transform our Nation's deployment and distribution system, ensuring our ability to project national power where needed with the greatest speed and agility, the highest efficiency, and the most reliable level of trust and accuracy. As a USTRANSCOM commander, General McNabb actively took on the role of the distribution process owner for DOD, charged with improving efficiency and interoperability across the entire DOD supply chain. To meet the needs of the military and the Nation, General McNabb developed the Arctic overflight route and expanded multimodal logistics throughout the northern distribution network. He has improved combat readiness and capability while saving hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Troops and equipment are now arriving and leaving the battlefield faster and at less cost.

General McNabb will be the first to tell you he did not accomplish these feats alone. He led the way in seeking collaborative joint solutions to today's complex global distribution issues. Those who worked for him and with him, military and civilians from every branch of service, will miss his leadership and mentorship. They'll miss the stories and humor he used to get his message across. We in Congress will miss his straightforward approach and sound counsel. The Nation will miss his devotion to duty, ceaseless drive for improvement, and unwavering support to the men and women serving in our armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize General McNabb for serving the Air Force with honor and distinction for 37 years. I also wish to recognize his wife, Linda, and wish her the very best in the future as well. The Air Force will lose not one but two exceptional people upon General McNabb's retirement.

General McNabb and Linda, we wish you well in your future endeavors and pray that those who follow in your footsteps may continue the legacy of unprecedented support for our great Nation.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray this day, O Lord, for peace in our world, that righteousness will be done and freedom will flourish.

The work of these days has concerned the interchange of goods, talent, and resources with other nations of the world. In Your wisdom You created many peoples and have asked us to live and work together so that all might know and experience Your blessings.

Send Your Spirit upon the Members of this people's House, that they might judiciously balance seemingly irreconcilable interests. Help them to execute their consciences and judgments with clarity and purity of heart so that all might stand before You honestly and trust that You can bring forth righteous fruits from their labors.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FORBES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MILAN PUSKAR

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, this past week, West Virginia experienced a tremendous loss. Milan ''Mike'' Puskar, cofounder, former chairman and CEO of Mylan Labs in Morgantown and the namesake of WVU's Milan Puskar Stadium, passed away.

Mike was not only a visionary entrepreneur who grew Mylan into the largest generic drug manufacturer in America, but he also was a beloved philanthropist who was passionate about our Mountain State. He was an extremely committed supporter of West Virginia University and gave selflessly of his time and treasure to the academic and athletic programs there.

Milan had a kind heart and lived his life with the utmost integrity. The life he lived and the legacy he left behind have left West Virginia a better place for our children and grandchildren.

My wife, Mary, and I, as well as all West Virginians and Mountaineer fans across this country, will keep Mike and his family in our thoughts and prayers. He will be missed by all.

RELIGIOUS VIOLENCE IN EGYPT

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the violence in Egypt. Months after Muslims and Christians fought for democracy, religious violence continues to plague the country. Worse yet, in post-revolution Egypt, violence against Coptic Christians is rising.

This weekend, over two dozen people were killed in Cairo, most of them Coptic Christians. Demonstrators had gathered to protest the attack on a Coptic church and other Christian-owned properties. In response, military officials aggressively confronted protesters by driving vehicles into crowds and shooting off rounds of live ammunition. In the end, 26 people were dead and hundreds were wounded.

This brutal crackdown puts into great question the ability of the military government to bring democracy to Egypt and protect its minority Coptic population. These military attacks are unacceptable, and the resulting deaths are absolutely appalling.

The Coptic Christians simply want respect for their churches, their homes, and their basic rights. Democracy cannot thrive in Egypt if the rights of Coptic Christians are not respected.

The United States must do everything it can to pressure military leaders to end the violence, punish those

responsible, and uphold the equal rights of all Egyptian citizens.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DAVID A. DRAKE

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice and laid down his life for our freedom: United States Army Private First Class David A. Drake.

Private First Class Drake enlisted in the United States Army in January 2011. In the Army, he served as a combat engineer, leading from the front with his unit, the 515th Engineer Company, 5th Engineer Battalion, 4th Maneuver Enhancement Brigade, and deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. On September 28, 2011, he gave his life in Ghazni province, Afghanistan, conducting operations against the enemy.

David is remembered not only for his heroics on the battlefield, but for the tremendous impact he had on his family, friends, and his community. His brother recalls David's absolute devotion to others in describing why he joined the Army. ''For him, it was pride in serving our country, serving the people, keeping our freedom.'' His character and patriotism are an example for us all.

Private First Class David Andrew Drake personifies the honor and selflessness of service in the United States Army. His bravery and dedication to duty will not be forgotten. As a Marine Corps combat veteran, my deepest sympathies go out to his family, his fellow soldiers, and to all who knew him.

SENIORS TASK FORCE: ENTITLEMENTS AND THE SUPERCOMMITTEE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for older Americans and pledge to protect the program they have paid into, have been promised and deserve.

Throughout much of the year, we have heard how Congress needs to cut Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits under the guise of deficit reduction. I reject that premise.

I do so for Dale, a Sacramento resident, who, at 70 years old, recently retired with his wife. The dream of retirement went well for a short while, then utility and home repair bills started piling up. And if this weren't enough, both Dale and his wife have suffered deteriorating health, which has increased their medical bills to levels they cannot afford. Cuts to Medicare or Social Security would, as Dale put it, ''take from the poorest of the poor.''

That is unacceptable. Any proposal to meet our deficit must meet the test of protecting our seniors.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRAYER

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Prayer Caucus to note the importance of prayer in our Nation's history. On October 12, 1844, 167 years ago today, John Chambers, the Governor of Iowa Territory, issued a proclamation declaring a day of Thanksgiving to God.

Chambers said, in part, ''I have deemed it proper to recommend a day of general Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the many and great blessings we enjoy as a people and individually, and of prayer and supplications for the continuance of His mercy and goodness towards us; and for the prosperity, happiness, and ultimate salvation of the American people.

''We are told that 'righteousness exalteth a nation' and are taught by divine authority that the voice of thanksgiving and prayer is acceptable to our Father in Heaven. Let us then unite our voices in the humble hope that they will reach the Throne of Grace and obtain for us a continuation and increase of blessings.''

□ 1210

PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT WEEK

(Ms. BASS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Physician Assistant Week, which is observed annually from October 6 through October 12.

On October 6, 1967, the first PAs graduated from Duke University. Today, more than 40 years later, legions of practicing PAs have reached the number of over 83,000, and 307 million patients visited PAs last year alone. I know firsthand the key role of the PA profession in the delivery of care. Before serving in office, I worked for nearly a decade as a PA and served as a clinical instructor who trained future PAs.

Created in response to a shortage of primary care physicians, the PA profession today is crucial to developing a strong primary care workforce. Not only do PAs provide high-quality, cost-effective care in virtually all health care settings, but PAs also extend the reach of medicine to underserved communities throughout the U.S. With health care reform expanding access to 33 million Americans, PAs are needed now more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, as we mark the final day of PA week, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the contribution, as well as the promise, of the PA profession.

FREE AMERICA TO TRADE FREELY WITH COLOMBIA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the House today will vote on a jobs plan that will create thousands of jobs for Americans. I'm talking about the pending free trade agreement with Colombia that has been waiting for years to be voted on.

In my great home State of Texas, new jobs will be created in the exporting sectors like petroleum, chemicals, and machinery. Texas is the number one State that exports to Colombia, but in my district alone, the 22 companies that exported to Colombia last year paid almost $12 million in unnecessary tariffs. When tariffs on these products are removed, United States companies will be able to expand their markets, export more products, and create American jobs; and America will become more of a competitive country in the international marketplace.

I've been to Colombia, and unlike some South Americans, Colombians like Americans. They are a U.S. ally. Free trade with Colombia helps both nations and solidifies our joint interests in South America. This agreement is a diplomatic win to help thwart the influence of dictator Chavez of Venezuela in that region.

Create jobs. Pass the free trade agreement with Colombia. It's good for Americans, and it's good for Colombians.

And that's just the way it is.

SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare were created because they reflect the values of our country. We should be incredibly proud of these programs, which provide a vital safety net for our seniors, and we should commit ourselves to strengthening them.

There are seniors like Rita Manley, in my district, who depend on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Rita is 82 years old, suffering from cancer. She lives in Central Falls, Rhode Island. She was recently laid off from her job at the Central Falls Housing Authority, and relies on Social Security for income and Medicare to cover her medication, which costs about $400 a month. Rita would not be able to afford her cancer medication without the support of Medicare.

We should do everything we can to protect and strengthen Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid for seniors like Rita all across this country. Our seniors deserve and have earned

the benefits provided in these programs. They deserve to live their retirement years with dignity. We should not ask seniors to sacrifice benefits before asking the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations to pay their fair share.

COMMEMORATING THE BOMBING OF THE USS ''COLE''

(Mr. RIGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 39 wounded and the memory of the 17 killed who were aboard the USS *Cole* when it was attacked by terrorists this day 11 years ago. I have the privilege of representing Norfolk Naval Station, the home port of the USS *Cole*.

On the morning of October 12, 2000, the USS *Cole* was moored off the coast of Aden, Yemen. At around 11:18 a.m., a small craft approached the port side of the ship and exploded, ripping a 40-by-40-foot gash through the steel of the destroyer. The ship's galley, where the crew was gathering for lunch, took a direct hit.

The attack was organized and executed and planned by Osama bin Laden. In his death, justice was served, but at the dinner table of 17 American families, there sits an empty chair. What should be a joyous family gathering is tempered by the loss of a loved one.

So we pause today, and rightly so, to honor and remember those who stand boldly in defense of America, in defense of freedom. We must meet our deep obligation to them, to our veterans, and to the families of the fallen.

May God forever bless the crew and families of the USS *Cole*, past and present, and may God forever bless the United States of America.

REJECT PROPOSED BENEFIT CUTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget would turn the American Dream into a nightmare for millions of senior citizens—eliminating Medicare, threatening Social Security benefits, and turning Medicaid into a block grant. Those same proposals are now being discussed in the Select Committee on Deficit Reduction.

Seniors are terrified, and they are speaking out against cuts—people like Debby from Wilmette, Illinois, a public school teacher whose husband was diagnosed with MS and was forced to sell his business at a loss. She says, ''My husband only gets $1,800 a month now. There is no way we will be able to keep our house and pay our bills. We are worried.''

Or Nirlean from Chicago, who lives on her Social Security check. ''Medicare helps with my medication. I'm living month to month, and I always run out of food before the next month. I really miss getting the cost-of-living increase, because my rent takes half my income.''

Let's listen to Debby and Nirlean and to millions of seniors. Let's reject benefit cuts.

LET'S PUT THE GULF BACK TO WORK

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again urge the administration to issue drilling permits in the Gulf of Mexico in a more timely and efficient manner.

As demonstrated at today's Natural Resources hearing, there is a critical need to correct the regulatory backlog. The long-term effects of the moratorium and subsequent regulatory slowdown will lead to decreased development levels in the Gulf of Mexico, which will reduce oil and gas production levels and associated employment and economic activity in the gulf South's economy. Recent reports show that up to 20 deepwater drilling rigs could leave the Gulf of Mexico due to the slow, uncertain pace of the permit process. Continued regulatory uncertainty will only exacerbate this trend as operators reallocate resources to other major offshore provinces.

President Obama has said over and over that jobs and the economy are the administration's number one priority.

Mr. President, the Gulf of Mexico sits ready to work. Let's put her to work for America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

AMPSURF

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Association of Amputee Surfers and its founder, Dana Cummings.

On Saturday, I participated in AmpSurf's sixth annual Operation Restoration on Pismo Beach in California. Together, disabled veterans and other people with disabilities took to the water and learned to surf with the help of the local surfers. This event proved that the power of the ocean can inspire, educate, and rehabilitate the disabled, especially our veteran warriors.

Earlier this year, I met one of those veteran warriors at Bethesda Naval Hospital. He was recovering from injuries he sustained from an IED attack in Afghanistan. Before he'd enlisted in the Marines, Cody had volunteered with AmpSurf right there on Pismo Beach. So it was a special treat to see his mother at the beach on Saturday, supporting all those in the water as her son rehabilitates.

I know Cody and so many others are resolved and determined to get back out in the water, and they'll be able to do it with the help of AmpSurf. Cody's story brings AmpSurf's wonderful cause full circle.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring AmpSurf and what it does for our veterans and for those who share the powerful forces of sacrifice, perseverance, and healing.

□ 1220

IN SUPPORT OF AMERICAN JOBS

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed the American Jobs Act to get people back to work. The bill will revitalize American manufacturing and invest in infrastructure to create jobs now.

It contains proven ideas for job creation that received bipartisan support, and economists agree. Mark Zandi at Moody's says passing this bill will create almost 2 million jobs and won't add a dime to the deficit.

So why aren't we passing the bill now? Sadly, last night, Senate Republicans stood with House Republicans to stop the American Jobs Act from even coming to a vote. In fact, in 40 weeks in which they have been in control of the House, Republican leaders have never called a vote on a jobs bill. It's time we put the country first in the face of this tough economy.

Last month, I welcomed some amazing World War II veterans to their memorial here in D.C., who shared with me their great challenges of their time, how they set their differences aside and pulled together for the good of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the great economic challenges we face today, it is time for us to pull together for the good of the country.

PRAISING LAWRENCE COMPANY COTTONWOOD

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise a not-for-profit organization in Kansas that I recently visited. Cottonwood, located in Lawrence, Kansas, provides a valuable service to our country by establishing employment and living opportunities to individuals with developmental disabilities. Over the years, Cottonwood has earned a reputation for quality services and care as a community service provider.

At Cottonwood, workers help make a number of consumer products, including industrial-strength cargo straps

that are used by our troops here at home and overseas for a variety of purposes. Thanks to the workers at Cottonwood, our soldiers have a great and much needed tool to help them do their jobs and keep them safe.

Cottonwood is a shining example of the potential within every American that can be developed and maintained when local community groups couple with the private sector to create products at a good value for our American military and other consumers. I am proud to use my voice on the floor of the U.S. House to praise Cottonwood and other organizations who provide meaningful employment for Americans with disabilities across the United States.

FREE TRADE

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as policymakers, it is our job to learn from the mistakes of the past and not repeat them.

Nearly 700,000 American jobs have been lost as a direct result of NAFTA. In my district, the 43rd Congressional District, we have lost over 2,000 jobs since the passage of NAFTA and other trade agreements; and the United States has gone from a $1.6 billion trade surplus to a $97 billion trade deficit with Mexico. Yet we stand this week ready to pass three more NAFTA-style trade agreements: Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

My constituents face a 15 percent unemployment rate. They need us to create jobs, not shift them overseas where thousands of jobs will be sent.

I ask you, who benefits from these trade deals? Not the American working families. Major corporations are the ones who benefit with this misguided agreement.

This is a debate about the haves and the have-nots. It is time to stand up for working families. I say it's time to stand up for working families and do the right thing for the American people.

COMMEMORATING 9/11

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, last month Americans around the country commemorated the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks. I had the honor and privilege to spend the day with some of the brave police, firefighters, EMTs, paramedics, and first responders that put their lives on the line every day to protect us from harm.

In Berthound and then in Fort Collins, Colorado, I had the opportunity to speak with local firefighters and police as we remembered the tragedy of 10 years ago and the sacrifice and loss of so many lives.

The lapel pin that I have on this morning was lent to me by a friend of mine, Ed Haynes. It's a pin given to New York Police Department police officers in the wake of September 11. An officer gave it to Ed in 2004.

The pin is a reminder of that day and the understanding that police officers and firefighters around the country share, the understanding that every day they go to work willing to give their own lives to save the lives of others.

As the 10-year anniversary of September 11 passed, we remembered the victims and the devastation, the fear and the anger of that time. But we also remember the unity, the sense of understanding that existed across the Nation in the days after that horrible tragedy.

The people that have observed September 11 over this past month, September 11 through today, the people that I saw that weekend, the firefighters, the police and the citizens, remember those days as well. And in today's political environment, we could do well to focus on how it should not require a national tragedy to bring us together.

CHILDHOOD OBESITY

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about our different concerns for the future of our Nation, but there is one gravely serious threat that exists in every single congressional district and could cripple future generations and the long-term strength of our Nation.

More than 12 million American citizens, children, 17 percent, are currently obese. In my home State of Kentucky, the number is even worse, with obesity affecting 37 percent of Kentucky kids. That's millions of children who are at a significantly higher risk of cardiovascular disease, diabetes and cancer, millions at risk of having their dreams cut short and millions who may not get the chance to contribute all their potential to our Nation's growth.

I am proud to applaud the work of Kosair Children's Hospital in Louisville, one of dozens of children's hospitals around the U.S. taking new steps to educate kids about the importance of eating healthy and getting active. Children's hospitals are essential allies in the battle to stop childhood obesity.

I urge my colleagues to support these initiatives and every effort to get our kids focusing on a fitter future.

PASS THE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, unemployment numbers just came out for our country; and again we see the country at 9.1 percent unemployment. The number one issue that we face here in this body and this government, I would argue, is jobs and the economy.

This week we have an opportunity to come together in a bipartisan fashion. The President has talked about the trade agreements with both South Korea, Colombia, and Panama; and I think this is an opportunity for us to be able to level the playing field to allow the American worker to win.

We know that if we level the playing field, the American worker can win; and we know that if we take South Korea alone, this is an opportunity for us to add $10 billion to our GDP. For every billion dollars that we send in exports, we create 6,250 jobs right here at home. Seventy-three percent of the dollars are outside of the United States and 95 percent of the consumers.

We want to make sure that we're selling America abroad. This is an opportunity for us to put American workers back to work, try to lower the unemployment rate from 9.1 percent, and move the country forward.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together today and this week to pass the free trade agreements and move our country ahead.

OPPOSING THE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, free trade deals are not an industrial policy. Unlike most industrial countries in the world, the United States is the only one that has no overall strategy for bringing back the 5 million manufacturing jobs that we've lost in the last decade or reopening the 50,000 factories that have been shuttered.

Without enforcing current trade laws, or pressuring China to adopt fair currency policies, or using U.S. taxpayer dollars to benefit U.S. companies, we are on the losing end of free trade before the deals are even negotiated. Where's the focus on industrial education? Where's the focus on requiring other countries to live up to their trade obligations? Where's the focus on making sure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent on U.S. jobs?

Now, I get the benefits of free trade, but come to Waterbury, Connecticut; New Britain, Connecticut; and Meriden, Connecticut, and what you will hear is a cry for help, not for more trade deals, but for a country that recognizes what every other developing industrial country has in this world, that we need a domestic industrial policy to protect and support our manufacturers here before we engage in free trade deals abroad.

WORKING TOGETHER FOR JOB CREATION

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to job creation, the American people are not waiting for the right speech but, rather, the right leadership.

While the Obama administration claims to seek common ground on which to help employers hire workers, House Republicans have already produced and passed more than a dozen job-creating bills through the House this year. We're going to do that here later today with the three trade bills that will create 250,000 jobs.

Unfortunately, these measures have long been ignored by the Senate and the White House. Where was the leadership? If President Obama is serious about helping create jobs, then he must listen to what job creators are actually saying. More than anything else, they need long-term confidence that Washington will stop punishing them with reckless red tape and threatening them with new taxes.

House Republicans are ready to work with the President, but not if it means supporting policies that only work against job creators and job-seekers.

□ 1230

JOBS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Some few weeks ago, the President addressed this Congress in this Chamber about jobs and introduced the American Jobs Act. Something that would help small businesses, something that would help put policemen and firemen and teachers to work, something that would help rebuild schools, a bill that would appropriately put Americans back to work and address our problems, but the Senate killed it yesterday. We should have known, and we did know the Senate would kill it because Senator MCCONNELL said right after the President was sworn in: Our main job is to see that he's not reelected.

The President is in support of these trade agreements. I'm not; he is. The Republicans are, but they don't give him credit for it. They condemn him today, the previous speaker, and yet he's for the trade agreements. He couldn't do anything for them. If he made them a kidney transplant, they'd want two. There's nothing he could do they'd think was right.

We need to create jobs. It's the main issue in my district and in this Nation. We need to work together to create jobs in America, and the millionaires need to pay their fair share.

JOBS

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, last night I was disappointed, although not surprised, to see the Senate fail to arrive at the number of votes needed to bring cloture so that the American Jobs Act could be debated. They not only don't want to pass the jobs bill, they don't even want to debate the jobs bill. I thought that was an embarrassing moment for the U.S. Congress because, with 9.1 percent unemployment, with people who have been chronically unemployed for so long, one would think that we'd want to get down here and talk about jobs, bring forth our ideas, offer amendments, and do everything we could to try to help spur the American economy on. And yet we saw that jobs bill go down.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that Congress can bring things up, and they can bring things up again. And as long as Americans are unemployed at the disgraceful rates that they are today, our Congress will never stop fighting to continue to bring jobs bills back to this Congress.

The Republican majority in this House has yet to bring a jobs bill. We hope to see one one day soon.

SUPPORT THE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, passing the South Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements will decrease our trade deficit and make it easier for U.S. companies to compete on a global level. Specifically, the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement levels the playing field for Texas exports and translates into a potential duty-free savings of $180 million for this fast-growing regional market.

For example, in the district I represent, Texas 22, Schlumberger exported $6.7 million in machinery parts to Colombia in 2010 and paid over $336,000 in duty fees. In Texas 22 alone, over 107,000 jobs are directly supported by over $57 billion in exports.

Free trade means more money—money that stays with the companies in America, money that can be used to expand American businesses and grow American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to level the playing field for American businesses by supporting these three free trade agreements. Let's export American goods and services, not American jobs.

CHINA CURRENCY MANIPULATION

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the trade agreements are front and center for us right now. But I have to ask you: What are you waiting for?

We talk about deficits; we talk about debt; we talk about trade agreements; but what is it that really would have an impact, and that is if you would set for hearing the whole concept of currency manipulation. We have got to address China's manipulation of its yuan.

I just came running over from HASC, the House Armed Services Committee, and one of the issues that was raised there was we've got to do something about the yuan. China is outbuilding us. China is going to try to take over the Pacific. China is building ships. China is doing all of these things that put our defense and our people at risk.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask you again: What are you waiting for? Let's hear that currency manipulation bill that has 226 of us, bipartisan support. Let's hear it. It's time to really come to grips with what is truly our problem, how this bill will then affect issues such as the deficit and the debt and increase our GDP. Think about it, Mr. Speaker.

JOBS

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it's a very important day today.

Five hundred and nineteen years ago, Columbus discovered America. He was on a trade mission. But the problem is that today, instead of dealing with trade missions and all the rest, we ought to have the bill out here that the President presented on creating jobs for American workers.

Now, this Congress has been in session for 300-some-odd days. With the Republicans talking about all of the problems of this society and how the President's plan hasn't worked, they have yet to bring to this floor a presentation of a way to create jobs for American workers.

These trade agreements, they say, well, if we had a level playing field with Korea and all of these other places, suddenly we would have a lot of jobs here. There is a much better way and a much surer way to provide jobs here in this country. My predecessor here talked about manipulation by the Chinese of our currency, which has been estimated to cut out a million jobs. There are other things we ought to be doing today than these free trade agreements.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 12, 2011 at 9:11 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1619.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3078) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, we've been waiting for these trade agreements for a long time. Every day that goes by without them has been a missed opportunity. At a time when our economy is struggling, these trade agreements mean more opportunities for Americans. They mean more American exports. And, most importantly, they mean more American jobs.

We've already seen the benefits of trade in North Dakota. Our exports have more than doubled over the last 5 years because of our renewed commitment to free trade. These trade agreements before us today could increase exports by $23 million in North Dakota alone and $13 billion nationwide.

If we're serious about creating jobs, if we're serious about getting our economy back on track and allowing the U.S. to stay competitive in a fast-moving global market, passing these trade agreements is a critical first step. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting them.

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. I oppose this bill for many reasons. First, Colombia does not yet meet the high standards we should be demanding of our trading partners. While Colombia has made admirable progress, trade unionists continue to be brutally murdered and attacked. This is unacceptable. We can't just look the other way and hope things get better.

Second, this agreement makes permanent the trade preferences that have absolutely devastated California's cut flower industry, which produces 80 percent of domestically grown flowers. This agreement continues millions of dollars in subsidies for Colombia flower growers but provides no such support for our domestic growers. California's growers have developed a plan to cut costs and compete globally, but they can't do it alone. It's only fair that our domestic flower growers get a little help from their government, too. This FTA is a huge missed opportunity to help this valued domestic industry.

For these, and so many other reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for yielding, and thank you for your leadership in this area.

It has been nearly 5 years since we signed our trade agreement with Colombia, and although I'm disappointed that it took this long, I am so pleased we will be ratifying this agreement today. Once this trade deal has passed, we will finally have what our Trade Subcommittee chairman Representative BRADY has correctly labeled a ''Sell American'' agreement with the third-largest economy in South and Central America.

Exports of American goods will increase by more than $1 billion, and the ITC expects our stagnant GDP will get a boost of at least $2.5 billion, not to mention Kansas wheat farmers can look forward to an even larger share of the Colombian grain market.

It's been 5 years in the making, but we are finally here. I urge my colleagues to come together and support the pro-jobs, pro-growth Colombian Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of our committee, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank my friend and colleague Mr. LEVIN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the United States-Colombia free trade agreement. Some of my colleagues do not believe that the issue of human rights and the issue of the rule of law should be addressed through our trade policy. Some believe it is not about stolen lands, ransacked homes. It is not about human rights activists whose families and friends were harassed and disappeared. It is not about murdered labor leaders. It is not about a crisis that is only comparable to Sudan.

Trade for the sake of trade. Money for the sake of money. Let someone else care. Let someone else do it. Let someone else work on the human rights. Let someone else fight for justice. Let someone else worry about peace, order, and tranquility. All we need to do is find the cheapest, fastest, and easiest way to make a buck.

My friends, we're mistaken to believe that this is not about us. But the crisis in Colombia affects every part of our region. It affects millions forced from their homes. It helped to create the drug cartels and international gangs. It impacts the cost of crack and cocaine on every single street on America.

We cannot ask someone else to address the violence. We cannot leave the question of corruption and impunity to another leader, another generation. We must demand these answers now. If we don't, who will? It is up to us. We can do better. It is on our watch.

Mr. Speaker, today is a very sad day. We could have taken our time and done it right.

Today, we are abandoning our duty to the people who elected us and to millions of Colombians who now know that their cries fell on deaf ears and cold hearts. We can do better. We must do better. This Congress and this administration must have the courage to stand up and do what is right and be on the right side of history. It is a missed opportunity for change, for good, if we fail to do what is right.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. First, I thank the chairman for his leadership in support of these agreements.

Let me say I agree with the President. The passage of the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea trade agreements will mean 250,000 new jobs at a time when our economy needs them most. But these trade agreements, Mr. Speaker, aren't just about new jobs. They're about the millions of Americans who rely on new markets and new customers. In my district in central Illinois alone, Illinois' farmers depend on customers in South Korea, in Panama, and in Colombia. And when the United States of America does nothing, we lose market share.

Five years ago, when this agreement was negotiated, Colombians purchased 60 percent of their wheat from the United States' farmers. Today, that number is 30 percent. It's costing jobs and it's costing opportunity here in our country. In manufacturing in my home area, Caterpillar, one of the major manufacturers of our country, employs a lot of high-wage union jobs, manufacturing jobs. Eight out of 10 of the tractors that are built in my district are sent to other customers around the world. With only 5 percent of the world's population in this country, it takes a pretty defeatist mentality to believe that our country would be better off not selling to the other 95 percent of the world.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will pass a jobs bill, a jobs bill that can pass the House, a jobs bill that can pass the Senate, and a jobs bill, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States has already said he will sign into law. And this jobs bill, Mr. Speaker, does not require a tax increase. This jobs bill does not require us to go into debt. And this jobs bill has bipartisan support and is good

not only for current Americans, but more importantly, it's good for future Americans and the future generation of America.

I urge passage of these three bills.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member on the Trade Subcommittee of Ways and Means, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are all proud Members of the United States Congress. We consider this the preeminent legislative body in the world that sets the standard for how the world should create laws and how we should govern our country. We believe in the rule of law. We talk about it all the time. We're for the rule of law. Well, that is the nub of this argument about why so many of us will vote against the Colombian Free Trade Agreement.

Now, we all know the horrors. And we'll hear them repeated again and again. But the fact is that we forced the government of Colombia—President Obama did—to sit down and write a Labor Action Plan in which they said what they would do. We had listened for a couple of years to the previous administration, the Uribe administration; promise, promise, promise—nothing happened. So this President said, I want it in writing. Write down a labor agreement. It set out the precise steps that Colombia had to take to address the particular problems faced in that country; for example, steps Colombia could take to detect sham subcontractors and punish employers for using them to suppress worker rights.

□ 1250

We went down to very specific things. Why was that? Well, many of us who have been here awhile were here when we passed NAFTA. And we thought we had read it and understood what it meant, but we didn't understand a lot of what happened because we agreed that we wouldn't put the labor into the agreement; we would write a side letter. And we wouldn't put the environment into the agreement; we would put it in a side letter. Maquiladoras would be taken care of; the Rio Grande would be cleaned up.

Nothing happened because it wasn't in the agreement. It did not have the force of law of the United States Congress behind it.

So when we came to this, we didn't seal the deal. We said to the President, we want that in there. The President talked to the Republicans, and back and forth it went. And the Republicans were absolutely implacably opposed to putting in any mention of the Colombian Action Plan. Now, if somebody says they're going to do something, you take them at face value—sure they're going to do it. Then write it down here; just let's put it right in there so there's never any confusion about what it was you said you were going to do. But the Republicans insisted that this be as wide open as the NAFTA agreement, that it not have built into it the one thing that makes this so difficult for us to deal with.

If we believe in workers' rights and if we believe in human rights in this place—and we talk about it all the time. We talk about it for every country in the world. But when we write a trade agreement for Colombia, we're unwilling to write in the demands for the Colombian workers. That's what's wrong with this, and that's why most of us will vote against it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I want to thank the chair for his excellent leadership in this because it's taken 5 years too long, but finally the House will have the opportunity to vote on the three pending free trade agreements.

We have to understand that America competes in the global economy; and if we ignore this, we ignore it at our own peril. And while these free trade agreements have been languishing on the President's desk for 5 years, we have actually lost market share to the EU, to Canada. And those are the things that are going to keep our country from growing again.

Now, if you look at just the Colombia free trade agreement, since we have actually drafted that agreement, $3.85 billion in unnecessary tariffs have been put on American products. When we actually have these free trade agreements in place, we're going to actually add to our economy and add to the jobs here in the United States.

In my home district, we have a very robust high-tech sector, and it's very heavily on trade. Last year, we had $10 billion of trade going out in exports, and a lot of them have been going to countries that we actually have free trade agreements for. And 35,000 jobs are directly related to that.

So I think that this is a jobs bill. I urge my colleagues to support all three free trade agreements, and I urge their passage.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time remains on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 23 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is just long overdue. This creates jobs. There is an issue that comes to the floor that has bipartisan support rarely these days. The Obama administration estimates this will create 250,000 new jobs. We agree. With respect to Colombia in particular, they have free access to our markets, but we don't have free access to theirs. This gives us a level and equal playing field.

Colombia is our strongest ally in the region. Colombia has done so much to help stop the proliferation of drugs coming into this country. They've helped us at the U.N. More importantly, they want to buy our products. Where I come from, Mr. Speaker, we make things and we grow things. Twenty percent of all the manufacturing jobs in Wisconsin require exports; $16.7 billion of our agricultural products in Wisconsin in 2009 were in exports, creating 200,000 jobs in Wisconsin alone. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers, they're not in this country; they're in other countries. If you're standing still in trade, you're falling behind.

All our trading competitors are going around the world getting better agreements and better deals for their exporters, freezing us out. It's high time we pass these agreements to break down these barriers so that we can make and grow things in America and sell them overseas so we can create jobs. And that's exactly what these three agreements, especially Colombia, do; and I urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to a very active member of our committee from the great State of Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

We need a new, 21st-century trade policy that encourages more trade without encouraging a race to the bottom in conditions for our workers and in the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink.

Trade agreements should not be measured solely with regard to how many tons of goods move across a border, but they must consider the impact on how our workers are treated, how our environment is treated. And that's the very kind of trade policy that President Obama has said repeatedly he is committed to. Trade Adjustment Assistance is just not a substitute for a new trade policy that recognizes that too often American jobs have been a leading American export.

All three of these Bush-Cheney trade agreements are deficient. But this one in particular shows just how far those who think that the only thing that matters in trade policy is the volume of goods from one country to another, to the exclusion of everything else, how that narrow view insists today that we must have totally free trade with the trade union murder capital of the world. Yes, supporters of this free trade agreement have forgotten it's not free, it's not free to those who attempt to represent workers in Colombia.

Last year, 49 trade union members were murdered in Colombia. And this year, it's already up to 20. Human Rights Watch has just reported that there is virtually no progress in securing murder convictions. They got six

out of 195 union member murders that were actually convicted. In nine of 10 cases, the Colombians haven't even identified a suspect in these murders. You can talk of an action plan, and that's fine; but it's just like talk of a new trade policy. It's just talk and nothing else.

This amendment denies any enforcement provision on the Action Plan that would make it actionable. LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens, opposes this agreement, quite rightly calling for a new American trade policy that promotes living wages and sustainable jobs, encourages human rights, labor standards, and a healthy environment—not only here, but among each of our trading partners.

Instead, today's agreement emplaces the principle that violence against the very people who make the goods being traded will be disregarded, will be overlooked if only we can increase the trade volume of what they make.

Reject this misguided agreement.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that obviously the murder of any citizen in any country is something to be avoided. But let's just set the record straight that the homicide rate since 2002 against union members has declined 85 percent in Colombia. I think this is an example that the efforts of the Colombian Government are succeeding. And the homicide rate for the general population has declined by 44 percent, and kidnappings as well have declined.

The ILO has also removed Colombia from their Labor Watch List. They did that in 2010, recognizing their collective bargaining rules, recognizing the measures they've adopted to combat violence against trade union members. And so we have a very different picture being painted by the reality there.

I would also point out that three main labor confederations have called the Labor Action Plan the most significant social achievement in Colombia in 50 years.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

□ 1300

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank Chairman CAMP not only for that great explanation that he just gave, but for bringing this bill to the floor.

Look, I keep hearing a lot about the horrors of Colombia. A couple of facts:

Because of the Andean trade pact preferential act, Colombian goods that come to the United States already basically come almost tariff-free. This would even it out so our products, created by American labor here, can go to Colombia with the same preferential treatment, fact number one.

And fact number two, the chairman just talked about this. I keep hearing about this Colombia, which is really, frankly, a caricature, an offensive caricature of what Colombia really is, as if we can just throw those things out there pretending that it doesn't mean anything. Colombia is a democratic ally, Mr. Speaker. They have taken incredible steps to move forward to lower violence, to lower crime, to lower narcotrafficking. They're even now training police forces across the world, including Mexico, in their fight against narcoterrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, it's an offensive caricature of Colombia, a democratic ally, a place that is fighting for democracy and for freedom and for due process and the rule of law. We should recognize it, commend them, thank them for being such an ally, for being a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it ironic that a lot of the people that want to do business with Castro's Cuba, where labor unions aren't even permitted, complain about Colombia because they are a democracy, because they're an ally, because they're doing the right thing. Let's pass this commonsense thing.

Let's also thank the President for finally doing what he said he was going to do a long time ago when he said that it was time to pass this.

It's better late than never, Mr. President, but thank you for finally sending it.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to our distinguished leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his great leadership on protecting American workers while promoting the global economy which we are proudly a part of.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as we consider the Colombia free trade agreement, to make the following statement:

Much has been said about this agreement creating 6,000 jobs in the United States—6,000 jobs. Now, we want to fight for every single job for the American people. But it is ironic or strange to hear a big fuss about we have to do this because it's going to create 6,000 jobs, when the leadership of this body is totally ignoring the fact that we are losing 1 million jobs—1 million jobs—because of the China currency bill.

When it was discussed that these bills would be brought to the floor, many of us said we shouldn't even be considering these bills: 6,000 for Colombia, perhaps 70,000 for Korea, maybe 1,000 for Panama, 77,000 jobs. That's significant if, in fact, those numbers really bear out. But let's assume they do for a moment.

We're making a big deal out of 77,000 jobs, which are a big deal. But how much bigger a deal is it to say we're ignoring the fact that we are losing over 1 million jobs per year because of the China manipulation of their currency?

The distinguished Speaker has said, if we push this bill, we will start a trade war with China. My, have I heard that song before. Many of us have been fighting for a better relationship with China in terms of our trade relationship, and for at least two decades we've been fighting for opening of our markets to China to stop the piracy of our intellectual property. The list goes on.

But this manipulation of currency, okay, the Speaker says we're going to start a trade war. Twenty years ago, when we started this debate, following Tiananmen Square, our trade deficit with China was $5 billion a year. We tried to use our leverage with most favored nation status to get the Chinese to open their markets, stop pirating our intellectual property, et cetera, and everybody said, if you do that, you will start a trade war. Just let the natural course of events take place.

Well, we didn't start a trade war. But do you know what China's surplus with the United States is today, what our deficit is with China? $5 billion a year two decades, 20 years ago when we fought this fight and lost. It's now $5 billion per week, over—more than $5 billion a week. Over a quarter of $1 trillion in surplus does the Chinese Government enjoy in their relationship with the United States.

So you're telling me that if we say, ''We want you to act fairly in terms of your currency,'' that they're going to give up a quarter of $1 trillion in surplus, much bigger exports to the United States, but in surplus.

This manipulation of currency is the subsidy of the Chinese Government for their products. By subsidizing their exports, they make it uncompetitive for us, not only in the U.S.-China bilateral trade relationship, but also in the global marketplace where we have to compete. Our exports have to compete with China's exports, and they have subsidized their exports on the manipulation of about 25 percent of their currency, 25 percent manipulation.

This is just not fair; a million U.S. jobs. So when our colleagues make a fuss about 6,000, every one of them is precious to us, yes, but why are we missing in action when it comes to a million jobs if 6,000 jobs are so important? And I agree, they are.

Last night in the Senate, they passed this legislation. They passed legislation to take action if China continues to manipulate their currency. We shouldn't even be talking about any trade bills until we do the same. They're not voting on Colombia, Korea, and Panama before they voted on China. They did that. They staked their claim for the American workers.

The Speaker says we're going to start a trade war. The Chinese Government started a war with America's manufacturing sector a long time ago. They've undervalued their currency, as I've said. They've violated intellectual property rights. They've subsidized target industry. They've dumped their products into our country. This is a

one-way street to the disadvantage of American workers.

Look, many of us, when we grew up, we dug a hole in the sand at the beach and we said we were going to reach China if we were digging far enough, if we dug far enough. It's a country that we want to have a brilliant relationship with culturally, economically, politically, in every possible way, economically, too.

But when are we going to call a halt to something that is so obvious? We're talking about not an 800-pound gorilla, an 8-ton gorilla that is lying on the floor of this House that we want to ignore so we can talk about 6,000 jobs and 70,000 jobs, which are important. I don't want to minimize that. But why are you minimizing a million jobs at least that would be affected?

It's funny to me because when we were having the fight on most favored nation status for China, we were winning every vote; we just couldn't override the Presidential vetoes. And so they had to change the name. You've heard the expression, PNTR. Do you know what that means? It went from most favored nation, which they said that sounds—we can't win that argument, to permanent normal trade relations.

You know what that means? Surrender all your leverage in the trade relationship. Surrender because this is a permanent normal trade relationship. So when specific things come up like the manipulation of currency—and, by the way, other Asian economies peg their currency to China's currency; so we're getting an onslaught of this. It's really, really important for us to say: Whom are we here for? Whom are we representing?

□ 1310

We have a Make It In America agenda to grow and to strengthen our industrial and manufacturing base in our country. Exports are essential to our success economically. Small businesses are essential to the success of our economy. Small businesses want to export as well. But why are we saying to small business people, to our industrial workers and to our manufacturing base, you are now going to go into an arena which we have subscribed to that makes you engage in an unfair relationship because we will not speak out against this manipulation of currency?

Sixty-one Republicans are cosponsors of the bill. It has bipartisan support. The Senate has passed the bill overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. They took it up first as a premise planting a flag, staking a claim for the American worker before they went on to consider other trade agreements. Why can't we do that in the House? I think we should call a halt to voting on any of these things until we say to the American worker, we're on your side. We're on your side when it comes to these trade agreements.

We recognize that trade is very important to us. President Kennedy is part of the legacy of all of us here talking about America as important in the world economy and free trade. Fair trade, I like to think, is part of that. But after 20 years of violations of our intellectual property, subsidizing their projects—the list goes on and on—we just sit by and say we're going to start a trade war if we do something about the war on America's manufacturers that the Chinese already have done.

Remember, 20 years ago, they made the same claims, $5 billion a year. How did that work out for us? Today, $5 billion a week at least. So the Chinese are going to walk away from a quarter of a trillion dollars in profits? I don't think so. Let's stop riding that tiger. Let's do the right thing for our workers. Let's not even consider any of these trade agreements.

Since we're talking about Colombia, I want to say the following. I really wanted very much to be able to vote for this legislation. I was very hopeful when the two governments, Colombia and the U.S., negotiated the U.S.-Colombian action plan related to labor rights. They addressed labor concerns to start the process of ending the abuses. But that didn't happen. The administration was advocating for this, but the leadership in the Congress said, no, and leadership in this House said no, we're not going to put language in the bill, the language that the two governments negotiated to address the labor concerns. If it's not in the bill, it doesn't exist. If we're going to implement this action plan, it has to be part of the legislation, or else we're just saying it's an incidental, it's something on the side. That's not fair to the workers in Colombia or to the workers in the United States.

So when the commitment made by our government and Colombia to each other was not included in the bill, I lost my faith in the legislation. I hope that today we can get a vote on China's manipulation of currency, get a Colombia free-trade agreement that can work for Colombian workers and U.S. workers, and get a trade policy that recognizes that it's a competitive world. We intend to be number one, we intend to be innovative, and we intend to educate our workforce so that our entrepreneurial spirit can prevail. It could be a very exciting time—something new and something fresh, instead of reverting to the same old same old ways.

So I urge my colleagues to urge the leadership of this House to take up the China currency bill before we consider any other trade bills.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the lead chief Democrat cosponsor of the bill we're considering today, the Colombia trade promotion agreement, Mr. FARR of California.

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of this agreement. Look, Colombia is a very important country to us. It has a lot of problems, but it has incredible potential. Colombia is a big country. It's the 20th-largest trade partner with the United States. It's our best ally in Latin America. It was the oldest democracy in Latin America, the first country to accept Peace Corps. It allowed an Air Force base to be built in Colombia. Other countries haven't allowed that. They fought alongside of us and are now fighting alongside of us in Afghanistan. They help us with Mexico drug cartels by teaching the Mexican national police and military how to handle those cartels.

It's the first country to adopt a labor action plan. And let me speak to that. That labor action plan was adopted this year on April 11. You're going to hear a lot of complaints—well, it hasn't moved fast. It's only been in effect 6 months. It's already been able to organize the grocers into unions and other big industries into unions. It's the strongest labor plan ever adopted in the history of the United States trade agreements. And that's not my opinion; that's the opinion of the Secretary of Labor of this country. It's the opinion of the Congressional Research Office.

And, frankly, a lot of people say, oh, this is another NAFTA. No. No. No. It's not NAFTA. NAFTA didn't have the ILO declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work and the follow-up provisions. This is the Peru free trade agreement which we passed. It has that right here under article 17, and this is the Colombian free trade agreement. They are exactly the same. The principles are the same. Number 2 reads, effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining—effective recognition. That means that anything that stops that can be brought under this agreement, an action against the country.

So, look, you'll hear arguments today that it will create a loss of jobs. There's going to be a loss of jobs if we don't do this. Do you know that we have made a free trade agreement with every single country in Latin America except Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador? Every one of them, none of them with these labor protections. These will be the strongest. But if we don't lift those trade barriers, all the products that we send to Colombia have a tariff on them. All those other countries, they don't. All of the European countries that are entering into a free trade agreement with Colombia don't have it. Canada doesn't have it. So guess what? We're going to lose the jobs of people who make things here and send them there because it's going to be too expensive to buy them in Colombia. So we don't want to lose those jobs. We want to grow those jobs. And there's a great market in Colombia to do that.

They say union workers are not protected, and they're not allowed to organize. That's not true. In fact, the only country that counts the crimes against

labor unions is Colombia. It's the only country that has set up a ministry just to handle those crimes. And some say, oh, they haven't prosecuted enough. Some of those crimes were committed in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, it's old, old hard evidence. It's hard to figure out who did it. But they have people assigned to it, they have investigators, they have judges, and they have prosecutors. They've worked those out with the Colombian labor unions as to what crimes do you want us to go after first? They're working with the unions. A lot of unions are in support of this free trade agreement because of the labor standards that we've required them to adopt.

So I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions in this Colombian free trade agreement are the strongest labor provisions in any U.S. free trade agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. FARR. If we're going to encourage progress—we're investing a lot of money in Colombia, we have Peace Corps volunteers in Colombia—if we're going to encourage growth of U.S. industries and markets in South America, and if we're going to really deal with the culture of poverty, then we have to encourage a strong future for both countries. And the only way to do that is to assure the adoption of this agreement.

Most agricultural groups across the state of California are strongly supportive of all three FTAs.

They understand that the FTAs will generate new export opportunities in their sector.

However, the California cut flower industry grows over 80% of the domestically grown flowers, supporting over 10,000 jobs and contributing $10 billion to the California economy.

They have real concerns about the pending Colombia FTA.

Our cut flower farmers are the group most adversely impacted by free trade with Colombia.

And I have been working hard to mitigate the impact of the FTA on their industry.

To their great credit, our California flower farmers do not oppose the FTA.

Together, they have developed a transportation and logistics center.

This will cut shipping costs by 22–34 percent, according to a new study by USC.

This would help level the playing field and restore competitiveness with Colombian farmers, who have received hundreds of millions of dollars in assistance from their government and ours over the past 20 years.

As reference I will point out that from 2002–2010, Colombian exports to the U.S. increased 89%.

In the same time span, the number of acres dedicated to cut flower production in the U.S. declined by 22%.

The Obama administration knows that I am a strong supporter of the Colombia FTA, and I am proud to be leading the charge in the House to pass it.

However, I have also made it very clear that I will continue to fight for funding for the new transportation center that is vital to California cut flower farmers.

I am optimistic that this vital U.S. industry that provides 20% of flowers sold to U.S. consumers will soon get the federal assistance that it needs to thrive over the long term.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Colombia trade bill.

Trade agreements must be balanced, facilitating reciprocal two-way trade between nations. It's absolutely necessary that we also take into consideration small, family-owned, domestic industries that are sensitive to cheap foreign imports. Unfortunately, the Colombia trade bill falls flat in accomplishing these goals.

□ 1320

For more than 20 years, Colombia has benefited from the duty-free access to the U.S. market under the Andean Trade Preference Act. At the same time, some Colombian industries have received big government subsidies from the Colombian Government, and oftentimes our own U.S. foreign aid dollars benefit them. These policies have slowly eroded one of California's most unique and innovative industries.

California is home to the vast majority of domestic cut-flower growers in the United States of America. They account for more than 10,000 jobs across our State and represent hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity every year. Because of these failed trade policies, Colombia now has a stranglehold on 75 percent of the U.S. cut-flower market, creating a marketplace dominated by cheap foreign flowers, produced with cheap, unregulated labor. This puts our small family-owned businesses at an extreme disadvantage.

You can't tell me that it's cheaper to import flowers from Colombia than it is to grow them in our own backyard. I drive through northern California on a very regular basis and see collapsed, dilapidated, and unused greenhouses littering the small towns and rural communities of California. It's clear this industry has taken a major hit over the last few decades due to this flawed trade policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. As we see more and more flower farms and greenhouses closing all over California, this reminds us of the last time we did business with Colombia. This agreement is anti-family business and it's anti-American jobs. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Colombia trade bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I want to thank Chairman CAMP and Chairman BRADY for their leadership in moving the three pending free trade agreements that are long overdue for our consideration.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of all three pending trade agreements. Passing the Colombian agreement would not only create jobs in the U.S. but would signal our dedication to a faithful and strategic ally.

During my service in the U.S. Army, I ran Army flight operations with the Multinational Force and Observers-Sinai while serving jointly with the Colombian military. That was over 25 years ago. In watching the changes that have taken place, Colombian troops are still serving in peacekeeping roles, and they're serving internationally now in counterinsurgency and counternarcotic roles around the globe.

In 20 years Colombia has gone through an incredible economic, social, and democratic transformation. They are a robust democracy with strong ties to the United States in a region that includes increasingly anti-American governments, especially Venezuela. Let's strengthen these ties and eliminate any concern about America's reliability as a partner by ratifying the Colombian trade agreement.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Colombia free trade agreement for the job creation potential it brings to our struggling economy and especially to improve our national security in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from Nevada, a member of our committee, Ms. BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time.

I rise today to talk about what should be Congress' top priority—jobs, jobs, jobs. The economic downturn has hit my State of Nevada particularly hard, and families are still struggling with record unemployment.

Instead, today, we are debating the job-killing Colombia free trade agreement that will result in more good-paying American jobs being shipped overseas. In fact, this trade agreement, taken together with the Panama and the Korean trade agreements, will cost our Nation over 200,000 more jobs.

How much more job loss can Nevadans be expected to absorb before we stand up and say enough is enough?

Congress needs to get our priorities straight. Job creation needs to be our top priority. We must create a level playing field for the American worker. Last night, the Senate took a step in that direction by voting to stand up to the Chinese Government, whose unfair currency manipulation has cost our Nation over 3 million jobs in the last decade, including over 14,000 jobs in the State of Nevada alone. The House should be following suit. Instead of focusing on a trade agreement that will

send more Nevada jobs to foreign countries at a time when we can least afford it, we should reject these job-killing trade agreements and pass the China currency manipulation bill.

Let's get on with the job of Congress, which is to create jobs for the American people, for the American worker.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I do understand the concern that my very good friends have expressed on the Democratic side about the threat of violence in Colombia and the loss of jobs in America. What I don't understand is how voting against this trade agreement helps on either front. A ''no'' vote does nothing to create more jobs in America or, in fact, to reduce the level of violence in Colombia.

The fact is that the rate of violence in Colombia has been cut in half. The murder of trade union members is down by 80 percent. College enrollment is up by 50 percent. 90 percent of children are in school now. Poverty is down by 25 percent. Why? In large part because of the $8 billion in Plan Colombia we provided.

Now the Colombian Government wants to show its appreciation for our investment in Colombia's future by letting us share in their new prosperity. It's difficult to do that, though, when Colombia has average tariff barriers of 9 percent, with agriculture at 17 percent. The U.S. has virtually no tariff barriers, so this is a one-way street going in our direction, this trade agreement.

The share of U.S. imports, though, to Colombia, as a total amount of their imports, has dropped from 21 percent to 9 percent; and that's because of the trade agreements Colombia has been able to sign with Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and others; and they're about to further eat into American jobs by signing a trade agreement with the European Union. We in America made the investment to help Colombia become less violent, more democratic and more prosperous; and now we want to disengage rather than reap the benefits of producing jobs, products and services in America for export to Colombia.

It seems to me my very good friends on the Democratic side should support our President, who is doing everything he can to create jobs here. He understands when other countries, don't have tariff barriers that we have to overcome we can produce and sell more products and services to those countries and generate more jobs in this country. That's what we ought to be about. It seems to me a ''yes'' vote on all three trade agreements is the right thing to do.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time remains, please, on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 14¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, Mr. KIND from the great State of Wisconsin.

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the gentleman from Michigan's allotment of time.

I rise in strong support of the three trade agreements before us today: the Colombia agreement, Panama, as well as South Korea. Let me explain why.

For too long, I feel the United States has been standing on the sidelines while other countries have been moving on without us in opening up market share and establishing bilateral/multilateral agreements with them.

In the specific case of Colombia, because of our inability to be able to come together and pass a trade agreement, in the last year alone we've lost close to 50 percent market share with agricultural products that we would normally be exporting in the Colombian market. Being from the State of Wisconsin, obviously the agriculture sector is immensely important; and the longer we delay in passing these measures, the more we're going to be precluded from the market.

Also Mr. Speaker, I rise and share the concern of so many of my colleagues today in regard to labor rights in Colombia, but I think the Colombia of today is not the Colombia of 10 years ago or even of 5 years ago.

□ 1330

And much to the credit of the ranking member on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN, who worked tirelessly to make sure that we had a Labor Action Plan to work with Colombia to improve labor rights and protections, he thinks it should be a part of the body of the agreement. I think it's being implemented as we speak now, and it's not necessary, but the Santos administration realizes it's in their best interest to do more to enhance labor rights and protections in Colombia. I think a large part of the credit deserves to be given to the gentleman seated next to me here today, Mr. LEVIN.

We're just 4 percent of the world's population. Of course we've got to have a proactive trade agenda. The question is whether we're going to be a member of a rules-based trading system or not, because we are going to be trading with these countries one way or the other. These trade agreements now have core international labor and environmental standards in the bulk of the agreement, fully enforceable with every other provision.

That is an attempt to elevate standards upwards rather than seeing this race to the bottom that so many of my colleagues are concerned about. That's the question I think that's before us today involving Colombia, Panama, and the larger market, South Korea, is whether we're going to move forward on trade agreements that have been much improved with the current administration, having inherited from the last, or whether we will continue to move forward without any rules with those countries. They already have virtual unlimited access to our market but we face restrictions to theirs. These trade agreements will fix that.

I would urge my colleagues to support all three trade agreements.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for this free trade agreement on behalf of America's farmers and ranchers.

All three free trade agreements under consideration today are essential for our Nation's agricultural industry. Out of every $100 in agricultural sales, more than $25 comes from exports. So market access is critical to the success of our farmers and ranchers.

Colombia is particularly important to our producers because without a free trade agreement in place, we have begun to lose market access. Tariffs on American goods have made them more expensive and Colombians are choosing to buy other countries' products instead. Lost market access means lost income, lost jobs, and we cannot afford that.

Right now Colombia imposes duties on all American agricultural products. They range from 5 percent to 20 percent. Yet we still sell more than $830 million in agricultural products there. That's because America's farmers and ranchers produce high-quality crops and livestock, and those goods are in demand.

Under this agreement Colombia will eliminate tariffs on 70 percent of our exports. We can be sure that when American agricultural products are no longer subject to tariffs and become more cost competitive, we'll see substantial benefits. In fact, the Farm Bureau estimates we'll see 370 million more dollars in farm exports to Colombia annually.

While our farmers and ranchers will benefit from increased market access, they will not be alone. Farm exports create jobs throughout the economy in processing, packaging, transportation, just to name a few industries. A vote to pass the Colombia free trade agreement is a vote for job growth in all these sectors. It's a vote to create income and opportunity for our farmers and ranchers.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support this free trade agreement and help keep America's agricultural industry competitive.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I thank my friend from Michigan, Congressman SANDER LEVIN, for the time.

I rise to oppose this so-called free trade agreement. I find it deeply disturbing that the United States Congress is even considering a free trade

agreement with a country that holds the world's record for assassinations of trade unionists and would cause a loss of 55,000 jobs in the United States.

The Congressional Black Caucus has been working hard to create jobs. We've held job fares in five cities in the country. We have been working hard to create jobs because the unemployment rate in this country is unacceptable: 9.1 throughout the country, 11.3 for Latinos, 16 percent for African Americans. We need jobs, not an unfair trade agenda.

Additionally, according to Colombia's National Labor School, 51 trade labor unionists were assassinated in 2010. That's more than the rest of the world combined. In addition, 21 unionists survived attempts on their lives, 338 unionists received death threats, 35 were forcibly displaced, 34 were arbitrarily detained, and 7 just disappeared in 2010. Another 23 unionists have been assassinated so far this year, and a total of 2,908 union members have been murdered in Colombia since 1986. And the Colombian Attorney General's Office has not obtained any convictions for these murders for the past 4 years.

The people of Colombia don't need a free trade agreement; they need a government that respects the rights of all of its citizens.

Let's vote down this trade agenda and tell the Government of Colombia that there can be no free trade without human rights and human dignity.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the chairman for his work and I thank the ranking member.

Let me start off by thanking Mr. LEVIN also, because indeed I know he's been back and forth to Colombia, and he's made this a better trade bill with the action plan. And it was your hard work and dedication, Mr. LEVIN, and I thank you for doing that.

Yesterday, I had a chance to talk briefly on the floor in regard to the economics of it, and I'm hearing a lot of people talk about the past of Colombia, but not some of the things that are taking place on the ground right now. I have heard a lot of individuals talk about how it may be devastating in reference specifically to the African Colombian community.

But let me bring some facts to the issue, because I think oftentimes when I looked and talked to President Santos and the civil rights struggle right here in America, I see some similarities that we've got to think about because there's some positive things, a lot of positive things that happen on the floor.

For example, for the first time we have the Victims and Land Restitution Law in Colombia that was passed by the Government of Colombia. We have at the Presidential program on Afro-Colombians. We have the development projects. We have the mining and prior consultation law. We have addressing discrimination law that has been passed. We have the Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Program that has been passed by the Colombian legislature. We have the Afro-Colombian leadership and scholarship program. We have the Martin Luther King scholarship program. We have the Equal Employment Opportunity initiative. All of this is done by the Santos government. We have the Pathways to Prosperity Women Entrepreneurs Mentoring Network. We have 400 scholarships for Afro-Colombian police. We have the emergency humanitarian assistance programs. These are just some of the programs that are happening on the ground right now that are benefiting African Colombians.

When you talk about the leadership there, because I'm getting letters back and forth, this is a diverse leadership in Colombia. This is a diverse leadership here in America.

And just as the goal is to make sure that we enact certain things into laws so that we can make changes to make it better for people for tomorrow, that is what President Santos has been doing. That's what has happened, and that's what is happening.

Some say Santos is not going to carry it out. When Lyndon Baines Johnson became President, some said he wouldn't do anything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MEEKS. But he did. He came with some of the most landmark legislation with reference to civil rights and voting rights in the history of this country, the same thing that I see happening right now on the ground with President Santos. Landmark, for the first time ever, legislation addressing the rights of African Colombians; and because of the work of Mr. LEVIN, also landmark rights addressing the rights of all in labor.

I think that it's a positive thing and we should pass this Colombia free trade agreement because we are moving in the right direction. We're not there yet, but we're moving in the right direction.

□ 1340

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to this debate, and I know that my good friend Mr. LEVIN and my friend Mr. CAMP have worked to try to craft an agreement that they feel is in the best interest of this country. But this debate cannot pass without pointing out some facts that concern those of us who are opposed to this.

According to Global Trade Watch, Colombia is the world capital for violence against workers, with more unionists killed every year than in the rest of the world combined. Unionist murders have been growing from 37 in 2007 after the deal was signed to 51 in 2010, even though Colombia has been under maximum security. Only 6 percent of the nearly 2,680 unionist murders that have occurred have been prosecuted to date.

The deal doesn't require Colombia to end the unionist murders or bring past perpetrators to justice to obtain special trade privileges. Colombian unions oppose the deal and agree with U.S. unions that a recent action plan will not fix this horrific situation.

Colombia has the highest number of displaced people in the world, outpacing even Sudan because of forced displacement and land grabs, often with Colombian military involvement.

Now, I know there has been an attempt to try to address these, but I think that we have to get the Government of Colombia to answer these things first before we pass a trade agreement, and I don't believe that they have sufficiently done that. In particular, they haven't brought to justice those who are responsible for the murder of all of these unionists.

I think, as a country which supports the right of people, freedom of association, the right of free speech, if we do not stand for them in these trade agreements, then we can expect the same kind of conduct to occur. This is a concern I have, notwithstanding what I know are the honest, good-faith efforts of my colleagues who support this, even though I don't. I urge the bill's defeat.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

As my colleagues have listened to this debate today, and as we listen to our constituents at home, our constituents are asking us to focus on one thing—jobs. We've talked about a lot of issues today. We've talked about unions. We talked about all sorts of issues; but at the end of the day, the American people are asking us to focus on jobs.

These trade agreements allow American companies to export more products to Colombia. They level the playing field, and they create jobs back here at home in America. Colombia is the third largest U.S. export market in Latin America; and for farmers and companies in places like Kansas, exports have grown over 667 percent in the last 13 years, even with the one-sided tariffs that Colombia is currently imposing. If we level the playing field, allow companies in Kansas and across the country equal access to Colombian markets, exports will go up, as will the jobs those exports create.

Mr. Speaker, every day we don't pass these agreements we are falling behind, and our companies and our workers are at a disadvantage. If our top priority is jobs, then it's time to open up these markets, put our businesses on a level playing field, and create jobs at home as opposed to exporting them overseas.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any additional speakers?

Mr. LEVIN. I think not. I'm going to sum up myself.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to cast my vote in support of the Colombia free trade agreement, even though it has taken almost 5 years to get a vote on it. I thank Chairman CAMP, Chairman DREIER, and Chairman BRADY for their leadership on this cause.

The Colombia free trade agreement is important for several reasons. First, it will create jobs here in the United States. The International Trade Commission has estimated this will increase U.S. exports to Colombia by over $1 billion. It will grow our Nation's economy by over $2 billion and create thousands of new jobs here at home.

In the case of the 23rd District of Texas, the Colombia free trade agreement is of particular importance as I have a great deal of agriculture in my district and more than half of current U.S. agricultural exports to Colombia will become duty free immediately and almost all remaining tariffs gone after 15 years. This agreement is also important as it demonstrates our commitment to a steadfast ally in Latin America against oppressive regimes like Hugo Chavez's Venezuela.

Fundamentally, this agreement is about the economic freedom of the American people to be able to have a wide array of choices and to pay less for those choices because of the power of trade and competition.

Mr. LEVIN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of all three free trade agreements that will be on the floor today.

In an era where we have a near-constant supply of Federal bailouts and stimulus packages and Federal spending, it is refreshing that Congress is doing today what it should be doing, and that is creating an environment in a bipartisan way under which businesses can create jobs and the economy can flourish. It's the appropriate role of Congress to take these kinds of steps, to simply create an environment and then step out of the way and let businesses create these jobs.

Arizona alone had more than $15 billion worth of merchandise exports in 2010. More than half was exported to countries with which we have free trade agreements. These three free trade agreements today will only expand the opportunities for that to increase. These arrangements will allow the private sector to create thousands of new jobs and strengthen the economy in the long term.

Again, that is the appropriate role for government, to create an environment where the private sector can create jobs. That's what free trade agreements do. That's why I'm pleased to support these agreements today.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I advise my colleague that I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me be clear what's at stake here on the Colombia FTA. I feel so deeply about it. Free trade agreements set the terms of competition between nations. It's more than about the mathematical flow of goods. The conditions for workers in the country we trade with are fundamental to that competition. Workers in Colombia have long been without their basic worker rights. More than any other democracy in the globe, there have been extreme levels of violence against workers and their leaders. There's been a universal, really, a universal lack of justice for murders of union activists. And there have been extensive flaws in Colombia's labor law and its practices.

These conditions and the insistence of Democrats that they be effectively and fully enforced are what held up consideration of the Colombia free trade agreement. What has been long overdue was work on these conditions, and there wasn't by the Bush or the Uribe administrations. Yes, it has taken 5 years because most of those years were taken up by inaction by the Bush administration, and by the administration previous to Mr. Santos.

□ 1350

Earlier this year, an Action Plan on Labor Rights was negotiated between the new American and Colombian administrations, and it included some commitments and deadlines at long last for Colombia to address issues of worker rights, violence, and impunity. Very regretfully, some key obligations have not been met in a meaningful way. Let me give you one example about a condition that I saw firsthand in visits to Colombia. Their employers have a history of using sham cooperatives and other contract relationships to camouflage true employment relationships and thereby to rob workers of their rights. The ILO has long identified this type of practice as among the most serious problems facing Colombian workers. In Colombia, only workers who are directly employed can form a union and collectively bargain. Colombia committed to stop such abuses in the action plan. It passed far-reaching legislation and proposed effective regulations. But, unfortunately, it then backed away.

Through loopholes in the law it has allowed employers in Colombia, including a major beverage company and palm oil producers, to begin converting cooperatives to other contract forms to continue denying workers their basic rights. So we privately, we Democrats in the House, pushed the Colombians for months to try to stem this problematic shift. But even a clarification it issued on the eve of the markup last week—after public pressure had been brought to bear—fell short. So this problem highlights precisely why it was vital to link the action plan to the FTA we're voting on today. But very regrettably, the Republicans blocked any reference at all to the Labor Action Plan in the implementation bill, and unfortunately, the administration acquiesced in that position.

I just want to emphasize: Explicitly linking the action plan to entry into force of the Colombia FTA was necessary as a vital step to ensure effective, meaningful implementation of the action plan. Without such a linkage, we have no leverage to ensure that Colombia lives up to the commitments it has made. I also want to emphasize it provides no context and meaning for the enforcement of the FTA worker rights standard in the future.

The language in the FTA is the basic international worker rights language. It is general in its provision. It has to be given meaning. The Action Plan would help to give it meaning if in the future action is needed to be taken under the dispute settlement system. And so when there's no linkage between the implementation bill and the Action Plan, it takes away the context for future action.

Other obligations under the action plan have not been meaningfully met.

Despite minimal requirements set in the action plan, Colombian employers continue to use direct negotiations with workers, referred to as ''collective pacts,'' to thwart workers from organizing. And I saw firsthand the use of those collective pacts when I was in Colombia on one of my three visits.

Another pervasive problem was highlighted earlier this month by Human Rights Watch: Little progress in investigating and prosecuting murders of people trying to exercise their rights—even those cases designated as priorities. Colombia authorities obtained just 6 convictions of 195 union murders that occurred in the 4-plus years leading up to May, 2011. It's told that the ILO left Colombia off its priority list. That's because employers vetoed Colombia being on the list.

Notwithstanding clear commitments under the Action Plan to improve the situation through reforms and investigatory policies and methods, Colombia did not take the first step to do this—namely, the publication of an analysis of closed union murder cases—until the eve of the markup, even though the action plan called for its completion. Even with this, it is clear that additional leverage is necessary. Interviews by Human Rights Watch with Colombian prosecutors reveal that there's been no clear direction to implement the new policies and methods as committed to under the Action Plan.

I wish I could stand here today and say that Colombia had fully implemented the commitments under the

Action Plan to date, and very significantly, vitally, that the legislation incorporated the Action Plan and conditioned the FTA's entry into force on its effective implementation. I cannot in good conscience do so. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that well before the Labor Action Plan was signed by President Obama and President Santos, Colombia had raised their labor standards and aided union members in the exercise of their rights well before the action plan ever occurred. Colombia now has implemented all eight of the ILO core conventions—six more than the United States. The statute of limitations for murder was raised in 2009 from 20 to 30 years. The minimum prison sentence was raised from 13 to 25 years and the maximum was raised from 25 to 40. The authority to declare the legality of strikes is now in the purview of the judiciary, not the executive branch, which depoliticizes these decisions and shows the transition and progress that Colombia has made in this area. Employers no longer have a unilateral right to force a strike to arbitration. The constitution reforms in 2004 shortened by 75 percent the time it takes to prosecute a homicide case. As I mentioned earlier, the murder rate in Colombia against union members has declined by 85 percent since 2002.

As my Democrat colleagues in support of the Colombian Trade Agreement have said, the Labor Action Plan is the most stringent Labor Action Plan anywhere in the world that has ever occurred.

With regard to the cooperative issue, the U.S. Trade Representative testified in the Ways and Means Committee when we worked up this legislation that that loophole has been addressed and has been closed by the Colombian government. This is something the administration has agreed has occurred as well, not just myself.

Let me just address this issue of the Labor Action Plan being placed inside the trade agreement. I would just say that to condition entry into force of the trade agreement with compliance with the Labor Action Plan is completely inappropriate, and that's why there was bipartisan opposition to doing that. I certainly welcome the gentleman's statement that I was able to get the administration to acquiesce to not having the Labor Action Plan put into the agreement. Frankly, there was bipartisan agreement, with the administration agreeing as well on that point.

Let me just say there is a labor chapter in the agreement itself that addresses the labor issues that appropriately fall within the scope of the agreement. The Labor Action Plan goes well beyond that scope. Let me say why. The purpose of the implementing bill, the purpose of the bill before the House today, is to make changes to the United States laws that are necessary to implement the agreement. The Labor Action Plan doesn't require any changes to U.S. law. So therefore it should not and is not in the bill. Apart from being inappropriate, it's really unnecessary to condition entry into force on a labor action agreement that the Colombians have agreed to.

□ 1400

They have demonstrated their commitment to fulfilling the terms of the Labor Action Plan. They have satisfied, and on time, every single action item that has come due thus far. And our administration has certified that they have satisfied those conditions. There's only a few conditions that remain, which are due at the end of the year, and a few due in 2012, which we fully expect they will completely agree to.

And let me just say that it is high time we took up this agreement. Last year Colombian exporters paid virtually no tariffs when they shipped goods to the United States, but our exporters paid a tariff on an average of 11 percent trying to enter into their market. This agreement removes that imbalance by eliminating the Colombian duties. This need is urgent. Our exporters have paid nearly $4 billion in unnecessary duties since this agreement was signed and has been pending over the years.

We know from experience these agreements will yield the benefits that we say they will. Between 2000 and 2010, total U.S. exports increased by just over 60 percent, but our exports to countries in which we have trade agreements increased by over 90 percent. Our exports to Peru, for example, have more than doubled since the passage of the U.S.-Peru trade agreement, and those are very important statistics in these tough economic times.

So this is a major economic opportunity. Delay has been costly. There are major economies whose workers and exporters compete directly with ours. They have moved aggressively to sign and implement trade agreements with Colombia, Canada, Argentina, Brazil. Those undermine our competitive edge for our Nation and our workers and our families.

So we've been falling behind. We've been losing export market share that took years to build, frankly. For example, just the U.S. share of Colombia's corn, wheat, and soybean imports fell from 71 percent in 2008 to 27 percent in 2010 after Argentina's exporters gained preferential access.

Obviously, we have seen, also, a decline in our exports of wheat since Canada signed its trade agreement with Colombia, 2 years after. They entered and enforced their agreement with Colombia, which was signed 2 years after ours. So we owe it to U.S. workers. We owe it to our exporters to approve this agreement now and to press the President for prompt implementation.

I would urge strong support for this agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 425, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3078 will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 358, PROTECT LIFE ACT

Ms. FOXX (during consideration of H.R. 3078), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–243) on the resolution (H. Res. 430) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2273, COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT

Ms. FOXX (during consideration of H.R. 3078), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–244) on the resolution (H. Res. 431) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2273) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to facilitate recovery and beneficial use, and provide for the proper management and disposal, of materials generated by the combustion of coal and other fossil fuels, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3079) to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hour of debate remains on the bill. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the pending trade agreements, all three trade agreements, with Colombia, South Korea, and Panama.

In my home State of Washington, where one in three jobs is dependent on international trade, we understand the importance of expanding foreign markets for economic success. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that these agreements will increase jobs. Let me give you an example on a parochial basis in my district. Today, potato growers and processors face an 18-percent tariff when sending their product to South Korea. This agreement will end the tariff immediately, allowing our growers to fairly compete in this very important market.

It is critical to my constituents that we act now on all three of these trade agreements. Let me be parochial again, Mr. Speaker. Apple sales in Colombia dropped 48 percent last year because Chile had duty-free access to the Colombian market while my growers in my State did not—in fact, they had a 15-percent tariff. The passage of this agreement is expected to increase apple sales by 250,000 boxes a year, allowing us to regain a market share or at least to compete on a level playing field.

As our economy is struggling to recover, I encourage all of my colleagues to act now to support all three of these trade agreements because all three of these trade agreements will expand an opportunity for our economy to grow, and especially, Mr. Speaker, the diverse agriculture economy I have in central Washington.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. While this agreement, based upon the flawed framework of the Bush-Cheney administration, offers no model for the future with regard to workers or environmental protection, I am supporting today's measure because of a successful response to a longstanding concern that I have had, that is, Panama's status as a notorious tax haven, a place where taxpayers who refuse to pay their fair share of the cost of our national security and vital public services could go to hide their assets and dodge taxes.

About 2 years ago, Senator CARL LEVIN and I urged the administration to postpone the approval of this trade agreement until Panama first signed a Tax Information Exchange Agreement, where we could get information about assets hidden there and for Panama to change its laws regarding bank secrecy and other matters to assure that this agreement was meaningful. Panama has now met these conditions.

For the first time ever, we can obtain information from the Panamanian Government on U.S. taxpayers who have Panamanian assets or income. Though the Treasury Department should have secured a stronger automatic information exchange similar to the one we have with Canada and 24 other countries—and I would much prefer also to see an actual record of Panamanian compliance—we need to accept this as a victory in the fight against offshore tax cheats. This would not have been possible had it not been for the strong Panamanian desire to get the trade agreement approved.

By also agreeing to 12 other exchange agreements on tax information, Panama was recently removed from the OECD gray list of tax havens. Now we must ensure that Panama's newfound openness and transparency does not end with approval of today's agreements.

I support this trade agreement, knowing that while it could have been much better, the dangers have been mitigated with an agreement that has a very modest scope.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The rights of workers, which have increasingly come under attack in this country, are also at risk under these NAFTA-style trade agreements.

In Panama a 2010 State Department Human Rights Report notes that ''the government lacked sufficient mechanisms to ensure that laws prohibiting employer interference in unions and protecting workers from employer reprisals were adequately enforced.''

So the government lacked sufficient mechanisms to make sure that they were adequately enforced. We shouldn't be entering into a trade agreement with a country that has yet to demonstrate its ability to uphold international standards for labor rights and financial regulation.

Panama's track record on fulfilling its promises is clear: Just as it failed to adequately address its status as a tax haven wonderland, it has failed in its promise to adequately protect its workers.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I thank both Chairman CAMP and Chairman BRADY for their leadership on the pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. All three countries have seen incredible transformation take place over the last generation, especially Panama and Colombia.

□ 1410

In the last 25 years, they have revolutionized their economies. They've revolutionized socially, and their democracies are robust.

I rise in support of the pending trade agreement with Panama and encourage my colleagues to support passage of this important agreement. It's critical, not just to our economy but also for our national security. Passage of this agreement will mark renewed U.S. engagement with the region, while countering anti-Americanism and China's increasing economic prominence in South America.

Additionally, the U.S. is the largest user of the Panama Canal and works closely with the Panamanian government to ensure the safety of the canal itself and to enhance regional, maritime, and port security. For this critical asset alone and maintaining that relationship, it would be essential to passing this agreement.

I'd like to comment on one other aspect of security that's been enhanced in all three trade agreements, and that's the security of intellectual property rights. These agreements, all three of them, Korea, Panama, and Colombia, make significant improvements to IPR protections for U.S. companies. In all categories of intellectual property rights, U.S. companies will be treated no less favorably than companies in the partner countries. That's a great step forward.

The agreements establish tough penalties for piracy and counterfeiting. They include state-of-the-art protection for U.S. trademarks. The agreements include enhanced protection for copyrighted work and, ultimately, the agreements include stronger protections for patent and trade secrets.

As we look at the changing demographics of the world and the face of relationships, it is important that we turn our eyes to the south and to the east, strengthening our ties with Latin America and with South America, strengthening our ties with Asian democracies and republics through the Korean Free Trade Agreement. What we're doing with Panama, Colombia, and Korea is critical to our future, to our children's future.

I strongly urge passage of the Panama Free Trade Agreement. It's a great step forward. It's a great step in our alliance.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to a member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for the nice words of introduction.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement is an example of how to do a trade agreement right. This agreement will improve the U.S. trade surplus, emphasis on the word surplus, with Panama, and help with U.S. job creation and economic growth. And thanks to the FTA, Panama has brought its labor laws up to international standards and addressed Panama's status as a tax haven.

Let's start with economics. In Massachusetts, which exported a total of over $8 billion worth of merchandise in 2010, the total number of jobs created in my district supported by exports is over 26,000.

New exports help to support new jobs, and that's why I support the Panamanian free trade agreement. Panama is one of the fastest growing economies in Latin America. This FTA will eliminate tariffs and other barriers to U.S.

exports, promote economic growth, and expand trade between our two countries.

For example, most goods from Panama currently enter the U.S. duty-free, whereas U.S. exporters face import duties in Panama ranging from 5 to over 35 percent. This FTA will level the playing field by eliminating Panama's import duties on U.S. goods. As a result, U.S. passenger vehicle exports are expected to increase by 43 percent, and machinery exports are expected to increase by 14 percent.

Furthermore, Panama is currently free to discriminate against U.S. suppliers in government procurement, including the ongoing $5.25 billion Panama Canal expansion project. The FTA will require Panama to treat U.S. suppliers the same as Panamanian suppliers. There is going to be an explosion of opportunity with the opening of the Panama Canal after its expansion.

Now let's go to labor rights. Over the course of several years, House Democrats, myself included, have identified a variety of deficiencies in Panama's labor laws, and we insisted that the Panamanian FTA not be considered until those issues were addressed. In April of this year, Panama's President signed into law the last remaining changes needed to bring Panamanian laws into compliance with labor obligations of this agreement.

Furthermore, when we took the majority in 2007, House Democrats insisted that the FTA be negotiated or renegotiated to include the May 10 agreement. Among other things, the FTA was renegotiated to require Panama to comply with international labor standards and key international environmental agreements. Labor rights, environmental concerns, human rights. We insisted that those be undertaken, and we were told at one time that the agreement offered had to be all or nothing. House Democrats changed that with our insistence on those basic issues.

Now let me highlight how Panama has addressed its tax haven issue. And I would submit to you today there is no Member of this House that has a stronger credential on cracking down on tax havens than I do. I have stayed at it through the course of a career, and we've had some success, with more guaranteed to come.

In 2000 the OECD listed Panama as a tax haven, but since that time, Panama has worked to adopt international standards of transparency and effective exchange of information. In 2010, the U.S. and Panama entered into a tax information exchange agreement, and this past July the OECD placed Panama on its white list of countries who have substantially implemented international standards for exchange information. These are substantial advancements.

This would not have been possible without Democrats in this House who insisted that the FTA not be submitted to Congress until the tax haven issue was addressed. This FTA is a better agreement because House Democrats insisted on those basic human rights issues.

There is no question but labor agreements, human rights agreements, and environmental agreements have been included because of work that the minority in the House has done. And at the same time, we understand that these trade agreements are not necessarily panaceas. But by and large, the ones that I know that I've supported over a career, and some I've opposed, have had a net impact on economic growth.

These are very difficult issues for Members of this body to undertake. But we argue that the genius of opportunity is what Steve Jobs promoted through much of his life, with many setbacks along the way. But understand that many of the products that Steve Jobs and his genius succeeded in implementing ensure that people across the globe use those products today, and I think this an example of those opportunities.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say, this agreement will create new market access for U.S. exporters of consumer and industrial products. Over 87 percent of our exports to Panama will become duty-free immediately, with the remaining tariffs to be phased out that are left over a 10-year period. This will cut by more than half the average 8 percent tariff that our exporters face.

This will provide U.S. firms with an advantage over major competitors from Europe and Asia. And because Panama recently signed an agreement with the EU, our advantage is dependent on having our agreement enter into force immediately. So it's not just about what the U.S. and Panama are doing in a vacuum; it's about what the rest of the world is doing as well.

As I said, there are key export sectors that get immediate duty-free treatment: aircraft, construction equipment, fertilizers, medical and scientific equipment. This levels the playing field for our exporters versus importers from Panama, and this agreement will create new opportunities for our farmers and ranchers.

More than half of the current U.S. farm exports to Panama will become duty-free immediately. It gives our U.S. farmers an advantage over our EU and Canadian competitors. Our exports in agriculture to Panama now face a 15 percent average tariff. Our exports of pork, rice, soybeans and wheat, and most fresh fruit will receive immediate duty-free treatment, while our competitors in Asia and Europe will continue to face tariffs on those commodities as high as 90 percent. And that's why you've seen great support, both bipartisan, for this agreement. The American Farm Bureau estimates that the increase in farm exports to Panama alone could increase our agricultural exports by $46 million a year.

Obviously, this agreement also provides our access to Panamanian services markets. It will give our U.S. service firms market access, national treatment, regulatory transparency, and that is going to be very helpful as we continue to try to grow our economy and create jobs here in the United States.

□ 1420

I would agree with my friend from Massachusetts, Panama has improved their tax transparency; and because of the cooperation, adoption of the Tax Information Exchange Agreement, as well as other numerous double taxation treaties that I won't repeat that he referenced, they have been removed by the OECD from the so-called ''gray list'' to join countries such as the United States that meet internationally-agreed-to tax standards.

So by almost any measure, this agreement is positive, and it is something that we should strongly support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Public Citizen is an organization that dedicates itself to an impartial economic analysis of trade agreements. They looked at the Panama trade agreement, and here's what they came up with. They said that it includes extreme foreign investor privileges and offshoring protections and their private enforcement in international tribunals. It includes limits on financial and other service sector regulation, a ban on Buy America procurement preferences, limits on environmental safeguards and imported food and product safety and limits on drug patent rules that limit generics.

The AFL–CIO is one of the most important workers' organizations in the history of this country. They've analyzed the Panama free trade agreement, and here's what they have said. They've said it's the wrong trade model at the wrong time. Instead of helping workers here or in Panama, it rewards a country that has a history of repressing labor rights and has achieved much of its economic growth by making it easy for money launderers and tax dodgers to hide their income from legitimate authorities.

Moreover, this agreement, which was negotiated by the previous administration, contains too many flawed trade policies of the past, rather than laying out a new and progressive vision for the future. President Obama should not waste valuable time and effort advancing this inadequate agreement, but should instead focus on effective job creation measures, including currency reform, infrastructure investment, and robust training and education, and reforming our trade model so that it strengthens labor rights protections for all workers, safeguards domestic laws and regulations, and promotes the export of goods, not jobs.

The AFL–CIO noted that due to the small size of Panama's economy, the

economic impact of the Panama free trade agreement is likely to be small. Panama's gross domestic product is tiny in comparison to that of the United States, and Panama accounted for less than ½ of 1 percent of total U.S. exports in 2010. Thus, any demand for U.S. goods and services is likely to be minuscule. This is simply not an agreement that will substantially increase net exports or create American jobs.

While the Panama FTA contains—and we have to say it contains—improved labor and environmental provisions, these provisions need to be further strengthened, and our government needs to invest more resources and energy in more consistent enforcement across the board; and President Obama should work to further improve the labor, environment, investment, financial services and government procurement provisions contained in the Panama free trade agreement to build a new trade model for the future.

The AFL–CIO also pointed out another thing, Mr. Speaker. They said that Panama is not a part of any meaningful U.S. jobs plan. Even the Obama administration is not selling the Panama free trade agreement as a job-creating measure. Panama's economy is so small that the U.S. International Trade Commission was unable to quantify any job-creation effects of the Panama free trade agreement.

While economists routinely predict that trade agreements between the U.S. and developing countries will create jobs and improve our trade imbalances, the fact is that these rosy predictions repeatedly fail to pan out. The current U.S. approach to trade agreements has tended to destroy jobs, not create them.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the three free trade agreements that we are considering today. Free trade is good for America. These agreements will increase our products flowing to other countries that currently get to send their products for free here. We live in a world where products flow freely around the world. It's time for us to get American jobs to produce some of those goods moving abroad.

I would note that the President has asked us to pass pieces of his legislation, his jobs-creating legislation. I would compliment the chairman that we've waited 2½ years to get this particular proposal from the administration, and in less than 9 days, now we have it on the floor of the House. We're serious about doing the things to fix the economy. While the President lectures us, he fails to follow through on regulatory relief and tax relief. He fails to follow through on those things which would actually create jobs.

So we in the House appreciate the opportunity to vote on these particular bills today, because it is our way of saying that we will agree with the President when he's right, and we'll steadfastly disagree with him when he's wrong. We've got many areas that we can move forward together on, and I would recommend that the President come and sit down with us, come back to this floor of the House and sit and discuss with us the way to move forward instead of pushing a plan that says ''my way or the highway.''

We have generally a great threat from American Government on American jobs. The overregulation is killing jobs in the electrical utility field, it's killing jobs in oil and gas, and it's killing jobs in manufacturing. We can protect workers, we can protect the environment, and we can protect species and create jobs simultaneously. It is up to us, the policymakers, to find those balance points and to move forward with commonsense legislation that will effect these.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Panama trade agreement, as well as the Colombia and South Korea agreements before us today. And in the matter of Panama, to Panama's credit and to Panama's Parliament's credit, they realize that in order for this trade agreement to be fully considered by the Congress, they had to make improvements in regards to the tax havens of their country. And as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee pointed out, they did that. They took that additional step removing them from the ''Gray List'' of tax havens internationally.

But that brings me to the larger point. When President Obama took office, I believe he inherited three pretty good trade agreements at his desk negotiated by the previous administration; but he knew that they could be improved upon, which they immediately set out to do. And to the credit of many members of the Ways and Means Committee, especially the chairman and the ranking member both from Michigan, and the tireless efforts they put into improving these trade agreements, we finally reached the point where we could get back in the game.

At just 4 percent of the world's population, we have to be engaged with a proactive trade agenda; but the last time we had a trade agreement before this Congress has been roughly 6 years ago while other nations have been moving on with bilateral and multilateral agreements. That's too long when we have a floundering economy. Not that these trade agreements are going to be the panacea to rapid and significant job growth, but they will be helpful. In fact, countries like Panama and Colombia have virtually duty-free access to our country's markets already.

So the question is whether or not we want to try to level the playing field for our workers, for our businesses, and for the jobs being created here in the United States. And in the specific case of Panama, tariff reductions will be significant that will lead to further job growth in both the manufacturing, the service and the agricultural sectors alone.

But I commend the Obama administration and the team at the USTR led by Ambassador Kirk with the work they did in improving this Panama trade agreement, along with Colombia and South Korea, putting them in a position where there can be bipartisan support, and more importantly, to get us back into the arena of active trade which will help create jobs here at home.

□ 1430

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Maine, a champion of workers' rights, Ms. PINGREE.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague and friend from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed trade agreement. The Panama free trade agreement is structured exactly like NAFTA, a trade policy that resulted in the loss of millions of manufacturing jobs all over America. In Maine alone, we have lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was ratified in 1994. In addition to manufacturing jobs, it has hurt our agricultural and fishing sectors, and has had a huge impact on the economy of our State.

I have a perfect example. Steve White of Brewer, Maine, comes to mind. He worked in a factory for 22 years, making components that were used by GM, Ford, and Chrysler. Now those parts are being made in Mexico. Steve wrote this in the Bangor Daily News:

''We were given the opportunity, if we wished, to travel to Mexico and further train our replacements. My coworkers who went said that the conditions for the Mexican workers were very poor and far below the American standard. The pay rate was very low, and they would work long hours every day of the week.''

Here we are today, voting on three more trade agreements that could have the same devastating consequences for American jobs. Why would we do this at a time when we desperately need these jobs right here in the United States?

This week, in addition to the three free trade agreements, we will also vote on the extension of Trade Adjustment Assistance, a program that was created for those adversely affected by trade agreements. For several years and for probably many more, we have and will spend millions of dollars retraining people who have been put out of work by misguided trade agreements.

And for what? So that big companies can get a better deal on cheap labor and loose environmental standards in other countries?

What our workers want today, what the people in my State, the State of Maine, want are jobs, not readjustment assistance, not retraining, not some idea of another job to come in the future. They want a job today. They don't want these trade agreements, and they don't want to lose any more jobs in our State.

Mr. Speaker, America has a long history of supporting our hardworking families, but this policy does not invest in our workforce. It is not what is right for America's future, and I cannot support it.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chair of the Trade Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

I first want to thank Chairman CAMP and Speaker BOEHNER for insisting that the White House submit the Panama trade agreement along with those of Colombia and Korea to ensure that we open all three markets equally to American farmers, manufacturers, service, and technology companies. But for your work, we would not be here today.

This agreement is long overdue. As families know, the world has changed. It's not simply enough to buy American; we have to sell American all throughout the world. Panama is a dynamic new market for America with almost 9 percent a year in economic growth—far stronger than our own. Panama is important to our manufacturers in America, it's important to our farmers, it's especially important to our service companies because so much of Panama's economy matches up beautifully with America's economy. With the expansion of the Panama Canal, you're going to see increased cargo at our ports, increased jobs along our coasts, and lower prices in products in America as well.

Critics will say, Panama is too small an economy. Why do we bother?

In this dismal economy in America, every sale, every job counts. From Europe to Canada, to Thailand, to Singapore, and many more, our competitors negotiate sales agreements with Panama because they know those customers matter.

Critics say, Panama is a tax haven. Why are we doing this agreement? But those simply aren't the facts. They also often say that labor rights aren't what they ought to be.

Panama has passed more than a dozen labor laws that dramatically commit to raising the standard of labor protections in that country. They have passed tax information agreements with America and with other countries around the world, so much so that they are now considered in standing on tax transparency equal to the United States.

This is a valued ally in a strong and growing part of the world that, frankly, has waited far too long. It is embarrassing that it has taken 4 years to bring this agreement to the floor. But today it is here. Today, we will signal we are going to open those markets, that we are going to strengthen our ties, and that we are going to pass this sales agreement with Panama.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) be permitted to manage the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Maine will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, Panama will be the only trade deal that I will vote for because they import very little to the United States in the first place. More importantly, this allows for, as I see it, new opportunities for the U.S. gulf and east coast ports. Over 60 percent of the goods shipped through the canal sail to or from the United States. I think they've corrected what needed to be corrected. There is no indication of a loss of American jobs, and I think that's what we should be all about.

As for Colombia, I don't know how anyone could stand in front of the American people and say that Colombia is making progress in terms of stopping the concerted, conspiratorial effort, proven time and time again, of the murder of trade unionists in that country. In fact, there have been no convictions in 94 percent of the cases from 1986 to 2010—6 percent of convictions. I don't know how anybody could stand on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and compare the system of justice there to the system of justice of the United States. Some have suggested, well, we have murders here in this country, too. Of course there are. This is an absolute disgrace. We've lost our soul on this deal, no question about it.

Also, a number of multinational companies didn't want the China currency fixed because it doesn't help their big businesses and their purposes. So let's come to the crux of the issue:

If we'd have put together all the promises that were made to the American workers for the past 25, 30 years on trade deals, we would be very, very disappointed. This deal has come a long way, perhaps, since the last administration, but neither party is privy to perfection here. This is not a one-party rap.

I've read every one of these deals as much as I could, and there are good aspects of the deal, but let's take, for instance, that the United States International Trade Commission does not believe this bill will create jobs. Let me repeat that over and over again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. In fact, the updated report they provided to Congress contains a very specific disclaimer that is not an official estimate.

When are we going to stop the hemorrhaging of American jobs? It is part of what we've gone through, both parties, but more importantly, the entire Nation, over the last 4 or 5 years.

Every trade deal does not mean that there are jobs created in this country. In fact, 90 percent of the trade deals have led to a lessening of jobs in the United States of America. So you can't have high hopes, and you don't have the evidence to show it. Let's bring jobs here to this country.

□ 1440

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a champion of new markets, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for this free trade agreement with Panama.

Trade agreements open market access to our farmers and ranchers, which brings in valuable income and creates jobs. In my home State of Oklahoma, agricultural exports support more than 10,000 jobs. Across the country, agriculture exports support more than 1 million jobs total. Those jobs aren't confined to the farm either. They stretch across a variety of industries, including processing, manufacturing, and transportation.

In fact, for every dollar of farm products that we export, we add another $1.31 to our economy from those nonfarm industries. That's why it's so important to continue opening markets for American agricultural products.

More than 60 percent of our agricultural exports to Panama face some sort of duty or tariff. Those tariffs average 15 percent; but they can be as high as 70 percent on meat, 90 percent on grain, and a staggering 260 percent on poultry. Meanwhile, more than 99 percent of Panama's farm exports enter the U.S. duty free.

So this agreement will not only create new opportunities for America's farmers and ranchers but it levels the playing field for our exporters. As soon as this agreement is implemented, more than half of our farm exports will become duty free. So we can expect to see immediate opportunities once this agreement is in force.

America's farmers, ranchers, processors, manufacturers and shippers can all benefit from those opportunities. Let's help them expand their businesses and create more jobs. Let's pass this agreement.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from Maine for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here today voicing the concerns of America's workers and rise in opposition to the Panama free trade agreement, as well as the South Korean and Colombian.

Like many others, in terms of Panama, I have expressed concerns about Panama's long history of being a tax haven. Supporters of this NAFTA-style trade deal claim that the Tax Information and Exchange Agreement, or TIEA, that Panama ratified in April of this year wiped away decades of secrecy as a tax haven there. We've been told that Panama's recent removal from the OECD's gray list indicates that it's a fresh start.

Well, I ask, when have the promises made in other NAFTA-style trade deals that have brought us these trade deficits since NAFTA was first signed, when have they ever made good on their agreements?

Public Citizen notes that the 2001 Panama tax agreement, called TIEA, includes a major exception, a major exception that allows Panama to reject specific requests if it's contrary to the public policy of Panama. Now, that's an interesting concept for a country that derives a significant national income from activities related to being a tax haven.

Time has proven those who oppose these NAFTA-type trade accords correct. They have all been job losers.

Otherwise, America would have a trade balance, but we have a half a trillion dollar trade deficit. Sure we might sell a few more pork chops and a few more soybeans. But, you know what, overall America loses almost all of its GDP growth simply because the growing trade deficit just squashes down the opportunity for job creation in our country. We've seen millions and millions of jobs outsourced.

Let me say a word about the U.S.-Korea trade agreement. It's modeled after NAFTA too; and, again, it's one of these copy-cat agreements. In the last decade alone, these agreements have cost Americans over 6 million jobs, 55,000 plants have been lost, so many outsourced. I mean, what world do you live in if you don't even understand what's happening with job outsourcing to our country between our borders from Atlantic to Pacific.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

I'm from northern Ohio. Just to clarify what this means for one of America's lodestar industries, here's a little graph that shows how many Korean cars are coming into the United States today, over half a million.

This little dot here represents what the U.S. is selling into the Korean market right now: 7,450 of our cars in that market versus over half a million of their cars sold here. This agreement basically says maybe America could sell 75,000 cars—but there's no guarantee, no guarantee—and if you go to Korea today, you see less than 5 percent of the cars on their streets are from anywhere else in the world. So, you think they're going to be reciprocal?

Theirs is a closed market. When is America going to stand up in its trade policies to state-managed capitalism in these other countries and give our workers and our companies an even break? All this deal says is we might sell—it doesn't say must sell—it says we might sell up to 75,000 cars in that economy, but they're already eating our lunch.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates this agreement will cost us another 159,000 net jobs. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I sure hope they don't come out of Ohio again. I hope they come out of the districts of every single person here who's going to vote for this agreement and cause more job hemorrhaging to this economy.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me some time.

Madam Speaker, I find that sometimes when we talk about issues around here, we hear the same thing we've heard for years and years and years, and sometimes that's a good thing.

But sometimes it's also important to acknowledge that the world is changing. Things are happening. Globalization is a mixed bag, globalization creates opportunities, but it also creates a lot of challenges. As policymakers, what we need to do is look for where we can best position this country to compete in that changing environment.

I rise in support of all three of these agreements, and I will tell you what's going on compared to years ago. The rest of the world's moving on. The rest of the world is opening markets to each other, and U.S. products and U.S. opportunities are being limited by that phenomenon.

For example, in Colombia, 2008, the United States was responsible for 46 percent of all the goods coming into Colombia. But what happened after 2008? Well, Colombia entered into bilateral trade agreements with Argentina and with Brazil, and just 2 short years later, in 2010, the U.S. only had 20 percent of the products that were being shipped into Colombia. That's a pretty big drop. About 25 percent of all the materials coming into that country, the U.S. used to have that market and then we lost it.

We should seek out the fairest deals, the best deals for this country; but we should not be in denial for what's going on in the rest of the world. We should not be in denial about markets opening up elsewhere and the U.S. sitting on its hands and doing nothing.

Now, mind you, in the case of Colombia, in particular, it's already had an opportunity for markets in the U.S. due to the Caribbean Basin Initiative. Their goods have been coming here duty free for years. We have an opportunity now to level that playing field.

So I encourage my colleagues to recognize where we are in 2011 and the circumstances we are in and what other countries in the world are doing to respond to the opportunities presented by globalization and dealing with mitigating the problems. I encourage you to vote for all three of these trade agreements.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would point out in manufacturing we actually run a trade surplus with our trading partners, including NAFTA, selling much more products there. It's our trade deficit with our nontrade agreement partners that we have troubles with. Panama is a surplus for America.

I now yield 2 minutes to a key member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has helped lead the freshman class in opening new markets and finding new customers, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

□ 1450

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of all three free trade agreements we will be voting on this evening. This is a great day. We are talking about, with the passage of these free trade agreements, approximately 250,000 new jobs across America. Those are new jobs that will put families back to work. They'll put roofs over their heads, put food on their tables, and allow them to enjoy the American Dream.

I rise in particular in regards to the U.S.-Panama agreement. Some of my colleagues, Madam Speaker, have argued that free trade has forced a lot of our manufacturing and industrial jobs to go overseas. Well, one of the facts of the circumstances can be illustrated by what's going on with U.S.-Panama. Right now our goods, as they go into Panama, face up to a 260 percent tariff at its borders. Yet the imports coming from Panama to America, because of the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act, come to us duty free. That is an uneven playing field.

What these free trade agreements do, in my humble opinion, is even the playing field so that American workers can compete on an equal and level playing field. And if that is the case, I'm confident that the American worker and American families will always win in that competition. So I strongly support these trade agreements.

It's amazing to me that it has taken 5 years to get these agreements to this Chamber; but rather than point fingers at who caused what and what the reasons for those delays were, I always will look to the future. And what these agreements will represent is a step in the right direction of getting America back in a position where it competes in

the world market and once again rises up and says we are the strongest, we are the best, and we will create 250,000 new jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2½ minutes to a new parent who is bringing a picture of his new son with him to the podium, Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Today I am pleased to see that Congress is finally focused on America's top priority, jobs. As economic experts from across the ideological spectrum have made clear, these trade agreements with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea will create jobs for Americans. In fact, the White House has said these deals will create 70,000 new jobs for Americans at a time when we need them. That's why I intend to vote for all three agreements.

I'm also going to vote ''yes'' because these trade pacts will help put money back in the pockets of hardworking Americans. By lifting the aggressive tariffs on many commonly purchased clothing and household items, we can cut the prices of essentials that every family needs. Tariffs are essentially like a sales tax on imported goods, and like sales taxes in many States, they're regressive.

Most U.S. imports today come into this country duty free, but a small amount of items that many Americans use, like sneakers and clothing and other household items, come with a tariff that's much higher than many luxury items. For example, a pair of fancy Italian loafers has a tariff of only 8.5 percent, but a pair of affordable sneakers that moms and dads buy for their kids when they're heading back to school carry a tariff that increases their price by 50 percent. Thrifty cotton and polyester work shirts carry a 16 and 32 percent tariff, but a silk Armani shirt comes with only a 1 percent tariff. Not only are these regressive tariffs hard on the middle class, but they hurt American businesses.

Many businesses in my district can expand their operations and hire more workers with these three trade agreements. For example, in my district alone, four businesses that export electronics, building materials, and foods pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in tariffs just to the Colombian Government. That translates into jobs in my district.

Most importantly, as the gentleman from Michigan mentioned, as a new father, I think about the kind of world I want my son to grow up in. I want a world that reduces barriers between ideas, between people, and between the flow of goods and services so that we can fully embrace our brothers and sisters in Colombia, our brothers and sisters in South Korea, our brothers and sisters in Panama and, indeed, across the world to build a common greatness of humanity that manifests itself economically through the flow of goods and services, culturally, and of course to better establish the greatness of global culture.

Congress should pass these three trade agreements. I'm proud to support all three of these job-creating free trade agreements. I compliment President Obama on his leadership for bringing these deals before us, and I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to create jobs in America.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how many speakers we have remaining, if I may.

Mr. MICHAUD. I have one more, plus I will be closing.

Mr. LEVIN. I will close on our side.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. We have two more and then closing.

At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for Appropriations.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the three free trade agreements with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea. Frankly, it is about time they have come to the House for action. Studies have shown that further delays on these three trade agreements would put 380,000 American jobs at risk; whereas, passing them will create over a quarter of a million new jobs and add $13 billion to our gross domestic product.

The latest data shows 130,000 jobs in New Jersey depend on international trade. Of these, 50,000 are manufacturing jobs. Approximately one out of every six manufacturing jobs in New Jersey is directly related to global trade. We need more activity on the trade export agenda, and these free trade agreements will produce many, many hundreds of thousands of jobs. We need to get about it. Let's act on it. I strongly support it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on all sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 9½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. I now would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. The United States of America has failed trade policies. They are unlike any other in the world. And I guess the question before this body today should be: Will these trade policies create jobs? The answer is yes. Will they create jobs in America? The answer is no.

Like all the other free trade agreements we've entered into, these are designed to benefit multinational companies seeking cheap labor and fewer restrictions in terms of the environment and labor protections and other things overseas. That's what these are about. They're also about transshipment of goods with the low content requirement in Korea. Yeah, goods will be cheaper. Made in China, maybe made by slave labor in North Korea, those will be really cheap.

American consumers who don't have jobs will benefit from this. No, American consumers would benefit a heck of a lot more if their neighbors had jobs, if they had jobs and if our kids had a future. Passing more of these free trade agreements, which has led to this sea of red ink, isn't going to fix the problem.

Directly before us now is Panama. Now, Panama has a very interesting economy, mostly bolstered by being a tax haven and money laundering center. Now, the agreement that we're voting on doesn't prohibit that, but there's a separate agreement entered into by the administration that will go into effect a year from now. It doesn't require an automatic exchange of tax information between the U.S. and Panama, unlike other countries where we have these sorts of agreements. We must know what we want and submit detailed information to Panama, and Panama might or might not honor that request; i.e., we submit a request for drug money laundering. They say, ''You have to be more specific.''

''Name the drug money people's deposits.''

''Well, we can't do that.''

''All right. Forget about it.''

We can name them. Good. But then Panama says they won't give us the information if it is contradictory to their public policy; i.e., the way they make a living, by being the largest Western Hemisphere haven for the laundering of drug money, as a tax haven, and also terrorist money in recent cases. We're going to facilitate that with this agreement.

Somehow, a country with 3.5 million people, about the same size as my State but a much lower income per capita, has 400,000 corporations domiciled there, almost one for every Panamanian.

□ 1500

No, these aren't really domiciled there. They're very conveniently avoiding our laws and the laws of other advanced nations around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEFAZIO. As I said yesterday on Colombia, the noted economist Joseph Stiglitz says that our agriculture—yes, we'll get a few agriculture jobs—will displace traditional agriculture in Colombia, causing huge disruptions in that country, driving people to produce more coca. But don't worry. Right next door, the Colombian drug lords will be able to deposit their money and not have to worry about the U.S. finding out about it—right next door in Panama. How convenient.

This is really a great series of trade agreements.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to a freshman lawmaker who represents a region of Texas where international trade means jobs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. I rise in strong support of the Panama free trade agreement. Like the Colombian agreement, this agreement has been pending for far too long. And I thank the leadership of Chairmen BRADY, DREIER, and CAMP.

At a time when unemployment is hovering above 9 percent, the Panama free trade agreement will be a welcome shot in the arm to help the U.S. economy. The International Trade Commission's analysis shows that the Panama agreement will boost U.S. exports to Panama for key products between 9 percent and 145 percent. This will mean thousands of new jobs here at home. The Commerce Department has estimated that every $1 billion in exports creates 6,000 new jobs.

This agreement will benefit all sectors of the American economy, from agricultural to financial services to manufacturing. It does so by leveling the playing field for American exporters who currently face tariffs of up to 260 percent while Panama exports face virtually no tariffs in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CANSECO. Fundamentally, this agreement is about the economic freedom of the American people to be able to have a wide array of choices and pay less for those choices because of the power of trade and competition.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, is the chairman prepared to close?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Yes, I am.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for up to 6 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. On the House floor today, we are considering three trade agreements: the FTA with Korea, which manipulates its currency; the FTA with Colombia, the labor unionist murder capital of the world; and the FTA with Panama, which has one of the smallest populations in Latin America.

At a time of 9 percent unemployment, why are we even considering these trade agreements? We should not be advancing the failed NAFTA-style trade policy when millions of Americans are still out of work. Instead, we should be considering legislation that will create jobs here at home.

The American people were pretty clear in 2008 when they voted for hope and change, and they were even clearer in 2010 when they voted in a new generation of lawmakers to set Washington straight. Both times, Americans voted against the inside-the-beltway perspective and for Representatives and a President they thought would take the country in a different direction. Both times, despite these signals from the American people, the White House and Congress have ignored them, and Washington remains as beholden to Wall Street and as detached from Main Street as ever.

In a poll done by NBC and the Wall Street Journal last year, the majority of Americans said that they thought the FTAs had been bad for the country. Given that they're so unpopular, why on Earth would the President send these agreements up to Congress right now? Well, you only have to look at the President's economic advisers to find out.

Since elected, the President has surrounded himself with advisers from Wall Street banks, with CEOs from companies that don't pay taxes, and with staffers who pushed the NAFTA-style trade agreement under Clinton. Those advisers don't bring fresh perspectives to the White House. They bring more of the same corporate priorities that have caused the current and previous White House administrations to turn a blind eye while the big banks played roulette with our pensions and mortgages and then asked for a taxpayer bailout.

The Panama free trade agreement is another example of Washington's corporate priorities. Panama's GDP is about $25 billion. That's about the same GDP as the city of Portland, Maine. The entire country has a population of 3.4 million. We have three times as many people in the United States on unemployment lists alone. And this agreement does nothing for those 14 million Americans without jobs.

Panama simply isn't a significant market opportunity for U.S. exports, and this FTA won't do anything to reduce our 9 percent unemployment. But the big companies and the big banks want it, so President Obama is going to give in to the Washington elites once again.

The working people and the middle class don't want these trade agreements—not with Panama, not with Korea, and not with Colombia. They want good-paying jobs that allow them to provide for their families. They want a government to pass laws to help get the economy going again. They don't want another NAFTA-style trade agreement, and they definitely don't want any more Wall Street-centric, beltway-based policies from the White House or Congress. They want Washington to wake up and they want the hope and change that they voted for. How much clearer could the American people be? They want policies written by citizens, not by chief executives. They want leaders to listen to town halls, not wealthy tycoons. They want change, not more of the same.

I call on my colleagues who were sent here in 2010 with a mandate of change to work with me. Vote against these trade deals, which will cost us more than $7 billion. I call on my colleagues on the Democratic side to remember we have always been the party of the working people. We must vote against these NAFTA-style trade agreements. These agreements are unjust to the American people.

I urge a ''no'' vote on all three of these trade agreements.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for up to 3 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. First, let me speak as someone who opposed, actively, the NAFTA agreement and led the effort in this House in opposition to CAFTA. This is, in terms of worker rights, the opposite of NAFTA and CAFTA. What this does is to embody the basic international worker rights enforceable in the trade agreement. Peru was the breakthrough, and Panama continues along that pioneering path.

Secondly, on Panama, why are we here? Panama acted to change its labor laws before we voted, as was true for Peru. We pointed out the deficiencies in their laws and I discussed them with the previous administration in Panama. But neither it nor the Bush administration was willing to make sure action occurred.

□ 1510

Now those changes have been made as to companies less than 2 years. Those changes have been made in terms of the economic processing zones, and they have prohibited bypassing unions by direct negotiations with non-unionized workers—unfortunately, not true in Colombia. Look, on the tax haven, they signed the TIEA. We asked them to do that, and that's precisely what they have done.

In terms of investment, this bill strengthens the present status quo in terms of investment protections for the United States communities.

So, in a word, we have a bill before us that meets the requirements that we set out when we said to the Bush administration, we will not take up Panama until changes have been made. Those changes have now indeed been made in terms of worker rights, in terms of strengthening investment, in terms of ending Panama as a tax haven. Those changes having been made, I urge support of this FTA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, to close, I am proud to yield the balance of my time to a champion for job creation in America, the majority leader of the House, Mr. CANTOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for up to 2½ minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, our current economic environment has left millions of Americans without the hope of a brighter future. The constant threat of tax increases and the continued threat

of excessive regulations coming from this administration sends the wrong signal to our entrepreneurs, our investors, and our small business people, the very people we need to create jobs. It sends the signal that America is not open for business. And there is a sense that we may be falling behind other nations in the global marketplace.

We face big challenges, but America has always stood up when times were tough. We are a country of entrepreneurs and innovators. Madam Speaker, it is time to energize our small businesses and job creators and get the economy growing again.

When House Republicans released our plan for America's job creators, we outlined our ideas to get our economy back on track, to promote an environment for job creation, and to ensure America remains the land for opportunity without raising taxes or adding to the deficit. And part of that plan was passage of the free trade agreements with Colombia—yes, Panama, and yes, South Korea.

But our support for passing these agreements is not new. On December 22, 2009, I, along with other House Republican leaders, wrote to President Obama outlining what we called the ''No Cost Jobs Plan.'' In that letter, we noted that passage of these trade agreements would, according to experts, increase exports by 1 percent. That 1 percent increase in exports equates to a quarter of a million new jobs. We noted in our letter that the only thing standing in the way of creating those jobs was for the President to submit the trade agreements to Congress for approval. Since then, we have repeatedly called on the President to move forward with these agreements so we can clear the way for thousands of new jobs and create an environment for economic growth. Nearly 2½ years later, on October 3, the President finally submitted all three agreements.

I am glad that the administration has recognized the importance of expanding market access for American companies, both small and large. As majority leader, I introduced all three agreements the very same day the President submitted them, and I am pleased today that the House will approve all three agreements.

By moving forward on these agreements, Madam Speaker, we will help manufacturers in my home State of Virginia and those across the country increase exports and increase production. The more manufacturers produce, the more workers they need, and that means more jobs.

Our action today is proof that when we look for common ground and work together, we can produce results. I'd also like to note that today, Madam Speaker, the House is acting on another bill that is part of the President's jobs plan. The House will pass the VOW Act, the Veterans Opportunity to Work Act, to help our soldiers and veterans with the challenges of reentering the workforce.

Madam Speaker, there is no more time to waste. We have said over and over again that we should not let our differences get in the way of producing results, and we want to find common ground so that we can work together to improve the economy. I hope today's action will encourage the Senate and the President to join us in helping to pass these trade agreements and other pro-growth measures to help the American people get back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 425, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I rise in support of all three of these very important agreements because they promote U.S. engagement in strategically important countries around the world. Also, they promote U.S. leadership. They open new markets for American farmers, ranchers, and businesses. This means American jobs, good-paying American jobs. These agreements constitute a signature jobs bill, a jobs promotion bill.

South Korea is a critical U.S. ally in Asia and one of the fastest growing economies in the world. Multiple agreements have occurred throughout Asia over the past few years while America sat on the sidelines. This agreement is the largest free trade agreement for the U.S. and could result in an increase of our exports by $9.7 billion, according to the International Trade Commission, by lowering tariffs and other barriers to U.S. goods and services. We must pass this agreement in order to gain leverage in Asia and to show support for one of our key allies in Asia.

This expansion of U.S. engagement will serve as a platform to build further commercial relationships, creating more jobs for American workers by opening new markets. Upon implementation, more than one-third of Louisiana's exports will be duty free, and that's just a starting point. This alone will give Louisiana companies a significant advantage over similar products made in countries that don't have an FTA with South Korea.

We know small and medium-size businesses are the key to creating new jobs. Over 18,500 companies of this size, small and medium companies, export to South Korea. And they will be able to grow and hire new workers here in the United States, right here at home.

□ 1520

These agreements are about creating jobs. In fact, President Obama estimates that the passage of these bills will create over 250,000 new jobs right here at home as a starting point.

Madam Speaker, I urge voting to promote all of these agreements because it will promote American competitiveness and American jobs. It will promote American credibility with our trading allies. It will promote American confidence in our international engagement. And it will promote American leverage as we work with our trading partners. And most importantly, it will promote American leadership in the 21st century.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), ranking member on Trade.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Korean free trade agreement.

We should all be proud of Korea. We created Korea. Our troops went to Korea at the beginning of the Korean War and saved South Korea from becoming North Korea. That's how the Koreans look at it.

I took a trip with the Commerce Secretary, Gary Locke, who's now the Ambassador to China. And the Koreans said, we're very grateful and we want to have this relationship with you. And they have come—because we opened our markets to them, they are the most successful country in Asia in coming from nowhere to an average income of around $33,000 per person.

Now, making an agreement with them is making an agreement more with an equal. And when we went from Seattle, we know about our regional relationship with them, we are the third-largest State exporter to Korea. In 2010, Washington State exported more than $55 billion worth of goods; more than half of all that went to Asia. Hundreds of thousands of jobs in my State depend on this trade relationship. So this is not something where we're going to lose jobs.

I believe it's important to move ahead because I think it's equally important to move ahead right. And what

is amazing is how the Bush administration went into this thing and never figured out the biggest problem, that it was a one-way trading operation. We said to them, send us anything you want, and they did. And now we were going to go for an agreement where we were going to turn it around and say, we're going to send some things to you.

The Bush administration ignored that. Had it not been for CHARLIE RANGEL and SANDY LEVIN and the Democrats, we would never have gotten them to sit down and renegotiate. They didn't want to reopen. They had actually passed it and felt badly, and kind of—they lost some face because we didn't respond. But we said, no, it's not good enough. So we brought this agreement back and got an agreement that is much fairer and much more equitably deals with our economy, particularly our automobile industry, but also beef and some other things.

And this is an agreement between equals. This is not going out looking for cheap labor. They were that once. Back in the mid-1950s, when we said send us anything, they made all the textiles. They were the textile bunch. But they don't make textiles anymore. That's not what they're doing. They're dealing with high-end exports. And we have to have an agreement with them that makes it possible for us to have a level playing field.

This agreement does it, and from that point of view, I think this is one that everybody can support. I urge my colleagues to support this free trade agreement with the People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

In response to the two previous speakers, I just want to highlight at this time the lunch bucket that I carried with me for over 29 years at Great Northern Paper Company in the mill. The Korea free trade agreement is bad for the workers who carry a lunch bucket similar to this.

At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to this fatally flawed trade agreement. During a time when our top priority should be job creation, Congress is instead considering free trade agreements that will ship more American jobs overseas.

Making matters worse, we need to make sure that our current trade laws are being enforced. This Korea FTA will allow China to dump even more cheap goods into the U.S. without paying proper duties. And we're not talking about just a couple of dollars here either.

Chinese companies fraudulently labeled many of their products as ''Made in Korea'' to the tune of $153 million last year. This fraud will mean lost jobs and lost revenue here in the United States. If this agreement passes, more Chinese companies will ignore our trade laws. I think we can all agree that we should be working toward supporting our manufacturing sector, not making it easier for China to cheat us.

Working families in this country deserve better than this flawed agreement. For that reason, I'm urging my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of these free trade agreements. Simply put, the trade agreements create more jobs, increase exports, and broaden economic growth. At a time when the United States unemployment hovers around 9 percent, including 8½ percent in Texas, engines of job growth are needed.

As the independent International Trade Commission points out, the three trade agreements would increase U.S. exports by $13 billion. While more jobs are good news for the country as a whole, Texas, in particular, stands to benefit from increased trade. In today's globalized economy, Texas depends more than ever on world exports.

Businesses in the Dallas-Fort Worth area are positioned for big gains. DFW Airport, one of the world's leading trade gateways, already handles almost 65 percent of all international air cargo in Texas. The trade agreements would increase shipments of goods from DFW to some of the most lucrative Latin American and Asian markets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. MARCHANT. DFW alone has five direct flights every week to South Korea. Madam Speaker, I am in support of the trade agreements.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. On balance, the package of measures moving forward is a constructive development for America's economy, and particularly for my State of Oregon. The people I represent will see increased sales abroad of machinery, technology, and agricultural products. This, in turn, will lead to increased activity at our ports. Beef exports from Oregon will increase to help our State's farmers and ranchers. Services ranging from engineering, design, to the legal sector, all will increase. The Korean free trade agreement means jobs for Oregonians.

Some people have complained this process took too long, but I commend this administration and, particularly, my colleague, Mr. LEVIN, who didn't rush to approve trade deals that weren't good enough. Dramatic improvements have been made to the Korean free trade agreement where blatant unfairness towards American automobile sales in Korea have been addressed. Indeed, this agreement is now supported by the American workers who make cars. And I commend Mr. LEVIN for his untiring efforts.

In total, these agreements represent improvements that we can build upon, but do not signal that we can relax our efforts. There's more that can be done. We need to redouble our efforts to ensure the benefits of trade are more widely distributed, and in the spirit with which we discussed today, that they, in fact, are enforced.

I've been encouraged by the renewed commitment to use the tools as they're supposed to be. I was pleased the Senate has acted on Chinese currency manipulation, and that the administration's decision to impose tariffs on illegal Chinese activity in the tire market was sustained by the WTO. I look forward to helping ensure a continued focus on appropriate trade enforcement.

Our economy has grown increasingly interdependent around the world, especially in Oregon. Our best efforts are needed to make sure we realize the promise of international trade. It is not a one-way street. The years spent to improve these agreements were an important step in that direction.

□ 1530

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, the Korea trade agreement is bad for workers who carry a lunch bucket like this one.

At this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

Mr. KISSELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Korean free trade agreement, and I want to make two points. One, Korea is a very important ally, a good friend of ours. It's just that their name is on the latest of these NAFTA-type template deals that we've been asked to pass. Two, I love exports, but if you look at our trade deficit, you've got to figure out that we don't know how to get our exports higher than our imports, not even get close.

I want to talk about the textile industry today. I spent 27 years of my life working in textiles. Hundreds of thousands of good Americans were working there. Their only mistake was in believing their American Dream could be fulfilled in an industry that our government decided to give away in trade deals. Now we're at it again. The South Korean free trade agreement will eliminate around 40,000 textile jobs. How much more can one industry be asked to give? They give good solid jobs, and, once again, we give those jobs away.

We heard last week the average American working family is now effectively down to a standard of living of the mid-1990s. I simply ask this question: How much more of the American Dream of our American working families should they have to give up, have to delay, until we figure out how to get this right, until we quit trying to give

our jobs away to other parts of the world and we concentrate on this great American economy and make it here in America?

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I would just note that in countries that we have trade agreements with, we have a surplus in manufacturing exports.

With that, I would yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Being from Georgia's Third Congressional District, we have been blessed to have a robust manufacturing industry. We have both Kia Motors and a large textile presence in my district.

I would like to ask the chairman if he would enter into a colloquy.

Mr. CAMP. Yes, I would be glad to.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, what will the Ways and Means Committee do to ensure no textile jobs in the U.S. are lost due to the Korea free trade agreement?

Mr. CAMP. If the gentleman would yield, first of all, the agreement includes a robust safeguard that allows the United States to raise tariffs if imports from South Korea surge and injure the domestic textile industry.

Second, the agreement includes a number of provisions to prevent transshipment of products from China or other third countries to ensure that U.S. companies are competing only against South Korean imports.

Third, KORUS uses a ''yarn forward'' rule of origin, which requires that the yarn production and all operations forward occur either in South Korea or in the United States. This stringent rule is consistent with other U.S. trade agreements.

Fourth, the agreement will open up significant new commercial opportunities for U.S. textile and apparel exporters and support the creation of new textile and apparel jobs in the United States.

South Korea is the 10th largest market for U.S. textile and apparel exports. The ITC estimates that U.S. textile exports would increase by $130 million to $140 million, that's 85 to 92 percent, and apparel exports would increase by $39 million to $45 million, that's 125 to 140 percent.

U.S. textile and apparel exporters are currently at a significant disadvantage vis-a-vis European textile and apparel exporters. U.S. companies currently face average tariffs in South Korea of 10.2 percent on U.S. textile and apparel exports. As a result of the EU-South Korea FTA entering into force, EU textile and apparel exporters now face an average tariff of just 0.1 percent.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further, Mr. Chairman, what has the Ways and Means Committee done to ensure textiles from China do not illegally enter the U.S. through Korea?

Mr. CAMP. If the gentleman would yield, we are currently working with U.S. Customs and with the Koreans to avoid this problem. The agreement itself includes a number of aggressive provisions to address transshipment. In addition, U.S. Customs and South Korean Customs have worked closely to develop state-of-the-art procedures, including advanced risk management techniques. For example, textile products are automatically categorized as ''high risk'' and subject to a greater level of scrutiny by U.S. Customs.

In addition, the agreement authorizes textile-specific fraud detection and verification programs. For example, article 4.3 of the agreement requires the South Korean Government to share detailed information about textile manufacturers in South Korea, including production capacity, supplier information, and machinery. This allows U.S. Customs to quickly and accurately estimate likely production and to flag suspicious shipments and companies.

The agreement also allows U.S. Customs to send inspectors to South Korea to conduct on-site verifications to prevent evasion and transshipment. These inspectors are allowed to make unannounced visits; and if the South Korea firm refuses to allow U.S. Customs officials to inspect, Customs can suspend preferential tariff treatment for goods from that company.

U.S. Customs maintains a permanent Customs liaison in our Seoul Embassy who focuses closely on transshipment issues. South Korea has already started implementing its commitments in preparation for the trade agreement. South Korea has dramatically increased resources to address transshipment, including tasking 157 Customs employees to work exclusively to verify the accuracy of country of origin information to products going to countries in which South Korea has a trade agreement.

I will continue to work with Customs and the Koreans to ensure that trade enforcement is a high priority in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his commitment to bolster the customs enforcement and close the loopholes in the customs process that have negatively impacted U.S. textiles, including taking up the Textile Enforcement and Security Act, which I'm sure the chairman would do.

It is my understanding that Korea's tariffs on U.S. textiles are subject to a 5-year phaseout, but the U.S. tariffs would go to zero immediately, allowing for free entry for Korean textiles. What is your committee doing and will it do to ensure an equal playing field for U.S. textiles in Korea and there's not a flood of Korean textiles into the U.S. market?

Mr. CAMP. If the gentleman would yield, actually the tariff asymmetry works the other way around. By value, 73 percent of U.S. textile exports to South Korea would receive duty-free treatment immediately upon entering into force. In contrast, only 52 percent of South Korean textile exports to the U.S. by value would become duty-free immediately.

So, in addition, it's worth noting that South Korean exports to the United States have fallen by 50 percent over the past 5 years, while U.S. exports to South Korea have nearly doubled.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I'd like to ask the chairman, will you promise to work with the Textile Caucus to ensure that the textile provisions of the Korean free trade agreement are not used as a model of future free trade agreements, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

Mr. CAMP. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I look forward to continuing to work together with you and your colleagues in the Textile Caucus to work to address your concerns and ensure that the USTR is aware of industry concerns and that Customs adequately prioritizes its trade enforcement responsibility, particularly as it relates to textiles.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the chairman for the colloquy.

I would like to submit two articles about the impact of the Korea free trade agreement on the textile industry.

[From Bloomberg Businessweek, Sept. 15, 2011]

KOLON LOSES $920 MILLION VERDICT TO DUPONT IN TRIAL OVER KEVLAR

(By Jef Feeley, Gary Roberts and Jack Kaskey)

Kolon Industries Inc. lost a $919.9 million jury verdict to DuPont Co. over the theft of trade secrets about the manufacture of Kevlar, an anti-ballistic fiber used in police and military gear.

Jurors in federal court in Richmond, Virginia, deliberated about 10 hours over two days before finding Gyeonggi, South Korea-based Kolon and its U.S. unit wrongfully obtained DuPont's proprietary information about Kevlar by hiring some of the company's former engineers and marketers. The award yesterday is the third-largest jury verdict this year, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

DuPont, based in Wilmington, Delaware, is spending more than $500 million to boost Kevlar production and meet rising demand for armor and lightweight materials that reduce energy use. Kevlar and Nomex, a related fiber used in firefighting gear, accounted for about $1.4 billion of DuPont's $31.5 billion in sales last year.

The ''jury decision is an enormous victory for global intellectual property protection,'' Thomas L. Sager, DuPont's general counsel, said in a statement. ''It also sends a message to potential thieves of intellectual property that DuPont will pursue all legal remedies to protect our significant investment in research and development.''

DuPont rose 86 cents, or 1.9 percent, to $45.52 in New York Stock Exchange composite trading yesterday. The shares have declined 8.7 percent this year.

Kolon said it disagrees with the verdict and will appeal.

MULTIYEAR CAMPAIGN

The ''verdict is the result of a multiyear campaign by DuPont aimed at forcing Kolon out of the aramid fiber market,'' Kolon said in a statement e-mailed by Dan Tudesco of Brodeur Partners, a public relations agency. ''Kolon had no need for and did not solicit any trade secrets or proprietary information of DuPont, and had no reason to believe that

the consultants it engaged were providing such information. Indeed, many of the 'secrets' alleged in this case are public knowledge.''

Kolon said it will continue to pursue an antitrust case against DuPont, which is scheduled for a March trial. DuPont will file motions later this year to have the case dismissed, Sager said in a telephone interview.

DuPont will pursue recovery of the award ''wherever we can find Kolon assets,'' Sager said. The company also will seek punitive damages for each of the 149 stolen secrets, reimbursement of more than $30 million in attorney's fees and an order barring Kolon from making products with DuPont's information, Sager said.

BODY ARMOR

DuPont, the largest U.S. chemical company by market value, sued Kolon in February 2009 alleging it stole confidential data about Kevlar. DuPont began selling the bullet-resistant fiber in 1965 and it's used in body armor, military helmets, ropes, cables and tires. Kolon began making its own version of the para-aramid fiber in 2005.

DuPont argued in court filings that Kolon executives conspired with five former employees of the U.S. chemical maker or its Japanese joint venture, DuPont-Toray Co., to gain access to Kevlar information.

To spur sales of its Heracron aramid fiber, Kolon hired Michael Mitchell, a former DuPont engineer who also had served as a Kevlar marketing executive, DuPont said in court papers. DuPont contended that Mitchell, hired as a consultant, provided Kolon with proprietary information about Kevlar.

HOME COMPUTER

Mitchell ''retained certain highly confidential information on his home computer'' and passed the information to Kolon, DuPont alleged in court filings.

After learning about Mitchell's activities, DuPont executives alerted the Federal Bureau of Investigation, according to U.S. Justice Department officials.

During a search of Mitchell's Virginia home, FBI agents uncovered DuPont documents and computers containing confidential information belonging to his former employer, federal prosecutors said last year.

Mitchell pleaded guilty to theft of trade secrets and obstruction of justice and was sentenced in March 2010 to 18 months in prison.

Kolon recruited other former DuPont workers, including engineers and researchers, as part of a ''concerted effort'' to obtain information about Kevlar, according to court filings.

''DuPont's investment in developing this information, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars over many years, was thereby essentially lost,'' the company said in a filing in October. ''Kolon is now able to compete against DuPont in the aramid marketing using DuPont's own information against it.''

[From the New York Times, Oct. 11, 2011]

TEXTILE MAKERS STRUGGLE TO BE HEARD ON SOUTH KOREA FREE TRADE PACT

(By Binyamin Appelbaum)

WASHINGTON.—There are still a few textile mills in the Carolina piedmont, making futuristic fabrics that cover soldiers' helmets and the roofs of commercial buildings.

There is also a new threat on the horizon. A proposed free trade agreement with South Korea, which the House and Senate are scheduled to consider this week, would open the American market to a manufacturing powerhouse that has its own high-technology textile industry.

The South Korea deal, and companion pacts with Colombia and Panama, are sailing toward approval. Both political parties are eager to show they are doing something to revive the ailing economy, and there is a broad consensus among the Obama administration, Republican leaders in Congress and many moderate Democrats that the deals will reduce costs for American consumers and increase foreign purchases of American goods and services.

That has left opponents of trade deals, like the textile industry, struggling to be heard. They say past trade agreements, which remove tariffs and other protections for domestic manufacturers, have eroded the nation's industrial strength. The new round of deals will repeat that pattern, they say, allowing South Korean companies to flood the domestic market without creating significant export opportunities for American manufacturers.

''We are very much in favor of global trade, but we're just not about having agreements that are unfair to the U.S. textile industry,'' said Allen E. Gant, Jr., chief executive of Glen Raven, a family-owned company that employs 1,500 people in the United States. ''The U.S. needs every single job that we can get.''

The Obama administration renegotiated some elements of the deals—first authored by the Bush administration—to address concerns raised by trade unions and industries including automakers. The agreements are a centerpiece of its strategy to increase exports as a driver of faster economic growth, and the White House is pushing to seal the deals in time for a state visit to Washington this week by President Lee Myung-bak of South Korea.

Votes in both chambers of Congress could come as soon as Wednesday, during Mr. Lee's scheduled visit.

''These agreements will support tens of thousands of jobs across the country for workers making products stamped with three proud words: Made in America,'' President Obama said in a statement last week when he submitted the deals to Congress.

Economists generally argue that free trade agreements benefit all participating countries by creating a larger market for goods and services. But that benefit derives in part from the movement of some activities to the lower-cost countries. In other words, even if the deal is good for the United States as a whole, it is likely to create clear losers.

The government estimated in 2007 that the deals would increase annual economic output by up to $14.4 billion, or about one-tenth of one percent. Most of that demand would come from South Korea, which would join a short list of developed nations that have free trade pacts with the United States, including Australia, Canada, Israel and Singapore.

But the study by the United States International Trade Commission found that the deals would cost jobs in some industries, and it singled out the textile industry as one likely to face the largest blow.

Highland Industries, a Greensboro, N.C., company that employs 680 people at two factories, manufactures a kind of fabric that is used to reinforce the roof coverings on commercial buildings like big-box stores. The massive rolls of fabric can be 12 feet wide and 5,000 yards in length.

South Korean companies already sell similar material at prices 15 to 20 percent below Highland's. Bret Kelley, the company's marketing manager, said Highland was able to compete on speed and customer service, but he said that could change if the trade agreement passed, because the tariff reductions would allow South Korean companies to lower prices by another 10 percent.

''We're quick and nimble, and we forge strong relationships, but what we're selling is a commoditized product,'' Mr. Kelley said. ''Those companies will start looking away for savings of 25 and 30 percent.''

Textile industry executives are particularly incensed that for some products, like the roofing fabric produced by Highland, the deal requires the United States to reduce tariffs more quickly than South Korea.

The administration says there are only about two dozen such cases, and that the deal on the whole favors American companies. South Korea must eliminate tariffs immediately on 98 percent of the roughly 1,500 listed products in those categories, and to complete the process within five years. The United States, by contrast, would eliminate tariffs immediately on 87 percent of listed products, and complete the process within 10 years.

But many in the textile industry say they have a broader concern. Even once all the tariffs are gone, a deal between a large economy and a smaller one inevitably favors the smaller one, because it gains access to a much larger market. South Korea's economy is less than one-tenth the size of the American economy.

''There's not a market for our products there,'' Mr. Kelley said. ''We don't have an opportunity.''

All of this is a familiar story for the textile industry. The production of shirts and sheets has shifted steadily from the United States to countries with lower-cost labor. Economists argue that this process strengthens the economy as companies and workers shift to more productive and lucrative kinds of work.

The American Apparel and Footwear Association, a trade group that includes many members who have shifted some production overseas, is among the supporters of the trade deals. The group's president, Kevin M. Burke, has said the deal would ''create more jobs here at home,'' because American workers still run textile companies, and design, transport and sell the products.

But from the perspective of the dwindling ranks of domestic manufacturers, putting existing jobs in jeopardy seems like an act of senseless destruction.

''We have felt for many years that our government isn't supporting the idea of keeping manufacturing alive in the United States,'' said Ruth A. Stephens of the United States Industrial Fabrics Institute, a trade group that represents companies with domestic factories.

Critics also see little evidence that American workers are moving on to better jobs in more competitive industries. The primary benefit of the deals, they say, is that corporations are able to produce goods more cheaply for consumption in the United States.

''We don't have a free trade agreement with Great Britain, which could actually buy American products,'' said Auggie Tantillo, executive director of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, which opposes the agreements. ''Instead we have this penchant for doing free trade agreements with countries that are low-cost manufacturing centers. Why? Because multinational companies aren't looking at this and saying, 'It will be great to make things in Ohio and send it to South Korea.' No, they're looking at this and saying, 'It will be great to make things in South Korea and send it to Ohio.' ''

Mr. Tantillo said he expected it would be clear even a year from now that the benefits predicted by the government were overstated.

Mr. LEVIN. First, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, in a letter to the president of the Committee to Support

U.S. Trade Laws, the Ambassador of the Trade Representative, Mr. Kirk, said there is nothing in the trade treatment that will weaken the international rules or U.S. laws to address unfairly traded imports that injure U.S. industry and workers. The specific trade remedies provisions you raise are carefully crafted by our negotiators to mean that they will not adversely affect the efficacy of relief under U.S. anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,

Washington, DC, April 13, 2011.

GILBERT B. KAPLAN,

President, Committee to Support U.S. Trade Laws, c/o King & Spalding, LLP, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KAPLAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding certain provisions in the trade remedies chapter of the U.S.-Korea trade agreement (KORUS). Let me assure you that the Administration is committed to maintaining strong and effective trade remedy laws. There is nothing in KORUS that will weaken the international rules or U.S. laws to address unfairly traded imports that injure U.S. industries and workers.

The specific trade remedies provisions you raise in your letter were carefully crafted by U.S. negotiators to ensure that they would not adversely affect the efficacy of relief under U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty laws, and would not impinge upon the rights of U.S. petitioners to seek and obtain relief from unfairly traded imports. None of the provisions mentioned in your letter—relating to undertakings, pre-initiation notification and consultation, and the committee on trade remedies—will require any change in current U.S. laws or regulations or any substantive change to current U.S. practice. Furthermore, the dispute settlement provisions of the agreement do not apply to the antidumping and countervailing duty provisions of the trade remedies chapter.

With regard to undertakings, which are currently permitted under U.S. law, KORUS does not require that any special consideration be given to requests for undertakings from Korean exporters or the Korean government or otherwise obligate the U.S. Department of Commerce to enter into undertakings. The only requirement in KORUS that does not already exist in current practice involves the provision of written information on the procedures for requesting an undertaking, as well as the timeframes for offering and concluding such an undertaking. This information is readily available in U.S. law and regulations. The requirement to provide a copy of this information at the time an investigation is initiated will in no way affect our ability to enforce our trade remedy laws.

With respect to the pre-initiation notification and consultation provisions in KORUS, these are procedural provisions that will not require any changes to U.S. law, Under current law and practice, the Commerce Department notifies the government of the exporting country when an antidumping or countervailing duty petition is filed. Pre-initiation consultations are already required under U.S. countervailing duty law, In the antidumping duty context, the agreement clearly states that the provisions are to be applied consistent with U.S. law. Accordingly, these provisions do not alter current laws or regulations in any way.

As you note in your letter, KORUS establishes a Committee on Trade Remedies, the purpose of which is to exchange information and discuss issues related to trade remedies; enhance each country's knowledge and understanding of the other country's trade remedy laws and practices; and improve cooperation on trade remedy matters. This forum will allow U.S. trade law administrators and experts an opportunity to exchange information and views with their Korean counterparts, and could provide us a basis to address matters of common concern and better advocate on behalf of the commercial interests of U.S. exporters, manufacturers and workers. Moreover, the United States succeeded in obtaining a commitment from Korea to use this Committee as a forum to discuss industrial subsidies, which will enhance our ability to obtain information on Korean government subsidy practices to the benefit of U.S. companies and workers.

Thank you again for sharing your views on these important issues. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any additional concerns.

Sincerely,

AMBASSADOR RON KIRK.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. I rise in strong support of the U.S.-Korea trade agreement today as I have in support of Colombia and Panama as well.

Madam Speaker, the Korea trade agreement is another example of President Obama and his team at USTR, led by Ambassador Kirk, inheriting what I thought were three pretty good trade agreements when they assumed office, but realizing there was room for improvement, and much to the credit of the chairman and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, we got that crucial improvement with Korea over two vital sectors of the U.S. economy—automobiles and beef.

More specifically for the State of Wisconsin, which is the largest cranberry-producing State in the Nation, this enables us to get back into the game with meaningful exports going into the Korean market. Each day we wait to pass this agreement, Chile captures more market share, affecting the ability to export and the job creation that we desperately need back home.

□ 1540

It's also true for one of the largest manufacturers and, therefore, one of the largest employers in my district in western Wisconsin, located in my hometown of La Crosse. Right now, the goods and products that they're making at that La Crosse plant face an 8 percent tariff barrier to the export into the Korean market. With the passage of this agreement, that tariff goes down to zero, which is the point of all of these trade agreements, that we're leveling the playing field for our workers and our businesses so they can compete more effectively and fairly in gaining greater market access to Korea, to Colombia, and to Panama.

These won't be the panaceas to the job creation we need at home, but they are important steps in the right direction. They all contain vital international labor and environmental standards in the bulk of the agreements, fully enforceable with all other provisions. That has been a significant improvement as far as the elevation of standards globally and the leveling of the playing field for our businesses and our workers at home, which cannot be discounted.

Again, I commend the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the leadership there, and especially President Obama and his USTR team in taking these three trade agreements, improving upon them, and making sure that the ''open for business'' sign is over the United States of America again so we can pursue a meaningful economic engagement throughout the rest of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KIND. I do subscribe to Cordell Hull's theory on trade. He once stated that trade is more than just goods and products crossing borders because, when that occurs, armies don't.

These are an important tool in our diplomatic arsenal and also part of the answer to the economic growth that we need desperately in this country.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. My friend who preceded me talked about the reduction in tariff exports. Well, guess what? That will be blown away if they manipulate their currency, and Korea is one of only three nations on Earth identified as a currency manipulator by our own U.S. Treasury. Does this agreement preclude currency manipulation? No, it does not.

Secondly, they rebate their national taxes, a Value Added Tax, to all their exports. Build a car in Korea, you don't have to pay taxes in Korea. Guess what? Build a car in the U.S., we can't rebate the taxes under these crummy trade laws we've bound ourselves to, and when the U.S. car gets to the border of Korea, they have to pay a 10 percent tax. So we're going to be able to export autos to Korea if they're 20 percent cheaper than those produced by cheaper labor in Korea. Not very likely, but let's say we could do that. Then there are a couple of other problems.

If you buy a U.S. car and if you're a Korean citizen, they will audit your taxes. Most employers do not allow the owners of foreign automobiles, which are mostly luxury automobiles over there—there are very few foreign automobiles—to have parking spaces at work. Also, Korea does not buy very many cars. They have a 65 percent mix: 65 percent of the cars they produce are exported.

This is not about U.S. exports to Korea. Once again, it's a platform for them to say to us stop here—it's cheaper—and displace American jobs.

Even the U.S. International Trade Council, the wildest cheerleader in the

world for all of these failed agreements, says we're going to have a bigger deficit in autos. These are the same people who said we were going to have huge trade surpluses with Mexico. Whoops, got it wrong. They can't even mess around with this and pretend we're going to benefit from this—$300 million, they say, of additional auto exports to Korea and $1.7 billion of more auto exports from Korea to the U.S. That's what the cheerleader is saying. Imagine what the real numbers are going to be like.

We're talking about 160,000 to 200,000 U.S. jobs. Kiss the remainder of the auto industry and auto parts goodbye with this agreement.

Mr. CAMP. I would just note that this agreement is endorsed by the three big automakers as well as by the United Auto Workers.

With that, I would yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important issue and for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, many Americans believe that Congress can't agree on anything; but if there is one thing Washington can agree on, it's that we're in a jobs crisis and that we should be doing everything in our power to create an environment that encourages the private sector to thrive and create jobs.

If we are looking to make a dramatic and immediate impact on our job market, we need to look no further than the South Korean trade agreement. Ratifying this deal will secure at least 70,000 American jobs as we increase our exports by more than $10 billion, adding $12 billion to our GDP. This agreement also means jobs for Kansas. Our agriculture sector is looking at a multibillion-dollar expansion in our processed foods, chemical and transportation industries, which do well over $150 million of business with South Korea each year, and are prime to expand further under this deal.

If our focus is on jobs, jobs, jobs, then let's pass this South Korean trade agreement, and let's get America back to work.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I rise today in support of this agreement between the United States and Korea. I especially want to thank my colleague, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, for his tireless efforts to improve the agreement, along with Chairman CAMP and Congressman BRADY of Texas in a bipartisan way.

A lot of credit for the concept of this agreement should also go to President Obama. The Bush administration was willing to submit an agreement that heavily favored Korea, but the Obama administration held out until we got a better deal—a more fair deal, a more fair agreement.

For a long time, our roadways have been home to cars named Hyundai. Now, because of this agreement, South Korean roadways will see more American cars on them. It's only right that Fords and Chevys have the same access that Hyundai has here in America. This agreement will not only break down barriers for American car manufacturers, but American services and goods, such as insurance, legal, finance, television, and movies will now be available in South Korea. Korean services companies have always had the right to operate here, but this agreement is about making sure that American companies have the same ability to operate in South Korea.

That's good news for American businesses and good news for American workers. For a State like mine, which depends so much on the service industries, it is important that we are able to export our products throughout the world. It is no secret that the number one reason to support this agreement is that it tears down barriers for U.S. exporters and will create jobs right here in the United States.

But the number two reason is just as important. I have often discussed with my Korean American constituents back in Queens and in the Bronx the importance of there being a strong South Korea. This is as much about diplomacy. This is as much about our geopolitics. South Korea is in an area of the world that is dangerous and unpredictable. America needs strong allies in this region, and this agreement acknowledges South Korea as a friend and stalwart ally of the American Government and, more importantly, of the American people. Since we stood shoulder to shoulder during the Korean war against the advancement of Communism to our joint efforts today to stop terrorism throughout the world, South Korea has been a true ally of the United States.

This agreement sends a message to countless other countries around the world that, if you want to be treated like South Korea, act like South Korea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. South Korea has strong labor and environmental laws. South Korea is committed to a representative democracy, and South Korea recognizes that trade is a two-way street that must benefit Americans as well as South Koreans.

I strongly urge the passage of this agreement.

□ 1550

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise to voice my strong opposition to this trade agenda with South Korea.

Like the two other NAFTA-style trade agreements before us, we know this deal will lead to the outsourcing of American jobs, potentially displacing 159,000 U.S. workers, according to the Economic Policy Institute. It will provide Chinese businesses engaged in the transshipment of goods through third countries an easy opportunity to take advantage of tariff rates that are intended for South Korean goods.

According to the Korea Customs Service, the quantity of products illegally labeled ''Made in Korea'' doubled from 2008 to 2010. These transshipped products come primarily from China and southeast Asian nations.

Chinese companies have a history of transshipping goods to the U.S. through other countries so that they can avoid duties that are levied against them for illegal trading practices. Korea's proximity and 16 ports, including the world's fifth-largest, makes them a usual target for Chinese companies.

Investigations by U.S. Customs in recent years have resulted in indictments and convictions for a variety of duty evasion schemes that hurt America, including cases concerning steel, wire garment hangers, and honey from China. There are no provisions in this agreement to guard against a potential flood of Chinese products shipped through Korea.

That means we can expect an increase of cheap Chinese goods into our market, again to the detriment of U.S. workers, if we pass this agreement. Millions of jobs have been lost or displaced because of our trade deficit with China, and Chinese products from chicken to toys have posed serious public health concerns.

What American families need right now is real job creation. We should be focused on policies that will put Americans back to work here at home in good, well-paying jobs that cannot be outsourced. And what we do not need are shortsighted trade deals that open a back door for Chinese companies to exploit.

I urge my colleagues: Stand up for struggling Americans and oppose this agreement.

DISTRICT LODGE 26, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS, AFL–CIO,
Kensington, CT, March 22, 2011.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DELAURO: I am writing to you, and all members of the Connecticut Congressional delegation, to make certain that we have conveyed clearly to you the position of the International Association of Machinists regarding the proposed South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

It is our understanding that you have already declared your opposition to this unacceptable treaty. Thousands of IAM members across the state and the country thank you for your decision to protect working families rather than cave in to global corporate interests. Hopefully, the material in this letter will give you more ammunition with which to actively encourage defeat of this flawed pact.

Let me start by stating plainly and without equivocation—the Machinists Union nationally and in Connecticut is strongly opposed to this proposed agreement. Much has

been written about this pact, so I will not repeat arguments unnecessarily. Attached to this correspondence is a statement from our national leadership declaring their opposition. Our main concern, and one that has been borne out by the results of a series of regrettable so-called ''free trade'' agreements, is further loss of US jobs, and a mounting US trade deficit.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that the US will lose approximately 159,000 jobs as a result of this pact. We cannot afford to lose any jobs, and certainly not here in Connecticut.

Our state is particularly vulnerable in regards to this agreement. As you may know, South Korea has embarked on an ambitious renewable energy program, and one of their favored technologies is the fuel cell. While neither our state nor our federal government has seen fit to invest significantly in fuel cells, South Korea is now the largest consumer of the technology.

Fuel Cell Energy has already located production facilities in South Korea, and there is no doubt that other producers, including UTC Power, are continually evaluating the location of their production in relation to markets.

The US State Department, in its 2010 Investment Climate Guide, states:

The Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS–FTA) would be a major step to enhance the legal framework for U.S. investors operating in Korea. All forms of investment would be protected under the KORUS–FTA agreement, including enterprises, debt, concessions and similar contracts, and intellectual property rights. With very few exceptions, U.S. investors will be treated as well as Korean investors (or investors of any other country) in the establishment, acquisition, and operation of investments in Korea. In addition, these protections would be backed by a transparent international arbitration mechanism, under which investors may, at their own initiative, bring claims against a government for an alleged breach of the KORUS–FTA chapter. Submissions to investor-state arbitration tribunals would be made public, and hearings would generally be open to the public.

Such re-assurances about the ease & safety of investing in Korea are, in fact, alarming to workers whose jobs will be the ''collateral damage'' when such investments occur. That includes Connecticut working families.

The 35% content provision—allowing goods with up to 65% content produced outside of South Korea to be treated as South Korean exports—makes the agreement a conduit for sweatshop products from all over Asia. These are not provisions that help workers either in the US or South Korea.

There has been some small confusion, exacerbated by proponents of the treaty, about where the US trade movement generally stands on this issue. It is true that the United Auto Workers and the United Food & Commercial Workers have stated their support—but labor's support stops there. The AFL–CIO and its affiliates oppose this treaty—period.

Just as importantly, the South Korean labor movement also vigorously opposes the pact. Given the claims that workers' rights are enhanced in the agreement, the Koreans' opposition is a sobering reality check. In fact, the International Metal-Workers Federation (IMF), of which the IAM is a part, stated in 2009 that ''Union repression in South Korea is among the worst in the world.'' That article is attached, as is a recent piece concerning a huge struggle taking place at a South Korean shipyard where thousands of workers are losing their jobs, despite contractual commitments from the employer.

Incidentally, the conduct of large Korean corporations, even outside of Korea, calls into question their attitude towards workers. Attached is an article describing the ongoing hardship being endured by employees of the South Korean ship building HANJIN in the Philippines. The situation is, in a word, shameful.

South Korea, and the rights of workers internationally, is of such importance to our Union and its members that Eastern Territory General Vice President Lynn Tucker recently traveled to Korea for a conference of ship-building unions, to speak to delegates. General Vice President Tucker was appalled at the accounts of abuse of South Korean workers. He asks very pointedly how President Obama can give assurances that the ''re-negotiated'' treaty protects workers, when here in the US workers in states like Wisconsin and Ohio are being trampled into the ground. ''Does Obama know how to get to Wisconsin or Ohio and demand from those Governors a fair agreement for workers? I think not,'' GVP Tucker concluded.

Please dispense with any notion that the labor movement is supportive or ambivalent about the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. We urge you to remain steadfast against the treaty and to work on persuading your colleagues to do the same, in the best interests of our great country and our beleaguered state.

Thank you. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns about this matter. I can be reached at 860 459–5381.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. HARRITY.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Select Revenue Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

Mr. TIBERI. I rise in support of the three agreements before us today and would like to read a recent quote from our President, Barack Obama:

''If Americans can buy Kias and Hyundais, I want to see folks in South Korea driving Fords and Chevys and Chryslers. I want to see more products sold around the world stamped with three proud words: 'Made in America.' ''

Madam Speaker, this is about jobs, and I support the President's effort, our chairman's effort in crafting these three agreements before us today. In fact, I asked Ambassador Kirk earlier this year in our full committee, how many jobs did he think would be created if these three agreements were passed? And his answer was 250,000 new American jobs would be supported with these three agreements.

In Ohio, Madam Speaker, agriculture is still the number one industry. We believe, the trade ambassador believes, that we will see an increase in exports to South Korea and the three other countries of 55 million per year.

This is about jobs, Madam Speaker. This is about exports. This is about leveling the playing field.

I urge my colleagues' support of the agreements.

Mr. LEVIN. It is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement, as well as the Panama and Colombia agreements before us today.

Economic growth depends upon a number of factors, including growing access to foreign markets. These agreements do that. Foreign goods enter our country under few restrictions, but around the world our products face product tariffs and other prohibitive barriers to trade. The current situation is neither free nor fair trade.

This changes that. The barriers are against our products. This reduces and eliminates those barriers.

The pending agreements will allow American products to better compete globally and drive job creation here at home. That's why I support these agreements.

Perhaps no industry stands to gain more than agriculture throughout America, and especially in California, the number one agricultural State in the Nation. Passage of these agreements with South Korea means American-grown raisins, asparagus, almonds, pistachios, and wine will benefit from immediate duty-free access to the world's 12th-largest economy. Many other crops, including citrus, will also benefit. Recognizing the agreement's potential to create over 70,000 American jobs, it's been endorsed by the United Auto Workers, United Food and Commercial Workers, and many of the agricultural trade associations.

With Panama, American exports will gain duty-free access to Latin America's fastest-growing economy. The agreement with Colombia will eliminate most barriers to trade for U.S. products entering Central and South America, its third-largest economy, and strengthen our ties with a key ally in that region.

Simply put, expanding access to emerging foreign markets will boost agricultural revenue and, in turn, help put Californians back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. COSTA. But simply passing these agreements is not enough. We must build on the current and future administration's accountability to ensure these trade agreements are enforced. We cannot afford to sit on the sidelines while other countries forge their own pacts with emerging markets. Increased exports mean more jobs for here at home and for America.

I ask you to support these measures.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

These are the same promises that we heard during NAFTA and during the Most Favored Nation trade status debate with China.

We hear a lot of statistics about job creation. We don't need statistics. Come to Ohio. Go to Toledo. Go to Pittsburgh. Go to Fayetteville, North Carolina. Go to Youngstown, Ohio. Go to Akron. Go down the Ohio River. All

these promises were made before, and it didn't pan out. It didn't work.

And these trade issues are sideshows. The number one issue facing this Congress is whether or not we're going to deal with China and their currency manipulation. That bill came to the floor, this floor, last year. We had 99 Republicans vote for it. It passed with 350 votes. It just passed the Senate.

We need to bring that bill to the floor and take on the beast in the middle of the room, and that's the Chinese, and drive investment back.

When we put a tariff on oil country tubular goods in China, countervailing duties and anti-dumping, we had $2 billion of investment that now came into the United States in steel mills.

We know what to do. We just need the courage to do it. And to all my friends here who are going to help all these multinational corporations, they're going to get the money that they made, and they're going to utilize the Citizens United case, and they're going to invest it in your campaigns to beat you.

It's time we have the courage to take on the beast and do what's right.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Well, the beast in the room is jobs, and that's what these bills are about: jobs.

We need to pass these trade agreements just like President Obama said. Pass these trade agreements now. Pass these jobs bills now. That's what these are, jobs bills.

Korea alone, 70,000-plus jobs. And how does that work? Well, 95 percent of the tariffs that we pay currently to Korea disappear. They're eliminated almost immediately.

What happens then? Guess what. Our prices go down. More demand for our goods. More demand for our goods, what does that mean? Produce more products. When you produce more products, what happens? This is Economy 101.

□ 1600

You have to hire more workers, more workers to make more products. Guess what. The unemployment rate goes down.

That's what we need to do today. We have to come together, and we know this is a bipartisan effort. We know that people have come together on both the Democrat side and the Republican side. We know that the White House has supported these trade agreements.

What happens if we don't pass these bills? We lose. The European Union has already made their agreement with Korea. It went into effect on July 1. Their exports to Korea have already increased by 17 percent. We are losing market share. Ninety-five percent of our market is outside of this country. We need to sell America. We need to pass these trade agreements now. We need to pass these jobs bills now.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman MICHAUD, for his tireless work to promote responsible trade policy.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the U.S.-South Korea free trade agreement. Nearly 14 million Americans remain out of work; and instead of considering a job creation bill, we are voting today on a trade bill that the Economic Policy Institute estimates will cause the loss of an additional 159,000 U.S. jobs.

This trade deal will further devastate the American manufacturing sector which has already lost 6 million jobs since 1998; 55,000 factories have closed in the last decade. The three Bush-negotiated trade deals under consideration today are an expansion of the NAFTA trade model, which has decimated cities and towns across America. Agreements like the Korea FTA have accelerated the outsourcing and offshoring, sending American jobs and plants overseas.

This trade agreement is a bad deal for American workers. Trade can be a valuable tool to bolster the U.S. economy, but only if we utilize a trade model that promotes U.S. jobs. If we want to create jobs, we need to create jobs, not pass another trade agreement that will ship even more U.S. jobs abroad.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is a difficult time in the life of our Nation—9.1 percent unemployment nationally, and millions of Americans families are hurting. And the American people are looking to Washington, D.C., more for solutions than for fights. And today with the Korea free trade agreement, with the Colombia trade promotion agreement and the Panama trade promotion agreement, Washington, D.C., in a bipartisan way is coming together with a solution that will help to create jobs and get this economy moving again, and I heartily support it.

I want to commend Chairman CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, Speaker BOEHNER, Leader CANTOR, and even the President of the United States for working together in common purpose to bring us to this important moment. I've always believed that trade means jobs. And I say with some pride, that's especially true in the Hoosier State.

Indiana is uniquely poised to take advantage of the free trade opportunities provided in these agreements, and I'm grateful for the chance to elaborate on that. I often say in Indiana we do two things well: we make things and we grow things. The truth is that in the State of Indiana, we do a lot more than that. But in Indiana, what we grow and what we build is really at the heart of the Hoosier economy, and expanding global markets for what we make and for what we grow is going to create jobs in Indiana, in the city and on the farm.

The American Farm Bureau estimates that implementing these three agreements will increase agricultural exports in Indiana by nearly $55 million a year, creating 500 new agricultural-related jobs.

The Korea agreement that we debate at this moment will eliminate $1.3 billion in tariffs on U.S. exports that cover many products Indiana is known for, like feed corn, soybeans, and dairy. It will eliminate those duties while other duties on products like pork will be phased out. Other industries, like Indiana's growing life sciences sector, will benefit.

Let me say again, I rise in support of these agreements because I believe that trade means jobs. And America and Indiana need jobs like never before. I urge my colleagues in both parties to join in this bipartisan effort, and let's move this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 11 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Every time a President, Democrat or Republican, asks Congress to approve a trade deal, they give us these wild optimistic projections for how many jobs these deals are going to create.

Sadly, this administration is no different. President Obama has suggested that the Korea free trade agreement will create 70,000 new jobs. The record shows just how wrong that claim is.

In the 1990s, President Clinton suggested that NAFTA would create over 200,000 jobs. Well, here's the reality: Since NAFTA passed in December 1993, America has lost 5.15 million jobs. Lost 5.15 million manufacturing jobs. And 384,000 of these jobs were lost in my home State of North Carolina.

In 2005 President Bush claimed that CAFTA was a ''pro-jobs bill'' that would stem the tide of U.S. manufacturing job losses. But since CAFTA passed in September of 2005, America has lost 2.4 million manufacturing jobs.

Here we have roughly 9.1 percent unemployment in this country, due in no small part to the Washington elite jamming these job-destroying trade agreements down our throats.

Americans do not want more ''free trade.'' A recent NBC-Wall Street Journal poll showed that 69 percent of the American people believe that free trade has cost American jobs. The poll shows that 61 percent of Tea Party supporters believe that trade agreements have hurt this Nation.

It's time we started listening to the will of the American people and doing what is in the best interests of the American people, not in the best interests of the foreign nationals who desperately want to take our jobs.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will show their true American colors and vote ''no,'' ''no,'' and ''no'' on these three trade agreements.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, as the public is listening to this, I think they're kind of collectively going, Whew, finally there's something that's going on in Congress. Finally there's something going on with the other body. Finally there's something going on with the White House that is common ground around a very simple premise, and that's this: no-cost job creation. It doesn't cost a single dime.

For my home State, the proof is in the pudding. This means it's going to help 145,000 Illinois jobs right now that are tethered within 650 companies that are dealing with exports. This deal helps them. Twenty-five percent of all manufacturing jobs in my home State of Illinois are related to exports. And let's face it, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States. So you know what this trade deal does, this says: game on. The U.S. can compete. Give us a fair playing field, and game on. We can compete.

These were hard-headed, hard-nosed negotiations led by Chairman CAMP and the White House and Ranking Member LEVIN and others. These were tough deals that were put together that were not just weak handshakes. This was staring down opponents and finally coming to common ground and putting something together that has a great deal of possibility, a great deal of promise in a country that is desperate, I mean absolutely desperate, for solutions; and this is a remedy. This is a way for us to move forward.

□ 1610

It's important from a strategic point of view. We've got one of our Nation's best friends poised in Asia, the 10th largest economy in the world, a country that has moved from the devastation of the Korean War, that has transcended all of that and is now a donor nation, and we've got the opportunity to be in a unique and strategic relationship with them.

This is our opportunity to move forward. I think we need to support all of these FTAs. I urge their passage.

Mr. LEVIN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has fought harder and longer for fair trade than any Member I have served with.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank my dear colleague Mr. MICHAUD, who has fought equally hard.

I'm proud to stand here on behalf of the communities and workers and businesses of our country that want to compete on a level playing field. The problem with our trade policies is they export more U.S. jobs than products.

The gentleman talks about possibility. I don't want possibility. I want results. When you look at what's happened over the last quarter century, we don't have any balanced trade accounts. They're all in the red. And these trade deficits snuff out economic growth. Didn't anybody here take math? Look at the balance sheet. It's all negative.

This is Korea today. All negative. Our trade accounts with them have been negative. They're already negative. What difference does this deal make? It only says ''maybe.'' Maybe Korea will allow us to sell more than 7,450 cars in their market when they're selling half a million here already. Shouldn't reciprocity be at the heart of our trade deals?

We've got a half a trillion dollar trade deficit. How many times do you have to be hit over the head before you say, You know what? This isn't working.

Soybean exports aren't enough. Cranberries aren't enough. Look at the job outsourcing of America from coast to coast. Our people's wages are going down. Their standard of living is going down. Their jobs have been outsourced. They're losing their homes. Unemployment is stuck. GDP isn't rising. Is anybody here listening? Is anybody paying attention?

This is just another example of powerful Washington elites being totally out of step with Main Street and the American people.

I'm proud of the Tea Partiers who are out there organizing and I'm proud of the Occupy Wall Street rallies because they're saying, You folks, you are out of step up here in Washington. Pay attention to what is happening on Main Street.

I oppose this agreement with Korea as well as Colombia and Panama and ask this Congress to have some real common sense and move to trade balance rather than trade deficit. Create jobs in America by balancing our trade accounts.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO).

Mr. CANSECO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the South Korea free trade agreement, which is the most significant trade agreement the United States has negotiated in more than 16 years, and I thank the leadership of our chairmen, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. DREIER, in this regard.

The International Trade Commission's analysis shows that the South Korean agreement will increase U.S. exports to South Korea by at least $9.7 billion annually, the tariff cuts alone will add $10.1 billion to the U.S. economy annually, and that U.S. exports to South Korea will increase by nearly 30 percent more than imports from South Korea.

The economic activity that will result from the South Korean agreement will mean thousands of new jobs here at home. The Commerce Department has estimated that every $1 billion in exports creates 6,000 new jobs.

In particular, the South Korean agreement is especially beneficial for agriculture. In the 23rd District of Texas, I have the privilege to represent many agricultural producers. This agreement would be a huge win for American farmers and ranchers by ensuring that our competitors who are also seeking trade agreements with Korea are not at an advantage in South Korea's $15 billion per year agricultural market.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, would you tell us each our remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 8 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 3½ minutes. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) has 7½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today as a former mill worker who punched a time clock for over 29 years at the Great Northern Paper Company in East Millinocket, Maine. What I've seen firsthand is the devastation that these free trade agreements can do to our communities.

This agreement is the most economically significant since NAFTA, and its consequences for America's middle class will be enormous. Since NAFTA, we have lost more than 5 million manufacturing jobs. We've seen more than 50,000 factories close in the last 10 years alone. The Korea FTA will bring more of the same. It will cost us more manufacturing jobs, it will shut down more factories, and it will ship more jobs overseas, all at a time of 9 percent unemployment when the American middle class can least afford it.

My colleagues have already highlighted the many reasons to oppose the Korea FTA, but I want to highlight two of those issues again. First, it does nothing to protect the U.S. in the face of Korea's currency manipulation. Second, this agreement isn't just a giveaway to Korea; it's also a giveaway to China.

Korea has a history of manipulating its currency to boost its exports. Once in 1988 and twice in 1989, the U.S.

Treasury Department officially labeled Korea a currency manipulator. Even though the Treasury stopped officially identifying currency manipulators, in their February and May report of 2011 they stated explicitly, ''Korea should adopt a greater degree of exchange rate flexibility and less intervention.''

The International Monetary Fund agrees. In August of this year, the IMF stated that the won was undervalued by 5 to 20 percent. The fact is, Korea manipulates its currency. Our own Treasury Department recognizes it. But the FTA does nothing to protect American businesses and workers from it.

You only have to look at Mexico's 1994 devaluation of the peso to see how effectively an undervalued currency can wipe out an FTA's benefits. Our trade balance with Mexico has never been positive since.

Without a provision to protect us from the won undervaluation, Korea's exports will continue to be cheaper than our own exports. This Korean advantage will wipe out the FTA's tariff benefits for American companies and cost American workers their jobs.

□ 1620

Candidate Barack Obama recognized this threat, claiming that as President he would ''insist that our trade deals include prohibition against illegal subsidies and currency manipulation.'' But this FTA includes no such prohibition at all.

And, second, this agreement is not just good for Korea; it's great for China too. Today, we're actually voting on an FTA that will be an outright boon for China's auto parts sector. The agreement's rules of origin require that only 35 percent of the car's content value come from Korea or the U.S.

We have two FTAs with car-producing countries: NAFTA and the Australia FTA. In the Australia FTA, the content requirements are 50 percent. And in the NAFTA, the content requirements are 62.5 percent. Korea's car production in 2010 was almost equal to that of Canada's and Mexico's combined; yet the Korea FTA content requirements are much lower than NAFTA's. By allowing 65 percent of a car's content value to come from a third country, we're opening the door for that 65 percent to come from—guess who—China. As a result, these rules of origin will be devastating to the American auto parts industry.

The U.S. auto supply chain is already facing challenges from China. According to the Commerce Department 2010 report titled, ''On the Road,'' China auto parts exports to the U.S. have increased 43 percent from 2004 to 2009, and they're expected to account for an increased share of U.S. automotive parts in the future. In fact, Commerce predicts that many auto parts companies will continue to move production to China in an effort to reduce costs and remain competitive. If this FTA passes, that's not a prediction; that's a guarantee.

I've already mentioned the fact that we have lost more than 50,000 factories since 2001. Before voting today, I urge you to imagine how many more factories will close if we are to pass this agreement, and to think about the devastation that will be brought to those towns when that happens.

I oppose it because it will devastate our manufacturing sector at a time when we need to rebuild it. I oppose it because this President promised hope and change, not more of the same. I oppose it because in my home town, unemployment is more than 28 percent. I oppose it because I want to create jobs in the United States, not South Korea, and definitely not in China.

As a former mill worker from East Millinocket and on behalf of America's middle class, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Korea FTA agreement.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the AFL–CIO in opposition to all three free trade agreements.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, July 7, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I write to urge you to oppose the proposed trade agreements with Colombia, Korea and Panama. Working people, in the U.S. and around the world, are bearing the brunt of decades of flawed trade policy. We need Congress and the White House to focus on creating the millions of good jobs at home that we so desperately need—not passing more flawed trade deals. These trade agreements, negotiated by the Bush Administration, incorporate too many of the disastrous policies of the past, rather than laying out a new and progressive vision for the future.

Instead of using valuable time and effort advancing these flawed agreements, Congress should instead focus on effective job creation measures, including currency rebalancing and enforcing existing trade laws. We need to invest in a modern, functional infrastructure; in a high-tech, high-skilled workforce; and in clean renewable energy. It is time to update our trade model for the 21st century so that it strengthens labor rights protections for all workers, safeguards domestic laws and regulations, and promotes the export of U.S. goods rather than jobs.

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Violence: Colombia is the most dangerous place in the world for trade unionists. In 2010, 51 labor leaders were killed in Colombia, an increase over 2009 and more than in the rest of the world combined. So far in 2011, another 17 have been killed. The government of Colombia—despite renewed efforts—has been unable to effectively guarantee the rule of law allowing workers to exercise their legal rights without fear of violence.

Impunity: Impunity in cases of violence against trade unionists remains high, with more than 95% of cases unsolved.

No Opportunity to Exercise Fundamental Rights: As a result of this campaign of violence, as well as weak labor laws and inconsistent enforcement, only four percent of Colombian workers are unionized today, and only one percent of workers are covered by a collective bargaining agreement. Most workers lack freedom of association, the ability to engage in collective bargaining, and the right to strike effectively.

Labor Action Plan Inadequate: In April 2011, the Obama Administration negotiated a Labor Action Plan with the Colombian government to address long-standing concerns about violence, impunity, and weak and unenforced labor laws. Unfortunately, the Labor Action Plan does not go nearly far enough in addressing these issues. It fails to require sustained, meaningful, and measurable results with respect to reductions in violence and improvements in impunity prior to ratification or implementation of the agreement, and it does not address the need for broad labor law reform. In addition, the Action Plan is not enforceable under the trade agreement itself.

Need to Wait for Results: Once the agreement is in force, the United States will have lost its most important leverage to improve the human rights situation in Colombia. The Labor Action Plan will not fix Colombia's problems overnight. Congress should wait to see if it is implemented as promised, and if conditions for working families in Colombia actually improve as a result.

KOREA-US FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Job Loss: The Korea FTA is the largest trade deal of its kind since NAFTA. If enacted, the Economic Policy Institute estimates the Korea FTA would displace 159,000 U.S. jobs—mostly in manufacturing.

Kaesong: The Korea FTA does not adequately protect against goods from the Kaesong Industrial Complex, a sweatshop zone in North Korea where workers have few rights and earn an average wage of $61 a month. Kaesong provides $20 million a year to a dangerous North Korean regime.

Weak Rules of Origin: In order to qualify for reduced tariff under the Korea FTA, automobiles need only have 35% U.S. or South Korean Content—meaning up to 65% of the content of autos traded under the deal could be from other any other country, including China.

Transshipment: South Korea has already reported an increase in transshipped goods (primarily from China) illegally and improperly labeled ''made in South Korea.'' This illegal transshipment is likely to increase further as unscrupulous businesses try to take advantage of reduced U.S. tariff rates specified in the Korea FTA.

PANAMA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Investment, Financial Services, and Procurement Problems: The Panama FTA contains similar flaws as other past trade agreements, including:

Investment provisions that give foreign investors the right to bypass U.S. courts while they challenge our domestic health, safety, labor, and environmental laws.

Provisions that reduce our ability to reregulate the financial sector; prevent banks from becoming ''too big to fail''; and even use taxpayer money to ''buy American'' and create local jobs.

Labor Rights: Panama has a history of failing to protect workers and enforce labor rights.

Tax Haven: Panama is known as a ''tax haven,'' with a history of attracting money launderers and tax dodgers. The Tax Information Exchange Treaty that Panama recently signed does not go into effect for another year and may be too weak to fix the problems. Only time will tell if Panama will live up to its promises.

American families need a new way forward on trade, not more of the same. So long as these agreements fall short of protecting the broad interests of American workers and their counterparts around the world in these uncertain economic times, we will oppose them.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. KISSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KISSELL. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD 27,000 petitions from American Textile Workers expressing opposition to the Korean free trade agreement.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congresswoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the AFL–CIO on Korea's labor violations.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, July 6, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE ALERT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you will soon be asked to ratify the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, I would like to share important information regarding serious labor violations in South Korea.

The AFL–CIO has learned disturbing allegations from our colleagues in the Korean Metal Workers Union (KMWU). These allegations call into question the Government of South Korea's commitment to promote and defend not only the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (as promised in Chapter 19 of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement), but human rights more generally.

The allegations center on concerted actions against two different employers. The first involves Hanjin Heavy Industries, which in December 2010 unilaterally dismissed 170 workers in violation of the employment security agreement with KMWU. Later that month, the union local began a strike, which included a sit-in protest inside the factory. We understand that, in June, Hanjin hired some 400 private contractors, who, together with 2000 riot police, forced most of the peaceful protestors out of the building. In addition, it is alleged that, for the protesters who remain on site in ''Crane 85,'' these security forces have limited the food and water available and cut off electricity.

Instead of helping these workers, we understand that the Government of South Korea has imprisoned one striker, issued arrest warrants for four union leaders, and issued police summonses for an additional 240 union members in connection with its ''Obstruction of Business'' law. The ILO has repeatedly called on Korea to revise this law to bring it into conformity with the internationally recognized right of workers to exercise their freedom to associate.

The second incident involves Yuseong Piston Ring (YPR), a major supplier for Hyundai Motors. On May 18, workers at YPR engaged in a two-hour work stoppage in order to protest management's apparent failure to implement a ''2-day shift system'' per an agreement signed with the workers in 2009. That day, YPR instituted a lockout that remains in place. When workers attempted to return to work on June 22, 150 private contractors physically attacked union workers with iron pipes, fire extinguishers, and other weapons. Some 20 union members were seriously injured, and four arrest warrants were issued for KMWU leaders.

These allegations are made all the more disturbing with the impending vote on the Korea FTA. If these types of violations are occurring at a time when Korea should be putting its best foot forward in hopes of gaining trade concessions from the U.S., it is unlikely that the government will feel the need to better uphold its promises to guarantee fundamental rights for workers once the agreement is in place and Korea's internal labor relations are no longer under a microscope.

While opinions differ on the underlying merits of the Korea FTA, the AFL–CIO asks that you oppose Congressional consideration of the FTA at least until the fundamental rights of South Korean workers to organize and bargain collectively are respected.

I urge you to contact the Korean Government and make your views known on this important matter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congresswoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a resolution from the League of United Latin American Citizens expressing opposition to the free trade agreement.

TO SUPPORT A FAIR TRADE MODEL AND OPPOSING THE COLOMBIA, PANAMA AND SOUTH KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Whereas, the League of United Latin American Citizens is this nation's oldest and largest Latino organization, founded in Corpus Christi, Texas on February 17, 1929; and

Whereas, LULAC throughout its history has committed itself to the principles that Latinos have equal access to opportunities in employment, education, housing and healthcare; and

Whereas, LULAC supports a new U.S. trade policy that creates living-wages, sustainable jobs for people in the U.S. and trade partners countries while promoting democracy, human rights, labor standards, a healthy environment, and access to essential services; and

Whereas, LULAC opposes the U.S. Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA), U.S. Colombia FTA and U.S. Panama FTA, and it has in the past opposed the U.S. Peru FTAs and the Central America FTA (CAFTA) because these pacts did not meet these goals; and

Whereas, LULAC has succeeded in bringing to national attention how agriculture provisions in the North American FTA (NAFTA) and CAFTA have forced rural Latin Americans to leave their countries and families, risking their lives crossing the U.S. border to be able to support their loved ones back home; and

Whereas, since NAFTA the U.S. has lost over 5 million family-supporting manufacturing jobs and whereas the country cannot sustain further job loss of this magnitude, especially when unemployment disproportionately affects Latino families and other people of color; and

Whereas, the foreign investor provisions and their private enforcement included in pacts like NAFTA and CAFTA threaten the sovereignty and the environment of Latin American nations, and their control of their natural resources; and

Whereas, President Obama committed during his campaign to create a new American trade model that could deliver benefits to more people and remedy these problems, but to date has not implemented these commitments; and

Whereas, a comprehensive, bipartisan reform bill—the Trade Reform, Accountability, Development and Employment (TRADE) Act—that would deliver on Obama's commitment by addressing agricultural displacement, job loss and other past trade deal problems was supported by LULAC and over 150 members of Congress; and

Whereas, the Obama administration has announced that it will send to Congress three NAFTA-style trade deals with Colombia, Panama and South Korea; and

Therefore be it resolved, that the League of United Latin American Citizens will continue to fully and actively support a new fair trade model based on the TRADE Act; and

Be it further resolved, opposes ratification of FTAs with Colombia, Panama and South Korea leftover from the Bush administration; and

Be it further resolved, that a copy this resolution be provided to the President of the United States, the Members of the appropriate Congressional committees, the U.S. Trade Representative, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Approved this 1st day of July 2011.

MARGARET MORAN,
LULAC National President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congressman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CRITZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the United Steelworkers in opposition to the Korea free trade agreement.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,

June 20, 2011.

Re oppose the free trade agreements with Korea, Panama and Colombia

U.S. SENATE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.2 million active and retired members of the United Steelworkers (USW) I write to urge you to vigorously oppose the Free Trade Agreements with Korea, Panama and Colombia. These three FTA's will undermine our economic recovery, further decimate American manufacturing and jobs and deepen the economic insecurity and devastation faced by workers across the country.

International trade and the consequences of accelerated globalization are matters of long-standing and deep concern to the USW, as an overwhelming portion of our members work in import-sensitive manufacturing sectors and all too often have lost their jobs due to bad trade deals and unfair and predatory trade practices. Promises made by administrations past and present touting the benefits of free trade have simply not materialized for America's manufacturing workers. This is clearly reflected in the nation's massive trade deficit—a deficit fueled by trade deals that grease the path for greater and greater out-sourcing and off-shoring of jobs and capacity—and every bit as dangerous as our federal deficit.

The results of ''free trade'' deals are all too clear: In the last decade alone six million manufacturing jobs and 55,000 plants have been lost. Multinational companies easily set up operations overseas and export back to the U.S. market. Numbers tell the story. New Department of Commerce data show that large U.S. multinational companies cut their workforces in the U.S. by 2.9 million during the 2000s while increasing employment overseas by 2.4 million. This continues even as workers and families wrestle with a tepid and uncertain economic recovery that is generating insufficient job growth with millions still unemployed or underemployed. It's no wonder—our trade policies encourage job growth overseas. Trade deals force working Americans to assume all the risk and encourage big multinationals to reap all the rewards.

USW members have sacrificed enough. We oppose these trade deals because they do not adequately address the changing nature of trade and accelerating globalization. They are based on the failed NAFTA model. We need to update and reform our nation's trade policies, not simply continue on the present course.

The following comments provide an overview of our objections to these three agreements. They touch upon only some of the issues which undermine our nation's interests.

US-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

The Steelworkers have spent considerable time and effort analyzing the proposed FTA and engaged in a substantive and extensive dialogue with the Administration and leaders on the Hill regarding the FTA's provisions. Regrettably, the US-Korea FTA (KORUS) will undermine America's economic interests and lead to higher trade deficits and greater job loss.

While the focus of the Obama Administration's activities relating to KORUS was on improving the provisions relating to trade in autos, their efforts came up short for the vastly larger US auto supply chain. The final provisions allow for a vehicle to be eligible for the preferences of KORUS with only 35% of the content, by value, coming from the signatory countries. So, a Korean vehicle, to be eligible for duty-free treatment entry into the U.S., could have almost 2/3rds of its content, by value, coming from another country—like China. And, KORUS gives automakers the discretion to choose among three different methods to calculate content allowing them to choose whichever method is best for them, not for job retention or creation.

Americans want the term ''Made in USA'' to mean something. Indeed, the Federal Trade Commission's standard for Made in USA is that ''all or virtually all'' of the content should be of U.S. origin. The KORUS will accelerate the off-shoring and outsourcing of auto parts production, jeopardizing not only the jobs of the 350,000 Steelworkers that make products that can be used in the auto supply chain, but those of other workers across the country.

These provisions alone make the FTA fundamentally flawed, but, there are other problems that will cause serious economic consequences with the KORUS:

It will jeopardize jobs across the economy. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that KORUS will cause the loss of 159,000 jobs;

It will increase the trade deficit in seven high-paying sectors, according to the International Trade Commission;

It undermines our trade laws by allowing for the diversion of dumped or subsidized components to be shipped to the U.S. from third countries. The agreement lacks sufficient safeguards to address this serious problem and provides new procedures that could advantage Korean producers.

It does not include provisions to ensure reciprocal market access—the Korean market is one of the toughest markets in the world for foreign products to compete in. Tariffs are often buttressed by a labyrinth of non-tariff barriers that will continue to impede our exports.

It fails to address Korea's ongoing currency manipulation.

It fails to include a comprehensive and annual review mechanism that will allow for comprehensive oversight of the workings of the FTA to ensure that the provisions that are adopted, and fully and faithfully enforced. It largely leaves to the private sector the job of demanding compliance, rather than an ongoing review mechanism that identifies and addresses problems before the injury is inflicted on our workers, farmers and businesses.

U.S.-PANAMA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The U.S.-Panama FTA is not an economically meaningful agreement in terms of providing a robust market for U.S. exports and job creation. But, its flawed provisions continue to expand the existing trade model that has proven to undermine our economic and employment interests. Thus, it further jeopardizes our economic recovery and expands an unacceptable trading framework.

Among the reasons the U.S. Panama FTA should be rejected are:

It fails to provide significant economic opportunities to promote our economic recovery and job creation;

It fails to reform the existing FTA approach to investment allowing for Panamanian investors to challenge many of our most important health, safety, environmental and other laws;

It fails to ensure adequate provision of labor rights despite recent changes adopted by the Panamanian government;

It does not do enough to address Panama's historic role as a tax haven or center for narco-trafficking.

US-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement puts in jeopardy America's moral leadership by sacrificing the lives and livelihoods; the worker and human rights of the Colombian people at the altar of free trade. Trade has the power to lift people up and to advance America's values—it also has the power to entrench the status quo.

In Colombia, the status quo has made that country the most dangerous place in the world to be a union member. Indeed, as the ITUC concluded in its most recent, 2011 world survey of anti-union violence, Colombia, in the words of the ITUC, continues ''to maintain the lead in a grim record of murder and repression of workers involved in trade union activities.''

Moreover, the Colombian government continues to fail miserably at effectively prosecuting those responsible for anti-union violence. Thus, impunity for anti-union killings remains at 96%, while impunity for other forms of anti-union violence remains at an incredible 99.8%.

Colombia should not be rewarded with a trade agreement until it has a proven track record of bringing to justice those who have perpetrated crimes against union activists and has adopted and enforced workers' rights throughout the country. In recent weeks,—since the Action Plan was announced between our two countries—violence against union activists and worker repression has continued unabated. And, while the Action Plan purports to improve Colombia's existing framework of laws and regulations, there is no reason to believe that these changes will have any real positive impact on workers. The US is giving away the one tool it has to effect change in Colombia, by voting to pass the agreement before there is time to see if the Santos Administration will live up to its commitments under the Action Plan. Only time, and additional improvements in the operation of their laws and judicial system and the enforcement of their labor laws, will position Colombia as an appropriate free trade agreement partner.

Among the reasons that the US-Colombia FTA should be rejected are:

Violence against union leaders and activists continues;

Colombia has not developed a sufficient investigatory and judicial infrastructure to bring the perpetrators of this violence to justice;

Significant opportunities exist for employers to deny workers their most basic organizing rights. Employers can continue to use cooperatives, temporary contracts and other means to thwart union organizing and the ability of workers to exert their rights;

The Action Plan is not part of the FTA and, as a result, Colombia's adherence to its terms may be subject to the discretion of this and future Administrations. The provisions of the Action Plan need not only to be given time to be fully and faithfully implemented but must be subject to specific mechanisms and commitments to ensure that they will be effective—now and in the future;

The FTA, through its agricultural provisions and its encouragement of further corporate exploitation of Colombian land, will only accelerate internal displacement in Colombia which just overtook the Sudan as the country with the largest internally displaced population (over 5 million) in the world.

America's economic recovery is still tenuous. We face a significant jobs and trade deficit which will only deepen if these agreements were to pass. And, indeed, passage of the Colombia agreement will create a moral leadership deficit—where America's promotion of internationally-recognized workers' rights is put in jeopardy. At any time, but certainly at this time, these three agreements should be rejected.

The American people, in increasing numbers, reject the approach our policymakers have taken on the trade issue. They will remember, at the next election, those who stood by their side and those who put their jobs, their families and their communities at risk.

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congresswoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO in opposition to all three FTAs.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2011.

DEAR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: As President of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, I strongly oppose the Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) with Columbia, Panama, and South Korea, and I urge you to oppose each of these trade agreements because they represent an expansion of failed trade policies that will cause great harm to workers in the building and construction trades.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton worked to pass the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) that was negotiated by President George H.W. Bush. NAFTA has contributed to the erosion of America's industrial base and been a disaster for our members who build America's factories and retool and service them. Many of our unions represent manufacturing workers, as well as those in the construction trades, and our members have lost jobs as well as line workers in America's shuttered factories. The loss of manufacturing jobs also undermines our nation's ability to finance the public infrastructure (roads, bridges, schools) on which we all rely.

When unfair trade policies destroy our manufacturing base and erode the tax base for infrastructure, our jobs in the building and construction trades disappear too.

With that experience, I am very disappointed that Congress may soon consider the free trade agreements for Colombia, Panama and South Korea. These trade agreements, negotiated by President George W. Bush, replicate the failed trade policies of the past that have exploded our trade deficit, destroyed millions of jobs, driven down U.S. wages, undermined the Buy America policies that reinvested our taxes in our communities, and exposed our domestic laws to repeated attacks in foreign tribunals.

From the extreme violence against labor leaders in Colombia to the tax havens in Panama and the failure to address currency manipulation in South Korea, these trade deals are a bad deal for U.S. workers. In addition, efforts to provide expanded Trade Adjustment Assistance benefits are a recognition that jobs will be lost as a result of these trade agreements.

The Building and Construction Trades Department supports a more equitable trade model. Our nation can and must do better to enact fair trade policies that expand economic opportunities for all Americans. With unacceptable unemployment levels and working families struggling to recover from the Great Recession, our members want Congress to pass real job-creation legislation, not more job-killing trade agreements. In the end, working families will remember who is working for them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MARK H. AYERS,
President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Representative from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD two letters opposing the Korean free trade agreement, one from the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition and another from the United States Industrial Fabrics Institute.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING
TRADE ACTION COALITION,
October 7, 2011.

AMTAC URGES ''NO'' VOTE ON KORUS

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition (AMTAC) urges you to vote NO on the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS). The agreement was submitted to Congress on October 3, and a vote is expected in both the House and Senate on Wednesday, October 12.

AMTAC strongly opposes KORUS for three main reasons:

the agreement is flawed in concept;

the terms of the agreement are unfavorable to key industries such as textiles; and,

the textile and apparel provisions in the agreement are unlikely to be adequately enforced.

These problems are why as many as an estimated 40,000 U.S. jobs are expected to be lost in the first seven years after implementation just as a result of textile concerns with the agreement.

If Congress is serious about creating jobs, passing trade-law enforcement measures like the stalled anti-currency manipulation legislation, strengthening our ''buy American'' laws, and eliminating trade distortions caused by foreign border-adjusted taxes should be targeted instead.

(1) KORUS IS A CONTINUATION OF A JOB-DESTROYING U.S. TRADE POLICY

KORUS replicates a fatal flaw contained in almost every free trade agreement (FTA) that the United States has implemented: our FTA partners can (and do) sell more to us than we to them. During the lifetime or our existing FTAs, the United States has run a cumulative $2.1 trillion deficit with our trade partners. This flaw drives up the U.S. production shortfall manifested in our trade and current account deficits that have destroyed so many middle-class American jobs.

The disparity in market opportunities is immense for several reasons. South Korea's population is less than one-sixth of the United States. Its GDP of $986.3 billion is less than 7 percent of the U.S. GDP of $14.6 trillion in 2010.

Despite the South Korean economy's smaller size, it is an export superpower in many important industries such as autos, electronics, and textiles.

With respect to textiles, South Korean has a highly sophisticated, vertically integrated industry that is a world-class manufacturer of even the most technical products. In 2010, South Korea was America's 8th largest supplier of textiles and apparel by volume. For just yarns and fabrics, the largest component of the U.S. industry, South Korea is America's 2nd largest source of imports.

In addition, South Korea has a long history of unfair trading practices. Currently, there are 16 antidumping and countervailing duty orders in place against U.S. imports of goods from South Korea.

Moreover, despite its obligations under the World Trade Organization (WTO), South Korea has been hostile to imports. It has raised non-tariff barriers for those goods where there is sizeable Korean production, autos being the prime example.

We would also note that while KORUS will give South Korean goods duty-free entry into the U.S. market, U.S. exports to South Korea will still be subjected to a 10 percent Value Added Tax (VAT). Through their VAT system, South Korea will be allowed to maintain what amounts to a permanent 10 percent tariff on U.S. exports to their market. Moreover, South Korea has complete freedom to raise their VAT rate above the current 10 percent at any point in the future. It was a major error on the part of our negotiators not to address this inequity as part of KORUS, as border taxes are another persistent example of foreign practices that place domestic companies at a competitive disadvantage.

Finally, the agreement is geographically disadvantageous to the United States. South Korea faces roughly the same logistical challenges as its other Asian competition when it exports to the United States. In contrast, the United States must ship its exports of manufactured goods several thousand miles across the Pacific Ocean to a market where our competitors in China and Japan are right next door.

The disparity in market opportunity is one reason why the United States ran a $10 billion trade deficit with South Korea in 2010. Of that total, the U.S. ran a $10.6 billion deficit in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts and a $600 million deficit in textiles and apparel. It is also why the U.S. textile industry and some other sectors expect few export opportunities for their products under KORUS.

In the face of these unfavorable factors, KORUS will eliminate U.S. tariffs on 95 percent of current trade in industrial products within three years of implementation of the agreement while not guaranteeing reciprocal U.S. access to the South Korean market for key industrial products such as autos and textiles.

With South Korea's current capabilities as a major producer and exporter of industrial products, its close proximity to China, and its traditional hostility to imports, KORUS will hurt U.S. manufacturers and exacerbate our trade deficit.

No wonder the Economic Policy Institute predicts the KORUS agreement will increase the total U.S. trade deficit with South Korea by about $16.7 billion annually and displace approximately 159,000 American jobs within the first seven years after it takes effect.

(2) KORUS'S TEXTILE CHAPTER HURTS U.S. TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS

The United States International Trade Commission (USITC) estimates that U.S. textile and apparel output will decline by the largest percentage of any sector as a result of KORUS and cites expected increases in U.S. imports from South Korea as the driving factor.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission's initial analysis of entering into an agreement with South Korea, ''The largest gains for Korean exports to the United States are anticipated in textiles, apparel, and leather goods, and other manufacturing (e.g., chemicals and allied products, electronics, and transportation).'' Various studies cited in the 2007 USITC report on KORUS uniformly predict declines in U.S. textile and apparel output ranging from 0.4 to 1.5 percent.

AMTAC estimates that 9,300 to 12,300 U.S. textile and apparel manufacturing jobs are expected to be lost in the first seven years after implementation as result of flaws in the textile chapter of KORUS. Moreover, because U.S. government figures show that approximately three additional jobs are lost to the U.S. economy for each textile job that is eliminated, the total estimated job loss climbs to nearly 40,000. It is also important to note that these figures do not account for job losses as a result of a likely surge in illegal Chinese transshipments via South Korea, which we expect to be significant.

One highly sensitive market where South Korea competes head-to-head with U.S. producers in the U.S. market is in industrial textiles, a sector with employment of more than 25,000.

U.S. industrial textile manufacturers are particularly concerned about this agreement and its impact on the extended domestic supply chain for coated and laminated membranes used in industrial and military applications such as fuel cells, oil booms, rapidly deployable shelters/tents, radar attenuating covers, safety and protective gear, and many more advanced applications, including automotive fabrics. Many companies participating in this supply chain also support the military needs of our warfighters. Their ability to innovate and responsively supply the military is dependent on an overall healthy domestic market and industry.

Our principal concerns with the text include (1) accelerated tariff phase-outs that

do not give U.S. producers time to adjust, (2) non-reciprocal tariff phase-outs that favor the South Korean textile industry in key products, and (3) exclusion of certain textile components from the rule of origin.

The aforementioned reasons and others are why, as the auto provisions of KORUS were being reopened, AMTAC and other industry associations made a request to the Obama administration in August 2010 that they also reopen the textile and apparel chapter of the agreement to fix the problems therein. Textile concerns, however, were never raised with South Korea and these damaging provisions remain unchanged.

PROBLEMATIC ACCELERATED TARIFF PHASE-OUTS

Contrary to the precedent established in the NAFTA, 86 percent of textile and apparel product lines are duty free immediately under KORUS and an additional 10 percent will be duty free on January 1 of Year 5 of the agreement. This is the first time a large number of sensitive products from a country with a large, sophisticated textile industry have received immediate access to the U.S. market. Tariff phase-outs for sensitive products have traditionally been a key part of trade agreements in order to give companies time to adjust business models and minimize large-scale potential job displacement. For example, South Korea exports of polyester fiberfill have entered the United States under anti- dumping orders for the past 15 years. This dumping case passed two sunset reviews, the last of which was successfully completed prior to the end of the KORUS negotiations. Nevertheless, KORUS immediately removes the U.S. duty on polyester fiberfill, defeating the purpose of the anti-dumping rule and defying logic of equitable trade negotiations.

In the U.S. technical textile market, South Korea has emerged as the number one exporter of advanced textile reinforcements, and this sensitive tariff line is scheduled for immediate tariff phase out. U.S. industrial textile producers have already lost significant market share to South Korean manufacturers, and this FTA will do significant harm to the industrial textile industry and greatly diminish the sustainability of our fragile domestic supply base.

Socks are another sensitive product where most tariff lines go to zero immediately. South Korea was the 6th largest exporter of socks to the United States in 2010 by volume, shipping more than 152 million pair.

NON-RECIPROCAL TARIFF PHASE-OUTS

The agreement also provides South Korea with a more generous and expedited tariff elimination schedule than what is afforded U.S. producers and exporters for certain products. One example is para-aramid fiber, which is used to produce tough, flame-retardant fabrics for industrial and military applications including body armor. Under KORUS, South Korea will be allowed to export aramids to the United States with immediate duty free treatment. U.S. producers do not get duty free access to the Korean market as South Korea is allowed to phase out its tariff to be duty free on January 1 of Year 5. This puts U.S. manufacturers at a direct disadvantage.

JOB-DESTROYING LOOPHOLES IN RULE-OF-ORIGIN

The rule of origin is a critical element of any free trade agreement because it defines which products qualify for preferential treatment and whether countries not party to the agreement will receive benefits. The KORUS contains a ''yarn forward'' rule of origin. While we support a basic yarn forward rule, certain specific exemptions to the product origin rules under KORUS are very problematic.

In essence, the rule applies only to the component that determines the tariff classification of the apparel or home furnishing good (in other words, the main or essential fabric) plus certain visible lining fabrics. Applying origin rules in this manner means that key component yarns, threads and fabrics are not adequately covered under the rule of origin and therefore do not have to be of U.S. or South Korean origin. This conflicts with the majority of our recent agreements including CAFTA–DR, Peru, Colombia and Panama which apply the yarn forward rule beyond just the essential character fabric.

Under KORUS, components including sewing thread, pocketing and narrow fabrics, all of which are in plentiful supply from U.S. producers, are allowed to come from anywhere. This allows third parties, such as China, to benefit without making any market concessions of their own. Domestic producers of these types of component yarns and fabrics provide thousands of U.S. jobs, which will be put into jeopardy if KORUS is implemented.

(3) HIGH LIKELIHOOD OF MASSIVE CUSTOMS FRAUD DUE TO INADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT PROVISONS

In addition to the flaws in the textile chapter of KORUS, there is strong evidence that Customs' ability to enforce this agreement will be ineffective.

Due to South Korea's history of transshipment paired with significant cross-border investment with China, upgraded customs enforcement provisions are essential to prevent large-scale customs fraud under KORUS. China already exports nearly $4 billion annually in textiles and apparel to South Korea, and South Korea was labeled by U.S. Customs as a major transshipment point for Chinese exporters when quotas were in place.

Instead of strengthening enforcement, however, the customs language in KORUS was significantly weakened compared to other high risk agreements such as the Singapore PTA.

Key enforcement provisions that were dropped under KORUS include the ability for U.S. Customs to (1) seize goods from repeat offenders, (2) reduce South Korea's access if it does not enforce the rules of the agreement, and (3) deny fraudulent companies import privileges for several years.

The substandard customs provisions in the KORUS leave the U.S. textile industry and its workers vulnerable to large-scale illegal imports from China through South Korea. As a result, the industry fully expects Chinese textile exporters to be a primary beneficiary of KORUS.

In addition to its direct threat to the U.S. market, the specter of increased illegal transshipments likely to be generated by KORUS represents a significant attack on the hemispheric textile production structure encouraged by U.S. policy for the past three decades.

The KORUS threatens to damage the Western Hemisphere because South Korea's textile and apparel exports are expected to surge and displace orders currently being sourced in the region. When finished product orders are lost by manufacturers in the Western Hemisphere, U.S. mills also lose the orders for the yarns and fabrics that go into garments and made-up articles.

The potential loss of business is enormous. As a result of trade preference programs and the NAFTA/CAFTA/Peru FTAs, nearly two million textile and apparel workers in those regions produce garments, home furnishings, and the textile components incorporated into those products. The U.S. textile and apparel industry is a critical link in the supply chain. We export more than $12 billion a year to our preferential partners in the Western Hemisphere, predominantly in components such as yarns, threads, and fabrics. This trade accounts for more than 60 percent of total U.S. textile and apparel exports.

CONCLUSION

AMTAC urges Members of Congress to vote NO on KORUS due to the expedited tariff reductions, lack of reciprocity in certain key product areas and overall negative impact on U.S. companies and jobs. Congress should prioritize fixing U.S. trade policy, stopping manufacturing job loss, and closing the trade deficit before considering any new trade deals including KORUS.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

AUGGIE TANTILLO,
Executive Director,
American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

USIFI,
April 6, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Ways and Means Committee Office, 1102 Longworth House Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN: The United States Industrial Fabrics Institute (USIFI) submits the following comments for the record in conjunction with the Ways and Means Hearing on the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

The United States Industrial Fabrics Institute (USIFI) has fifty company members, each with significant U.S. manufacturing. The member companies supply technical textiles and made-up products for advanced industrial and military applications. USIFI is a sub-set of the 2,000 member not-for-profit Industrial Fabrics Association International (IFAI).

The United States technical textile industry (also known as specialty or industrial textiles) continues to be a pawn in the chess game of international trade agreements. Our own government, in its analysis of the pending U.S. Korea Free Trade Agreement, states ''The expected increase in imports from Korea will likely be concentrated in goods for which Korea is a competitive, and major supplier, and U.S. tariffs are high, such as man-made fibers, yarns, fabrics, and hosiery, and will likely displace domestic production of such goods and especially imports of such goods from other sources. . . . The expected increase in U.S. imports of textiles and apparel from Korea under the FTA will likely be concentrated in man-made fibers and goods made of such fibers, for which Korea is a major world producer and has a ''proven advantage.''

In fabrics, the expected growth in U.S. imports from Korea will likely be concentrated in knit and woven industrial and specialty fabrics and will likely displace domestic production of such fabrics. Korea was the third-largest source of U.S. fabric imports in 2006 with 11 percent ($953 million) of the total, reflecting significant positions in knit fabrics (27 percent import share or $203 million) and specialty fabrics (13 percent or $116 million). Korean producers reportedly are expanding output of industrial and specialty fabrics that use information technology and biotechnology for use in tire-cord fabrics and engineering, construction, and medical applications. Industrial fabrics include high-strength reinforcements, textile reinforcements, and laminated sheet goods that use

the textile reinforcements to make them stronger. The fabrics are used in awnings, tents and shelters, signs and banners, tarpaulins, commercial roofing membranes, health-care mattress and seating covers, truck covers, conveyor belting, fabrics for package handling and treadmills, and geotextiles for water-containment linings and erosion control.

Committee Members, these are the products our member companies produce in the United States.

U.S. companies in the specialty technical textile industry manufacture highly specialized products for protection (ballistic, shelter, chemical-biological-radiation-nuclear protection textiles, potable water and fuel fabrics and bladders); partner with our military and academic institutions to develop new textile fibers, fabrics, and finishes; and employ highly skilled workers in almost every state in the Union. The U.S. technical textile industry is a success story—expanding, efficient, and leading the world in innovation. These are the jobs that will disappear if you ratify the U.S. Korea Free Trade Agreement.

A USIFI member, one of the largest U.S. military tent manufacturers, shared this comment:

The technical textile military shelter supply base consists of suppliers of fibers, yarn, woven fabrics, specialty chemical films and technical coatings, all of which are combined by our technical fabric suppliers to our end products manufacturers for use in the manufacture of military tent liners, covers and flooring materials in broad range military tent shelters as well as a large family of related products made from technical fabrics. This supply chain employs unique and highly sophisticated processes that require major capital investments, thus making their sustainability extremely sensitive to the loss of volume.

The severe constriction that has already occurred in the U.S. technical fabrics supply chain has greatly diminished the sustainability of the industry. This proposed FTA will further reduce the sustainability of our extremely fragile domestic supply base upon which our U.S. military relies for shelters and related personal protection products.

—J.C. Egnew, President, Outdoor Venture Corporation, Stearns, KY.

The technical textile segment of the U.S. textile and apparel industry has grown; in 1998, this segment made up 25% of the market by volume. Now it comprises 43% of the domestic market. In contrast, the apparel market in 1998 had 38% share and now is only 20%, directly due to imports and the move to off-shore manufacturing.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 393,000 textile and apparel jobs left in the United States as of February 2011. Five years ago, this segment employed 617,500 (February 2006), a loss of 224,500 jobs (−36%). Ten years ago, the textile and apparel industry employed 1,028,900 (February 2001), making a cumulative loss of 635,900 good paying, skilled jobs (−62%) in the last decade. It is estimated that U.S. domestic textile mills and finishers producing fabrics specifically for the technical textile market employ approximately 160,000. USIFI member companies account for more than 25,000 of this number. This figure does not include made-up products nor does it include the raw materials like fiber or chemicals for dyes and finishes. The U.S. textile industry predicts that the threat placed on us by the substantial increase in Korean imports if KORUS is ratified will jeopardize 40,000 technical textile and related jobs. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that 159,000 good paying American manufacturing jobs across all sectors will be lost if the KORUS agreement is passed.

With South Korea's current capabilities as a major producer and exporter of industrial products, its close proximity to China, and its traditional hostility to imports, the Agreement is not in the best interests of American manufacturing. USIFI has been tracking imports from Korea for more than a decade; their data, compiled from the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) and the USITC, shows that Korea is the largest supplier to the U.S. of advanced textiles reinforcements, the second largest supplier of yarns and fabrics, and second largest supplier of coated and laminated membranes.

Specifically, we have three main concerns with the Agreement:

Customs enforcement;

Tariff phase-out schedule;

Product coverage of the rules of origin.

Customs Enforcement: Korea is a known illegal transshipment axis for Asia, especially China. The Agreement as drafted leaves the U.S. and its workers vulnerable to large-scale fraud. The long history between the South Korean and Chinese textile industries and the documented cases of transshipment cooperation between producers in these countries are major sources of concern. Korea's position as a transit hub for Chinese goods will make the enforcement of the KORUS particularly challenging. The Korean port of Busan is the 5th largest container port in the world and is the largest transshipment port in northeast Asia, handling more than 13 million twenty-foot equivalent unit (TEU) containers annually. The port handles cargo from 500 ports and 100 countries with an expansive feeder vessel operation connecting Busan with China, Japan and Russia. The U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, while its budget has increased, has decreased its commitment to its customs textile enforcement program as priorities have shifted to other areas.

Tariff Phase-Out Schedule: Korean textile products are provided a much more generous phase-out schedule than U.S. products, allowing many Korean products immediate duty-free access to the enormous U.S. market (96% of their products go to zero duty within three years). Access to the much smaller Korean market for those same U.S.-made products will be phased in over ten years. The disparity in the phase-out schedule is particularly concerning because Korea is already the largest supplier to the U.S. of technical textiles and has a sophisticated, government supported technical textile industry, with excess capacity, just waiting for this agreement to pass so they can flood the U.S. market with their products.

Product Coverage of the Rules of Origin: The rules of origin under the KORUS agreement exclude certain components such as sewing thread, narrow fabrics and pocketing fabrics, items that are required under the CAFTA-DR and Panama Agreements and are important to U.S. textile manufacturers. Allowing these inputs to be sourced from countries not party to the Agreement is a departure from recent FTAs and it is illogical that these and other products were excluded in this Agreement.

You have seen the Agreement and studied its analysis. You read in government documents that whole segments of the U.S. economy will not be helped by this Agreement, including technical textiles. We are asking that you address this flaw now with your vote against the U.S. Korea Free Trade Agreement, ending the chess match where U.S. textile manufacturing never wins.

Sincerely,

RUTH A. STEPHENS,
Executive Director, U.S. Industrial Fabrics Institute (USIFI).

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this job-killing trade bill, and I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the International Federation for Professional and Technical Engineers in opposition to the Korea FTA.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2011.

Hon. HILDA L. SOLIS,
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON KIRK,
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SOLIS AND AMBASSADOR KIRK: The International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE) applauds the Obama Administration, most notably the Department of Labor (DOL) and the office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) for your willingness to include labor in last year's discussions preceding the Administration's announced agreement on the US-South Korea (KORUS) Free Trade Agreement. That said, and after a long review and analysis of this FTA, I am writing to express IFPTE's concerns with the final proposal. While some improvements compared to the Bush Administration negotiated KORUS FTA were achieved, IFPTE continues to believe that the proposed agreement falls short in several key areas and fails to put US workers and businesses in a better position to compete.

First and foremost, KORUS does not include enforceable labor protections. Granted, the language urges the United States and South Korea to adhere to the International Labor Organization (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. However, like the 2007 Bush Administration negotiated Korea deal, as well as the Panama, Peru and Colombia FTAs, the practical implication of this provision is the exclusion of any enforceable ILO labor protections. The fact is that the ILO Declaration itself has no teeth and is not enforceable. Instead, it is the eight ILO Conventions themselves that are enforceable. Yet, and despite the urging of labor to include the ILO Conventions, they are not included in KORUS. The resulting compromise allows potential FTA panels the flexibility to ignore, or even weaken through misguided interpretations, the true labor protections called for by the ILO.

It is IFPTE's long-standing position that any trade framework should be reflective of a broader US industrial policy whose foundation is enhancing the rights of workers not only here in the US, but worldwide. Consequently, the mere fact that the ILO Conventions are absent from this agreement is reason enough for IFPTE to oppose the KORUS FTA.

We have many other concerns as well, including our skepticism with claims of a limited negative impact on American workers. The basis for these claims stems from an analysis of KORUS by the United States International Trade Commission (USITC), which attempts to predict the impact that specific trade agreements will have on the US economy. The USITC suggests that KORUS will have no negative impact on US jobs, and will have a limited impact on the US trade deficit with South Korea over the

first seven years. However, USITC estimates have historically underestimated the damage that past trade agreements have had on US workers and the economy. For example, when China sought membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO), the USITC predicted that our trade deficit with China would increase by $1 billion, and it would have a negligible impact on jobs. Instead, from the time China entered the WTO in 2001, through 2008, our trade deficit with China ballooned to $185 billion annually and resulted in the loss of 2.4 million American jobs. In other words, IFPTE warns against relying on the USITC metric.

We at IFPTE believe that a more reliable, and realistic, estimate of the impact of KORUS is outlined by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI). Contrary to the USITC findings, EPI found that over the first seven years of implementation, KORUS will result in 159,000 lost American jobs and increase the US trade deficit with Korea by $16.7 billion. To put this into practical terms, an analysis by the United Steelworkers of America (USW), for example, suggests that KORUS will only enflame our trade deficit with Korea. In expressing their opposition to KORUS, the USW issued a statement saying, ''auto parts, petroleum products, tires and iron and steel, for example—have contended with fast growing imports from Korea this year, and the FTA will only ensure a continuation of the negative impact of this import flood on domestic production and employment.''

Equally troubling is that KORUS mirrors NAFTA when it comes to foreign investor privileges and Buy America policies. Among the foreign investor problems with this bill are the following:

Gives foreign investors the right to enforce FTA privileges by suing the U.S. government in foreign tribunals for violations of FTA rights;

Opens up U.S. environmental, health, zoning and other policies to challenge by foreign investors in foreign tribunals;

Requires that foreign based companies in South Korea, like those in all FTA nations, have the same access to state and federal government contracts as that of U.S. based companies; and,

Forbids the reinvestment of U.S. taxpayer dollars back into the domestic economy by governments at the state and federal levels through, ''Buy America'' policies.

It is worth noting that the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions (KCTU), South Korean Farmers organization, and civil and human rights groups have also lined up in opposition to KORUS. Indeed, our national experiment with free trade agreements has been negative for workers in America, as well as those around the world. There has been enough suffering from one sided trade deals that are great for business, but are disastrous for American and foreign workers alike. Therefor IFPTE opposes the KORUS FTA and will encourage Congress to reject it.

I thank you for your consideration. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me, or IFPTE Legislative Director Matt Biggs.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement from the National Council of Textile Organizations in opposition to the Korea free trade agreement.

TEXTILE WORKERS DELIVER 27,000 PETITIONS URGING ''NO'' VOTE ON U.S.-KOREA FTA

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE VIRGINIA FOXX (R–NC)

2,584 PETITIONS SIGNED

The U.S. textile industry has witnessed firsthand the damage that poorly constructed trade agreements inflict on textile and apparel producers in our country. The industry requested that the Obama Administration renegotiate the textile and apparel chapter of the Korea FTA and was ignored.

At a time when our country's unemployment rate remains at record high levels, the industry would like to count on you to stand up for textile jobs and vote NO when this poorly negotiated agreement comes up for a vote.

The textile industry is creating jobs in the United States. Exports have increased more than 16 percent this year alone. The industry is experiencing a shift of sourcing by brands and retailers out of China and into the Western Hemisphere in order to take advantage of the hemisphere's unique trading relationship and its ability to quickly supply major retailers in the U.S.

Enacting the Korea FTA will reverse this positive trend. The reality is that this agreement benefits China and a select group of Korean exporters while it hurts U.S. textile workers.

PLEASE VOTE NO ON H.R. 3080, THE U.S. KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congresswoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades and a letter from the National Farmers Union in opposition to the Korea FTA.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PAINTERS AND ALLIED TRADES, AFL–CIO,
Hanover, MD, June 30, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 140,000 active and retired members of the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades (IUPAT), I am writing you regarding the proposed Free Trade Agreement between the United States and the Republic of Korea (KORUS FTA). I have serious concerns about duty free construction materials entering the United States and the devastating effect that this and all free trade agreements have on the manufacturing sector.

The IUPAT represents men and women working in the finishing trades as commercial and industrial painters, drywall finishers, wall coverers, glaziers, glass workers, floor covering installers, sign makers, display workers, convention and show decorators, and many more occupations. Our union is made up of over 400 local union halls throughout the United States. While the IUPAT is working overtime to make sure our membership has the ability to provide for their families through this time of chronic and crippling unemployment, I find it unimaginable that this job killing trade agreement would even be considered. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 13,700,000 Americans remain unemployed and nearly 2.5 million Americans have given up on finding work because job loss is so rampant in their communities. The United State International Trade Commission (ITC) report from March 2010 projects that implementation of the Korea Free Trade Agreement would increase the U.S. goods trade deficit. This predicted increase in the U.S. trade deficit under the Korean FTA would risk the jobs of millions of Americans, including IUPAT members, employed in our industries.

Even the White House has ceded the point that this Free Trade Agreement will cost jobs when they demanded on May 16, 2011, that Trade Adjustment Assistance be a prerequisite to the ratification of any of the three pending Free Trade Agreements. While the IUPAT is supportive of the president's promise to provide burial insurance to thousands upon thousands of Americans who will lose their jobs due to the Korean Free Trade Agreement. A better policy would be to focus on rebuilding the frail U.S. economy by investing in American workers instead of workers from North Korea, Korea, China or any other country that imports component parts through Korean ports.

Approximately 20% of IUPAT members work in the manufacturing sector. They work to maintain factories and manufacture paint, plate glass, and floor covering materials, and fabricating glass systems. According to the ITC, these members' jobs and their livelihood would be directly threatened by the duty free importation of the products they proudly manufacture or fabricate as American made.

IUPAT members working in glass fabrication shops manufacture energy efficient shells for buildings and factories. Their product would be turned away in favor of duty free glass panels shipped from Korea. The ITC report indicates that IUPAT members who manufacture floor covering materials or wall coverings would be told to find a new career when cheap carpets, rugs, and wall covering materials flood the United States duty free. It is clear that duty free will destroy American communities and leave Americans families helpless.

Beyond the very troubling job loss predicted by the USITC, I am deeply concerned about the weak rule of origin that was negotiated by President George W. Bush in this Free Trade Agreement. In 2009, millions of pounds of toxic drywall entered the United States. That lack of oversight put thousands of IUPAT members and an estimated 60,000 families at risk. This was the direct result of allowing uninspected products from an under-regulated country. The weak rule of origin opens the United States, the members of the IUPAT, and American property owners up to the strong possibility that subpar and possibly dangerous building materials will enter the United States and be used in our homes and businesses.

In the interest of the United States economy and all of the families who wish to be working again, including the membership of the IUPAT, I strongly urge you to stand up for American made products and jobs by voting against the Republic of Korea/United States Free Trade Agreement.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. WILLIAMS,
General President.

JULY 7, 2011.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As the House Ways and Means Committee conducts mark ups of the three pending Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), National Farmers Union (NFU) urges members of Congress to oppose these FTAs unless changes are made to make sure that the FTAs are fair for each party involved. As described in a policy resolution NFU's membership passed in the spring of 2011, in order for NFU to support the FTAs negotiated with South Korea (KORUS), Colombia and Panama, inequalities stemming

from lack of market access, weak labor standards, extraordinary foreign investor rights and currency manipulation must be addressed.

The U.S. International Trade Commission has released their analysis of the KORUS agreement. Losers under the agreement include all oilseeds (which include soybeans), wheat and specialty crops (which include forages, sheep, goats and horses). The report predicts that the agreement would lead to an increase in the overall U.S. good trade deficit of $308 to $416 million because seven U.S. industrial sectors will see net losses. The Economic Policy Institute projects the agreement will cost the U.S. 159,000 jobs in the first seven years. At a time of high unemployment, it would be irresponsible to pass this job-killing FTA.

The U.S. Treasury declared South Korea a currency manipulator in 1988 and 1999. In February 2011, the Treasury issued a warning that South Korea was taking the same steps as it did before past devaluations. Devaluing their currency could wipe out any gains achieved in any sector of the agreement. The KORUS agreement does nothing to address currency manipulation, which puts U.S. producers at an economic disadvantage.

Although U.S. agriculture has a substantial net trade surplus with the world as a whole, U.S. agriculture is currently running a net trade deficit with countries that have FTAs with the U.S. In fact, U.S. agriculture has actually done worse after FTAs have been entered into.

As your committee considers the pending FTAs, given our concerns, we strongly urge members to vote against the agreements.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,
President, National Farmers Union.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the hardest-working workers in America—the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers—in opposition to this Korean free trade agreement.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS, IRON SHIP BUILDERS, BLACKSMITHS, FORGERS & HELPERS,
Kansas City, KS, December 16, 2010.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, I write to express our opposition to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA). This misguided agreement fails to address the long-standing concerns of American workers, will result in more lost American manufacturing jobs, and fails to establish an appropriate model for sustainable global trade. At a time when so many Americans are struggling in our weak economy, the KORUS FTA is the last thing our nation can afford to pursue.

We continue to be disappointed the U.S. Trade Representative has failed to negotiate positive changes in core aspects of this agreement. The provisions on investment, procurement, and services continue to constrain both governments' ability to regulate in the public interest, promote domestic job creation through responsible procurement policies, and provide public services. The agreement's rules on procurement have the potential to restrict policy goals of vital importance to our union, including domestic sourcing requirements. It is inappropriate for trade agreements to restrict the ability of governments to invest tax dollars in domestic job creation and promote legitimate social objectives. In addition, the investment provisions of the agreement include provisions that allow foreign investors to claim rights above and beyond those granted to domestic investors.

With respect to the labor chapter, no effort was made to improve and strengthen the labor provisions with the Korean Government. Contrary to popular belief, Korean labor laws fail to conform to norms established by the International Labor Organization (ILO). In fact, dozens of trade unionists have been imprisoned for exercising basic labor rights. Further, the Korean Government passed legislation several years ago weakening basic labor protections, contrary to the recommendations of the ILO.

This trade agreement—the most significant in over a decade—fails to live up to the standards workers in both countries deserve. During the 2008 Presidential campaign, then candidate Obama promised to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Instead, two years later, the Obama administration is asking American workers to once again turn a blind eye to yet another unfair and unbalanced trade agreement. It is time to abandon the flawed model on which the KORUS FTA is based, and move toward a new policy that creates good jobs, benefits the U.S. economy as a whole, and protects fundamental rights.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this important matter.

Sincerely,

NEWTON B. JONES,
International President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the Congresswoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in opposition to the free trade agreement.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2011.

DEAR SENATOR OR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the approximately 725,000 members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), I write to express my strong opposition to the proposed trade agreements with South Korea, Columbia, and Panama. All three are North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)-style pacts originally negotiated by President Bush. I urge you to vote no when they are considered by Congress.

As I stated in a letter I sent you in December, 2010 regarding the South Korea agreement: ''It is long past due that common sense be applied to the issue of international trade. For the better part of two decades Americans have been told that free trade is good for workers and consumers. In reality, trade policies promulgated by both Democratic and Republican administrations have benefited multi-national corporations and their top executives. Although these policies have allowed consumers access to cheap (though sometimes toxic) products, they have come at a tremendous cost in the form of lost jobs, a shrunken tax base, diminished access to health care, and a reduced quality of life.'' Now, in addition to the South Korea agreement, the Columbia and Panama pacts will perpetuate the same job-killing provisions that gained their greatest traction in NAFTA.

The problems with these agreements are well-documented. Adoption of the South Korea agreement will lead to the loss of approximately 159,000 jobs and expand our trade deficit with this country by $16.7 billion during the first seven years of implementation. Additionally, South Korea is a proven currency manipulator having been declared so by the U.S. Treasury in 1988 and again in 1999. Unfortunately, the South Korea agreement does nothing to address currency manipulation.

Like South Korea, the Columbia agreement is another NAFTA-style pact, but in Columbia more is being lost than jobs. Columbia is the most dangerous place in the world for trade unionists. In 2010, 51 labor leaders were killed in Columbia, an increase over 2009. This is more than in the rest of the world combined. The government of Columbia has been unable to effectively guarantee the rule of law to allow workers to exercise their legal rights.

The last of the nations being considered for a NAFTA-style agreement, Panama, is a known ''tax haven'' with a history of attracting money launders and tax dodgers. Although the Tax Information Exchange Treaty that Panama recently signed looks to combat these issues, it does not go into effect for another year and may be too weak to fix the problems. Additionally, Panama has a history of failing to protect workers and enforce labor rights.

''Free trade'' has proven to be a job-killer in the good-paying manufacturing sector. Lay-offs, closed factories, and lost tax base have been the legacy of NAFTA, CAFTA, and their associated trade agreements. This is why I urge you to vote no on the South Korea, Colombia, and Panama free trade agreements when they are brought to a vote in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN D. HILL,
International President.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CRITZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the International Longshore and Warehouse Union in opposition to the Korea free trade agreement.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHORE & WAREHOUSE UNION,
San Francisco, CA, Dec. 13, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: President Obama has reached a trade agreement with South Korea. That agreement must now be submitted for Congressional ratification. We anticipate that the President will aggressively shepherd this pact through Congress.

The International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) represents approximately 14,000 full time dockworkers and 14,000 part time dockworkers on the West Coast of the United States and in Hawaii and Alaska. Our members are in the business of moving cargo. By all accounts, the Korea-United States Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA) will increase trade between South Korea and the United States, which

will result in an increase in cargo movement between the two countries. An increase in cargo movement is good for dockworkers. However, this fact alone is insufficient to overcome the vast deficiencies of the KORUS FTA.

The KORUS FTA will cost jobs, lower environmental, labor, food and product quality standards, and empower corporations from the United States and South Korea to challenge public interests in both countries. The labor standards provision of the agreement only provides that each country enforce its own laws to adhere to the core labor standards identified by the International Labor Organization. The United States and South Korea's laws and enforcement in this area are completely inadequate and must be amended prior to the implementation of the agreement.

Labor supported President Obama and numerous other democratic candidates two years ago. In exchange for this support, we were promised a return to policies and practices that maintain, restore, and strengthen the middle class and working people across the United States. For two years, we have watched campaign promises be broken, one after the other, on this relentless march down the road of business as usual. Now, despite his campaign promise that he would only support trade agreements that ''put workers first,'' the President is pushing a trade agreement, the largest since the NAFTA debacle, that undeniably puts workers in South Korea and the United States in jeopardy.

On December 10, 2010, the International Executive Board of the ILWU voted unanimously to oppose the KORUS FTA. The ILWU will not support trade policy that exacerbates inequities, awards special rights to foreign investors, allows banks to practice the same disastrous policies that resulted in the current economic downturn, opens domestic environmental laws to foreign challenge, increases the trade deficit, and costs jobs. We urge Congress to support the Trade Reform, Accountability, Development and Employment (TRADE) Act, which outlines a way forward to a new trade and globalization agenda that would be better for labor, the environment, the economy, consumers, and our trade partners.

If my letter serves but one purpose, let it be to communicate this basic message: we have had it. Today, we join the growing chorus of labor unions who oppose the KORUS FTA. We also ask that our representatives in the Democratic Party stand up, discard meaningless oration, and remind us, with action, what the Democratic Party stands for because we have forgotten.

The Democratic Party needs to reject the KORUS FTA and stop taking its base for granted.

Sincerely,

ROBERT MCELLRATH,
International President.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. This is an important discussion, and I want to be clear what is really at stake here. It's the automotive industry of this country, but it's more than that. There's a basic principle involved in the Korea FTA issue, and that is whether we will replace one-way trade with two-way trade.

When this was negotiated by the Bush administration, it failed to take the most important step relating to Korea. They were shipping hundreds of thousands of cars to the United States. We were shipping, at that time, less than 10,000. So this, indeed, while it mainly involved automotive—and that was 75 percent of our deficit—it was even more than that, opening up markets for our goods produced in the United States of America. This was a Make It in America issue. And there was a Korean iron curtain against our products—by the way, not only automotive, but refrigerators and others.

The number one priority of the Koreans was to eliminate the 2.5 percent U.S. tariff, because if you ship 600,000 to 700,000 cars, that's a lot of money. We said to the administration, no way, we were not going to let the Korea free trade agreement be approved if it continued to embody one-way trade.

□ 1630

The Korean Ambassador met with Mr. RANGEL and me often, and the Trade Minister, and they said, We aren't going to talk about it. And we said, Well, if you don't talk, there will be no agreement.

And then what happened was that the new administration came into being, the Obama administration, and it began to work on this issue. And what happened was there were major changes in the agreement. Instead of the elimination of the tariff on most vehicles, immediately it was delayed to the 5th year, and on trucks it was delayed for 8 years to give time to make sure that the one-way street became a two-way street. That has been accomplished, and to make entirely sure of this, there were provisions to make sure that they could no longer use their tax provisions and their environmental standards to keep out our products.

And to make it even safer, we made sure that there was a safeguard, so if there's a surge of automotive products into the United States, we could defend ourselves. That was unique.

And that's why the big three are saying the following: ''As representatives of the largest exporting sector, this FTA will help open up an important auto market for Chrysler, Ford, and GM exports. Our companies make the best cars and trucks on the road, and we are excited for the export opportunity this agreement represents.'' And that's why the UAW has indicated its support, because workers making their cars will now be able to see that their cars can be shipped to Korea. And Ford has said they're going to use Korea as a base to penetrate, with American products, the markets of the rest of Asia.

So that's what this is all about. No, it won't be China getting into the U.S. It will be the U.S. getting into Korea. That's really what this is all about.

I want to say a word about the issue relating to issues of transshipment. We insisted in the FTA that there be provisions relating to transshipment, and I want to quickly refer to them.

If Customs has any doubt about a shipment, it can require Korean exporters to provide documentation showing that the goods qualify for FTA treatment. If a Korean exporter refuses or the document is not acceptable, Customs can deny FTA treatment to the good.

U.S. Customs can also do site visits—this is something different—to Korean factories to verify information. And if our Customs officials are denied access or the visit shows problems, they can deny entry to the Korean goods. And exporters who intentionally or repeatedly make false claims are subject to penalties.

I have a letter embodying this from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection that I would like to insert in the RECORD. I would also like to insert in the RECORD the letter that I referred to from the automobile association and from the UAW.

I also want to quote the statement from the Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association. It says as follows: ''The pending FTAs offer real opportunities for parts manufacturers and our employees in two of the fastest growing regions: Asia Pacific and South America. We can ill afford to neglect these and other markets as key competitors.''

I would like to insert this letter from MEMA into the RECORD.

So that's what the issue is here today. We faced a one-way market with impenetrable barriers. These are now being torn down.

This is a jobs bill. This is a jobs bill. We have to be able to compete, and our auto industry can now compete. In order to be able to compete effectively, we have to tear down the markets of other countries and make sure that our markets are not only open to them, but their markets are open to us.

We worked very hard to make this happen. It wasn't an easy job. There were times when the administration, perhaps, the new one, the Obama administration, was going to settle for something less than was necessary. We pressed. We pressed effectively.

The Obama administration rose to the occasion and, in the end, said to Korea, You must agree to open the market or we will not send this agreement, this revised agreement to the U.S. Congress.

This revised agreement has now been sent here. I urge its support.

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: CBP'S ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) plays an integral role in the implementation and enforcement of free trade agreements, which provide duty-free or reduced duty access to the U.S. market for qualifying merchandise. CBP is responsible for assessing and collecting duties, taxes, and fees and ensuring compliance with all import laws. CBP works to ensure that the benefits afforded by

Trade Agreements accrue only to eligible importations.

CBP will utilize its layered trade enforcement approach to ensure compliance with the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement's (KORUS) provisions. If CBP finds violations, CBP will take action to recover duty losses, pursue penalties when necessary, and establish enforcement criteria to prevent future potential fraudulent claims.

CBP will use the various enforcement mechanisms listed below to implement KORUS. Many of these mechanisms are used in the enforcement of all Trade Agreements, but will be tailored to take into consideration factors that are unique to Korea and the provisions listed in KORUS.

Targeting High-Risk Imports

CBP will conduct trend analysis to spot unusual trade patterns such as U.S. imports of products that South Korea does not produce.

CBP will monitor the emergence of new importers or changes in importer behavior.

CBP will review intelligence provided by other governments or industry.

Under KORUS, CBP can also take several other courses of action, including but not limited to: conducting comprehensive cargo exams or importer audits and performing laboratory analysis on the contents of imports.

Trade Agreement Verifications

Under KORUS, CBP will conduct extensive verifications as warranted of imports that seek preferential duty treatment to ensure that they legitimately qualify under the agreement.

CBP will request documentation from importers to substantiate their preference claims, as needed. If an importer cannot substantiate its preference claim, CBP will bill the importer for the duty amount owed, as well as other associated fees.

Under KORUS, CBP can visit South Korean factories to validate a factory's production capability as well as compliance of the goods with the requirements of KORUS. If a factory does not have the facilities to produce goods or documentation to support a KORUS claim, CBP can deny duty-free treatment under KORUS on future shipments.

CBP can also visit South Korean exporters or any other individuals or companies that may have evidence relative to the verification of a KORUS claim.

CBP can deny the preferential treatment granted under the agreement to any good when verification can not be completed because of a lack of cooperation from the foreign entity.

Textiles and Apparel Goods

KORUS includes provisions similar to other Trade Agreements that allow CBP to address major concerns of the U.S. business community, such as the transshipment of textile or apparel goods from China or other countries to take advantage of the duty preference.

Under KORUS, CBP can visit South Korean textile factories to validate a factory's production capability as well as compliance of the goods with the requirements of KORUS. If a factory does not have the facilities to produce goods or documentation to support a KORUS claim, CBP can deny duty-free treatment under KORUS on future shipments.

CBP can also visit South Korean exporters or any other individuals or companies that may have evidence relative to the verification of a KORUS claim.

CBP can deny the preferential treatment granted under the agreement to any textile or apparel good when verification can not be completed because of a lack of cooperation from the foreign entity.

Korea is required to provide CBP with an annual report detailing those factories that are involved in textile and apparel production. This information will be used to validate legitimate yarn, fabric, and apparel producers to assist CBP with their targeting.

AMERICAN AUTOMOTIVE POLICY COUNCIL

AAPC STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL PASSAGE OF THE U.S.-KOREA FTA

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The American Automotive Policy Council (AAPC)—representing its member companies Chrysler Group LLC, Ford Motor Company and General Motors Company—strongly supports the passage of the U.S. free trade agreement with South Korea (U.S.-Korea FTA). AAPC and its member companies worked closely with the United States Trade Representative (USTR) throughout the negotiations to ensure that the agreement provides the opportunity for our companies to compete and succeed in the Korean auto market. Our full support for this agreement was secured through this ongoing collaboration and the important improvements made to the auto provisions late last year.

''As representatives of the largest exporting sector, this FTA will help open an important auto market for Chrysler, Ford and GM exports. Our companies make the best cars and trucks on the road and we are excited for the export opportunity this agreement represents,'' AAPC President Matt Blunt said.

AAPC and its member companies support the agreement's automotive rule of origin (RoO), which is required to be met for auto products to receive the benefits of the FTA. When the high-level of integration of the North American auto market and the very narrow subset of costs that can be counted under the strict methodology used is considered, AAPC believes the automotive RoO content level maximizes its members' export opportunities from the United States, and allows America's automakers and its workers to fully benefit from the FTA.

''This agreement will help open a major Asian market that has been largely closed to U.S. auto exports. I urge members of Congress to vote for the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement. Not only is it good for the American auto industry and its workers, but it is good for the nation,'' Blunt said.

The Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association (MEMA) represents over 700 companies that manufacture motor vehicle parts for use in the light vehicle and heavy-duty original equipment and aftermarket industries. Motor vehicle parts manufacturers are the nation's largest manufacturing sector, directly employing over 685,000 American workers. MEMA represents its members through four affiliate associations: Automotive Aftermarket Suppliers Association (AASA), Heavy Duty Manufacturers Association (HDMA), Motor & Equipment Remanufacturers Association (MERA) and the Original Equipment Suppliers Association (OESA).

On behalf of this industry, I urge you to vote in favor of the free trade agreements (FTA) with Colombia, Panama and South Korea. These agreements are critical to helping America maintain its leading role in the world economy while promoting democratic and free market values.

The global economy has drastically changed, bringing greater competition which requires us to more actively engage our trading partners, be it through free trade agreements or other trade/investment partnerships, to help grow our economy. The pending FTAs offer real opportunities for parts manufacturers and our employees in two of the fastest-growing regions: Asia-Pacific and South America. We can ill afford to neglect these and other markets as key competitors, such as the EU and Canada, forge stronger partnerships with key countries.

As manufacturers, MEMA members are ready to take advantage of the pending FTAs, a sentiment expressed in testimony by MEMA in April before the House Small Business Committee. As our members continue to readjust their business operations in response to the recession, the agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea will provide significant business opportunities for the motor vehicle parts industry, creating jobs and helping to restore manufacturing to its rightful place in America's economy.

Thank you for your attention as Congress considers these important agreements.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW

Washington, DC, October 12, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is expected to vote this week on legislation to implement pending free trade agreements and renewal of the 2009 Trade Adjustment Assistance program (TAA). The UAW urges you to vote for the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA) and TAA, and to oppose the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

The automotive provisions of the original 2007 trade agreement with South Korea were substantially renegotiated by the Obama administration in 2010. The revised agreement creates the opportunity to address our Korean trade imbalance by providing greater market access for American exports and stronger safeguards to protect our domestic markets from harmful surges of Korean automotive imports.

The revised KORUS FTA keeps the 2.5 percent U.S. tariffs on automobiles and most auto parts in place until the fifth year after the agreement goes into effect. It also allows the U.S. to maintain the full 25 percent tariff on light trucks until the eighth year, and then phases this tariff out over three years. Korea will immediately reduce its electric car tariffs from 8 percent to 4 percent, and will phase out the tariff by the fifth year of the agreement. American automakers believe that the delayed tariff reductions will give them sufficient time to enhance their ability to compete in the historically-closed Korean market.

The revised KORUS FTA includes an auto-specific safeguard provision to protect against drastic increases in imported Korean vehicles that harm the domestic auto industry. The remedy for a finding of injury is the ''snapback'' to the original tariff levels prior to implementation of the FTA. The new agreement also addresses the pervasive use of Korean non-tariff barriers (NTBs). The KORUS FTA includes standards for the protection of worker rights, including obligations for South Korea to respect core International Labor Organization (ILO) labor rights and standards, to refrain from weakening any laws that reflect those rights in any way, and to effectively enforce labor laws designed to ensure a level playing field for American workers to compete. These labor standards are enforceable in the same manner as the commercial provisions of the FTA.

The UAW believes that the revised KORUS FTA will lead to an improvement in our economic relationship with South Korea and help to protect America's domestic auto industry and its workers from South Korea's tradition of engaging in unfair trade practices. Therefore, the UAW urges you to vote for the implementation of the KORUS FTA.

The UAW commends the Obama Administration's efforts to strengthen labor and human rights protections in Colombia through the recently negotiated Action Plan, and we are hopeful that the provisions in the Plan will result in significant changes on the ground in Colombia. We note, however, that the Action Plan is not included in the Colombia FTA. Moreover, we cannot support Congressional action on the Colombia FTA until there is significant progress on the paramount moral issues surrounding the continued violence against unionists and concrete evidence that the perpetrators of these crimes are being brought to justice.

Earlier this month, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) released its new Annual Survey on Trade Union Rights, which confirmed that Colombia remains the most dangerous place on earth for unionists: last year 49 people were murdered for their trade union activities, more than the rest of the world combined; 75 additional individuals received credible death threats; at least 2,500 unionists were arrested; and thousands more fired from their jobs solely due to union membership. The Action Plan is not enforceable under the FTA, and the passage of the U.S.-Colombia FTA would seriously weaken the pressure on the Colombian government to fulfill its human rights obligations. The Colombian government has been unambiguously complicit in the abuse of labor and human rights and the signing of the FTA would be an insult to workers everywhere, and to the basic principles of freedom and justice. Therefore, we urge you to vote against the Colombia FTA.

The 2009 enhanced TAA program expired in February of this year. Since that time, tens of thousands of service workers and manufacturing workers whose jobs were shipped to China and India have been ineligible for TAA retraining benefits, and workers who have been certified for TAA have received reduced benefits. The UAW urges you to vote for legislation already passed in the Senate to reinstate the provisions of the 2009 TAA so that workers whose jobs have been offshored have an adequate opportunity to find reemployment.

Accordingly, the UAW urges you to vote for the KORUS FTA and TAA, and to vote against the U.S.-Colombia FTA. Thank you for considering our views on these very important matters.

Sincerely,

BARBARA SOMSON,
Legislative Director.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

This agreement will break down trade barriers. Frankly, it will level the playing field for 19,000 small and medium-sized businesses here in the United States and the farmers here who export into this market. It means 280,000 new American jobs and, frankly, it means $10 billion in new exports.

And let's remember this: Europe has this trade agreement. It went into effect on July 1. They've seen a 17 percent increase in their exports into the market in South Korea at our expense. Why? Because, frankly, U.S. exports to Korea currently face an average tariff of 12.2 percent, and it's, frankly, 49 percent for agricultural products. If we can bring that down—their tariffs are higher than ours. If we can bring that down, we can get that market share. We can increase that trade and develop these jobs.

And the agreement also removes the barriers and provides transparency. It provides property rights. It has rules on competition that make U.S. businesses much more competitive in Korea, that gives them access into that market.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I do want to just touch on some points raised by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN). We did work closely together on the supplemental agreement last year with the administration, with automakers, with autoworkers, and that is incorporated in the legislation before us today.

It does address, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, key tariff and nontariff barriers, including numerous provisions to ensure that South Korea cannot use a regulatory system or process to block our exports.

The International Trade Commission estimates that the removal of nontariff barriers alone will add an additional between $48 million and $66 million in new exports. That's in addition to the $194 million dollars in new exports expected from lower Korean tariffs on autos alone.

Inaction on the Korean trade agreement has allowed the European Union and other competitors to step in and take our market share. That's diminished our leadership in Asia. The Korean trade agreement is key to our engagement in Asia, and it will be a critical counter to Chinese influence in the region.

We've heard a lot about China today, but how do we counter Chinese influence in the region through this agreement?

□ 1640

This agreement, also, I think, is critically important because it deepens our ties with a strong and important ally. The United States and South Korea have had a 60-year history of standing together. This agreement is really a step forward in our bilateral relationship, and it is an important step that we need to take today.

I would urge passage of this agreement. It has been endorsed—and I have a 4-page list of organizations and associations, including the American Farm Bureau, the Business Roundtable, Heritage, and other groups, a 4-page list—by many organizations supporting the passage of this agreement.

[From The Committee on Ways and Means]

THE SUPPORT FOR JOB CREATING TRADE AGREEMENTS IS LARGE . . . AND GROWING

Aerospace Industries Association, Agri Beef Co., American Apparel & Footwear Association, American Automotive Policy Council, American Chamber of Commerce in Korea, American Chemistry Council, American Council of Life Insurers, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Feed Industry Association, American Forest & Paper Association.

American Frozen Food Institute, American International Automobile Dealers Association (AIADA), American Iron and Steel Institute, American Meat Institute, American Peanut Product Manufacturers, Inc., American Potato Trade Alliance, American Seed Trade Association, American Soybean Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Animal Health Institute, Asia-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce.

Association of American Chambers of Commerce in Latin America, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Blue Diamond Growers, Business Roundtable, Business Software Alliance, California Cherry Export Association, California Date Commission, California Dried Plum Board, California Fig Advisory Board, California Pear Growers.

California Strawberry Commission, California Table Grape Commission, California Walnut Commission, Campbell Soup Company, Cargill Incorporated, Club for Growth, Coalition of Service Industries, Commodity Markets Council, Computer & Communications Industry Association, ConAgra Foods, Inc., Corn Refiners Association.

Dairylea Cooperative Inc., Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, Dow Chemical Company, Emergency Committee for American Trade, Equity Cooperative Livestock Sales Association, Footwear Distributors & Retailers of America, FreedomWorks, Grocery Manufacturers Association.

Heritage Action, Hormel Foods Corporation, Idaho Barley Commission, Idaho Grain Producers Association, International Dairy Foods Association, International Intellectual Property Alliance, JBS USA, Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, Kentucky Small Grain Growers Association, Kraft Foods.

Land O'Lakes, Inc., Latin America Trade Coalition, Montana Grain Growers Association, Motion Picture Association of America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council.

National Confectioners Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Fisheries Institute, National Foreign Trade Council, National Grain and Feed Association, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., National Meat Association, National Milk Producers Federation, National Oilseed Processors Association.

National Pork Producers Council, National Potato Council, National Renderers Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Sunflower Association, National Taxpayers Union, National Turkey Federation, North American Equipment Dealers Association, North Dakota Grain Growers Association, Northwest Dairy Association/Darigold.

Northwest Horticulture Council, Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc., Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, Outdoor Industry Association, Pet Food Institute, Produce Marketing Association, Recording Industry Association of America, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Seaboard Foods, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

Smithfield Foods, South Dakota Wheat Inc., SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Sunmaid Growers of California, Sunsweet Growers, Inc., Sweetener Users Association, TechNet, Texas Wheat Producers Association, The Financial Services Roundtable, Third Way.

Travel Goods Association, Tyson Foods, Inc., U.S. Apple Association, U.S. Canola Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Council for International Business, U.S. Dairy Export Council, U.S.-Korea FTA Business Coalition, U.S. Meat Export Federation, U.S. Premium Beef.

Unilever United States, United Egg Association, United Egg Producers, United Producers, Inc., US Dry Bean Council, US Wheat Associates, US-Colombia Business Partnership, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, USA Poultry & Egg Export Council, USA Rice Federation, Valley Fig Growers, Washington State Potato Commission, Welch Foods Inc., Western Growers Association.

I urge passage of this agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 425, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may postpone further proceedings on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2832 as though under clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the chair for yielding.

Three and a half trade deals that we have taken up today have bipartisan support, the three pending free trade agreements and the GSP extension within this bill. Both parties in both Chambers agree that these important trade pacts will grow our economy, create jobs, and make America more competitive in the global marketplace.

Sadly, however, the bipartisan, bicameral approval of the merits of these trade deals did not keep the Washington gamesmanship at bay. For nearly 10 months, as they pushed for an expanded and enlarged TAA program, our colleagues in the Senate allowed the GSP to lapse, holding American jobs hostage until their political allies could be pacified with a sufficient payoff.

This delay wasn't simply an intellectual exercise either. It hurt real businesses, real families, and cost us real jobs in my home State of Kansas. Take the Berger Company in Atchison, Kansas. The family-owned Berger Company manufactures leather goods for sale across the United States. But due to the increased cost of materials caused by the lapse in the GSP, Berger has lost customers to foreign competitors like China, causing lower profit and placing real Kansas jobs at risk.

I'm voting for this bill because we need GSP to be reauthorized immediately, but I'm extremely disappointed that Senate Democrats have again risked the continued lapse of this important program all for a TAA program that does not work.

The results of Washington brinksmanship have real life impacts across this country. So while I'm hopeful that we will finally extend the GSP package today, I'm disappointed Washington political games made our small businesses, like the Berger Company, wait so long.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 2832, which is extending what have been historically two programs that have received strong bipartisan support. Beginning in 1962, the TAA bill was originally put in under the Kennedy administration, and it has been extended for all these years. And the Generalized System of Preferences has also been there for a long time. Our importers and exporters have been using it as ways of getting things into the United States that have made real differences not only for our people but for people in developing countries.

Now, TAA provides critically needed assistance to workers who lose their jobs as a result of trade. It would be hard to find anybody on the floor of the House who wouldn't say that trade causes displacement of workers. There are jobs that move here, move there, and this is a recognition of that and a statement that we care about what happens to workers and that we give them some kind of help. It provides them with support, education, and training so that they can obtain new jobs in growth sectors. In my State, we used to do log exports. Logging was a big issue. Then it went away. Well, you have to retrain people, and community colleges have trained a lot of people in this kind of thing.

In 2009 Congress made some much-needed reforms in TAA, many of which addressed past criticisms of the program. These reforms included extending TAA to cover service workers and more manufacturing workers, offering long-term training and increasing training funds, and increasing the health care coverage tax credit.

This was probably the most important of the reforms. When people lose their job, they have no health care. And everything that you have in your life can be wiped out by an illness or an injury. So the idea that you can get COBRA is a nice idea, but you've got to have money to do that. Most of the unemployment checks in this country don't make it possible for people to take advantage of the COBRA. So when we had this increase in support from the Federal Government for workers, we were really looking at the real problems that people face.

Now, unfortunately, last winter the House leadership let the 2009 reforms lapse, leaving a lot of workers just hanging out there. The Generalized System of Preferences was also permitted to expire, which harmed businesses that rely on the program both in developing countries and in the United States. While it's long overdue, I'm pleased to see we're finally moving the legislation to expand both of these programs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2832, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it's taken a long time for us to get here. We've had hours and hours of debate, last night and today, and literally years and years and years of discussion and of negotiation, and a lot of anguish and a lot of pain, but we have finally gotten here.

I want to begin by expressing my great appreciation to a man with whom I've been pleased to partner in cochairing what has been a longstanding group known as our Trade Working Group. It's sometimes partisan, sometimes bipartisan. It began two decades ago when Bill Archer was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and Phil Crane chaired the Trade Subcommittee, and with every chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the Trade Subcommittee, I've been privileged to join with them in working to build these coalitions for the very important goal of breaking down barriers to ensure that we can have access to consumer markets for union and nonunion workers in this country. And this is what it's all about.

DAVE CAMP has done a phenomenal job in negotiating these trade agreements and the issue which is before us today, which is trade adjustment assistance. Now I know that there's a lot of concern about it. I'm frankly not a huge enthusiast, but I recognize that while there is a net gain—a net gain—when it comes to the issue of global trade, there are some workers who are displaced.

□ 1650

While some people have been saying that those of us who are enthusiastically supporting the Korea, Panama, and Colombia free trade agreements are greatly exaggerating the positive impact of this, I've got to say that I recognize that there are some people who are going to be going through challenging economic times as a byproduct of this agreement. That's why, as we look at this 21st century economy, it is critically important for us, Madam Speaker, to do everything that we can to ensure that our fellow Americans, U.S. workers, have the kind of training and expertise necessary to deal with this global economy in the 21st century. That's exactly what the Trade Adjustment Assistance package is all about. It's a modest package of $300 million.

I know that last night, as he has just informed me, Mr. CAMP outlined the details of this to the House. He worked with the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. BAUCUS, and with others to get this to the point where we are.

But we are now winding down this debate, and I think about the fact that, when Ronald Reagan on November 6 of 1979 announced his candidacy for President of the United States, in that speech, it was seen as heresy. I mean, it was almost a joke, Madam Speaker. Ronald Reagan said that he envisaged an accord of free trade among the Americas so that we could allow for the free flow of goods and services and capital. He was laughed at here in the United States, and he was laughed at throughout the hemisphere. Madam Speaker, since that time, we have seen tremendous, tremendous changes taking place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. It has been almost 32 years since Ronald Reagan made that announcement; and last Monday, a week ago Monday, on October 3, Democratic President Barack Obama sent these agreements for us to consider, and here we are now doing this.

There are so many people who have been involved in this. One of the things that has really impressed me, Madam Speaker, has been the involvement of the 87—now, I guess, 89—new Members on our side of the aisle who have brought about a change in the makeup of this institution. There are people who have stepped to the forefront—TOM REED, RICK BERG, TIM GRIFFIN, BOB DOLD, QUICO CANSECO, and many others—who have felt strongly about the need to get our economy growing and who know that, in so doing, we will be able to create jobs for U.S. workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just close by saying, over that 5-year period of time, Madam Speaker, we have seen so many tremendous changes that have taken place. Five years is half the life for a child who was born on September 11. There have been changes in our economy—and in the global economy—in dealing with issues that weren't even addressed then. The iPad didn't exist 5 years ago when these were put into place. There are issues like encryption, cross-border dataflow, things like intermediary liability, privacy. Those were barely discussed then. Today, these are critical, important issues. This is a very small first step towards regaining our position as the world's global leader.

I thank my friend for his support, and I thank all of our colleagues who have been involved in this.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise in support of H.R. 2832, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011.

This legislation continues vital coverage of the TAA program while it expands the Generalized System of Preferences, a key trade and development program.

We have a responsibility to ensure that our workers, communities, and economy can adjust to a rapidly globalizing economy. As Congress advances international trade opportunities for our firms, it has an opportunity to ensure that American workers can also compete.

Since 1962, the TAA has expanded to respond to the continual changes to the economy and the global system. Among the most significant changes were those that we made when the Democrats were in charge just in 2009, which expanded the program to include service workers as well as to improve the coverage of reemployment benefits, job search benefits, relocation and health care benefits. It produced tangible results. The coverage in 2008 certified 125,000 workers. As a result of the changes we made in 2009, 280,000 workers were certified.

The expansion of the program appropriately reflects the challenges trade poses to our service economy, and continues our commitment to the manufacturing sector. In my State alone, in 2010, the coverage reached over 10,000 workers and directed $30 million in Federal funds to carry out those efforts and to support our economy as it adjusted to competition from international trade.

It's interesting to see the broad range of supporters. The Communications Workers of America say that TAA is a critical lifeline in providing retraining and education, helping service workers to pull themselves back up and find good new jobs. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce will score the vote on TAA, writing that this legislation is a thoughtful compromise that preserves the more effective elements of the five-decade-old TAA program.

I am also pleased that we are dealing with the Generalized System of Preferences. I think my good friend from the State of Kansas may have been confused. I was, frankly, frustrated that it had been held up. We passed it in the last Congress. There was nothing to have prevented my Republican friends from bringing it forward at the beginning of this Congress. In fact, I wished that they would have, but they didn't get around to it until September. I don't know why, but I think the criticism is misplaced.

Regardless, each day without action on GSP costs American companies $1.8 million in extra, unnecessary import tariffs. I've watched as the expiration of GSP has cost Evergreen Container in Portland, Oregon, $50,000 already this year—$10,000 for this company, $70,000 over here, another $5,000 here. It adds up. $1.8 million a day.

But it's more than just a trade agreement and helping American companies. Under the GSP program, we will judge our trading partners on the protection of American commercial interests, such as the protection of intellectual property and preventing the seizure of property belonging to U.S. citizens or businesses. We judge them on the protection of individual rights, the protection of commonly accepted labor rights, and the elimination of child labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We ought to add the protection of the environment to this criteria. I raised it in our Ways and Means hearing. The thought was we were going to go ahead and not adjust the status quo, but the protection of the environment exerts tremendous influence on international trade. The trade in illegally logged timber, for instance, costs the U.S.-based legal timber industry billions of dollars a year. If we truly expect trade to be a tool of development, trade must support environmental protections in our partner nations as our free trade agreements do.

Concern for the environment is a core element of development. It reflects the appreciation for civil law, for the protection of the rights of individuals, and of a concern for the long-term sustainability of state and society and of the planet. It should have a place in our GSP program. I hope when it comes next before us that we've added environmental protections to the criteria.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY. I rise in strong support of the bill.

I can speak very clearly about the relationship that we have with Korea because, in addition to being a General Motors dealer who sells Chevrolets and Cadillacs, I also sell Hyundais and Kias. I can tell you of the alliance that we have had, of the very strong partner we have had in Korea for so many

years. Since 1949, Korea has fought with us in every military skirmish—side by side, shoulder to shoulder with us. In the United States alone, Hyundai has invested over $3 billion in bricks and mortar in building two plants—one in Montgomery, Alabama, the other in West Point, Georgia. When we're worried about the number of cars being sold here, let's understand one thing, that over 60 percent of the Korean cars sold in the United States are made by Americans.

□ 1700

There are 60,000 jobs in the United States right now because of Hyundai and Kia's investment between our borders. And when we look at our market, our global opportunity, we have got to pass these trade agreements. We have got to pass the TAA. Why? Because it's good for America in addition to all these jobs and the possibility of 250,000 additional jobs in the country that's looking for a job almost every day.

These jobs are there. They're available to us. We have got to get on with these trade agreements. In addition, let me also state that Hyundai and Hyundai dealers have raised over $43 million in the fight against pediatric cancer, which is over 10 times what this Congress has invested in that fight against pediatric cancer.

The opportunities are outstanding right now. The opportunity is now, and what better time to pass these agreements than when we're hunting for the jobs that we need the most for our people and also with allies who have stood shoulder-to-shoulder and arm-in-arm with us in every single battle.

I would urge every single Member in this House to please pass the agreements. Let's move on. Let's get America back to work.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my good friend and colleague from the committee for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, many of us have been rising throughout the course of the debate today talking about the merits of the three pending trade agreements before us and why it's important for us to move forward on them, the reduction of tariff and non-tariff barriers, greater market access to the goods, product services that are being made right here in America, a system of rules that all countries have to abide by that are parties to this agreement, according to international labor and environmental standards included in the body of the agreement, fully enforceable with any other provision, protection of intellectual property rights, and on and on and on. That's why I'm supportive of the three bilateral agreements before us.

But to be honest with the American people, and as long as trade remains a two-way street, there will be adverse impacts of trade on companies and workers here in America. When that occurs, then the workers of that business should not just be left on their own.

That's why the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance is important today, to move forward hand-in-hand with those trade agreements so those workers will have an opportunity to upgrade their skills, to go to school, to have a better match in the job market and find placement as quickly as possible. Since 1962, the TAA program has assisted those workers who lost their position as a result of international trade, helped them retrain and acquire skills needed for them to be more competitive in the global marketplace.

In Wisconsin alone in 2010, we had an estimated 10,359 workers who were covered by this program, and my State's not alone. In fact, the three largest TAA State recipients were Michigan, Ohio, California.

In 2010 in Wisconsin, 52 percent of the TAA participants were successfully employed within 3 months of leaving the program, and 88 percent of those participants continued that employment over the next few quarters. The benefit of this program not only helps workers in my State, but also those specifically in western Wisconsin that I represent.

In 2010, again, when Chart Energy & Chemicals in La Crosse moved some of its production line to China, approximately 230 employees were laid off, but they were able to receive reemployment and training services under the Federal TAA program. When Northern Engraving Corporation shut down its Luxco division tool shop in La Crosse, 27 workers were laid off; and they too qualified for assistance so that they could get reintegrated in the regional economy.

There are many more examples of that throughout Wisconsin and, I am sure, throughout the country. And that's why it was a bit discouraging that it took so long for us to reach an agreement on TAA reauthorization when there's wide bipartisan support and great support on the outside, from the Chamber of Commerce to the AFL–CIO, saying this is the right and decent thing to do for America's workers if we are going to move forward in a proactive trade agenda.

I want to take a moment and commend my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, for the work that he did with Senator BAUCUS in order to get the TAA reauthorization in the place that it is today. I think it was very helpful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend.

As I mentioned in committee last week during the markup, I think it would make sense if the committee, Ways and Means that had jurisdiction, were to hold some hearings as we move forward on ways that we can improve the efficiency and the outcome of the TAA program. Any program is worthy of change and improvements. I think this is right for that.

My concern is this is only a 3-year reauthorization. I hope we can continue bipartisan support that continues beyond 3 years so it's not having to be linked to other trade agreements, but I think our committee has some work to do to improve a very successful program.

I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Washington that I have no other speakers and am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I thank the Ways and Means Committee for their excellent work on the trade agreements and, most importantly, on Trade Adjustment Assistance; and I agree with the comments of my colleague from Wisconsin about why this program is so important.

I mean the bottom line is the TAA and the trade agreements themselves are part of figuring out how to help American workers and the American economy compete in a very, very difficult global economic situation. The amount of skills that our workers need now are vastly beyond what they needed in previous generations, and the need to update them constantly in order to continue to be competitive, to continue to be employable are a significant challenge for American workers.

This program is one way to give them help, to help give them the training and the skills that they need to continue to be employable. It is incredibly important for our workers, and we have heard the statistics about the number of workers in our country who have benefited from these programs.

But I also submit to you that it is critically important to our economy. Our economy needs a skilled workforce in order to compete. Trade Adjustment Assistance is one way to help our workers get those skills that they need. Certainly it helps them, but it also helps our businesses and our overall economy.

I, along with my colleague from Wisconsin, support all three trade agreements. I believe trade is critically important to growing our economy as well, and it's simple math. Ninety-five percent of the people in this world live someplace other than the United States of America, but the United States of America is responsible for 20 percent of the world's consumption.

If we're going to grow, we need access to other markets. Korea, Colombia, and Panama are good steps in that direction to give us access to those other markets so that our businesses can

have the possibility of growing their businesses and taking advantage of the growing economy.

It has been Asia and other parts of the world that are growing the most. We need access to those markets. Trade agreements like this give us that opportunity.

But as I have said for the entire 15 years I have been in Congress, that alone is not sufficient to protect American workers in our economy. Access to overseas markets on its own isn't enough to take care of our workers as they should be taken care of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. They need training. That's the other critical piece of these trade agreements that I want to emphasize.

For the first time—not the first time, actually we did it in Peru—thanks, actually, to the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and Mr. RANGEL and others, we have enforceable workers' rights in all three of these agreements.

There have been justifiable criticisms, for instance, in Colombia of the ability of workers that organize and collectively bargain. But this agreement will give us the enforceable ability to make sure that they do. If Colombia or any one of these countries doesn't live up to the ILO standards and requirements, this agreement now gives us the ability to use trade sanctions to make sure that they do.

That is an incredibly important step forward to protect the workers in this country. It needs to work together, access to overseas markets, to trade agreements and adequate protections for our workers so that they can compete in that environment with TSA, with the workers' rights provisions in these trade agreements. I believe that all three trade agreements and this TAA bill do this.

I thank the Ways and Means Committee, both Republican and Democrat, for their work in making this happen.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1710

Mr. LEVIN. I rise in strong support of this proposal, this bill. It restarts TAA and the GSP program. You know, this should have happened long ago. The Republican decision to let it lapse over 8 months ago was very wrong. And as a result, and we're not sure of the exact numbers because that isn't public, but hundreds of service workers were completely shut out. Fewer manufacturing workers became eligible, and those who did qualify for TAA received less assistance and support. So now we're taking action today that's long overdue.

I heard last night somebody said that the trade agreements were being held ''hostage'' to the TAA program. They just got it 180 degrees wrong. It was the TAA program that was being held hostage to trade agreements, and that never should have happened.

Well, now we can act. I just want to say, some people, I think, look upon TAA as kind of the teaspoon of sugar to make the trade agreements go down. That could not be more incorrect. What TAA does is to help those who are thrown out of work because of trade, through no fault of their own. And if we're going to have a competitive workforce, people need to be able to be retrained. And interestingly enough, if you go to any place where TAA operates, you'll see a wide variety of people who have become eligible and who are being helped.

So I very, very much support this bill which preserves the integrity, although not all, of the TAA program, and the 2009 reforms.

I close by saying I also support the GSP provisions in this bill. I think there is a misconception. It does help, indeed, developing countries who rely on the GSP. But as our ranking member knows from all of his work, it also benefits American companies and the workers they employ. In fact, the majority of GSP imports are inputs used to support U.S. manufacturing, including raw materials, parts and components, and machinery and equipment. So not only did failing to extend GSP hurt developing countries, it hurt American businesses and their employees.

A wide spectrum supports this bill, and I hope all of us on this side of the aisle will vote in favor of it.

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's important that we are passing this TAA today. But it is just the tip of the iceberg of the problems faced by workers in this country. I think that we are picking one group and saying, well, if you can qualify for having lost your job because of international trade adjustment of one sort or another, you're eligible for some benefits. But I think that in the much larger sense the House faces a problem. We're seeing it in the streets. We're seeing it on Wall Street. We're seeing it on my Central Plaza. We're seeing it here in Washington, DC. We're seeing it in Atlanta. The workers of this country are very upset, and there's a long agenda that is sort of dealt with here for one small group of workers that ought to be available for all workers.

Now, we're going to have to extend unemployment benefits at the end of this year unless, like last year, at Christmastime, we'll be saying to people, You know what? We don't care about you; you're done. We haven't extended unemployment benefits. We ought to be doing it right now. It will be caught in the crush of all what happens at the end of the year, but it needs to happen.

Foreclosure relief. We continue to have foreclosures in this country with no way out for the workers of this country, including these. We didn't do anything for foreclosure problems for somebody who's lost their job because of trade. We make no adjustment. We don't say that you can lower the amount of your loan or the banks must negotiate. We don't do anything for people who are struggling with foreclosures in this country.

Health care. Health care in this bill makes it possible for people to get health care coverage. But there are thousands and thousands and thousands of workers, 14 million of them walking around in this country, with no health care, and we have done nothing this session to implement the Affordable Care Act.

Finally, I would just say there is one last issue that needs to be thought about. What happens to a worker who, training or not, exhausts all their unemployment benefits, and they have a family and they have a house? Now in the 1930s what people did was backed the car up to the house, put the furniture up on top, and drove off and got a job in California. You have got millions of people today who are tied to a house in Flint, Michigan, or Toledo, Ohio, or a thousand places. They can't drive off to Florida and get a job, or to California. They're stuck. And so they find themselves with no access to any kind of way to pay their mortgage. They're going to get foreclosed. Then they can leave, of course.

Or we've got to find some way to make it possible for workers in this economy as it recovers to somehow get by. If we don't care, if we just care about the workers who are lost because of trade—that's nice and we ought to do that. We're doing the right thing, but we ought to be thinking much broader than that if we're serious about coming out of the problems we have in this economy.

I urge everyone to vote for this bill and begin the drumbeat for the unemployment insurance extension and a couple of other things.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I support H.R. 2832, the bill that renews the Generalized System of Preferences, known as GSP, and also contains the Trade Adjustment Assistance, also called TAA.

This bill really is the cornerstone of the carefully crafted bipartisan and bicameral agreement that then prompted the President to send the three trade agreements to the Congress last Monday. So this has allowed us, this legislation today, has allowed us to move forward on a long-stalled trade agenda.

The bill renews GSP, which the House passed last month, and that is the largest trade preference program and is estimated to account for 82,000 U.S. jobs that are directly or indirectly related to that program.

The second portion of this bill, the bill that reauthorizes Trade Adjustment Assistance, is absolutely critical because it is one of the core items that has allowed these trade agreements to come forward. And this legislation really does ensure smaller government and less spending on an important program in these difficult economic times where we have a growing debt and deficit.

This program was streamlined and scaled back, and just quickly I'll note some of the highlights. There is no TAA for public sector workers. The number of weeks was reduced from 156 in the 2009 law down to 117 weeks. Also, there is no double-dipping. These benefits run concurrently with current unemployment insurance, or UI benefits, and the health care subsidy was reduced in this legislation.

We also eliminated half of the allowable justifications for the program's training waivers to ensure that those who are eligible for TAA are in those training programs with only limited exceptions.

We also consolidated and reduced all the non-income support expenditures. We reduced funding for the TAA for firms, and also added enhanced performance measures. Now, no worker will qualify for this unless certified by the Department of Labor. This is an important attempt to bring some reform and integrity to our unemployment programs, particularly by strengthening the job training provision where 80 percent of the waivers were used to waive people out of the requirement they job train.

□ 1720

This is an important reform; and it's going to be an important reform in this bill to make sure we implement it so as we move forward on the employment insurance debate later this year, as the gentleman from Washington State alluded to, we actually have a track record on some of these items and can see how they're at least beginning to work.

So I urge my colleagues to support not only all three trade agreements, but also what really was the cornerstone for bringing those three trade agreements to the floor, H.R. 2832.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 425, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3078) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LEVIN. I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEVIN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3078 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VII—CURRENCY REFORM FOR FAIR TRADE ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act''.

SEC. 702. CLARIFICATION REGARDING DEFINITION OF COUNTERVAILABLE SUBSIDY.

(a) BENEFIT CONFERRED.—Section 771(5)(E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and''; and

(3) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) in the case in which the currency of a country in which the subject merchandise is produced is exchanged for foreign currency obtained from export transactions, and the currency of such country is a fundamentally undervalued currency, as defined in paragraph (37), the difference between the amount of the currency of such country provided and the amount of the currency of such country that would have been provided if the real effective exchange rate of the currency of such country were not undervalued, as determined pursuant to paragraph (38).''.

(b) EXPORT SUBSIDY.—Section 771(5A)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(5A)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of a subsidy relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency, the fact that the subsidy may also be provided in circumstances not involving export shall not, for that reason alone, mean that the subsidy cannot be considered contingent upon export performance.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF FUNDAMENTALLY UNDERVALUED CURRENCY.—Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(37) FUNDAMENTALLY UNDERVALUED CURRENCY.—The administering authority shall determine that the currency of a country in which the subject merchandise is produced is a 'fundamentally undervalued currency' if—

''(A) the government of the country (including any public entity within the territory of the country) engages in protracted, large-scale intervention in one or more foreign exchange markets during part or all of the 18-month period that represents the most recent 18 months for which the information required under paragraph (38) is reasonably available, but that does not include any period of time later than the final month in the period of investigation or the period of review, as applicable;

''(B) the real effective exchange rate of the currency is undervalued by at least 5 percent, on average and as calculated under paragraph (38), relative to the equilibrium real effective exchange rate for the country's currency during the 18-month period;

''(C) during the 18-month period, the country has experienced significant and persistent global current account surpluses; and

''(D) during the 18-month period, the foreign asset reserves held by the government of the country exceed—

''(i) the amount necessary to repay all debt obligations of the government falling due within the coming 12 months;

''(ii) 20 percent of the country's money supply, using standard measures of M2; and

''(iii) the value of the country's imports during the previous 4 months.''.

(d) DEFINITION OF REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE UNDERVALUATION.—Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677), as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(38) REAL EFFECTIVE EXCHANGE RATE UNDERVALUATION.—The calculation of real effective exchange rate undervaluation, for purposes of paragraph (5)(E)(v) and paragraph (37), shall—

''(A)(i) rely upon, and where appropriate be the simple average of, the results yielded from application of the approaches described in the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues; or

''(ii) if the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund's Consultative Group on Exchange Rate Issues are not available, be based on generally accepted economic and econometric techniques and methodologies to measure the level of undervaluation;

''(B) rely upon data that are publicly available, reliable, and compiled and maintained by the International Monetary Fund or, if the International Monetary Fund cannot provide the data, by other international organizations or by national governments; and

''(C) use inflation-adjusted, trade-weighted exchange rates.''.

SEC. 703. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the amendments made by this title.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which United States industries that have been materially injured by reason of imports of subject merchandise produced in foreign countries with fundamentally undervalued currencies have received relief under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), as amended by this title.

SEC. 704. APPLICATION TO GOODS FROM CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1993 (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by section 702 of

this Act shall apply to goods from Canada and Mexico.

Mr. CAMP (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I want everybody to know what this is. This is a bill on currency. This is the opportunity for people to once again stand up and be counted. This is the bill that passed last year 349–79, with 99 Republicans supporting it. This is the House bill that has 225 cosponsors. More than 60 are Republicans.

It's clear that China's currency manipulation is a major cause of hundreds of thousands of lost manufacturing jobs, and imports from China are about half of that. So we're talking about 1 million jobs, at the least. What is also clear is that the manipulation of currency tilts the playing field in favor of China at least 25 percent, and it's not getting better.

China's currency manipulation isn't the only cause of that deficit and loss of jobs. But because it's not the only cause doesn't mean we should address it. It's a major one. It's clear we haven't been effectively confronting China on this issue, and China pushes ahead.

So in a few words, the time has come for action. Eight years of talk have yielded very meager results.

As said, this has broad bipartisan support. And to make it utterly clear, last night the Senate passed a bill on currency by 63–35. Sixteen Republican Senators supported it.

This will not kill the bill. It will not send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately go to passage.

So, as I said, now is the moment for all of us to be counted, to stand up and be counted. No excuses. As Robert Samuelson said in The Post last weekend, there's already a trade war between them and us, but only one side is fighting. Now we'll make sure that both sides are in this effort.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is so active on this issue.

Mr. CRITZ. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue.

''As the Chamber closest to the people, the House works best when it is allowed to work its will.'' Those aren't my words. They're a direct quote of Speaker BOEHNER.

Since China's 2001 entry into the World Trade Organization, we have lost nearly 3 million manufacturing jobs, and our overall trade deficit with China has grown to over $237 billion. Our manufacturers are hurting. The American people are hurting.

We were sent here to lead. Here is our chance.

We're talking about creating over 2 million American jobs and reducing our annual trade deficit by over $70 billion. The Speaker warns of a ''trade war.'' You want to talk about a trade war? Ask the workers in industries like steel tubing, tires, and solar panels who have lost their jobs because of China's unfair trade practices. At some point, we have to stand up and do what is right for the American people.

You gain respect through strength. This is our moment of truth. This bill has broad bipartisan support. We must send a strong message the United States will not stand idly by while foreign currency manipulators destroy American manufacturing jobs. It's time to stand up and be leaders for the American people and defend their interests over all others.

At any rate, Madam Speaker, it's time to stop being part of the problem and become part of the solution. Lead, follow, or get out of the way, and as the Speaker said, ''Let the House work its will.''

