Here is an example of what is wrong with Korea. Mr. President, 99 percent of the automobiles in Korea driven on the streets are made in Korea. Is that an accident? Why is that the case? Because that is the way Korea wants it. They don’t want imported vehicles. They want the people of Korea to buy Koreans cars that produce Koreans jobs in the manufacturing marketplace.

Here is what has happened with Korea. Last year, Korea sent us 730,000 Korean cars to be sold in our marketplace. So Korea said: Load all these cars on ships, send them to America, sell them to American consumers and, by the way, while we send you 730,000 Korean cars, we will limit you to 4,200 American cars coming our way.

You say maybe there is not a market for American cars in Korea. Talk to the folks who try to sell Dodge Dakota pickups and learn that story, and then you will learn what happens with respect to American vehicles that are attempted to be sold in Korea.

Now, in the discussion this morning, I read of the celebration at the White House by Members of the House and the White House, making some sort of deal with respect to the U.S. and Peru, Colombia, Chile. They talked about labor standards, which I think is very important. In fact, the only trade agreement that has ever had labor standards is the Jordan agreement. The Clinton administration agreed that the trade agreement with Jordan would have labor standards.

Well, guess what. Last year there were findings of sweatshops operating underneath the umbrella of a free-trade agreement with supposedly strong labor standards is in Jordan. Laborers were brought over from Bangladesh to sweatshops in Jordan, to turn Chinese materials into garments for sale in the U.S. market. The workers were forced to work 10 days, yes, 10 days in sweatshop conditions in a country with whom we have a trade agreement where there are labor standards. These standards mean virtually nothing unless you have enforcement. All of these are just words unless you have enforcement. And this Administration has certainly demonstrated that it has no interest in enforcing labor standards.

The Government of Jordan has taken some steps to try to fix some of these problems. Is that because our U.S. trade officials tried to enforce the labor provisions in the trade agreement? No, it’s because a labor rights group called the National Labor Committee exposed these problems, and because the New York Times wrote a front page story about them. So it’s not the labor standards in the trade agreement that got the Jordan government to start to do the right thing, because legislation never got enforced to enforce those standards. It was the fact that these abuses were independently exposed and held to the light.

These failed trade policies are undermining our country. This is pulling the rug out from under our country. But this is kind of a Rip Van Winkle moment again. We have an announcement of surging trade deficits, and the President has not acknowledged it, the White House sleeps through it. Instead of deciding there is a crisis we ought to deal with, we now see a bunch of people going to the White House and embracing, saying: We have got a new agreement between House leaders and the President. What we are going to proceed on certain trade agreements.

Well, let me say to them there is another voice in this Congress, a voice that will come from the Senate. There are some of us that will insist we stand up for the economic interests of this country.

I am not suggesting we are against trade. That is not the case. But we will insist there will be a new day in trade agreements for our economic interests. That has not been the case to date.

Now, let me finish by going back to the issue of what has happened this week in Wahpeton, North Dakota.

Those workers in Wahpeton, ND, appreciated those jobs; good jobs that paid well with good benefits. I appreciated the company that was there that made those jobs possible. But I do not appreciate the circumstance where they are told they are obsolete, or at least the very plant we are now told is obsolete, or at least the very plant we are now told houses the production that will be moved elsewhere; production that will be moved to Mexico because of lower labor costs.

We did not strive for a century to raise standards in this country just to find them undermined day after day, by 30-cent or 20-cent-an-hour labor in China, or 50-cent-an-hour labor in Mexico. That is not the right approach. It is not an approach that strengthens it is an approach that weakens our country.

We expanded the middle class in this country over a century by lifting people up. I will not go into great detail about it, but I have told this story 100 times about James Fyler, who died of lead poisoning, I guess. He was shot 54 times. That is lead poisoning, I guess. He was shot 54 times. The reason he was shot was because in the early part of the last century, he insisted that people who went into a coal mine to work ought to be told open, be paid a fair wage and expected to be working in a safe coal mine; for that he was killed.

Over a century, so many men and women worked to raise standards, to say: People ought to have the right to organize, they ought to have the right to a living wage, a safe workplace. Over a century we lifted those standards. It did something important to expand the middle class of this country. But this is being undermined by the massive trade deficits we are running, the $836 billion annual deficit we had in 2006, and the nearly $64 billion trade deficit we ran in March 2007.

I hope one day there will be enough of us in the Congress who will say: Stop. Enough. We are not going to put up with it. We are going to insist and demand that our trade agreements represent the best economic interests of our country. Yes, we want to help others. But most importantly, we want to preserve a standard of living in this country that gives us opportunity for the future.

Let me end by saying, again, I believe in trade. I believe in plenty of trade. I believe we can compete and compete successfully, but the rules have to be fair, and those who negotiate trade agreements have to do so with one eye on how it is going to affect this country.

Regrettably, most of the trade negotiations in the last two and a half decades have been incompetent and I think have pulled the rug out from under America’s workers and dumbed down the standards that many have given their lives to create in this country.

