

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. President, with that I yield the floor.

#### U.S. TRADE POLICY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

they now will enforce environmental standards, this same crowd sent a letter to the Jordan Trade Minister saying: We are not enforcing, we are not going to push you, we are not going to push you on dispute resolution to enforce those labor standards.

Today, as a result, Bangladeshi workers enter Jordan—from one of the poorest countries in the world—they have their passports confiscated, and work in some cases up to 20 hours a day without breaks. Then Jordan exports those goods to the United States. There is no enforcement of labor standards, no enforcement of environmental standards. There is simply the continuation of the exploitation of some of the poorest workers in the world in order to reap more profits and backdoor those products into the United States.

If that is the plan, if that is the Bush administration plan—forget what they talk about on labor standards, forget what they promise on environmental standards—if that is the plan for Peru, if that is the plan for Panama, if that is the plan for Colombia, if that is the plan for South Korea, then they will simply not get the support for these trade agreements. They will not get the support from those who talked about fair trade in their campaigns, not from small business owners, not from small manufacturers such as the local tool and die shop in Akron, the local machine shop in Dayton, not from workers across the country who say: We don't want more of the same.

That is what the elections last fall were all about. I believe every single new Democratic Member of the Senate—there are nine of us—every single one of us has talked about fair trade, not free trade. If this administration thinks by simply saying: We are for labor standards, we are for environmental standards, we will put it in a little side letter here, and then a wink and a nod to their friends in the National Association of Manufacturers, a wink and a nod to the large corporations that benefit from slave labor and child labor, simply giving them a wink and a nod, if they think this Senate and the other body are going to pass this kind of legislation, they are wrong. We know our trade policies have failed. As I said, if they bring back this kind of trade agreement for Peru, for Panama, for Colombia, for Korea without labor and environmental standards in the core agreement and without real commitments to enforce those labor and environmental standards, then those trade agreements aren't going to fly here.

We know our trade policies have failed. When I first ran for Congress, our trade deficit in 1992 was \$38 billion. Even in those days, President Bush—the first President Bush—said a \$1 billion trade deficit represented about 13,000 jobs, mostly manufacturing—many manufacturing jobs. So if you had a \$1 billion trade deficit, it meant it was costing your country a net loss of 13,000 jobs. If you had a trade sur-

plus, it was a gain of 13,000 jobs. That was then a \$38 billion trade deficit in 1992. In 2006, our trade deficit was in the vicinity of \$800 billion—\$800 billion. That means the trade deficit has grown by a factor of 20. If it is 13,000 jobs for every \$1 billion trade deficit, you do the math. It is clear this trade policy has failed. It has failed our workers. It has failed our small manufacturers. It has failed our restaurants and our drugstores in those communities that suffer devastating job loss. It has failed our families. It has failed our country.

The current system is not sustainable. Senator DORGAN has said: We want trade, and plenty of it, but under new rules. That means benchmarks. When we pass trade agreements, we have to show how much this has done for America's wages, how much it has done for American job creation, and we want accountability, something we have never brought to the table on these trade agreements. That does not mean trying to pass off more of the same kind of trade policy, packaging it in a different way, speaking of all the platitudes of the administration and that some others in the House and Senate have spoken about, just simply saying it is new and improved.

Now is not the time for more bad trade deals. We need to pause. We need to have a national conversation about a new direction for trade in the 21st century, a conversation that includes everybody.

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

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to express some thoughts about the earlier statement of the Democratic leader, Senator REID, that he was not going to attempt to bring this bill up for a vote this week. I think that is the only right choice that could have been made. He has been talking about bringing it up this week and actually getting a vote on Friday on a bill that we only got the paperwork on Saturday morning at 2 a.m. It hasn't been substituted yet, to my knowledge.

This is a piece of legislation of enormous complexity which has not gone through the proper committee—the Judiciary Committee. It was written by a group of people who claim they have reached an agreement. The agreement is that on both sides, they are saying nobody can offer an amendment that goes to what they consider the core of it because they will all band together and vote against it. So I guess that means if anybody has a different view about how immigration should be han-

dled, the people I really love and respect, whom I affectionately call “masters of the universe,” are just going to all get together and vote no. So I am not sure what the purpose of having votes is. But presumably, the rest of us, now that we have had a chance to read it, will be able to at least nibble around the edges and offer a few amendments that might make it a little better, and I look forward to that opportunity.

I think it is very important that this bill was not rammed through this week and no attempt was made to do that. I think it would have poisoned the atmosphere. It would have been a very bad scene had that occurred. So now we are talking about 2 weeks of debate. There is no doubt in my mind that this Senate could spend a month easily on this bill—maybe more. It is a critically important piece of legislation. It has much impact on our whole economy, our culture, and our rule of law. We could do better with it if we spend time on it. So I hope we are not in a situation where the leadership—the conferee group which has been meeting—is going to lock together and just vote down anything that displeases them or one side or the other says this is important and shouldn't be amended. So I am worried about that. We will see how it goes.

I hope the American people will take the opportunity to study the legislation. It does have some good things in it. It does have provisions in it that are quite superior to the bill I referred to as fatally flawed last year. But the cloture vote we just took was to move to last year's bill, and unless I am mistaken, we have not seen the new bill that is supposed to be substituted. We haven't seen anything other than a draft of the former bill. It has not been put in legislative language, even in the smaller print in the draft version that has been floated since Saturday. It is 326 pages, but in normal bill language, it will turn out to be probably 800, maybe 1,000 pages with each one of the clauses and phrases. Based on our history of dealing with immigration, it has to be read carefully because experts seem to have the ability—some of these lawyers, particularly—to slip in phrases that can have significance far beyond what might appear to be the case when you first read it. So it needs to be studied carefully.

A lot of people wanted to ram this through before the Memorial Day recess.

I am glad Senator REID has abandoned that and will allow the American people the opportunity to have an extra week to look at it.

I thank my colleagues who have worked on the bill. They are good people. They have it in their heads that they want to fix immigration, and it is time for a comprehensive fix of immigration. There are tough decisions to be made. But I get a little bit worried when time after time I hear people say: Well, there is a lot in it I don't like,