I urge my colleagues to stand up for America, to level the playing field with China. Support this motion to recommit.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. That's all it will take.

The issue is clear: Act. Act. You must stand up and be counted. This is the moment on currency for every Member of the House.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw the point of order, and I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, the implementing bill before us reflects a carefully negotiated agreement that involved the White House, the U.S. Trade Representative, and bipartisan staffs and members from both Ways and Means and Finance. All four offices were consulted at every step of the process and all sides were fully involved. This provision was not part of that negotiation. In fact, it was not even raised during negotiations. This threatens to undue the carefully negotiated terms of this compromise and set our trade agenda back.

This motion is a true poison pill. Any change, even moving a single comma, would strip the bill of fast-track protections under Trade Promotion Authority in the United States Senate. Thus, this motion really isn't about Chinese currency practices. It's an effort to kill the Colombian free trade agreement. In fact, the irony is that the only reason the minority is even allowed to offer this motion is because then-Speaker PELOSI took the unprecedented step of turning off the clock on TPA 3 years ago on the Colombian free trade agreement. Passing this or any other motion would reward that decision to put our trade agenda on ice—a decision that hurt our economy, cost us jobs, as U.S. farmers and exporters lost out on opportunity in that fast-growing country.

□ 1730

Finally, with respect to the substance of this motion, everyone agrees that China's currency is undervalued. China must let its currency appreciate and commit to allowing market supply and demand to determine its value. But at the same time, we need to recognize that currency is not the only barrier that U.S. businesses face in China and that legislation on currency is not a silver bullet.

I plan to hold a hearing in the Ways and Means Committee this month on all of these issues, including currency; but this is the wrong vehicle for such legislation and would kill the very important Colombian trade agreement. I therefore urge defeat of this motion and passage of this important trade agreement.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3078, if ordered; passage of H.R. 3079; passage of H.R. 3080; adoption of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2832; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2433.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 236, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 780]

YEAS—192

Ackerman	Capps	Costa
Altmire	Capuano	Costello
Andrews	Cardoza	Courtney
Baca	Carnahan	Critz
Baldwin	Carney	Crowley
Barrow	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Bass (CA)	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Becerra	Chandler	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Chu	Davis (IL)
Berman	Cicilline	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (MI)	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clay	Deutch
Boren	Cleaver	Dicks
Boswell	Clyburn	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Doggett
Braley (IA)	Connolly (VA)	Donnelly (IN)
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Doyle
Butterfield	Cooper	Duncan (TN)

Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Bachus
Giffords
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1757

Messrs. FARR, FRANK of Massachusetts, COOPER, PAYNE, ROHRABACHER, and Ms. EDWARDS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 167, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 781]

AYES—262

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1804

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3079) to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 129, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 782]

YEAS—300

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—129

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1810

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3080) to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 151, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 783]

YEAS—278

Ackerman
Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
McKeon

McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—151

Aderholt
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Cummings
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gowdy
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Markey
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1817

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2832, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 307, nays 122, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 784]

YEAS—307

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—122

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul
McClintock
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pearce
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1827

Mr. RIBBLE and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS OPPORTUNITY TO WORK ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2433) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the employment and training of veterans, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 6, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 785]

YEAS—418

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—6

Amash
Campbell
Filner
Flake
Garrett
Jones

NOT VOTING—9

Bass (CA)
Cardoza
Giffords
Hoyer
Lewis (GA)
Matheson
Paul
Slaughter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1834

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2944) to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 2, line 12, strike '''27 years' or '27-year period'" and insert '''26 years' or '26-year period'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11:30 a.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 822

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 822.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EPA REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2250.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 419 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

□ 1838

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUFFY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, October 11, 2011, amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 18, strike ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 7, line 19, strike ''impacts.'' and insert ''impacts; and''.

Page 7, after line 19, insert the following subparagraph:

(F) potential reductions in the number of illness-related absences from work due to respiratory or other illnesses.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment is a very simple amendment. It should get unanimous support here. It simply requires the Environmental Protection Agency administrator to consider increases in illness-related absences from work when establishing a compliance date for the boiler rule.

Last week, I offered similar language as an amendment to the Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act, which, unfortunately, didn't pass. I don't think it was clearly understood by both sides of the aisle. However, I believe my amendment is more applicable to this legislation since boilers and incinerators pose an even greater health threat to the American people. In fact, EPA's analysis demonstrates that for every year this rule will be in effect, it would prevent up to 320,000 missed work- or schooldays.

During the debate on my amendment last week, the majority conceded, which I appreciated, that the amendment would do no harm because the majority thought that the language was already in the bill and that it would be duplicative and unnecessary.

□ 1840

The reality is that there's nothing in the underlying legislation that requires the administrator to consider illness-related absences from work when setting a compliance date. Now, indeed, it should have been in there—and I can understand why the other side thought it would be in there because it should have been in there—but it wasn't in there, and that's why I offered this amendment. But this factor is critical, and any establishment of a compliance date that does not consider the health of the American workforce is fundamentally flawed and inadequate.

As the majority correctly stated last week, the EPA already knows how many work days will be missed as a result of delaying the boiler rule, so my amendment will not hinder the EPA's decisionmaking process. Additionally, as the majority admitted last week, at worst, my amendment does no harm—or, as kind of the NBA rule, no harm, no foul. However, at best, my amendment ensures that EPA's decision is based on a more complete analysis of the economic impacts of the rule. And given the economic consequences of 320,000 days of missed work or school a year, it's imperative that EPA factor this information into its compliance date decision.

I ask the majority to recognize that if the United States is going to retain its status as the world's economic engine, then we need to have the world's healthiest and most productive workforce—and children. But that will not happen if we continue to let polluting boilers and incinerators undermine the health and well-being of millions of American workers and children.

I encourage my colleagues to understand the importance of a healthy workforce and support my amendment. On behalf of the millions of American workers and schoolchildren who have been forced to miss work or school because of sickness incurred by breathing toxic pollutants from boilers and incinerators—mercury, no less, which interferes with young people's abilities to think—I ask that you support my amendment. It's time to put partisanship aside and work together to strengthen the American worker and the American school child.

I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for offering this amendment. He always does a great job of articulating his position on these issues, some of which are pretty complicated.

In this amendment, he would add illness-related work absences to the considerations when EPA is setting the compliance deadline. And of course that's one of the main purposes of H.R. 2250, to allow additional time for universities, hospitals, and industries in complying with these rather complicated Boiler MACT rules. And in the legislation, we set out six or seven specific items that EPA must consider in setting the compliance deadline. They do have to set it no sooner than within 5 years, but the EPA administrator has additional time after that. And the section of the bill that I'm talking about identifies specific issues relevant to a facility's ability to comply and simply ensures that in setting these compliance dates, plant-focused considerations are taken into account.

Now, EPA already has the responsibility for considering health impacts in setting its standards. And its unclear exactly how this amendment would be implemented different from what the act already requires the EPA to do. So I'm going to respectfully oppose the amendment and ask that it be defeated. However, if we end up having a vote on this and if it is defeated, either by voice vote or by record vote, if we are successful in getting this into a conference with the Senate, I would specifically make the commitment to the gentleman from Tennessee that I would work with him sincerely in trying to address his concern. And I might say that we've had a lot of amendments, and this is, I guess, the only time we said we would really be willing to do that. I know you're trying to address an issue that's of concern to you. And while I oppose the amendment here, if we are successful in getting to conference, I'd look forward to working with the gentlemen at that time. For that reason, I would formally, at this time, oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUFFY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I've been appearing on the floor of this House now for quite a while talking about regulations, but information has come to my attention from a report that was prepared by a group of people in the Texas government about problems that are way beyond anything that many people are perceiving concerning what's going on on the border between Texas and Mexico in this ongoing immigration crisis that we have in America. And quite honestly, it's so concerning that tonight we're going to talk about—I'm going to talk about it, and I hope we will be joined by some of my colleagues—the actual crisis that is going on with the criminal element that has gathered across the border from Texas with the drug cartels in Mexico.

I'm going to have some posters here in a few minutes to talk about some of these things. But I think that everybody is well aware of the fact that we have an issue that is going to have to be addressed by this Congress. And that issue is not only that legal immigration needs to be worked on and fixed so that we can have an immigration policy that actually works in this country, rather than one that seems to be haphazard and in many ways subject to the whims of people's personal opinions rather than the laws that should be established under the rule of immigration law for our country, but this whole issue of illegal immigration is compounded and geometrically compounded by the fact that massive illegal drug cartels have gathered on our border.

First, remember—and I think all people that have dealt with criminology anywhere, anytime will tell you that when you create a criminal environment, you have to expect that environment to grow. At some point in time in the recent past, the cartels that deliver drugs to basically the entire Western World decided to move their operation from South America right to the border of the United States, across the border in Mexico. And these cartels have been battling each other in literally warfare to determine what cartels will dominate the illegal importation of drugs and people into this country—and those people brought in, in many instances, for illicit purposes, such as prostitution.

□ 1850

The most recent count that I have heard is approximately 44,000 Mexicans across the border have lost their lives in this war that's going on in Mexico. That is a number that, when you look at the 10 years of warfare our country has been involved in in other places around the world, is astronomical. And to think that that's happening.

I live in Round Rock, Texas, which is approximately close to 200 miles from the Mexican border. And to think that there's a war going on in an area where most Texans have, when there was peace upon the border, most Texans visited that area many times during their lifetime because those were our friends across that border. Now they're no longer our friends, they're our enemies, and not only the enemies of all law-abiding people, but they're enemies of mankind because they are bringing poison into our Nation in every form and fashion; and they're killing each other for the right to do so.

One of the things that has concerned members of our Texas delegation and members of other delegations in this Congress has been, will that lawlessness spill over into the United States of America.

The report that was done by Todd Staples and the Texas Department of Public Safety and others in Texas tells us that not only will it spill over into our country, but it has spilled over into our country, and that there is an evil plan by these cartels to actually come in and try to seize control of every border county in Texas that borders on the Rio Grande. Now, that's a big project that they are—and, actually, I would say it is a plan for the invasion of the United States of America.

This is something we honestly have to address in a serious manner. We have a lot of legislation pending. One of the bills that I have that connects to this talk today is a bill that will add further assistance to the border sheriffs in their war against the illegal element on the border.

Our Border Patrol has grown to an enormous body, and they are involved in this war on the border. Currently, the Texas Rangers have a task force on the border. They are the elite law enforcement officers of Texas, and they have a task force which is working up a, hopefully, a counter-plan to stand up to this plan that's coming out of Mexico to start to infiltrate our counties along the border and ultimately, through intimidation, kidnapping, beheading, murdering and bribing and all other types of illegal activity, they are going to try to both buy and intimidate their way into a position of control of these counties.

Some of these counties have large populations, but some of these counties have very small populations and a lot of land mass along the Texas border. And it is a real concern when you're talking about 1,200 miles of border between the United States and Mexico, that someone would have a plan to invade our country and take control of those border counties that are bordering on Mexico.

The first question you would say is, with them fighting to establish their base in Mexico, why would they cross the border?

The report that was given, and when I get that report I'll talk to you about some of the people that were involved in it, but I don't have it in front of me. It was done with the aid of two former United States military generals who looked at it from the standpoint of strategic and tactical planning that you would have in the case of any other kind of military invasion, to look at what countermeasures we would take in this country and others.

One of the countermeasures that would fall upon the people of Texas would be that we would need to be using every law enforcement officer we could to their maximum benefit; and therefore we have done things to enhance border sheriffs in the past. We're going to do things to enhance border sheriffs in the future; but we have a bill that will add to that enhancement, and I would think that's just the tip of the spear of what's going to be needed if these people get serious about trying to come across the border and create criminal counties along the Texas/Mexican border on the Texas side of the border.

It's almost beyond our belief. And here's the man with my materials. Bring them over here.

That's almost beyond our conception of what will truly happen. But this is a copy of the plan. You want to hand one up there to Judge POE and let him, he's read it, but he might want to have it as a reference. It's ''Texas Border Security Strategic Military Assessment,'' prepared in September of 2011. And some of the funds were provided by Todd Staples, the commissioner of the Texas Department of Agriculture, assisted by the Texas Department of Public Safety, and four star Retired General Barry McCaffrey and Retired Army Major General Robert Scales, both of whom looked at this from a unique and strategic assessment as they would do with a military project.

General McCaffrey is the former director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy under President Bill Clinton and a former commander of all U.S. troops in Central and South America. Major General Robert Scales is a former commander, United States Army War College.

These two gentlemen have taken the intelligence that has been gathered by the Texas Department of Public Safety, the Border Patrol, special group called the Texas Rangers, and others, to discuss this criminal element on the border.

Now, why would we do this today? Well, it's because of what's on this poster right here. We have had an event in our country where these blatant criminals from the cartels have at least attempted to be—they have been solicited by enemies of our country from Iran to commit an assassination bombing here in Washington, D.C. on behalf of Iran. And they tried to hire Mexican cartel members to do this heinous event here to attack the Saudi Arabian—and I believe potentially the Israeli embassies here in Washington, D.C. in an attempt to kill those ambassadors from those countries.

Now, I have a particular interest in this, above the interest I would have

anyway, having dealt with law enforcement for many, many years now, in that one of these guys that tried to make the deal has a home in my hometown of Round Rock, Texas. This has just come out recently. I haven't seen what neighborhood it's in yet because I haven't seen it on television. But I'm going to call my son as soon as I get through talking here, and he knows everything that goes on in Round Rock because he's the coach, and he'll know where it is.

But this is serious business when you start realizing that there are people trying to set up assassination plots that live in your hometown. And we are one of the most law-abiding—I would argue we are the most law-abiding county in the State of Texas and one of the most law-abiding counties in the entire Nation. And to think that someone would be stupid enough to choose Williamson County as a place for operations for terrorist behavior is almost beyond my belief. But it seems to be, from the indications that are being reported in the news, at least one of these people owned a home in Williamson County.

It shocks me to come up here on the floor and admit that about my hometown; but I can promise you, if we can find anything we can do to him in Williamson County, we'll take care of the boy. I can give you my assurance of that. But that's another story.

But look at these characters and realize we live 200 miles from the Mexican border, and yet operations are being planned by people from a foreign country, Iran, an enemy of our Nation, part of the axis of evil that former President Bush talked about. These guys are trying to make a deal with this criminal element across the border.

So that, coupled with this Texas Border Security Act, is a huge eye-opener, that this issue that we have talked about now for the entire almost 10 years I have been here in Congress is a lot more serious issue, from a national security standpoint, than anything we ever imagined; and I think that's something we really need to start thinking about.

□ 1900

I am joined by another very law-and-order former judge from the State of Texas, my good friend, TED POE. Judge POE and I both served on the bench. We both did our best to put bad guys where they belong, and I think we did more than our share.

I will just yield to Congressman POE whatever time he may wish to consume to discuss this matter.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Judge CARTER.

The reason Williamson County doesn't have any criminals in it is you sent them all to the Texas State penitentiary when you were judge. But I think this event that has occurred should tell us a lot of things. One, that the country of Iran is so bold they believe that they can commit a crime of terror on the soil of the United States and get away with it, that the United States wouldn't do anything, or there wouldn't be any consequences, whatever. But the government, and I believe the Government of Iran was in the middle of this, was so arrogant to hurt and kill Americans that they were willing to do this on our homeland.

I think that we have the responsibility to treat this just like it had actually occurred, had they carried out the assault on the Embassy here, killed the Ambassador at a restaurant, apparently, killed the Israeli Ambassador, killed the two Ambassadors of the same countries in Argentina, which was discussed. We should be very concerned about that and not give it a pass because our law enforcement did a good job.

But also, they're willing to recruit the Zeta cartel to bring explosives into the United States. I wonder whether this is the first time they thought they were dealing with the Zeta cartels. We don't know. But the Zetas, to me, are the worst of the worst drug cartels. It reminds me of the old show on television back years ago, ''Paladin,'' where his business card read ''Have gun—will travel.'' And that's what the Zetas are. They've got guns, and they'll travel anywhere to assassinate people to make a little money.

So you've got Iran on one side of the world and the drug cartels in Mexico, two criminal enterprises working together—one for political reasons, one for money reasons—to cause harm to the United States.

Now, that brings us to a question of the real problem, which is the border. The U.S. border with Mexico and its porousness is a national security issue. It is not an immigration issue. That is a completely different issue. It's a border security, national security issue.

Last year, from the, I believe the same report that you have provided, there were 663 individuals from special interest countries that were captured by our law enforcement. Now, special interest countries are countries where terror organizations originate—Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Afghanistan. That's where these 663 people were from that were captured by our law enforcement trying to come into the United States. And they weren't coming in here looking for work that Americans won't do. They were coming over here for mischief reasons. And that's because the border is open. The world knows if you can get to Mexico, you can get to the United States. And that was the plan in this bold endeavor to commit terror in the United States.

Recently, we did a border forum in Brownsville where we had primarily law enforcement and people who lived on the border testified about violence on the border. There are some places on the border that aren't violent on the United States side. But there are other places that are. It's not all peaceful, and it's not all violent. It depends on the area of the border.

One of the cattlemen that is a ranger for the Cattlemen's Association testified that he was so concerned about cross-border travel and crime coming into the United States on ranches and nothing was being done about the crime that was being committed on these ranches by people crossing into the United States, primarily drug cartels, that the cattlemen, since they don't feel protected, may end up taking the law into their own hands. And we don't want to get into that situation.

You mentioned trafficking, human trafficking. That's another tremendous problem that the United States needs to be aware of, that young people, young women and girls from all over the world are being smuggled to Mexico, then smuggled into the United States, and then trafficked throughout the United States for sexual crimes. And it's an awful, awful scourge, but they cross the border because it's open in so many places.

In our Judiciary Committee a couple weeks ago, we had testimony that the number one threat to national security of the United States is not al Qaeda but the criminal drug cartels that operate in Mexico. The number one national security threat is the criminal drug cartels that operate in Mexico. That should give us, really, a warning that we really do have a tremendous crisis on our hands, because those people are at war not only with Mexico, but they're at war with the United States.

Lastly, I wanted to point out that there are several things that are being done, but the problem still exists—people are crossing into the United States. Border Patrol is doing the best they can. Of course, local law enforcement, the sheriffs, are doing as good a job as they can, and they mentioned the problem that you have talked about, about how the drug cartels want to infiltrate this side of the border and actually control regions. It's pretty simple what they do. They own land on one side of the Rio Grande River in Mexico, and they want to buy or steal or confiscate land on the Texas side of the Rio Grande River. That way they can move their drugs and smuggling operation from one land they own to another land they own across the river.

And when we get in that situation where the drug cartels are owning land on both sides of the border, we've got ourselves a real problem. And it's not just drugs; it's this problem right here. It seems to me that we need more people to protect the security of the United States. That's one of the things the Federal Government is actually supposed to do is to protect us.

And one piece of legislation I've offered is to put the National Guard on the border, not behind the border, but on the border, 10,000 troops, at the request of the Governors, supervised by the Governors, paid by the Federal Government, but put them on the border. Right now our policy seems to be,

since we can't have enough people on the border, we have them behind the border, and we try to catch them if you can, that's people coming into the United States, everybody, the good, the bad, and the ugly. And once we catch them, they become our problem, our financial problem, and then we have to deal with them and try to send as many as we can back.

If we have the National Guard on the border, they're not going to cross into the United States if we have that presence. And I think it's come to that, where we actually need to do that and talk about the role of the Federal Government is national security.

With that, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming the time, thank you, Judge. I also have a bill, and I'm a cosponsor of your bill.

I also believe that we need the National Guard on the border. As this report indicates, you fight wars tactically and strategically. Strategically are big, big issue plans. Tactically is how you do the fighting. Well, they seem to have a plan that has been worked out strategically to seize the Texas border, as much of it as they can get; and then tactically, how to go about doing this with all sorts of criminal activity so they control some of these very rural, very large rural counties. But I'm sure they're even going to try for some of those urban and quasi-urban counties that are along the border with a whole intent that it would enhance their ability to move their products.

There's an anecdote in this bill, and I think I need to read it. This is what one rancher observed: ''But the Border Patrol, I can tell you that their hands are tied about a lot of stuff. They have to call Washington. Even if they're having a gunfight down at the river, they're on the phone. They have to call Washington. The Border Patrol have boats on the river. They patrol the river, but they are not allowed to pick up anybody that is in the water unless they are dead.

□ 1910

''If the drug guys are loading drugs, all they have to do is wade out into the water, and the Border Patrol can't touch them. They are not allowed to go into the water. They can't do anything about it.''

If that's the policy of the country and if that's what's going on, then they're looking at ways to avoid law enforcement—this is what this plan goes on to say—on both sides of the border. If the Texas authorities are chasing a carload of drugs in Texas, then drive out into the river, and they can't come after you. If the Mexicans are chasing you, then drive out into the river on the Mexican side. It gives them a getaway to get into that international zone.

I'm not sure of the legal ramifications of that policy. It has always been my understanding that the State of Texas owns to the middle of the river; but there seems to be some policy that says, once you're in the water, you can't make an arrest of these people unless you get your hands on them without going into the water. I don't know how you do that. If that's the policy, then that's a getaway zone on both sides of the river. They can run right back in.

If they get this control of law enforcement and other things—and I'm not in any way besmirching these guys who are working nights, weekends and holidays down there who are trying to stop this invasion; but look what they've done to law enforcement across the border. I mean, I think the life expectancy of a chief of police in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, is about 6 hours before they either kill you or behead you, set you on fire, burn up your family or do something to you.

These are evil people; and the Zetas, they're the worst of the gathering of the evil people over there. They do it for money. They'll do anything for money. Almost anything. Obviously, they didn't do this, but it's only by the grace of God and good intelligence and, quite honestly, good law enforcement work down there that we prevented this. It's almost, arguably, that we got lucky, because there are so many people they could have contacted; and then we wouldn't have known about this. It's kind of frightening.

Another comment by another person who lives on the border: ''We see a lot of things, but we keep our mouths shut about it. We just don't want to be on anybody's hit list. I keep to myself. The people who are doing what they're doing; they keep to themselves. If I see something, I ignore it—I look the other way—but there is a problem. It's really bad. Here on the river, you see a lot of stuff, and you don't pay attention to it. You walk away, and you try to stay in an area where they don't see you, so if somebody gets caught they don't say, 'Well, somebody called.' So you try to blend in and not create any waves.'' This is a citizen.

I can tell you that one of our citizens owns land on the border, and he has told stories of 50-caliber machine gun-armed, mounted Toyota pickups—I don't mean to besmirch Toyota, but that's what they are—that drive all loaded up, with the cartel members telling deer hunters to get off the ranch because they're hunting there that day, which means they're bringing a big load of drugs across the river. There is anecdote after anecdote from the citizens of Texas.

One of the things, I think, that's very important that we explain to people and to everybody who might be paying attention to this is that there is one big difference between Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, which is: in Texas, we retained our public lands when we came into the United States under treaty.

So the land that they cross the river onto is not Federal land. It's individual human beings' land. People water their cattle in the Rio Grande off of their ranches, and that Rio Grande is one border of their ranches. They own the land right up to the river. It's different in Arizona, and it's different in California. In most instances, they butt up against federally owned land because, in the other States, all land not owned by the individuals is owned by the Federal Government as part of Federal lands. In our State, we have no Federal lands. We have only State-owned lands and lands owned by individuals. So it's actually State-owned land or it's individual land with the exception of Big Bend National Park. That's the only exception that we have.

Mr. POE of Texas. I just wanted to point out another statement made by Texas ranchers. I think the Texas ranchers are the finest law enforcement organization in the world next to Scotland Yard—the two of them.

Lieutenant Arthur Barrera, whom I met when I was down there about 3 weeks ago, grew up on the border and knows how the life has changed. Here is what he says about what has taken place on the Texas-Mexico border. The people in Washington, D.C., who live in never-never land, thinking there are no problems down on the border, need to listen to some law enforcement officer who has been there for a long time.

Lieutenant Arthur Barrera says: ''We are in a war. We are in a war, and I'm not going to sugarcoat it by any means. We are in a war, and it is a war, and we need to understand that.'' That's exactly what has taken place on the border.

Mr. CARTER. Quite honestly, if they have a plan to seize American soil, I think that's as close to an invasion plan as I can think of, and that concerns me greatly. If it's going to happen in Texas, it's going to happen in other States.

I've had the pleasure twice now to go to the border of the great State of Arizona. To be very honest, at least we've got a river between us and them. With the exception of some of the fences being built in Arizona—and I've seen the old fence. It was a two-strand, barbed wire fence that a young heifer calf could walk through without any problem at all.

Tonight, we're joined by Congressman FRANKS from Arizona. He wants to tell us a little bit about his view of this serious problem on our border with our cartels from the standpoint of our friends in Arizona. I yield to the gentleman whatever time he may wish to use here tonight.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman very much. I know that Texas and Arizona are kin in a lot of different ways, and I appreciate all the good work that you do; and I certainly thank Mr. POE.

I suppose it's important for us first to just restate the obvious, that the President's most fundamental duty is to protect our country. This recent attempted attack, which could have resulted in an act of war if they'd been

successful, I think reveals two very glaring examples of President Obama's abject failure to adequately fulfill his responsibility to protect our southern borders and the failure to respond to a terrorist regime on the verge of obtaining nuclear weapons.

The main terrorist attempting to organize these attacks on our soil sought to hire members of the Mexican drug cartel known as the Zetas—I'm sure you folks have discussed that already—partly because of their seemingly unfettered access to weaponry. It's an astonishing irony to me, Mr. CARTER, that it was the Obama Department of Justice that was involved in allowing just such weaponry to be walked across the border into the waiting arms of Mexican drug cartels like the Zetas.

Yesterday's foiled plot underscores the serious nature of the allegations surrounding Operation Fast and Furious; and, of course, I think it's very appropriate that Attorney General Holder has now been rightly subpoenaed. Beyond any shadow of a doubt, this momentous event establishes that Iran is committed enough to try to foment an attack upon the United States.

There are really only two fundamental components to any threat to our national security. One is intent. The second is capacity. If this doesn't clarify once again in the starkest terms Iran's intent, I don't know what it will take to wake this administration up. The frightening part about it is that this same regime has gone on unabated for years now, inexorably and inevitably pursuing a nuclear weapons capability. This administration has been asleep at the wheel, and I can't express to you how dangerous I believe that is.

Last year, General David Petraeus announced that Iran was directly assisting al Qaeda. Shortly thereafter, General Raymond Odierno, now Chief of Staff of the Army, said Iran was funding and training insurgent groups in Iraq. Furthermore, in a report last September, he indicated that Iran was also funding Taliban efforts to kill American troops in Afghanistan.

□ 1920

This is a pattern here; and if they are committed enough to try to foment an attack here and literally try to blow up the Israeli embassy here or to kill the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the U.S., let me suggest to you that the intent is so clear that our entire focus now should be upon dealing with the capacity.

And this administration should have the courage now to take this moment to stand up and say to the whole world that America will not let Iran gain nuclear weapons with which to threaten the entire human family, even if it means a military response on the part of the United States.

They need to make that very clear, and this is the moment to do that, because I would suggest to you that there is an effort by Iran to create a hegemony in the Middle East that's causing a lot of the Middle Eastern countries now to flock to Iran's side out of absolute sniveling terror that Iran will gain a nuclear weapons capability.

I would just say to you that if Iran does do this, not only will it change the history of humanity, not only will we all be stepping into the shadow of nuclear terrorism, but history will record that this President was the one that stood by and allowed that to happen. I would suggest to you that that is a complete abrogation of Presidential duty.

Perhaps this President would do better if he were able to focus on the threats of our Nation without being so busy apologizing for America at every opportunity. It's been reported the State Department under Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, that they called to express condolences to the family of al Qaeda propagandist Samir Khan, who was killed in the same attack that took out Anwar Awlaki.

It's a difficult thing to say or ask, but I just wonder if the Obama State Department called all of the families of the victims of the terrorism that these two men fomented in the world, especially those perhaps who died at Fort Hood. I am just astonished that this President is so busy apologizing to the families of terrorists that I wonder if he has time to defend this country.

We have an administration that not only refuses to enforce our immigration laws, but then allows weapons to pass to the very criminals from whom they are given charge to protect Americans from, and then they sue the States who step in, like Arizona, and try to enforce immigration laws themselves.

Meanwhile, Mr. CARTER, I just suggest to you that it is just astonishing that we have to sit here and have this conversation while the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, Iran, is drawing closer and closer to building a functional nuclear weapons capability that they could pass on to their terrorist proxies, some of which are believed to be operating near the same unsecured southern border.

Just the fact that Iran was willing to try to bring in the Mexican drug lords, the Zeta gangs, is proof that they're willing to try to pass some of their deeds off to proxies. Now, if that becomes a nuclear weapons capability, then the world's in trouble and there's just no way I can conjure words strong enough to describe the insanity of this administration's lackadaisical, irresponsible approach to national defense. I wish I could.

Mr. CARTER. You paint a pretty severe picture, which I agree with. Think about this. Part of the contract they were trying to make with the Zetas was to bring into this country explosives, supposedly to set a plant, a bomb, in a favorite eating place here in Washington, D.C. and blow up that place in order to kill the ambassador.

Now, just let's assume for the sake of argument that something like C–4 that was smuggled in here, if they can smuggle C–4 across the border in from Mexico and transport it across the country to Washington, D.C., once they develop a tactical nuclear weapon in Iran, what's to prevent them from smuggling a tactical nuclear weapon into the United States. I would argue, nothing.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. If the gentleman would yield, I serve on the Strategic Forces Committee and am familiar with some of the designs of our nuclear warheads, and this is certainly open-source material.

But the fact is that a couple of people in a large red wagon can pull a W88 nuclear warhead across the border if they wanted to. Then people say, well, how could they ever do that? How could they ever bring a nuclear warhead across the border? The remark that I think clearly illustrates the significance of the possibility is maybe they could just hide it in a bale of marijuana. That would help them get it across.

So the fact that terrorists are beginning to move in this direction where they're getting so bold that they're willing to try to foment attacks on American soil, let me suggest to you that it's very late in the day, Mr. CARTER, and I think maybe we missed one other point, that is, that in blowing up the Israeli embassy, that would be an act of war against Israel, because that would be Israeli soil in terms of our entire architecture for diplomacy.

Yet there was no hesitancy on the part of these terrorists to try to foment exactly that outcome and, again, if it had occurred, if they had been successful, it would have been nothing short of an act of war on the United States. Yet this administration is strangely quiet, and I wonder what this body should do to try to wake up this administration.

Mr. CARTER. I think that what we will hear is this, as what we have heard before in the past, this is a law enforcement matter being handled by the FBI and law enforcement, and it will be handled accordingly. That's what I think we will hear from the administration.

But this is a threat to the national sovereignty of this country, potentially the national sovereignty of our friends from Israel and our friends from Saudi Arabia. This could have been the major incident that set off a chain reaction that could have done who knows what to the future of mankind, and these crazy people would do that using a criminal element that is smuggling horrible drugs and people for illicit purposes into our country every day.

And you're talking about the marijuana loads. They pack hundreds of backpacks across the border loaded with marijuana almost daily, and they march right on into Texas and Arizona. In your case, they go off into the Federal lands, into the reservations and up to the highway and off to the east coast and the west coast. In our case,

they come across the border, off the ranches, get up to the highway, east coast and west coast.

We are the major dispersal route for all this illegal and illicit poison that they're selling, and that's who they would hire to deliver a blow against two of our allies. That's frightening, what could have occurred.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Yes, sir, I agree. Speaking of our allies, I was just in Israel not long ago, and I have to say to you, you understand that a lot of us—and I know including you, Congressman CARTER—believe that Israel is our most reliable, most vital ally in the world.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Yet they feel under siege right now because they don't sense that this administration truly has their best interest in mind, partly because the Obama administration has reserved more open rebuke for Israel building homes in its own capital city than it has reserved for people like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for building nuclear weapons to threaten the entire human family. And I find that lack of priority beyond my ability to articulate.

Mr. CARTER. I agree. And that's the purpose for us being here tonight. There is no reason to scare people. They can make them draw their own conclusions.

But if you're hiring, if you're contracting, this guy who represents Iran is contracting with this creep, who represents the Zetas, that's frightening to think lawlessness being directed by a nation-state to attack innocent people in our country. And when you blow up an area in Washington, D.C., how many Americans are going to get killed besides the Israelis or the Saudi Arabians that are attacked? We don't know.

And then we thought of nuclear, nuclear elements. It's frightening.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I just think that sometimes it's very easy for all of us as Americans. We've grown so used to being the most secure Nation in the world, and we owe that to the greatest military and the greatest men and women wearing the uniform that any nation could ever have.

But we've grown complacent and we, I think, have forgotten the seriousness and the reality of nuclear weapons. And we're living in a world now where countries like Pakistan have a major arsenal. If there is some sort of breakdown in the hierarchy in Pakistan or if Iran gains nuclear weapons, there's a lot of very dangerous circumstances facing this country.

□ 1930

I just think that somehow the lack of priority frightens me because this administration seems so focused on so many other things rather than doing what's necessary.

I haven't heard the outrage from this administration even related to this Iran-Mexican drug cartel effort. I haven't heard the strident outrage that you hear on a lot of other issues that they put forth. I just suggest to you, Congressman CARTER, I hope that the people of this country will somehow let their Members of Congress and their President understand that the first responsibility we all have to offer them is security.

I know we're all focused on the economy of this country and jobs, and I certainly recognize the significance of that and the importance of it. But do we realize what would happen to our civil laws, to our liberties, do we realize what would happen to our economy if we had a major nuclear weapons attack on this country by terrorists? I mean, I don't think any of us would ever sleep again. The damage that could be caused is almost beyond my imagination, and yet again this administration seems focused on other things.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, in fact if that happened, I would argue that we would have the same kind of mental strain that the people of Israel have been living with since the creation of their country. That any day, any minute of any day could be the day a rocket lands in your house, or when a terrorist blows your house up or shoots you. We'd have the same feeling in this country. You think we have economy problems now, who's out there to pick us up? We picked up countries around the world after wars and put them back on their feet for no other reason than because it made good sense. But there is no country that will pick us up and put us on our feet, so it's a crisis.

I don't know if you're aware of this, but there has been a study made, a Texas border security study, a strategic military assessment, and here's an executive summary of the 150 pages. It is much more detailed, but just to read this very quickly: During the past 2 years, the State of Texas has become increasingly threatened by the spread of Mexican cartel organized crime. The threat reflects the change in the strategic intent of the cartels to move their operation into the United States. In effect, the cartels seek to create a sanitary zone inside the Texas border one county deep that will provide sanctuary from Mexican law enforcement, at the same time allow the Mexican cartels to transform the Texas border counties into narcotics transshipment points for continued transport and distribution into the continental United States. To achieve their objective, the cartels are relying increasingly on organized gangs to provide expendable and unaccountable manpower to do their dirty work. These gangs are recruited on the streets of Texas cities and inside Texas prisons by top-tier gangs who work in conjunction with these cartels.

So in addition to this threat from Iran, I mean if you have a plan to seize a part of the United States of America by force, I would call that invasion. And I would argue that if that is a true statement, Texas has already put together a task force under the leadership of the Texas Rangers. They are setting up stations along the border with a goal of setting up an intense communication system to be prepared for what may be coming from across the river. But they are just a small body of very effective law enforcement people. This could be a major, major intrusion on the United States. Add that to their partners, Iran, trying to make a deal with these criminals, the Zetas, it's frightening.

We learned a long time ago in law enforcement that when you create an environment of lawlessness, it breeds more lawlessness. Quite honestly, that theory is what cleaned up New York City under Rudy Giuliani. Using that theory, they said we're going to go into neighborhoods and we're going to take the street lawlessness out of the neighborhoods so that the big lawlessness will move somewhere else, because if they're in a lawless environment, it just enhances lawlessness. And it worked. And they cleaned up the streets of New York, and it's a much safer place for people to go these days than it was 20 years ago. And it's all because of the concept lawlessness breeds lawlessness.

Because we were allowing laws to be violated on our border, from Brownsville all of the way to San Diego, we basically created, by our own efforts by not enforcing immigration laws and the sovereignty of our country, we created a lawlessness area before the cartels got there. So when lawlessness breeds lawlessness, why wouldn't they go there. There are already people not obeying the laws in that area, why not go in and make it official. And they did. It's frightening.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, you know, I couldn't agree with you more. We have to realize that the criminal element reads our intent. They know how serious we are. And terrorists across the world don't really believe that Barack Obama is serious about doing what's necessary, not only to identify clearly the difference between freedom and terrorism. I mean, they're calling the war on terror now overseas contingencies. They're using all these euphemisms. You know, I wonder, maybe now they'll say the drug cartels are merely unlicensed pharmacists. When we use words that don't reflect the truth and reflect the reality, we are undermined from the very beginning.

My concern is that Iran doesn't take this President seriously. They have put explosive form penetrators in the war in Iraq that have killed many of our soldiers. They've sent weapons to Afghanistan. And now they're trying to send drug cartels into our country to help blow up our embassies, and this administration allows them to continue on this inexorable march to gaining nuclear weapons.

And I just want to tell you, I'm afraid of something tonight. Again, it

frightens me, like a lot of other things that we've talked about tonight, and that is that I'm afraid that this administration has embraced the notion that it's too late to stop Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, and that they're going to go ahead and allow them to do that and then pursue a policy of containment when they do. I cannot find the words to express how dangerous that policy is and how it will damn this and future generations if we allow that policy to take hold.

If Iran gains nuclear weapons capability, history itself is divided because for the first time a jihadist rogue nation will have its finger on the nuclear button. And whatever challenges we face to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, whatever they are, and I know that they are myriad and significant, but they will pale in insignificance compared to the problems we'll have after Iran gains nuclear weapons. It will change the world for all of us.

And I would just join with you and call upon the administration to refocus their efforts on the central duty of the President of the United States and upon this government, which is to protect the lives and constitutional rights of our citizens, and that starts with national security. And whether it's a porous border or whether it's allowing a country like Iran whose leaders have made it clear that they intend to do everything they can to destroy Israel and ultimately the United States, we need to do everything that's necessary again, including military response, to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons. The sooner the President makes that clear, the better chance that we won't have to have a military response. But right now the Iranian administration, the Iranian leaders are simply not convinced that this President intends to hold them accountable and keep them from gaining nuclear weapons capability, and I think it's one of the most dangerous things that we face in the world for that reason.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with everything that you say, and I want to say this further: it's the duty of the President of the United States and the executive branch to enforce the laws of the United States, to protect the borders of the United States against intrusion. It's their duty to protect our Nation from those who would wreak havoc and harm upon our Nation wherever they may be located, Iran being the primary example on the face of the earth today as a threat to our country.

And, quite honestly, jobs are very important in our country, and once we get the government out of the way we'll get some jobs started, but it's time for this administration to do something on the border of this country to protect the citizens on the border. There's no reason why a landowner who lives on the border has to get assassinated like the landowner in Arizona, or has to get run off his land by armed men, as our landowners in Texas are doing, without the protection of the Federal Government. We are the United States of America, and when they attack one State, they attack all of the States of our Union.

□ 1940

When they attack our border, they attack every State in this Union. By the way, there are many Americans who realize that today. I had sheriffs from the State of North Carolina and the State of Maryland and maybe one other State, I don't remember where it was, but those two I know were in my office telling me, Hey, this violence is all the way in Maryland, it's all the way in North Carolina. They showed me pictures of an assassinated cartel member shot in the back of the head found right outside of a town in North Carolina.

So these guys in their terror tactics come from across that border and are all the way up here on the East Coast dealing terror in smaller doses but just as serious for the future of this country. Meanwhile, we've got Iran contracting with this criminal element, which is a ruthless criminal element, and saying, We want you to do our bidding on our behalf, and here's the money. As Judge POE says, Have gun, will travel. And you'll travel and kill whoever we want you to kill and blow up whoever we want you to blow up in any form or fashion that we see fit. How about a deal? And they were making a deal.

That ought to scare the pants off of everybody, and it ought to wake the Obama administration up that there are serious things being overlooked by their cavalier idea that everything America does is bad and everything other countries do is excusable. That seems to be our policy, to the point where they're willing to let an agency of the United States Government become the biggest gun runner in the history of Mexico in Fast and Furious, which we are investigating right now in the Halls of this Congress. These are things that people ought to wake up and say, My Lord, this is insane. What is wrong with us? Where are those people who stood up for Americans and stood up for freedom and fought for the right ideas? They seem to have disappeared.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. CARTER, I think we forget when we talk about the economy and jobs that the most important thing we can do for the economy and jobs is to make sure that this country is secure and that productivity is allowed unfettered; that it has a secure environment in which to flourish. If the government will get out of the way, this economy will flourish. It will go forward. But if we fail as a government to do what is our duty, which is national security, there's nothing that could damage our economy more.

I remind everyone that we lost $2 trillion in our economy when two airplanes hit two buildings. It's very easy to forget the cost of war. Someone said that war devours everything that peace gives. And we need to make sure that we defend this country and make sure that the people who are investing in this country and are trying to work in this country and be productive know that they can do so in a fully secure environment. It is the most important thing that we can do for our national economy.

And I would suggest to you that it's important for us to start asking this administration some key questions. The number one question is: Where do they put the national security of the United States on their priority list? Secondly: What are they willing to do to clarify this dangerous jihadist ideology in stark terms where everyone can understand what we're dealing with and that we're willing to do whatever is necessary to prevent terrorism in this country and protect the American people? And third: What is Mr. Obama willing to do? What is he willing to do to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons with which to threaten the peace of mankind?

With that, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CARTER. I appreciate you being here, TRENT. You're a good friend, and I value your opinions that you have given here tonight.

This is a problem that has risen its head because of this event. We could talk for days about this because it is so serious to the future and welfare of every American citizen. And to think that any enemy of our country is contracting with a criminal element that has a track record thus far of killing 44,000 people, many of whom were just bystanders, just in an ongoing event of driving their illegal operation. If they get involved in international terrorism, heaven help us. I hope that heaven will. And I hope this administration will take a hard look at where they're going to be willing to draw the line and say, We're not taking this any more. And I would argue at least it ought to be at the borders of our country and at those who would develop a nuclear weapon that could devastate mankind.

I thank both of my friends for joining me tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PUTTING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. For our hardworking stenographers, it's late into the evening, and we thank you for all the work that you do recording our words, many of which are worth listening to and having written down and some of which are probably not.

I want to thank my colleagues from across the aisle for bringing the issue

of securing our borders to our attention tonight and along with it the issue of immigration. I would just like to remind them that the current administration has done more in the last 2½ years to secure our borders than in the previous 8 years of the George W. Bush administration, putting more Border Patrol to work—significantly more—and also putting on the borders members of the National Guard. It remains a difficult and in very many places a very dangerous situation. Nonetheless, a great deal is being done.

I would also like to remind my colleagues from the Republican side that they control this House. When a certain piece of legislation came here with regard to appropriations, they actually proposed to cut the men and women that are there to protect the border. So I'm not quite sure I understood all of tonight's debate from their side. And also I would remind them that if immigration is such a big issue, they should bring a comprehensive immigration bill to this floor so that we have a rational immigration policy in the United States.

I guess it's easier to talk than it is to take action.

What I would like to spend tonight talking about is putting Americans back to work. Let's go back to work. This is one great country. We're America. We're the people that make things. We're the people that can do things. We're the people that want to go back to work. And this government wants to put people back to work.

About a month ago the President proposed the American Jobs Act, a very comprehensive program that would put Americans back to work. I want to spend this evening talking about the critical and the most important elements of that legislation that he has proposed. Unfortunately, our friends in the Senate—well, maybe they're not America's friends—they killed the American Jobs Act. When it came up for a vote this week, they chose to not allow it to come to a vote. They did one of their little filibuster routines over there, with every Republican voting against putting Americans back to work.

Now, I don't know exactly what they have in mind. I guess they would like the economy to stumble along with millions of Americans out of work. They couldn't possibly want that. They couldn't possibly want a situation where men and women are desperate for a job when there's an opportunity—and I'll explain in a few moments how many people will be able to go back to work if this American Jobs Act were actually to become law. But they voted not even to allow it to come to a vote. They did one of their little filibuster threats and every Republican lined up sufficient in number to block the bill from moving forward.

I must say two of my Democratic colleagues over there also voted on the wrong side of putting Americans back to work. But I'll let them explain that to their constituents.

□ 1950

So what is the American Jobs Act? Well, let's start with the foundation. The foundation of any economy is the infrastructure. It is that part of the structure of an economy that is the foundation. It is the transportation system. Infrastructure is the sanitation and the water systems and the modern communication systems.

In the President's American Jobs Act is $50 billion, in addition to what we're already spending, to build the bridges, to repair the roads, to add to the transportation systems—the light rail, the heavy rail, the Amtrak systems—to move Americans, and also to move modern communication systems. Fifty billion dollars.

What does that mean to my State of California? Well, it's $4 billion right off the top. It's 51,500 jobs that could begin the day after this House and the Senate sends to the President the American Jobs Act—$50 billion, 51,500 jobs for California, building the foundation of economic growth.

In addition to that, the President proposed a $10 billion capitalization of an infrastructure bank in which pension funds from around the Nation could then invest in that infrastructure bank—more money for those projects that are not earmarks, not political, but rather jobs and programs that are actually needed in communities, that have the ability to repay the loans that the infrastructure bank would make.

Let me just put up a couple of things here that really build an economy, and we will soon come to this issue of making it in America. But before I do, I just want to point out that these are the key elements in creating an economy.

We talked a moment ago about the infrastructure. It's down here at the bottom, not for any reason other than that's the foundation. So the infrastructure. The other thing that's in the American Jobs Act deals with this: education. Now, education is the most fundamental investment that any society must make if it's going to have future economic growth and social justice.

So what has the President proposed in the American Jobs Act for education? How about putting 280,000 teachers back to work the day after this bill passes this Congress and the Senate and is signed by the President; 280,000 teachers in the classrooms teaching our children, preparing them to compete in the world's economy; 280,000 teachers. For California, $3.6 billion and 37,000 teachers in the classroom immediately.

Now, my daughter is a teacher; my son-in-law is a teacher. Their class size went from 22 or 24 to 35, a very difficult situation for any teacher in the second grade to be able to adequately prepare those children. However, my daughter is a great teacher and she's hanging in there, but this is tough. This is a very, very difficult situation. What would it mean to her if there's one additional second grade teacher in her school? It would mean her classroom size would come down and her ability to bring those kids along faster would very, very much be in play. 280,000 teachers. So that's the education piece of it.

Let's talk for a moment about the classroom itself. We know here in Congress, all 435 of us, we go back to our districts and we see our schools. The parents out there, they know their schools need to be renovated. They know that many of the bathrooms aren't working. They know the playgrounds are in disrepair. They know the paint is peeling and the roofs are leaking. In the President's bill, 35,000 schools across this Nation are going to be renovated—35,000 schools. In California, that amounts to 2,800 schools being rehabilitated and 36,000 jobs.

This is a big deal. If a kid takes pride in his school, he's going to be a better student. If a kid sees his school and it's in disrepair, bathrooms are not working, he could just lose interest. So let's give them a good environment in which to learn. And so the President has proposed $25 billion, 35,000 schools across this Nation. This is a big deal for education: teachers, better schools, renovation.

And for community colleges, there's also money in here for community colleges, $5 billion to upgrade the plant, the laboratories, the science facilities for community colleges across this Nation.

Let's go back to work. Let's put America back to work. Let's pass the American Jobs Act. The Senate, you haven't helped. In this House, in the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership refuses to even bring this bill up for a vote, even bring it to a hearing in any of the committees. They simply say ''no.'' So what's their solution? What's their solution for putting Americans back to work? Well, thus far it's been to cut budgets, to lay people off all across this Nation.

How is this going to get paid for? It's fully paid for. This is not going to be borrowed money. This is not going out and borrowing money to create jobs here in the United States, fundamental investments that we need to grow the economy. This American Jobs Act, just under $500 billion, is fully paid for. It's paid for by fairness. Finally, some fairness in our tax policies. No longer are the superrich in this Nation going to be able to skip out of their share of carrying the burden of America. No longer are we going to see situations in which the top 1 percent of America continue to acquire more and more wealth at the expense of the rest of this Nation.

The President and the Senate Democrats—and I credit them with this, positively credit them with this—have said, let's allow the millionaires to share in putting Americans back to work. They certainly have benefited significantly over these years. They will have their opportunity to pay their fair share and put Americans back to work.

Now, on tax policy, there's another thing here. Some are going to pay more. Those millionaires who have more than $1 million of annual income, yes, they will pay more. However, the working men and women of America, the 160 million working men and women in America are going to get a tax break. They're going to see one half of their payroll tax reduced, about $1,500 per person. This is a big deal. To have an extra $1,500 in your pocket, you'll be able to pay your mortgage, buy food for your kids, be able to go out, and maybe replace that refrigerator that's broken. 160 million Americans are going to get a tax break when their payroll tax is reduced.

Now, what about the businesses in America? We hear a lot of talk from our Republican friends about protecting small business. The American Jobs Act provides 98 percent of the businesses of America with a 50 percent reduction in their payroll tax, a 50 percent reduction in their payroll tax. What's more, in California, 710,000 businesses will see a 50 percent reduction in their payroll tax. That's a big deal. That's money that those businesses can then use to hire new workers.

And if they hire a new worker, guess what? The President has proposed that if they hire a long-term unemployed worker, they will have a $4,000 tax credit, a tax credit. That is money right off the bottom line that they don't have to pay to the government, a reduction in their taxes. And if they go out and they hire an injured veteran coming home from the wars in Afghanistan or Iraq, they will get another tax credit. And if they hire a long-term unemployed person, similarly, very strong incentives in this legislation for employers to hire the unemployed, to hire our heroes who are returning from the wars—some injured—giving an additional incentive to hire those people. And let's understand that they do come back with skills, not just skills in war, but skills in communication, skills in repairing machinery. These are vital skills that most businesses in the United States need.

So when we look at the American Jobs Act that the President brought here to this House with the speech, standing right there, a speech to the joint session, he said, Pass this law.

□ 2000

Let's go back to work. Let's go back to work, America. We are a strong, vibrant Nation. We're a Nation of workers. We're not a Nation of slackers. We're a Nation that wants to work. And what we need is a government that's willing to help American go back to work. And that's what the President has proposed in the American Jobs Act.

So where is the American Jobs Act? It died in the Senate early this week.

Did it die? I don't think so. Americans are rising up across this Nation. They are in the streets. We often talked about the ''Arab Street'' and the ''Arab Spring.''

Well, this is the ''Autumn in America,'' and Americans are back in the street and they are demanding jobs. They're demanding fairness in their tax policy. They're demanding that Wall Street bankers get with the program of putting Americans back to work. Stop playing your games and all of your derivatives. Stop all of those computerized trading games and make the loans, make the loans to American businesses. That's what the people in the streets are saying. They want fairness in this system. They want a job. They want to be able to get an education, and they want this government to do the kinds of things that the President has proposed in the American Jobs Act: education, teachers in the classroom, renovating the schools, building the infrastructure, putting this Nation back on its feet. That's what we can do, and that's what we must do.

Let's take a look at the other things that are necessary if America is going to make it. If America's going to make it, we must, once again, make it in America. Make it in America. This Nation is still, even though we have lost more than half of our manufacturing jobs in the last 25 years—that's right. In this Nation of manufacturers, in this Nation where we once built the armaments of the world, where we once built the cars of the world, where we once built the great earthmovers, in this Nation that once was the strongest manufacturing Nation in the world, we have lost half of the manufacturing jobs.

How did that happen? It happened with tax laws that encouraged American corporations to go global, to offshore American jobs and get a tax break.

You heard me right. American tax policy, until last December, gave American corporations a tax break for every job they shipped offshore. Before the Democrats lost the House of Representatives in January of this year, we passed a law that repealed those tax benefits. More than $12 billion returned to the United States Treasury, taken out of the hands of American corporations that were shifting jobs overseas—$12 billion. Not one, not one Republican voted to end that tax break.

Let's understand. There's a very different way in which we look at how to make it in America. End the tax breaks that allow corporations to shift jobs offshore.

Trade policy. My view, today is a sad day in American trade policy. Today this House, and yesterday the Senate, passed three trade bills. They were called ''free trade.'' They were certainly not fair trade, in my estimation. Those trade bills are going to cause a loss of American jobs no matter how you look it, and I'll tell you what the proof is.

No sooner had those three trade bills passed out of this House than a fourth bill came up. You know what the fourth bill was? It's called the Trade Adjustment Act, providing a substantial amount of money, billions of dollars for those workers that lose their jobs as a result of the three trade bills that passed this House today.

Do you get it? What's going on here?

You're telling me these are going to create jobs, and then you turn around not more than 50 seconds later and pass a bill that provides unemployment benefits and educational benefits for the very same workers that lose their jobs as a result of those fair trade acts? Excuse me—free trade, not fair trade.

Anyway, trade's an important issue. This Nation has opened its doors to the world. You send your stuff here and we'll buy it. And the doors around the world only opened a little tiny bit. It's not fair.

Nonetheless, the President will sign it and we'll go on our way.

We talked about tax policy.

Let me talk about one more thing here that's really important. Here we go. I think I'll leave that up there. Again, it's tax policy. I suspect most of you have been offered an opportunity to buy photovoltaic solar systems for your roof, generate your own electricity. And I suspect many Americans have seen the big wind turbines and these wind farms going round and round generating electricity.

This is really important energy policy for this Nation. It is extremely important that we move to these renewable energy sources. However, it is part of the American energy policy to encourage investments in solar and wind and biofuels and other kinds of renewable energy, and we do that in a variety of ways. We do that by loan guarantees. We do that with direct subsidies. We do that with tax credits. All of those are our tax money being used to encourage the appropriate and correct energy policy.

However, there's one thing missing. Where are those pieces of equipment made? Where is our tax money going? Where is it going? Is it going to American-made solar panels, American-made wind turbines, or is it going to solar panels that are made in China or Germany, Korea? Where are those solar panels made, and where is that gigantic wind turbine made with blades that are 300 feet across? Are those made in America? Our tax money is being used to buy it.

This is my legislation, House Resolution 487. It says this: If you're going to use our American tax money, your tax money, my tax money, the American tax money, if you're going to use that tax money to subsidize the purchase of a solar panel, a wind turbine, a bioelectric system, then that tax money's going to be used to buy American-made equipment. We're going to make it in America when we use our tax money to buy American-made equipment. That's what this bill does. And I think we ought to be passing this, along with the American Jobs Act.

If we're going to go out and spend $50 billion on infrastructure, then it ought

to be American-made concrete. That ought to be American-made steel on those bridges. It ought to be American-made, and we can make it in America if we have the right policies in place.

A couple of more things.

Any of you buy gasoline? Any Americans out there buying diesel fuel for their trucks or their pickups or cars? When you do, you're paying a tax. It's the excise tax on fuel. A little over, what is it, about 16 cents, 18 cents for gasoline and 24.5 cents, 25 cents for diesel fuel. So every gallon you're paying a tax.

Where's that tax money go? It goes to build your highways, to repair your highways. It goes to build your bridges. It goes to buy trains, locomotives for Amtrak. It goes to buy light rails for San Diego, heavy rail or transit systems for Washington, DC.

□ 2010

That's where the money goes. And we need it. We need that money to be spent on our basic transportation systems, whether they are the rails, the concrete for the highways or the steel for the bridges, or for the buses and trains that we travel in. However, is that money being used to purchase American-made concrete and American-made steel for the bridges? Is it used to buy American-made buses, American-made trains, locomotives and light rail systems? Not always. But if my legislation, H.R. 613, becomes law, it will be American made; and, once again, we will make it in America because we're using our tax money to buy American-made equipment.

We can put Americans back to work, and we must put Americans back to work. We can do these things. We can use our government in coordination and cooperation with the private sector to build this Nation once again, to build the infrastructure of this Nation, to educate our children, to do the research that's necessary for tomorrow's innovation. We can do this. We can use our tax money wisely to buy American-made equipment, American-made buses and steel. We can do it.

But we need good laws to do it. We need wise laws to do it. We need to not just abandon the American worker and say there's nothing that can be done, government has to get out of the way, just back up and let it go. It doesn't happen that way. We wish it did, but it doesn't happen that way. There are no economists out there that are saying, continue to cut government spending and somehow there will be jobs created. If you cut that spending now, then you're going to lay people off.

Surely we have to deal with the deficit, and that's going to take 5 to 10 years to do that. So what we need to do now, in a balanced way, with the American Jobs Act, is to put people back to work, to let those who have prospered so much, those who have made out so well in this economy, the top 1 percent, those whose annual income is $1 million or more, in fairness, in equity, in what is right for this Nation, let them share the burden. Let them help the 99 percent that have been struggling these many, many years. Let them help with their taxes. They can afford it. They're not going to go belly up, they're not going to be hurting, and they're not going to be out in the street homeless. They're going to continue to do very, very well.

Fairness demands, as the President has proposed and as the Democrats in the Senate have proposed, that the millionaires, those whose annual adjusted gross income is more than $1 million, that they pay a little extra, that they contribute to the future of this Nation. And in doing so, the American Jobs Act that the President has proposed could become law, not increasing the deficit, but, in fact, reducing the deficit by giving Americans the work, by restarting the great engine of the American economy and by making it in America once again. That's where our future lies, and that's where we must go.

So, as we go about the debates this week, as we talk about those things that are before us, let us think about making it in America, let us find ways to use the wisdom of 535 Members of Congress and the Senate and the administration to reflect the wisdom of the American public. Use our tax money here at home. Put Americans back to work, educate, create a fair and equitable tax system. We can do it. We have no choice but to do it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR H.R. 2832

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 305 of H. Con. Res. 34, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2012, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 287, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates set forth pursuant to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012. Aggregate levels of budget authority, outlays, and revenue are revised and the allocation to the House Committee on Ways and Means is also revised, for fiscal year 2012 and the period of fiscal year 2012 through 2021.

The revision is provided for H.R. 2832, legislation extending the Generalized System of Preferences and Trade Adjustment Assistance. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution.

Section 305 of the budget resolution allows the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to revise the allocations of spending authority provided to the Committee on Ways and Means for legislation that decreases revenue. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution if such measure would not increase the deficit over fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

H.R. 2832 decreases the deficit over this period by $6 million and is hence eligible for these adjustments.

Section 407(d) of the budget resolution provides an exemption for legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments in the allocations or aggregates of the resolution and that complies with such resolution.

This subsection specifically provides that: "Any legislation for which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution on the budget and complies with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 405." The table that follows indicates what these adjustments are.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2012	Fiscal Years 2012–2021
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,858,531	[1]
Outlays	2,947,902	[1]
Revenues	1,866,402	26,125,311
Changes for legislation to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes. (H.R. 2832):		
Budget Authority	−28	[1]
Outlays	−240	[1]
Revenues	−996	−1,784
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,858,503	[1]
Outlays	2,947,662	[1]
Revenues	1,865,406	26,123,527

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2012 through 2021 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

	2012		2012–2021 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
House Committee on Ways & Means:.				
Current allocation:	1,030,988	1,031,520	13,173,262	13,173,925
Changes for legislation to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes. (H.R. 2832):	−28	−240	−1,709	−1,790
Revised Allocation:	1,030,960	1,031,280	13,171,553	13,172,135

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 13, 2011, at 9:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3445. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Michigan [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0075] received September 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3446. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received September 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3447. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism, National Broadband Plan for Our Future [CC Docket No.: 02-6] [GN Docket No.: 09-51] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3448. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Video Description: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-43] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3449. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Editorial Correction to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 100325169-0629-01] (RIN: 0694-AE90) received September 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3450. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of Monmouth, New Jersey, as a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AM49) received September 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3451. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Noncompetitive Appointment of Certain Military Spouses (RIN: 3206-AM36) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3452. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2011-12 Early Season [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2011-0014] (RIN: 1018-AX34) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3453. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Six Foreign Birds as Endangered Throughout Their Range [FWS-R9-ES-2009-0084; MO 92210-1111F114 B6] (RIN: 1018-AW39) recieved September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3454. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of Echinacea tennesseensis (Tennessee Purple Coneflower) from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2011-0059] (RIN: 1018-AW26) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3455. A letter from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — Subpart B, Federal Subsistence Board [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2011-0004] (RIN: 1018-AX52) received September 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3456. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Protests and Contracts Dispute [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0840; Amdt. No. 17-1] (RIN: 2120-AJ82] received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3457. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Track Safety Standards; Concrete Crossties [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0007, Notice No. 4] (RIN: 2130-AC35) received September 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3458. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2011-75] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3459. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 6707A and the Failure to Include on any return or Statement any Information Required to be Disclosed under Section 6011 with Respect to a Reportable Transaction [TD 9550] (RIN: 1545-BF61) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3460. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Announcement of the Results of the 2010-2011 Allocation Round of the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program [Announcement 2011-62] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3461. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2011-45) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3462. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — List of Nonbank Trustees and Custodians [Announcement 2011-59] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3463. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Air transportation and aviation fuels excise taxes [Notice 2011-69] received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3464. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Implementation of Form 990 [TD 9549] (RIN: 1545-BH28) received September 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 430. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act (Rept. 112–243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 431. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2273) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to facilitate recovery and beneficial use, and provide for the proper management and disposal, of materials generated by the combustion of coal and other fossil fuels (Rept. 112–244). Referred to House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend section 1112 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 3155. A bill to preserve the multiple use land management policy in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 3156. A bill to repeal the debit card interchange price control provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act and restore balance to the electronic payments system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance of tax by insurance companies through reinsurance with non-taxed affiliates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BERG, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CARTER, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 3158. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BONNER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. KELLY):

H.R. 3159. A bill to direct the President, in consultation with the Department of State, United States Agency for International Development, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Department of Defense, to establish guidelines for United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 3160. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to make permanent the E-Verify program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for activities to increase the awareness and knowledge of health care providers and women with respect to ovarian and cervical cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 3162. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from implementing certain rules relating to employment of aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3163. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require any State offering an early voting period in elections for Federal office to make the period available for the entire 14-day period that precedes the date of the election, to prohibit States from imposing identification requirements on individuals who wish to vote or register to vote who are not otherwise required to provide identification under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3164. A bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to disclose the minimum purchase price that such an enterprise will accept on the short sale of a residence financed by a mortgage purchased by such an enterprise in order to make short sales a viable alternative to foreclosure; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 3165. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to increase implementation of school-wide positive behavior supports; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 3166. A bill to add engaging in or supporting hostilities against the United States to the list of acts for which United States nationals would lose their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3167. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a program under which certain veterans entitled to educational assistance under the laws administered by the Secretary can use such entitlement to start or purchase a qualifying business enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 3168. A bill to make payments by the Department of Homeland Security to a State contingent on a State providing the Federal Bureau of Investigation with certain statistics, to require Federal agencies, departments, and courts to provide such statistics to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to publish such statistics; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3169. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States for assistance in hiring additional school-based mental health and student service providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 3170. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide incentive grants to promote alternatives to incarcerating delinquent juveniles; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3171. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 with respect to juveniles who have committed offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to protect the eligibility of incarcerated youth for medical assistance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3173. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to reform the process for the enrollment, activation, issuance, and renewal of a Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) to require, in total, not more than one in-person visit to a designated enrollment center; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3174. A bill to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the methodology for calculating the amount of any Postal surplus or supplemental liability under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3175. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to suspend temporarily the process of imposing restructuring sanctions on such schools and local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WATT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WEST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr.

YARMUTH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H. Res. 432. A resolution celebrating the life and achievements of Reverend Fred Lee Shuttlesworth and honoring him for his tireless efforts in the fight against segregation and his steadfast commitment to the civil rights of all people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself and Ms. BASS of California):

H. Res. 433. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children in foster care awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, recognizing current programs and efforts designed to promote adoption, and encouraging people in the United States to seek improved safety, permanency, and well-being for all children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 3156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to ''regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .''.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 3160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution clause 18 (relating to the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 3162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which states, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IV.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, section 4 of the United States Constitution:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 The Congress shall have power * * * To establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. MARINO, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 36: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 58: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 100: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 104: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 157: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 237: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 360: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 363: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 420: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 452: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 574: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 607: Mr. WOLF and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 640: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 645: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 674: Mr. KIND, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 733: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 735: SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 835: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 854: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 883: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 886: Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 890: Mr. TURNER of New York.

H.R. 891: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 930: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1085: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1130: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1161: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1186: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1195: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1206: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1291: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1307: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1322: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1340: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 1367: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1370: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BERG.

H.R. 1489: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1509: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1513: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1519: Ms. HOCHUL.
H.R. 1527: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 1558: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1580: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1588: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1653: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1681: Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1697: Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1738: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1746: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1755: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 1798: Ms. CHU, Mr. GIBSON, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1834: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1842: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1876: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1905: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1946: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1974: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 2020: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2042: Mr. CAMP and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2108: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2182: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 2193: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 2233: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2284: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2304: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2337: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2418: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2437: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2447: Mr. HIMES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2457: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2471: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2479: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2492: Mr. LEWIS OF GEORGIA, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 2500: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2513: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2514: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2517: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2528: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2541: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2559: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2602: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2668: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2674: Mr. LONG and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2679: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2694: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 2695: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2696: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2697: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2784: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 2799: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2815: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2829: Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2840: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 2874: Mr. CANSECO and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2876: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2880: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2885: Mr. LANCE and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2888: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2898: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 2900: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2913: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2945: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 2962: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2966: Mr. HIMES and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2967: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2978: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. WEST.
H.R. 2982: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2985: Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2993: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2994: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2998: Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3009: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3029: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 3046: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3048: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3050: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3059: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3062: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3074: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3090: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3094: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3099: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3104: Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3110: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3128: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3147: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3148: Mr. CLAY.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. POSEY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.J. Res. 80: Mr. CONYERS.
H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H. Res. 95: Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 111: Mr. TONKO and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 177: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H. Res. 247: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 336: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H. Res. 364: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HANABUSA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 367: Mr. LANCE.
H. Res. 378: Mr. FILNER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative SHIMKUS, or a designee, to H.R. 2273, the ''Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act,'' does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 822: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1380: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2011 No. 152

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Lord, whose glory has been revealed through the generations, renew within our Senators a true understanding of Your purpose for their lives, for our Nation, and for our world. Amid the challenges of our time, infuse them with a spirit of wisdom and courage so that they will be instruments of Your providence. Lord, use them to make an impact on the lives of the forgotten who lack hope and on all people who seek Your presence. May Your grace, mercy, and peace be on us all now and stay with each one of us always.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks, the Senate will begin consideration of the free-trade agreements. There are three of them. There will be up to 12 hours of debate on these matters. The Senate will have its normal recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today for our caucus meetings. We expect to yield back some of the time—I certainly hope so—on the trade agreements, although people can speak as much as they want on these matters. But we are going to complete the action tonight. Whether it is at 4 o'clock or midnight, we are going to complete action on these bills today. The House is awaiting our action.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2681

Mr. REID. Madam President, H.R. 2681 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2681) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for cement manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would object to any further proceedings at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, Republican obstructionism was once again in evidence last night, and it has cost this Nation millions of jobs.

Last night, Republicans blocked the American Jobs Act, President Obama's plan to create 2 million jobs by giving tax cuts to businesses and middle-class families and investing in modern roads, bridges, and schools.

It is not the first jobs bill they have blocked this Congress, although I hope it will be the last. But it seems as if the Republicans do not really want to put Americans back to work. They believe a weak economy means a weak President. So even though they have supported each piece of the American Jobs Act in the past, they blocked this job-creating legislation in the hopes of doing political damage to the President.

But we have not given up on creating jobs in America, and we will not let Republican political games stand between Congress's most important duty: to put 14 million Americans back to work.

Passing the American Jobs Act would have been a step in the right direction. Economists of every stripe agree it would have impacted the economy immediately and put up to 2 million people back to work.

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's and economic adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN's Presidential campaign said this:

Given the high odds of another recession in the next few months, it is vital for Congress and the administration to provide some near-term support to the economy.

Zandi says the American Jobs Act could shave a percentage point off the unemployment rate. Conversely, he warned that without immediate action

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the likelihood is high of a double-dip recession. So the last thing we should be doing right now is wasting time, but that is what Republicans are forcing us to do.

Last night, a majority of the Senate voted to take up this bill. But Republicans will not put politics aside for a moment, even when the price of their stubbornness is struggling families and failing businesses.

I say it again: Democrats are not going to give up on creating jobs. We will introduce the American Jobs Act piece by piece.

I had two conversations last night while the vote was taking place with Republicans, and both Republican Senators said they would like to join in moving some pieces of this legislation. So we are going to do that, and I am glad to see there is some interest by my Republican colleagues in doing that.

Many of the ideas we will advance will be proposals Republicans have supported in the past, as I have already indicated. I think they will have to explain to the American people—at a time of record unemployment—why they continue to oppose job-creating tax cuts for small businesses and the middle class and other proposals they have supported in the past. So, as I said a minute ago, I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues in moving forward parts of this bill they like. At the end of the day, if they do not do this, their motive will be crystal clear: politics.

So I hope Republicans will be able to see past partisan posturing to support their own past proposals when we consider them individually in the next few weeks.

Take, for example, the payroll tax cut. My friend, the Republican leader, has supported payroll tax cuts in the past. Most Republicans have. This is what my friend, the Republican leader, said about the same tax cut in 2009. I quote:

> It would put a lot of money back in the hands of businesses and in the hands of individuals. . . . Republicans, generally speaking, from Maine to Mississippi, like tax relief.

So that is part of the American Jobs Act.

Another Republican Senator sponsored a bill to give tax credits to businesses that hire out-of-work veterans. Yet that same Republican Senator voted against the same proposal last night. It was part of the bill last night.

Republicans have supported these proposals in the past. They should have supported them yesterday. But Democrats care so much about creating jobs that we will give our Republican colleagues another opportunity to do the right thing, and we will move forward in the best way we can to put these matters before the American people, if necessary, piece by piece.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have worked hard to be in the posture we are in today to have votes on these trade bills. My friend, the Republican leader, has heard me say this too much, but I do not favor these bills. But a majority of this Senate does, and I believed it was important we move these forward. I have worked with the Republican leader to do it today. I think it is important to do it today. We have the President of Korea here in America. He is going to speak to a joint meeting of Congress tomorrow. I look forward to a very productive day in moving these matters forward.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

THE JOBS BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, before my friend, the majority leader, leaves the floor, let me remind him and our Senate colleagues and the American people that Republicans were prepared to vote on the President's second version of the stimulus bill last night. In fact, I offered a unanimous consent that we have that vote—not the motion to proceed to it but the actual vote. I am not going to renew that request at the moment but just would say to my friend, we are happy to have that vote. We were happy to have it last night.

With regard to the pieces of it, my friend is correct; some of the pieces of this second stimulus might well be appropriate. I have recommended to the joint select committee—that he and I appointed 50 percent of—that they take a look at some of the pieces of it which could well be included in a product we are going to get before Thanksgiving before the Senate and the House.

So, again, we would be happy to vote on the entire package. We were happy to do it last night and also happy to look at pieces of it. We do have, as the majority leader and I have discussed before, important work to do in the Senate. We have the trade agreements we are going to approve tonight. We have three appropriations bills we are going to go to after that—the basic work of government, which we have not done in the last few years, the American people would like to see us do. We also have a joint select committee set up that could look at parts of the proposal to which the majority leader is referring. So I have some optimism that we will be able to come together on pieces of it that we think make sense.

I will say that as far as I know, there is not a single Republican who thinks it is a good idea to raise taxes on over 300,000 business owners, which is what would happen under the so-called millionaires' surtax. So there are parts of it we very much disagree with. We have divided government. Neither party controls the entire government. We will only be able to pass those things we do agree on. I think there are parts of the package my friend refers to that could well be agreed to at some point this year on a bipartisan basis.

FREE-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, later today the Senate will show that Democrats and Republicans can, in fact, work together to make it easier for American businesses to create jobs.

By passing free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, we will help the economy, and we will put the lie to the ridiculous Obama campaign claim that Republicans are somehow rooting against the economy. Nothing could be more ridiculous and absurd as to suggest that Republicans are somehow rooting against our economy.

In fact, if President Obama were willing to work with us on a more bipartisan piece of legislation, nobody would even be talking about a dysfunctional Congress. There would not be any reason to.

But, as we all know, that does not fit in with the President's election strategy. The White House has made it clear that the President is praying for gridlock—he is actually hoping for gridlock—so he has somebody besides himself to point the finger at next November.

That is a big mistake. The American people will not tolerate their own President putting politics ahead of working with Congress on the kind of bipartisan legislation that we know both parties could agree on right now.

So this morning I would like to repeat my call to the President to put the political playbook aside and work with us instead on the kind of bipartisan, job-creating legislation the American people truly want.

The trade bills we will be voting on tonight are a good start. There is no reason we should have had to wait nearly 3 years for this President to send them to Congress for a vote, but they are a good start nonetheless—3 years late but still very important to do.

Now let's move on to some other things. We have pointed to areas such as regulatory reform, tax reform, and energy exploration where the parties could help create jobs without raising taxes or adding to the deficit.

It is just the kind of bipartisan cooperation that the American people are actually demanding from us, and what I am saying this morning is that Republicans are eager and willing to join Democrats in making that happen.

The Presidential election, for goodness' sake, is 13 months away; 13 months from now is the Presidential election. There is plenty of time to campaign. Why don't we put that off for a while and do what we were sent here to do?

But right now we have an opportunity to work together. Let's put aside the political playbook and focus

on results. I know that does not come easy for some around here. The senior Senator from New York, for example, made it pretty clear yesterday that he is more interested in drawing a contrast with Republicans than he is in actually passing bipartisan legislation that we know will spur job growth. But I do not believe the 14 million Americans looking for work right now care more about contrast than about jobs. The jobs crisis we are in calls for lawmakers to rise above these games.

Americans expect us to do something to help create jobs. That is what we should be doing. That is why Republicans will continue to seek to find Democrats who are more interested in jobs than in political posturing and work with them on bipartisan legislation such as the trade bills we will vote on tonight.

What we will not do, though, is vote in favor of any more misguided stimulus bills because some bill writer slapped the word ''jobs'' on the cover page. The stimulus bill with the word ''jobs'' slapped on the cover page and wrapped around a talking-point tax hike is not our idea of what is good for America. We refuse to raise taxes on the very people Americans are depending on to create jobs. We need to be looking for ways to make it easier to create jobs, not harder.

For nearly 3 years, Republicans have told Democrats again and again that we are willing and eager to work with the Democrats anywhere, anytime, on real job-promoting legislation on which both sides could agree.

I have been calling on the President to approve these three free-trade agreements since the day he took the oath of office. All the President had to do was to follow through on these agreements and send them up to Congress, and we would have had an early bipartisan achievement that did not add a single dime to the deficit, that would have convinced people the two sides could work together, and that by the President's own assessment created tens of thousands of jobs right here at home. But he did not. The President chose to push a highly partisan stimulus bill instead that the administration said would keep unemployment below 8 percent. We all know how that turned out. Nearly 3 years later, the only thing left is the nearly $1 trillion it added to the debt and the government programs it created. As for jobs, well, unemployment has been above 8 percent for 32 months straight, and according to the Labor Department, there are now 1.5 million fewer jobs than there were then.

It is time to try something different. Republicans have proposed a number of ideas that would not only represent a change in direction but would also attract broad bipartisan support. There is no good reason whatsoever for the President and Democrats in Congress to prevent us from doing these things. As I see it, the President actually has a choice: He can spend the next 13 months trying to get Republicans to vote against legislation which will not create sustainable private sector jobs and which is designed to fail in Congress or he can work with us on legislation that will actually encourage small businesses to create jobs and is actually designed to pass.

There is an entire menu of bipartisan job-promoting proposals the President could choose to pursue over the next year. Republicans hope he works with us to approve them. Americans are waiting. We are ready to act. The free-trade agreements we are voting on tonight are a good first step. They demonstrate the way Washington can actually help tackle the jobs crisis, not by spending borrowed money to create temporary jobs—spending borrowed money to create temporary jobs. We have tried that. This will lower barriers to private enterprise, unleashing the power of the private sector to make and sell products, expand market share, and in doing so create sustainable private sector jobs that will not disappear when the Federal cash spigot runs dry. But if we are going to tackle the enormous challenges we face, we need to do much more than that. With these trade agreements, we are showing we can work together to create jobs and help the economy. We can and must do more of this kind of thing.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will consider H.R. 3080, H.R. 3079, and H.R. 3078 en bloc, notwithstanding the lack of receipt of papers from the House of Representatives.

Under the previous order, there will be up to 12 hours of debate, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHANNS. Madam President, I come to the floor today—thankfully for the last time, I hope—in support of the pending free-trade agreements with Korea, Panama, and Colombia. For nearly 3 years we have heard the administration say the right things. Yet there were countless delays. It has been 1,566 days since the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement was signed, 1,568 days for the Panama agreement, and 1,786 days since we completed negotiations with Colombia. Finally, though, I believe the waiting has ended, and the administration took action and has submitted these agreements for a vote. I am eager to vote for all three FTAs this evening and to see their job-creating power in action. By the administration's own estimates, these agreements will spur a quarter of a million new jobs.

We should all be able to agree that the benefits of trade are significant. In my home State of Nebraska alone, more than 19,000 jobs and more than $5.5 billion in revenue were directly tied to exports in this last year. With these agreements, these statistics will only improve. Nebraska is a big agricultural State, and these three agreements eliminate tariffs and other barriers on most agricultural products, including beef, corn, soybeans, and pork—all products grown in Nebraska. In fact, according to the Farm Bureau and economic analysis from the USDA, full implementation of those agreements will result in nearly $2.5 billion increases in U.S. agricultural exports each year. In Nebraska, this increase in agricultural exports is expected to total about $125 million per year and add another 1,100 jobs to our State.

The benefits for my home State are not hard to see. In fact, they would be hard to miss. As the Nation's fourth largest exporter of feed grain and a key beef State, the U.S.-Korea agreement holds great opportunity and promise for Nebraska. It immediately eliminates duties on nearly two-thirds of U.S. agricultural exports to Korea. U.S. exports of corn for feed enter at zero duty—zero duty immediately. For the second largest corn State, that is a significant leveling of the playing field. And it phases out the 40-percent tariff on beef muscle meat and the 18-percent tariff on variety meats.

The Colombia agreement offers great opportunities to both manufacturing and the agricultural sector. Just one example: Nebraska manufactures and exports irrigation pivots to customers all over the world. Currently Colombia imposes a 15-percent duty on pivots, which would be eliminated by this trade agreement. This will allow Nebraska manufacturers to compete on a level playing field with European companies.

The Colombia agreement also eliminates barriers for many Nebraska agricultural products, including beef, corn, soybeans, pork, and wheat. In particular, the agreement immediately eliminates the 80-percent duty on some

of the most important products to the U.S. beef industry—prime and choice cuts of meat. The Colombia agreement eliminates all tariffs on wheat and barriers on corn and on soybeans.

Unfortunately, during these years of delay I referenced at the start of my comments this morning, negotiators for other countries saw an opportunity. Negotiators from the European Union, Argentina, and Canada saw the void the U.S. companies, workers, and farmers should have been filling, and they acted. As a result, our exporters now face even greater competition in these markets. For example, when the U.S.-Colombia agreement was signed, American wheat farmers supplied 70 percent of the Colombian market. In 2010, U.S. wheat growers supplied only 45 percent of that market. During that time, the United States lost market share in Colombia to competitors such as Argentina and Canada that did not wait on the sidelines, and now they enjoy duty-free access. Because of unnecessary delays, our farmers have lost out in markets they dominated when this agreement was signed. But if we act quickly, if we pass these agreements tonight, U.S. producers can work to build back market share.

I am confident that Nebraska farmers, businesses, workers, and those around the country can compete with anybody in the world, and in doing so we can create jobs here at home. By the administration's estimates, the Korea, Colombia and Panama Free Trade Agreements will create, as I have referenced, 250,000 U.S. jobs. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce took a broader view; they have an estimate of 380,000 jobs to be created. But either number is worth celebrating.

In May, the President called for ''a robust, forward-looking trade agenda that emphasizes exports and domestic job growth.'' I am glad the President has turned these words into action on these long overdue job-creating agreements. These three bipartisan votes should have been near the top of the agenda 3 years ago. By now, we should be voting on new agreements this administration has negotiated, not the leftover work of the past administration.

During the challenging economic times our Nation has endured, we should have been exerting every ounce of energy to get our economy going. That is not done by heavyhanded government regulation and massive, unsustainable new government spending. It is accomplished by lowering and removing barriers so our job creators can flourish in a global environment. That is what we have today—an opportunity to give our job creators a chance to flourish in the global environment. We cannot ignore that the fastest growing opportunities for American businesses, farms, and ranchers are not in the United States or outside our borders, they are overseas in rapidly developing countries where 95 percent of the world's population lives. I sincerely hope those long delays have not hurt our ability to negotiate high-quality trade agreements, but more importantly, I hope it has not hurt the ability of Americans to compete in these growing markets.

I look forward to working with the administration over the rest of this Congress on forward-looking trade efforts. Real progress forward would produce even more opportunities.

I am optimistic this morning. I am optimistic that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting in favor of the trade agreements with Korea, Panama, and Colombia. Together, we can allow hard-working Americans to create jobs here at home.

I hope these three agreements are the beginning, not the end.

Following today's vote, we should rejoice in an accomplishment, but more work remains to be done. I am prepared to tackle this endeavor, as I did when I was Secretary of Agriculture. For the sake of our Nation, I hope to find willing partners on these three votes and, in the future, more trade agreements and additional opportunities.

Before yielding the floor, I ask unanimous consent that all time during the quorum calls be divided equally.

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I was on the phone earlier this week with a friend in Delaware. We were talking about these free-trade agreements negotiated by the Bush administration and fine-tuned by the Obama administration. My friend said: Why do we have free-trade agreements anyway? I said: Let's go back a little bit in time. At the end of World War II, when the baby boomers and my sister and I came along, the United States was on top of the world. Our industrial infrastructure was strong. We were a vibrant economy. We had come out of the Great Depression with all guns blazing, while a lot of the rest of the world lay in ruin. Some of the nations that would go on to become our greatest competitors, including China, Korea, and some others as well, were in the midst of wars of their own, and eventually they would be governed—at least in part in Korea—by a Communist form of government. So the competition wasn't that great.

Then things started to change. The competition got a whole lot stronger. I remember when I was a kid growing up, at Christmas time we were opening presents around the Christmas tree. I grew up in Danville, VA. We received a knickknack or something from friends of our family, and my father turned it over and it said ''Made in Japan.'' He and my mom kind of sneered at that, as if it were unworthy of us—anything being made in Japan.

Things have changed—in some ways for the better and in other ways maybe not. For a long time, we were the 800-pound gorilla in the room. In terms of auto sales, I think we had about 90 percent of the market share in the United States—maybe more than that—well into the latter part of the last century. Now we don't. Our market share in cars is less than 50 percent. The quality is good, but the market share is less. If we look at the amount of cars that come to us from Korea, they will roughly export 500,000 vehicles to the United States this year, as they did last year and will next year. We will export barely 5,000 cars to them. Think about that. Roughly, for every 1 American car we sell them, they sell us about 100. That is not free trade. As it turns out, it is not fair trade either. They don't put tariffs on their cars. They have nontariff barriers—a very clever way to keep our vehicles out. It could have to do with the environmental equipment on the car, the fuel system, transmissions, you name it. They find all kinds of ways to keep our vehicles out. We don't do that or play that game. They take advantage of that.

We wish to sell in a place such as Panama. In this country, a lot of people like the white meat of the chicken. Overseas, a lot of people eat the dark meat. It is an opportunity to export the dark meat for us. If we want to export leg quarters, drumsticks, and thighs in Panama, normally, a package of leg quarters costs $10 here, and there is a 260-percent tariff for those leg quarters going into Panama. They have to pay $36. I don't know what that translates into pesos, but they pay $36 for $10 worth of chicken.

We allow other countries, whether it is Korea, Panama, Colombia or many other nations, to sell their goods and products at will into our country, without much at all in the way of barriers, without impediment, without tariff barriers or nontarrif barriers. But they impose barriers against us. The reason why flows from the situation we were in at the end of World War II, when we were such an economic juggernaut. Other countries wanted to protect their markets a little bit from the 800-pound gorilla in the world, which was us.

While we are still a strong and vibrant nation, we no longer dominate world markets. We want to make sure we have access to other markets in ways we have not had in recent years in some countries.

I would like to think of one of the roles of government, and one of the major roles of government, is to provide a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. That includes a lot of things. That includes

making sure businesses, large and small, have access to the credit; it means that when folks come up with an idea, we have an innovative economy and a lot of technology; when people come up with new technology and new ideas, they go to the Patent Office to file it and they end up getting the patent and they don't end up in years of litigation.

Businesses like predictability, and that is part of the environment we need to provide. We need to provide a workforce where the people can come out of our schools and can read, write, think, do math, and have a good work ethic. We have to have common sense in regulations. Obviously, we need regulations, and we need to consider cost-benefit relations. As we do those regulations, we can get input from all sides.

We need predictable tax policies—tax policies that are progrowth. We also need access to foreign markets. Folks who build products in this country need access to foreign markets. In too many cases, we don't have that. These trade agreements are attempting to change that. Very soon, for that family in Panama who has to pay $36 for the same amount of drumsticks and thighs that now cost $10 here, that is going to change. We are going to start exporting and selling cars in Korea. They will still be able to sell theirs here, but we will sell tens of thousands of cars in Korea in a year or two.

In my State, we used to make a lot of cars. We had a GM plant and a Chrysler plant. They are now gone. But starting next year, a new plant will start up, and they will make some of the most beautiful cars in the world. Some are already being made, called the Karma. It gets about 70 miles per gallon. It is a drop-dead beautiful vehicle. Starting late next year, they will be making it a less-expensive car. We want to make sure they use our Port of Wilmington to ship those cars around the world. It would be nice to sell some of those in Korea or in Latin America and South America, as well as in Europe.

For my State, 80 percent of our agricultural industry, believe it or not, is chickens. I don't know what it is like in Iowa or in Florida or New York, but 80 percent of ours is chickens. Agriculture is one of the top three sectors of our State's economy—80 percent chickens. One out of every five chickens we raise in the Delmarva Peninsula is exported to another country. This is not chickenfeed; this is a big deal for us in Delaware.

This is important for our ability to export vehicles, our ability to export chemicals, plastics, poultry, and the ability for us to export some of our services—the work we do in financial services with banking or insurance. A lot of those companies would like to be able to do business in Korea or Latin America. This legislation will enable them to do that.

I think a lot of people will vote for the agreements today with Panama and with South Korea. Even some of the labor unions—the UAW and others—support the South Korea agreement. There is still skepticism and concern, understandably, regarding the agreement with Colombia. As everybody in the Chamber knows, and a lot of people in this country know, for years, labor leaders, organizers have been the target of assassinations in Colombia. According to the Colombians, in 2001, I believe there were about 205 assassinations in that 1 year alone in Colombia. The numbers are a little bit confusing because that includes folks who are not necessarily labor organizers but who are educators and maybe members of labor unions—205 people in 1 year. Can you imagine in this country if 205 labor leaders, organizers, and teachers were murdered in a year? That is a much smaller country than ours. The numbers have come down.

In one of our conversations yesterday with some labor unions in Delaware, one shared the latest number reported by the Colombian Government; I think it was 22 in the early part of this month. That is 22 too many. About half those folks killed were teachers who have been targeted by criminal elements and drug folks, drug gangs, because of the threat that teachers and educators pose to the ability of the drug folks to destabilize that country. So they are targets as well.

The Colombian Government has provided almost like a witness protection service down there, but it is somewhat different. They don't take people and change their identities and move them and hide them. They actually provide extra protection for folks who are believed to be at risk. That caused a reduction of almost 90 percent in the assassinations over the last decade. Even if it is just one or two, we know that is too many.

The question for us is, Do we ignore the progress or do we say, no, we are not going to ratify a free-trade agreement with Colombia until there are no assassinations? We have a saying: Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. That may trivialize this particular argument, and I would not suggest that is the standard we should use. But substantial progress has been made. We have embedded in that trade agreement environmental provisions, labor provisions, that are now part of the agreement. We have done the same with Panama and Korea. There is an implementation schedule that the government is expected to follow and has been followed. It has been certified by the President. They are taking the steps they are supposed to be taking in order to further reduce the level of violence. Overall, rather extraordinary progress has been made in Colombia.