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

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk to proceed to call the roll.

Mr. Reid. Mr. 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.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, it is clear—we all agree—that the immigration system is broken and badly in need of a fix. We have 12 million immigrants, some of who live in constant fear. We have employers facing the quandary each day over who they can hire and who they cannot hire, while raids regularly disrupt and even shut down their businesses. Crops can’t be harvested. Produce is dying on the vine because farmers cannot hire enough workers to harvest the crop. Under the current system there are no winners but lots of losers.

Next Tuesday, right after our weekly party conferences, the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on whether to begin debate on the complex and critical challenge of immigration reform. The bill we debate and eventually pass will give us a chance to strengthen border security, put in place an effective and efficient employer verification system, design a new worker program to take the pressure off the border, and provide a path to legal status for 12 million undocumented immigrants the opportunity to come out of the shadows and into the light of day.
Over the past several months, Senators from both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, have spent countless hours negotiating a bipartisan solution to this critical challenge. These Senators have been bargaining in good faith. I believe they are working hard to reach a compromise. I hope they can do that. But if they are not able to reach a new bipartisan agreement, we have an opportunity to move forward on a previous bipartisan piece of legislation. The bill I placed on the calendar last year is the same bill the Senate passed last year overwhelmingly with 23 Republicans voting in favor of the legislation. Last year’s bill was far from perfect. Many of us had misgivings about it—this Senator included—but it is a solid, comprehensive package that will serve as a good start for this year’s very important and vital debate. Several of my colleagues have said we should not move forward at this time; let’s wait.

Over this weekend, there will be negotiations taking place—the rest of this day, Saturday, Sunday, and I hope Monday—to see if a compromise can be reached. If we put this off a week, the same thing would happen. People would be having meetings, but we would grind to a halt at the last minute. There has been ample opportunity for people to work out an arrangement. I have asked publicly and privately that the President be involved. Members have put so much time and effort into working on an immigration bill, they certainly should embrace a motion to start debate.

Those who have threatened a filibuster on the motion to proceed I hope will reconsider the threat and understand how illogical it would be not to allow us to proceed. A bill that passed this body last year with 21 Republicans voting for the legislation now saying they are not going to proceed does not make sense to me.

Let me be clear as I can: By moving this bill, I am trying to make sure negotiations continue. There has been ample time for negotiations to bear fruit. The purpose of this legislation is to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform. I want this Congress to accomplish immigration reform, but we are running out of time to do it. We have set aside the next 2 weeks to do this. After that, we have 4 weeks, and then we have the July 4 recess. After that, and then we are into the August recess. There is no more time to do it. Today is the time. If we don’t do it, starting next Tuesday, there will be no immigration reform this Congress. That would be a real shame.

The House is waiting for us to do this. As everyone knows, the schedule we have is so crowded. This next 2 weeks, in addition to doing immigration reform, we have to send a bill to the President for supplemental appropriations for the ongoing conflict in Iraq, the civil war in Iraq. We want to try to do our budget. We are going to finish WRDA. We have an energy bill we have to do. That is keeping in mind all the procedural hurdles that are always present in the Senate.

A vote to proceed is a vote to open debate, not shut the door on it. If a new agreement is reached, it can be offered as a substitute amendment to this bill on the floor. If the new agreement is not reached, we can legislate the old-fashioned way—taking out what people do not like and putting in new stuff. We can offer amendments to the existing bipartisan bill to make it even better. If a new agreement is not reached, we can legislate the old-fashioned way—taking out what people do not like and putting in new stuff. We can offer amendments to the existing bipartisan bill to make it even better.

The next 2 weeks are critical. Either path leads to progress that is long overdue.

I 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. REID. Mr. 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to H.R. 1495 now be agreed to; that on Monday, May 14, at 3 p.m., the Senate begin consideration of the measure and the majority manager, Senator Boxer, then be recognized to offer an amendment.

If I could withhold that, Mr. President, and note 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to H.R. 1495 be agreed to; that on Monday, May 14, the Senate begin consideration of the measure and the majority manager, Senator Boxer, then be recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, may turn to the provision of rule XXII, the majoritarian provision of the Senate, and note the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the prior statement before was to just alert those Senators who had called asking that we put the vote over that we are going to do that, and we will not vote on cloture on the immigration bill on Tuesday afternoon. We will be able to work all day on Monday and Tuesday on WRDA. Who knows, we may get lucky and be able to complete most of the work or all of the work on that.

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, let me just say with regard to the immigration bill, the only chance to get a bill is on a bipartisan basis. I agree with the decision of the majority leader to accept the recommendation of those who have been involved in that discussion, to give us the maximum opportunity to piece back together the bipartisan agreement that we thought we almost had a week or so ago on this most important legislation.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to H.R. 1495 be agreed to; that on Monday, May 14, the Senate begin consideration of that measure, and that the manager of that bill, Senator Boxer, be recognized to offer an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR MEASURE TO BE PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate