

from accomplishing because the minority will not let us.

First of all, that is not the case because, with respect to oversight hearings—which was the subject I raised and my colleague from Illinois raised this morning, oversight hearings—nobody is obstructing anybody from holding oversight hearings. That is the responsibility of the committees and the chairmen of the committees, to hold oversight hearings.

I have held some in the Democratic Policy Committee because the regular committees won't hold them, but let me describe a few of the things I have found in the hearings I have held—some big, some small, all of them, in my judgment, cheating American taxpayers: Contractors in Iraq paying \$45 for a case of Coca-Cola; contractors in Iraq paying \$7,500 for a 1-month lease on an SUV; contractors in Iraq who are buying towels for the troops, and instead of buying the hand towels for our troops to use that would cost a relatively small amount of money, they triple the amount that the taxpayers pay for these hand towels for our soldiers because they want the company name on them, Kellogg Brown and Root, embroidered on the towels. So they triple the cost of the towels.

Henry Bunting came and testified about that. He said he was the purchaser. They said: Purchase the towels with the embroidered name of our company on it. He said it costs more. They said: Don't bother about that; it doesn't matter. It is a cost-plus contract. The taxpayer pays for it.

The list of abuses is endless. At any point along the way did anybody say we ought to look into this, issue subpoenas? No, no; dead silence.

Twenty-five tons, 50,000 pounds, of nails are laying in the sands of Iraq because the contractor ordered the wrong size. What did they do? Dumped them out. It doesn't matter, the taxpayers are paying for all of that.

There were \$85,000 new trucks left to be torched, put on fire on the side of the road because they had a flat tire and they did not have a tool to fix them. The contractor says: That is not a problem. The taxpayers will pay for that.

Serving food to the soldiers? The contractor that gets the contract to provide food for the soldiers is providing food that has out-of-date stamps on the food. It doesn't matter. Serve it to the soldiers anyway.

Yesterday, a woman came forward who worked in Iraq, as I mentioned earlier today, Mrs. McBride. She said they were charging the Government five times the amount of money, five times the billings of the number of soldiers who were using the recreational facilities. They were double counting and triple counting and, in some cases, submitting forms with five times the number of people. Why? To inflate the cost, to extract money from the American taxpayer.

All of this is going on and nobody seems to care. Oversight hearings? You

show me where the oversight hearings have been held. Show me. They have not been held because nobody wants to embarrass anybody around here. We have one-party rule—in the White House, House, Senate. Nobody wants to embarrass anybody.

You have sole-source, no-bid contracts given at the Pentagon. The top civilian official, the top person in the Pentagon who rose to the top civilian level in the Pentagon as a contracting officer, who everyone said is one of the finest contracting officers in the Pentagon, do you know what she said? She said: The awarding of these sole-source, no-bid contracts to Halliburton is the most substantial abuse that I have seen in my service in the public arena.

What happened to her? Nobody cares. Under the reconstruction program, I am told, we, the American taxpayers, spent \$18 billion for reconstruction for Iraq. We ordered an air conditioner for a room in Iraq, and then it went to a contractor, a subcontractor, another subcontractor, and pretty soon the American taxpayer paid for air conditioners and that room now has a ceiling fan—yes, a ceiling fan. It is just unbelievable what is going on. Again, nobody seems to care.

I mentioned before that in the 1940s, Harry Truman was a Senator in this Chamber, and he put together the Truman Committee. It was bipartisan. They went after waste, fraud, and abuse. They wouldn't tolerate it. I am sure Franklin Delano Roosevelt was furious that a Congress of his own party nipping at his heels on these issues. It didn't matter. Harry Truman, Republicans and Democrats together, went after it.

I proposed three or four times in the Senate to have votes to establish a select committee to do just that, but, sorry, no dice. Nobody wants anything to do with this issue.

I will come to the floor and give a list of what we have discovered in 10 hearings and see if anybody stands up to say: Yes, that makes sense; we support all that. None of this makes sense. It cries out, it begs for leadership. This undermines American soldiers and it cheats American taxpayers and it is unbelievable what is going on and nobody seems to care very much. So when I have the opportunity to hear someone say: We haven't held oversight hearings because we have been obstructed—nonsense. Or: We have held oversight hearings—nonsense again. Neither excuse washes. Nobody is minding the store. Nobody is watching the till.

The fact is, American taxpayers are taking a bath—and it is not just the taxpayers. It is water connected to the Euphrates River taking water to the military installations in Iraq. And, yes, the top American in the company, Halliburton, who is responsible for moving nonpotable water to the soldiers in the military installations in Iraq, is the American who wrote the report. I have seen the report. What he said was the

nonpotable water that is provided to the soldiers for the purpose of showering and brushing their teeth and washing their hands and doing the kinds of things they do was more contaminated than raw water coming from the Euphrates River. And their internal report says: This was a near miss. This was a near miss. It could have caused death or mass sickness.