A friend of mine who works there in the Embassy described to me the difference is between night and day.

It wasn't all that long ago when gunmen rounded up 11 supreme court justices in Colombia and took them into a room and shot them all dead. We know it is not just teachers or labor leaders who are being targeted for assassination and have been targeted but people at the highest levels of that country's government—government leaders, people who run for office, officeholders, law enforcement officers, judges, all kinds of people.

For the most part, it has changed. It is a lot better. The question is, Do we reward the improvement made or do we say, no, that is not enough, come back when you are pristine clean, pristine pure? For me, it is one I wrestled with and others have as well. I think, in this case, we can vote with our hopes, and our hope and expectation is that this progress has been realized and will continue.

There is one last thing I wish to mention before I finish.

Any number of folks have said to me: You know, NAFTA didn't help us all that much—Mexico and Canada—and so how do we know these trade agreements will help us? We learned some things from NAFTA. One of the things we learned is if we have environmental concerns, we ought to embed in the agreement the rest of those environmental concerns—actually addressing them in the treaty. We have done that with all these nations. We have done the same thing with respect to labor provisions. They are actually embedded in the agreement.

The other thing I have said to folks who are concerned this isn't in our best interest and it will not help us economically, I don't agree with that. But think about this. To say this is not going to help us is counterintuitive. Think about it. We allow these countries to sell their goods and services in our country without impediment. We don't keep them out. We don't impose, for the most part, tariff or nontariff barriers. But if we want to sell our goods and services there, they impose these barriers—tariff or nontariff barriers. Under a free-trade agreement, the barriers that others put up to keep our goods and services out pretty much go away and in some cases pretty fast.

It is hard for me to say: Well, if we are going to let them ship their goods and services to us—continue to—and they are going to eliminate their tariff and nontariff barriers, why shouldn't we do better? We will do better. We make great chicken, we build great cars, have great chemical products, and excellent financial services. Those products will sell and we will be able to grow our economy.

The last problem is this. For us to come out of this recession—and we have come out of the recession officially, but there is still a lot of hurt and pain all over the place, including in my own State, but for us to come out of it, we need to grow the economy—we need to grow the economy—and we need to grow it across the world. We make any number of products in this country. Some are products—cars, chickens, chemicals, plastics—and others are services. They are

as good as any in the world. We want to make sure we have access to sell them anywhere in the world, including these three countries. Their consumers will be better off and our producers and our businesses will be better off. That is why I am happy to support these agreements.

The last thing I want to do is to acknowledge the excellent leadership Senator BAUCUS has provided for us. Senator GRASSLEY is on the floor, and I know these are issues he cares a lot about. The partnership he and Senator BAUCUS have had over the years is a model for the Senate.

They are not on the floor now, but I also want to mention Senator BLUNT and Senator PORTMAN, two of our Republican colleagues, who joined with me to make sure at the end of the day we didn't just vote for three free-trade agreements but we also had the opportunity to vote and put in place trade adjustment assistance to ensure those workers in this country who might be negatively affected or displaced would have the opportunity to get unemployment compensation and have the opportunity to get job training so they will be treated fairly as well. It is the personification of the Golden Rule: Treat other people the way we want to be treated.

So we have succeeded in not just passing three free-trade agreements, which I think will help our economy overall, but we will also look out for the people who might be adversely affected. So I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY and the other Republicans who provided the support to make that happen too. And again to Senator BAUCUS: A job well done.

Madam President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor to anyone else who is here and wants to speak at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Well, can you believe it, we are finally here. After several years of waiting for these trade agreements to come to the Congress, it looks as though we are going to be able to vote on them, pass them, and send them to the President for his signature, and they will become law.

Quite frankly, I thought soon after May 10, 2007, we would be voting on the Colombia trade agreement because President Bush was anxious to send it to the Hill. But the Democrats took over the Congress after the 2006 election, and the way it was negotiated by the Bush administration wasn't good enough. There wasn't enough negotiation to go far enough on labor and environment, so the new Democratic-controlled Congress said we have to do more on those negotiations for environment and labor.

So more was renegotiated, and on May 10, 2007, there was a news conference announcing a bipartisan result between the Bush administration and the Democratic Congress on an agreement with Colombia on better environment and labor issues that had been reached. So a bipartisan agreement, particularly when you have a Democratic Congress and a Republican President, you would have expected that right away we would be having at least Colombia up here. At that time, South Korea wasn't completely negotiated. But the other party turned into a protectionist party and so nothing has happened until now. The goalposts have been moved several times, but the free trade reality of creating jobs has come back to the other political party. So I am glad we are here at last, even though it may be 4 years late. We are doing the right thing, even though it is being done later than it should have been done.

Everybody knows that every day in this Congress, and rightly so, with 9.1 percent unemployment, the topic is jobs. And that is as it should be. The question gets asked a lot: What policies can we implement here in the Congress to create jobs or at least to encourage jobs. With over 9 percent unemployment in this country, we should, in fact, be talking about how to have an environment that creates jobs, and freeing up trade is one of the best ways to create jobs. These aren't just creating jobs, these are good-paying jobs. On average, jobs related to international trade pay 15 percent above the national average.

The truth is for years we have known one clear and simple way to create jobs and stimulate growth in our economy, and that is international trade. The Colombia, South Korea, and Panama trade agreements will create and support thousands of jobs, and I believe even hundreds of thousands of jobs. So we must implement the trade deals reached with Panama, South Korea, and Colombia, and we must do it today, even though it should have been done, in the case of South Korea, a year ago and in the case of Panama and Colombia 3 or 4 years ago.

We entered into these agreements back in 2006 and 2007, and there is no excuse why we have had to wait nearly 5 years—until now—to get to them. Yet congressional Democrats, and later President Obama, continued to move the goalposts, putting up barriers that prevented their consideration and passage until this day. There is no clearer or easier way of creating jobs in the near term, and good jobs lasting for a long period of time, than passing these trade bills and doing it now. Thank God the President has said he would sign them.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, 100,000 jobs will be created by the implementation of these trade agreements. There are estimates from other sources that suggest the number of jobs may be even higher. The administration—and I believe rightly so—believes that the higher number of jobs being created would be in the few hundred thousand. The Obama administration estimates in the case of the Korea trade agreement alone 70,000 additional jobs for the U.S. workforce will be created.

Not only do these trade agreements expand opportunities for U.S. workers, they also present tremendous opportunities for American agriculture. It is estimated that the Korean agreement could increase the price farmers receive for pigs by $10 per head. So you see in the case of Delaware, where Senator CARPER says it is good for his poultry industry because that is so dominant there, where larger livestock is so dominant in the Midwest, in my State of Iowa, it is going to be a very good agreement as well.

The Colombian agreement will level the playing field for U.S. corn farmers so they can begin to reclaim some of the market share they lost due to high tariffs for our products going down there. We have lost markets not just because of the high tariffs but because Colombia, in the last 5 years, has reached agreements with other countries that have allowed those countries, through their agricultural products—particularly grain—to take over the share of the Colombian market that American agriculture previously had.

The agreement with the country of Panama will bring about better opportunities for a variety of agricultural products, including beef, poultry, and pork, to name a few.

We have been waiting a long time to get to this point, and so, as I have said two or three times, because I am satisfied we are going to get the job done, I am eager to cast my vote in support of all three agreements. But as the finish line nears on these agreements, the American people should be asking why President Obama has dragged his feet on these agreements for so long. There has been a lot of wasted time and tax dollars with stimulus programs that were supposed to create jobs but did not produce any measurable amount of jobs; whereas, if these agreements had been in place, these jobs we are talking about creating from this day forward would probably have already been created. The stimulus plan failed to do what President Obama promised Americans, but I am telling you these trade agreements will do what President Obama promises the American people, they will do in the way of creating jobs.

Of course, the President wants to try it again with yet another costly stimulus program, as we were debating yesterday. We don't need more government spending to create jobs. We know that doesn't work. What we need to do is create an environment so the private sector will create jobs. We know what works, and these agreements are part of what works to create jobs. We need to continue opening markets for U.S. exports, and that is what these agreements will do. We need to pass these trade agreements and do it now. American workers need them now and the unemployed need the new jobs that will be created as a result of these agreements.

But for the economic future of our country, we should not stop with these

three trade agreements. The President can provide certainty to businesses, farmers, and workers by renewing his commitment to expanding trade opportunities. The best way to do that is to ask Congress to renew his authority to negotiate free-trade agreements through a long-used cooperative process between the Congress and the executive branch of government, involving the Congress giving the President what is called trade promotion authority so he can work further agreements.

In January of 2010, the President said he wanted to double exports by 2015, and that was welcome news. But actions speak louder than words, Mr. President. The President has repeatedly delayed these trade deals. He has routinely dodged the question of when he would request authority for trade promotion to negotiate new agreements, and he has not laid out a clear strategic plan for in fact reaching the trade goals he expressed at the beginning of 2010. We are now nearly 2 years further down the road from that discussion he had.

While it may be tough to reach the goals of doubling exports by 2015, we can still push on toward that goal, as we should. The more we do to open new markets and then get out of the way, the more we will help our struggling economy. There are three steps to continue helping U.S. businesses, farmers, and most of all the workers of America—particularly the unemployed workers of America. First, we need to pass these three trade agreements with no more political gamesmanship by this administration, and I think we are over that hurdle. Secondly, Congress should pass trade promotion authority so the administration can responsibly seek opportunities for greater market access for U.S. products. Finally, the administration must make it a top priority to actually seek more opportunities for opening foreign markets for our products.

We live in a global economy. We once led the way in forming trade agreements and expanding trade relationships. The rest of the world waited for the United States to take the first step.

In recent years, we have lost our way. The rest of the world isn't going to wait on the United States as they did for the last 60 years. That is why we have lost market share in Colombia that I just spoke about as one example.

We need to reestablish our position as a world leader in opening and expanding markets. Passing these trade agreements is crucial and long overdue, but it is a necessary first step. The next step is for the President to seek trade promotion authority and get back in the game leading the rest of the world.

I urge my colleagues to help U.S. businesses, farmers, our workers, and, most importantly, our unemployed workers by voting in support of the Panama, Colombia, and South Korea trade agreements.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I compliment my colleague for his kind and good words on the floor. He is a great leader in the Senate, and the Senator from Iowa is one of the truly great people I have met.

Today, we are finally considering our free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. It has been 9 long years since the authority to negotiate these trade agreements was passed by Congress, and it has been over 4 years, as the distinguished Senator from Iowa said, since each of these agreements was signed.

After a burst of international economic engagement under President Bush, we witnessed nothing but passive indifference by the 111th Democrat-led Congress and then, in more recent years, by the Obama administration.

While purporting to support trade and seemingly acknowledging its benefits, the current administration took little concrete action to advance these or any trade agreements for years. In fact, the opposite was true. Instead of devising ways to gain their approval, President Obama used his time to create excuses for not supporting any of the three agreements.

Finally, early this year, under relentless political pressure from Congress and from American businesses and farmers who will benefit from these agreements, the administration's excuses slowly melted away. Then, with every reasonable excuse gone and with bipartisan support for passing the agreements building and the end in sight, President Obama threw another obstacle in the path of their consideration. This time he made new demands for more spending on domestic worker retraining programs. Let's consider that at a time when virtually every government spending program faces intense scrutiny and many programs are being cut, this administration demanded more spending for a program of dubious value and with an unproven track record. In doing so, the President put his thirst for more spending ahead of the interests of the broader American economy that would benefit from these agreements entering into force, and he risked the tens of thousands of jobs his own administration insists these agreements will create. His reckless demands ground any progress we had achieved to pass the agreements to a halt. Accordingly, it took months for Congress to unravel this substantive and procedural Gordian knot of the President's own making. Meanwhile, U.S. workers continued to lose ground as our foreign competitors completed agreements to benefit their workers at our expense.

With today's vote, our Nation can hopefully begin to awaken from its trade stupor and confront the opportunities and challenges the world economy offers once again. Frankly, I am baffled by this administration's disregard for trade. They should know better. Our country benefits from free-trade agreements, and the reason is simple: The tariffs of our trading partners are generally significantly higher than are those of the United States. Free-trade agreements even the playing field for U.S. exporters by lowering the tariffs of the United States and our trading partners to the same level of zero.

For those who say they demand fair trade, it is hard for me to conceive of fairer trade than that—a level playing field where our products and services enjoy the same access and protections that foreign goods and services enjoy here in the United States. By leveling the playing field, free-trade agreements promote U.S. exports. Indeed, U.S. exports to our free-trade-agreement countries increased at a faster rate than U.S. exports to the rest of the world from 2009 to 2010. Moreover, in 2010, U.S. exports to our free-trade partner countries constituted 41 percent of all U.S. exports. Yet the United States has free-trade agreements with only 17 countries, and that is out of the 234 countries on which the U.S. Department of Commerce collects trade data. So our exports to our free-trade-agreement partners—just 17 countries—come close to dominating U.S. exports.

Let's look at this another way. The combined population of our free trade agreement partner countries is only about 310 million, while the world population is approximately 7 billion. So almost half of U.S. exports go to the less than 5 percent of the world's population that lives in countries with which we have free trade agreements. To me, it is clear that if we really want to double exports over the next 5 years, among the best tools available to us are our free trade agreements.

The export numbers under our recent free trade agreements certainly bear this out. Staff economists at the U.S. International Trade Commission share these observations on the benefits of the recent free trade agreements. They wrote last month that ''the United States has a significant and sustained trade surplus with recent FTA partners.'' In an analysis of recent free trade agreements that excluded oil trade, these economists noted that the U.S. trade surplus with these recent free trade agreement partners grew from $1.7 billion in 2005 to $16.7 billion in 2010, and they stated that this expanded trade surplus was driven mainly by a $24.5 billion increase in U.S. exports to those countries. During this same period, U.S. non-oil exports to the recent FTA partner countries increased by 23 percent, while non-oil imports from those countries grew by only 3 percent.

So the facts are clear that the recently implemented U.S. free trade agreements have benefited the United States. There is little doubt that the pending U.S. free trade agreements will do the same. As with existing U.S. free trade agreements, the free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and

South Korea will level the playing field for U.S. exporters. They will eliminate the significant disparity between tariffs imposed by Colombia, Panama, and South Korea on imports from the United States and tariffs that the United States applies im imports from those countries.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. exports to these countries may increase by up to $12 billion following implementation of these agreements. The U.S. International Trade Commission also estimates that these agreements, once implemented, could expand the U.S. GDP by over $14 billion.

Let's take a moment to review the unique benefits of each of these agreements. The South Korea FTA is in many ways the gold standard for trade agreements. South Korea's economy is worth over $1 trillion, and this agreement enables American workers and companies to take advantage of it.

The FTA incorporates state of the art intellectual property rights protections, significantly expands services sector market access, opens a large agriculture market, and offers new market access for American manufacturers. It adopts the most advanced regulatory, non-tariff barrier, and investment provisions of any FTA thus far and champions the rule of law which is so critical to an effective and fair rules-based trading relationship.

For my home State of Utah, South Korea is already an impressive market. South Korea imported more than $294 million of goods from Utah in 2009 alone. Implementation of the agreement will help boost Utah's exports even more, as over two-thirds of our exports to Korea will become duty-free immediately.

The sectors that will immediately benefit from the agreement's tariff cuts reflect Utah's economy, including computers and electronics, metals and ores, machinery, agriculture, and services.

But the benefits of this agreement for Utah go far beyond just reducing tariffs. By adopting the strongest intellectual property rights, regulatory reforms, investment protections, and transparency provisions, the South Korea FTA will ensure that our companies, farmers, and workers realize the full potential of the South Korean market. By protecting the ideas of America's entrepreneurs and providing a level playing field, U.S. workers and job creators stand to benefit significantly from implementation of this agreement.

Panama plays a unique and important role in international trade. The construction of the Panama Canal bridged East and West, allowing us to link economies across the globe. Today, Panama is building towards an even more interconnected future as it engages in an ambitious $5.25 billion construction project to broaden and deepen the canal. The Panama FTA will provide our companies and workers with access to this and other government procurement projects.

Panama is one of the fastest growing economies in Latin America, having experienced a decade of economic growth that has at times reached double digits. Panama's GDP is expected to more than double by 2020. Passing this agreement will provide significant new access for U.S. companies and workers to this growing market.

Bear in mind that today, 98 percent of Panama's goods enter the U.S. duty free. Our trade agreement turns this into a two-way street, ensuring that 87 percent of U.S. goods will enter Panama duty free immediately once we get this agreement implemented.

Panama is also one of the world's financial hubs and in recent years has taken giant leaps to increase its fiscal transparency. This financial industry underpins a services market worth over $20 billion. Our services firms will have guaranteed access to this market once we the FTA enters into force. Our farmers and ranchers will gain additional market access through tariff reductions and a fair and transparent, science-based regulatory environment which will enable them to sell more products to Panama's growing consumer class. The agreement will foster greater customs transparency, which will benefit both exporters and importers, including Utah companies who currently export almost $4.5 million per year in goods to Panama.

The Colombia agreement will also help our exporters. Our agreement with Colombia will transform a one-way preferential trade relationship into a two-way street, giving U.S. exporters fair access to a large and growing consumer market. Colombia's economy is the third largest in Central and South America. Colombia is also the third largest recipient of U.S. exports in Latin America. In fact, in 2010 the U.S. sold more products to Colombia—approximately $12 billion—than to Russia, Spain, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Chile, Peru, Indonesia, South Africa, Thailand, and the Philippines.

The agreement will affect the lives of farmers and workers across the United States in a positive way. A good example of the agreement's positive effects can be found in my home State of Utah where workers at AC Med, a Salt Lake City company that exports hospital beds to Colombia, will see tariffs of 20 percent eliminated immediately upon implementation of this agreement.

Implementation of this agreement will result in over 80 percent of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial products to Colombia becoming duty free immediately, with the remaining tariffs being phased out over 10 years.

The agreement will also provide significant new access to Colombia's $134 billion services market, will require the use of fair and transparent procurement procedures protecting United States companies in Colombia against discriminatory or unlawful treatment, protect intellectual property rights, and increase access for U.S. service providers, telecommunication companies, and agricultural exporters.

There are a number of reasons beyond the economic benefits to the United States economy to support our trade agreement with Colombia in particular. Colombia is a strategic ally of the United States. In a part of the world where the United States has too often lacked friends, Colombia is a sound and steadfast ally. In fact, I can think of no other countries in South America with which the United States has closer, stronger, and more positive relations.

While Colombia has a long democratic tradition, undemocratic forces have tried over the years to topple its government. Determined to keep these armed entities from destroying their democracy, Colombians fought for decades against these forces. Far too many brave men and women lost their lives and their livelihoods in this struggle.

The United States stood by the side of these Colombians, devoting significant resources in the fight against drug traffickers and narco-terrorists through Plan Colombia. The accomplishments of Plan Colombia have been significant, but there is more work to be done. Continued economic growth will be key to helping Colombia further solidify its democratic gains and strengthen the rule of law. This FTA can contribute to both our economies while strengthening democracy in Colombia and helping our friends.

Each of these agreements will enhance our economic competitiveness and provide new opportunities for our exporters. Our Nation has been denied the benefits of these agreements for long enough. As President Obama himself has said, it is time to put country before party, and support each of these important trade agreements. I urge all my colleagues to vote for each of these agreements.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

IRANIAN BOMBING PLOT

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I wish to speak on the trade bills, but first I would like to comment on the fact, as the Senator from Utah has reminded us, of the sacrifice a lot of young Americans are enduring.

One of the more difficult tasks that I have is to sign the letters of condolence to the families on the loss of one of their members anywhere in the world having to do with the armed services.

I might say that another major part of our protection of our national security is the young men and women we do not hear about, the men and women of the intelligence community all across the globe who likewise are protecting our national security interests, many times in direct coordination with the U.S. military. From time to time, we have casualties in the intelligence community as well.

I just want to again express my profound thanks and gratitude to those across the globe who are protecting the national security interests of our blessed country.

It is interesting because we just learned of a plot that was a threat to our security interests. Can you believe—a plot to assassinate a diplomat here in our Capital City of Washington; a plot that has intrigue like a B novel, that brings in the Mexican drug cartels; a plot that, according to the Attorney General, has been hatched by high levels of the Iranian Government. Now, the question is, who is in control in the Iranian Government? Is it the Supreme Leader? Is it the President, Ahmadi-Nejad? Is it what this plot was traced to, which is one arm of their governmental apparatus, the Revolutionary Guard, the Quds Force? It doesn't seem that Iran has its act together.

Even though we hear the protestations by the Iranian Ambassador at the United Nations that this is all a fabricated lie, this perpetrator has already confessed. According to the news reports, they are saying this plot included bomb attacks, plotting on the Saudi and Israeli Embassies here in Washington, and that is all here in our National Capital. It was, according to the Attorney General, conceived, sponsored, and directed from Iran. This is obviously a flagrant violation of international law.

An FBI informant, in the transcript the Justice Department released yesterday, asked the alleged plotter whether he was worried about innocent people being killed by a bombing in a restaurant where the supposed plot was to have taken place, where the Saudi Ambassador was going to be dining. In a reference to his Iranian superiors, this bomber said, ''They want that guy done'' even if ''a hundred go with him.'' The people of the United States have every reason to be outraged, to view this plot as an outright attempt to assault our Nation and our allies. I appreciate the Secretary of State calling for tougher sanctions. I want to hear what the administration is going to do, to make it very clear that these kinds of actions are not going to be tolerated.

I thank, again, the intelligence community, which is how I started my comments. I thank the intelligence community for what they are doing around planet Earth, day in and day out, gathering the information that protects us.

I want to comment on the matter at hand, the trade bills. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work in bringing to the table and shepherding these trade agreements through the Finance Committee and now here to the Senate. I came here to talk about what is good about these agreements and other people are coming here to talk about what is good, but all you hear is people want to blame the administration for something. Why don't we say something good?

Not only are these agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama critical to the U.S. economy, they are certainly critical to the economy of my State of Florida, and they send an important signal that the United States is not going to turn its back on economic engagement. These trade agreements are creating a level playing field for American companies by removing foreign barriers to U.S. exports and U.S. investment. And, by the way, some of us would not have let these trade agreements go forward unless there had been also the passage of the trade adjustment assistance, which is assistance for workers who might be displaced as a result of the trade bills, especially with regard to retraining.

The bottom line of these trade bills, then, means real jobs for struggling American workers. If there is any doubt with regard to an economy such as Florida's, there is no question that trade with Colombia, trade with Panama, trade in our agricultural sector with South Korea, is in the interests of my State. But this is also in the interests of the economy of the United States.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates American economic output will grow more from the U.S.-Korea agreement than from the last nine trade agreements of the United States combined; just from this one agreement with Korea, more economic output than the last nine agreements combined. The administration has taken extra steps to obtain these labor protections I talked about and further labor protections in the agreement with Colombia and the necessary tax transparency in the agreement with Panama. There is no question that free trade, if it is done right, creates jobs and opportunities. My State, Florida, is the launching point, the gateway to Latin America. Thousands of jobs in Florida depend on maintaining a vibrant commerce in the economic relations with our trading partners to the south. If we fail to move these agreements with Colombia and Panama, we are going to run the risk of losing these jobs.

I often say why does Florida reflect the Nation in a lot of our political mood? It is because the country has moved to Florida. But what is also reflective of Florida, Florida is increasingly a reflection of the Western Hemisphere because of all our ties into Central and South America and the Caribbean.

Under these agreements we are going to pass, emerging industries in Florida, such as aerospace, will be able to increase sales abroad while we are going to be able to hire more people here at home. In the agricultural sector, our ranchers, our farmers, our growers are going to significantly benefit from these agreements. Korea's 54-percent tariff on certain citrus products is going to be eliminated immediately or reduced to zero over 5 years. Do you know who that helps? It helps a specialty section of citrus called the Indian River region, the region this Senator grew up in, on the banks of the Indian River. The delicacy fruit of the world comes from the Indian River region. They are a huge exporter of fresh grapefruit, and especially that grapefruit going into Korea as a result of this agreement is going to be helpful.

The changes will create new export opportunities for the entire citrus industry and the tariffs on Florida beef exports to Korea will also come down. A lot of people do not know—the Presiding Officer being from New York, people they do not know that New York is a great agriculture State. A lot of folks do not know that Florida is not only how they would identify it—citrus—but it is a huge agriculture State. A lot of people do not realize how much the beef industry, the ranches this Senator grew up on, are so much a part of our economy, and among the 50 States Florida is a leader among beef ranches. This is all going to benefit as a result of this trade agreement with Korea.

The Colombia and Panama agreements include important protections to prevent Brazil, a major producer of orange juice, from shipping orange juice through these other countries to the United States.

These trading agreements are important for strategic reasons as well. Obviously Colombia is a key ally in the region. You have to give credit where credit is due to the Colombian Government, the previous government of President Uribe and the present government, for the close working relationship with the U.S. military, as well as our intelligence community. Give credit where credit is due, that the Government of Colombia pulled off that ruse that helped us bring our three American hostages, who were held by the FARC for years, out of the jungles. South Korea and Panama are strategic partners and share regional interests in security and economic stability.

With all of these trading partners, we are bound by our commitment to freedom and the rule of law, and these trade agreements are certainly going to help us solidify our converging aspirations.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, it is my understanding we are in morning business and I am allowed 10 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no restriction on floor time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Marvelous. Before the Senator from Florida leaves, let me say, from the banks of the Indian River to the prairies of Kansas and Dodge City, I know many people do not quite grasp the fact that there are a lot of cowboys in Florida. Obviously we have a lot of cowboys in Dodge City. From the wheat we want to export to Colombia, despite their trade agreements

with other countries, and you want to export citrus, beef—the same kind of thing—it just shows you from Kansas to Florida, we have similar interests. I thank the Senator for his comments and for his comments yesterday in the markup in the Finance Committee, and for his support. A lot of my remarks will be duplicative of his. That shows you, in regard to Florida and Kansas, we have a very strong mutual interest.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. And also in a bipartisan way that we are supporting this. Isn't that a wonderful term to suddenly throw around, ''bipartisanship,'' where we can come together, not as partisans, not as ideologs, but in the best interests of the country?

Mr. ROBERTS. I share the Senator's views, and I am very hopeful this will not be the last trade agreement we see. I, again, thank him for his comments and his work.

Madam President, some of my remarks will be duplicative of those of Senator HATCH and those of the Senator from Florida, as I have indicated, but on behalf of our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, service providers, I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of strong support for passing the pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and Korea.

I will be candid with you. I am not trying to be a ''bad news bear'' here, but I was not all convinced this day would ever come. But after learning that the President was sending the trade agreements to Congress, I think the word I thought of in my head was ''finally,'' maybe five ''finallys,'' because it has been 5 years that the U.S. trade agenda has been put on hold and frankly was hostage to demands by certain environmental groups, labor groups, and a rewrite of the trade adjustment assistance. But yesterday under the perseverance of the chairman, Senator BAUCUS, and others on the committee, finally the Senate Finance Committee did pass the trade agreements.

We had a markup. It was amidst protesters. It was not a unique situation, but one that the chairman handled very deftly. I call to the attention of Members in regard to their interests in the trade agreements, if they have any possible concerns, read the remarks by Senator HATCH and by the chairman, by Senator CRAPO, Senator WYDEN, and Senator KERRY—more especially Senator WYDEN. He got a little static from the audience, undeservedly.

The good news is, the pending trade agreements add up to $13 billion in additional exports and estimated 250,000 jobs.

A few big picture highlights: Right now, Korea imposes on average a 54-percent tariff for ag products. Upon implementation, two-thirds of current tariffs are immediately eliminated, with most zeroing out after a decade. For beef producers—and that is a big thing for Kansas—that means the 40-percent tariff on beef products will be phased out over 15 years. Around 75 percent of the ag and non-ag exports entering Colombia will be duty free upon implementation of the agreement. Duties on many other tariff lines will be phased out over a 5- to 10-year period.

For Panama, while reducing import duties is important, the expansion of the Panama Canal is not only an important project for U.S. bidders, it is geographically key for international commerce and transportation and security for the region.

But from the agricultural perspective, just for the aggies, the three pending trade agreements represent $2.5 billion upon full implementation; in regard to exports, more than 22,000 jobs. The Kansas Farm Bureau estimates the three agreements in total are expected to increase direct exports by $130 million for Kansas agricultural producers and an additional 1,150 jobs.

Finally, these trade agreements will help put American workers and exporters on a level playing field with our competitors and hopefully—a tough job—regain lost market share.

Let me emphasize that in the case of two of these agreements, Panama and Colombia, under normal conditions their exports already have duty-free access to the U.S. market. The pending agreements merely create a two-way trade and allow U.S. exporters the same treatment we already grant their countries. It makes one wonder what all the fuss was about. The 5-year fuss and delay hurt us, not them. That is the point I think everybody should finally discern.

Yet for 5 years, 3 years under this administration, the goalposts continued to shift and action was delayed indefinitely—2 years under the previous administration, basically with objections by the House of Representatives. As a consequence, U.S. producers and exporters lost market share to our competitors.

Let me give an example. Over the past 2 years, U.S. wheat producers have already lost market share to Argentina, which receives preferential trade treatment based on a regional trade agreement. In just 2 years, the U.S. share of the Colombian wheat market dropped by 30 percent. Including corn and soybeans, the lost market share jumps to 57 percent.

In addition, the largest food processor in Colombia—Nutresa—announced shortly after the Canada-Colombia trade agreement went into effect that they were sourcing all of their wheat purchases from Canada, accounting for half of all wheat imports. Previously, U.S. wheat growers were the largest suppliers of wheat in Colombia.

In July, the Korea-European Union trade agreement—not U.S. agreement, European Union agreement—went into effect, and within the first month, according to Korean Customs, European Union exports are up 34 percent. That is market share going to the European Union, not the United States. Notably, aerospace equipment increased a whopping 1,693 percent. We can see where that is going. Kansas is a major player in the aviation sector. We exported $2.7 billion in transportation equipment last year. Considering the European Union agreement, we can see what happens with lost market share.

Finally, with regard to the United States and future trade and trade in general, the United States must be trusted to stand by its word. Trust in our word in trade means everything. The dithering on these trade agreements has not been lost on our trading partners or the world at large. It is just not economic growth and job creation we have gambled with. All the back and forth and increased demands on our part calls into question our integrity. Is the United States a dependable partner and ally?

As the former chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I am quite familiar with who is a friend to the United States and who is not. In the 31 countries and 10 territories that make up the U.S. Southern Command, there is a growing sense of anti-Americanism. Venezuela's President, Hugo Chavez, is a perfect example.

A decade ago, Colombia was essentially a failed state suffering from a war waged between the guerilla groups and the paramilitary groups, the FARC and the ELN. Much has changed over 10 years under the leadership of then-President Uribe and continued by President Santos—an amazing job.

U.S. support during this time has helped establish a firm relationship and form a key ally in an increasingly hostile area. So strengthening our economic relationship just makes sense. The unjustified delay on our part is not only embarrassing, it has potentially damaged our credibility, in my view.

As Kansans and the rest of our Nation continue the slow and bumpy climb out of these tough economic times, we must do all we can to foster economic growth. Opening foreign markets to U.S. goods, services, and agriculture is an obvious and long overdue part of the solution. But we can't stop with passing these three trade agreements, pat ourselves on the back, and call it a day. I assure my colleagues that our foreign competitors are not stopping. In fact, it has been reported that there are approximately 100 trade agreements being negotiated right now, give or take, that do not include the United States—100.

We, the United States, are negotiating one, initiated in the waning days of the Bush administration—the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP. The TPP provides critical access to the ever-growing Asia-Pacific region and has the potential to include other countries later in the future.

While negotiations continue, there will soon come a point when talks will

stall because the U.S. negotiators' hands are tied without the protection of trade promotion authority or fast track, as some refer to it. Without TPA, negotiating countries will have little reason to negotiate much less make any difficult concessions until they know the United States is serious. Fast track provides the substance to these talks.

So why is TPA not a priority? I am concerned that as the administration quietly defers on seeking trade promotion authority, negotiators will be unable to negotiate, and trade will take a back seat once again. The signal may well be—and I hope this is not true—that these trade agreements will be the last under the current administration.

Now, let me get off the ''Bad News Bears'' stuff and the stubborn facts and the 5-year delay. Let me give credit to the President for finally—yes, finally—sending these trade agreements to Congress. But let's not become pacified with the long overdue action. In order to stay competitive with our foreign partners, we need to stay in the game.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I will speak for up to 10 minutes, but I would first defer to the Senator from Michigan for a unanimous consent agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after Senator VITTER has completed his statement I be recognized for up to 30 minutes, and that I may yield time during that 30-minute period to Senators on this side as we control the 30 minutes.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

ENERGY

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, today is the 1-year anniversary of President Obama and Secretary of Interior Salazar finally lifting the formal moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico following the BP disaster. But simply lifting the moratorium did not solve the problem. I return to the Senate floor today to again say that still, a year later, that problem is not solved because there is a continuing permit logjam.

It started with a de facto moratorium. Now there has just been a trickle of permits, and there is a continuing permit logjam that has dramatically shut down and slowed energy activity in the Gulf of Mexico. That must change.

Of course, this is vitally important for my State of Louisiana and the livelihoods of tens of thousands of my citizens. That must change for the good of the country as well, for our economic well-being and to increase our revenues to address deficit and debt.

As we talk about jobs and various jobs bills and jobs proposals, we must focus on the domestic energy sector, and we must change the situation. We must reverse this virtual shutdown of the gulf for the good of the country, and I hope we do that.

To that end, I joined Congressman JEFF LANDRY yesterday in a meeting with Obama Director Michael Bromwich and other high-ranking administration officials who have to do with this very permitting and leasing process. We wanted to sit down with these officials in the Obama administration to again make this very point. The formal moratorium was lifted a year ago, but the problem persists, and we need to do better. We need to issue permits at a much more healthy pace. We need to get that important domestic energy activity back up and running in the Gulf of Mexico.

Recently, there was an independent study by HIS Global Insight which put some hard numbers on this situation. That study said leasing in the Gulf of Mexico is down about 65 percent from pre-formal moratorium levels. It also pointed out that the waiting line of people and companies to get permits has almost doubled. It has increased 90 percent.

So what does that mean? That means far less activity in the gulf, far less energy activity for the country, and far fewer jobs—jobs we need now more than ever in this horrible economy.

Let me give some other relevant numbers. As of the end of September—just a few weeks ago—there were 21 floating rigs in the Gulf of Mexico, of which about 18 are currently drilling wells. That compares, premoratorium, to 33 floating rigs with 29 drilling wells at that time. That is a 37-percent drop in both the number of rigs and those drilling.

Since the moratorium began, 11 rigs have left the Gulf of Mexico. Only one of these has returned. In addition, three more are sitting idle. Seven of these rigs have left to go to African countries, including Egypt, Nigeria, Liberia, and the Republic of Congo. Three have gone to South America, mostly to Brazil and French Guiana; and the remaining rig was mobilized to Vietnam. This all translates to about 60 wells lost based on the original contract terms for these rigs.

The loss of these rigs isn't just loss of equipment; it is loss of important energy and economic activity, and it is loss of jobs. It is lost spending of $6.3 billion and an annual loss of direct employment of 11,500 jobs over just 2 years. When we look at indirect employment, it is a multiplier that brings that lost job figure to way more than that.

Again, it started with the formal moratorium. The formal moratorium was lifted 1 year ago today, but the problem persists because there was a de facto moratorium, and there is still a permit logjam.

Another example of this enormous problem isn't just permitting. Another example is lease activity by the administration. Again, that is completely separate and apart from permitting. But the dramatic decline in lease sales, lease activity that the administration is putting out, shows the same problem mindset. What do I mean?

Well, in the last fiscal year, the administration had no new lease activity—zero, nothing, nada. What that means is—just a few years ago the income to the Federal Government from lease sales was almost $10 billion, and that has fallen like a rock through the floor and is now zero. That is another indicator of a problem mindset in this administration, leading to a dramatic economic slowdown. We need to reverse this. We need to do better for the economy, for jobs, and for that important revenue it brings to the Federal Government which could lower deficit and debt.

So as we talk about the need to create good American jobs, as we also talk about the need to grapple with our deficit and debt situation and dramatically lower deficit and debt, as we talk about the need for revenue to be part of that picture, domestic energy has to be part of the solution, and it can be a big and productive part of the solution to both of those huge problems—the need to create good American jobs and the need to lower deficit and debt. If we aggressively pursue domestic energy production, starting in the gulf, fully reopening the gulf, getting the permit process to a pace at least equal to preformal moratorium levels, get lease activity back online, and then expand to other areas of our resources off the Atlantic, Pacific, offshore Alaska—we have enormous resources that are now off-limits to energy production—if we do that, we can grow jobs, we can grow Federal revenue and lessen deficit and debt, and we can help attack both of those major economic problems for the country.

Again, yesterday, I met, along with Congressman LANDRY, with Director Bromwich to make those points, to give specific examples of what we can be doing to go down that path in favor of good American jobs and lowering the deficit and debt. I hope it made a difference. Ultimately, only time will tell. But this needs to be part of our overall economic approach. This needs to be part of our deficit and debt reduction approach, and it can make a major contribution to solving both of these problems.

I hope in a bipartisan way we will do that, and urge that in the Senate, and the administration will break through the negative mindset they have had for several years and do that in an aggressive way. Our country needs it. Our workers need it. We need it as taxpayers to lower the deficit and debt, and this would be a very productive way forward.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, more than 14 million Americans are without work. The American Jobs Act would help up to 2 million Americans get work or keep their jobs. It would prevent the layoffs of hundreds of thousands of teachers, police, firefighters, and other first responders. The jobs bill would give tax cuts to millions of small businesses. It would give incentives to those businesses to hire new workers. The American Jobs Act would provide a payroll tax cut to millions of American families. It would help our returning veterans find jobs. The American Jobs Act would put thousands of construction workers on the job repairing crumbling schools, building and repairing roads and bridges.

The chief economist for Moody's, Mark Zandi, estimates that this legislation would add 2 percentage points to economic growth and would reduce the unemployment rate by up to 1 full percentage point. Economists surveyed by Bloomberg believe this bill ''would help avoid a return to recession.'' Those are their words. That is what the majority of our economists say from both sides of the aisle, across the political spectrum.

How does it do this? The bill uses ideas that both Democrats and Republicans have supported in the past. It would not add a dime to the Federal deficit, and its provisions are overwhelmingly popular with the American people, according to all of the public opinion polls.

We should be debating this bill. We should be offering amendments, as the majority leader said we would be doing. We should be improving it. We should be preparing to vote on it so millions of American working families can get the relief they need. We should do this so we can demonstrate to our constituents and to the world that we will come together to act in the face of crisis. Yet here we are roadblocked again. Why are we roadblocked? Because our Republican colleagues last night voted not to allow us to even begin to debate legislation that has ideas so many of them have supported in the past.

Senate Republicans are once again walking down the filibuster road. The vote last night was not a vote on the American Jobs Act. Because the filibuster rules of the Senate require 60 votes, Senate Republicans last night were able to prevent the Senate from proceeding to a bill addressing the jobs crisis. We all know the rules of the Senate give the minority the power to stop us from holding this debate, but exercising that power, as they did last night, is profoundly mistaken. What they are doing when they do that is they are using a filibuster to prevent the Senate from even debating this bill. What that does in turn is elevate partisan interests over the good of the country.

A number of us are going to be speaking today because we are deeply concerned—concerned that Republicans once again have signaled to an anxious and skeptical nation that we cannot address a great challenge of the day. We are deeply concerned that the single most important need in this country—jobs—will not be debated and remedies will not be sought because the Republicans once again are walking down the filibuster road.

If Republicans oppose this bill, which is their right, vote against it. Better yet, if Republicans oppose this approach, for heaven's sake, offer an alternative jobs bill, offer a substitute, an alternative, something where the American public can compare what is in our jobs bill with what Republicans presumably favor. They oppose ours without saying what they favor, except vague references to less regulation. Everybody is in favor of eliminating wasteful regulations, but nobody believes you can do serious deficit reduction or create serious numbers of jobs by just freezing regulation.

By the way, the small business community does not believe that. The surveys which were taken of small businesspeople by their own organizations say the biggest problem small business has is not regulation, and it is not taxes; it is a lack of demand. This bill helps to create demand by putting dollars into the pockets of our workers. There is a tax cut here which is very important to help stimulate that demand.

So what is coming across to the American public loudly and clearly these days is that the Democrats here in the Senate have an alternative. The Republicans are filibustering that alternative without offering one of their own. Now, the majority could seek to break this filibuster by forcing the Republicans to sustain the filibuster and to try to wear them down. That process, however, at this time in this Congress is not a practical approach because it takes weeks or even months to break a filibuster. It is just simply too late in the session for us to practically be able to do that. And, by the way, the American people should not have to wait that long in any event for us to act.

But there is another way to overcome a filibuster. It is not just forcing the filibusterers to filibuster—that is one way to do it; it takes usually months in order to succeed, but it would dramatize where the obstruction is—but the other way to overcome a filibuster is for public opinion to wear down the Republican wall of obstruction. That is probably the only practical path available for overcoming this filibuster at this time of this Congress.

I hope the President will use his bully pulpit to make clear to the American people that it is the obstructionism of filibustering Republicans that prevents us from taking action on a jobs bill. The President has very effectively gone around the country supporting his jobs bill. I commend him for doing that. But what we need him now to do is to take that bully pulpit, which is unique to the President and to the Presidency, and use that bully pulpit to make it clear to the American people that filibustering Republicans are obstructing us from even taking up a jobs bill.

The majority leader has made it clear that this is open to amendment. If the Republicans have a better idea, they can offer a substitute. But what is going on here now is that, without any alternative of their own, they are preventing us from addressing the major issue of this country.

The Republican leader last night repeatedly asked unanimous consent to send this bill back to the calendar if we did not get 60 votes to proceed. The Republican leader wants this bill to go away. Well, this jobs bill is not going to go away. It should not go away. And the Republican leader is engaging in wishful thinking if he believes that because he and his colleagues on that side of the aisle are filibustering a jobs bill, that means the filibuster is going to succeed and this bill is simply going to be returned to the calendar.

The majority leader has said he is going to try again. Senator REID said specifically he is going to bring this bill back again by using his rights, after he made it clear last night he is going to reconsider this bill. He has the right to do that because of the way in which he voted last night. He voted with the prevailing side at the end in order that he could reconsider this bill—a technical way that he could. He already had expressed his view very strongly supporting cloture, but he also, in order to bring this bill back under the same cloture motion, then filed a motion to reconsider as a Member of the prevailing side at the end, after he switched his vote so he could do so.

I commend the majority leader. I commend him for taking that action. I commend him for signaling to the American people, to the media, to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle that he is going to try again. We are not simply going to fold our tent and go away. The majority leader is going to move to reconsider at a time he believes is appropriate, and then there will be another effort to break a Republican filibuster so we can at least debate this critically important legislation.

Madam President, I am going to read from an analysis on the jobs plan by Mark Zandi that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD. Mark Zandi is an economist at Moody's.

[From Economy.com, Sept. 9, 2011]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OBAMA JOBS PLAN

(By Mark Zandi)

President Obama's jobs proposal would help stabilize confidence and keep the U.S. from sliding back into recession.

The plan would add 2 percentage points to GDP growth next year, add 1.9 million jobs, and cut the unemployment rate by a percentage point.

The plan would cost abut $450 billion, about $250 billion in tax cuts and $200 billion in spending increases.

Many of the president's proposals are unlikely to pass Congress, but the most important have a chance of winning bipartisan support.

President Obama's much-anticipated jobs plan is a laudable effort to support the struggling economy. The plan would go a long way toward stabilizing confidence, forestalling another recession, and jump-starting a self-sustaining economic expansion. If fully implemented, the Obama jobs plan would increase real GDP growth in 2012 by 2 percentage points, add 1.9 million jobs, and reduce the unemployment rate by a full percentage point, compared with current fiscal policy.

The president's plan includes a wide range of temporary tax cuts and spending increases. Among its widely anticipated provisions are one-year extensions of this year's employee payroll tax holiday and the full expensing of business investment. Surprisingly, the plan would also increase the size of the temporary payroll tax cut and creatively expand it to employers. The president would also help state and local governments pay teacher and first-responder salaries, boost funding for unemployment insurance while meaningfully reforming the Ul system, and launch several infrastructure initiatives.

The plan has its drawbacks. It isn't cheap, costing taxpayers an estimated $450 billion. Of that, approximately $250 billion takes the form of tax cuts, while another $200 billion comes through spending increases. The president proposes paying for his plan with additional deficit reduction beginning in fiscal 2014, but he does not explicitly say how this is to be accomplished. The plan also results in weaker growth in 2013, as most of the tax cuts and spending increases are temporary and fade during the year. Presumably the economy will be strong enough to handle it by then, but that is far from certain. Moreover, the plan fails to address the ongoing foreclosure crisis and housing slump, major impediments to the recovery.

In the current political environment, it is less than likely that most of the president's plan will pass Congress. Our current baseline outlook assumes that the payroll tax holiday for employees is extended for only one more year. There is a fighting chance that broader payroll tax cuts for employees and employers could become law, but the odds aren't high enough at this time to change our baseline assumptions.

WHY MORE SUPPORT IS CRITICAL

There are compelling reasons why the Obama administration and Congress should provide more fiscal support to the economy. Most obviously, the U.S. is struggling to avoid recession as confidence flags. To complicate matters, federal fiscal policy is quickly becoming a significant drag on growth; state and local governments are already a weight. The Federal Reserve has resumed easing monetary policy, but with interest rates near zero, the Fed cannot lift the economy by itself. Moreover, with the government's borrowing costs as low as they have ever been and no indication that public borrowing is crowding out private activity, there is ample room to fund more near-term fiscal support, particularly if it is paid for with additional long-term deficit reduction.

The U.S. economy is on the cusp of another recession. Businesses have stopped hiring and households are spending more tentatively. Bankers are re-evaluating whether it makes sense to continue easing credit standards and wondering if instead they should be battening down the hatches again. Declining stock prices and widening credit spreads suggest investors are also losing faith.

CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Recession risks are uncomfortably high largely because confidence is low. The economy has fundamental problems, including the foreclosure crisis, a surfeit of residential and commercial real estate, and yawning government deficits. But even more serious is that investors, consumers and businesses appear shell-shocked by recent events.

Confidence normally reflects economic conditions; it does not shape them. Consumer sentiment falls when unemployment, gasoline prices or inflation rises, but this has little impact on consumer spending. Yet at times, particularly during economic turning points, cause and effect can shift. Sentiment can be so harmed that businesses, consumers and investors freeze up, turning a gloomy outlook into a self-fulfilling prophecy. This is one of those times.

The collective psyche was already very fragile coming out of the Great Recession. The dramatic loss of millions of jobs and double-digit unemployment have been extraordinarily difficult to bear. Businesses have also struggled with a flood of major policy initiatives from Washington, led by healthcare and financial regulatory reform. The lengthy political battle over raising the nation's debt ceiling and Standard & Poor's downgrade of U.S. debt eviscerated what confidence remained. While the loss of S&P's AAA rating has little real significance—Treasury yields have fallen since the downgrade—it unnerved investors, judging by the plunge in stock prices. Consumer and small-business confidence gauges are as low as they have been since the Great Recession.

Consumers and businesses appear frozen in place. They are not yet pulling back—that would mean recession—but a loss of faith in the economy can quickly become self-fulfilling. Whether the current crisis of confidence produces a double-dip recession depends critically on how policymakers respond. Washington must act aggressively to stabilize sentiment and lift flagging expectations.

If no changes are made to current federal fiscal policy, the economic impact of that policy will shift from acting as a small drag this year to subtracting 1.7 percentage points from real GDP growth in 2012. For context, at the peak of the federal fiscal stimulus in 2009, federal policy added 2.6 percentage points to real GDP growth. Yet as the impact of federal policy shifts from a stimulus to restraint, the private sector must grow faster for the economy to simply grow at its potential. In 2012 that potential is estimated at 2.7%; to reach it, private sector GDP would need to grow well above 4%. That seems unlikely given the weak pace of recovery.

The biggest drag next year under current federal policy comes from the scheduled expiration of two stimulus measures at the end of 2011: the current 2% employee payroll tax holiday and the emergency unemployment insurance program. Not extending the programs will shave 0.9 percentage point off 2012 real GDP growth and cost the economy some 750,000 jobs. The end of other fiscal stimulus measures enacted in 2009 will further reduce economic growth.

State and local government actions are already producing serious drags on the economy. Spending cuts and tax increases will shave an estimated 0.5 percentage point from real GDP growth this year and almost as much in 2012. The impact can be seen clearly in the job market. State and local governments have cut close to 700,000 jobs since their employment peaked three years ago and are continuing to shed workers at a stunning rate, averaging nearly 40,000 per month. Many of those losing their jobs are middle-income teachers, police, and other first responders.

The need for more federal fiscal support is increasing as the Federal Reserve's ability to respond to the weak economy diminishes. The Fed recently took a bold step by stating its intention to keep short-term interest rates near zero until mid–2013. This has brought down long-term interest rates and provided some support to stock prices. The Fed can provide even more help by extending the maturity of the Treasury bonds it owns and by purchasing more long-term bonds through another round of quantitative easing. But these ideas are not without problems, chiefly that they are becoming less effective in stimulating the economy.

THE FED CAN'T DO IT ALONE

Acknowledging this in his recent Jackson Hole speech, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke focused attention on fiscal policymakers. Bernanke explained that Congress and the Obama administration must follow through on plans for long-term deficit reduction but also must provide additional near-term support to the economy. Monetary policy alone may not be able to prevent another recession.

Additional fiscal help for the economy wouldn't be desirable or even possible if the federal government's debt costs were rising or if government borrowing were tightening credit for households and businesses. But there is no evidence that such crowding out is occurring. Ten-year Treasury yields have fallen below 2%, a near record. This is in part because of the Fed's actions, but the U.S. also remains the global economy's safe haven. Whenever there is a problem anywhere, the investment of choice is a Treasury bond—witness the current flight to Treasuries sparked by financial turmoil in Europe. Borrowing costs for households and businesses also remain extraordinarily low, with fixed mortgage rates closing in on a record low of 4% and Baa corporate bond yields (the lowest investment grade) nearing a 50-year low below 5.5%.

ASSESSING THE PLAN'S COMPONENTS

The president's jobs plan includes a wide range of temporary tax cuts and spending increases. The plan would cost close to $450 billion over 10 years, with slightly more than $250 billion coming from tax cuts and $200 billion from spending increases. For context, the plan's cost is equal to about 3% of current GDP and just over half the $825 billion ultimate price tag for the 2009 Recovery Act.

The largest tax cuts include an extension and expansion of the payroll tax holiday for employees and a creative new payroll tax holiday for employers. Employers would be able to cut their payroll taxes in half on up to $5 million in taxable wages annually. Small businesses, many of whom are cash-strapped, would enjoy a sizable albeit temporary boost in their cashflow. Businesses will also pay no additional taxes on any wages that rise from the year before, up to $50 million. This would give firms a substantive incentive to increase hiring and should result in a larger economic bang for the buck—additional GDP per tax dollar—than previous job tax credits such as last year's HIRE Act.

The president has also proposed a tax credit for businesses that hire people unemployed longer than six months—a group that, astonishingly, includes half the jobless. The longer these workers remain unemployed, the harder finding work becomes as their skills and marketability erode. Structural unemployment thus rises as a long-term threat; it appears to have already risen from around 5% before the Great Recession to closer to 5.5% currently.

DOING INFRASTRUCTURE THE RIGHT WAY

The Obama plan's most significant spending increases, totaling more than $100 billion, are for infrastructure. Such development has a large bang for the buck, particularly now, when there are so many unemployed construction workers. It can also help remote and hard-pressed regional economies and produces long-lasting economic benefits. Such projects are difficult to start quickly—''shovel ready'' is in most cases a misnomer—but since unemployment is sure to be a problem for years, this does not seem a significant drawback in the current context.

More serious concerns are the expense of infrastructure projects and their often political rather than economic motivation. A creative way to address these concerns is through an infrastructure bank—a government entity with a federal endowment, able to provide loans and guarantees to jump-start private projects. These might include toll roads or user-supported energy facilities or airports. Private investors and developers would determine which projects to pursue based on what works financially rather than politically. The infrastructure bank would take time to launch, however, and thus would not produce quick benefits.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORMS

The president also proposes more funding for unemployment insurance, but in combination with some much-needed reforms to the UI system. One idea involves scaling up a Georgia program that places unemployed workers at companies voluntarily for up to eight weeks at no charge to the businesses. Along with their unemployment benefits, workers receive a small stipend for transportation and other expenses, training, and a tryout with the employer that could lead to a permanent job. Employers can potentially abuse the program by recycling unemployed workers, but the program seems to have had some success since it began in 2003.

Another idea to reform UI is to more broadly adopt ''work share'' as an alternative to temporary layoffs and furloughs. Instead of laying off workers in response to a temporary slowdown in demand, employers reduce workers' hours and wages across a department, business unit, or the entire company. The government then provides partial unemployment insurance benefits to make up for a portion of the lost wages. Work share exists in 17 states and several countries overseas, including Germany, where it is credited for contributing to a relatively strong recovery.

SAVING VITAL PUBLIC JOBS

Like the temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits, work share has a large bang for the buck, since distressed workers are likely to quickly spend any aid they receive. Work share's economic effectiveness even exceeds that of straight UI benefits, because it reduces both the financial and psychological costs of layoffs. Work share can particularly help firms that expect reductions to be temporary, by reducing their costs for severance, rehiring and training.

Hard-pressed state and local governments would also receive additional relief under the president's plan. While state governments appear to be working through their near-term budget problems, local governments are still struggling with flagging property tax revenues. The biggest casualties are teachers and first responders, and Obama's plan would help with their salaries through the end of the 2013 school year.

FROM A HEADWIND TO A TAILWIND

The president's plan would provide a meaningful boost to the economy and job market in 2012. Compared with current fiscal policy, the plan adds 2 percentage points to real GDP growth, adds 1.9 million payroll jobs, and reduces unemployment by a percentage point. Federal fiscal policy would go from being a powerful headwind next year to a modest tailwind.

Of the 1.9 million jobs added in 2012 under the president's plan, the largest contributor would be the extended payroll tax holiday for employees, which adds approximately 750,000 jobs. The payroll tax holiday for employers is responsible for adding 300,000 jobs, although this may be understated; quantifying the impact of this proposal is difficult. Infrastructure spending adds 400,000 jobs—275,000 jobs are due to additional unemployment insurance funding and 135,000 jobs result from more aid to state and local governments.

One potential pitfall of the president's plan is that the boost to growth and jobs fades quickly in 2013. Additional infrastructure spending and aid to state and local governments continue to support growth, but the benefits of the tax cuts peter out. The hopeful assumption is that the private sector will be able to hold up as government support abates. While reasonable, it is important to acknowledge that policymakers hoped for the same thing last year when they passed the one-year payroll tax holiday and extended emergency unemployment insurance through 2011.

ALSO NEEDED: HELP FOR HOUSING

The president's plan is large, but in some key respects it is not complete. Most notably, it does not directly address the foreclosure crisis and housing slump, save for some added funding for neighborhood stabilization. The President did mention in his speech that he would be working with the FHFA (Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's regulator) to facilitate more mortgage refinancing; this would be a significant plus for housing and the broader economy if he is able to break the logjam in refinancing activity.

With some 3.5 million first-mortgage loans in or near foreclosure and more house price declines likely, it is hard to be enthusiastic about the recovery's prospects. A house is most Americans' most important asset; many small-business owners use their homes as collateral for business credit, and local governments rely on property tax revenues tied to housing values.

Most worrisome is the risk that housing will resume the vicious cycle seen at the depths of the last recession, when falling prices pushed more homeowners under water—their loans exceeded their homes' market values—causing more defaults, more distress sales, and even lower prices. That cycle was broken only by unprecedented monetary and fiscal policy support.

OTHER CRITICISMS

The president's plan will be criticized for many other reasons. Some will argue that he should have proposed massive public works, like the Depression-era WPA. Others will say the plan should have included broader reforms to corporate taxes or even immigration. While these suggestions may have merit as policies, they seem like steps too far given what lawmakers need to do and how quickly they need to do it.

Given the current political environment, it is unlikely that much of what the president has proposed will become law, but nearly all the proposals have some bipartisan support. An extension of the current payroll tax holiday for employees seems most likely to pass and is included in the Moody's Analytics baseline economic outlook. The proposed expansion of the employee tax holiday and the new payroll tax holiday for employers are also possible. The president's spending initiatives, while worthwhile, seem like longer shots.

POLICYMAKERS NEED TO WORK FAST

The risk of a new economic downturn is as high as it has been since the Great Recession ended more than two years ago. A string of unfortunate shocks and a crisis of confidence are to blame. Surging gasoline and food prices and fallout from the Japanese earthquake hurt badly in the spring; more recently, the debt-ceiling drama, a revived European debt crisis, and the S&P downgrade have been especially disconcerting. Confidence, already fragile after the nightmare of the Great Recession and Washington's heated policy debates, was severely undermined.

Whether the loss of faith in our economy results in another recession critically depends on how policymakers respond. Whether they will succeed in shoring up confidence is a difficult call. The odds of a renewed recession over the next 12 months are 40%, and they could go higher given the current turmoil in financial markets. The old adage that the stock market has predicted nine of the last five recessions is apt, but the recent free fall is disconcerting. Markets and the economy seem one shock away from dangerously unraveling. Policymakers must work quickly and decisively.

Mr. LEVIN. This is what Mark Zandi said about the President's job proposal:

[It] would help stabilize confidence and keep the U.S. from sliding back into recession.

[It] would add 2 percentage points to GDP growth next year, add 1.9 million jobs, and cut the unemployment rate by a percentage point.

The plan would cost about $450 billion, about $250 billion in tax cuts and $200 billion in spending increases.

Many of the president's proposals [may be] unlikely to pass Congress, but the most important have a chance of winning bipartisan support.

They deserve bipartisan support. Again, most of these proposals have been made by Republicans, not just by Democrats. But even if we cannot get the Republicans to support the proposal—because at least on the spending side it is the President's proposal; on the revenue side, it is now a Democratic Senate proposal in terms of the millionaires' surcharge—but if the Republicans will not vote for it, if they will not offer a substitute, an alternative of their own, if they will not seek to amend it to improve it, for heaven's sake, allow us to take up this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I say thank you to Senator LEVIN.

Yes, I try to explain this. I was on some radio calls this morning with stations in Dayton and Cincinnati and all over the State, and the questions they

asked were just that: Wait a minute, OK, I understand people being against a proposal, but why would the leader of one political party say about a jobs bill—when unemployment is this high in the Senator's State and my State and millions and millions of Americans want jobs and cannot find them—why would they say: Let's not even put it on the floor for discussion.

The rules of this place are peculiar, obviously, but why would you say: I am not even willing to bring it up for a vote. I am not even willing to debate it. I am not even willing to set the stage so we can discuss it.

People do not want to hear about process. I understand that. But people do want us to do something about jobs. The first step is, you have a debate—you bring the bill forward, you have a debate, you offer amendments, and then you come up with something.

Last night, as you recall, I say to Senator LEVIN, right before the jobs bill vote, we had a huge bipartisan vote, with 63 votes for the China currency bill. To do what? I know the Senator has advocated for years that we have a level playing field in our dealings with China so that so many Chinese companies do not get an advantage selling here and so that so many Michigan and Ohio companies do not get a disadvantage—a currency tax; a tariff, if you will—when our companies in Michigan and Ohio try to sell into China.

So I guess I am curious as to the Senator's thoughts on why we would not even set up ourselves—why Republicans would not want to at least come together and say, let's debate it. Then maybe we can make some interesting amendments we can come together on, like we came together bipartisanly just 24 hours ago—less than that—fewer than 24 hours ago, to come up with a real jobs bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I wish there was an explanation which was satisfactory or an answer which was satisfactory to Senator BROWN's question. I am afraid the only answer I can come up with is because this started off as President Obama's job bill. It has been changed. Now we have a different source of funding for it. We have a millionaire's surcharge in there which will fund these critically important programs, these job-creation programs.

I cannot think of any other reason, other than they think it will simply go away. What is an explanation? Maybe it was in the unanimous consent request of the Republican leader last night: I ask unanimous consent that this bill not be amendable—no amendments would be in order under his unanimous consent proposal—and then when it does not get 60 votes, which he knew it would not get, that it be immediately returned to the calendar.

That is what he asked twice last night—immediately be returned to the calendar. The Republican leader wants this bill to go away. It cannot go away. It should not go away. It will not go away. The majority leader has already said he is going to move to reconsider the vote last night. I expressed the hope, in my remarks, that the President use his bully pulpit not just to support the jobs bill, which is critically important—he is doing a good job as he goes around the country—but to make it clear where the obstruction is; that the Republicans will not allow us to consider a jobs bill, amend it if they want to try, substitute their own if they have one, which so far they do not. But let us debate this bill. I hope the bully pulpit of the President is used, not just to support a jobs bill, which is so critically important, but to point out where the obstruction is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN.) The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to join Chairman LEVIN in his plea that we be allowed to consider this legislation. The greatest crisis we face in the United States, for families all across the country, is jobs. The President has proposed a bill that is going to help us begin to deal with that job crisis, and he proposed a way to pay for it. An overwhelming portion of the country, the polling is definite, supports the President's proposal and our proposal, as modified by Senator REID, to have a surcharge on individuals making over $1 million.

So we have a bill that responds to the greatest need, that is paid for by doing what the American people overwhelmingly want us to do, and we cannot get it on the floor for debate, for amendment, and finally for passage. We are not able to respond to this crisis because we have been frustrated by our colleagues who refuse to let us take up the bill. The American people are demanding we act—the message is being sent far and wide in many different mediums—and we get it directly from home, and it is: Do something. It might not be perfect. It might not solve the problem immediately. But do something. Do not just stop debate, stop progress, stop discussion on the issues that are so critical to this country.

Again, we are in a serious jobs crisis. We have seen the latest job report showing some sort of improvement but not enough, and we have to do more. If we do not pass the American Jobs Act, then we are going to be in a situation where—and this is one of the great ironies—the deficit will get worse, not better. One of the most direct ways to begin to deal with the deficit is to put people to work so they can resume their participation in the economic life of this country and contribute not only to their own well-being and that of their family but the growth of the country, and the robustness of our economy. In that way, we can address the deficit.

So this refusal to act does not even serve the goal of deficit reduction. Again, I wish to emphasize this: We have a bill that has measures in it that are proven, that are bipartisan, that will put people to work, and that are fully paid for by a tax that is overwhelmingly supported by the American people. If we do not act, the jobs crisis and our deficit will persist.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Michigan for bringing us together and making the point, as clearly as we can make it, that last night we had a chance to launch maybe the most important single issue in debate that we can consider in the Senate. We had a chance to bring both parties to the floor of the Senate and ask for the best ideas each of us has to move the economy forward.

The President has a plan. I think it is a good one. I support the plan. I think it is a reasonable way to move this economy forward and put people to work. But it is the nature of the legislative process that some will disagree with one aspect of it, some with others, and Members may have their own ideas to bring to the floor. That is what this branch of government is all about, that we have this debate, an open debate, Democrats and Republicans on the floor, and at the end of the day vote on something to move forward with together.

But last night not one single Republican Senator would join us in an effort to bring this matter to a debate on the floor. In fact, the Senator from Michigan has made the point over and over that the Republican filibuster requiring 60 votes to break the filibuster is stopping the majority from acting in the Senate on the issue of creating jobs—a Republican filibuster. That is problematic. It is troublesome. It is frustrating.

Because I am sure in Michigan, where they have been wracked for years now with unemployment and businesses struggling—we have similar problems in Illinois, 14 million Americans unemployed across the board. Take a look at what the Senator from Kentucky comes and tells us every day as Republican leader. He tells us that one of the big problems with this bill, as he sees it, is it is paid for. He does not like the fact that President Obama has paid for it and certainly does not like the way he paid for it. The way he paid for it is to impose a surtax of 5.6 percent on people making more than $1 million a year. That generates enough revenue, over a 10-year period of time, that we can give a payroll tax cut to working families across America, and we can provide tax incentives for businesses to hire unemployed veterans and people who have been out of work for a long time.

The money generated from that millionaire's tax is going to end up allowing us to save, in my State, 14,000 teacher, firefighter, and policemen jobs that otherwise would be lost. It will allow us to put money into modernizing our schools—which we need to do

in Illinois and across the country, in Minnesota, Michigan, in Montana and every State and to build the basic infrastructure that America needs to be successful. Senator MCCONNELL has said over and over, he will not agree to this tax hike.

Let's take a look at what middle-income Americans are paying as an effective Federal tax rate as opposed to the wealthiest in America, the point made over and over by President Obama and a point worth repeating today. Middle-class families in America, people making between $50,000 and $75,000 a year have an effective Federal tax rate of 14.9 percent. The wealthiest 1 percent, those making over $1 million a year, their effective Federal tax rate, 12 percent; 14.9 percent for middle-class families, working families; 12 percent for the wealthiest. What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong with it is that working families across America struggle paycheck to paycheck, and they are paying a higher Federal tax rate than the wealthiest people in America.

I think everyone in America has to sacrifice. Now I know, some of the most vulnerable in America cannot. Physically, mentally they cannot rise to this challenge. But the rest of us, for goodness' sake, have to be prepared to sacrifice. Working families are already sacrificing, living paycheck to paycheck. To ask the wealthiest people in America, who are comfortable in this country because of the greatness of our economy, this open and transparent system, this rule of law we have, to ask them to pay a little more so America can move forward is not unreasonable.

I would say this: At the end of the day, when the economy picks up and moves forward, and it will, the folks in the highest income categories are going to do quite well. It is the bottom line. They are going to do well. The ones I have run into, the ones I have talked to who are fortunate enough to be in this category—I know a few of them—say: This is not unreasonable, Senator. Why do the Republicans oppose $1 in additional taxes to get the American economy moving forward?

But that, of course, is the reason the Senate Republicans, not a single one of them, would support bringing this jobs bill from the President to the floor. A second reason is fairly obvious. It is the President's plan. For many of them they are in full campaign mode now. They do not want to give this President anything that looks like a victory. So they are not going to vote for anything that has his name on it. In fact, they will oppose things which historically they have supported. When President Bush came forward with his own stimulus plan to create jobs, supported by the Republicans, it had a payroll tax cut in it—a payroll tax cut for working families. It also had tax breaks for businesses to hire the unemployed. That is what President Obama proposes, and now the Republicans have said: Oh, we liked it as a Bush plan. We do not like it as an Obama plan. What is the difference? The name.

I do not think the American people are going to cut us any slack if they believe we are spending more time designing bumper stickers for next year's election than we are in designing an economy that moves this country forward. I think they expect us—they demand of us—that we respond to this. When the Republicans impose a filibuster on President Obama's jobs act it is wrong. Let us have, as Senator REID asked for last night, let us have the motion to proceed, let's get on this matter, and let's do it this week.

I wish to say a word as well—Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor frequently and says: Whoa. There is a big jobs bill coming up, the trade agreements. Listen, trade agreements can expand opportunity for the sale of goods and services. That is a fact. But when we look at the scheme of things and look at these trade agreements, the proposal I have read says the South Korea Trade Agreement would expand U.S. exports by $10 to $11 billion and support up to 70,000 jobs. That is a lot of money and a lot of jobs, except when we look at the universe—$10 to $11 billion in additional exports to Korea at a time when we have a $15 trillion economy. Good but not good enough. We need to make sure we are expanding jobs at a greater rate to get people back to work. The other two trade agreements are much smaller in comparison. So to argue that these trade agreements are the engine that will pull us out of the ditch and drive the economy forward is to completely overstate the positive impact which they might have.

I would say to my friends on the Republican side, do not believe that voting for a trade agreement that generates $10 billion more in exports and 70,000 jobs will solve the problems we face in America.

Yesterday, I went to a place called Career Tech in Chicago, funded by the Federal Government, an effort to take people who have been out of work for a long time and get them back into the workforce. They are introducing workers who had successful careers at businesses that closed to a new world, the world of social media, the world of information technology. They are learning. With that new education and training, they are getting new jobs.

I asked them about what life was like unemployed. Some of them have been out of work for over 2 years. I said to them: The President wants to extend unemployment benefits for those out of work. A lot of folks on the other side of the aisle are saying: Oh, we already tried that. We are not going to try that again. I said: What would happen to your family without unemployment benefits? To a person they said: I am not sure if we could have survived.

They are basically making the mortgage payment, paying utility bills, putting food on the table—the basics. So if the Republicans are opposed to unemployment benefits for those who cannot find a job, no matter how hard they try, unfortunately, that is going to have a devastating impact on working families across America.

For a footnote, I asked each one of them: What happened to your health insurance when you lost your job? They lost their health insurance. Think about it, Mom and Dad. Think about your responsibility to one another and to your kids with no health insurance. I mean, that is what happens to an unemployed person. Life is not a crystal staircase for these folks. They are just basically trying to get by and find a job. We need to help them. It is time for the Republicans to stop the filibuster and bring the Obama jobs bill to the floor. If they have better ideas, present those ideas as amendments. Our people will present their ideas. Let's have a full-throated debate about moving America forward. But for goodness' sakes, let's not stop the American economy cold in its tracks in an effort to preserve a Republican filibuster.

It is time for us to move together in a bipartisan nature as a Congress in both political parties. I thank my colleague from Michigan for bringing us together for this conversation. There is nothing more topical that we face.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Colombia remains the most dangerous country in the world for trade unionists and workers seeking to exercise their internationally recognized right to organize and bargain collectively. The International Trade Union Confederation reported that in 2010 Colombia had 49 union worker assassinations. That is more than the rest of the world combined. To make matters worse, a 2011 ILO report found that the majority of the cases of violence against workers in Colombia had not been investigated nor had the perpetrators been brought to justice. That is simply unacceptable and the United States should not enter into a free trade agreement with a country with such an atrocious human rights record.

The Colombian government has failed to enforce its laws, adhere to its international commitment on worker rights, or to prosecute those who commit acts of violence against workers. This repression of fundamental labor rights presents a threat to the lives of the workers in Colombia and a threat to the livelihoods of the workers in the United States who are forced to compete against a country that doesn't play by the rules.

I have written several letters to the administration expressing concerns about entering into a free trade agreement with Colombia until these worker rights abuse concerns are adequately addressed. The agreement before us does not adequately address them, and as a result I will oppose H.R. 3078, the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

The Obama administration recognized the need to address these concerns before the free trade agreement

could be submitted to Congress and reopened the Bush administration-negotiated U.S.-Colombia FTA to try to address them. That resulted in the action plan related to labor rights agreement reached between the U.S. and Colombia on April 7, 2011.

The action plan lists steps Colombia must take to improve its record on antilabor violence and, if rigorously implemented and enforced, could protect Colombian workers' internationally recognized rights. Unfortunately, we gave up any leverage we had to ensure this outcome would occur when we failed to link the action plan to the FTA or its implementing legislation. Both House and Senate Democrats during committee mark up of the bill proposed an amendment that would have created a link between the two, but Republicans blocked any reference to the labor action plan in the Colombia FTA.

I disagree with the administration's conclusion that Colombia has made enough progress on implementing the Action Plan to send the U.S.-Colombia FTA implementation act to Congress. Because this free trade agreement is being considered under fast-track procedures, Members of Congress like me, who would like to amend it to make improvements such as linking entry into force of the Colombian FTA to Colombia meeting its obligations under the action plan, cannot do so.

Yes, Colombia may so far have technically met its commitments under the action plan. But it has done this only in the narrowest sense, and not in a way that really tries to address the labor problem. For instance, in Colombia, only workers who are directly employed by a company or business can form a union and collectively bargain. To get around allowing workers to form unions and collectively bargain, Colombian employers have formed cooperatives, or made other arrangements to hire their employees as contractors rather than as direct employees. The action plan addressed these abuses by requiring Colombia to pass legislation and regulations to prohibit such misuse of cooperatives and contract employees. Colombia did pass legislation and regulations that looked good on paper, but they were undermined when Colombia decided to narrowly interpreted the new law and regulations as applying only to cooperatives. This is leaves plenty of ways for employers to continue the same practice under a different guise.

Given the lack of full implementation of the action plan to date, and without a provision explicitly inking implementation of the FTA to Colombia addressing anti-union violence, impunity and fundamentally deficient labor laws under the action plan, the legislation is fundamentally flawed and I cannot support it.

I recognize that we currently do not have two-way trade with Colombia because most Colombian exports enter the U.S. duty free under the Andean Trade Preferences Act. Some might say we should adopt the U.S.-Colombia FTA so U.S. exports can face lower tariffs in Colombia. But Colombia's market is small compared to the U.S. economy and as a result the ITC estimates the overall effect of the U.S. Colombia FTA on the U.S. economy is likely to be small. To me it is more important to insist that any country to which we enter a free trade agreement abide by internationally recognized labor standards and that plans to implement compliance actions be enforceable.

Mr. President, I will vote in favor of H.R. 3080, the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. I will do so because the Obama administration has succeeded in improving the automotive provisions in the Bush administration-negotiated original agreement. The result is that U.S. made vehicles now have a better opportunity to gain access to the historically closed South Korean market.

For too long, trade with South Korea has been a one-way street. The American market has been open and South Korea's market persistently closed by using a combination of tariff and nontariff barriers constructed to keep U.S. products out. This was most pronounced in the automotive sector, which makes up the majority of our trade deficit with South Korea. For instance, in 2010 South Korea shipped 515,000 cars to the United States while U.S. automakers exported fewer than 14,000 cars to South Korea. In 2010, we ran a $10 billion trade deficit with South Korea. Our trade deficit with South Korea in the automotive sector accounted for all of that $10 billion. Correcting our deficit in the automotive sector would go a long way to fixing our overall trade deficit with South Korea.

The original 2007 U.S.-Korea FTA negotiated by the Bush administration was fundamentally flawed. The agreement called for significant concessions from the United States but would have perpetuated a skewed playing field that unfairly disadvantages U.S. automotive exports. It would have left in place the ever-shifting regulatory regime South Korea has used to effectively bar U.S. autos from the South Korean market. For example, South Korea has imposed so-called auto safety regulations that are unique to Korea and don't have anything to do with safety such as the location of towing devices or headlights or the color of turn-signal lamps. This means that no vehicle built outside of Korea can be sold in Korea without special and expensive modifications and testing to meet these Korean requirements.

The failure to address these and other arbitrary, ever-changing regulations was one of the main reasons the agreement was not brought before the Congress for approval for so long. I was opposed to that agreement and as cochairman of the Senate Auto Caucus I spoke out against it.

I am pleased that President Obama recognized the importance of the U.S. automotive industry and reopened the agreement to negotiate significantly improved terms for U.S. auto exports to South Korea.

Importantly, the revised agreement will prevent South Korea from relying on discriminatory, rotating safety regulations as it has in the past to keep out U.S. auto imports. It does this by requiring South Korea to recognize 25,000 vehicles built to meet U.S. safety standards per automaker per year as meeting South Korean safety standards. This is an increase from 6,500 in the 2007 agreement. The revised agreement also includes an auto-specific safeguard designed to protect against potential surges of South Korean cars and trucks once the applicable tariffs are eliminated.

Under the original 2007 agreement, almost 90 percent of South Korea's auto exports to the United States would have received duty-free access. But why should we have reduced our few remaining tariffs to South Korean auto exports unless we were assured greater access to the South Korean markets for our auto exports? For instance, the U.S. auto tariff is only 2.5 percent compared to the South Korean auto tariff of 8 percent. The revised agreement corrected this inequity by reducing Korea's 8 percent duty to 4 percent immediately and to zero in year 5 while delaying elimination of the duty on South Korea's auto exports until year 5, giving U.S. automakers the time to build a brand and distribution presence that will reverse decades of South Korean protectionism.

The 2007 agreement was flawed also in how it dealt with the growing field of electric vehicles. The 2007 agreement would have allowed for a 10-year phase-out of the 8 percent South Korean tariff on hybrid electric passenger vehicles and the 2.5 percent U.S. tariff. That was not a fair deal for U.S. electric car exports. It's bad enough that the current South Korean electric car tariff is more than three times the U.S. tariff. The 2007 agreement would have locked in place for 10 years South Korea's electric car tariff advantage. Why in the world would we agree to that? Thankfully the Obama administration did not. Under the revised agreement, the South Korean tariff on electric cars immediately drops from 8 percent to 4 percent. Then the 4 percent South Korean tariff and the 2.5 percent U.S. tariff are phased out over 5 years. Though the tariffs are still not completely symmetrical, it's a big improvement over the original deal. And importantly, this phase-out now tracks the EU-Korean FTA, so U.S. automakers will now not be disadvantaged compared to European auto makers in the South Korean market as they would have been under the 2007 agreement.

Stakeholders, including Members of Congress, the United Auto Workers and U.S. auto companies, pushed hard for improved market access in the U.S.-Korea FTA. Thanks to the improvements the Obama administration has

negotiated, the UAW, Ford, GM and Chrysler as well as the Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, MEMA, among others, support the agreement. They think it will result in their being able to sell more U.S.-made vehicles in South Korea. Specifically, Chrysler has stated that as a result of the FTA it expects to sell 20,000 units per year in South Korea by the end 2014 compared to the paltry 2,638 passenger vehicles it sold there in 2010, and that the company plans to expand its dealer network to 30 outlets from the current 16.

These additional U.S. auto exports translate into badly needed American jobs. The 2007 ITC report on the expected impact of the U.S.-Korean FTA estimated U.S. exports to South Korea would increase by $10–$11 billion annually. The administration estimates that an additional $11 billion in exports would mean around 70,000 more jobs annually. In an updated ITC report requested by Senator WYDEN to assess the impact on American jobs of the FTA tariff and tariff rate quota reductions on goods based on current economic conditions, the ITC concluded that the agreement has the potential to create about 280,000 American jobs.

The agreement also has strong labor and environmental provisions that were agreed to in May 2007 at the insistence of Democratic Members of Congress, led by my brother, Congressman SANDY LEVIN, the ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee. They include the enforcement of a commitment to adopt and enforce internationally recognized labor and environmental standards and agreements.

It is high time we insisted on a different trade model that fights for a level playing field for American exports and American workers. I believe the revised U.S.-Korea FTA moves significantly toward that model and I will vote in favor of the legislation to implement it.

Mr. President, I will support legislation to implement the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement. The Obama administration has taken important steps to address concerns about worker rights and environmental protections in Panama that represent a significant improvement over the original agreement negotiated by the Bush administration. And, after years of pressure from those of us concerned about the abuse of offshore tax shelters, Panama has finally removed a major impediment to this free trade agreement by agreeing to and beginning to implement a tax information exchange agreement.

For 6 years, the Bush administration failed to conclude a tax information exchange agreement with Panama. In 2009, I joined with Congressman DOGGETT in a letter to President Obama making clear that we could not support a free trade agreement with Panama unless that country upheld its international obligations under the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's standards for transparency. The OECD found in September 2010 that Panama has ''potentially serious deficiencies'' in its laws on tax transparency. Thanks to pressure from the OECD, the Obama administration and those of us in Congress who oppose offshore tax haven abuse, Panama negotiated an information exchange agreement that took effect earlier this year.

Panama also agreed in negotiations with the Obama administration to uphold internationally recognized labor rights, making changes in its laws to protect collective bargaining rights. These changes have removed a major obstacle to approval of this free trade agreement.

With Panama's agreement to meet international standards for tax transparency and labor rights, I believe the agreement before us will protect workers in both countries, and the interests of U.S. taxpayers who are tired of seeing others dodge their tax obligations using offshore tax havens.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to lend their swift support to the pending free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama that have at last come before this Chamber. In approving these FTAs, we have an opportunity to show the American people that we in Congress are prepared to set aside partisan politics and come together to do something truly important to help our nation at a time when our economy is under unprecedented pressure.

Simply put, free trade agreements like the ones before us today are not a choice for the United States—they are a necessity. As President Clinton used to point out, only 4 percent of the world's population lives in the United States, and there is only so much we can sell to each other. Creating new jobs and growing our economy requires tapping into the other 96 percent. And that requires breaking down trade barriers and lowering tariffs so that American goods can reach more consumers at a price they can afford.

That is precisely what these three FTAs will accomplish. This legislation is a jobs bill that won't add a dime to the deficit. Instead, it will add $10 to $12 billion to our GDP, grow U.S. exports by $13 to $15 billion, and support an additional 100,000 American jobs.

These FTAs are not only critical for our economic recovery, however. They are essential to our global leadership and our national security.

In the case of the Korea-U.S. FTA, known as KORUS, the success or failure of this measure is inseparable from U.S. leadership in the Asia-Pacific region. The balance of power in Asia will determine the shape of the 21st century and whether it will be an American century or a Chinese century. Our friends and allies across this region are looking to Washington. In the face of a rising Beijing, they want to know if the U.S. is a country they can count on, or whether we are in retreat. From Japan to India to Australia, there is no test for American leadership today that is more urgent than approving our FTA with South Korea.

That is because the competition for the future in the Asia-Pacific is as much about economic power as it is about military power. Since 2000, approximately 50 free trade agreements have been put in place in East Asia alone, with approximately 80 additional agreements currently under negotiation. The United States is party to just four FTAs in the Asia-Pacific region.

Passing KORUS is the first step to righting this wrong and restoring a balance of economic power that favors America. Doing so will send an unequivocal message across the Asia-Pacific of American strength and commitment. It will also deepen one of our most important alliances in the world, with the Republic of Korea—a dynamic, free market democracy that has climbed from the depths of poverty and the devastation of war to become a model for the entire planet and a great global ally in the cause of freedom.

The economic benefits of KORUS are also extraordinary. This FTA will increase exports of American goods to Korea by around $11 billion once the agreement is fully in effect, supporting as many as 70,000 additional jobs here in the United States.

The agreement will also grant American firms greater access to Korea's $580 billion services market, creating new jobs for American workers in sectors from delivery and telecommunications services to energy and environmental services.

While South Korea is on the cusp of becoming our third-largest free trade partner after Canada and Mexico, free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama also offer enormous opportunities for the United States and will open the way for tremendous growth here in our own hemisphere.

Colombia is the oldest democracy in Latin America and one of America's most steadfast allies in that region. Like South Korea, Colombia is a great global success story—a country that has overcome narco-insurgency and terrorism, and a pro-American bulwark against Hugo Chavez's corrupt authoritarianism.

By completing this FTA, the U.S. will strengthen not only our Colombian allies, but also our shared values of democracy, rule of law, and the free market across Latin America.

The U.S.-Colombia FTA will also strengthen our own economy—expanding U.S. exports by more than $1.1 billion, increasing U.S. GDP by $2.5 billion, and creating thousands of U.S. jobs. Keep in mind, currently Colombia collects $100 in tariffs on U.S. exports for every $1 the United States levies on Colombian goods. With this FTA, that will end.

Similarly, the U.S.-Panama FTA will eliminate tariffs and other barriers to

U.S. exports, promote economic growth, and expand trade with one of the fastest growing economies in Latin America. American companies will be granted immediate access to Panama's $21 billion services market, including priority areas such as financial services and telecommunications. Panama's economy expanded 6.2 percent in 2010, with similar annual growth forecasts through 2015. All of this translates to more opportunities for American workers.

Some have argued that free trade agreements threaten to increase our trade deficit. However, as the U.S. Department of Commerce recently pointed out, in recent years, U.S. manufacturers have run a $47 billion trade surplus with our FTA partners; by contrast, we have incurred a trade deficit of $823 billion with countries where no FTAs are in place.

Time is of the essence. If we delay any further on these agreements, it will cost our country dearly in jobs and growth. The rest of the world is not standing still.

The European Union finalized a free trade agreement with South Korea over the summer, and Canada implemented a free trade agreement with Colombia just weeks ago. If we do not act, jobs and market share that could have gone to U.S. companies will instead head to their competitors in Europe and Canada. That is why we must act now.

In conclusion, let me underscore how important it is that these FTAs are the beginning, not the end, of a revived American global trade agenda. In order to get our economy back on track, in order to create the new jobs we need, in order to lead the world economically, the U.S. must have a forward-looking, optimistic trade liberalization vision.

That is true not only in the Asia-Pacific and Latin America but also in the Middle East where millions of people who have long suffered and stagnated under thuggish dictators are at last grasping for greater political freedom and economic opportunity. More than foreign aid, countries like Tunisia and Egypt need the U.S. and Europe to lower trade barriers. That is why I believe so strongly that the U.S. should immediately begin negotiations for an FTA with Tunisia. Tunisia is a small country, but it is the place where the Arab Spring began and consequently critical to the future of Arab democracy.

I strongly urge the Obama administration to begin negotiations on a free trade agreement with Tunisia as quickly as possible. The freer the flow of world trade, the stronger the tides for economic progress, prosperity, democracy and peace will be.

Beginning today with the passage of these critical free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, we take another step towards restoring our economy and strengthening our global leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will yield briefly to the Senator from Montana, and I ask that we set an order. I thought I was scheduled to speak, but apparently it is up in the air. I will defer to the Senator from Montana and ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow him.

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the English poet, Thomas Gray, once said: ''Commerce changes the fate and genius of nations.''

The United States has always understood that commerce improves our fate and sharpens our genius. We know opening the channels of commerce creates new opportunity, generates new ideas, and forms new partnerships.

We know global commerce makes us more competitive, more innovative, and more productive—but also sometimes more difficult.

Today, the Senate has a historic opportunity to build on this legacy by approving our free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. These agreements will increase exports of U.S. goods and services. They will create tens of thousands of good-paying American jobs. They will bind us even more closely to the three important allies.

Colombia, especially, has returned from the brink of becoming a failed state to being the third largest economy in Latin America and one of its most respected leaders. It is astounding just how far Colombia has come. It has a lot further to go, but considering the state of Colombia 15, 20 years ago, with the narcotics trade, paramilitary forces, and assassinations, it is amazing how far they have come. A lot of this goes to the courage of the Colombian people, and especially to the leaders. It has not been easy, to say the least.

Panama is the crossroads of global commerce and among the fastest growing economies in the Western Hemisphere.

South Korea is the world's 15th largest economy, our seventh largest trading partner, and a strategic ally in a very volatile region of the world.

Now, more than ever, we need to expand commerce and improve our economic fate. Clearly, with unemployment at 9.1 percent, our economy is growing too slowly. Consumer demand is too weak, and American workers, farmers, and ranchers are desperately seeking new markets and customers for their products.

The Colombia, Panama, and South Korea trade agreements will help U.S. exporters gain new customers in three lucrative and fast-growing markets. They will increase U.S. exports by up to $13 billion each year. They will boost our GDP by more than $15 billion, and they will support tens of thousands of urgently needed American jobs. It will help the jobs picture—clearly, it will not solve it, but it will help.

These agreements will help folks such as Errol Rice, a fifth generation cattle rancher from Helena, MT. Earlier this year, Errol testified before the Finance Committee on the importance of the South Korea trade agreement. He told us that South Korea is the fourth largest market in the world for U.S. beef, and it is growing rapidly.

Errol welcomed the commitments I secured to increase funding for market promotion and fully implement our bilateral beef import protocol. But he underscored that our position in the South Korean market is at risk. Australia, a large beef exporter, is racing to conclude its own trade agreement with South Korea. By approving our agreement with South Korea today, we will help Errol and all American ranchers maintain their competitive edge, increase sales, and create jobs in their communities.

Trade agreements improve our economy only if they create a level playing field for U.S. exporters. We cannot allow our trading partners to gain unfair advantage by failing to respect workers' rights or protect the environment.

That is why the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea trade agreements include robust labor and environmental commitments that were basically made in 2007, with all the labor and environmental framework included in these agreements. These commitments require our trading partners to uphold internationally recognized labor rights, including the right to organize and bargain collectively. That is in the agreement.

They also required our partners to protect the environment, and these obligations are fully enforceable, just like the commercial obligations in the agreements. In many cases, our free-trade agreement partners have gone the extra mile to meet our high standards. Colombia is the best example. Many of us are concerned about labor violence in Colombia. We believe the death of even one union member is one too many.

I urge my colleagues to consider the progress Colombia has made in recent years and the commitment of the Colombian Government to continue that progress.

Colombia demonstrated this commitment in April when President Obama and Colombian President Santos agreed to the Labor Action Plan. In that plan, Colombia made specific and groundbreaking commitments to strengthen worker rights, protect workers from violence, and prosecute the perpetrators of violence.

Colombia has fulfilled every commitment to date. It has hired 100 new inspectors to enforce workers' rights. It has cracked down on the abuse of cooperatives. It has expanded protection of union members. It has sentenced to prison 47 people found guilty of killing

union members. There is still more to be done, but Colombia has demonstrated remarkable progress.

By approving the free-trade agreement, we will be able to enforce labor rights in Colombia, including the rights addressed by the action plan. If we reject the agreement, however, we lose our ability to ensure that labor conditions in Colombia will continue to improve. This is a very important point. Other countries' trade agreements with Colombia don't have the labor protection provisions. The U.S. one does have labor protection provisions that are very strong. If we don't ratify this agreement, then workers in Colombia will not be protected because other agreements don't protect them.

These trade agreements will also help us rise to the challenge of China. Today, China is the No. 1 trading partner for South Korea and No. 2 partner for Colombia and Panama. If we approve these agreements, we will give American exporters a leg up on competitors from China and other countries. If we reject them, China's advantage and influence in these markets will only grow.

After we approve these agreements, we should begin thinking about the next steps for our trade agenda. We should invite our new free-trade agreement partners to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, negotiations. We need to negotiate a Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement and extend these agreements to better facilitate even more jobs in America.

Colombia, Panama, and South Korea have demonstrated that they are willing to make the far-reaching commitments that our trade agreements require. Their participation in the TPP negotiations will help us achieve a high-standard 21st-century agreement that spans the Pacific.

Thomas Gray was correct when he said commerce changes the fate and genius of nations. There is no better example than the United States. We have benefited greatly from trading with foreign nations. In these tough economic times, we need to embrace these benefits now more than ever. For the sake of American exporters seeking to grow and create jobs, let's approve these three free-trade agreements.

One final point. I think it is fair to say that as we engage in commerce worldwide in countries around the world, we are not totally pure. We don't wear white hats, and other countries are not Darth Vaders and wear black hats. But it is true the shade of gray of our hats are a lot lighter shade of gray than the shade of gray of their hats, which is a darker shade. That is especially true in the American, Asian, and African countries—maybe a little less true in European countries.

These agreements are no-brainers. Why do I say that? Because with respect to Colombia and Panama, products, goods, and services coming to our country today are virtually duty free, virtually no tariffs, or nontariff trade barriers.

On the other hand, American products going to those countries today face very high tariffs and trade barriers, especially with agriculture but also in manufacturing goods. The figures are quite startling, frankly. So it is a no-brainer. These are, for the first time virtually, free-trade agreements. It is a freebie for U.S. exporters and American companies exporting products into Colombia and Panama. They are really free.

With respect to Korea, it is very similar. Korean manufacturing tariffs, tariffs that Korea has on U.S. goods are more than twice as high as U.S. tariffs on Korean-manufactured goods. Tariffs that U.S. companies face in trying to export to Korea are twice as high today as are the tariffs the Korean manufacturers face when they try to sell products in the United States. The average Korean tariff on U.S. agricultural goods is 54 percent. The average tariff on American agricultural goods that we are trying to sell in Korea is 54 percent, about 5 times as high as the tariff on Korean agricultural products as they attempt to ship to the United States.

That is why this is a no-brainer. This is so simple. Everybody should be for this agreement. It creates a more level playing field. I urge my colleagues to support this agreement. When they read the agreement and understand the terms, it should go through with no opposition because we are, in fact, helping Americans, American jobs.

The only wrinkle I hear about is Colombia. I have been there. When one is in Colombia—and I have known their leaders, the past two Presidents—it is clear that they have made huge progress. If we reject this agreement, I submit that the progress made thus far will slip, and the conditions in Colombia will start to deteriorate.

We must pass these three trade agreements. Also, the U.S. political-geopolitical position in South America is critical. If we adopt this agreement, that will enhance America's geopolitical position in South America. If we don't do it, Colombians are going to say: We have given up on the United States. We have been trying to negotiate this for over 5 years. Then where are they going to go? They will embrace Venezuela or China.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I also rise today to speak in favor of the pending free-trade agreements with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

More than 50 million Americans work for companies that engage in international trade. Currently, U.S. exporters operate at a distinct disadvantage in countries where U.S. goods face high tariffs or discriminatory regulations. Passage of these three free-trade agreements will erase those disadvantages and allow our American businesses to compete on a level playing field in the global marketplace.

For far too long, these trade agreements have sat on the President's desk. This delay has hurt our competitive advantage and cost American jobs. Moreover, the administration's slow walk of these bills has encouraged some of our major trading partners to go forward and quickly negotiate their own trade agreements with South Korea, Panama, and Colombia, putting their workers at an advantage over U.S. workers.

Canada has already approved trade deals with both Colombia and Panama. The European Union has passed agreements with all three countries. Canadian and EU workers and farmers are reaping the advantages of greater access to these markets.

Creating jobs, increasing investment, and growing the U.S. manufacturing and farming sectors should be our top priority. With a 9.1-percent unemployment rate, this is a no-brainer: export more, make our products more competitive by lowering the tariffs, and create jobs in America. What could be more clear?

If we fail to act, American businesses will continue watching from the sidelines as other countries enjoy duty-free trading and continue to gain an advantage over American companies and employees.

It has been estimated that failure to implement just the Colombia and South Korea Free Trade Agreements would lead to a decline of $40.2 billion in U.S. exports. The net negative impact on U.S. employment from these trade and output losses could total nearly 400,000 jobs.

Small businesses in America will be the largest beneficiary of these free-trade agreements. These are the businesses that account for the largest group of U.S. exporters. Indeed, more than 97 percent of the U.S. companies that export are small businesses, and they account for one-third of the total U.S. merchandise exports.

Our farmers and ranchers will also benefit from these agreements as the exports of our agricultural products have historically suffered from high tariffs and other nontariff barriers.

South Korea. The South Korea Free Trade Agreement will be America's largest free-trade agreement in Asia. South Korea is our Nation's seventh largest trading partner and the United States is South Korea's third largest trading partner. The White House has estimated that when the free-trade agreement with South Korea is fully implemented, U.S. exports to South Korea will increase by $11 billion annually and add as many as 70,000 U.S. jobs.

The pending agreement will open the door for increased U.S. exports to South Korea of our automobile products, which are among the U.S. industries and workers that will benefit. It should also be noted that approval of this free-trade agreement will send a strong message that we stand with our

allies in Asia and will further strengthen our long and positive relationship with South Korea.

Right here in our own hemisphere, the implementation of the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement will guarantee American companies access to Panama's $21 billion in services. This includes priority areas in financial, telecommunications, computer, distribution, express delivery, energy, environmental and professional services.

Once implemented, 88 percent of U.S. commercial and industrial exports to Panama will become duty free. The remaining tariffs would be phased out over a 10-year period. We need to act now in order to preserve current exports to Panama and pave the way for more. Panama has recently signed free-trade agreements with Canada and the European Union.

Nearly 5 years have passed since the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement was signed by the United States and Colombia on November 22, 2006. Last year, U.S. exports to Colombia totaled $12 billion, with many of those subject to the high tariffs. Our exporters have paid nearly $4 billion in duties to Colombia since that agreement was signed 5 years ago.

The Colombian Congress approved the free-trade agreement less than 1 year after it was signed. After 5 years, the Congress is only now finally considering this agreement. That is not the way to treat a friend.

With passage of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, 80 percent of U.S. exports of consumer and industrial products to Colombia will be duty free immediately, with remaining tariffs phased out over 10 years. The U.S. International Trade Commission has estimated that this agreement will increase the U.S. gross domestic product by $2.5 billion.

On another front regarding Colombia, they once had one of the worst drug cartel problems in our hemisphere. With their determination and integrity and with our help, Colombia's Government and law enforcement systems have substantially cleaned out the Medillin and Cali drug cartels. To acknowledge their sacrifice this should have been the easiest of the free-trade agreements to quickly have confirmed.

We have waited 5 years, as Colombia has done so much for itself to clean up the cancer in their system. We should have done this 5 years ago. So I hope there is no hesitancy now and there is overwhelming support in this Senate for this free-trade agreement.

In conclusion, with so many American businesses and workers struggling during this prolonged economic slump, it should be the easiest thing we do to enact these three free-trade agreements. Exports support millions of jobs in this country. These agreements will promote American sales in markets where we have been at a disadvantage for too long.

It was disheartening that this administration let these agreements languish for many months without taking action. We now have the chance to approve those before us today—these three—which are good for our bilateral relations with these three countries, for working Americans, for farmers and ranchers throughout our system, and for our struggling economy.

I am very pleased these votes are being scheduled for today. We know the South Korean President is going to address a joint session of Congress tomorrow and to have these done and, hopefully, signed by the President when the South Korean President comes is the welcome gift he has been looking for, for a long time.

I so look forward to having these three free-trade agreements with these countries that have shown they want to do business with America, they want to have free and fair access into their country for our great products and our great workers, and we should let them have it without further delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 12 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO ALEX GLASS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as every one of our colleagues knows, so much of what we do depends on the hard work and commitment of the dedicated staffers who toil behind the scenes on behalf of us and the constituents we represent. I wish to take a few minutes to recognize a member of my own staff who has been with me for many years, through good times and bad, and whose work ethic, competence, intelligence, and passion for public service is truly deserving of admiration and recognition as she now moves on to a new job, after more than 10 years of service in my office.

Alex Glass came to work for me on April 2, 2001. We hired her on as the deputy press secretary. She had graduated from Bryn Mawr the year before and had gone to work for the Gore for President campaign before joining my staff. Alex was similar to many young people who make their way to our Nation's Capitol after college. She was passionate about public service, wanted to make a difference, and cared deeply about her country and the serious issues we faced.

From the start, I knew Alex was a strong addition to my team. But just a few months later, it became clear to me she was much more. It was a Tuesday morning. We were right here in the Nation's Capitol. My communications director happened to be traveling that week. So even though Alex had just joined my staff, she was my only press staffer here that day.

As we all remember, a little bit after 9 a.m., we got word in the Capitol that planes had struck the World Trade Center. Shortly after that, I looked out the window of the Capitol and saw black clouds of smoke filling the sky above the Pentagon. It was September 11, 2001, a day of unspeakable tragedy and devastating loss for our Nation. For those of us here in Washington, DC, and those in New York, and for families across America, it was a day of great confusion, uncertainty, and fear.

On that day, Alex stepped up for me, she stepped up for our office, and she stepped up for our constituents. Alex felt the same way every one of us did that day. But right away, she realized families in my home State of Washington were going to want to hear from their elected official in this time of national crisis. She was calm, she was collected, and she was already thinking ahead to what we were going to need to do that day.

So before we even evacuated, she quickly scribbled down the phone numbers of the major press outlets in Washington State, and then throughout that dark day and into the night, Alex and I stayed together and, through our State's press, I was able to reach out to families who were desperate for news and who needed to know that, despite this tragedy, their government remained strong. That day, I knew what Alex was made of, and I saw that spirit and dedication again and again over the next 10 years because Alex always knew what this job was all about—it was about helping people and solving problems.

I remember so many times I was in the room with my staff, where we were discussing one issue or another. Every once in a while, we would hear a soft voice from the chair to my left—Alex only talks when she has something to say—and in the clearest and most concise way, she would help bring our discussion from the theoretical to the practical: How does this affect families in our State? How will these policies help the people I was sent to represent? These were the questions that were always on Alex's mind because she knew those were the most important questions to me.

So many times over the years I would wake and check my e-mail and see an article Alex had forwarded to me—stories about veterans who weren't getting the care they deserved, workers who couldn't find a job or families falling through the cracks. She didn't include a comment with those stories. She knew she didn't have to. She just passed them along because she knew I would want to see them. She understood it was those people, the ones in those stories, whom I came to DC to fight for. Alex isn't from Washington State, but she dove into her adopted State with gusto, and within a few months she knew more about the issues facing our local communities than most people from Washington.

I remember one time—and I never thought I would tell this story out loud—Alex and I were in Port Angeles, and someone thought it would be a good idea for us to travel in a helicopter to our next event. It may have

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 Europe 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 members 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 nontariff 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 MacDonald'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 Secretary 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 trilaterally 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 Ashtabula 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 anticheating 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, Colombia, 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 Korean 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 percent—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 good 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. competiveness 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 positive 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 hamstrings 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 opportunities 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 Islamic 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, including 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 importance 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

first met at the WVU stadium is now the site of the Mylan Tailgate Tent. But the thing Mike was most proud of was when he helped people build their own lives—and those people who knew Mike know exactly what I am talking about.

Mike was a pioneer who started Mylan Pharmaceuticals to give people access to affordable quality medicine. Mylan is a homegrown West Virginia company that he started with his Army buddy Don Panoz in 1961. He led Mylan until 2002, and Mylan has continued to grow and has now become the third largest generic and specialty pharmaceutical manufacturer in the world.

There are so few people like Mike, whose legacy will echo for generations to come. On Thursday, his friends and family will gather to pay tribute to his legacy when he is laid to rest in Morgantown, WV—a town he loved and gave so much to improve.

Tomorrow and every day our thoughts and prayers will go out to the entire Puskar family, Mike's friends and colleagues, and everyone whose life he touched, as all of them mourn the loss of this great man.

While every one of us is truly going to miss Mike, he truly will never leave us. We all have beautiful memories of Mike that will last a lifetime, and his legacy to West Virginia and its people will remain in our hearts forever.

BURMA CHALLENGES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today, as I do on many occasions, to bring attention to the numerous challenges that face the people of Burma. Of great concern to those advocating for democracy in Burma is promoting reconciliation among the diverse groups in the country. Like many ethnic groups in the country, the Kachin people of northern Burma have a distinct and longstanding heritage. Yet, they continue to be targeted by the ruling junta. Not only is their struggle against the oppressive junta of concern to those of us focused on reforms in Burma, but they also have an important historical connection to the United States, a connection that I would like to highlight today.

On September 13, 1945, Japanese soldiers surrendered to Allied forces in Burma. As many in this Chamber are no doubt aware, many Americans bravely fought in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II. The late Senator Ted Stevens, for example, flew the treacherous ''hump'' over the Himalayas, and many other Americans helped build the important Ledo supply road, linking China, Burma and India. In the Allied effort in this theater, the Kachin people deserve particular mention for the commitment, sacrifice and invaluable support they provided Allied forces to reclaim that country.

The situation in this region was bleak for Allied forces in 1942. The Burmese terrain, a combination of dense rain forest and high altitude, proved a formidable obstacle in itself. Of particular importance was building and maintaining the Allied supply lines into Kunming, China. This task was assigned to GEN Joseph Stilwell and was later described by George Marshall as ''one of the most difficult assignments'' given to any theater commander. As part of this endeavor, CPT Carl Eifler directed U.S. efforts against Japanese forces in Burma. Captain Eifler assembled an accomplished group of officers with a diverse set of skills, ranging from linguistics and medicine to piloting and explosives. Detachment 101 officially began on April 14, 1942, a mere 3 weeks before the Japanese Imperial Army would take Rangoon and, with it, effective control of the country.

As part of its mission, GEN Stillwell wanted Detachment 101 to learn to adapt to and thrive in Burma's thick rain forests. He would use his troops' familiarity with fighting in such terrain to harass the enemy with unconventional tactics, weakening its grip on strategic locations such as the Myitkyina Airbase in the Kachin State. The historian for U.S. Army Special Operations Command, Dr. C. H. Briscoe, credits part of Detachment 101's operational success to support from a group of Burmese in the ''Kachin Rangers'' unit and, in particular, their efforts in intelligence collection, as well as pilot rescue and sabotage missions. In the spring of 1945, due to its success, Detachment 101 expanded its Kachin forces to more than 10,000 troops.

The Kachin Rangers are credited with many effective and unconventional warfare tactics, some of which have subsequently been incorporated by the Army Special Forces Green Berets. In just a few years of combat, according to James R. Ward—a member of Detachment 101—the Kachin Rangers reportedly provided the U.S. 10th Air Force with 75 percent of its targets and the 164 Kachin radio teams in Burma provided some 85 percent of the intelligence received by General Stilwell's Northern Combat Area Command. In addition, these Kachin soldiers are credited with destroying an estimated 15,000 tons of Japanese supplies and killing or capturing more than 15,000 enemy troops. According to reports, the group also helped save the lives of as many as 425 downed Allied airmen during the war.

Ultimately, following the Japanese surrender of Burma, Detachment 101 was awarded the Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation by the Army Chief of Staff at the time, future President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Efforts by the Kachin people helped secure an Allied victory in Burma 66 years ago. Currently, the Kachin—like other ethnic minorities in Burma—deserve our recognition as allies in another noble cause: to secure freedom and reconciliation in a democratic Burma. We honor their bravery and commitment to freedom six decades ago as well as today.

TRIBUTE TO CARL WEAVER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments and achievements of lifetime educator Carl Weaver. For almost 40 years, Carl devoted himself to teaching young Kentuckians history, civics, and psychology while also coaching little league baseball in the afternoons and the South Laurel High School boys' baseball team.

Carl began teaching as an undergraduate student while at the University of the Cumberlands in 1963, at the age of 19. After graduation, Carl spent 6 years teaching in Ohio before returning to Laurel County, KY, where he earned his master's degree from Union College while simultaneously teaching full-time and raising his three children, Wayne, Karen (Davenport), and Whitney.

Carl witnessed many changes during his 33-year career teaching in Laurel County, but he cherishes most the time he spent teaching his own kids—Carl had each of his three children in at least one class in high school and also had the opportunity to teach Karen psychology her freshman year at Sue Bennett College. Carl never had a problem with any of his children in the classroom, recalling, ''I was probably harder on them than on other students.''

For Carl, it was always about the kids. Carl has an amazing passion for teaching and he truly enjoyed and appreciated the students. ''That's what it's really all about. You're teaching the student, not the subject,'' Carl says. Carl still misses teaching, but he was forced to retire at the 27-year mark due to ongoing complications with his legs as a result of his diagnosis with polio as a child.

These obstacles don't hinder Carl's spirit however, as he continues to stay busy by helping out in his son's produce stand on East Ky. 80. Carl admits he's enjoyed a good life. As he looks back now on his teaching career however, he says he doesn't regret a thing.

Mr. President, Carl Weaver is a humble, selfless Kentuckian who dedicated his life to educating the youth of Kentucky. I thank him for his passion and the wisdom he has shared with the people of our great Commonwealth. The Laurel County Sentinel Echo published an article in the spring of 2011 to honor Carl's career and accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Laurel County Sentinel Echo, Spring 2011]

BUSIER SINCE RETIREMENT: CARL WEAVER WORKS CONCESSIONS, MANS A PRODUCE STAND AND SPENDS TIME WITH GRANDCHILDREN. AND LIKE TEACHING, HE LOVES EVERY MINUTE OF IT.

(By Nita Johnson)

He walks with two canes due to rheumatoid arthritis, another storyline to the

limp he's had all his life since suffering from polio at age 3.

But the canes and the limp don't deter long-time educator Carl Weaver. In fact, since his retirement from the Laurel County school system in 2002, Weaver has been busier than ever.

In fact, Weaver depicts the word ''busy.'' With nearly 40 years of teaching experience under his belt, Weaver has always been active in the school, in his personal life, and in his community.

Even while raising his three children, his life has revolved around academics and athletics. During school hours, the classroom setting found him instructing students about history, civics, and psychology. During summer breaks, he taught psychology at Sue Bennett College.

After-school hours found Weaver on the baseball field where he coached the South Laurel High School baseball team for six years. When not on the baseball field, Weaver was the academic team coach for Laurel County High School, and when the county school split into two high schools, he remained on at South Laurel High School as academic team coach, garnering over 20 years in that position. During this time he was an unyielding advocate for the establishment of elementary school academic teams—a goal he not only saw accomplished but saw its success and contributions to the educational programs of the school system where he taught for 33 years.

As if that weren't enough, Weaver also coached baseball for the local Little League teams, coached basketball for the Laurel-London Optimist Club, and served as a 4–H leader. His ties to the baseball field didn't end when he retired in 2002.

''I help with the concession stands at South Laurel now,'' Weaver said. ''My son, Whitney, is assistant baseball coach there.''

Weaver's teaching career began in 1963 after graduation from Cumberland College (now University of the Cumberlands). He attended Sue Bennett College for two years prior to transferring to Cumberland College to pursue his bachelor's degree. After college graduation, he moved to Zanesville, Ohio, and taught seventh- and eighth-grade students for six years before returning to Laurel County.

''I was an undergraduate student and I was only 19 when I started teaching,'' he said.

He earned his master's degree from Union College while still teaching full-time and raising his own children.

Weaver saw many changes over the span of his career, but his focus always remained on the students who came through his classes. Three of those students were his own children—Wayne, Karen (Davenport), and Whitney.

''I had all three in at least one class during high school,'' he said, ''and I had Karen in her first year at Sue Bennett for psychology class. I never had any problems out of my children in class. I was probably harder on them than on other students.''

Many of his former students approach him even now, some of which he said he had in class as many as 30 years ago.

''I always enjoyed teaching. I enjoyed the students,'' Weaver said. ''You meet so many different students and see the uniqueness of each one, their personality. That's really what it's all about is the kids. You're teaching the student, not the subject matter.''

He related that he still misses being in the classroom but ongoing problems with his legs prompted him to retire after reaching the 27-year mark.

''I taught for 33 years but the six years in Ohio didn't count toward my retirement time,'' he explained.

But retirement didn't provide time off from being busy. In fact, between his own activities and those with his grandchildren, Weaver says he has more to do now than in the past.

Currently Weaver and his wife of 48 years, Pearl, are helping out in their son's produce stand, located on East Ky. 80 beside Arnold's Place, while they continue to raise strawberries and raspberries on their farm in the Laurel River community. That farm produces the fruits and vegetables that the Weavers display in their produce market—homemade strawberry preserves made by their son Wayne and wife Michelle. Jars of bread-and-butter pickles also adorn the counter of the market, another example of the Weaver's farming products.

''Good to see you,'' Carl Weaver greets the customers coming in to the produce market during the day, and their parting is accentuated with, ''Thanks for stopping by. Come back and see us.''

A friendly and informal manner from a man who holds his honorary doctorate in humanities, but the nature of his greeting is reason for the doctorate degree presented by his brother Neal, then president of Louisiana Baptist University in Shreveport.

''He gave me an honorary doctorate in humanities because of my long years of work with young people, in the classroom and in the community,'' Weaver said.

''It's been a good life,'' he added. ''When I started college I planned to pursue a law degree. But somewhere along the lines I decided I wanted to be a teacher. I guess some people look back and see visions of better things but I enjoyed teaching and I never regretted it.''

NOMINATION OF WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship favorably reported out the President's nomination of Dr. Winslow Lorenzo Sargeant to serve as Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

I am pleased that President Obama nominated such a talented individual to this top position at the SBA. His confirmation will complete the SBA's exceptional leadership team.

As Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Dr. Winslow Sargeant brings a unique background to this very important position. With a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in electrical engineering and a background as a very successful small business owner, he is not only well-educated but well-educated about the challenges facing small businesses today.

He is the former managing director of Venture Investors, a Midwest venture capital company with a concentration on starting up healthcare and technology companies. From 2001 to 2005, he served as a program manager for SBIR in electronics at the National Science Foundation. He has also worked at IBM as a staff engineer, at AT&T as technical staff, and as an associate adjunct professor at the University of Pennsylvania.

With capable leaders such as Dr. Sargeant at the helm, the agency is more than ready to continue to play an important role in assisting small businesses as they lead this country to an economic recovery. We look forward to continuing to work with them and to a new era for the SBA and American small businesses.

CELEBRATING THE U.S. NAVY'S 236th BIRTHDAY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, tomorrow, the U.S. Navy celebrates its 236th birthday.

On Friday, October 13, 1775, the Continental Congress, representing the citizens of 13 American colonies, passed a resolution to acquire the first two warships for the Continental Navy. It stated ''that a swift sailing vessel, to carry ten carriage guns, and a proportional number of swivels, with eighty men, be fitted with all possible dispatch, for a cruise of three months, and that the commander be instructed to cruise eastward, for intercepting such transports as may be laden with warlike stores and other supplies for our enemies, and for such other purposes as the Congress shall direct.''

The Founders recognized the essential nature of a Navy to the strength and longevity of the Nation by authorizing Congress ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' in article I of the Constitution. A Naval Committee was established to build a fitting Navy for our fledgling country, acquire and fit out vessels for sea, and draw up regulations. The Continental Navy began a proud tradition, carried out for 236 years by our U.S. Navy, to protect our Nation and pursue the causes of freedom we hold so dear.

For the past 236 years, the central mission of the Navy has been to protect the interests of our Nation around the world on the high seas, to fight and win the wars of our Nation, and to maintain control of the sea lines of communication enabling this Nation and other free nations to grow and prosper. Whether in peace or at war, U.S. citizens around the world can rest assured that the U.S. Navy is on watch, ever vigilant, and ready to respond.

U.S. sailors, as both ambassadors and warriors, have won extraordinary distinction and respect for the Nation and its Navy. The core values of ''Honor, Courage, and Commitment'' are the guides by which the U.S. sailors live and serve. Today, the U.S. Navy is the most capable, most respected, and most effective sea service in the world.

Seventy-five percent of land in the world is bound by water and 75 percent of the population of the world lives within 100 miles of the sea, assuring that our naval forces will continue to be called upon to respond to emerging crises, to maintain freedom of the sea, to deter would-be aggressors, and to provide our allies with a visible reassurance of support of the United States of America.

As we celebrate our Navy's 236th birthday, America's sons and daughters continue to stand the watch on the frontlines of the war on terror at sea and on foreign shores. While we look at

the current conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan as predominantly ground engagements, our Navy is there too. Twelve hundred Navy personnel are on the ground in Iraq (200 of these are Reservists), with a total of 21,800 deployed to the region aboard ships at sea, on bases, and air stations in the region supporting Iraq operations. Forty-six hundred sailors and officers are on the ground in Afghanistan and a total of 7,700 are deployed aboard ships at sea, on bases, and air stations in the region supporting Afghanistan operations (Operation Enduring Freedom). One thousand four hundred and thirteen Navy personnel have been killed in action in these conflicts, 576 in Operation Enduring Freedom, 820 in Operation Iraqi Freedom and 17 in Operation New Dawn as the Pentagon now refers to the Iraq war.

This year marks not only the 236th Navy birthday, but also the 100th anniversary of naval aviation. On May 8, 1911, Cpt Washington Irving Chambers, USN, Officer-in-Charge of Aviation, prepared the requisition for the Navy's first aircraft to be purchased from aviator and inventor Glenn H. Curtiss. The Navy is commemorating that historic event throughout the year at its ''Navy Weeks,'' one of which was held in Indianapolis in August.

The 20 Navy Weeks conducted annually across the Nation exemplify the respect and proud heritage that the U.S. Navy commands. Navy Week gives the Navy a chance to show off its heritage and hardware and allows Americans to learn more about their Navy and its heroes.

No matter the cause, location or magnitude of future conflicts, the Nation can rely on its Navy to produce well-trained, well-led, and highly motivated sailors to carry out the missions entrusted to them.

As a Navy veteran myself, I speak with no small measure of pride in calling attention to the significance of the 236th birthday of the U.S. Navy and expressing the appreciation of the people of the United States to the Navy and its men and women who have dedicated 236 years of service. The honor, courage, commitment, and sacrifice that generations of Americans have made throughout the history of the Navy and the sacrifices shared by the extended Navy family of civilians, family members, and loved ones who have served for the past 236 years are extensive and greatly appreciated.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BRIAN SCHMIDT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I speak today in honor of Brian Schmidt, one of three individuals who were awarded the Nobel Prize for physics this week. Dr. Schmidt, of the Australian National University, along with Dr. Adam Reiss, of Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. Saul Perlmutter, of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, completed groundbreaking work on the expansion of the universe. The scientific achievement of these three men deserves to be recognized. I am pleased to acknowledge that the scientific career of Dr. Schmidt was encouraged through his tenure in high school in Alaska.

Dr. Schmidt, originally from Montana, moved to Alaska in 1981, where he attended Bartlett High School in Anchorage, AK, graduating in 1985. At Bartlett, many teachers took note of his academic achievements and strong work ethic, and encouraged him to excel in his studies. Dr. Schmidt has remarked on the great experience he had attending school in Alaska, crediting his high school teachers for helping him cultivate an interest in science that has brought him to where he is today.

After leaving Alaska, Dr. Schmidt attended the University of Arizona, receiving a bachelors of science in both physics and astronomy, before continuing on to receive his doctorate in astronomy at Harvard University. He has since relocated to Australia with his wife Jennie and is a researcher at the Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics at the Australian National University.

Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Reiss, and Dr. Perlmutter are receiving the Nobel Prize for a discovery that has greatly changed the field of astrophysics and made great furloughs into the understanding of dark matter, the term for the force that is driving the universe apart. Conventional understanding was that rate of expansion of the universe has slowed. However, these three scientists turned this theory on its head by proving that, in fact, the rate of expansion is actually accelerating. This change in understanding affects predictions regarding the conditions of future galaxies, and the discovery has been lauded by some as one of the greatest discoveries in science.

Those who knew Dr. Schmidt in Alaska were not surprised to learn of his accomplishment. His teachers at Bartlett knew his intellect and passion for science would take him far. I, along with many others in my State, am proud to recognize this Alaskan who has made valuable contributions to our understanding of the universe.

I offer warm congratulations to Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Reiss, and Dr. Perlmutter on their Nobel Prize and scientific achievements.

REMEMBERING THOMAS P. FOY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, last Saturday, Thomas P. Foy died at his home in Bayard, NM, a few weeks shy of his 97th birthday. A native of Grant County, he lived most of his outstanding life there, except for the years he spent as a prisoner of war in Japan including the Bataan Death March. It was a life largely devoted to public service and completely devoted to the public good.

The word ''survivor'' is used rather freely these days, but he and his comrades, many of them fellow New Mexicans who managed to live through the horrors of years of internment, deserve the title if anyone does. But Tommy didn't just survive, he triumphed and prospered in a life well-lived.

He had graduated from Notre Dame, and received a law degree from there a year before he joined the New Mexico National Guard in 1940. Assigned to the Philippines, the 200th Coast Artillery Battery surrendered after holding out for 5 months against the Japanese and began their gruesome forced march to prison. In 1945, the war was ended and he was rescued.

His postwar life was full of accomplishment and service. Practicing law, marrying, running for—and winning—public office, founding a bank and raising five children with his wife Joan, and doing it all with a stout, cheerful heart brought him admiration and affection from all quarters. He served in the New Mexico State Legislature for 28 years.

For many of us from Grant County, this is the loss of a beloved family member. My parents, now deceased, and my wife Anne and I certainly share that view. A stalwart figure, he was true to his faith, his family, our country and Notre Dame, and deeply loved and respected in return. He is already greatly missed.

REMEMBERING MAJOR THOMAS E. CLARK

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Air Force Major Thomas E. Clark, from Emporium, PA, whose aircraft was shot down during a combat mission over Laos in 1969.

Thomas graduated from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1963. He served with the 416th Tactical Fighter Squadron, 37th Tactical Flight Wing.

He was the beloved son of Otto and Josephine Schager Clark. He was married to his high school sweetheart, Kathleen Mottern of Emporium.

On February, 8, 1969, Major Clark was flying an F–100D aircraft from Phu Cat Air Base, Republic of Vietnam, in a flight of four on a combat mission over Laos. The flight engaged a 23mm antiaircraft artillery battery and his aircraft was hit, burst into flames and crashed. No parachute was observed. Visual and electronic searches detected no sign of life. Subsequent to the incident the U.S. Air Force determined Major Clark to be Killed in Action, Body Not Recovered.

In his career, Major Clark was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Air Medal with Two Oakleaf Clusters, National Defense Service Medal and the Vietnam Service Medal with One Bronze Service Star.

On October 14–20, 2009, a joint U.S/Laotian team investigated the crash site for the fourth time and recovered a human tooth which was later identified as the remains of Major Clark.

During a ceremony at Emporium, PA, on October 22, 2011, his remains

will be interred in a plot beside his parents.

My thoughts and prayers are with Major Clark's family and friends as we honor the life and service of this Pennsylvanian hero.

All Americans are deeply indebted to Major Clark for his service and sacrifice.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JOE GARLAND

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, over the course of the past half century, Joe Garland served as the unofficial historian of Gloucester, MA—its fishermen, its boats and its life. But Joe Garland not only wrote history in his books and newspaper column—he was part of history, guiding his beloved hometown through headwinds and troubled waters. Joe Garland passed away August 30, and his family and friends gathered October 1 for a memorial service. I would like to share with the Senate the thoughts and memories of Joe that I shared with those who were part of that service honoring this great champion of all things Gloucester.

If you visit the Fisherman's Memorial on Gloucester's waterfront on a stormy winter day, the statue of the Heroic Mariner seems to be steering the whole town into the wind toward fair weather. And if you look closely at the statue, you can almost see Joe Garland in its carved granite face, full of grit and determination, guiding his beloved Gloucester through headwinds and troubled waters.

''Beating to windward'' is the art of sailing into the wind. ''Beating to Windward'' is also the name of the column Joe wrote so many years for the Gloucester Times. And it is no surprise to any of us who knew him that Joe used the column to champion all things Gloucester. Joe didn't just chronicle Gloucester's history—he was a part of it. In his column and in his books, he brought to life the era of the great schooners—like the 122-foot Adventure, the flagship of Gloucester, and the larger-than-life Gloucestermen—like the ''Bear of the Sea,'' Giant Jim Patillo, and the ''Lone Voyager,'' Howard Blackburn.

But he also used the sharpness of his pen to make his case on all kinds of civil causes—opposing unbridled economic development, warning about the loss of local control of the hospital and water supply, complaining about comprises on the environment or demanding the preservation of Gloucester's beauty. And trust me—Joe never hesitated to offer his advice to a certain U.S. Senator, if he felt like I needed it.

Joe wrote with passion, conviction and humor, never with ill will or with the intent to wound. He was a gentleman. And always, whether in his column or in his books, he promoted the interests of Gloucester's fishing fleet. In my office in Washington, I have a copy of the book he wrote in 2006, ''The Fish and the Falcon,'' about Gloucester's role in the American Revolution. His inscription to me expresses his appreciation ''for your efforts to relieve the fiscal crisis that has long haunted our beleaguered fishing industry.'' He urged me to keep up the fight, and I have.

Joe wrote 21 books, and I always enjoyed his sharing the latest with me. In my Boston office, I have a copy of his book about the Adventure, which he helped to restore. It arrived with an invitation from Joe to tour the schooner and, of course, I didn't waste any time accepting his invitation. He welcomed me aboard, and his tour made the Adventure's history come alive—from its construction in 1926 through its career as a ''highliner,'' the biggest moneymaker of them all, landing nearly $4 million worth of cod and halibut during her career.

But the book that spoke to me the most was his last, ''Unknown Soldiers,'' his memoir of World War II and his journey from a student at Harvard to a ''dogface'' with a close-knit infantry in Sicily, Italy, France and finally Germany. It is a clear, eloquent and unflinching panorama of the mundane and the horrific in war. It is, by turns, humorous, poignant and gut-wrenching, with the common soldier perspective long associated with journalist Ernie Pyle or cartoonist Bill Mauldin, a point of view with which soldiers from my war, from any war—a band of brothers stretching through generations of Americans—can identify.

I was deeply saddened to learn of Joe's passing. But I am glad that his passing was gentle, his last moments of his life near the window of his beloved house by the sea, surrounded by loved ones and squeezing the hand of the woman he loved—Helen, his wife, his World War II pen pal. And how fitting that in those final moments, the schooner Landon fired a farewell cannon salute to Joe as it headed out to sea. Joe loved the tradition of cannon salutes, so much so that he fired one at the wedding of his stepdaughter, Alison, only to have it backfire, burning a hole in his jacket and covering his face with gunpowder, just in time for the official wedding photos. But that was Joe, and a face smudged with gunpowder underscored what we all know—truly, his was a life well lived.

There is an anonymous quote I once read which may well describe how we should think of Joe's passing. It says:

I am standing upon the seashore. A ship at my side spreads her white sails to the morning breeze and starts for the blue ocean. She is an object of beauty and strength, and I stand and watch her until, at length, she hangs like a speck of white cloud just where the sea and sky come down to mingle with each other. Then someone at my side says, ''There! She's gone.''

Gone where? Gone from my sight—that is all. She is just as large in mast and hull and spar as she was when she left my side, and just as able to bear her load of living freight to the place of destination. Her diminished size is in me, not in her, and just at the moment when someone at my side says, ''There, she's gone,''—there are other eyes watching her coming, and other voices ready to take up the glad shout, ''There she comes!'' And that is dying.

Because Joe loved the sea so much—and because he enjoyed watching seagulls soar—I close with a special poem. It is titled ''Sea Joy'' and it was written in 1939 by a little girl named Jaqueline Bouvier. America eventually came to know her as Jackie Kennedy. But when she was 10 years old, she wrote:

''When I go down by the sandy shore
I can think of nothing I want more
Than to live by the booming blue sea
As the seagulls flutter round about me
I can run about—when the tide is out
With the wind and the sand and the sea all about
And the seagulls are swirling and diving for fish
Oh—to live by the sea is my only wish.''

To Helen and Joe's family, I extend my deepest sympathy, but with a reminder that Joe's work, like the sea he loved, is eternal and booming, and that Joe's life, like the seagulls he enjoyed so much, swirled and soared.

And to Joe, from one sailor to another, I wish him ''fair winds and following seas.''•

RECOGNIZING MOTHER'S MOUNTAIN

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, across the country one of the most treasured and comforting thoughts of home is our own family's homemade cooking. Regardless of whether this delicious homemade cooking is a main dish, a condiment, or a dessert, we will always remember the wonderful way it tastes. In my home State of Maine, one small business has taken the fond memories of home cooking and developed a successful small business. Today, I commend Mother's Mountain, located in the coastal town of Falmouth, which this month will celebrate its 30th anniversary.

Growing up during the Great Depression, Carol Tanner remembered her mother making homemade mustard for her father, and in later years she too acquired a fondness for this delectable condiment. In 1981, Carol Tanner and her then business partner now husband, Dennis Proctor, took Carol's childhood memories and turned that single mustard recipe into a business which now offers over 30 appetizing specialty products. Today, they make dozens of award winning jams, jellies, sauces, marinades and honeys. They also emphasize healthier alternatives by producing natural, gluten free, salt free, and fat free products.

As a family-run small business, Mother's Mountain employs three generations, who are instrumental in maintaining the quality and customer

service, which is the key ingredient in their success. In order to ensure that their customers receive personal attention and the highest quality product, Dennis and Carol personally hand-pack and label each and every jar.

Mother's Mountain creations have received extraordinary reviews from Maine Magazine and Eat Around Maine. In addition to selling its homemade goods, Mother's Mountain also provides appetizing recipe ideas to its customers using their products. Mother's Mountain also produces delectable items for other Maine-based companies, such as L.L. Bean.

Small businesses like Mother's Mountain are the lifeblood of our economy, and indicative of the great entrepreneurial spirit that is alive and well in Maine. I congratulate Carol and Dennis, for operating such a successful business from the ground up out of their home, and commend them for passing down this strong work ethic through three generations. I am proud to celebrate Mother's Mountain's 30th year anniversary, and offer my best wishes for their continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO KIRK KLANCKE

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I recognize Kirk Klancke, an angler and true Coloradan known for his commitment to preserving our environment and making Colorado a better place to live, work and play.

Kirk was recently selected as a finalist for Field and Stream Magazine's prestigious Heroes of Conservation Award. He was chosen based on his leadership and commitment to an effort he has led to preserve the Fraser River. This achievement goes to show how important his water conservation work in the West has been, and I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge his significant contributions to the State of Colorado.

Both Kirk and I have spent time enjoying the natural beauty of our State while appreciating the value of preserving it for future generations. Kirk's longstanding dedication to these values has not only ensured that we can fully enjoy what Colorado has to offer, but that our kids will too. His work embodies what I have long held to be true—we don't inherit the Earth from our parents; we borrow it from our children and the generations that will follow.

Currently serving as president of the Colorado River Headwaters Chapter of Trout Unlimited, Kirk leads a team improving watersheds, restoring trout populations and keeping our rivers and streams healthy. More specifically, Kirk has been instrumental in efforts to conserve waters of the Fraser River and ensure their use for generations to come. As one example of this work, he has spearheaded the removal of highway traction sand from the water, which impedes flows and the ability of trout to spawn.

Colorado has reaped many benefits from his efforts as a capable conservationist that understands this delicate work and how to overcome the challenge of building consensus around water-use solutions. Among others, he sits on the Grand County Water Information Network Board and the Colorado River Basin Roundtable. Formerly serving on the Fraser Sanitation District Board of Directors, and now as manager of the Winter Park Ranch Water and Sanitation District, Kirk's contribution to one of Colorado's most precious resources—our water—continues to be vital to the health of the Fraser Valley community and our State's water supplies.

I commend Kirk for his recognition as a Field and Stream Hero of Conservation, and I wish him well in his continued efforts to keep Colorado's natural resources healthy.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that it had passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1025. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law.

H.R. 1263. An act to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide surviving spouses with certain protections relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2074. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a comprehensive policy on reporting and tracking sexual assault incidents and other safety incidents that occur at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2302. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress of conferences sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2349. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the determination of annual income with respect to pensions for certain veterans, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to assess the skills of certain employees and managers of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes.

At 6:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that it had passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3078. An act to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

H.R. 3079. An act to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement.

H.R. 3080. An act to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1025. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1263. An act to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide surviving spouses with certain protections relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2074. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a comprehensive policy on reporting and tracking sexual assault incidents and other safety incidents that occur at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve rehabilitative services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2302. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress of conferences sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2349. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the determination of annual income with respect to pensions for certain veterans, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to assess the skills of certain employees and managers of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2681. An act to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for cement manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3545. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sudanese Sanctions Regulations; Iranian Transactions Regulations; Final Rule''

(31 CFR Parts 538 and 560) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3546. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice No. 2011–84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3547. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updated Procedures for Opinion and Advisory Letter Rulings for Pre-approved Plans'' (Notice No. 2011–49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3548. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Implementation of Recovery Auditing at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services'' for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3549. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Reactive Blue 69; Confirmation of Effective Date'' (Docket No. FDA–2009–C–0543) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3550. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program (CICP): Administrative Implementation, Final Rule'' (RIN0906–AA83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3551. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Presumptive Service Connection for Diseases Associated With Service in the Southwest Asia Theater of Operations During the Persian Gulf War; Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders'' (RIN2900–AN83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3552. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer—Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–500 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0088)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3553. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0225)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3554. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate No. A–815 Formerly Held by Bombardier Inc. and de Havilland, Inc.)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0597)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3555. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Model SAAB 2000 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0476)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3556. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–365N and SA–365N1 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0791)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3557. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34–10E2A1, CF34–10E5, CF34–10E5A1, CF34–10E6, CF34–10E6A1, CF34–10E7, and CF34–10E7–B Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0187)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3558. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL–600–2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701 and 702), Model CL–600–2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705), and Model CL–600–2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0515)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3559. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–200, A330–300, A340–300, A340–500, and A340–600 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0385)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3560. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC–9–81 (MD–81), and DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), DC–9–87 (MD–87), and MD–88 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–1213)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3561. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney (PW) Models PW4074 and PW4077 Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1095)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3562. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0473)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3563. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model DHC–8–400 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0470)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3564. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320–214, –232, and –233 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0305)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3565. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F–28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3566. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737–600, –700, –700C, –800, and –900 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2007–28661)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3567. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Harvesting Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the

Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA715) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3568. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA710) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3569. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA704) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3570. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure'' (RIN0648–XA690) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3571. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries; 2012 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surfclams and Ocean Quahogs; and Suspension of Minimum Atlantic Surfclam Size Limit'' (RIN0648–XA529) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3572. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species; Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures'' (RIN0648–BA35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3573. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 45; Adjustments for Fishing Year 2011'' (RIN0648–BA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3574. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA722) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3575. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure'' (RIN0648–XA709) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3576. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Removal of Regulations'' (RIN0648–BB07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3577. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure'' (RIN0648–XA677) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3578. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List; Implementation of Entity List Annual Review Change; and Removal of Persons from the Entity List Based on Removal Requests'' (RIN0694–AF28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3579. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Cross-Border Trucking Pilot Program Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3580. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109A, A109A II, A109C, and A109K2 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0823)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3581. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2007–27747)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3582. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to support the Proton launch of the W5A Commercial Communication Satellites from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3583. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement to include the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to The Netherlands for the manufacture of Improved Extended Forward Avionics Bays for the AH–64D Apache Helicopter for end use by the United States Government in the amount of $100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3584. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement to include the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to the Republic of Korea to support the manufacture and assembly of the Rolling Airframe Missile (RAM) Guided Missile Round Pack (GMRP) and Guided Missile Launching System (GMLS) in the amount of $100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3585. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, three reports entitled, ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2F for Fiscal Years 2008 through 2011, as of March 31, 2011'', ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4D for Fiscal Years 2008 through 2011, as of March 31, 2011'', and ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A for Fiscal Years 2008 through 2011, as of March 31, 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3586. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2010 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3587. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to the Revised Revenue Estimate Through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3588. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to the Revised Revenue Estimate Through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Joyce A. Barr, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Assistant Secretary of State (Administration).

*Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Public Affairs).

*Anne Terman Wedner, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2013.

*Katherine M. Gehl, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2013.

*Terry Lewis, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2011.

*Terry Lewis, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2014.

*Russ Carnahan, of Missouri, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

*Dan W. Mozena, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Nominee: Dan W. Mozena.

Post: Dhaka, Bangladesh.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Anne C. Mozena, None; Mark W. Mozena, None. (Both are single).

4. Parents: Kenneth E. Mozena, (Deceased); Edna C. Mozena, $100, Annually, Republican National Committee.

5. Grandparents: Frank Mozena, (Deceased); Hattie Mozena, (Deceased); William Gottschalk, (Deceased); Charlotte Gottschalk, (Deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Darryl & Terry Mozena, $500 (total), 2005–2010, RNC; Jeff and Janet Mozena, None; Terry and Angie Mozena, None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Kris Ann (Mozena) McNamer (Deceased; Marty McNamer, $100, 2008, RNC.

---

*Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Nominee: Robert Mandell.

Post: Ambassador to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $1000, 12/4/07, Robert Wexler for Congress; $1000, 9/5/07, Tom Feeney for Congress; $2100, 9/26/07, Citizens for Harkin; $2300, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $2300, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $4600, 8/23/07, Martinez for Senate; −$2300, 12/29/08, Martinez for Senate; $2,100, 09/07, ACT Blue; $2,500, 12/07, Dem Sen Camp Comm; $1,000, 12/07, Charlie Stuart Campaign; $2300, 3/17/08, Yarmuth for Congress; $100, 04/08, Darcy Burner for Seattle; $1000, 6/6/08, Alexander for Senate; $2300, 10/24/08, Castor for Congress; $2300, 10/25/08, Kosmas for Congress; $2300, 7/14/08, Hillary Clinton for President; $250, 4/21/08, Dollars for Democrats; $1000, 10/31/08, Committee to Elect Alan Grayson; $500, 8/12/08, Hodes for Congress; $2250, 6/27/08, Friends of Carl Levin; $5000, 10/30/08, Democratic Exec. Committee of FL; $1000, 2/11/08, Klein for Congress; $4000, 8/20/08, Obama Victory Fund; $1700, 8/27/08, Obama for America via Obama VF; $2300, 8/27/08, Obama for America via Obama VF; −$4000, 8/23/11, Obama for America (refunded); $27000, 10/2/08, Committee for Change; $28500, 5/21/08, DNC; $300, 02/09, Mica for Congress; $2500, 2/3/09, Franken Recount Fund; $1,000, 06/09, Kendrick Meek; $5000, 10/29/09, Midwest Values PAC; $400, 9/30/09, Kendrick Meek for Florida INC; $1000, 6/11/09, Kosmas for Congress; $1000, 9/30/09, Kosmas for Congress; $1000, 11/19/09, Klein for Congress; $4800, 4/28/09, Bill Nelson for Senate; $2300, 2/8/09, Al Franken for Senate; $1000, 7/16/09, Boyd for Congress; $1,000, 12/09, Kendrick Meek; $1000, 3/30/10, Kosmas for Congress; $500, 06/10, Mica for Congress; $2400, 9/29/10, Yarmuth for Congress; $1500, 4/13/10, DCCC; $1000, 8/2/10, Lori Edwards Campaign Cmte; $1000, 9/27/10, Lori Edwards Campaign Cmte; $1000, 3/2/10, Ted Deutch for Congress; $10000, 8/23/10, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; $1400, 8/16/10, Boyd for Congress; $1000, 3/1/11, McCaskill for Missouri.

2. Spouse: Julie W. Mandell: $2400, 3/26/10, Kendrick Meek for Florida INC; $1000, 3/31/10, Kendrick Meek for Florida INC; $2400, 9/10/10, Kosmas for Congress.

3. Children and Spouses: Zachary Mandell: $2300, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $2100, 6/30/07, Obama for America. Scott Mandell: $2000, 2/27/08, Obama for America.

4. Parents: Lester Mandell: $2300, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $2300, 6/30/07, Obama for America; $200, 09/07, Charlie Stuart for Congress; $28500, 7/31/08, DNC; $250, 2/14/08, Washington PAC; $1000, 7/9/08, Washington PAC; $250, 4/8/08, Charlie Stuart for Congress; $2000, 5/6/09, Bill Nelson for Senate; $500, 11/08/10, Washington PAC; $3000, 3/28/11, Bill Nelson for Senate. Sonia Mandell: $500, 6/18/08, Friends of Carl Levin; $500, 6/26/08, Friends of Carl Levin; $2300, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $2300, 6/30/07, Obama for America; $1250, 11/04/09, Midwest Values PAC.

5. Grandparents: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Allison Knapp: $1,000, 4/26/07, Obama for America; $3,600, 6/27/07, Obama for America.

---

*Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Nominee: Thomas C. Krajeski.

Post: Bahrain.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: $50, 07/08, Democratic Party.

3. Children and Spouses: Alix (Krajeski) O'Connell: None. Brian O'Connell: None. Jenna Krajeski: $25, 07/08, Obama. Aaron Krajeski: None.

4. Parents: Chester J. Krajeski—deceased; Helen J. Krajeski—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Jacob Krajeski—deceased; Anna Krajeski—deceased; Percy Trasher—deceased; Emma Trasher—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Stephen Krajeski—deceased; Michael & Maria Krajeski: $25, 07/08, Obama; William & Kathleen Krajeski: $50, 07/08, McCain; Lawrence & Pamela Krajeski: $50, 07/08, Obama.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Margaret Krajeski—deceased; Janet & Joseph Paquette: $250, 07/08, Democratic Party.

---

*Susan Denise Page, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan.

Nominee Susan Denise Page.

Post: Juba, South Sudan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount date, and donee:

1. Self: $300, 7–31–2008, Obama for America.

2. Spouse Damien Kaki Coulibaly 0.

3. Children and Spouses Names: Marius Muhjima Page: 0.

4. Parents Names: Dr. & Mrs. Harold A. and Maurice F. Page: 200, 2006, Campaign of Obama for Senate; 200, 2008, Obama for America; 100, 2000, Carol Mosseley Branun; 100, 2002, Sen. Nelson (Fl).

5. Grandparents Names: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Mr. and Mrs. Harold Brian and Natalie Page: 5.00. 2011, Organizing for Obama.

---

*Adrienne S. O'Neal, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cape Verde.

Nominee: Adrienne S. O'Neal.

Post: Cape Verde.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

Self: none; Children and Spouses: Quincy S. O'Neal, none; Parents: deceased; Grandparents: deceased; Brothers and Spouses: (N/A); Sisters and Spouses: Deborah P. O'Neal, sister, none.

---

*Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Nominee: Mary Beth Leonard.

Post: Mail.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: n/a.

3. Children and Spouses: n/a.

4. Parents: Earl W. Leonard—deceased; Margaret M. Leonard—none.

5. Grandparents: Thomas F. and Florence Leonard—deceased; Joseph and Catherine M. Mastrorio—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Leonard—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Claire M. and William K. McIntire, none; Ann Marie and David N. Stoica, none.

---

*Mark Francis Brzezinski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Nominee: Mark Francis Brzezinski.

Post: Ambassador to Sweden.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: $500, April 15, 2001, Alexandria (VA) Democratic Committee; $1,000, April 7, 2011,

Kaine for VA (Senate); $500, February 9, 2011, Bysiewicz for Senate; $250, July 1, 2010, Giannoulias for U.S. Senate; $1,000, May 28, 2010, Friends of Mark Warner; $1,000, Nov. 25, 2009, Forward Together PAC.

Spouse: Natalia Anna Brzezinski, None,

Children and Spouses: Aurora Emilie Brzezinski, None.

Parents: Zbigniew Brzezinski, None; Muska Brzezinski, None.

Grandparents: Emilie Benes, Deceased; Leonia Brzezinski, Deceased; Tadeusz Brzezinski, Deceased.

Brothers and Spouses: Ian Brzezinski, None; Ginny Brzezinski, None.

Sisters and Spouses: Mika Brzezinski, None; Jim Hoffer, None.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Nicholas E. Gutierrez and ending with John L. Shaw, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Erik M. Anderson and ending with Larry G. Padget, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2011.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Robert Donovan, Jr. and ending with Brenda Vanhorn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2011.

By Ms. LANDRIEU for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

*Winslow Lorenzo Sargeant, of Wisconsin, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1682. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to promote growth and opportunity for the dairy industry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1683. A bill to provide the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of the Treasury with authority to more aggressively enforce trade laws relating to textile and apparel articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1684. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1686. A bill to amend section 1112 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 1687. A bill to adjust the boundary of Carson National Forest, New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 1688. A bill to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the methodology for calculating the amount of any Postal surplus or supplemental liability under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 1689. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a comprehensive policy on reporting and tracking sexual assault incidents and other safety incidents that occur at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1690. A bill to preserve the multiple use land management policy in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1691. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. REID, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1692. A bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, to provide full funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance of tax by insurance companies through reinsurance with non-taxed affiliates; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1694. A bill to limit the use of cost-type contacts by the Department of Defense for major defense acquisition programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1695. A bill to require accurate disclosures to consumers of the terms and conditions of 4G service and other advanced wireless mobile broadband service; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1696. A bill to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1697. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H–2A nonimmigrants employed as sheepherders, goat herders, or dairy farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts):

S. 1698. A bill to add engaging in or supporting hostilities against the United States to the list of acts for which United States nationals would lose their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOHL:

S. 1699. A bill to reduce the costs of prescription drugs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 291. A resolution recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 292. A resolution designating the week beginning October 16, 2011, as ''National Character Counts Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 581

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 581, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks for child care providers.

S. 714

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 714, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 847, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to ensure that risks from chemicals are adequately understood and managed, and for other purposes.

S. 887

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from

Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 887, a bill to increase the portion of community block grants that may be used to provide public services, and for other purposes.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 1231

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1231, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1281

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1281, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1301

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1301, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 to 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in person, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1358, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1452, a bill to promote simplification and fairness in the administration and collection of sales and use taxes.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 1472

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1472, a bill to impose sanctions on persons making certain investments that directly and significantly contribute to the enhancement of the ability of Syria to develop its petroleum resources, and for other purposes.

S. 1506

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1506, a bill to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from expanding United States bank reporting requirements with respect to interest on deposits paid to nonresident aliens.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to revise the Federal charter for the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc. to reflect a change in eligibility requirements for membership.

S. 1569

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1569, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide State educational agencies and local educational agencies with flexible Federal education funding that will allow such State and local educational agencies to fund locally determined programs and initiatives that meet the varied and unique needs of individual States and localities.

S. 1600

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1600, a bill to enhance the ability of community banks to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1616

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for taxpayers making donations with their returns of income tax to the Federal Government to pay down the public debt.

S. 1679

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1679, a bill to ensure effective control over the Congressional budget process.

S. 1680

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1680, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the

Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices.

S. RES. 253

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 253, a resolution designating October 26, 2011, as ''Day of the Deployed''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1684. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2011. For far too long, bureaucratic red tape has prevented Indian tribes from pursuing economic development opportunities on tribal trust lands, including energy development. For years, Indian tribes have expressed concerns about how Federal laws and regulations governing the management of trust resources, including energy resources, create significant delays and uncertainty in development proposals.

This bill represents an effort to deal with some of those concerns, and for the RECORD I would like to highlight some of its provisions. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 included an Indian Energy title—Title V—that, in significant part, attempts to deal with these delays and uncertainties that are inherent in the Bureau of Indian Affairs' energy leasing process, by providing Indian tribes with an alternative way to develop their energy resources. However, more than 6 years after the enactment of that act, it appears that no tribe has yet availed itself of the new energy development process authorized in the 2005 Act.

This bill includes a number of amendments to the alternative process established back in 2005, all of which are intended to facilitate the use of that section—to make the process easier for Indian tribes to follow and more predictable—be clearing away some of the red tape and other impediments.

Another amendment to this process would provide the Indian tribes with some funding to implement the processes authorized under the 2005 Energy Policy Act, in a way that should not increase the cost of the program. What this amendment would do is require the Secretary to provide funding to the tribe for its energy development activities in an amount equal any savings that the United States might realize as a result of the Indian tribe pursing this process, since the Indian tribe would be performing many functions itself rather than the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The bill requires the Secretary to identify the savings to the United States and make that amount available to the Indian tribe in a separate funding agreement.

The ultimate goal of these amendments is to facilitate economic development, provide Indian people with an opportunity to make a good living, and give the tribes greater control over the management and development of their own trust resources.

There are other energy-related issues addressed in this bill as well. There is an amendment to section 201 of the Federal Power Act that would put Indian tribes on a similar footing with States and municipalities for preferences when preliminary permits or original licenses, where no preliminary permit has been issued, for hydroelectric projects. However, this provision does not affect any preliminary permit or original license issued before the bill's enactment date or any application for an original license where no preliminary permit has been issued that was complete before the date of enactment of the bill.

The bill would also authorize a ''biomass demonstration project'' for biomass energy production from Indian forest lands, rangelands and other Federal lands in accordance with program requirements developed by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture after consultation with Indian tribes. This amendment would promote the development of tribal biomass projects by providing them with more reliable and potentially long-term supplies of woody biomass materials.

There are many other provisions of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2011, but the foregoing items are among the more important. Before I conclude, I would like to thank Senator AKAKA, the Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, for his leadership on this issue and for agreeing to cosponsor this bill with me as well as the other Senators who have agreed to join as cosponsors.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to help us expand economic opportunity on tribal trust lands by moving this act expeditiously.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I rise in support of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2011. I am proud to co-sponsor this bill introduced by my friend, colleague, and Vice Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, Senator JOHN BARRASSO. I applaud his leadership and am proud to call him my full partner in our work on behalf of the Native peoples of the United States. Introduction of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2011 is an important first step. I look forward to hearings on this measure and working with all of my colleagues to increase the ability of Native communities to develop energy resources on their lands and enhance self-determination.

Indian lands hold great potential for traditional and renewable domestic energy production. Responsible development could help decrease our Nation's dependence on foreign energy sources and create much needed jobs in some of the most impoverished areas of the Nation. Today, Indian reservations make up approximately 5 percent of the United States land base, and it is estimated that those reservations contain about 10 percent of the country's energy resources. A number of Indian tribes are already working in the areas of traditional and renewable energy production, energy transmission, and energy planning. Yet, successfully tapping into the vast energy reserves in our Nation's Indian communities remains a difficult and complex task.

It remains challenging for Indian tribes to develop adequate information about their energy resources, to obtain interconnection to the electric transmission grid, and to partner with private entities to engage in energy projects. Congress recognized the potential of tribes to develop energy sources on their lands by enacting tribal provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. However, many of the programs and policies authorized by Title V of the act intended to benefit tribes have not been implemented or have only been partially implemented.

The Committee on Indian Affairs has held a listening session, and we have solicited comments from stakeholders across the spectrum on the issue. Tribes have made it clear they wish to chart their own economic destinies, but that in order to do so modifications are needed to the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The legislation introduced today will address tribal concerns as well as private sector concerns and will help unlock the huge potential of Indian tribal energy development to create jobs, promote tribal self-determination, and decrease our dependence on foreign energy sources.

This bill will set clear deadlines for Secretarial approval and streamline administrative processes related to tribal energy development which will help tribes and the United States ''win the future'' by enabling development of renewable energy sources from tribal lands.

I encourage all of my colleagues to stand with me and Senator BARRASSO in support of this legislative initiative.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 1688. A bill to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the methodology for calculating the amount of any Postal surplus or supplemental liability under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Save Our Postal Worker Jobs Act.

Even with advances in technology, America relies on the Postal Service

for everything from notes to family back home, birthday cards, medicine, tax returns and absentee voting. The Postal Service binds our nation together through communication. But the Postal Service is facing a financial crisis and it needs Congress to help.

The Save Our Postal Worker Jobs Act is simple. It doesn't restructure the Postal Service, lay off workers, or close Post Offices. It simply gives the Postal Service the authority it needs to take its own money—not taxpayer money—that it overpaid into its employee pension funds to use to help pay its obligations.

This bill is a jobs bill. Many of the plans that have been introduced to keep the U.S. Postal Service financially solvent include provisions to lay off thousands of workers, cut promised benefits, and undermine collective bargaining rights. The Postal Service has talked about reducing its workforce by more than 200,000.

Our postal service employees are on the front lines every day, working hard for America. I want them to know that I am on their side, and I will not let them be scapegoated for financial problems at the Postal Service. Through the dedication and diligence of our postal workers, the mail is delivered across the country through rain or sleet or snow. It is their work that conveys messages to family, brings medicine to our veterans and seniors, and helps our constituents who are away from home on election day have their voices heard.

This bill is about preserving the local Post Office—an important part of a neighborhood's identity and a piece of the fabric of our communities. This bill is about preserving Postal Service delivery—which is so important for rural areas like Western Maryland and the Eastern Shore. Each region has unique geography that can complicate or delay mail delivery. And reductions to the Postal Service could seriously harm those residents.

This bill alone will not solve all of the Postal Service's problems. The process of reforming the Postal Service and bringing it into the 21st Century may mean that some workers will be let go, some Post Offices may close, and some changes may be made to delivery.

Ultimately, this bill is about allowing those decisions to be thoughtfully considered, with time for the Americans who rely on the Postal Service to be heard. It's about avoiding making rash decisions with a crisis hanging over our heads.

It is about saving our postal workers' jobs.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1690. A bill to preserve the multiple use land management policy in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, Senator KYL, Senator HATCH, Senator LEE and Senator BARRASSO in introducing legislation to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from executing his plan to ban mining on 1 million acres of Federal land in northern Arizona. A companion bill has been introduced by Congressman TRENT FRANKS in the House. The purpose behind this legislation is best outlined in a recent letter that I along with several members of the Senate and House transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 2011.

Hon. KEN SALAZAR,
Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SALAZAR: We are writing to urge you to reconsider moving forward with a proposed 20-year withdrawal of approximately 1 million acres of federal mineral estate in northern Arizona. We predict such a decision, if finalized, would kill hundreds of potential jobs in our states and erode the trust needed for diverse stakeholders to reach agreement on how to protect and manage public lands in the future.

Grand Canyon National Park is an Arizona icon and a natural wonder that attracts visitors from around the world. The Colorado River that flows through the park is the lifeblood of the West, providing drinking water for millions in seven states. We share your desire to protect Grand Canyon National Park and the region's water supplies from adverse environmental effects that may be associated with hardrock mineral exploration and development. We disagree that the proposed withdrawal is necessary to achieve that objective. In our view, the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed withdrawal actually demonstrates that uranium mineral development would pose little, if any, threat to the park or water quality in the region. Thus, we are concerned that this proposed withdrawal is more about social agendas and political pressure than about the best available science.

The aspiration on the part of the environmental community to ban all mining activity in the Grand Canyon region is not new. It existed during the last uranium rebound of the late 1970s and early 1980s. The difference is that, back then, the environmental community put their aspirations aside to constructively work with the mining and livestock industries and Congress to reach an historic agreement on wilderness designations and multiple use land policy—an agreement that ultimately became Title III of the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984 (P.L. 98–406). The Act designated over 1.1 million acres of wilderness on the Arizona Strip while, at the same time, releasing another 540,000 acres of federal land for multiple-use development; how that development would be conducted was left to the land management planning process. The Act is rightfully held up as the gold standard of stakeholder collaboration and bipartisan compromise. Until now, it has allowed sustainable uranium mining to coexist with the protection of some of our most treasured natural resources. If the decision is made to move forward with the proposed withdrawal, you will be casting aside that historic compromise and ignoring the land management plans developed through the land management planning process that identify the bulk of the proposed withdrawal area as open to uranium mineral development.

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE ARIZONA WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

It is important that you review and fully consider the legislative history of the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984 before making a final decision regarding the proposed withdrawal. At that time, former House Interior Committee chairman, the late Rep. Morris Udall, led the Arizona congressional delegation (including then-Rep. John McCain) in crafting the legislation. The legislative history strongly substantiates that there was a compromise regarding wilderness protection and continued uranium exploration and development on the Arizona Strip. That compromise was originally embodied in a freestanding bill, the Arizona Strip Wilderness Act of 1983 (H.R. 3562). The Arizona Strip Wilderness Act of 1983 was incorporated into the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984 at Title III. A review of the House committee report (H.Rpt. 98–643, Part 1, pages 34–35) accompanying the bill demonstrates the clear recognition by Congress that the lands not designated as wilderness had significant uranium mineral potential, and that the land-management planning process would govern that future development. It states:

There is also a great desire on the part of the Bureau of Land Management and all the interest groups concerned to lay the wilderness issue to rest. This is particularly true for those companies engaged in uranium exploration and mining, as the current wilderness status of large acreages in the Arizona Strip constitutes an impediment to rational and coordinated exploration and development. Likewise, environmental groups feel that uranium activities should be excluded from certain key areas and that immediate wilderness designation for such areas is far preferable to relying on interim wilderness study protection. To this end, a broad coalition of groups and individuals sat down during the early months of 1983 and worked out an agreement that has since received the support from the Administration, the State of Arizona, the local congressman, both senators and virtually every other interest party of which the Committee is aware. Indeed, the Committee's hearings revealed nearly unanimous support for the Arizona Strip proposal. Accordingly, Title III of H.R. 4707 designates the following Arizona Strip lands as wilderness, and releases certain other lands for such non-wilderness uses as are determined appropriate though the land management planning process.

[T]he Committee has not included these lands in wilderness in recognition of their significant mineral (especially uranium) potential. In leaving these lands open for mineral exploration and potential development, the Committee emphasizes that this is an environmentally sensitive area that should be managed by the Bureau of Land Management to minimize adverse impacts on the current remote and wild values. The Committee understands that the type of mining that will take place here is of a low impact, underground type.

The hearing record on the Arizona Strip Bill is also instructive. It demonstrates that the stakeholders truly believed a ''win win'' had been struck and were willing to testify in support of the compromise. The following excerpts are taken from the testimony offered on October 21, 1983 on the Arizona Strip Wilderness Act of 1983 before the House Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks:

Testimony of Michael D. Scott, Regional Southwest Director, The Wilderness Society.

It [H.R. 3562] is supported by, among others, the mining industry, local government, the livestock industry, and conservationists. This unusual combination of support is not an accident. It represents many months of work at forging a compromise acceptable to the entire range of interests on the Arizona Strip.'' (Page 296)

At the same time that the Strip emerged as a top conservationist priority, energy companies, most notably Energy Fuels Nuclear (EFN), began to discover significant uranium deposits. As you know, Mr. Chairman, in most cases there are no significant minerals in wilderness or wilderness candidate lands. As unfortunately happens on occasion, some of these significant uranium deposits overlapped with outstanding wildlands in the Strip. Fortunately, EFN, is not a typical hard-rock mining company. Conservationists and EFN decided to discuss those differences. (Page 297)

Statement of Representative Bob Stump.

For many months, several divergent groups, who would usually be viewed as adversaries, have worked together to form a consensus on wilderness designation and multiple use for the Arizona Strip. The legislation which you have before you today is the result of those efforts and is proof positive that give and take on the part of all participants can result in a compromise which will address all concerns. (Page 271)

The key and important factor in this agreement is that it expresses the needs and desires of the ranching, mining, local government, public land managers and environmental communities . . . an example of business interests and environmental concerns working together. (Page 272)

Almost 800,000 acres were included in the Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Study Areas in the Arizona Strip. H.R. 3562 designates approximately 165,996 of those acres as well as 122,604 acres in the Paiute Primitive Area, Paria Primitive Area and Vermillion Cliffs Natural Area, as wilderness. The remaining 620,000 acres or 79% of the BLM Wilderness Study Areas will be released to multiple use. (Page 272)

Testimony of Gerald Grandey, Vice President, Energy Fuels Corporation.

Of what we know today, the Arizona Strip appears to be the only area in the United States that has the potential to produce relatively high grade uranium ore, which even at today's depressed market is capable of competing with foreign sources of the material, such as South Africa, Canada, and Australia. (Page 106)

The benefits to be had from the passage of the Arizona Strip Wilderness Act of 1983 are clear. The wilderness in question will be decided once and for all ending many years of potential controversy and debate. In the areas released to multiple use, our Company and others with active programs in the Arizona Strip will be able to conduct exploration in a cost effective and responsible manner. (Page 284)

Testimony of Russ Butcher, Southwest Regional Representative, National Parks Conservation Association.

It was exactly one year ago that we first met and began talking formally with the top officials of Energy Fuels Nuclear, talking about the company's uranium exploration and mining activities north of the Grand Canyon, and about the relationship of these activities to an array of Federal wilderness study areas. (Page 120)

The proposed withdrawal is a ''de facto wilderness'' designation; it will unravel decades of responsible resource development on the Arizona Strip in a misguided effort to ''save'' the Grand Canyon from the same form of uranium mining that environmental groups once agreed to. Moving forward with the proposed withdrawal will call into question the Department's interpretation of wilderness-release language in other legislation and its commitment to multiple-use policy in the years ahead. If the decision is made to finalize the proposed withdrawal, all future wilderness proposals will assuredly face even greater scrutiny as it will be clear that negotiated agreements, such as those contained in the Arizona Wilderness Act, are neither genuine nor enduring.

Again, we agree that the Grand Canyon deserves to be protected for the enjoyment of future generations. However, moving forward with the proposed withdrawal flies in the face of the legislative history regarding mineral development and responsible land management planning. We strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed withdrawal.

Sincerely,

Signed by: Senator John McCain, Senator Orrin Hatch, Senator Jon Kyl, Senator Mike Lee, Senator John Barrasso, Congressman Trent Franks, Congressman Rob Bishop, Congressman Jeff Flake, Congressman David Schweikert, Congressman Paul Gosar, Congressman Ben Quayle, Congressman Jason Chaffetz.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. REID, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1692. A bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, to provide full funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I introduced, along with Senator MURKOWSKI and 22 other Senators S. 1692, the County Payments Reauthorization Act of 2011. The bill would provide dependable funding to support public schools, transportation infrastructure, and other critical county programs in more than 1,900 counties in 49 States. Specifically, it would continue to fund for 5 more years the Payments In Lieu of Taxes Program, and it would reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. The Secure Rural Schools Act expired at the end of September.

Economists have long said that funding for local governments not only provides one of the most efficient and immediate ways to create and save jobs, it also helps to ensure that essential community services on which economic growth depends are maintained. These programs have proven that point in recent years. They have been lifelines for financially strapped rural counties and the thousands of Americans they employ and they contract with. They employ a multitude of public school teachers, support countless miles of county road projects, fund thousands of collaborative forest and watershed restoration projects, and pay for hundreds of community wildfire risk reduction programs in all parts of the country.

I would like to give one example from my home State of New Mexico. Many of my colleagues may know that the Wallow fire this summer grew to become the largest fire in the history of Arizona. My colleagues may not know that its leading edge burned more than 15,000 acres into New Mexico, and it threatened the community of Luna in Catron County, New Mexico.

When I visited the town of Luna, the community's firefighters told me the wildfire risk reduction projects they had completed using funds from the Secure Rural Schools Program helped to save their town. The funds from this bill also will fund many projects to help their local forests and watersheds and many others around New Mexico to recover from the severe fires that burned there this summer.

Despite the important work these programs support, we recognize that funding these programs is not easy, given the financial circumstance in which we find ourselves. We worked for months to build this strong coalition in the Senate and among the stakeholders in support of these programs across the country. In the process there have been an array of differing views about the details of how these programs should be structured going forward.

For example, recognizing the difficult financial situation in communities around the country and the urgent need to create jobs, some would significantly increase funding for these programs. Others, recognizing the challenging fiscal situation that the Federal Government faces, would sharply reduce funding for these programs. Some would shift the emphasis of the Secure Rural Schools Program to forestry projects such as those covered by titles II and III of that program. Others would shift the emphasis to public schools and to road projects.

But most importantly, there has been broad agreement on the most critical issues. First, there is broad agreement that funding for these two programs is immensely important. Second, there is broad agreement that the only way for us to successfully continue that funding is for us to renew the compromise we negotiated in 2008. Congress overwhelmingly passed that compromise, it has provided funding for these programs for the last 4 years, and our communities have broadly supported it.

The alternative, which seems to have become routine in Congress, is to emphasize our differences and destroy the coalition of support that will be essential to continue funding of these programs.

I greatly appreciate the support and leadership of Senator MURKOWSKI and many others. Let me mention all those who have helped with this bill and who are cosponsoring this effort: Senator BAUCUS, Senator CRAPO, Senator WYDEN, Senator RISCH, Senator REID of Nevada, Senator COCHRAN, Senator TESTER, Senator BLUNT, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator HELLER, Senator TOM UDALL, Senator BOXER, Senator CANTWELL, Senator MURRAY, Senator BENNET, Senator MERKLEY, Senator SANDERS, Senator TIM JOHNSON, Senator BEGICH, Senator MCCASKILL, Senator MARK UDALL, Senator FRANKEN, and Senator LEVIN—all of whom are cosponsoring this important legislation.

I hope the rest of the Senate will join us once again to support the continuation of these important programs and enact this legislation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to thank Senator BINGAMAN for leading the effort to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

Over 100 years ago this Congress passed a law which formed a compact with counties, boroughs and parishes in rural America where the National Forests are located. That compact stipulated that the Forest Service would share 25 percent of its revenues with local governments to support roads and schools.

This agreement was put into law 60 years before the Payment in Lieu of Tax law was written to help compensate counties for the loss of revenue caused by the inability to tax federal property.

Over the years, the Forest Service shared billions of dollars with the counties and, until 1990, the amount of those payments increased almost every year. In fact, the Forest Service sold $1.6 billion worth of timber in fiscal year 1990. As a result, counties received more than $402 million in 25 percent payments to support schools and roads.

More importantly, the Forest Service timber sale program in 1990 generated more than 102,000 direct and indirect jobs in areas that now have the highest unemployment rates in the country. Those timber sales generated more than $5.3 billion—that is billion with a ''B'' of economic activity and $800 million in Federal income taxes. Further, revenue from the Forest Service's timber sale program supported many of the other Forest Service's multiple-use programs, including recreation, wilderness, road building and maintenance, and fire suppression.

All that changed in 1990 and 1991, when activists used the Endangered Species Act to reduce, and in some instances stop, timber harvesting across the West. If I could wave a magic wand and legislate reforms to the many environmental laws that have been twisted and misconstrued in order to block any development of our natural resources, rather than ensuring responsible decision making by our Federal land management agencies, as Congress intended, I would.

In the long run, I think that is what is needed, and I am convinced that given the economic malaise this country suffers, the American public is beginning to understand the wrongheaded direction our Federal land management has taken over the last two and a half decades.

But I don't think I can accomplish that in this Congress, and I am compelled to avoid adding any additional pain and suffering to the shoulders of the small rural communities that depend on Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act payments. Therefore I am joining Senators BINGAMAN and WYDEN and others in cosponsoring legislation to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act for another 5-year period.

Senator BINGAMAN has fully described the bill, but it reauthorizes the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act at fiscal year 2011 payment levels for 5 more years. We have reduced the annual reduction in payments from the 10 percent level in current law down to a 5-percent annual reduction. Under this plan, counties, parishes, communities and schools will receive up to $364 million in temporary assistance each year for the next 5 years.

I say ''temporary'' because this program was, and is, designed to be a short-term bridge to allow counties and communities to transition to the new economic reality that our wrongheaded Federal lands policy has forced upon them.

I want everyone to also understand that while having signed on to this bill I am also considering a number of other alternative solutions that have the promise of generating enough revenue and jobs from Federal land activities to make our counties whole. I am willing to go as far as turning control of some Federal lands over to counties so that they may get some economic benefit from them. But first I will be taking a careful look at Representative HASTINGS's bill to generate additional resource management by lifting restrictions and expediting the processes needed to offer additional timber sales.

I want everyone to know that if a legitimate, acceptable, offset to pay for the cost of this program is not identified by the time the bill is ready to move to the Senate floor, I will have no alternative but to remove my name from the bill and will have to work to defeat the bill.

I would tell my fellow Senators that the folks in the House Resources Committee are fundamentally correct. We are going to have to either utilize our Federal lands to support our rural communities or we should divest the Federal Government of those lands and let the States, or the counties, manage those lands. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to find a path forward for this approach in this and future Congresses.

I will close by speaking directly to the counties, parishes, boroughs and communities that have now depended on the Secure Rural School program for more than a decade—and for some counties in Oregon, Washington and Northwest California for more than two decades—the Secure Rural Schools Payments are coming to an end. It could be this year if enough people do not rally around the bill that Senator BINGAMAN, I, and our other cosponsors have proposed. It could be 2 years from now if Representative HASTINGS and other Representatives prevail. Or it could be 5 years from now if we find the acceptable offsets needed to pay for our legislative proposal. My fervent hope is that the program will be replaced by a forest management system that actually puts people back to work in the forest, but it's coming to an end, and the counties and schools need to prepare for that eventuality.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1696. A bill to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce legislation to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act, PSOB. This law, enacted in 1976, is a vital safety net for our first responders who are permanently disabled in the line of duty, and for the families of those who make the ultimate sacrifice while serving their fellow citizens.

This legislation, along with several technical refinements to the program, will add certain classes of first responders who, due to gaps in the law, have been left without protection. For example, the bill contains legislation I introduced in the 111th Congress in response to the tragic death of Dale Long, a decorated emergency medical responder in Vermont. The Dale Long Emergency Medical Service Providers Protection Act would protect Mr. Long's survivors and those who may follow and encounter the same limitations under the current law.

Under current PSOB law, in order to be eligible for benefits, a member of an ambulance crew must work for an organization that is deemed a unit of State or local government, and thus be deemed a public employee. In Dale Long's case, as with rescue crews across the country, he worked for a private, non-profit entity that nonetheless served his community in a way indistinguishable from an organization with status as a unit of government. Based upon this distinction, Dale Long's surviving family was ineligible for these benefits. This is unfair, and undermines the Federal policy that is in place to support and protect these men and women. The bill I introduce today would end this disparate treatment.

The legislation also includes a provision to ensure that a cadet officer killed during a dangerous training exercise would be eligible for such benefits. The current law's weakness in this

area was highlighted in a case in Maryland, during which fire cadet Racheal Wilson was killed during a training exercise. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator CARDIN have been very concerned about this situation, and I commend them for advocating for its inclusion in this legislation.

In the 111th Congress, the Judiciary Committee considered and reported the Dale Long Emergency Medical Service Providers Protection Act by voice vote. Despite the Committee's work, and the process and debate it was afforded within the Committee, the bill was objected to when I tried to get Senate consideration. This was very disappointing, given the importance of this legislation to first responders around the country, and given the fact that the legislation was fully offset.

This year, I once again introduced the Dale Long Emergency Medical Service Providers Protection Act. During the Senate's debate in February on the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act, I worked closely with Senator INHOFE to propose an amendment that included both the Dale Long Emergency Medical Service Providers Protection Act and a proposal from Senator INHOFE to support those who volunteer their time and expertise as airplane pilots to help those in need. Our bipartisan amendment was adopted by voice vote.

During the course of the subsequent conference negotiations on the FAA authorization legislation, I worked closely with Chairman ROCKEFELLER and House Judiciary Committee Chairman LAMAR SMITH to ensure that our bipartisan amendment was retained in the conference agreement. During the course of these negotiations, Chairman SMITH proposed to expand the Dale Long Emergency Medical Service Providers Protection Act to include other changes to the current PSOB law.

For example, Chairman SMITH proposed a refinement of the Hometown Heroes law, a law that I authored and which was enacted in 2003. I worked with firefighters, police officers, and first responders to make sure that what Chairman SMITH had proposed would not only retain the spirit and intent of the original Hometown Heroes law, but, most importantly, would improve upon it to alleviate some of the administrative delays that the families of first responders had encountered in the past. This refined proposal is included in the bill.

The bill I introduce today also includes provisions to lessen the length of a currently unwieldy appeals process for claimants, clarify the list of eligible survivor beneficiaries, and make those who have been catastrophically injured eligible for peer support and counseling programs. It also removes artificial distinctions under the Hometown Heroes Act to expand the types of injuries that would make a public safety officer's survivors eligible for benefits.

The final version of the legislation to which Chairman SMITH and I agreed represents a bipartisan compromise on the overall improvement of this important program. I appreciate Chairman SMITH's willingness to work with me in support of this program, and the first responders for whom the law is intended to protect. I understand that our agreement was to be incorporated in the FAA conference report.

Unfortunately, the future for a conference agreement on the FAA legislation is unclear. Each day that passes is another day that Mr. Long's family, and others who would benefit from this legislation, must live without the assistance this benefit provides. The Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act has been in effect for over 30 years, and has brought a measure of security to survivors of fallen first responders. In 1990, Congress continued this tradition and acted again to ensure that those first responders who have been permanently disabled in the line of duty are taken care of. This longstanding policy is reflective of Congress' recognition of the importance and necessity of the men and women who commit themselves as firefighters, police officers, and medical responders.

It is difficult to imagine what communities across America would be like without these essential services. From the firefighters in Vermont who race to the scene of a rural fire during a cold winter night, to the ambulance crews providing emergency medical services following a natural disaster in Oklahoma, our dedicated first responders are all connected by their sense of duty and their selflessness in the service of their neighbors. In Congress, lawmakers have traditionally acted in support of these men and women irrespective of party and we should continue that great tradition. I hope the Senate will act quickly to pass this important bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1696

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN NONPROFIT EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE PROVIDERS AND CERTAIN TRAINEES; MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 901(a) (42 U.S.C. 3791(a))—

(A) in paragraph (26), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (27), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(28) the term 'hearing examiner' includes any medical or claims examiner.'';

(2) in section 1201 (42 U.S.C. 3796)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''follows:'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''follows (if the payee indicated is living on the date on which the determination is made)—

''(1) if there is no child who survived the public safety officer, to the surviving spouse of the public safety officer;

''(2) if there is at least 1 child who survived the public safety officer and a surviving spouse of the public safety officer, 50 percent to the surviving child (or children, in equal shares) and 50 percent to the surviving spouse;

''(3) if there is no surviving spouse of the public safety officer, to the surviving child (or children, in equal shares);

''(4) if there is no surviving spouse of the public safety officer and no surviving child—

''(A) to the surviving individual (or individuals, in shares per the designation, or, otherwise, in equal shares) designated by the public safety officer to receive benefits under this subsection in the most recently executed designation of beneficiary of the public safety officer on file at the time of death with the public safety agency, organization, or unit; or

''(B) if there is no individual qualifying under subparagraph (A), to the surviving individual (or individuals, in equal shares) designated by the public safety officer to receive benefits under the most recently executed life insurance policy of the public safety officer on file at the time of death with the public safety agency, organization, or unit;

''(5) if there is no individual qualifying under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4), to the surviving parent (or parents, in equal shares) of the public safety officer; or

''(6) if there is no individual qualifying under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5), to the surviving individual (or individuals, in equal shares) who would qualify under the definition of the term 'child' under section 1204 but for age.'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''direct result of a catastrophic'' and inserting ''direct and proximate result of a personal'';

(ii) by striking ''pay,'' and all that follows through ''the same'' and inserting ''pay the same'';

(iii) by striking ''in any year'' and inserting ''to the public safety officer (if living on the date on which the determination is made)'';

(iv) by striking ''in such year, adjusted'' and inserting ''with respect to the date on which the catastrophic injury occurred, as adjusted'';

(v) by striking '', to such officer'';

(vi) by striking ''the total'' and all that follows through ''For'' and inserting ''for''; and

(vii) by striking ''That these'' and all that follows through the period, and inserting ''That the amount payable under this subsection shall be the amount payable as of the date of catastrophic injury of such public safety officer.'';

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking '', as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4–622); or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking ''. Such beneficiaries shall only receive benefits under such section 8191 that'' and inserting '', such that beneficiaries shall receive only such benefits under such section 8191 as''; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) payments under the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note; Public Law 107–42).'';

(D) by amending subsection (k) to read as follows:

''(k) As determined by the Bureau, a heart attack, stroke, or vascular rupture suffered by a public safety officer shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of subsection (a), sustained in the line of duty by the officer and directly and proximately resulting in death, if—

''(1) the public safety officer, while on duty—

''(A) engages in a situation involving nonroutine stressful or strenuous physical law enforcement, fire suppression, rescue, hazardous material response, emergency medical services, prison security, disaster relief, or other emergency response activity; or

''(B) participates in a training exercise involving nonroutine stressful or strenuous physical activity;

''(2) the heart attack, stroke, or vascular rupture commences—

''(A) while the officer is engaged or participating as described in paragraph (1);

''(B) while the officer remains on that duty after being engaged or participating as described in paragraph (1); or

''(C) not later than 24 hours after the officer is engaged or participating as described in paragraph (1); and

''(3) the heart attack, stroke, or vascular rupture directly and proximately results in the death of the public safety officer,

unless competent medical evidence establishes that the heart attack, stroke, or vascular rupture was unrelated to the engagement or participation or was directly and proximately caused by something other than the mere presence of cardiovascular-disease risk factors.''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(n) The public safety agency, organization, or unit responsible for maintaining on file an executed designation of beneficiary or executed life insurance policy for purposes of subsection (a)(4) shall maintain the confidentiality of the designation or policy in the same manner as the agency, organization, or unit maintains personnel or other similar records of the public safety officer.'';

(3) in section 1202 (42 U.S.C. 3796a)—

(A) by striking ''death'', each place it appears except the second place it appears, and inserting ''fatal''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or catastrophic injury'' the second place it appears and inserting '', disability, or injury'';

(4) in section 1203 (42 U.S.C. 3796a–1)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**WHO HAVE DIED IN THE LINE OF DUTY**'' and inserting ''**WHO HAVE SUSTAINED FATAL OR CATASTROPHIC INJURY IN THE LINE OF DUTY**''; and

(B) by striking ''who have died in the line of duty'' and inserting ''who have sustained fatal or catastrophic injury in the line of duty'';

(5) in section 1204 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (9) as paragraphs (2) through (10), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) 'candidate-officer' means an individual who is officially enrolled or admitted, as a cadet or trainee, in an officially recognized, formal program of instruction or training (such as a police or fire academy) that is solely and specifically intended to result, directly or immediately upon completion, in—

''(A) commissioning as a law enforcement officer;

''(B) conferral of authority to engage in fire suppression (as an officer or employee of a public fire department or as an officially recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department); or

''(C) the granting of official authorization or license to engage in rescue activity or in the provision of emergency medical services as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew that is (or is a part of) the agency or entity sponsoring the enrollment or admission of the individual;'';

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''consequences of an injury that'' and inserting ''an injury, the direct and proximate consequences of which'';

(D) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) by inserting ''or permanently and totally disabled'' after ''deceased''; and

(II) by striking ''death'' and inserting ''fatal or catastrophic injury''; and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(E) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking ''post-mortem'' each place it appears and inserting ''post-injury''; and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(F) in paragraph (8), as so redesignated, by striking ''public employee member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;'' and inserting ''employee or volunteer member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew (including a ground or air ambulance service) that—

''(i) is a public agency; or

''(ii) is (or is a part of) a nonprofit entity serving the public that—

''(I) is officially authorized or licensed to engage in rescue activity or to provide emergency medical services; and

''(II) is officially designated as a prehospital emergency medical response agency;''; and

(G) in paragraph (10), as so redesignated—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''as a chaplain, or as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;'' and inserting ''or as a chaplain;'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew who, as authorized or licensed by law and by the applicable agency or entity (and as designated by such agency or entity), is engaging in rescue activity or in the provision of emergency medical services; or

''(E) a candidate-officer who is engaging in an activity or exercise—

''(i) that is a formal or required part of the program described in paragraph (1); and

''(ii) that poses or is designed to simulate situations that pose significant dangers, threats, or hazards.'';

(6) in section 1205 (42 U.S.C. 3796c), by adding at the end the following:

''(d) Unless expressly provided otherwise, any reference in this part to any provision of law not in this part shall be understood to constitute a general reference under the doctrine of incorporation by reference, and thus to include any subsequent amendments to the provision.'';

(7) in each of subsections (a) and (b) of section 1212 (42 U.S.C. 3796d–1), sections 1213 and 1214 (42 U.S.C. 3796d–2 and 3796d–3), and subsections (b) and (c) of section 1216 (42 U.S.C. 3796d–5), by striking ''dependent'' each place it appears and inserting ''person'';

(8) in section 1212 (42 U.S.C. 3796d–1)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Subject'' and all that follows through '', the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''reduced by'' and all that follows through ''(B) the amount'' and inserting ''reduced by the amount'';

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DEPENDENT''; and

(ii) by striking ''dependent'';

(9) in section 1213(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3796d–2(b)(2)), by striking ''dependent's'' each place it appears and inserting ''person's'';

(10) in section 1216 (42 U.S.C. 3796d–5)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''each dependent'' each place it appears and inserting ''a spouse or child''; and

(B) by striking ''dependents'' each place it appears and inserting ''a person''; and

(11) in section 1217(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3796d–6(3)(A)), by striking ''described in'' and all that follows and inserting ''an institution of higher education, as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002); and''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 402(l)(4)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''section 1204(9)(A)'' and inserting ''section 1204(10)(A)''; and

(2) by striking ''42 U.S.C. 3796b(9)(A)'' and inserting ''42 U.S.C. 3796b(10)(A)''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; DETERMINATIONS; APPEALS.

The matter under the heading ''PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS'' under the heading ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS'' under title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 1912; 42 U.S.C. 3796c–2) is amended—

(1) by striking ''decisions'' and inserting ''determinations'';

(2) by striking ''(including those, and any related matters, pending)''; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '': *Provided further*, That, on and after the date of enactment of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2011, as to each such statute—

''(1) the provisions of section 1001(a)(4) of such title I (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(4)) shall apply;

''(2) payment shall be made only upon a determination by the Bureau that the facts legally warrant the payment;

''(3) any reference to section 1202 of such title I shall be deemed to be a reference to paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section 1202; and

''(4) a certification submitted under any such statute may be accepted by the Bureau as prima facie evidence of the facts asserted in the certification:

Provided further, That, on and after the date of enactment of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2011, no appeal shall bring any final determination of the Bureau before any court for review unless notice of appeal is filed (within the time specified herein and in the manner prescribed for appeal to United States courts of appeals from United States district courts) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Bureau serves notice of the final determination: *Provided further*, That any regulations promulgated by the Bureau under such part (or any such statute) before, on, or after the date of enactment of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2011 shall apply to any matter pending on, or filed or accruing after, the effective date specified in the regulations, except as the Bureau may indicate otherwise.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to any matter pending, before the Bureau of Justice Assistance or otherwise, on the date of enactment of this Act, or filed or accruing after that date.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) RESCUE SQUADS AND AMBULANCE CREWS.—For a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew (as defined in section 1204(8) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act), the amendments made by this Act shall apply to injuries sustained on or after June 1, 2009.

(2) HEART ATTACKS, STROKES, AND VASCULAR RUPTURES.—Section 1201(k) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act, shall apply to heart attacks, strokes, and vascular ruptures sustained on or after December 15, 2003.

(3) CANDIDATE-OFFICERS.—For a candidate-officer (as defined in section 1204(1) of the title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by this Act), the amendments made by this Act shall apply to injuries sustained on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 291—RECOGNIZING THE RELIGIOUS AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FESTIVAL OF DIWALI

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 291

Whereas Diwali, a festival of great significance to Indian Americans and South Asian Americans, is celebrated annually by Hindus, Sikhs, and Jains throughout India, the United States, and the world;

Whereas Diwali is a festival of lights, during which celebrants light small oil lamps, place the lamps around the home, and pray for health, knowledge, peace, wealth, and prosperity in the new year;

Whereas the lights symbolize the light of knowledge within the individual that overwhelms the darkness of ignorance, empowering each celebrant to do good deeds and show compassion to others;

Whereas Diwali falls on the last day of the last month in the lunar calendar and is celebrated as a day of thanksgiving for the homecoming of the Lord Rama and worship of Lord Ganesha, the remover of obstacles and bestower of blessings, at the beginning of the new year for many Hindus;

Whereas for Sikhs, Diwali is celebrated as Bandhi Chhor Diwas (The Celebration of Freedom), in honor of the release from prison of the sixth guru, Guru Hargobind; and

Whereas for Jains, Diwali marks the anniversary of the attainment of moksha, or liberation, by Mahavira, the last of the Tirthankaras (the great teachers of Jain dharma), at the end of his life in 527 B.C.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; and

(2) in observance of Diwali, the festival of lights, expresses its deepest respect for Indian Americans and South Asian Americans, as well as fellow countrymen and diaspora throughout the world on this significant occasion.

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 16, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK''

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 292

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of ''National Character Counts Week'', during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 16, 2011, as ''National Character Counts Week''; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, October 13, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Carcieri Crisis: The Ripple Effect on Jobs, Economic Development and Public Safety in Indian Country.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, October 20, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a meeting on S. 1262, the Native Culture, Language, and Access for Success in Schools Act to be followed immediately by a hearing on the following bills: S. 134, Mescalero Apache Tribe Leasing Authorization Act; S. 399, Blackfeet Water Rights Settlement Act of 2011; S. 1327, A bill to amend the Act of March 1, 1933, to transfer certain authority and resources to the Utah Dineh Corporation, and for other purposes; and S. 1345, Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Equitable Compensation Settlement Act.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 12, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Universal Service Reform—Bringing Broadband to All Americans.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 12, 2011, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on October 12, 2011, directly after the business meeting scheduled for 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The State of Chronic Disease Prevention,'' on October 12, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 12, 2011, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Ten Years After 9/11: A Status Report on Information Sharing.''

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 12, 2011, immediately after the first vote, off the Senate floor.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 12, 2011, at 2 p.m. in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''A Time for Solutions: Finding Consensus in the Medicare Reform Debate.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of Senator BAUCUS's staff be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea Free Trade Agreement legislation: Jane Beard, Sarah Babcock, Danielle Fidler, Laura Jaskierski, Stephen Simpson, Jonathon Goldman, Nick Malinak, and Cosimo Thawley.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Rose Fennell, who is a National Park Service fellow working on the staff of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted the privilege of the floor for today's session.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Eli Zupnick, Alex Glass, Paula Burg, Matt McAlvanah, Moire Duggan, Shawn Bills, Adam Goodwin, Zach Mallove, Lauren Overman, and Evan Schatz, members of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of today's session.

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

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 270 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Life Insurance Awareness Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any related statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 270

Whereas the vast majority of people in the United States recognize that life insurance is important to protecting their loved ones;

Whereas the life insurance industry pays approximately $60,000,000,000 to beneficiaries each year, providing a tremendous source of financial relief and security to families that experience the loss of a loved one;

Whereas, as of the date of agreement to this resolution, the unfortunate reality is that approximately 95,000,000 adults in the United States have no life insurance, and ownership of both individual and employer-sponsored life insurance has declined in recent years;

Whereas life insurance products protect against the uncertainties of life by enabling individuals and families to manage the financial risks of premature death, disability, and long-term care;

Whereas individuals, families, and businesses can benefit from professional insurance and financial planning advice, including an assessment of their life insurance needs; and

Whereas numerous groups supporting life insurance have designated September 2011 as ''National Life Insurance Awareness Month'' as a means to encourage consumers to become more aware of their life insurance needs, seek advice from qualified insurance professionals, and take the actions necessary to achieve financial security for their loved ones: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Life Insurance Awareness Month''; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 292, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 292) designating the week beginning October 16, 2011, as ''National Character Counts Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 292) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 292

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into their teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of ''National Character Counts Week'', during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 16, 2011, as ''National Character Counts Week''; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2011

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, October 13, 2011; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes; and that at 12 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 251, 252, and 253, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, we expect two rollcall votes at approximately 2 p.m. tomorrow on judicial nominations.

Additionally, there is a joint meeting of Congress with the President of Korea at 4 p.m. tomorrow. Senators will gather in the Senate Chamber at 3:40 p.m. to proceed to the House together.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 13, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

PAUL W. HODES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2016. (NEW POSITION)

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

ROBERT L. SUMWALT III, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ELIZABETH M. COUSENS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ELIZABETH M. COUSENS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN AND INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

JAMES A. BEVER, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH K. KENNEDY—IRAHETA, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN G. REICHLE, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL E. WEISENFELD, OF MARYLAND

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER COUNSELOR:

WILLIAM R. BRANDS, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS R. DELANEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
T. CHRISTOPHER MILLIGAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BETH S. PAIGE, OF TEXAS
ALEXANDRIA L. PANEHAL, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICIA L. RADER, OF MARYLAND
MAUREEN A. SHAUKET, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

R. DOUGLASS ARBUCKLE, OF FLORIDA
DAVID C. ATTEBERRY, OF FLORIDA
REBECCA RANDOLPH WALLACE BLACK, OF NEW MEXICO
DERRICK S. BROWN, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTINE M. BYRNE, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY S. CHAN, OF VIRGINIA
KIRK M. DAHLGREN, OF FLORIDA
ALEXANDRE DE PREZ, SR., OF FLORIDA
CARL BRANDON DERRICK, OF VIRGINIA
AZZA EL-ABD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NANCY L. ESTES, OF FLORIDA
STEPHANIE A. FUNK, OF FLORIDA
JAMES LAURENCE GOGGIN, OF NEW MEXICO
CAREY NATHANIAL GORDON, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL J. GREENE, OF MARYLAND
CAROL J. HORNING, OF VIRGINIA
GARY C. JUSTE, OF FLORIDA
NEIL MC DONALD KESTER, OF FLORIDA
NATHAN S. LOKOS, OF VIRGINIA
SHEILA M. LUTJENS, OF FLORIDA
KATHLEEN S. MC DONALD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIN ELIZABETH MC KEE, OF CALIFORNIA
ALFRED M. NAKATSUMA, OF CALIFORNIA
JOHN R. POWER, OF MINNESOTA
DIANA BRITON PUTMAN, OF CONNECTICUT
R. THOMAS RAY, OF FLORIDA
FREDERIC G. SCOTT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTINE SMATHERS, OF CALIFORNIA
ELIZABETH BANCROFT WARFIELD, OF MARYLAND
A.J. ALONZO WIND, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN MARK WINFIELD, OF MARYLAND

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE POSITION OF COAST GUARD BAND DIRECTOR IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 336:

To be captain

KENNETH W. MEGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 211(A)(2):

To be commander

JENNIFER A. KETCHUM

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GARY R. ALLEN
ANDREW M. HARRIS
ROBERT W. LESHER
JOHN A. PAPILE, JR.
ORAN L. ROBERTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

PATRICK A. BARNETT
CHARLES T. CROSBY
MARK D. DROWN
BRUCE D. FARRELL
KERRY W. GOODMAN
ROBERT D. GUADSMITH
LYNN M. HENG
JAMES W. HILLIARD
PAUL E. LIPPSTOCK
KEVIN D. LYONS
JOHN J. MORRIS
MARTIN K. MOTE
WILLIAM J. PRENDERGAST IV
ELLEN J. REILLY
TROY W. ROSS
WILLIAM R. SPRAY
JEFFREY P. VAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DAVID S. FUCHS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

DANIEL J. TRAUB

To be lieutenant commander

KURT A. MICHAELIS
WILLIAM N. SOLOMON

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RON ALLERD TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ron Allerd, a Colorado businessman who transformed Telluride, Colorado into one of the nation's most treasured, world-class ski resorts. Because of his vision and determination, Mr. Allerd will officially be inducted into the Colorado Ski Hall of Fame on November 2, 2011.

Mr. Allerd first envisioned what the town of Telluride could become after skiing with Telluride native, Johnnie Stevens. In 1978, Mr. Allred and his business partner, Jim Wells, purchased the Telluride Ski Company, a small company that operated only a few lifts and one day resort.

Their vision slowly became a reality in the community, but on more than one occasion its existence was threatened. After tireless effort and determination, Mr. Allred worked with various stakeholders and the community to bring amenities to the area, such as an airport, a golf course and a gondola transportation system.

Today, Telluride is an all-season resort that offers unique character to a once dying mining town. Networks of lifts now cover Telluride and its adjoining town, Mountain Village, bringing tourists from around the world to visit this vibrant and active Colorado community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Ron Allerd. His legacy and vision is one that will affect Coloradans and Americans for many years to come.

MR. BRIAN GRYBOSKI

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Brian Gryboski for the recognition of his athletic ability as he is accepted into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gryboski began his sports career as a pitcher and shortstop in the Plains Little League and as a running back and linebacker with the Plains Yankee football team. In 1989, his final year in the Plains Little League, he threw a no-hitter against Pittston, and he and his team would go on to win the District 16 Little League championship.

While attending Bishop Hoban High School, Mr. Gryboski was a two-year starter for the Argents basketball team when they won two District 2 championships. In 1994, the team reached the state quarterfinals. Also in 1994, Mr. Gryboski was named the McGrane Tournament Most Valuable Player. In 1995, he was a Wyoming Valley Conference All-Star, and he was the leading scorer in the conference.

While at Wilkes University, Mr. Gryboski played in a record-setting 116 games for the Colonels through his four years. During his stretch at Wilkes, the team earned an impressive 99 wins with just 17 losses. He was a three-year starter, and he was team captain as a senior. Mr. Gryboski's teams accumulated four Middle Atlantic Conference (MAC) Freedom League Championships, three MAC conference titles, and trips to the NCAA Division III "Elite Eight" in 1996, "Final Four" in 1998, and "Sweet 16" in 1999.

Individually, Mr. Gryboski was selected to the All-Eastern College Athletic Conference Third Team in 1997–1998. He left a legacy at Wilkes University, where he is ranked in the Top 20 in all-time scoring with 1,120 points, and he is in the Top 10 in rebounding, free throws attempted, and free throws made.

Mr. Speaker, as a fantastic baseball and basketball player, Mr. Brian Gryboski, left his mark on numerous sports teams, and he will be honored by being inducted into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame.

VETERANS' BENEFITS TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2349, the Veterans' Benefits Training Improvement Act. I particularly appreciate that the language from my bill, H.R. 1826, was incorporated into H.R. 2349 in Committee. The language that I introduced would simply reinstate the criminal penalties that were previously in place on any individual charging veterans illegal fees for claims before the VA.

Though it is already a violation of the law to charge a veteran in conjunction with filing a benefits claim before the VA, no federal punishment exists, leaving the door open for fly-by-night companies and con artists to take advantage of veterans, unlawfully charging them hundreds or even thousands of dollars.

The language from my bill would make this offense punishable by up to one year in prison and/or fines. Crooked practices must be stopped, and this enforcement mechanism is a critical first step.

Taking advantage of our most vulnerable veterans is a shameful act. I have seen local news reports, and I hear frequently from veterans' liaisons in my district that this problem is rampant, so much so that one of the counties in my district, Hillsborough County, is moving forward to implement a county ordinance that borrows the concept of implementing such an enforcement mechanism from my legislation.

All veterans, regardless of where they reside, should not be forced to bear the financial burdens of an unenforceable law. They so diligently protected us during our nation's time of need, and now is our opportunity to protect them in their time of need. I am both honored and humbled to serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for his strong leadership on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and all of my colleagues on the Committee for their cooperation in pushing this language.

RECOGNIZING PROF. KRZYSZTOF KANIASTY FOR RECEIVING THE STRESS AND ANXIETY RESEARCH SOCIETY (STAR) LIFETIME CAREER ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. MARK S. CRITZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding scholar for being honored by his peers with an internationally coveted award for excellence in the field of social psychology. Krzysztof Kaniasty, a psychology professor at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, received the Stress and Anxiety Research Society (STAR) Lifetime Career Achievement Award during the 32nd annual STAR Conference held recently in Munster Germany. Each year, STAR presents this award to one of its members who has contributed an original and impactful body of work to one or more of the psychology sub-fields of stress, coping, emotions and health.

Dr. Kaniasty received a Master of Arts in Clinical psychology from Adam Mickiewicz University in Poland in 1981 and a Ph.D. in Social/Community Psychology from the University of Louisville in 1991. Since completing his Doctoral work, he has had over 50 articles published in respected professional journals and has been invited to speak about his work at over 150 different international conferences and meetings. In addition to receiving STAR's lifetime achievement honor, he has been given awards for his work by both the Polish government and Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Kaniasty rose to prominence in his field by producing research that provides valuable insight into the psychological impact of natural disasters and criminal victimization. His ability to write and speak prolifically on the complex social dynamics and psychological processes that characterize populations that have experienced a traumatic event is a testament to his skillfulness as a scholar.

It pleases me greatly that Dr. Kaniasty's scholastic efforts have been officially recognized by a professional society as reputable as STAR. I expect that his research from this point forward will be as edifying as it has been over the first 30 years of his distinguished career.

HONORING FARHAD MANSOURIAN

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marin County's departing Director of Pubic Works, Farhad Mansourian. After more than three decades of service to the County of Marin and seven years as Director of the Department of Public Works, Mr. Mansourian has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment to the people of Marin. His passion for managing public works initiatives has earned him the respect and admiration of colleagues across the North Bay. Mansourian moves on to a position as General Manager of the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) District, where his voice of experience will be instrumental in bringing our regional rail service to completion.

Farhad Mansourian began his service with the County of Marin in 1980 as a Junior Civil Engineer, gradually branching into new fields as he was promoted to administrative analyst, traffic operations engineer, road maintenance engineer, and eventually Assistant Director. In 2002, the Marin County Board of Supervisors named Mansourian Director of the Department of Public Works, putting him in charge of an agency with over 200 employees and an annual budget of roughly $80 million.

Since that time, Mansourian has distinguished himself as the principal guardian of the County's infrastructure, including roads and bridges, flood control operations, hazardous waste systems, and public buildings. The County has turned to Mansourian every winter to keep an aging infrastructure functioning in the aftermath of heavy storms. The community turned to him in the event of emergencies like flooding or earthquakes many times. Mansourian also serves as Co-Commander of the Regional Urban Search and Rescue Task Force, which has provided assistance not only in the North Bay, but in other communities recovering from natural disasters, as far away as the Gulf Coast.

In countless ways, Farhad Mansourian has been responsible for keeping our County functioning by facilitating environmental protection and economic development that ensure the safety of Marin County residents. I have found him to be a thoughtful, reliable, and expert partner when working together on these important issues.

Over the past several years, Mansourian has also been a strong advocate for the SMART initiative linking the urban centers of the North Bay with a modem and environmentally responsible rail system. He was active in gathering support for the proposal and in achieving the overwhelming public support received for the bi-county ballot measure providing SMART funding. Mansourian's new role managing the SMART District is fitting for a man so committed to advancing the North Bay's vision for its future, while bridging its infrastructure needs with strong environmental priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in thanking Farhad Mansourian for his many contributions to Marin County. He represents an admirable model of public service, and we wish him the same success in his new endeavors.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE OPINION THAT THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY HAS VIOLATED THE LAW AND THE ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT IN ITS BILATERAL DEALINGS WITH THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit an opinion that I have received from the Government Accountability Office that White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, led by Dr. John Holdren, is in violation of the law and the Anti-Deficiency Act due to its continued dealings with the Chinese government.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2011.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Subject: Office of Science and Technology Policy—Bilateral Activities with China

This responds to your request for our opinion on the propriety of activities undertaken in May 2011 by the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) with representatives of the government of the People's Republic of China. Letter from Representative Wolf to the Comptroller General (May 11, 2011) (Request Letter). Specifically, you point to meetings with Chinese representatives during the U.S.-China Dialogue on Innovation Policy (Innovation Dialogue) and the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) held in Washington, D.C., in May 2011. You ask whether OSTP violated section 1340 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011. Section 1340 prohibits the use of OSTP appropriations for bilateral activities between OSTP and China, or Chinese-owned companies, unless specifically authorized by laws enacted after the date of the appropriations act. Pub. L. No. 112–10, div. B, title III, 125 Stat. 38, 123 (Apr. 15, 2011).

As explained below, we conclude that OSTP's use of appropriations to fund its participation in the Innovation Dialogue and the S&ED violated the prohibition in section 1340. In addition, because section 1340 prohibited the use of OSTP's appropriations for this purpose, OSTP's involvement in the Innovation Dialogue and the S&ED resulted in obligations in excess of appropriated funds available to OSTP; as such, OSTP violated the Antideficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. § 1341(a)(1)(A).

Our practice when rendering legal opinions is to obtain the views of the relevant agency to establish a factual record and to elicit the agency's legal position on the subject matter of the request. GAO, Procedures and Practices for Legal Decisions and Opinions, GAO–06–1064SP (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 2006), available at www.gao.gov/legal/resources.html. In this case, OSTP provided us with its legal views and relevant supporting materials. Letter from General Counsel, OSTP to Assistant General Counsel, GAO, Re: B–321982, Office of Science and Technology Policy—Bilateral Activities with China (June 23, 2011) (OSTP Response). We also spoke by telephone with OSTP's General Counsel to ask questions about OSTP's June letter. Telephone Conversation with General Counsel, OSTP (Aug. 4, 2011) (August Conversation). See also Letter from General Counsel, OSTP to Senior Attorney, GAO, Re: Follow-up to August 4, 2011, Telephone Call (Aug. 29, 2011) (OSTP August Letter).

BACKGROUND

The Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 established OSTP to ''serve as a source of scientific and technological analysis and judgment for the President with respect to major policies, plans, and programs of the Federal Government.'' 42 U.S.C. 6614(a). Part of the agency's mission is to ''advise the President of scientific and technological considerations involved in areas of national concern including . . . foreign relations. . . .'' 42 U.S.C. 6613(b)(1).

Between May 6 and 10, 2011, OSTP ''led and participated in a series of meetings with Chinese officials'' as part of the Innovation Dialogue and the S&ED. OSTP Response, at 3. On May 6, 2011, the OSTP Director and Chinese Minister of Science and Technology participated in the Innovation Dialogue. According to OSTP, a goal of the Innovation Dialogue was to ''serve as a forum for persuading the rollback of discriminatory, counterproductive Chinese procurement and intellectual property policies. . . .'' OSTP Response, at 3. Among the topics discussed were ''market access and technology transfer; innovation funding and incentives; standards and intellectual property; and government intervention.'' OSTP Response, at 4. OSTP informed our office that the OSTP Director opened and closed the Innovation Dialogue and served on discussion panels. OSTP August Letter, at 1. OSTP staff helped the Director prepare for and participate during the meetings. Id. See OSTP Response, at 5.

On May 8, 2011, OSTP hosted a dinner to honor Chinese dignitaries. Six U.S. participants attended the dinner, along with an unidentified number of ''staff-level employees from other federal agencies.'' OSTP Response, at 4, n.13. The Director is the only listed dinner attendee from OSTP. There were six Chinese invitees. Id.

On May 9 and 10, 2011, OSTP participated in the S&ED. The purpose of the S&ED was to bring together various U.S. and Chinese government officials to ''discuss a broad range of issues between the two nations,'' including on matters regarding trade and economic cooperation. U.S. Department of the Treasury, U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, available at www.treasury.gov/initiatives/Pages/china.aspx (last visited Oct. 4, 2011). The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State co-chaired the S&ED along with the Vice Premier and State Councilor of the People's Republic of China. Id. Topics of discussion included ''enhancement of trade and investment cooperation; an overview of bilateral relations; military-to-military relationships; cooperation on clean energy, energy security, climate change, and environment; customs cooperation; and energy security.'' OSTP Response, at 4. The OSTP Director spoke many times during the various sessions, including on U.S.-China cooperation on climate science. August Conversation. OSTP also had at least one staff member attend the S&ED in addition to the Director. Id.

The Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, enacted into law on April 15, 2011, included appropriations for OSTP for fiscal year 2011 in title Ill of division B. Pub. L. No. 112–10, div. B. Section 1340 of title III provides:

''None of the funds made available by this division may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Office of Science and Technology Policy to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement,

or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this division.''

Pub. L. No. 112–10, 1340.

OSTP informed us that it incurred costs of approximately $3,500 to participate in the week's activities, including the cost of staff time for nine employees preparing for and participating in the discussions, as well as the cost of the dinner OSTP hosted on May 8. OSTP Response, at 5.

DISCUSSION

At issue in this opinion is whether OSTP violated section 1340's proscription, and, if so, whether the agency violated the Antideficiency Act.

As with any question involving the interpretation of statutes, our analysis begins with the plain language of the statute. Jimenez v. Quarterman, 555 U.S. 113 (2009). When the language of a statute is ''clear and unambiguous on its face, it is the plain meaning of that language that controls.'' B–307720, Sept. 27, 2007; B–306975, Feb. 27, 2006; see also Lynch v. Alworth-Stephens Co., 267 U.S. 364, 370 (1925).

The plain meaning of section 1340 is clear. OSTP may not use its appropriations to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned companies. Here, OSTP's participation in the Innovation Dialogue and S&ED contravened the appropriations restriction. The Director opened the Innovation Dialogue and moderated discussions therein. OSTP staff prepared materials for and attended the discussions. OSTP then invited U.S. and Chinese officials to a dinner that it paid for using its appropriation. Finally, OSTP participated in the S&ED, during which the Director spoke on multiple occasions, including on climate science. OSTP did not identify, nor are we aware of, any specific authority to do so that was enacted after the date of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

OSTP does not deny that it engaged in activities prohibited by section 1340. OSTP Response; August Conversation. OSTP argues, instead, that section 1340, as applied to the events at issue here, is an unconstitutional infringement on the President's constitutional prerogatives in foreign affairs. OSTP Response, at 1; August Conversation; Letter from Director, OSTP, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Re: Section 1340 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011 (May 16, 2011) (OSTP May 16 Letter). OSTP claims that section 1340 is ''unconstitutional to the extent its restrictions on OSTP's use of funds would bar the President from employing his chosen agents for the conduct of international diplomacy.'' OSTP Response, at 1. OSTP asserts that the President has ''exclusive constitutional authority to determine the time, place, manner, and content of diplomatic communications and to select the agents who will represent the President in diplomatic interactions with foreign nations.'' OSTP May 16 Letter. OSTP argues that, for this reason, Congress may not ''use its appropriations power to infringe upon the President's exclusive constitutional authority in this area.'' Id.

It is not our role nor within our province to opine upon or adjudicate the constitutionality of duly enacted statutes such as section 1340. See B–300192, Nov. 13, 2002; see also B–306475, Jan. 30, 2006. In our view, legislation that was passed by Congress and signed by the President, thereby satisfying the Constitution's bicameralism and presentment requirements, is entitled to a heavy presumption in favor of constitutionality. B–302911, Sept. 7, 2004. See Bowen v. Kendrick, 487 U.S. 589, 617 (1988). Determining the constitutionality of legislation is a province of the courts. U.S. Const. art. III, §2. Cf. Fairbank v. United States, 181 U.S. 283, 285 (1901). Therefore, absent a judicial opinion from a federal court of jurisdiction that a particular provision is unconstitutional, we apply laws as written to the facts presented. See B–114578, Nov. 9, 1973. In 1955, for example, we stated that we ''accord full effect to the clear meaning of an enactment by the Congress so long as it remains unchanged by legislative action and unimpaired by judicial determination.'' B–124985, Aug. 17, 1955. We see no reason to deviate here. Indeed, we are unaware of any court that has had occasion to review the provision, let alone adjudicate its constitutionality, nor did OSTP advise of any judicial determination or ongoing litigation.

As a consequence of using its appropriations in violation of section 1340, OSTP violated the Antideficiency Act. Under the Antideficiency Act, an officer or employee of the U.S. Government may not make or authorize an expenditure or obligation exceeding an amount available in an appropriation. 31 U.S.C. §1341. See B–300192, Nov. 13, 2002. If Congress specifically prohibits a particular use of appropriated funds, any obligation for that purpose is in excess of the amount available. 71 Comp. Gen. 402 (1992); 62 Comp. Gen. 692 (1983); 60 Comp. Gen. 440 (1981). By using its fiscal year 2011 appropriation in a manner specifically prohibited, OSTP violated the Antideficiency Act. Accordingly, OSTP should report the violation as required by the act.

Sincerely,

LYNN H. GIBSON,
General Counsel.

MS. ERIN TREASTER

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Erin M. Treaster for her performance on the basketball court and soccer field, and as she is accepted into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

A graduate of Bishop Hoban High School, Ms. Treaster was a four-year starter on both the soccer and basketball teams. In both sports she excelled, as she was selected as an all conference performer. She was also selected as the most valuable player of the Wyoming Valley Soccer Conference, and she was selected to the All-State Soccer team.

While attending college at Bloomsburg University, Ms. Treaster was a four-year starter for the Huskies in both basketball and soccer. In soccer, she was selected to the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (PSAC) second team from 1995 through 1998, a regional All-American in 1996 and 1997, and ranks as the 10th overall soccer assist leader in Bloomsburg University history.

In basketball, Ms. Treater's performance was equally impressive. She was selected All-Conference PSAC East Rookie of the Year in 1995–1996. With 456 assists, she is the all-time leader in the school's history, and the eighth all-time leader in steals with 202.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to officially congratulate Ms. Erin M. Treaster for all of her accomplishments, and especially her induction into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame.

VETERANS OPPORTUNITY TO WORK ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, as our servicemembers return home from Iraq and Afghanistan, Congress must continue to focus on assisting in their transition back to civilian life. For many of these individuals, the wounds of war are not easily forgotten and it is imperative that we stand by these soldiers.

As the wife, mother and daughter of servicemen I have a strong appreciation for the contributions of our United States military personnel and I am a constant advocate for improving military and veteran benefits. That is why I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 2433, the ''Veterans Opportunity to Work Act of 2011.''

H.R. 2433 provides unemployed veterans and active duty members who are about to retire with comprehensive training opportunities and employment assistance. It achieves these goals by: extending training benefits to unemployed veterans to teach them new skills for high-demand jobs; making career and transition courses mandatory for servicemembers leaving the military; strengthening re-employment protections for National Guard and Reservists; and improving licensing and credentialing processes for new veterans.

Recently I held a veterans job fair in my district and got to meet with some of these brave men and women as they looked for jobs. It is an honor to be able to help veterans while at home and this bill serves as a chance for us to help our veterans back home from Washington, DC.

Ensuring that our servicemen are well taken care of is one of our Nation's greatest responsibilities and I am pleased we will take up legislation today that will do just that.

GREATER NEW BEDFORD COMMUNITY HONORS NATE MEDEIROS

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that those of us who have stayed at home can discharge the debt we owe to the men and women who put their lives and safety at risk as members of the Armed Services, but it is important that we do what we can to show that we understand how deep that debt is. On October 23, I will have the privilege of participating in an effort to do that in the town of Fairhaven, Massachusetts, where the Greater New Bedford Community will gather to honor Army Pfc. Nathan Medeiros. Pfc. Medeiros is recovering from serious shrapnel and burn wounds he sustained from a roadside bomb last month in Afghanistan. His friends and neighbors will be gathering to show how deeply they honor his courage and appreciate his sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the wounds from which Nate Medeiros is recovering remind us all that while war is sometimes necessary in national self defense, it is always terrible in the toll it takes of our best and bravest. I am honored to be able to participate in this community effort to show Nate Medeiros how deeply we feel the debt to him, and Mr. Speaker, as an example that the nation should note, I ask that the article from the New Bedford Standard Times from October 11 about this event be printed here.

EVENT SCHEDULED TO HONOR NEW BEDFORD SOLDIER WOUNDED IN AFGHANISTAN

(By Brian Fraga)

NEW BEDFORD.—An event will be held later this month to honor Army Pfc. Nathan Medeiros, a New Bedford native recovering from shrapnel and burn wounds he sustained from a roadside bomb in Afghanistan last month.

''Honoring Our Own: Nate Medeiros'' is scheduled for Oct. 23, from 3–7 p.m., at the Seaport Inn in Fairhaven. Due to military regulations, the event is not a benefit, and there will be no admission charge.

''After all, this will be the true epitome and best way to honor Nate for his heroic efforts,'' said Carl Pires, a friend of Medeiros's family who is coordinating the event, and will serve as its emcee.

The night will also feature performances by local musicians and artists such as poet Charles Perry and singers Tiny Tavares, Candida Rose, Glenn ''G-Money'' Enos, Navelle ''Chops'' Turner and Irving Washington III, former lead singer of the R&B group Portrait.

New Bedford Mayor Scott W. Lang, State Sen. Mark C.W. Montigny, D–New Bedford, and U.S. Rep. Barney Frank are also scheduled to be on hand to speak and present resolutions to Medeiros and his family, Pires said.

On Sept. 14, Medeiros, 28, an infantry machine-gunner assigned to the 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team of the 25th Infantry Division, was on patrol in Afghanistan, clearing roadside bombs from an area known as ''IED Alley.''

Medeiros said he had just noticed two Afghan men crouching at a distance, and was pointing out their location to his fellow soldiers when a roadside bomb detonated less than 2 feet from where he was standing.

''I turned back around and just as I do this, I'm blown into the air and back onto my side,'' said Medeiros, who has undergone several surgeries to remove shrapnel and debris from his legs.

Medeiros, a graduate of New Bedford High School's night program, also sustained lacerations to his face and neck, swelling in his hands and partial hearing loss.

He arrived home in New Bedford last week on leave, and will be present for the event.

''It's great to have him home,'' said Medeiros' mother, Cherele Fortes, who said her son surprised them in coming home.

''He looks good. He's got some scars, some bruising, but he is in great spirits. He is an amazing kid. God still has plans for him. That's why he's still with us,'' Fortes said.

HONORING THE NAACP—MORRIS COUNTY BRANCH

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris County Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, as it celebrates its 80th Anniversary.

Founded in 1909, the NAACP is the nation's oldest and largest grassroots-based civil rights organization. With over a half-million members and supporters both throughout the country and around the world, the NAACP strives to ensure the political, educational, social and economic equality of rights of all persons to eliminate race-based discrimination.

To support the national organization's mission, different branches of the NAACP have been established throughout the United States. The NAACP, Morris County Branch, was established in 1931. Headquartered in Morristown, New Jersey, the Morris County Branch has provided great support to the mission and vision of the national organization.

Throughout its 80 years, the Morris County branch has sought to pursue the elimination of racial prejudice and discrimination through numerous events and fundraisers, most notably their Annual Freedom Banquet. This annual fundraiser, also celebrating its 80th anniversary, brings together people from all races, all economic backgrounds to join together for one common purpose: to ensure equality for our fellow citizens.

The NAACP, Morris County Branch, is a wonderful organization, one of which I am proud to say calls the New Jersey 11th Congressional District home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the members and staff of the Morris County Branch of the NAACP as they celebrate 80 years of promoting equality for our nation.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ENDING A CURRENT LAW LOOPHOLE THAT ALLOWS FOREIGN INSURANCE GROUPS TO STRIP THEIR U.S. INCOME INTO TAX HAVENS TO AVOID U.S. TAX

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to come before the House to introduce legislation ending a current law loophole that allows foreign insurance groups to strip their U.S. income into tax havens to avoid U.S. tax and gain a competitive advantage over American companies. I am pleased to be joined in my efforts by Senator MENENDEZ who is introducing the Senate companion bill.

Many foreign-based insurance companies are using affiliate reinsurance to shift their U.S. reserves overseas into tax havens, thereby avoiding U.S. tax on their all investment income. This provides these companies with a significant unfair competitive advantage over U.S.-based companies, which must pay tax on their investment income. To take advantage of this loophole, several U.S. companies have ''inverted'' into tax havens and numerous other companies have been formed offshore. And, absent effective legislation, industry experts have predicted that capital migration will continue to grow and other insurers will be forced to redomesticate offshore. As we grapple with significant budget challenges in the years to come, it is essential that we not allow the continued migration of capital overseas and erosion of our tax base.

The bill I am introducing today does not impact third party reinsurance, which adds needed capacity to the market. It is a fundamental business technique for risk management and is to be fostered. Rather, the bill is targeted solely at reinsurance among affiliates, which adds no additional capacity to the market and is often used for tax avoidance.

There have been previous attempts to address the tax avoidance problem resulting from reinsurance between related entities. Congress first recognized the problem of excessive reinsurance in 1984 and provided specific authority to Treasury under Section 845 of the Tax Code to reallocate items and make adjustments in reinsurance transactions in order to prevent tax avoidance or evasion. In 2003, the Bush Treasury Department testified before Congress that the existing mechanisms were not sufficient. In 2004, Congress amended Section 845 to expand the authority of Treasury to not only reallocate among the parties to a reinsurance agreement but also to recharacterize items within or related to the agreement. Congress specifically cited the concern that these reinsurance transactions were being used inappropriately among U.S. and foreign related parties for tax evasion. Unfortunately, as recent data shows, this grant of expanded authority to Treasury has not stemmed the tide of capital moving offshore.

Since 1996, the amount of reinsurance sent to offshore affiliates has grown dramatically, from a total of $4 billion ceded in 1996 to $33 billion in 2008, including nearly $21 billion to Bermuda affiliates and over $7 billion to Swiss affiliates. Use of this affiliate reinsurance provides foreign insurance groups with a significant market advantage over U.S. companies in writing direct insurance here in the U.S. We have seen in the last decade a doubling in the growth of market share of direct premiums written by groups domiciled outside the U.S., from 5.1 percent to 10.9 percent, representing $54 billion in direct premiums written in 2006. Again, Bermuda-based companies represent the bulk of this growth, rising from 0.1 percent to 4 percent. And it should be noted that during this time, the percentage of premiums ceded to affiliates of non-U.S. based companies has grown from 13 percent to 67 percent. Bermuda is not the only jurisdiction favorable for reinsurance. In fact, one company moved from the Cayman Islands to Switzerland citing ''the security of a network of tax treaties,'' among other benefits.

A coalition of U.S.-based insurance and reinsurance companies has been formed to express their concerns to Congress. They wrote to the leadership of the House and Senate tax-writing committees urging passage of my prior bill because, as they wrote, ''This loophole provides foreign-controlled insurers a significant tax advantage over their domestic competitors in attracting capital to write U.S. business.'' With more than 150,000 employees and a trillion dollars in assets here in the U.S., I believe it is a message of concern that we should heed.

That is why I am again filing legislation to end the Bermuda reinsurance loophole. This proposal has been developed working with the tax experts at both the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation to address concerns that have been raised with prior versions of the bill and develop a balanced approach to address this

loophole. The proposal is consistent with our trade agreements and our tax treaties.

Specifically, the proposal I am filing today effectively defers any deduction for premiums paid to foreign affiliated insurance companies if the premium is not subject to U.S. tax. This is accomplished by denying an upfront deduction for any affiliate reinsurance and then excluding from income any reinsurance recovered (as well as any ceding commission received), where the premium deduction for that reinsurance has been disallowed.

The bill allows foreign groups to avoid the deduction disallowance by electing to be subject to U.S. tax with respect to the premiums and net investment income from affiliate reinsurance of U.S. risk. Special rules are provided to allow for foreign tax credits to avoid double taxation. This ensures a level-playing field, treating U.S. insurers and foreign-based insurers alike.

The legislation provides Treasury with the authority to carry out or prevent the avoidance of the provisions of this bill.

A fuller technical explanation of the bill can be found on my website.

This "deduction deferral" proposal is similar to one contained in the administration's budget this year. In an effort to combat earnings stripping, this bill uses a common-sense approach, which will effectively defer the deduction for premiums paid until the insured event occurs—thereby restricting any tax benefit from shifting reserves and associated investment income overseas.

Ending this unintended tax subsidy for foreign insurance companies will stop the capital flight at the expense of American taxpayers and restore competitive balance for domestic companies. Closing this loophole does not impose a new tax. It merely ensures that foreign-owned companies pay the same tax as American companies on their earnings from doing business here in the United States. Congress never would consciously subsidize foreign-owned companies over their American competitors. Thus, there is no reason an unintended subsidy should be allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this important matter and I assure my colleagues that I will continue my efforts to combat offshore tax avoidance, regardless of what industry is impacted.

MR. JOHN BARANSKI

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John Baranski for his performance as an athlete, coach, and mentor, and on his acceptance into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

John Baranski, who was better known as Jack, is a graduate of Coughlin High School. At Coughlin, he played tackle on both offense and defense for the Crusaders, and was part of their 1985 and 1986 Wyoming Valley Conference Championship teams. In 1987, Mr. Baranski was selected by the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader newspaper as a first-team All-Conference tackle. Because of his stellar performance in the Wyoming Valley West High School game, he was awarded the Outstanding Senior Athlete Award from the Coughlin Booster Club and the Red Pendergrass Award. Also as a senior, Mr. Baranski played in the UNICO All-Star Game.

Mr. Baranski's playing career may be over, but his knowledge and skills are present in the student-athletes he has coached over the years. He coached at Coughlin from 1992 through 1999, and now he is the offensive coordinator for the Spartans of Wyoming Valley West. During his career as a coach, his teams have combined for seven District 2 AAAA championships and five Wyoming Valley Conference championships. He has also served as president of the Ed/Stark Little League in 2009, and of the West Side Little League in 2010 and 2011.

Mr. Speaker, John "Jack" Baranski, a product of Plains youth football and basketball, has certainly proven himself worthy of being called a "Hall of Famer" through his years of outstanding performance as a player and coach.

HONORING PAMELA ANN COCHRANE OF LAKEPORT, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Pamela Ann Cochrane, a resident and servant of the County of Lake for over three decades and among the most cherished and appreciated members of her community.

Mrs. Cochrane has been a public servant for 40 years, beginning her career of service in Lake County as an accountant in the Auditor-Controller's Office in 1980. Since that time her responsibilities and contributions have only increased. She became a supervising accountant in 1988, was promoted to Chief Deputy Auditor-Controller in 1994, served as Interim County Clerk/Auditor-Controller in 1998, and was successfully elected by the citizens of Lake County to the post of County Clerk/Auditor-Controller in 1998, 2002, 2006, and 2010.

Always a leader who valued versatility and adaptability among her staffers, Mrs. Cochrane made good on her campaign promise to "cross train all employees of the Auditor-Controller's Office," and is regarded by many of her colleagues and peers as an outstanding boss and coworker, and a great friend. She has always been quick to champion the accomplishments of her staff and department, which has won awards for excellence in financial reporting from the Government Finance Officer's Association and the State Controller's Office.

Mrs. Cochrane is also a model citizen and an enduring participant in a number of community organizations and groups. She is treasurer and a long-time member of the Lake County Hospice Board of Directors, a very active member of the Lakeport Rotary Club, a proud mother of three and grandmother of four.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I believe it is appropriate at this time that we commend and applaud the tremendous contributions that my friend, Mrs. Cochrane, has made to the County of Lake and her fellow members of that community. We wish to extend to her our deepest gratitude and best wishes for many years of happy retirement with her husband, James.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2832, legislation that will extend the Trade Adjustment Assistance program and the 2009 TAA reforms for workers, firms, and farmers through December 31, 2013.

Since its creation nearly half a century ago, TAA has helped millions of Americans whose jobs were lost to outsourcing, off-shoring, and increased foreign competition.

For many, TAA is a critical lifeline that provides retraining and education, health insurance assistance, and other crucial support initiatives to workers affected by international trade.

TAA also helps small businesses and farmers become more competitive through the TAA for firms and TAA for farmers program.

This legislation will also extend important reforms made to TAA in 2009, but were allowed to expire in February of this year. These improvements include guaranteeing access to training for American service and manufacturing workers, as well as allow workers to qualify for TAA benefits if their firms shifted production to any country, including China and India, not just countries with which the United States has entered into a free trade agreement.

More than 185,000 additional trade-impacted workers have become eligible for training opportunities and benefits under the 2009 reforms.

In my state alone, over 20,000 workers have benefited from TAA's services and support since May 2009. Nationwide, nearly half a million Americans have benefited from TAA over the past two years.

TAA has historically received bipartisan support in this chamber. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me and support this legislation.

Unfortunately, programs like TAA would not be necessary if this Congress and this Administration would push for trade deals that would focus on job creation here at home.

The history of free trade agreements shows that the promised benefits of FTAs, be with Mexico and NAFTA, or with China and Most-Favored-Trade Status, have not materialized.

In fact, it has been the opposite.

Soon after the enactment of NAFTA in 1994, six factories in my district in Houston were shut down. The thousands of Houstonians who were laid-off were able to get assistance through TAA, but would have much rather have kept their jobs than seen their livelihoods moved to Mexico.

Before NAFTA came into effect, the United States had an annual trade surplus of over $1 billion with Mexico. Last year, our nation's trade deficit with our southern neighbor reached $66 billion.

The story is similar with China. In 1999, the year before permanent MFT status was granted on China, our trade deficit was $68 billion.

Today, that deficit has exploded to $273 billion, and with it, millions of American jobs. A recent study by the Economic Policy Institute found that the trade deficit with China eliminated or displaced 2.8 million jobs between 2001 and 2010.

I fear that enactment of the trade agreements debated in this chamber today will further exacerbate job losses in our country.

EPI found in a study last year that the Korea FTA alone would displace 159,000 jobs in the United States. The same study found that the Colombia FTA would cost the American people 55,000 jobs.

It is time for this chamber to ask why our nation gives open access to our markets to foreign competitors—as is the case with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama—and only, years later, look to gain similar access into their markets.

History has shown me that genuine free trade comes when all parties receive equal access to each others' markets. All three of these agreements fail to do so.

I close by calling on my colleagues today to vote in favor of working Americans by voting against these trade agreements and voting in favor of TAA.

CAPE VERDEAN EX-PRESIDENT PIRES IS PRAISED FOR HIS LEADERSHIP ROLE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week, on the death of former Cape Verdean President Aristides Periera, I noted the great achievement of that country in showing the world that a nation winning its independence in the post-World War II period can progress economically while fully respecting democratic norms. Earlier this week, that extremely admirable record was recognized as well by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation as they awarded the Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership to Pedro de Verona Rodrigues Pires, the recently retired President of Cape Verde. President Pires was elected to two terms as President and was one of those responsible for the great record of economic development a record recognized by both the Bush and Obama administrations in their strong support for Cape Verde's participation in our Millennium Challenge program. President Pires' popularity and record of success was such that some urged him to support a constitutional amendment so he could run for a third term, but he refused to do that, demonstrating a strong commitment to both the spirit and the letter of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of Cape Verde for the example they set so much of the world in combining economic progress and democratic commitment, and I am glad to once again express to President Pires, whom I had the privilege of meeting in Brockton, Massachusetts last summer, my great admiration and respect for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article from the New York Times about Pedro Pires winning the Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership be printed here, because the example set by President Pires and by the people of Cape Verde is one that deserves to be chronicled widely, and, I hope, followed.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 10, 2011]

EX-PRESIDENT OF CAPE VERDE WINS GOOD-GOVERNMENT PRIZE

(By Adam Nossiter)

MONROVIA, LIBERIA.—Pedro de Verona Rodrigues Pires, the former president of Cape Verde, the desertlike archipelago about 300 miles off the coast of West Africa, has won one of the world's major prizes, the $5 million Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership.

The record of governing in Africa has been poor enough lately that the Mo Ibrahim Foundation decided not to award the prize for the past two years. In many African countries, leaders have refused to leave office after losing elections, tried to alter constitutions to ensure their continued tenure or gone back on pledges not to run for reelection.

But on Monday the foundation of Mr. Ibrahim, a Sudan-born telecommunications mogul whose goal is to promote good government in Africa, announced it had picked Mr. Pires of Cape Verde, a sparsely populated former Portuguese colony of 500,000 people, mostly of mixed Portuguese-African descent. The islands are a perennial exception to the many low rankings that international organizations, including Mr. Ibrahim's, give to nations on the continent for human rights and governing.

Mr. Pires served two terms—10 years—as president until stepping down last month. During that period, the foundation noted, Cape Verde became only the second African nation to move up from the United Nations' ''least developed'' category. The foundation says the prize is given only to a democratically elected president who has stayed ''within the limits set by the county's constitution, has left office in the last three years and has demonstrated excellence in office.''

Mr. Pires resisted suggestions that his country's Constitution could be changed to allow him to run again, a further point in his favor, the foundation said. In addition to the $5 million award paid over 10 years, the winner receives $200,000 annually for life thereafter.

''It is wonderful to see an African leader who has served his country from the time of colonial rule through to multiparty democracy, all the time retaining the interests of his people as his guiding principle,'' Mr. Ibrahim said in a statement. ''The fact that Cape Verde with few natural resources can become a middle-income country is an example not just to the continent but to the world.''

Mr. Ibrahim publishes an index scoring African countries on how they govern, and this year the index noted significant improvements in Liberia and Sierra Leone, while nonetheless finding an ''unchanged continental average'' in ''overall governance quality.''

THE U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: A NO WIN SITUATION FOR AMERICA AND ITS WORKERS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, why would Congress pass three leftover Bush NAFTA-style "free trade" agreements with Korea, Panama and Colombia?

A report issued by the Economic Policy Institute concluded that the Korea FTA agreement not only fails to create jobs for American workers, it would result in the net loss of 159,000 U.S. jobs in its first seven years. And when one considers the details of the agreement, it is not hard to see why.

Under the proposed Korea FTA, the United States will eliminate tariffs on South Korean cars and trucks, increasing South Korean imports here, without requiring them to buy more of our vehicles. As a concession, South Korea did agree to waive certain environmental and safety requirements for up to 25,000 cars per U.S. maker—if suddenly there is demand for U.S. cars in South Korea, whose consumers historically have not bought U.S. imports. More than 95 percent of the cars sold in South Korea today are made in South Korea.

Additionally, no changes were made to the low domestic content rules. Under the proposed agreement, up to 65 percent of the value of a vehicle can be sourced in low-wage nations like China and still qualify for the FTA's duty-free access. As a result, this agreement is an open invitation to the auto industry to send American auto parts jobs to China. Indeed, the Korean Auto Workers Union opposes this FTA because the low domestic content rules will also invite the South Korean parts industry to outsource their jobs to China. Meanwhile, Europe's trade agreement with South Korea requires 55 percent domestic content. Even NAFTA required 50 percent domestic content.

But while this FTA does not follow NAFTA's domestic content requirements, it does replicate NAFTA's special privileges for foreign investors. This allows foreign investors to evade domestic courts and use foreign tribunals to get reimbursed for regulatory costs from U.S. taxpayers. There are more than 270 Korean corporate affiliates in the U.S. who would be empowered to use these tribunals to raid our Treasury if the Korea FTA were implemented.

Among the laws exposed to attack are financial regulations that the U.S. and Korea implemented to restore stability after the devastating global financial crisis. The banks and securities firms that wrecked the global economy would be newly empowered under this deal to attack the policies designed to get them under control. Not surprisingly, the Korea FTA is loved by Wall Street's titans.

And the FTA even includes President Bush's ban on references to the International Labor Organization's Conventions—the global labor standard. The agreement does nothing to require South Korean labor law to be put on equal footing with U.S. law, as under South Korean law, union members can be fired for striking and then sued for their employers' lost profits. The AFL-CIO, Teamsters, and many other American and Korean unions oppose this FTA.

With the Big Three beginning to recover and hire more workers thanks to major U.S. government assistance, it seems problematic that Congress would support an agreement that could boost the auto industry's profits, but only at the cost of more off-shored jobs.

The proposed Korea FTA is a bad deal for our country and America's workers. It's time to put the American worker first and stop these trade deals.

MR. KEVIN GRYBOSKI

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Kevin Gryboski for his lifetime of outstanding athleticism, and on his acceptance into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gryboski is a graduate of Bishop Hoban High School and Wilkes University. He began his baseball career in Plains with a Little League championship in 1984. He was also selected first-team All-State and top pitcher in the state in 1992 while playing for the Plains American Legion Baseball team. While at Bishop Hoban, Mr. Gryboski showed his talents on the field, as he was named an all-star in 1990 and 1991, and he also played basketball for the Argents.

Mr. Gryboski continued to show his talents during his time at Wilkes University, where he participated in both baseball and basketball. On the mound, he was named pitcher for the 1994 Middle Atlantic Conference championship team. To this day, he holds the Colonels' all-time record for complete games, and he has been inducted into the Wilkes University Athletic Hall of Fame.

Mr. Gryboski is an inspiration to many student-athletes because he showed the importance of education. In 1994, he was drafted by the Cincinnati Reds, but he deferred signing so he could finish earning his degree. He had truly ended up with the best of both worlds, as in 1995 he had his degree and signed with the Seattle Mariners, where he played until 2001. He was traded to the Atlanta Braves in 2002. His career also took him to the Texas Rangers, the Washington Nationals, the Pittsburgh Pirates, and finally to the San Francisco Giants in 2008 before he retired after a shoulder injury. He pitched in 190 regular-season games and 13 post-season games, and he helped the Braves win a National League East championship.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to commend Mr. Kevin Gryboski, and speak for the members of his hometown in appreciation of his gifts and abilities.

CONGRATULATING SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES ON RE-OPENING THE SONORA SAWMILL

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sierra Pacific Industries on re-opening the Sonora Sawmill. This dedicated business is assisting in bringing back economic vitality to the region.

Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) is a third-generation family-owned forest products company based in Anderson, California. With its formation in 1949, the firm now owns and manages nearly 1.9 million acres of timberland in California and Washington, and is the second largest lumber producer in the United States. Sierra Pacific employs over 3,500 people in these two states, with about 3,000 of them in California. The U.S. Forest Service estimates that these direct jobs in California also provide more than 7,000 indirect jobs in related and affected businesses.

At Sierra Pacific Industries, the company's dedicated team members produce quality wood products using the most sophisticated equipment and machinery. This basic understanding represents Sierra Pacific's philosophy toward its valued crew members. During the course of Sierra Pacific's growth and development, efforts have been made to assure an atmosphere of fair treatment and appreciation for all employees. Some of SPI's continuing programs include: appropriate compensation and benefit levels for crew members and their dependents; development of supervisors sensitive to the needs and concerns of today's crew members; and career advancement opportunities for all employees through a desire to promote from within the company whenever possible. Through a full commitment to this philosophy, SPI continues to be an organization where its crew members are proud to work and others strive to become part of the team.

Sierra Pacific continues to make substantial investments in forestry and mill modernization in the State of California. Although many companies have left the state due to its difficult economic and regulatory climate, SPI remains committed to rebuilding a competitive climate for business in California and investing in the rural communities where it operates.

Sierra Pacific Industries is committed to managing its lands in a responsible and sustainable manner to protect the environment while providing quality wood products and renewable power for consumers. To SPI, sustainable forest management means more than planting trees. The company employs modern forest management practices that closely mimic natural forest events. It has invested in state-of-the-art equipment to optimize every fiber of every tree. SPI is a voluntary partner in the independent Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI®) forest certification program to help ensure our forests are here for generations to come. The expertise of its registered professional foresters and natural resource specialists guarantees that wildlife habitats, water quality, and other forest values are protected.

The Sierra Pacific Foundation was established and funded in 1979 by A.A. "Red" Emmerson's father, R.H. "Curly" Emmerson. During the past 20 years, the Foundation has provided over $3 million in Higher Education scholarships to dependent children of SPI employees. The Foundation also contributes to youth activities and other organizations in the communities in which Sierra Pacific Industries has facilities, with contributions to more than 100 worthy organizations each year. The Foundation awarded $403,250 to 177 students to assist them as they attend colleges, universities and trade schools during the 2011–2012 school year.

Mrs. Ida Emmerson, wife of company president A.A. "Red" Emmerson for nearly 41 years, served as president of the Sierra Pacific Foundation until her death in 1996. Red and Ida's daughter, Carolyn Dietz, proudly succeeded her as Foundation president.

The original Sonora sawmill was first constructed in 1901. It had several owners before Sierra Pacific Industries purchased it and nearby timberlands in 1995. Sierra Pacific operated the plant continuously until it was forced to close the facility in 2009 amid weakness in the lumber market, reduced timber harvests on nearby national forest lands, and increasing state regulatory burdens. In June of 2011 SPI announced that it would rebuild the mill using new technologies that would allow it to cut a wider array of log sizes to maximize the efficiency of the operation. The mill restarted in September, 2011 and employs about 130 workers on two shifts.

Sierra Pacific Industries generates $11.7 million in annual payroll in Tuolumne County to its direct employees, and pays $400,000 in property taxes. In addition, SPI pays out over $200,000 annually to local vendors for their supplies and services.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in praising Sierra Pacific Industries for their diligent work in the timber industry and applauding them in the re-opening of the Sonora Sawmill.

H.R. 2017, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

HON. MICK MULVANEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2017 would fund the Federal Government from October 1, 2011 through October 4, 2011. It was considered by a unanimous consent request, which does not require a recorded vote. Had a recorded vote been required, I would have voted against this spending bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 11, 2011, I regrettably missed the votes on rollcall. My leave of absence was due to a district event with the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on the following bill.

H. Res. 425—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3078, United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, H.R. 3079, United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, H.R. 3080, United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendments to H.R. 2832 which extends the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

Following H. Res. 425, I would have voted "Yea" on the following amendments.

Waxman Amendment (#11) which adds a new section at the end of the bill to ensure that the bill complies with the Republican discretionary CutGo protocol. The section says if the bill authorizes the appropriation of funds and does not reduce an existing authorization of appropriations to offset that amount, then the bill's provisions cease to be effective. CBO currently scores the bill as spending $1 million over 5 years subject to appropriations.

Connolly Amendment (#18) which adds a new section at the end of the bill that directs the EPA Administrator not to delay actions to reduce pollution emissions from waste incinerators or industrial boilers at chemical facilities,

oil refineries or large manufacturing facilities if such emissions are causing respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses and deaths, including cases of heart attacks, asthma attacks and bronchitis.

Markey Amendment which adds a new section at the end of the bill which directs the EPA Administrator not to delay actions to reduce pollution emissions from waste incinerators or industrial boilers at chemical facilities, oil refineries or large manufacturing facilities if such emissions are increasing the risk of cancer.

Edwards Amendment which adds a finding to the bill which states, according to EPA, if the rules overturned by the bill remained in effect, they would create 2,200 net additional jobs, not including jobs created to manufacture and install equipment to reduce air pollution. This finding is drawn from EPA's analysis of the rules.

Schakowsky Amendment which adds a finding to the bill that mercury released into the ambient air from cement kilns is a potent neurotoxin that can damage the development of an infant's brain.

Ellison Amendment (#12) which allows EPA to require compliance by boilers sooner than 5 years (underlying bill says boilers get at least 5 years or longer to comply) if the new regulations required to be written under the bill result in the creation of more than 1,000 jobs.

Welch Amendment which adds a finding to the bill affirming that that the American people are exposed to mercury from industrial sources through the consumption of fish containing mercury and every state in the nation has issued at least one mercury advisory for fish consumption.

Jackson-Lee Amendment which requires boilers to comply no later than 3 years after EPA completes the re-write of boiler rules required by the bill. The bill includes a deadline of at least 5 years, the Clean Air Act currently requires 3 years and gives states or EPA the ability to extend for a 4th year. The Jackson-Lee amendment would retain the CAA's current provisions.

MR. GERRY GRYBOSKI

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Gerry Gryboski for his performance as an athlete, coach, and role model, and on his acceptance into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Gerry is a graduate of Sacred Heart High School, where he participated in basketball and baseball. He posted a 4–0 record as a pitcher in the 1962 Catholic League Championship, and he led the team with a .484 batting average.

Mr. Gryboski was invited to tryouts for both the Pittsburgh Pirates and Philadelphia Phillies; however, he ended up serving his country in the United States Army from 1963 to 1966.

Mr. Gryboski coached Biddy league as well as seventh and eighth grade basketball. He also coached Little and Teener league baseball for eleven years, from 1980 to 1991. He also contributed two All-Star sons to the Wyoming Valley Conference, Kevin and Brian.

Mr. Speaker, Gerry Gryboski must surely be proud of the spectacular athletes he has coached and raised, as well as of his career and the teams he has coached. It is with great pleasure that I commend him as he is accepted into the Plains Sports Hall of Fame.

SUPPORTING THE EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE AND OPPOSING THE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH SOUTH KOREA, PANAMA AND COLOMBIA

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extending the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program (TAA) and in opposition to the three free trade agreements between the U.S. and South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

TAA provides essential assistance to workers who lose employment due to trade agreements with foreign countries. We need to extend it. More than 280,000 displaced workers in 2010 relied on the greater job training options, health care tax credit coverage, and extra weeks of income support provided under the TAA program to get back on their feet after losing their jobs to foreign countries.

The residents of my district in California have firsthand experience with the benefits of TAA. California has seen multiple plant closings due to trade with countries around the globe. Last year, the NUMMI auto plant in my district closed and nearly 5,000 employees lost their jobs along with thousands more who worked at suppliers for the plant. For these workers, TAA is a lifeline that is providing retraining, education, and other assistance to help them find new jobs.

U.S. trade policies and free trade agreements, such as NAFTA and DR-CAFTA, have decimated our manufacturing sector. They have protected corporate interests at the expense of workers and created incentives to ship jobs overseas. I opposed those agreements and I oppose the unfair free trade Agreements with Panama, Korea and Colombia that are currently before Congress.

If we want to get our economy back on track, we need to focus on creating jobs and not shipping more jobs overseas. These three free trade agreements follow the same failed Bush-era trade policies that allow multinational corporations to challenge public interest laws that protect the environment, health, and workers.

The agreement with South Korea will increase our trade deficit by billions of dollars and cost us an estimated 159,000 jobs. The Colombia agreement stands out because it would have us lower trade barriers with a country in which only 2 percent of workers are unionized and more trade unionists are murdered annually than anywhere else in the world. We should not sign more agreements that ship our jobs overseas, grant exceptional rights to large corporations, and fail to protect workers' rights or our environment.

Republicans in Congress have spent eight months tying the extension of critical TAA benefits to the three pending free trade agreements. In doing so, they've abandoned the very people who will get our economy going again: workers. It is a further wrong that the extension of TAA is just for two years, and not longer. These new trade agreements are going to be permanent. We should ensure that permanent TAA protections are there for the workers who will lose their jobs as a result of the trade agreements. Our vote today in favor of an extension of TAA will provide real help to these workers and their families. We owe it to them to support TAA and to oppose the three pending free trade agreements that will cost more jobs. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING DR. JOSEPH N. HANKIN

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Joseph N. Hankin, who will be honored October 12 for his 40 years as President of Westchester Community College, the State University of New York, in Valhalla, NY. His four decades of exceptional leadership and dedication at this outstanding institution make him the longest-serving community college president in the nation.

That distinction is only the latest in Dr. Hankin's distinguished career in higher education. At age 26, he became the youngest community college president in the nation, when he assumed the presidency of Harford Community College, in Maryland. Four years later, he moved to Westchester Community College. Under his leadership, WCC's enrollment has grown from several thousand to more than 30,000 in both credit and non-credit programs. The college's Continuing Education division is now the largest in New York State, providing lifelong learning for students of all ages. Its faculty and professional staff have received more SUNY Chancellors Awards for Excellence than any other community college in the system and the Westchester Community College Foundation has grown into one of the most successful community college foundations in the nation.

Mindful of the need to keep education relevant to the changing needs of its students and society, Dr. Hankin has overseen the addition of dozens of new curricula and the redesign of existing programs as well as the growth of comprehensive corporate training for businesses and entrepreneurs. Committed to the college's mission of quality, affordability and accessibility, he launched the highly-regarded Honors Program, and continues to support WCC's English Language Institute and its Virginia Marx Children's Center on campus. The latter gives students and staff the best child care possible at affordable rates. Dr. Hankin also has expanded the college's reach into every corner of the community, with five stand-alone extension centers and class offerings at hundreds of additional locations.

For all of these accomplishments and many more, Dr. Joseph N. Hankin has been named one of the Top Fifty Community College Leaders in the Nation and one of the Most Effective College Presidents in the U.S. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing him for his exemplary educational leadership, vision, service and commitment during his 40 years at Westchester Community College.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EMMA BATES

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor the memory of Emma Bates from Riviera Beach, Florida. Mrs. Bates passed away on October 9, 2011, following a year-long battle with stomach cancer. Previously, she had beaten both breast and colon cancer, attesting to the strength and perseverance that drove Mrs. Bates throughout her life.

Mrs. Bates moved from her native Baxley, Georgia to the Glades area in Florida as a child. She graduated from Roosevelt High School in West Palm Beach. After graduation, she enrolled in several business management courses at what is now known as Palm Beach State College and later found an interest in cosmetology. It was not long until she opened her own hair salon, the Intimate Salon of Beauty in Riviera Beach. Mrs. Bates was believed to have been the first licensed African-American beautician in Palm Beach County.

She was known by many in the community as an activist who worked tirelessly for what she believed was right and in the best interest of the Riviera Beach community. She served as the chairwoman of the Citizens Task Force and was a campaign manager for multiple candidates, including a successful campaign for City Council in 2007.

Mrs. Bates was a woman who was truly loved by her community and worked hard for what she believed in. I am deeply saddened by her passing, which is more than a personal loss, but also a loss for the community that she fought for and inspired. Her selfless efforts will continue to be felt for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my deepest condolences to Mrs. Bates' family and friends during this most difficult time. Her memory will live on and she will be dearly missed.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF TAKAYOSHI OSHIMA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American innovator and entrepreneur, Mr. Takayoshi Oshima. On the occasion of his 70th birthday, which he celebrated last month, I would like to take this opportunity to herald Mr. Oshima's many achievements in the field of business and technology—achievements that have helped establish Silicon Valley, which I am proud to represent, as the international center of IT research and development.

Born in Tochigi, Japan on September 17, 1941, Mr. Oshima moved to the United States with the support of generous benefactors to pursue an engineering degree at the University of Florida. He began his studies with little English fluency, but he studied hard and excelled academically, demonstrating early the high standards to which he has held himself throughout his life. Upon graduating, he was recruited by ITT to work in Puerto Rico. Restless for new challenges and opportunities, Mr. Oshima returned to Florida to study business after which he joined the esteemed ranks of the technology industry's earliest and most promising pioneers. He worked for the legendary Fairchild Semiconductor company, where he and his colleagues like Dr. Robert Noyce, Dr. Gordon Moore, and Dr. Andy Grove helped start what today has become Silicon Valley. He would later take on senior technical, marketing, and managerial roles at Advanced Micro Devices and Ungermann-Bass.

Taki currently serves as Chairman and CEO of Allied Telesis Holdings KK which he founded in San Jose, CA in 1987. Internationally recognized for developing sophisticated data networks used in high performance and high reliability applications, Allied Telesis today employs over 2,400 people in 23 countries around the world. At 70, he remains committed to leading a company on the cutting edge of technological innovation. He is personally motivated to address some of our nation's most pressing challenges: improving health care, homeland security, and transportation through more advanced technologies.

Mr. Oshima has not only distinguished himself in engineering and business; he is also a respected leader in the San Francisco Bay Area's Japanese American community. He is a committed family man—a proud father to two daughters and one son and a doting grandfather to four grandsons.

As a fellow Californian, as a Japanese American, and as a friend, I am proud today to pay tribute to Mr. Oshima for his contributions to America's technological advancement and economic growth. Although his modesty would seek to convince you otherwise, Mr. Oshima is among Silicon Valley's most successful and transformative entrepreneurs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank and applaud Mr. Takayoshi Oshima for his outstanding achievements and his passion to discover and foster untapped potential in every frontier. He is a true American pioneer.

MS. MARIE PAGE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Marie Page, president of Marie Page Cleaning Services, for her entrepreneurial spirit. Ms. Page started her business in residential cleaning and janitorial service in 1989. She proved herself as a legitimate business owner through hard work and determination. Marie Page Cleaning Services LLC is certified by the State of Pennsylvania as a woman-owned business enterprise.

Ms. Page's company is affiliated with the not-for-profit organization, Cleaning for a Reason, through which Marie Page Cleaning Services provides free cleaning for women undergoing cancer treatment—something we should note during Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Ms. Page shows her good heart as a business owner as she still offers compensation to her employees but donates the supplies and services. Marie Page has made her presence known as a businesswoman as well as her community efforts. It is for these reasons that I commend her.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of this woman and her enterprising spirit in the face of adversity and in a difficult business climate. It is citizens such as Marie Page that make Northeastern Pennsylvania a wonderful place to live and work. As a former small business owner, I understand the concerns of starting a business, and Ms. Page has turned her start-up company into a successful and philanthropic organization that I am sure has a very bright future.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, the free trade agreement between the United States and Colombia means jobs. If you are looking for bright spots in the U.S. economy, our trading relationship with Colombia is one of them. Even though we have been operating under a handicap to competitors like Argentina because of higher tariffs and duties, American exports to Colombia have been growing. Our exports last year were worth $12.1 billion, up 26 percent, and the International Trade Commission estimates this agreement will increase exports by at least another $1.1 billion.

Each of those exports supports jobs in the United States, not to mention jobs in the State of Alabama. Colombia is one of Alabama's best export markets in this hemisphere, and it is an excellent customer for high-value manufactured products like machinery and transportation equipment. Our former Governor Bob Riley demonstrated the importance of the partnership when he led a trade delegation to Colombia in 2009, and it is my view that this agreement will create even more opportunities for mutually beneficial trade.

Colombia is a strategic ally committed to a free market economy. Working together, our governments have made progress in addressing the scourge of narcotics. The Colombian government has also instituted major labor reforms, and the labor provisions in this agreement reflect the government's commitment to protect those rights. For the record, I am submitting information I received from the Colombian Ambassador to the U.S. regarding the Action Plan on labor protections.

The U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement will open up new avenues of cooperation between our two countries, and provide an immediate boost to our farmers, the textile industry, our energy industry, and our manufacturers to name just a few. It is a win-win agreement and I am pleased to support it.

THIRD PARTY VALIDATORS

COLOMBIA HAS ACHIEVED ALL OF THE ACTION PLAN MILESTONES

September 15 Milestones: ''Colombia continues to meet its milestones for the action plan.''—Deputy USTR Miriam Sapiro, September 23, 2011.

June 15 Milestones: ''The Action Plan is designed to significantly increase labor protections in Colombia, and we are pleased

that Colombia is meeting its commitments. We are eager to see Congress move the Colombia trade agreement forward as soon as possible (. . .).''—USTR Ron Kirk, June 13, 2011.

April 22 Milestones: U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk sent a letter to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees ''indicating that Colombia has taken the necessary steps, consistent with the April 22 milestones outlined in the Action Plan, to move to the next stage in the process.''—USTR Ron Kirk, May 4, 2011.

COLOMBIA IS ON THE RIGHT TRACK: PROMOTING AND PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF WORKERS AND THE RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS

''On September 8, 2011, the Department of State determined and certified to Congress that the Colombian Government is meeting statutory criteria related to human rights.''—U.S. State Department, September 15, 2011.

The International Labor Organization (ILO) Committee that has monitored Colombia since 1985, excluded Colombia in June 2010 and again this year from the list of countries that need special monitoring.—ILO, June 2011.

For the first time in more than a decade, Colombia has been selected as a titular member of the ILO Governing Body for the 2011–2014 term. Colombia was elected with 96 percent of votes from the tripartite delegations of 182 countries around the world.—ILO, June 2011.

COLOMBIAN GOVERNMENT AND LABOR UNIONS: WORKING HAND IN HAND

An effective Three-Party Agreement was signed by the Colombian Government, labor unions and employers to strengthen democracy and advance the social dialogue on labor issues. The Agreement, which was originally signed in June 2006, was updated in May 2011 to reaffirm all three parties' commitment to reestablishing a social dialogue to generate solutions on labor-related issues and address conflicts and differences.—May 2011.

The Colombian Government and Colombian Federation of Educators—Fecode, which represents 250,000 educators—signed an historic agreement on May 4, 2011 that will improve working conditions and the quality of life for the nation's educators. ''We achieved very important points and discussed important topics such as the teachers' status. As teachers, we have welcomed this agreement.''—Senén Niño, President of Fecode. June 15, 2011.

TRADE UNIONS AND NGO EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR ACTION PLAN AND PROGRESSIVE AGENDA

On the Progressive Agenda: ''The General Labor Confederation (CGT) salutes the achievements of the Administration of President Juan Manuel Santos during his first year in office. The Administration has enacted a series of policies of enormous value to workers and all Colombians.''—CGT, August 11, 2011.

On the Progressive Agenda: ''The agenda that is being constructed at this moment is the result of a constant battle and the work of the Colombian union movement with the support of international unions. The measures contained in the agreement signed by Presidents Santos and Obama last week, the recommendations of the High Level Mission of the OIT that visited us in February, and President Santos' programs on labor are all measures that the union movement has advocated for years.''—Luciano Sanin, Director of the National Union School (ENS), April 2011.

On the Action Plan: ''It is a step in the right direction that the President (Santos) deepened the agreement so that the topics of union liberty, human rights and guarantees for workers are included in the FTA.''—Julio Roberto Gomez, General Secretary of the CGT, April 8, 2011.

A VIEW FROM OUTSIDE: ''COLOMBIA'S PROGRESS DESERVES SUPPORT''

''The best way to encourage Mr. Santos to take further steps to end impunity and protect activists, political candidates and indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities is to approve the FTA.'' (. . .) ''Democrats should join in ratifying the Colombia pact, and they should credit progress on human rights.''—Mark Schneider, Senior Vice President, International Crisis Group and Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, September 18, 2011.

''We commend President Juan Manuel Santos's commitment to compensate the victims of violence and return confiscated land to poor farmers. And we applaud efforts to reduce homicides of union members, which Colombia reports have declined by nearly 90% since 2002. These are significant steps. The FTA will further Colombia's progress by providing clear protections for fundamental labor rights.''—Sens. John Kerry (D–MA) and Max Baucus (D–MT), Wall Street Journal Op-ed, April 4, 2011.

''A Gain for Workers.'' In an article on labor cooperatives, Revista Semana highlighted that the new decree that tackles illegal forms of labor intermediation ''is very good news for the working class (. . .) 300,000 jobs will be formalized (. . .) several companies are already adjusting to the new standard. Carrefour added 600 employees to its payroll, representing additional annual costs of about 5,000 million pesos (US$2.5 million). Exito has hired 2,500 packers, as part of a plan that includes the direct hiring of 6,250 employees this year. This will cost Exito about 70,000 million pesos per year (US$35 millon).''—Revista Semana, June 18, 2011. The Colombian news weekly Revista Semana was awarded in 2009 by the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) with the Charles A. Perlik, Jr. Award for Excellence in the Field of Print Journalism throughout the hemisphere.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is $14,863,312,407,851.35.

On January 6, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $4,224,886,661,557.55 since then. This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to not make cuts to vital safety net programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

52.5 Million people received Social Security in 2009 alone—and 3 million seniors live below the $11,000 federal poverty level.

Today, 40 million Americans are enrolled in Medicare.

More than 48 million people rely on Medicaid services.

Unfortunately, Republicans want to turn back the clock and place increasing costly burdens on the backs of America's seniors and their families.

We must not ask seniors to sacrifice benefits before asking the wealthiest few and major companies to pay their fair share.

Seniors have health care security and a greater financial security because of these services—we must ensure their protection and avoid cuts that will negatively impact job creation.

We must lower our long-term deficit and work together to find a better solution so that America's beneficiaries are not at risk.

TO COMMEMORATE THE GRAND OPENING OF OTTO BOCK POLYURETHANE TECHNOLOGIES IN ROCHESTER HILLS, MI

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the grand opening of Otto Bock Polyurethane Technologies in Rochester Hills, Michigan. Otto Bock is world-renowned and award-winning for its work in the field of prosthetics and orthotics. The story of the Otto Bock family of companies is a striking example of how innovation and technology can be transferred across discrete industries to create synergies for new products and processes.

Founded in 1919 in Berlin, Germany and named for its founder, Otto Bock has stayed true to its origins as an innovator and manufacturer of prosthetic devices. The perpetual process of innovating and improving prostheses combined with the challenge presented by the physical needs of returning war veterans, pushed Bock to use new materials and processes to increase production of improved prostheses. Traditionally an artisan-based process, Bock sought to move the industry toward a component-based manufacturing system. He was a forerunner in the use of aluminum parts and in 1950, he applied the first plastics to prosthetic production, some of which are still used today. Recognizing the vast potential of this new material, Max Näder, Bock's son-in-law, founded the Otto Bock Kunststoff in 1953. Today, the company is an important technology partner for Otto Bock HealthCare as well as a successful developer

and supplier of plastics for the automobile industry. The third pillar of the company group Otto Bock is Sycor. Formerly part of the computer department of Otto Bock, the information and communication technology company develops customized solutions for company networks.

Otto Bock's Rochester Hills facility will focus on advanced products and manufacturing of technologies of noise-reducing NVH Foam Parts for automotive engines and will eventually bring nearly $14 million in capital investments and 100 jobs to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome the entire Otto Bock family to Michigan's 9th Congressional District and I am honored to recognize Otto Bock Polyurethane Technologies and the dedicated individuals who work to maintain its mission of innovation. I know that the leadership of Otto Bock will find some of the best engineers and skilled workers in the world here to further its work in advanced technology and manufacturing. I look forward to Otto Bock maintaining its strong tradition of innovation, excellence and good corporate citizenship in our communities for many decades to come.

MS. RITA LACEY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rita Lacey of Close the Loop, for her excellent work as an entrepreneur. Ms. Lacey has managed to merge business and the phrase ''Reduce, Reuse, Recycle'' through her business, Close the Loop LLC.

Close the Loop LLC began in 2000. Ms. Lacey started a new venture with no background in sales or accounting. Its aim was to help United States manufacturers of recycled products build the demand for their products made from recycled materials. By 2008, Close the Loop had shipped more than 7 million pounds of rubber mulch and more than 130,000 pounds of plastic fencing.

In 2009, a time of economic downturn led Ms. Lacey's company to get more socially involved in the community. Close the Loop organized free community events such as ''Give and Take Days,'' during which community members donated items they no longer needed and took items they could use. Ms. Lacey has passed her business knowledge to others by offering free workshops and classes at Careerlink in Tannersville and the Monroe County Chamber of Commerce. She shows unemployed and underemployed people how they can start their own business while on a limited budget. I commend Ms. Lacey for all she has done as an entrepreneur and a philanthropist.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts that Rita Lacey has made. It is citizens such as Ms. Lacey that make Northeastern Pennsylvania a wonderful place to live and work. In these struggling times, it is wonderful to see all of the positive work Ms. Lacey is doing to promote her community.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR. RICHARD ''FOZ'' RYAN

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Mr. Richard ''Foz'' Ryan, teacher, coach and community servant, who passed away this week on Monday, October 10, 2011.

A native of East St. Louis, Illinois, Foz Ryan was a competitive athlete who blended his interests in education and sports as a highly successful coach. Foz coached an impressive array of sports over a 36 year career, including basketball, football, cross country, track and volleyball. The lessons learned by his athletes enabled them to achieve success, not only in their athletic pursuits, but in life as well.

Foz never faced a worthy cause he did not champion or an event he could not organize. He became involved with the Special Olympics over 30 years ago and was a dedicated supporter of that organization ever since. While Foz was honored for his years of service to Special Olympics he noted that his true reward came through his interaction with the Special Olympics athletes.

Through his work with the Knights of Columbus and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Foz organized and initiated a number of community events, including the annual St. Patrick's Day parade in Belleville, Illinois, which was founded through Foz's initiative and which has grown in popularity every year.

Always proud of his Irish ancestry, Foz made several trips to Ireland and worked tirelessly to promote an appreciation for Irish heritage within his community. He was honored as the ''Hibernian of the Year'' and held every office of his local chapter of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Foz Ryan's lifetime of achievement was accomplished through his roles as a teacher, coach, mentor, volunteer, fund-raiser and community servant. He is now reunited with his wife, Shirley, to whom he was married for 44 years and who preceded him in death in 2000. Foz is survived by three children, Theresa, Timothy and Patrick, and eight grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Mr. Richard ''Foz'' Ryan, offering our best wishes to his family and recognizing the indelible mark he left on his community and in the hearts of everyone who knew him.

A GOTHAM HEART—IN HONOR OF AN AMERICAN HERO, PFC BYRAN A. DILBERIAN, JR., UNITED STATES ARMY, 10TH MOUNTAIN DIVISION, 1ST BATTALION, 32ND INFANTRY REGIMENT

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 2011 PFC Bryan Dilberian, Jr., while on patrol in Arghandab Valley in Afghanistan, was nearly killed by an Improvised Explosive Device that took both of Bryan's legs and an arm. His brother in arms, SPC Jimmy Waters died literally in his arms from the same IED explosion.

But, because of his Gotham Heart and extraordinary will to live, and not just live but flourish, he is now walking less than three months from the day he lost his legs. His courage is a lesson to us all in the resilience of the human spirit. PFC Dilberian and his wonderful family make us all proud to be Americans; their faith, courage, and character throughout this trying ordeal is an inspiration, and like all Wounded Warriors, are shining examples for our nation. I submit this poem penned by Mr. Albert Caswell to honor PFC Bryan Dilberian Jr. of The Tenth Mountain Division from Brooklyn, New York and his fallen brother in arms SFC Jimmy Waters.

A GOTHAM HEART

(By Mr. Albert Caswell)

A Gotham Heart!
And from this Gotham City of great consequence!
Has but come such a fine young Man, to all hearts to so enhance!
A Man of such heart and soul, to warm our hearts when they are cold!
Oh yes my Lord, something so special so . . . as but such a sheer work of art, to behold!
One Mountain of a Man! Tenth Mountain . . . ''The Chosen'' . . . America's Son,
who makes all of us so very proud this one!
As One of The Band of Brothers, known as 10th Mountain Men!
Angels put upon this earth, to but protect us all our Lord has sent!
Oh to be A Tenth Mountain Man!
Magnificent . . . Magnificent . . . Magnificent!
And so gallantly off to war, for all of us he so went!
Who upon battlefields of honor bright!
One of Brooklyn's best, who so makes all our hearts ignite!
As so soon Bryan, you began your new fight!
While, out on patrol . . . as you so stood at death's door that night!
Losing your two strong legs, and arm of might!
As the tears rolled down your most precious eyes, this sight!
And your Brother In Arms SPC James Waters, almost in your arms so died!
As the Angels cried, The Angels Cried!
As there they found you together side by side . . .
And Bryan, you so said to yourself, I will live! I will not die!
Armed now, with only the kind of courage that makes the Angels cry!
As Bryan you so wiped away all of those tears from your most brilliant eyes!
To so teach as all, how high a heart can rise!
All about, what within a Gotham Heart so lies!
Even Batman, doesn't have such a Gotham Heart as comprised!
With such courage and faith, oh how Bryan you make us cry!
As you were off running, for you had mountains to so climb!
In less than three months Bryan, you would walk with your head held high!
Making your wonderful Mother Mary Jane, and your family so cry!
With your heart as big as New York City, full of courage . . . as tall as any building does rise!
Yea, The Beasty Boys aught to write a song about your life . . . Word!
Don't Sleep to Brooklyn, might be one of the lines!

Showing us all, as to what new heights a heart can climb!
Beseeching us all to behold, the beauty of mankind!
As against all odds, somehow Bryan the way back you'd find!
As you live each new day, all in honor of your Brother Waters in kind!
And that blood that binds you, forever in time!
For in your heart your brother in arms, Machine Gunner . . . this American Hero will never die!
Yes, Strength In Honor Bryan . . . is what your most courageous life defines!
As so Gotham is your heart, so beating here now so in time!
For all in your life, you will so teach woman and mankind!
Because, Tenth Mountain man . . . you do, you do shine . . .
For Bryan there is no mountain that you cannot climb!
All over this Gotham City with your Gotham heart in time!
Yes, arms and legs we all need . . . but we can survive!
But, without a Gotham Heart of Gold . . . we will surely die!
Because, up in Heaven you need not arms or legs!
And Bryan my son, that's where your are going one day!
And you will look into our Lord's eyes!
And if ever I have a son?
I wish he'd have a heart as Gotham, as your one!
Hooah Bryan! For you have mountains to so climb!
And you have miles to go, and hearts to heal and inspire before you die!
As Bryan, out across our Nation your Gotham Heart so cries!

HONORING GERALD SCOTT

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Mr. Gerald Scott, on the occasion of his induction as a distinguished alumnus of Mountain View High School.

Mr. Scott graduated from Mountain View High School in 1970, after which he received his Associate's Degree from Keystone College and his Bachelor's Degree from Wilkes College, all while working as a carpenter and a machinist. In 1983, he received his Master's of Science Degree from the University of Virginia and two years later his Doctorate. Mr. Scott then began his career at Alcoa as a senior engineer overseeing the Wire and Bar Division of the company. Mr. Scott gained invaluable experience while at Alcoa, primarily in the field of international business, as he was able to travel to Asia, Europe, Australia, and South America on behalf of Alcoa.

Mr. Scott has numerous patents and publications, both here in the United States and internationally. His community involvement includes membership to the Carnegie Museum, service as a judge for Junior Academy of Science at the University Of Pennsylvania Wharton School Of Business, automotive racing consultant to the NHRA, and a NASA advisory board member. Gerald and his wife, Lynn, are the proud parents of three children, Alexander, Philip, and Karl.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Mr. Gerald Scott, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to country and community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 11, 2011, I inadvertently voted "no" on rollcall No. 774. I intended to vote "aye."

UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement.

We have been waiting to vote on this agreement since it was first signed in 2007, which means four years of lost opportunities.

But now we have a chance to repair that damage.

In the past year alone, Panama's economy grew 6.2 percent, making it one of the fast growing in Latin America and an expanding opportunity for American exporters.

Panama is already among Miami-Dade county's top 25 trading partners, and Florida as a whole ranks number one among the 50 States in exports to that country.

These figures will only increase once the FTA has been approved and American businesses no longer face heavy tariffs and other artificial barriers to trade.

Currently, U.S. industrial exports face an average tariff of 7 percent, with some tariffs as high as 81 percent.

Once this agreement goes into effect, 87 percent of all U.S. goods exported to Panama will become duty-free immediately.

In the past 4 years since the U.S-Panama Free Trade Agreement was signed, American companies have paid millions upon millions of dollars in tariffs to the Panamanian government.

Those are dollars needlessly spent by U.S. businesses, which they could have used for investments and expansion here in the U.S. instead of paying fees to a foreign government.

Approval of the U.S.-Panama FTA will eliminate this transfer of wealth, increase U.S. exports, and create new jobs here at home that so many Americans are desperately searching for.

The agreement also has many other provisions of importance to U.S. businesses, especially strengthening intellectual property rights, which are under assault around the world.

In addition to the potential economic growth stemming from this agreement, Panama is a key strategic ally in the region.

Ever since the Panama Canal was completed a century ago, Panama's importance to the U.S. has only increased as a major transportation route, with two-thirds of its traffic consisting of shipments between our west and east coasts.

For these many reasons—expanded exports, increased jobs, and closer ties with a strategic ally—I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement.

AMERICAN TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. ROBERT T. SCHILLING

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the spirit of competition, in support of American workers and as an advocate for a government that seeks to provide economic certainty for the businesses that create jobs in this country.

Later today, the House will vote on bipartisan trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea. These agreements represent an opportunity to compete, grow jobs and promote American exports.

Here is what we know. Ninety-five percent of the world's customers live outside of our great country.

Here is what I believe. If America gives itself the opportunity to compete with other countries—like these three agreements will—American manufacturers and farmers will deliver, and we will win.

Job creation is a red, white and blue issue. And that is why you see Democrats and Republicans coming together to provide this opportunity for American exports to compete.

In the 17th District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent, I recently visited a company that manufactures mining trucks. Nine out of 10 of these mining trucks are bought by customers overseas. These jobs are dependent on exports. This same company also manufactures bulldozers, 8 out of 10 of which are sold to buyers overseas. Yet again, this is an example of jobs being created because of demand for American products by customers in the global economy.

These trade agreements will reduce tariffs on goods and remove barriers that are currently in place. By leveling the playing field for our manufacturers and farmers, we can further promote these cornerstones of the American economy. We need to enact policies that strengthen our manufacturing base which is why I am a cosponsor to legislation offered by my colleague and friend, DAN LIPINSKI. Three million manufacturing jobs and almost 4 million agriculture sector jobs are dependent on U.S. exports.

The independent U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that these agreements will increase American-made exports by $13 billion and inject $10 billion to our GDP. President Obama estimates that these agreements could create a quarter-of-a-million jobs.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the last time the United States signed a trade agreement was back in 2006 with Peru. These FTA's could have been sent to Congress back in 2009. Every day we hold off on is a day we deny American workers the opportunity to compete.

These trade agreements aren't about rhetoric, they are about results. We cannot afford

to sit on the sidelines while other countries enter in to trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea, causing us to lose market share.

Again, I rise in support of these trade agreements. If as a country we are allowed to compete, I know we will deliver.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MAYOR FRANK SALVATO OF WARREN, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mayor Frank Salvato of Warren, New Jersey. Frank was a lifelong resident of Warren Township, in the heart of Somerset County, where he owned and operated a farm for over forty years.

Frank held the record as New Jersey's longest serving elected official. During his 60 years of public service Frank served five terms as Mayor of Warren and was a member of the Township Committee for eleven terms. Frank also served on the Board of Adjustment, the Board of Health, the Planning Board and the Recreation, Police, Roads, Finance, Environment and Senior Citizens Boards. He was a 50-year Charter member of the Warren Lions Club and served on the Watchung Hills Regional High School Board of Education for 27 years, including seven years as its president.

Today I rise to share Frank's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives. I extend my sincere condolences to his wife, Aldona, and his family and my deep gratitude to Frank for his lifetime of service and leadership.

HONORING RAYMOND WILMARTH, JR.

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Mr. Raymond Wilmarth, Jr., on the occasion of his induction as a distinguished alumnus of Mountain View High School.

Mr. Wilmarth graduated from Harford Vocational High School in 1950 and went on to attain a General Certificate from the American Institute of Banking. Mr. Wilmarth served as an active duty member of the United States Army, including a tour in Germany from 1953 through 1955. In 1962, Mr. Wilmarth became Vice President of County National Bank, a position he held until 1990. Raymond, along with his wife Ruth, owned and operated Harford Store until he became Business Manager for the Mountain View School District in 1993.

As a proud member of his community, Mr. Wilmarth has served as President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the Montrose Rotary Club. Additionally, Raymond founded the Rotary Youth Leadership Awards and the District 741 Girls Leadership Camp. From 1992 to the present, Mr. Wilmarth has served as the Chairman of the Board for the Endless Mountains Health System and has worked to raise money for equipment purchases, facility improvements, and land purchases, striving to improve healthcare in the area.

Raymond and Ruth are the proud parents of six children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Mr. Raymond Wilmarth, Jr., and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to community and country.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHY CLONINGER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kathy Cloninger for her outstanding service as the Chief Executive Officer of Girl Scouts of the USA for the past 8 years, and for her 28 years of service to the Girl Scouts Movement.

Kathy Cloninger epitomizes the American spirit of community service. She has devoted her life to girls and to an institution that itself is a shining example of America at her best. We honor her today for a career that has been dedicated to building girls of courage, confidence and character who make the world a better place.

Ms. Cloninger's journey with Girl Scouts began in 1983, and spanned more than two decades of service as CEO of Girl Scout councils in Tennessee, Texas and Colorado.

After taking the reins at Girl Scouts of the USA in 2004, Kathy initiated a truly transformative strategy that led to a national realignment of the Girl Scout Movement. Under her guidance, Girl Scouts accomplished a nearly impossible task by successfully merging 315 councils down to 112 high-performance councils. Thanks to Kathy's compelling leadership, the Girl Scout Movement has unified around a common mission and business strategy that has set the organization on a path to success for its upcoming 100th anniversary and beyond.

Kathy has also been instrumental in developing the Girl Scout Leadership Experience where girls discover themselves and their values, connect with others and take action to make the world a better place. She oversaw the launch of the first-ever national program evaluation system that measures girls' development of 15 leadership outcomes and ensures that all Girl Scouts grow into strong leaders in their lives today and into the next generation of female leaders in our country and the world.

Ms. Cloninger should also be commended for heightening Girl Scouts' focus on research and advocacy activities. During her tenure, the Girl Scout Movement amended its Constitution to be the "voice for girls and an expert on their growth and development." The Girl Scout Research Institute has published many groundbreaking studies on issues that affect girls and leadership, such as research on body image, social media and girls' participation in science, technology, engineering, and math, as well as research on African American and Hispanic girls' leadership aspirations. Thanks to her vision, Congress and decision makers across our nation have an incredible resource in the Girl Scout organization, so all of us can better understand the issues girls face today and advocate for the solutions important to their success.

Ms. Cloninger has received numerous awards for her work, including "Nonprofit CEO of the Year 2000" from the Center for Nonprofit Management, and "CEO of the Year 2008" from the National Assembly of Human Services. In 2010, Ms. Cloninger was named one of the "21 Leaders for the 21st Century" by Women's eNews.

Kathy's service as a leader expanded beyond the Girl Scouts. As a champion for youth empowerment and the non-profit community, Kathy served as chair of the National Collaboration for Youth, she was the secretary of the board of directors of the National Assembly of Human Services (2008–2011), was on the national boards of the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance and the National Council for Research on Women, and she is a member of the Women's Leadership Board of Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

Ms. Cloninger is also the author of the forthcoming book Tough Cookies, which chronicles the recent transformation of Girl Scouting and issues a call to arms on behalf of all girls today. Johnnetta Cole, President Emerita of Spelman College and Bennett College for Women, explained, "Tough Cookies shows what vision, courage, and an unflinching dedication to mission can accomplish. Kathy Cloninger makes it clear that the Girl Scouts—and girls—rank high among our nation's treasures."

It is obvious why Kathy has received such wide praise for her leadership. I would have to agree with Willie Pietersen, leadership guru and author of Reinventing Strategy, who noted that, "Guided by a transcendent mission and Kathy Cloninger's courageous leadership, the Girl Scouts have transformed themselves for a new century."

Kathy leaves Girl Scouts on the eve of its 100th anniversary, which they will celebrate throughout 2012. Kathy led the Girl Scout Movement to this exceptional point in history with a mission and program that is as critically important today as it was 100 years ago, and I know she leaves it a stronger, more vibrant part of our culture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Kathy Cloninger for nearly 30 years of service to the Girl Scouts and to our country. We wish her the best in all of her continuing work for girls nationwide.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of American families are struggling and so many people are looking for work, passage of the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement should be a top priority for our government.

It is time to grant American businesses and exporters barrier-free access to the world's 13th largest economy.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that it will increase our export of goods by at least $10 billion a year.

That's not even counting the high-value services in which our country leads the world, which are now largely shut out of many areas of South Korea's economy.

The Administration estimates that at least 70,000 jobs will result from the free trade agreement with South Korea alone.

That means paychecks for 70,000 American families.

The years of delay in sending this agreement to Congress since it was first signed in 2007 have put U.S. businesses at a severe disadvantage.

Earlier this year, the European Union's free trade agreement with South Korea went into effect, giving their companies a major boost and resulting in lost sales for American companies and lost jobs here in the U.S.

But there is more at stake than just increased exports.

South Korea is a key U.S. ally in an unstable region of the world, where tens of thousands of U.S. troops stand on guard against aggression, and where U.S. interests are increasingly under threat from China and other countries.

At a time when much of the world is waiting to see if the U.S. will retreat from its responsibilities, passage of this free trade agreement will serve as a clear demonstration of our enduring commitment to our ally South Korea and our determination to defend our interests throughout East Asia.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade agreement and for the creation of tens of thousands of jobs for the many Americans who desperately need them.

OPPOSITION TO THE KOREA, PANAMA, AND COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in opposition to the Korea, Panama, and Colombia Free Trade Agreements.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2011.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million men and women of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I am writing to urge you to oppose the three pending so-called free trade agreements (FTAs)—South Korea, Colombia, and Panama—when they reach the floor of the House for a vote. All three agreements are modeled after the job-killing North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

Trade agreements based on the NAFTA model have resulted in nearly two million job losses in the U.S. The three pending FTAs continue this trend. With the unemployment rate at a record high of more than nine percent, we must focus on job creation and growth in the U.S. Not only will these trade agreements result in job losses, they will further exploit workers and deny basic human rights.

The South Korea FTA is projected by the Economic Policy Institute to cause job losses of 159,000 in the U.S. and the International Trade Commission estimates the trade deficit will increase in seven high-paying sectors. In addition, the South Korea HA forbids reference to the International Labor Organization (ILO) conventions.

The South Korea FTA's investment chapter would give South Korean investors rights to challenge U.S. laws, regulations, and even court decisions in international tribunals that circumvent the U.S. judicial system. Any potential benefit from reduced tariffs would be mitigated, as South Korea is one of the three countries that the U.S. Department of Treasury lists as a currency manipulator.

Even more troubling is that the South Korea FTA lacks assurances that products assembled in South Korea will not contain parts from North Korea's Kaesong Industrial Complex.

These three pending agreements insult basic human rights. The country of Colombia remains the global capital for violence against workers; more unionists are killed every year in this country than any other country. Most recently, a lawyer representing sugarcane workers was gunned down in May—only five weeks after a so-called U.S.-Colombia Labor Action Plan was released.

Nearly 2,680 unionists have been murdered in the country. Only six percent of the murders have been prosecuted. Most are never even investigated. In June, a Colombian rights leader campaigning for the return of land snatched by illegal militias was gunned down. While the Action Plan is a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough to ensure enforcement and compliance. We must see real improvement in labor laws and a stop to the killing of unionists in Colombia, before any trade agreement is approved. Simple public relations gimmicks and laws that go unenforced are not enough.

The Colombia FTA will result in the further displacement of the country's Afro-Colombian population. The country has the highest population of displaced people, an estimated 5.2 million. The agreement will only accelerate the displacement of impoverished Afro-Colombians and farmers.

Panama remains one of the world's top tax havens. The country is home to approximately 400,000 corporations, including U.S. firms, which incorporate in the country to avoid paying taxes. The pending Panama FTA does not require U.S. construction and other firm's equal access to work on the Panama Canal improvement project. In addition, Panama continues to be a main site for drug money laundering by Mexican and Colombian drug kingpins.

Each of these three pending trade agreements remains flawed. None will further U.S. job growth, which should be our nation's top priority. Ensuring basic human rights and dignity is a moral imperative. For economic and moral reasons, we urge you to vote against these agreements. If you have any questions, please contact Lisa P. Kinard, Director, Department of Federal Legislation and Regulation, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 3080, the Korean Free Trade Agreement.

Earlier today, I voted to support free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama because I recognize the value of promoting trade with our neighbors.

Unfortunately, the Korean trade agreement that we're debating right now is deeply flawed, poorly negotiated, and will cost American jobs by picking winners and losers in the market place.

The textile provisions alone in the agreement will cost Americans nearly 40,000 jobs over the next 7 years. Sadly, many of those jobs will be lost in my own state of South Carolina.

While this agreement gives South Korean goods duty-free entry into the U.S. market, American exports to South Korea will still be subjected to a 10 percent Tax. That amounts to an automatic 10 percent tariff on certain US goods, putting our manufacturers at an immediate competitive disadvantage. Additionally, this agreement opens US markets to Korean goods, but doesn't guarantee the Korean market will be open for US goods.

Finally, I'm concerned about this agreement's impact on our national security as it relates to the extended domestic supply chain for industrial and military applications. These include fuel cells, oil booms, rapidly deployable shelters and tents, radar covers, Kevlar body armor for our troops, and many more advanced applications. This trade agreement could have a major negative impact on the private sector's ability to innovate and supply our military.

I strongly urge my colleagues to send this trade agreement back to drawing board. For the sake of our economic and military security, I urge a NO vote. Thank you, and may God Bless America.

JANUARY 20, 2011.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, As representatives of the domestic textile and apparel sector and its nearly 600,000 workers, we strongly urge you to oppose the U.S.–South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS). In regards to textiles and apparel, the FTA is seriously flawed and will result in the continued outsourcing of valuable textile, apparel and other manufacturing jobs. With our nation struggling through one of the worst economic periods in its history, we believe the current agreement sends the wrong message to our workers and to American voters.

During the past forty years, Korea has developed a sophisticated industrial and apparel fabrics sector and, as a consequence, is the second largest exporter of textile yarns and fabrics to the United States. Although the U.S. textile sector is one of the most efficient and quality-driven producers in the world, the Korean economy presents virtually no export opportunities to Korea for U.S. textile producers. As a measure of this one-way trading relationship, the U.S. trade deficit in textiles and apparel totaled $708 million in 2009.

As a result, the textile industry asked the Obama Administration to make three fixes

to the KORUS agreement in order to ensure that U.S. textile, apparel and fiber jobs were not outsourced to Korea and China. These fixes concerned (a) loopholes in the enforcement portions of the agreement that benefit China, (b) a tariff schedule that gives Korean exporters better terms than U.S. companies and (c) the exclusion of textile components in the agreement's rules-of-origin that advantage non-signatories to the agreement such as China.

These mistakes not only hurt our manufacturing workers but also damage our industry's ability to supply our military with essential goods for our men and women in uniform. In particular, Korea's producers get longer phase-out schedules than U.S. producers on a number of sensitive product lines that include products that are needed by the U.S. military. Damaging surges by Korean producers because of this inequitable arrangement will hurt U.S. companies that the military depends on for a number of important products.

Unfortunately, the Administration chose not to address the concerns of textile workers in your districts, and we are concerned that their jobs are now in jeopardy.

Polls have shown a rising concern by the American voter regarding the outsourcing of American jobs, particularly manufacturing jobs, and the decline of the U.S. as an economic power. Recent Wall Street Journal and Pew polls show voter dissatisfaction regarding badly written trade agreements is at a record high.

An analysis by the Economic Policy Institute estimates that 159,000 good paying American jobs will be destroyed if the KORUS agreement in its present form passes Congress. Of that total, we estimate that between 9,300 and 12,300 jobs will be lost specifically in the U.S. textile and apparel sector as a result of legal KORUS trade. U.S. government figures show that approximately three additional jobs are lost to the U.S. economy for each textile job that is eliminated. In addition, U.S. job losses from illegal Chinese exports are not included and these would be significant. Total U.S. job losses because of the flawed KORUS textile text are expected to be at least 40,000 jobs.

With job creation a central concern in the country, we do not believe that this agreement meets that goal. We continue to urge that the textile portions of the agreement be renegotiated in order to ensure that textile jobs are not imperiled. Until that time, we ask you to stand firm on behalf of textile workers in your district and oppose the Korean FTA when it comes before a vote in Congress.

Sincerely,

AUGGIE TANTILLO,
Executive Director, American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

KARL SPILHAUS,
President, National Textile Association.

PAUL O'DAY,
President, American Fiber Manufacturers Association.

CASS JOHNSON,
President, National Council of Textile Organizations.

RUTH STEPHENS,
Executive Director, U.S. Industrial Fabrics Institute.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID J. PALMER

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Lieutenant Colonel David J. Palmer, on the occasion of his induction as a distinguished alumnus of Mountain View High School.

After graduating from Mountain View High School in 1973, David J. Palmer enlisted in the United State Air Force as an aircraft maintenance specialist. Four years later, Mr. Palmer transferred to the U.S. Air Force Reserves, where, in 2004, he was commission to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Over his illustrious career, Lieutenant Colonel Palmer has earned fourteen medals and awards for his dedicated and selfless service.

Lieutenant Colonel Palmer received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees at the University of Scranton and has always been diligent in service to his community. He has worked with the Northern Tier Planning and Development Commission, the Susquehanna Housing Authority, and Wilkes University. Lieutenant Colonel Palmer continues to be active in many local organizations, including sitting on the Board of Trustees for the First Universalist Church, as well as serving as a Citizenship Merit Counselor for the Boy Scouts of America's Baden-Powell Council.

Lieutenant Colonel Palmer and his wife, Luann, have two sons, both of whom are combat veterans and have received a Purple Heart and Joint Service Commendation for their service in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Today, the Palmers reside on their farm, near Hop Bottom, Pennsylvania, where they raise sheep and train border collies.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Lieutenant Colonel David J. Palmer, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to community, country, and family.

(SCREEN) ACT FOR 112TH CONGRESS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce fhe Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now (SCREEN) Act. This legislation will remove barriers to one of the most effective preventive health screenings available, saving lives and reducing health care costs in the process. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The statistics surrounding colon cancer are startling. Colon cancer is the number two cancer killer in the United States for both men and women. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011)

Over 50,000 people will die this year from this disease according to the American Cancer Society (2010 Fact & Figures).

These deaths become more tragic when one considers that colorectal cancer is highly preventable with appropriate screening. According to the American Cancer Society (2010 Facts & Figures), the 5 year survival rate is 90 percent for those diagnosed at an early stage; however, less than 40 percent of the cases are diagnosed at that stage.

During colorectal cancer screening by colonoscopy, pre-cancerous polyps are removed during the same encounter, thus preventing cancer from developing, as opposed to other cancer screenings where early detection is the goal. That is one reason why the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force provides an "A" rating for CRC screenings.

The CDC "colorectal cancer control program" screening target rate is 80 percent. The American Cancer Society and other patient advocacy groups have a target rate of 75 percent. Unfortunately, only half of the Medicare population is being screened, despite the availability of a Medicare colon cancer screening benefit. According to CMS and American Cancer Society (March 2011), Medicare claims indicate that only 52–58 percent of beneficiaries have had any colorectal cancer test and there is "clearly an opportunity to improve colorectal cancer screening rates in the Medicare population."

The latest findings by the American Cancer Society confirm that screening rates among the Medicare population continue to be in this 50th percentile range, with screening rates among minority populations are especially low among Medicare-aged beneficiaries.

The CDC concludes that 1,000 additional colorectal cancer deaths will be prevented each year if screening rates reached 70.5 percent. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011).

In addition to saving lives, colorectal cancer screening has been demonstrated to save Medicare long-term costs as noted by the New England Journal of Medicine in a recent article (Feb. 2008).

The direct costs of treating colorectal cancer in 2010 reached $4 billion. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011)

I am pleased that Congress took steps to improve access to life-saving colon cancer screening when it passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act PPACA in March 2010.

While Congress has made tremendous strides in incresing colorectal cancer utilization rates in PPACA, this bill will further make live saving screenings more accessible to Medicare beneficiaries.

Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for any colorectal cancer sceening recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. However, should the beneficiary have a precancerous polyp removed, the procedure is no longer considered a "screening" for Medicare coding purposes.

The unintended consequence of this is that the beneficiary is obligated to pay the Medicare coinsurance because the procedure is no longer a "screening." However, the purpose of the screening is to find and remove precancerous polyps.

the SCREEN Act waives all Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing for colorectal cancer screenings that become "therapeutic" or diagnostic procedures.

The legislation also resolves this unintended consequence for beneficiaries participating in health insurance exchanges beginning in 2014.

The SCREEN Act also provides incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries

so that our Medicare beneficiaries are in fact receiving the quality screening they deserve.

Lastly, the SCREEN Act removes barriers to screening rates by allowing a Medicare beneficiary to sit down and discuss the importance of the procedure before seeing the provider for the first time right before procedure. The federal government and colorectal cancer patient advocacy groups have concluded that the "fear of the procedure" is a major impediment to increasing colorectal cancer screening rates.

Promoting access to colorectal cancer screening is good policy. It will save lives and reduce costs to families and the health care system. Please join with me in the fight against colorectal cancer by cosponsoring this legislation.

H.R. 3078 COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 3079 PANAMA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 3080 SOUTH KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 2832 TAA AND GSP EXTENSION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the three trade agreements this House is considering with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, respectively. At a time when our national unemployment rate is at 9.1 percent, with 14 million Americans looking for work, we cannot afford to pass trade agreements that cost jobs here in the United States. Instead, I urge my colleagues to bring a real jobs bill—one that will create jobs for American workers—to the floor of the House immediately.

America depends on trade with countries around the world to expand export markets for our products and create good-paying jobs in the U.S. To achieve fair trade, agreements must not export U.S. jobs or economically harm communities. We must insist that all trade agreements promote environmental sustainability, workers' rights, and improved living standards for people throughout the world. The negotiated trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea do not meet the standard of fair trade agreements and will leave Americans worse off. I do not support their passage.

In Colombia, the intimidation and murder of trade unionists and human rights workers is widespread. According to Human Rights Watch, over 50 trade unionists were murdered last year. The Colombian government's human rights record may be improving but it is still very poor. This is not the time to reward Colombia's poor record with a preferential trade arrangement. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The proposed free trade agreement with Panama fails to create any American jobs. Widely known as a tax haven for multinational corporations, Panama has not shown the inclination or ability to change its status as an offshore tax shelter. This practice rewards U.S. companies that ship jobs overseas to avoid taxation here. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

In South Korea, between 2001 and 2009, the U.S. ran a trade deficit in goods of approximately $125 billion. The Economic Policy Institute found that implementation of the Korea trade deal would increase U.S. trade deficit by $16.7 billion and result in 159,000 American jobs lost over the next seven years. According to Public Citizen, almost 8,000 good-paying jobs would be lost in the 4th Congressional District of Minnesota. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

As we've seen with free trade agreements with China, NAFTA, and CAFTA, unfair trade deals cost American jobs. This is why Trade Adjustment Assistance, TAA, exists—to provide training to workers who lose their jobs due to trade. Considering TAA while we consider these three agreements is evidence that these deals result in the loss of jobs here in the U.S. I support the passage of the needed TM extension, H.R. 2832, in order to provide some protections for American workers.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose these unfair trade deals and support the badly-needed extensions of TAA.

YES ON COLOMBIA AND PANAMA AND NO ON KOREA

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, at one time, North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District was one of America's manufacturing power houses. Over the years, our manufacturing strength has been compromised by discriminatory trade practices that unfairly benefit overseas competitors.

Unfortunately, the Korea-United States Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) is a critically flawed trade proposal. With respect to textiles, South Korea has a highly sophisticated and vertically integrated industry. In 2010, South Korea was America's 8th largest supplier of textiles and apparel by volume. For example, yarns and fabrics, the largest component of the U.S. industry, South Korea was America's 2nd largest source of imports this past year.

The U.S. textile industry is staunchly opposed to the KORUS agreement due to the fact that it provides Korean textile exporters with instant, duty-free access for virtually all textile and apparel products, while giving U.S. producers no time to adjust. At the same time, KORUS has a number of non-reciprocal tariff phase-outs that favor the South Korean textile industry in key product areas.

We also understand that China could exploit the KORUS agreement by utilizing business relationships in South Korea to reach U.S. markets.

Our manufacturers are competing against foreign trade barriers, high tariffs, export subsidies, state-ownership of enterprises, and currency manipulation. The goals of this Congress should be to prioritize fixing U.S. trade policy, stopping manufacturing job loss, and closing the trade deficit.

South Korea and its people are true allies of the United States, and I value our diplomatic relations. As a Korean War-era veteran, I have witnessed first-hand how relations between our two great nations have improved dramatically over the years.

Unfortunately, I cannot support KORUS because it will do real harm to the North Carolina textile industry. I am sure that our two countries will continue our harmonious relations, but I am hopeful that we can reach a trade deal someday that is fair and equitable to both trading partners.

On the other hand, trade with Colombia and Panama does not pose similar threats to the textile industry in the United States generally and North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District specifically. In fact, textile trade among these great nations is healthy and balanced—we trade raw materials, value added materials and finished goods. Furthermore, agreements with Colombia and Panama are far less likely to be exploited by countries such as China or Vietnam.

Colombia and Panama are strategic diplomatic partners with America in Central and South America. Free trade agreements with these countries will boost our economy, according to the International Trade Commission. A deal with Colombia will boost exports of goods by $1.1 billion and add $2.5 billion to our Gross Domestic Product. An agreement with Panama will greatly improve the export of American agricultural goods, manufactured goods, specialized services, and support other diplomatic efforts to close a notorious tax reporting loophole that involves money laundering and tax cheating.

The agreements with Colombia and Panama show the way fair trade agreements should be written. My hope remains that a similar deal can be reached with Korea in the near future.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the U.S.-Korean Free Trade Agreement (KORUS). Put simply, this agreement is a bad business deal for the United States.

KORUS is an example of an agreement that stands to benefit certain industries at the expense of others. For instance, the Obama administration went to great lengths to include special provisions to ensure that our auto manufacturers have equal access to South Korean markets. While the economic fairness may help, the effect is likely to be minimal. Currently, over 95 percent of South Koreans drive South Korean cars. Because of this, I have serious concerns about the realistic ability of our auto industry to succeed in a reluctant Korean market.

In addition to my concerns with the feasibility of success for the auto industry in South Korea, it is widely acknowledged that textile workers will lose out because of the deal. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that 159,000 American manufacturing jobs will be lost, and because of the administration's failure to address textile issues, it is estimated that 40,000 textile jobs will be lost. I have always said that 1 job lost as a result of free trade is too much.

Perhaps most troubling about KORUS–FTA is the unintended economic boost it will give to China, currently South Korea's largest trading partner. Rules of origin provisions in the agreement are set far too low so that only 35 percent, less than half, of a product has to come from either South Korea or the United States.

Because such a small portion of a product must come from South Korea in order for it to ensure duty-free access to the United States, the majority of supplies can come from neighboring countries in Southeast Asia, such as China, or even other foreign trading partners, such as the European Union with which South Korea recently entered into a free trade agreement. The United States currently has a $273 billion trade deficit with China, and we should not be in the business of helping China increase their exports with special access to our market.

Proponents argue that new, stronger customs provisions in the agreement prevent the transshipment of goods from China or other countries through South Korea. However, the fact of the matter is that these provisions are modeled off NAFTA, which stands as an example of failed free trade. U.S. Customs data shows that fraud has increased as a result of NAFTA, and there has been a decreased ability to intercept or deter illegal activity. These same failed policies should not be replicated in a new agreement.

We need to look no further than our previous free trade agreements to see the effects of these deals. In the 17 years since NAFTA, our trade balance with Mexico has gone from a $1.4 billion surplus in 1994 to a $97.2 billion deficit in 2010. South Korea is currently the seventh-largest trading partner of the United States, and the United States is South Korea's third-largest trading partner. Therefore, any agreement is sure to have significant effects on the U.S. economy and trade balance.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this agreement includes too many loopholes, carries too many unintended benefits for foreign competitors, and will result in U.S. job loss.

HONORING STATE REPRESENTATIVE SANDRA MAJOR

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Honorable Sandra Major, on the occasion of her induction as a distinguished alumna of Mountain View High School.

Representative Major graduated from Mountain View High School in 1972. She has been a resonant voice for Susquehanna County, beginning with her service as Direct Assistant to the late Representative Carmel Sirianni, to her current position as State Representative for Pennsylvania's 111th legislative district. Representative Major was elected to the Pennsylvania State Legislature in 1995 and has served as Majority Caucus Chairman since 2007.

Representative Major has been a leading advocate for rural and agricultural communities. She is a member of the President's Advisory Council for Keystone College, the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, and the National Rifle Association. Furthermore, she has been recognized for her service with numerous awards, including the Boy Scouts Distinguished Citizen Award, the American Legion Generals Medal of Excellence, and the Pennsylvania Landowner Association's Representative of the Year. Representative Major and her husband, Anthony Cerasaro, currently reside near Montrose, PA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, the Honorable Sandra Major, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising her commitment to public service.

HONORING THE USS ''CRUISER'' OLYMPIA

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since 1922, an American icon of the late 19th and early 20th Century, the USS *Cruiser Olympia,* rests majestically at Penn's Landing, in our District, along the Philadelphia waterfront of the Delaware River. The *Cruiser Olympia* is a National Historic Landmark, a National Historic Engineering Landmark, is on the National Register of Historic Places, and is best known in history as the Flagship of Commodore George Dewey in his 1899 victory at the Battle of Manila Bay during the Spanish-American War, as well as being sent by the President to France in 1921 to return the remains of a World War I U.S. soldier for internment in the ''new'' Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery. This first unknown solider was laid in State in the Capitol Rotunda before beginning the final journey across the Memorial Bridge to Arlington Cemetery on November 10–11,1921. It is one of the only warships of that era still afloat in the world! The *Cruiser Olympia* stood for the principles that make America the great Nation that it is, and is the sole survivor of a time in American history when these principles helped to define a Nation to the entire world.

Unfortunately, unless the American public and the U.S. Congress takes notice to preserve this national treasure for future generations, I am afraid our Nation might lose this great ship to old age and neglect. Unless it is placed in dry dock in Philadelphia, and its hull stabilized, we could lose this historic vessel. The *Cruiser* suffers from a combination of threats. It has not been placed in dry dock for maintenance in over sixty years. There are 62 openings along the hull near or at the waterline that permit water to enter the vessel, the steel is rusting, and the original wood has been slowly rotting and deteriorating, causing leaks into the interior. The land underneath the *Cruiser Olympia* also requires dredging as years of silt have built up underneath her, not allowing her to float free from her moorings. We simply cannot permit the *Cruiser Olympia* to disappear.

The legislation I am introducing today will be one of many efforts to restore and preserve the *Cruiser Olympia*. The bill permits the U.S. Mint, at no cost to the taxpayer, to design and offer for sale to the public a commemorative coin honoring the *Cruiser Olympia*, and that the sales of these coins will be utilized by the Friends of the *Cruiser Olympia* for dry-docking and preserving the *Cruiser Olympia* as a ship museum. As a tax-exempt organization whose mission is to restore the *Cruiser Olympia*, I cannot think of any more worthwhile project to support. I understand that after its successful voyage to Manila Harbor, the U.S. Congress in 1899 struck a medal to present to each of the sailors and officers aboard the *Cruiser Olympia* to commemorate their victory in this engagement. This would be the first time in 112 years that the Congress would once again honor the *Cruiser Olympia*.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the bill and support its passage in the Congress so that we can begin the process to restore this great historic *Cruiser* so that present and future generations of Americans and visitors to our nation can view the *Cruiser Olympia*, walk its decks and envision a time years ago when it ruled the waves.

HONORING DR. JAMES EDWARD BOWMAN

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. James Edward Bowman who passed away on September 28, 2011 at the age of 88. An American physician and specialist in pathology, genetics, and hematology, Dr. Bowman made invaluable contributions to the world of medical research.

Dr. Bowman was born on February 5, 1923, in Washington, DC After earning both his undergraduate and medical degrees from Howard University, he completed his residency in pathology at St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago. Dr. Bowman served in the U.S. Army, serving as chief of pathology for the Medical Nutrition Laboratory at Fitzsimons Army Hospital in Denver.

Dr. Bowman has many ''firsts'' to his credit; he was the first African-American resident to train at Chicago's St. Luke's hospital, as well as the first tenured African-American professor in the University of Chicago's Biological Sciences Division. He was also one of the first to study the relationship between genetics and minority health which led to significant findings regarding sickle cell disease and other inherited diseases.

Later in his career, Dr. Bowman focused on the legal and ethical issues surrounding human genetics and mandatory screening tests. In 1972, he garnered national attention when he declared that the passage of mandatory sickle cell screening laws was ''more harmful than beneficial.''

Serving as a mentor and role model to many, Dr. Bowman was highly respected and beloved among his colleagues and students alike. At the time of his passing, Dr. Bowman served as professor emeritus in the departments of pathology and medicine at the University of Chicago. Dr. Bowman is survived by his wife Barbara Bowman and his daughter, Valerie Bowman Jarrett, a senior advisor to President Barack Obama.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Dr. James Edward Bowman. I greatly appreciate the dedication and innovative contributions he made to medical research. He will truly be missed.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

After having waited for four years since this agreement was first signed, the time has finally come for Congress to vote to approve it.

This agreement is good for Colombia but is even better for the United States.

According to the International Trade Commission, the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement will expand exports of U.S. goods by more than $1 billion dollars every year, which will allow businesses to create thousands of new jobs for those Americans who are struggling to find one.

In South Florida, Colombia is already our second largest trading partner.

Our two largest economic engines are the Port of Miami and Miami International Airport, both of which will benefit tremendously from the increase in trade with Colombia.

In 2010, Colombia was the 10th largest trading partner with the Port of Miami, with bilateral trade worth $6.8 billion.

And 96 percent of the flowers that are sent to the U.S. from Colombia come through Miami International Airport, which helps support tens of thousands of jobs related to the airport and several aviation industries.

These figures will grow rapidly once this agreement has been approved.

But there is more at stake here than increased trade.

Colombia has been a strong democracy and a steadfast ally in a region where U.S. interests are under assault.

We have jointly battled narco-terrorists, leftist guerrillas, and the aggressive actions of Venezuelan strongman Hugo Chavez.

This agreement will strengthen that vital partnership between our two nations and demonstrate to our friends and enemies alike that the U.S. intends to remain a strong presence in the region.

Madam Speaker, it is time to put American interests first instead of the partisan political considerations that have delayed this agreement for four years.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote yes on the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement and allow our businesses to finally begin creating the jobs that so many Americans are searching for.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, ratification of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement—or KORUS—is economically important, for the nation and for my home state of Virginia. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. exports to South Korea would increase by more than $10 billion. Increased U.S. exports mean more U.S. manufacturing jobs.

Korea is the 14th largest export market for Virginia goods, and the trade agreement would strengthen that relationship. Upon implementation of KORUS, Virginia exporters would have a $4 million cost advantage over similar global competitors without a Korean agreement. Eight out of Virginia's ten top exports would enter Korea duty free immediately.

The U.S. tech industry, which has a significant presence in Northern Virginia, also stands to gain from KORUS. According to industry groups, exports from the U.S. to South Korea could increase by up to 49 percent. Korean businesses have a strong presence in Virginia and we must ensure that businesses in Virginia and throughout the nation have equal access. I urge my colleagues to support the Korean Free Trade Agreement.

PANAMA AND COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to provide qualified support of the U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement (FTA), and to express my opposition to the U.S.-Colombia and U.S.-South Korea Trade Agreements.

The original Panama and Colombia FTAs, negotiated by the Bush Administration, were fatally flawed. The Democratic congressional leadership negotiated substantial improvements to the accords, among them ensuring that generic medicines could be made available in these countries at the same time as the United States. There is no reason that intellectual property rules in free trade agreements should force our trading partners in the developing world to wait longer than the United States to have access to affordable medicines, and I strongly believe that we need to make more progress on this issue in future agreements. I am deeply concerned that the proposal USTR has made for the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) may result in generic medicines becoming available in TPP developing countries later than in the United States. Denying poor countries access to generic competition can mean the difference between life and death. I am prepared to support the Panama FTA, consistent with my previous support of the Peru FTA, because the issue of access to medicines is positively addressed; and I will continue to argue that, at the minimum, the precedent in the Peru and Panama treaties be followed.

Unfortunately, I regret I am unable to support the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Colombia is a great friend of the United States. We are strong economic partners and have strong cultural ties. And Colombia has been an important ally at the UN Security Council, opposing the unilateral bid for statehood for Palestine. But this trade agreement contains a fatal flaw at the heart of what trade must be about: raising the quality of life for the people living and working here in the United States and in the countries we trade with. Jobs, job security, and labor rights are fundamental to a successful trade relationship. Regrettably, Colombia has had a long and painful struggle with labor abuses and violence and retribution against labor rights activists. Although Colombia has taken significant steps to reform labor and workplace protections by carrying out the Action Plan on Workers Rights that was negotiated with the help of the Obama Administration, the plan is not yet fully implemented and significant benchmarks for labor reform are still outstanding. Moreover, the Republican leadership has refused to allow the Action Plan to be referenced in the FTA implementing legislation we are voting on today. If the Action Plan had been incorporated directly into this legislation, I would have been inclined to vote for the Colombia FTA today. But this inherent deficiency prevents me from supporting this measure for a country I respect and value as a strategic ally.

Finally, I regret that I am unable to support the U.S.-South Korea Trade Agreement. I am pleased that the agreement makes transformative progress in copyright protection by strengthening enforcement against counterfeits and extending intellectual property protection to the digital and online domain. But the agreement includes a harmful provision exempting American vehicles from South Korea's progressive greenhouse gas and fuel economy standards. I have consistently believed in the principle that trade agreements negotiated by the United States should not compromise environmental standards in the US or abroad, and I believe the provisions in this FTA, by weakening South Korea's overall environmental benchmarks, sets a dangerous precedent for future FTAs. The global market for automobiles increasingly demands more fuel efficient and environmentally friendly vehicles. We should strengthen the competitiveness of our auto industry by raising our own standards, not by weakening those of others.

I am disappointed that further progress on these core issues could not be made as the Colombia and Korea trade agreements were finalized. I remain committed to strong economic ties between the United States and these vital markets in Latin America and Asia.

VETERANS OPPORTUNITY TO WORK ACT OF 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2433, the Veterans Opportunity to Work Act of 2011.

I commend Chairman MILLER for introducing legislation to allow veterans to receive retraining assistance. However, with unemployment of veterans at an all time high, and those coming back from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan not having jobs, I don't understand the reasoning of limiting the age of eligibility to those between 35 and 60.

I also don't understand the funding mechanism for the program. In this time of budget tightening, and a refusal to discuss tax increases for any issue, this bill taxes veterans with higher interest rates to pay for more government programs. This legislation doubles

the interest rates veterans for housing loans. The new lower rates went into effect on October 1, and I am sure in these tough economic times our veterans can use the estimated $1.6 billion dollars this change in law will cost them.

The Veterans Home Loan Program is one of the homeowner programs that works in this country. The foreclosure rate is much lower than anything in the private sector and I don't think changing this program will do anyone any good.

I cannot agree with balancing the budget on the backs of our veterans.

I cannot support this legislation as it is currently written.

SOUTH KOREA, PANAMA, AND COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the South Korea, Panama, and Colombia Free Trade Agreements. It is estimated that, combined, these free trade agreements will create over 250, 000 jobs and will increase U.S. exports by $13 billion dollars. Given the extraordinary economic challenges we face today, we must seize every opportunity which promises to stimulate our weakened economy and put Americans back to work.

In the Texas' 30th district, merchandise exports support 64, 000 jobs and directly benefit 48 companies. In 2010, my congressional district exported $876 million worth of goods to South Korea, which directly supported nearly 2,250 jobs. The South Korea Free Trade Agreement will increase market access for the district's goods and services exports and reduce costs for imported raw materials.

The State of Texas depends on world markets; last year alone, Texas' shipments of merchandise totaled $207 billion. Recently implemented trade agreements, such as the U.S.-Singapore agreement, which increased Texas exports to Singapore by 159 percent, prove that trade works for Texas.

Despite the benefits we stand to reap as a result of passage of these agreements, we must not ignore the associated labor and human rights issues. The Obama Administration, along with Ambassador Kirk, have worked tirelessly to address these valid concerns. Specifically, Colombia has agreed to a Labor Action Plan which requires Colombia to fulfill a series of measures in defined time frames to advance the rights of its workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the South Korea, Panama, and Colombia Free Trade Agreements to ensure that America continues to remain at a competitive advantage when it comes to international trade. Our nation's economic growth depends on it.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2832, a bill whose consideration by the members of this House is long overdue. It is absolutely unconscionable that working Americans displaced by trade have had no Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) benefits since the beginning of this year. I am ashamed that partisan rhetoric has stalled congressional consideration of TAA, once a reliably non-partisan issue. In more human terms, my home state of Michigan has weathered the ill effects of free trade agreements arguably longer than any other state in the union. Thousands of displaced workers in my district have relied on TAA to start their careers over in fields like nursing, alternative energy, an information technology. These workers have experienced first-hand the benefits of TAA and understand—as I do—the value the program brings to communities across the country.

In closing, I call on my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2832 and stand up for the American families all over the country to whom free trade has been less than fair. And when we finish voting on this measure, I urge everyone on both sides of Capitol Hill—Republicans and Democrats alike—to take the country's best interests to heart and pass legislation to create jobs.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LISA CODISPOTI

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Lisa Codispoti, a dynamic and talented champion for better health care who, tragically, lost her battle with her own personal health care challenges last week.

A senior counsel for the National Women's Law Center, Lisa was well-known on Capitol Hill. You could always count on Lisa for an on-target analysis of an arcane policy question or a suggestion for a creative way to overcome any one of the many obstacles we faced in winning health care reform. My staff and I relied on her for so much, and we were far from the only Congressional office that did so.

Lisa was also a hero to health care advocates around the country. As Rachel DeGolia, executive director of the Universal Health Care Action Network said of her, "The movement for health care justice, and for justice of all kinds for women, has lost a wonderful champion and friend."

Lisa's influence was broad and important. They may not have known Lisa personally, but millions of Americans are better off today because of her. Her work is evident throughout the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. As a result of the law she helped to fashion and then enact, being a woman will no longer be a pre-existing condition. People with existing health problems will no longer face job-lock or the pain of knowing that their condition is raising premiums for their co-workers. Coverage will no longer be denied or lifetime limits imposed. These are very real improvements that will make tangible differences in people's lives.

As her blog post below shows so clearly, this was not a theoretical exercise for Lisa. She lived her entire adult life knowing the significant problems that the private insurance market creates for anyone living with a health care condition—big or small. Her understanding and her experience made her arguments even more compelling and more effective.

We are better off for having known and worked with Lisa Codispoti. Her eloquence and knowledge, combined with her optimistic and gracious spirit, will be deeply missed.

THE HEALTH CARE LAW: PROVIDES NEW PEACE OF MIND FOR MILLIONS OF PEOPLE WITH CHRONIC HEALTH CONDITIONS—LIKE ME

(By Lisa Codispoti)

For many health care advocates, the fight for the health care law is more than just a job—it's personal. I was just a sophomore in college when I was diagnosed with a chronic condition that would require lifelong medical treatment. At a time when most college students believe they are invincible, my parents and I were consumed with issues like, would my life-saving medical treatment—which would be necessary for the rest of my life—be covered by insurance, and if so, would they cover my treatment at school five-hours away from my home? And what would happen when I graduated? Would I be able to find a job that had decent health insurance? And what if I decided to go to graduate school? In short, in addition to worrying about my newly diagnosed condition, health insurance was something I had to worry about. A lot. In fact, it has been a recurrent worry throughout the last 28 years since I was diagnosed. What is proper etiquette when receiving a job offer to try to figure out if the insurance they offer is good enough to cover your needed medical treatment? Will you doom a small employer's health insurance premiums with huge cost increases once you are added to their workforce? How to explain to others offering to hire you that, thanks anyway, you couldn't possibly open your own consulting gig because you wouldn't be able to get health insurance on your own?

That's why for me—and millions of Americans living with a chronic health condition—passage of the Affordable Care Act provides such peace of mind. And while I've been very lucky over the last three decades to have jobs with decent insurance, I wonder what kinds of different opportunities I might have pursued had I not been so worried about finding and keeping health insurance coverage. And still, there are opponents of the law who want to repeal it and have stated that the "private market" would somehow magically take care of these problems. Right. Like the private market has done so well for insurance for decades now. Like how the private market has created conditions where women can't find insurance at any price that includes coverage of a basic health care service like maternity. Or allows insurance companies to charge women more than men just because of their gender.

Some opponents of the law have said that there could be high risk pools for people like me who can't get coverage due to a pre-existing condition. To an insurance company executive, that sounds like a dream come true. After all, insurance companies have been rejecting people from coverage due to pre-existing conditions without accountability or

recourse for decades. But we're not just talking the serious stuff like breast cancer or heart disease—we're talking about previously having had a c-section. Or acne. Should someone who is rejected by an insurance company because they had acne be in a high risk insurance pool? All that does is incentivize insurance companies to reject even more people and fight over the remaining cream of the insurance risk pool crop: healthy, young people. And thus further incentivize insurers to reject people they deem not worth the risk (ie: a risk to their high profits).

Already the Affordable Care Act is helping millions of Americans living with a chronic health condition like me. And for us, 2014 can't come fast enough because that's when the majority of the Affordable Care Act provisions come into effect. The thought that some would want take this law away—and the peace of mind that comes with it—is maddening to me. Is the law a cure for all the problems of our current health care system? Of course not. Could the law be better? Absolutely—I could point you to several places. But to repeal the whole thing? No way. We can't go back. I know I've waited 28+ years for this law—and there are millions who have waited far longer.

That's why today I'm one of millions saying, Happy Anniversary to the Affordable Care Act; here's to many more years to come.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SPEECH OF

HON. ALLEN B. WEST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Free Trade Agreements with Panama, Korea and Columbia. These long overdue trade agreements will increase exports, lower the trade deficit and stimulate much-needed economic growth in the United States.

Free market competition is the proven way to create wealth and jobs in the economy. When the Federal Government attempts to create winners and losers, the American people get the short end of the stick.

South Florida is the gateway to Latin America, and the trade agreements with Colombia and Panama will support and create jobs in Florida and throughout the nation by leveling the playing field for United States goods and services.

Today, nearly all imports from Colombia and Panama enter the United States market duty free, but these countries continue to impose tariffs on our farm and manufactured goods exports that often soar into the double digits. Colombia currently collects $100 in tariffs on United States exports for every $1 the United States collects in tariffs on Colombian goods, and a similar lopsidedness holds back American export sales to Panama.

The free trade agreements will eliminate these tariffs and other barriers United States exporters face, and will create new opportunities for the sale of American products. In addition, they will secure the intellectual property of United States inventors, researchers, and creators; open services markets; and protect American investors and the jobs they support in the United States.

The independent United States International Trade Commission estimates that implementation of the three pending trade agreements would increase American exports by at least $13 billion and add at least $10 billion to our nation's Gross Domestic Product per year, which would mean 250,000 new jobs in the United States. Passing all three pending trade agreements will directly benefit small and medium-sized businesses, as well as the hundreds of thousands of American jobs they create.

Exports are critical to United States economic growth, and will have a significant, positive impact to my Congressional District that is home to two major ports—Port Everglades and the Port of Palm Beach. In 1986, exports equaled 7.2 percent of GDP. In 2010, exports equaled nearly 13 percent of GDP.

In 2010 alone, the State of Florida exported more than $4.2 billion to Colombia, Panama and South Korea combined. This represents a significant increase over the last decade. With the passage of the Free Trade Agreements, all indications point to significantly increased exports for the State of Florida.

Finally, the implementation of each of these Free Trade Agreements is important for our security and geostrategic goals. Each of the agreements will strengthen the United States' relationship with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, some of our country's strongest partners in advancing both regional and global security.

However, in May of 2011, President Barack Obama's Administration announced that it would not submit these three long-pending, job-creating trade agreements to the United States Congress unless "trade adjustment assistance" benefits (TAA) were renewed and expanded.

Quite simply, TAA is a federal program that sends cash and provides other benefits to workers whose jobs are purportedly affected negatively by trade. As a letter that was sent to Republican Leadership earlier this year states, "TAA is undoubtedly—and deliberately designed as—a federal wealth redistribution program that has no business existing in a free society."

Furthermore, the central components of these TAA programs—job-training, unemployment subsidies, and health-care subsidies—are available under dozens of other federal programs. In all, there are currently 47 government-sponsored and taxpayer-funded job training programs that received over $18 billion in Fiscal Year 2009. There are eight taxpayer-funded programs that provide unemployment insurance, and six taxpayer-funded programs that provide health insurance—all duplicative to programs found within TAA.

TAA accepts the premise that free trade is bad and needs to be offset by another federal program paid for by the American taxpayers. By strictly assisting workers who claim job losses due to trade, the program provides an incentive to exaggerate the negative impact on jobs due to free trade. In my assessment, TAA programs amount to subsidized excuses. Americans can openly compete with anyone in the free market—we do not need government creating victims.

I will not support H.R. 2832 because TAA programs allow the Federal Government to pick winners and losers. As The Heritage Foundation recently analogized, "the worker who loses his job to a foreign competitor should receive the same treatment as the Blockbuster employee who lost his job to Netflix."

Free trader benefits all parties involved—from consumers to business owners and farmers, to the port employees in my Congressional District. Free market competition and enterprise through free trade agreements should not be held back by what amounts to another duplicated, wasteful Federal Government program.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF EKOJI BUDDHIST TEMPLE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ekoji Buddhist Temple on the occasion of its 30th anniversary and to recognize the commemoration of the 750th Memorial for Shinran Shonin, the founder of Jodo Shinshu Buddhism.

Ekoji Temple, which was founded in 1981 by Rev. Kenryu T. Tsuji and Rev. Dr. Yehan Numata, shares the Pure Land Buddhist teachings of Shinran Shonin, which is based on the Nembutsu Teaching of Amida Buddha, the Buddha of Infinite Life and Light. The Nembutsu Path is to become aware of the ignorant self and to transcend the petty selfishness of the individual. The aim of the Ekoji Temple fellowship is to live the life of gratitude and share the rejoicing with others.

The name Ekoji, selected by Rev. Numata, means "The Temple of the Gift of Light." Ekoji Buddhist Temple shares this gift with all who wish to enter. Ekoji is a place where the differences of race, color and creed disappear and all who seek the truth are welcomed.

The 11th Congressional District of Virginia is blessed by its diversity. This district is more than 40% minority and is home to people of many ethnic heritages, cultures, and religions. Ekoji Temple adds to this rich tapestry and benefits our entire community by its presence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise and join me in congratulating the Sangha of the Ekoji Buddhist Temple in the celebration of its 30th anniversary, and also in thanking the Rev. Kazuaki Nakata and Rev. Shojo Honda, Emeritus for their leadership and inspiration.

UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the proposed free trade agreement with Colombia, which, of the three agreements we are considering today, is the one with which I have been most personally involved.

My support for this agreement did not come lightly. As the representative of the Research

Triangle region, I have witnessed the transformative impact of trade on our state's economy, and I have supported free trade agreements that help create a truly level playing field for American workers through the inclusion of robust labor and environmental standards. When agreements have failed to meet this test, I have opposed them, as I did the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

I am keenly aware of the unique challenges that Colombia has faced throughout its history and the relationship between these challenges and international trade. The country has only recently emerged from a long period of civil conflict and political instability, one of the darkest features of which has been a campaign of intimidation, violence, and murder against Colombian labor leaders. At best, the Colombian government failed in the past to adequately respond to this campaign, and at worst officials turned a blind eye to, or were even complicit in, the violence.

This left me with a fundamental decision to make when the Bush Administration proposed a free trade agreement with Colombia: I could reflexively oppose the agreement from the outset, notwithstanding the potential benefits it could bring to both of our countries. Or, using the relationships I have built through my work in Colombia, I could help shape the agreement, using it as a source of leverage to achieve meaningful progress on issues such as labor violence. I chose the latter.

From the beginning, I have been very clear about what it would take for me to support the agreement in the end. Any agreement that failed to strengthen Colombia's labor and environmental standards or to ensure meaningful progress toward addressing labor violence would be unacceptable. And, in the current economic environment, I wanted assurance that no agreement would be approved without an extension of Trade Adjustment Assistance for displaced workers.

In two subsequent visits to Colombia, and in regular consultations with the Obama Administration, I have carried this message to the highest levels. During a visit in 2007, in addition to meeting with President Uribe, members of the Colombian parliament, and Colombian labor leaders, I requested a briefing by the special Attorney General unit that was created to prosecute labor violence cases. I was not impressed with what I heard, and I made this clear to the Colombian government.

When I returned in 2009 and received a similar briefing, the progress made over the past two years was significant and encouraging. Since then, and particularly since President Santos came to office, the Colombian government has made further strides in prosecuting incidents of labor violence, legislating improved labor protections, adopting judicial reforms, and enforcing its new labor law. Colombia has welcomed an ILO office to Bogota to monitor labor violations and appointed a Ministry of Labor to guide the executive on pressing labor issues and reforms.

Has Colombia done enough to solve this problem? No. One incident of labor-related violence is too many. I believe it is critical for us to continue to hold the country's leaders accountable for prosecuting labor violence and protecting labor rights. I was among the group of Democratic Members of Congress urging the Obama Administration to go beyond the text of the free trade agreement on the issue of labor rights.

The result was the Labor Action Plan negotiated between the Obama and Santos administrations, which represents an unprecedented mechanism to hold a trading partner accountable to a set of concrete commitments on labor rights. The Obama Administration has made its commitment clear to ensure compliance with this Action Plan for as long as it takes, a commitment I confirmed with Ambassador Ron Kirk as recently as this morning.

I remain concerned about the potential impact of this agreement on Colombia's subsistence farmers, particularly among Afro-Colombians and other indigenous communities. The land reform law recently approved by the Colombian Congress is a step forward, and the agreement before us today (unlike NAFTA) allows Colombia to protect its most sensitive agricultural commodities for up to 19 years. But we must do more to mitigate any displacement caused when reduced trade barriers are combined with subsidized imports, leaving local farmers unable to compete. This means addressing the significant threat to small farmers in Colombia and around the world posed by the distortive agricultural subsidies some of our own farmers receive.

On balance, however, I believe the labor and environmental protections in the agreement, along with the Labor Action Plan and the extension of Trade Adjustment Assistance, largely meet the demands I made when I decided to participate in the negotiations surrounding this agreement. The Colombian government has made undeniable progress and continues to move in the right direction. By any metric, labor violence in Colombia is down. Colombia's land and agricultural reforms are working, albeit slowly. Progress on these fronts is much more likely with an agreement than it would be without.

We also have to consider the best way to encourage further reforms and further progress. Is it by walking away from an agreement at a time when Colombia is expanding trade with China, Canada, the EU, and other partners? Or is it by using a free trade agreement with the United States as a catalyst, as leverage, for further reforms to address the underlying causes of the country's conflict: poverty, inequality, and a lack of economic opportunity.

The best way forward is to support a robust and vibrant Colombian economy. A higher standard of living in Colombia results in greater social stability and a lower crime rate. It is important that we remain a powerful and progressive force in the development of its democracy and economy, and I believe the best way to do that is to approve the Colombia FTA. For me, to oppose this agreement now, after encouraging—even demanding—that the Colombian government enact reforms, would amount to changing the rules in the middle of the game.

THE KOREA, COLOMBIA AND PANAMA FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the Korea, Colombia and Panama trade agreements, I would like to set forth my analysis of the effects that these agreements will have on my home state of California. In all three cases, the facts are overwhelming that California will benefit from these agreements.

At the outset, it is important to note that these agreements are mis-labeled. They do not provide "free trade" in the sense of unfettered, unregulated commerce. In reality, these agreements are a set of detailed rules that provide for regulated commerce in terms that apply to both parties. They specify the tariffs that may apply, the non-tariff restrictions that may be imposed, the rules of origin to prevent third-countries from benefiting, and the enforcement and dispute resolution procedures that will provide discipline and order.

KOREA-U.S. TRADE AGREEMENT

CALIFORNIA BENEFITS

With regard to the Korea-U.S. agreement (KORUS), California stands to benefit substantially. California already exports $8 billion a year to South Korea, accounting for one-fifth of all U.S. exports to that country. For California's 60,000 exporting companies, there is potential for growth; in 2010 only 6 percent of California's total $143 billion in exports went to South Korea. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that KORUS will lead to increases in 9 of the 10 products that now account for $6 billion of California's exports to South Korea. Of these, 5 categories are high value-added products, produced by skilled California workers: semiconductor manufacturing equipment, computers, electrical equipment, optical and other medical equipment and aircraft and aircraft engines.

In addition, KORUS will increase exports of California-grown edible fruit and nuts, in particular walnuts and almonds. We will sell more chemicals. And, we will sell more reusable iron, steel and aluminum scrap.

According to the U.S. Trade Representative, some 6,000 jobs are supported for every $1 billion in manufactured exports and some 4,500 jobs are supported for every $1 billion in services exports.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTIONS

KORUS has important benefits for California's entertainment industry. KORUS relaxes a number of Korean content quotas and should increase the U.S. motion picture and television industries' opportunities to compete in the Korean market. KORUS obligates South Korea to decrease the domestic content quota on films and animation products. KORUS improves the opportunity for U.S. ownership in the broadcast sector, by permitting U.S. firms that establish Korean subsidiaries to have 100 percent ownership of program providers, phased in over 3 years.

In a side letter, South Korea has agreed to place a priority on enforcement against Internet piracy, aimed not only at direct infringement but also those who profit from services that induce infringement. KORUS also obligates South Korea to implement the World Intellectual Property Organization Internet Treaties and expands intellectual property protections and penalties against unlawful decoding of encrypted satellite TV signals. It also covers cable and satellite signals that are retransmitted without authorization of the signal distributor. Further, the side letter to KORUS ensures that copyright owners have the exclusive right to make their works available online.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ANALYSIS

There have been many analyses and position statements issued for and against the Korea trade agreement. In particular, the analysis by the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation is persuasive. In its conclusion, the LACEDC said:

''KORUS would create multiple opportunities for both U.S. goods and services. On the goods side, the agreement opens the 12th largest economy's large middle class of consumers to American-made goods. On the services side, the agreement opens up South Korea's $560 billion services market to American and Los Angeles area based companies.''

''The agreement also creates new opportunities for the U.S. manufacturing industry. And the manufacturing capital of the U.S. is Los Angeles County. Thus the local economy has a lot to look forward to in the coming years, as increased exports will boost economic growth and create new and well paid jobs in the Los Angeles region.''

COLOMBIA-U.S. TRADE AGREEMENT

There are compelling foreign policy reasons to pass the Colombia-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA). Colombia is an important U.S. ally in the Western Hemisphere, and this agreement will help cement our relationship. The FTA will also increase American exports, providing a needed economic boost for the U.S. economy and the creation of new jobs here at home.

I've listened very carefully to the debate on issues of human rights and labor rights in Colombia, the horrific levels of violence, and its deplorable track record in bringing to justice those accused of violating these rights. These issues are profoundly important to me and I will continue to work with the government of Colombia to ensure that the Labor Action Plan is fully implemented. I believe it is in the interests of both the United States and Colombia to subject this FTA to labor rights and human rights conditions.

President Obama deserves credit as the first President to shine such a sharp spotlight on labor issues in Colombia, and it is fair to say that this FTA addresses labor issues more fully than any FTA before it. The Action Plan agreed to by the White House and the government of Colombia on April 7 was comprehensive and highlighted specific areas where it could improve its record on labor issues. And in his October 3 letter transmitting the FTA to Congress, the President pledged that he would not bring the agreement into force until key elements of the Action Plan are implemented.

Results matter and the kinds of fundamental changes we seek from and wish for Colombia and its people will be a long term process. I have derived great comfort in the positive seachange that President Santos has represented for Colombia, but I will be watching closely for progress and whether this transformative President fulfills his promises to change the labor and human rights environment in Colombia.

PANAMA-U.S. TRADE AGREEMENT

While Panama's trade with the U.S. is small, the U.S.-Panama trade agreement includes enforceable labor standards for Panamanian workers, compulsory Panamanian membership in multilateral environmental agreements—both included at the behest of the U.S. administration and Congress. Under this agreement, 88% of U.S. commercial and industrial exports would become duty-free upon implementation, with remaining tariffs phased out over a 10-year period.

More than 50% of U.S. farm exports to Panama also would achieve immediate duty-free status, with tariffs and tariff rate quotas (TRQs) on select farm products to be phased out by year 17 of the agreement (year 20 for rice). The agreement also contains provisions on telecommunications, services trade, government procurement, investment, intellectual property rights and tax transparency—the latter to address Panama's significant problems with money laundering.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3080, the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. The United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, or KORUS, is the most significant trade agreement our country has entered into since NAFTA sixteen years ago, and it would help stimulate the U.S. economy at no cost to the American taxpayers.

Trade liberalization is a consistent precursor to global economic growth, and when done with a fair and close trading partner, could prove critical to American economic recovery. The current fiscal environment facing the federal government requires that we pursue all available options to create jobs and spur economic growth. Currently, the Republic of Korea is the world's twelfth largest economy and our seventh largest trading partner. This trade agreement will remove nearly 95 percent of tariffs on consumer and industrial goods within three years, create approximately 70,000 jobs nationwide, and increase U.S. GDP by an estimated $10 to $12 billion.

Further, Korea's strong record on labor rights and environmental protection ensures that American firms will compete on a level playing field with their Korean counterparts. By increasing trade with Korea, American businesses will have greater access to a nearly $1.5 trillion economy. The provisions included in the agreement will improve intellectual property rights protections and benefit businesses across all sectors of the American economy.

KORUS would also strengthen our relationship with a critical democratic ally and reaffirm our nation's commitment to the Asia-Pacific region. As the first trade agreement between the United States and a North Asian country, KORUS underscores this strategic alliance and may serve as a model for future agreements across the region. Moreover, the benefits of this longstanding partnership are evident on Guam, where Korea was first accepted into the Guam Visa Waiver Program. To date, Korean visitors remain the second largest group to visit Guam annually.

The United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement would stimulate the U.S. economy, create jobs, and increase economic competitiveness of the United States in East Asia. I strongly support the passage of H.R. 3080, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

CONGRATULATING MARTIN'S POINT HEALTH CARE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today I am thrilled to congratulate Martin's Point Health Care Medicare Advantage plans for receiving five-star quality ratings from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Martin's Point Health Care is a not-for-profit health care organization that provides primary care services, health plans, and wellness services in Maine and other parts of northern New England.

Under the direction of their president and chief executive officer, Dr. David Howes, Martin's Point has established a long tradition of providing high quality, efficient, and affordable care to thousands of veterans, seniors, and families in Maine.

Today CMS announced that Martin's Point has received five-star ratings for both its Value and Prime Medicare Advantage plans—the highest possible rating granted by CMS.

High quality care is not new to Martin's Point: for the last 3 years, Martin's Point has had the highest rated Medicare Advantage plan in Maine. But I am particularly proud to say that it is one of only nine Medicare Advantage organizations in the entire country to receive the CMS five-star designation for 2012.

The five-star rating system helps Medicare beneficiaries compare available plans and make meaningful choices about which plans are right for them based on quality of care and customer service. As a five-star plan, Martin's Point will be able to assure potential patients that they offer the highest quality, patient-centered care. And thanks to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, this five-star rating will make Martin's Point Health Care eligible for quality bonus payments from CMS to help bolster their good work and ensure that patients in Maine will continue to benefit from their services for years to come.

I want to congratulate Dr. Howes and the entire team of health care providers and support staff at Martin's Point for this tremendous accomplishment. Their commitment to delivering quality health care and service excellence is second to none.

As we continue to work to shift our health care system to one that better values quality outcomes and patient experience, Martin's Point will stand as a model for health care organizations across the country, and a real asset to the people of Maine.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 11, I missed a couple of

rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 771 and "nay" on Nos. 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT LEE MYUNG-BAK OF SOUTH KOREA TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I welcome President Lee Myung-bak of the Republic of Korea to the United States and his address to the Joint Session of Congress on October 13, 2011. His visit to our great nation is another significant step in broadening and deepening the friendship and cooperation between our two sovereign nations.

For more than 60 years an enduring friendship has existed between the United States and the Republic of Korea which has been of enormous economic, cultural, and strategic benefit to both nations. Our countries share common ideals and a clear vision for the 21st century, where freedom and democracy are the foundations for peace, prosperity, and progress.

During the Korean War the United States and the Republic of Korea forged a bloodshed alliance. Approximately 1,789,000 members of the United States Armed Forces served in-theater along with the forces of the Republic of Korea and 20 other members of the United Nations to defend freedom and democracy of the Republic of Korea from 1950 to 1953. Since 1975, the Republic of Korea has invited thousands of American Korean War veterans to revisit Korea in appreciation for their sacrifices. Currently more than 28,500 members of the United States Armed Forces have served annually in the United States Forces Korea to defend the Republic of Korea against external aggression, and to promote regional peace.

The Republic of Korea is among the closest allies of the United States, having contributed troops in support of United States operations during the Vietnam War, Gulf War, and operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, while also supporting numerous United Nations peacekeeping missions throughout the world.

As a Korean War veteran, I am proud to see that in the 60 years since the outbreak of the Korean War, the Republic of Korea has emerged from a war-torn economy into one of the major economies in the world and one of the largest trading partners of the United States.

The success of Republic of Korea is a shining example of the peacekeeping efforts and contribution made by the United States.

I would like to congratulate President Lee Myung-bak for recently being awarded the World Statesman Award for his leadership in furthering democracy, freedom, peace and human rights, on September 20, 2011, by The Appeal of Conscience Foundation, an interfaith organization founded and presided by my good friend, Rabbi Arthur Schneier.

I applaud President Lee Myung-bak's many accomplishments, including his tenure as the CEO of Hyundai Engineering and Construction, Member of the Korean National Assembly, Mayor of Seoul, and as the 10th President of the Republic of Korea. Under his presidency since 2008, Republic of Korea has emerged as one of the key players on the international scene through hosting the 2010 G–20 Seoul Summit. Now with the passage of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, I hope that the economies of both the United Sates and Republic of Korea would continue to prosper as our partnership remains strong.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

The free trade agreement with Korea is of vital importance to America's farmers and ranchers.

Korea is the fifth largest market for our agricultural exports. But currently, America's farmers and ranchers face an average tariff of 54 percent when exporting to Korea. Similar goods from Korea enter our country at an average rate of only 9 percent.

Passing this agreement corrects that imbalance and gives us better access to Korea's 49 million consumers.

The Farm Bureau estimates that once the agreement is fully implemented, we could see $1.9 billion in increased farm exports.

Every dollar in agricultural exports creates another $1.31 in economic activity off the farm in industries like processing, manufacturing, and transportation. So the agricultural provisions alone have the potential to provide a significant boost to our economy.

That isn't including the other tariff cuts in this agreement, which the International Trade Commission predicts will add more than $10 billion annually to our GDP.

Within agriculture, we could see dairy exports to Korea quadruple under this agreement. Fruit and vegetable sales would increase by 50 percent. And processed food sales would increase by more than a third.

Those increased sales will translate directly to more jobs—both on and off the farm. That's especially good news because workers whose jobs depend on trade earn 13 to 18 percent more than the national average.

That's why there is such tremendous support among the agricultural community for these free trade agreements.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support our farmers and ranchers . . . to support American jobs . . . and to support this free trade agreement.

REMARKS ON TRADE AGREEMENTS

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and Korea we are considering today.

I do not support these agreements for one simple reason: I remain completely unconvinced that they can create jobs in the short term. Job creation must be our principal objective. That is what nearly everyone in New Jersey tells me is their concern. Given the tough economic times we face and the high rates of unemployment and underemployment, we need to take steps to help create jobs now. In my view these agreements fail that job-creation test. Instead of advancing these steps that might possibly start producing some jobs years from now, we should be passing immediately legislation that creates jobs now, legislation that helps homeowners now, and legislation that helps the middle class now.

H.R. 3078, THE UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, H.R. 3079, THE UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, AND H.R. 3080, THE UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the pending free trade agreements (FTAs) with Colombia and Korea. I wish, however, to commend my good friend from Michigan and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, SANDY LEVIN, for his hard and effective work with the Obama Administration to improve them. Sandy and the Administration have fought hard to ensure improved market access for American workers and companies, all while insisting that our trading partners' labor protections be improved. Nevertheless, my experience with FTAs has been one of nearly two decades of broken promises and widespread domestic economic dislocation, particularly in my home state of Michigan. With our economy teetering on the edge of recession and the painful memory of millions of lost jobs, I cannot vote in good conscience for more free trade agreements.

With respect to Colombia, I am disappointed by the Administration's decision not to include the Labor Action Plan as a binding and enforceable provision of the FTA. Colombia has a well known history as one of the world's most inhospitable places for labor leaders. While the country was showing some signs of progress under the action plan, there is nothing to prevent Colombia from backsliding once the FTA is in effect and the plan itself does not have the force of law.

Although I recognize that significant improvements in terms of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade have been made in the Korean trade agreement, I rather unhappily believe that promises will not translate into reality. In short, I believe the United States is giving up far too much for mediocre market share gains in the short term. This agreement may well boost our exports to Korea over the next few years, but I am firmly convinced that the benefits Korea will reap in the long run—especially

in the auto sector—will eclipse any that the U.S. may achieve. Even the International Trade Commission estimates that our auto trade deficit with Korea will rise by over $700 million in the next ten years if this agreement is implemented.

With due recognition of my colleagues' hard work to improve these agreements, I must respectfully part ways and vote in opposition to them. Lest we be condemned to repeat it, I ask my colleagues to learn the lessons of history and vote ''no'' on these trade deals.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 13, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 18

10 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the status of response capability and readiness for oil spills in foreign Outer Continental Shelf waters adjacent to United States waters.

SD–366

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine a review of the 2011 floods and the condition of the nation's flood control systems.

SD–406

Finance

To hold hearings to examine tax reform options, focusing on incentives for charitable giving.

SD–215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Primary Health and Aging Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the recession and older Americans.

SD–430

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine ten years after 9/11 and the anthrax attacks, focusing on protecting against biological threats.

SD–342

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine the ''Small Business Jobs Act of 2010'', one year later.

SR–428A

2:30 p.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Elementary and Secondary Education Act'', and any pending nominations.

SD–106

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine pipeline safety since San Bruno and other recent incidents.

SR–253

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

OCTOBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities, Insurance and Investment Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine market microstructure, focusing on an examination of Exchange-Traded Funds (ETFs).

SD–538

10 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Superfund, Toxics and Environmental Health Subcommittee

To hold a joint oversight hearing to examine the Brownfields Program, focusing on cleaning up and rebuilding communities.

SD–406

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–342

Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine concussions and the marketing of sports equipment.

SR–253

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD–226

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 544, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, S. 1083, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the Smoky Hill Trail, an overland trail across the Great Plains during pioneer days in Kansas and Colorado, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System, S. 1084, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the routes of the Shawnee Cattle Trail, the oldest of the major Texas Cattle Trails, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System, S. 1303, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish Fort Monroe National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 1325, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1347, to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, S. 1421, to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 1478, to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and S. 1537, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the Board of Directors of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center Foundation, Inc., the donation of title to The National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center.

SD–366

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the final report of the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

SR–232A

OCTOBER 20

2:15 p.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 134, to authorize the Mescalero Apache Tribe to lease adjudicated water rights, S. 399, to modify the purposes and operation of certain facilities of the Bureau of Reclamation to implement the water rights compact among the State of Montana, the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of Montana, and the United States, S. 1298, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 1327, to amend the Act of March 1, 1933, to transfer certain authority and resources to the Utah Dineh Corporation, and S. 1345, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

SD–628

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold an oversight hearing to examine shale gas production and water resources in the Eastern United States.

SD–366

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

NOVEMBER 3

9 a.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine speculation and compliance with the ''Dodd-Frank Act''.

SD–342

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 3080, United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

Senate passed H.R. 3079, United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act.

Senate passed H.R. 3078, United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6397–S6471

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1682–1699, and S. Res. 291–292. **Page S6461**

Measures Passed:

United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act: By 83 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. 161), Senate passed H.R. 3080, to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement. **Pages S6399–S6418, S6418–51**

United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act: By 77 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 162), Senate passed H.R. 3079, to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement. **Pages S6399–S6418, S6418–51**

United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act: By 66 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 163), Senate passed H.R. 3078, to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. **Pages S6399–S6418, S6418–52**

National Life Insurance Awareness Month: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 270, supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Life Insurance Awareness Month'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6470**

National Character Counts Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 292, designating the week beginning October 16, 2011, as ''National Character Counts Week''. **Pages S6470–71**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 12 p.m., on Thursday, October 13, 2011, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Susan Owens Hickey, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, and Katherine B. Forrest, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, under the previous order of September 26, 2011. **Page S6471**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Paul W. Hodes, of New Hampshire, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2016.

Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2016.

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Elizabeth M. Cousens, of Washington, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Routine lists in the Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, and Navy. **Page S6471**

Messages from the House: **Page S6457**

Measures Referred: **Page S6457**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Pages S6397, S6457

Executive Communications: Pages S6457–59

Executive Reports of Committees: Pages S6459–61

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S6461–63

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S6463–69

Additional Statements: Pages S6456–57

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S6469

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S6469–70

Privileges of the Floor: Page S6470

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—163) Pages S6451–52

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:41 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 13, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6471.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FEDERAL ROLE IN DISASTER RECOVERY AND RESPONSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine the Federal role in disaster recovery and response, after receiving testimony from Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant of the Army for Civil Works, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; Bruce Nelson, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, and Homer Wilkes, Acting Associate Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, both of the Department of Agriculture; James Rivera, Associate Administrator, Small Business Administration; Gregory G. Nadeau, Deputy Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation; and Fred Tombar, Senior Advisor for Disaster Programs, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine improving the congressional budget process, after receiving testimony from Louis Fisher, Constitution Project, Washington, D.C.; Philip G. Joyce, University of Maryland School of Public Policy, College Park; and Paul L. Posner, George Mason University Centers on the Public Service, Fairfax, Virginia.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE REFORM

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine universal service reform, focusing on bringing broadband to all Americans, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Frontier Communications, and Michael K. Powell, National Cable and Telecommunications Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Mary N. Dillon, United States Cellular Corporation, Chicago, Illinois; Shirley Bloomfield, National Telecommunications Cooperative Association, Arlington, Virginia; and Philip B. Jones, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Olympia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Joyce A. Barr, of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary for Administration, Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Dan W. Mozena, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Susan Denise Page, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, Adrienne S. O'Neal, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cape Verde, Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, and Mark Francis Brzezinski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Sweden, all of the Department of State, Anne Terman Wedner, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, Katherine M. Gehl, of Wisconsin, and Terry Lewis, of Michigan, both to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Russ Carnahan, of Missouri, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-sixth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Michael Anthony McFaul, of California, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

TEN YEARS AFTER 9/11

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ten years after 9/11, focusing on a status report on information sharing, after receiving testimony from Cathy L. Lanier, Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia Chief of Police, John McLaughlin, Johns Hopkins University Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Thomas E. McNamara, George Washington University Elliot School of International Affairs, and Jeffrey H. Smith, Markle Task Force on National Security in the Information Age, all of Washington, D.C.; and Ronald E. Brooks, Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, San Francisco, on behalf of the National Fusion Center Association.

CHRONIC DISEASE PREVENTION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of chronic disease prevention, after receiving testimony from Howard K. Koh, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Health; Nancy Brown, American Heart Association, Dallas, Texas; John R. Seffrin, American Cancer Society, Atlanta, Georgia; John Griffin, American Diabetes Association, Victoria, Texas; and Tevi Troy, Hudson Institute, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Winslow Lorenzo Sargeant, of Wisconsin, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

MEDICARE REFORM DEBATE

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine finding consensus in the Medicare reform debate, after receiving testimony from Maya MacGuineas, New America Foundation, Joseph R. Antos, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, John Holahan, Urban Institute, and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, all of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 21 public bills, H.R. 3154–3175, and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 432–433, were introduced. **Pages H6852–54**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6854–55**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 430, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act (H. Rept. 112–243) and

H. Res. 431, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2273) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to facilitate recovery and beneficial use, and provide for the proper management and disposal, of materials generated by the combustion of coal and other fossil fuels (H. Rept. 112–244). **Page H6852**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Marchant to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6783**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:14 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6791**

United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act: The House passed H.R. 3078, to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, by a recorded vote of 262 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 781. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, October 11th. **Pages H6796–H6804, H6836–39**

Rejected the Levin motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with amendments, by a yea-and-nay vote of 192 yeas to 236 nays, Roll No. 780. **Pages H6836–38**

H. Res. 425, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832) and providing for the consideration of the bills (H.R. 3078), (H.R. 3079), and (H.R. 3080) was agreed to yesterday, October 11th.

United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act: The House passed H.R. 3079, to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement, by a yea-and-nay vote of 300 yeas to 129 nays, Roll No. 782. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, October 11th. **Pages H6804–12, H6839**

H. Res. 425, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832)

and providing for the consideration of the bills (H.R. 3078), (H.R. 3079), and (H.R. 3080) was agreed to yesterday, October 11th.

United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act: The House passed H.R. 3080, to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, by a yea-and-nay vote of 278 yeas to 151 nays, Roll No. 783. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, October 11th.

Pages H6812–32, H6839–40

H. Res. 425, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832) and providing for the consideration of the bills (H.R. 3078), (H.R. 3079), and (H.R. 3080) was agreed to yesterday, October 11th.

Extending the Generalized System of Preferences: The House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, by a yea-and-nay vote of 307 yeas to 122 nays, Roll No. 784. Consideration of the Senate amendment began yesterday, October 11th.

Pages H6832–36, H6840

H. Res. 425, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832) and providing for the consideration of the bills (H.R. 3078), (H.R. 3079), and (H.R. 3080) was agreed to yesterday, October 11th.

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated yesterday, October 11th:

Veterans Opportunity to Work Act of 2011: H.R. 2433, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the employment and training of veterans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 418 yeas to 6 nays, Roll No. 785. **Page H6841**

United States Parole Commission Extension Act of 2011: The House agreed by unanimous consent to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2944, to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission. **Page H6841**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate and 11:30 a.m. for legislative business. **Page H6841**

EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 2250, to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators. Consideration of the measure began on October 6th.

Pages H6841–42

Proceedings Postponed:

Cohen amendment (No. 22 printed in the Congressional Record of October 4, 2011) that seeks to insert a subparagraph relating to potential reductions in the number of illness-related absences from work due to respiratory or other illnesses. **Page H6842**

H. Res. 419, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2681) and (H.R. 2250) was agreed to on October 4th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on pages H6795–96.

Senate Referrals: S. 1619 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6737–38, H6838–39, H6839, H6839–40, H6840, and H6841. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AMENDING TITLE VII OF THE DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing to review legislative proposals amending Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, including the following bills: H.R. 1840, to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; H.R. 2682, Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2011; H.R. 2779, to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; H.R. 2586, Swap Execution Facility Clarification Act; and three discussion drafts. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE U.S. MILITARY TEN YEARS AFTER 9/11

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "The Future of National Defense and the U.S. Military Ten Years After 9/11: Perspectives of Former Chairmen of the Committee on Armed Services." Testimony was heard from former Representative John Warner, Representative Duncan Hunter, and Representative Ike Skeleton.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE COMPONENT ACQUISITION AND MODERNIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on National Guard and Reserve component acquisition and modernization. The following officials of the Department of Defense testified: LTG Harry M. Wyatt III, USAF, Director, Air National Guard; MG Raymond W. Carpenter, USA, Acting Director of the Army National Guard; LTG Jack C. Stultz, USA, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve; LTG Charles E. Stenner, Jr., USAF, Chief, U.S. Air Force Reserve.

WORKFORCE DEMOCRACY AND FAIRNESS ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3094 ''Workforce Democracy and Fairness Act.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FOOD MARKETING: CAN 'VOLUNTARY' GOVERNMENT RESTRICTIONS IMPROVE CHILDREN'S HEALTH

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, and the Subcommittee on Health held a joint hearing entitled ''Food Marketing: Can 'Voluntary' Government Restrictions Improve Children's Health?'' Testimony was heard from William Dietz MD, Director, Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Robert Post, Deputy Director, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion, U.S. Department of Agriculture, David C. Vladeck, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, and public witnesses.

CUTTING EPA SPENDING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Cutting EPA Spending.'' Testimony was heard from Barbara Bennett, Chief Financial Officer, Environmental Protection Agency.

MARKUP OF LEGISLATION ON SUPPORTING ECONOMIC AND NATIONAL SECURITY BY MAINTAINING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, ordered reported as amended, legislation Supporting Economic and National Security by Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Multilateral Development Banks Act.''

OVERSIGHT FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.'' Testimony was heard from Bruce Morrison, former Member of Congress, and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS LENDING ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2011

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled H.R. 1418, the ''Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 2011.'' Testimony was heard from Deborah Matz, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXPLOITATION OF DRUG WARS AND WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The International Exploitation of Drug Wars and What We Can Do about It.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NARCOTERRORISM AND THE LONG REACH OF U.S. LAW ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Narcoterrorism and the Long Reach of U.S. Law Enforcement.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Committee on Homeland Security: Began markup of H.R. 3116, the ''Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.''

THE STATUS OF FEDERAL SENTENCING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crimes, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing entitled ''Uncertain Justice: The Status of Federal Sentencing and the U.S. Sentencing Commission Six Years after U.S. v. Booker.'' Testimony was heard from Patti B. Saris, Chair, United States Sentencing Commission.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law.'' Testimony was heard from John Morton, Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE LINGERING IMPACTS ON JOBS, ENERGY PRODUCTION AND LOCAL ECONOMIES ONE YEAR AFTER OFFICIAL GULF OF MEXICO MORATORIUM LIFTED –

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''One Year after President Obama's Gulf of Mexico 6-Month Moratorium Officially Lifted: Examining the Lingering Impacts on Jobs, Energy Production and Local Economies.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATUS REPORT ON THE TRANSITION TO A CIVILIAN-LED MISSION IN IRAQ

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations held a hearing entitled ''Status Report on the Transition to a Civilian-Led Mission in Iraq.'' Testimony was heard from Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary for Management, U.S. Department of State; Alexander Vershbow, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, U.S. Department of Defense; Alan F. Estevez, Assistant Secretary for Logistics & Material Readiness, U.S. Department of Defense.

HOW GREEN ENERGY POLICY WILL IMPACT SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, Stimulus Oversight and Government Spending held a hearing entitled ''Running on Empty: How the Obama Administration's Green Energy Gamble Will Impact Small Business and Consumers.'' Testimony was heard from David Strickland, Administrator, National Highway Transportation Safety Administration; Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Margo Oge, Director of the Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Environmental Protection Agency and public witnesses.

COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Held a hearing on H.R. 2273 ''Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act''. The Committee granted, by a record vote of 5 to 2, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Rep. Joseph R. Pitts, Rep. McDermott.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

Committee on Rules: Held a hearing on H.R. 358 ''Protect Life Act.'' The Committee granted by a record vote of 5 to 2 a closed rule providing one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Rep. John Shimkus, Rep. Henry Waxman and Rep. Terri Sewell.

STEM EDUCATION APPROACHES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a hearing entitled ''What Makes for Successful K–12 STEM Education: A Closer Look at Effective STEM Education Approaches.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing entitled ''The International Space Station: Lessons from the Soyuz Rocket Failure and Return to Flight.'' Testimony was heard from William H. Gerstenmaier, Associate Administrator, Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; LTG Thomas P. Stafford, USAF (Ret.), Chairman, International Space Station Advisory Committee; Vice

Admiral Joseph W. Dyer, USN (Ret.), Chairman, Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel.

LIGHTSQUARED: THE IMPACT TO SMALL BUSINESS GPS USERS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''LightSquared: The Impact to Small Business GPS Users.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: MORE BUREAUCRACY AND MORE RED TAPE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing entitled ''National Infrastructure Bank: More Bureaucracy and More Red Tape.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FAILURES AT MIAMI VAMC: WINDOW TO A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Failures at Miami VAMC: Window to a National Problem.'' Testimony was heard from William Schoenhard, FACHE, Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations Management, Veterans Health Administration, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Joint Meetings

MONGOLIA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Commission received a briefing on Mongolia, focusing on its intention to seek status as a participating State in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, from Khasbazaryn Bekhbat, Ambassador of Mongolia to the United States, Terrence Hopmann, John Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, and John Tkacik, China Business Intelligence, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine addressing potential threats from Iran, focusing on Administration perspectives on implementing new economic sanctions one year later, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Green Jobs and the New Economy, to hold hearings to examine innovative practices to create jobs and reduce pollution, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1262, to improve Indian education; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Carcieri crisis, focusing on the ripple effect on jobs, economic development and public safety in native communities, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1301, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2012 to 2015 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, to enhance measures to combat trafficking in person, H.R. 368, to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify and improve certain provisions relating to the removal of litigation against Federal officers or agencies to Federal courts, S. 1636, to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, H.R. 394, to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, S. 1637, to clarify appeal time limits in civil actions to which United States officers or employees are parties, H.R. 2633, to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the time limits for appeals in civil cases to which United States officers or employees are parties, S. 1014, to provide for additional Federal district judgeships, and the nominations of Adalberto Jose Jordan, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, John M. Gerrard, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska, Mary Elizabeth Phillips, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, Thomas Owen Rice, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, David Nuffer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, and Steven R. Frank, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Martin J. Pane, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and David Blake Webb, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine arbitration, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Future of National Defense and the U.S. Military Ten Years After 9/11: Perspectives of Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey.'' 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on an update on KC–46A and legacy aerial refueling aircraft programs, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled ''Regulations, Costs, and Uncertainty in Employer Provided Health Care.'' 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Understanding Consumer Attitudes About Privacy.'' 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on The American Energy Initiative: Electric Transmission Issues,

Including Topics Related to the Sitting, Planning, and Allocation of Costs for Electricity Transmission Infrastructure, 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The U.S. Housing Finance System in the Global Context: Structure, Capital Sources, and Housing Dynamics.'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''The Section 8 Savings Act of 2011: Proposals to Promote Economic Independence for Assisted Families.'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Emerging Threats and Security in the Western Hemisphere: Next Steps for U.S. Policy.'' 10 a.m., and, to mark up H.R. 2829 to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, continue markup of H.R. 3116, the ''Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.'' 311 Cannon, time to be announced.

Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''TSA Reform: Exploring Innovations in Technology Procurement to Stimulate Job Growth, Part II.'' 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, mark up the following bills: H.R. 2870, the ''Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2011''; H.R. 1254, the ''Synthetic Drug Control Act of 2011''; H.R. 10, the ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2011''; H.R. 822, the ''National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011''; and H.R. 3012, the ''Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act.''

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''BOEMRE/U.S. Coast Guard Joint Investigation Team Report.'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, markup of H.R. 2309 Postal Reform Act of 2011, 10:30 a.m., 2154 RHOB.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, hearing entitled ''The Endangered Species Act: Reviewing the Nexus of Science and Policy.'' 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing entitled ''Advancing Coal Research and Development for a Secure Energy Future.'' 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled ''Streamlining Emergency Management: Improving Preparedness, Response, and Cutting Costs.'' 8:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Full Committee, mark up the following bills: H.R. 2668, ''Brian A. Terry Memorial Act''; H.R. 2919, ''Community Shelter Protection Act of 2011''; H.R. 1734, ''Civilian Property Realignment Act''; and H.R. 2840, ''Commercial Vessel Discharges Reform Act of 2011''. 11:15 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup of the following bills: H.R. 674, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the imposition of 3 percent withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities, H.R. 2576, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the calculation of modified adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs. 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: To receive a briefing on elections and political transition in Tunisia, focusing on Tunisia's mass popular uprising, known as the ''Jasmine Revolution'', 9:30 a.m., B318, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, October 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Susan Owens Hickey, of Arkansas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, and Katherine B. Forrest, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, with votes on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 2 p.m.

(At 3:40 p.m., Senators will meet in the Senate Chamber to proceed to the House of Representatives for a Joint Meeting of Congress, to begin at 4 p.m., to receive an address from His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 13

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Joint Session with the Senate to Receive His Excellency Lee Myung-bak, President of the Republic of Korea.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E1830
Baca, Joe, Calif., E1828
Bachus, Spencer, Ala., E1827
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1819, E1821, E1823, E1825, E1826, E1827, E1829
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E1839
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1819
Black, Diane, Tenn., E1821
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1840
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1835
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1836
Coble, Howard, N.C., E1834
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1828
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1836, E1838
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1824
Costello, Jerry F., Ill., E1829
Critz, Mark S., Pa., E1819
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1825
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1837, E1841
Duncan, Jeff, S.C., E1832
Frank, Barney, Mass., E1821, E1824
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1822
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1840
Green, Gene, Tex., E1823, E1832
Grimm, Michael G., N.Y., E1829
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1827
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1841
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E1827
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E1834
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1835, E1837
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E1831
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1826
Lucas, Frank D., Okla., E1841
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1834
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1831
Marino, Tom, Pa., E1830, E1831, E1833, E1835
Mulvaney, Mick, S.C., E1825
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E1825
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1822, E1833
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1828
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1840
Price, David E., N.C., E1838
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1841
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E1830, E1831, E1836
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1837
Schilling, Robert T., Ill., E1830
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1826
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1823
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1819
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E1836
West, Allen B., Fla., E1838
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1820
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E1820

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.