This event, which was a near miss, could have caused death or massive illness, it has been denied that it even happened by the company. The Pentagon doesn't seem to be very interested. The company denies it happened, despite the fact that we have it in writing from the person who was in charge and who still works for the company. It is unbelievable.

I didn't come to talk about that, but when I hear people say there has been aggressive oversight, or any oversight in this Congress—it is a sham. It is not the case.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

UNITED STATES-OMAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5684, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5684) to implement the United States-Oman free trade agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes divided as follows: Mr. DORGAN, 10 minutes; Mr. CONRAD, 10 minutes; the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, 10 minutes, equally divided.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I believe I had reserved 1 hour of which I had used 30 minutes previously. The vote is at noon, so I intend to speak for the other 30 minutes, if that is appropriate?

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me talk about the Oman Free Trade Agreement. There are nine additional free-trade agreements being negotiated right now, nine of them. This past week there was an announcement that the monthly trade deficit is now \$68 billion a month; a \$68 billion monthly trade deficit. If ever there was a definition of failure, this is it.

So here is what we have: We have the good old boys negotiating trade agreements—Republicans and Democrats. They happen to be Republicans now because they are in power, but it has gone on for some long while. Here is what you see: Trade deficits, which are

represented by a mountain of red ink—or a deep valley of red ink in the case of this chart—the highest trade deficit in history, an unbelievable trade deficit. No country has ever had these kinds of deficits. They will have significant consequences for our country.

These deficits must be paid for with a lower standard of living in our country. Every single day, we send \$2 billion out to foreign countries because we import \$2 billion more than we export. That means every single day we are selling \$2 billion of this country. We are selling America piece by piece.

Does this give anybody pause? Is anybody concerned? No. You know what we need to do? Let's do another trade agreement. We have done trade agreements here, at this point on the chart, we have done them here, we have done them here, and every single incompetent trade agreement this country signs up for ends up dramatically increasing our Federal deficits. We are choking on them, pulling the rug out from under American workers, shipping more American jobs overseas. And what is the response of this Congress? You know, let's do more of it. Why? Because we live in a global economy, and this is free trade.

I once knew, in my little home, a three-legged blind dog with fleas that they used to call Lucky. Labels didn't mean much to me—didn't mean much to that dog either, as a matter of fact. "Free trade," that is the label on this nonsense. It is not free and it certainly is not fair.

This country has become Uncle Sucker on trade agreements. We have signed up to almost anything. Most of our trade is foreign policy and soft-headed foreign policy at that. I am in favor of trade. I want to expand trade—the more the better, but I demand it be fair to this country. When it is not fair, I think we ought to insist. It doesn't matter to me whether it is Oman or China or Europe or Japan or Korea or Mexico or Canada, I think we ought to say it is a new day. And the way we are going to trade with you is with circumstances that are fair to our country, to our workers, and to our country's interests.

Trade ought to be mutually beneficial. When we sign up to trade with somebody, it ought to be mutually beneficial.

Let me tell you what is coming next year. Next year everyone in this country will have an opportunity to start buying Chinese cars because China has announced that they intend to start shipping Chinese automobiles to the U.S. marketplace. We have a trade agreement with China about cars. Let me describe what it is.

It says: China, when you ship a car to the United States—it will happen starting next year—we are going to hit you with a 2.5-percent tariff, a tiny little tariff, a 2.5-percent tariff you are going to have to pay on the cars you ship into our marketplace. And, by the way, any American cars that we send

to China next year, we agree we will pay a 25-percent tariff.

So a country with whom we have a \$2.5 billion trade deficit, we signed up, on bilateral automobile trade, that they should be able to charge a tariff 10 times higher on automobiles when we try to sell a car in their country. That is unbelievably incompetent. That is what our country has agreed to.

That is just one little piece. Most people wouldn't know about dealing with bilateral automobile trade. It affects American jobs. It pulls the rug out from under our workers. That is just one. There are dozens and dozens of similar examples.

Since I am speaking about automobiles, let me describe the situation with Korea. South Korea sent us over 700,000 cars last year. I will show you the chart. South Korea sent 730,000 cars last year into our marketplace. Do you know how many American cars we sold in South Korea? We sold them just 4,251 cars. Is it because they don't want American cars? No. It's because the Koreans largely closed their market to our product even as we opened our markets with theirs. Do we do anything about it? No. We sit around twiddling our thumbs—sucking our thumbs in some cases—and lament that this is going on. It is an unbelievable failure.

Ninety-nine percent of the cars driven on the streets of South Korea are Korean-made cars. Why is that the case? That is exactly the way they want it, and that is the way it will stay because our country doesn't seem to care. We sign up to all of these trade agreements. In fact, we are doing a new agreement with Korea now. That is one of the nine. Does anyone really care about fair trade?

So in this context, let me talk about Oman now.

There are about 400 organizations, ranging from the League of Rural Voters to the National Farmers Union to the Sierra Club to the AFL-CIO, about 400 organizations have come out in opposition to this trade agreement. What is the reason for that? Let me describe it with a letter which many of them signed which says the following:

Like NAFTA and CAFTA, OFTA [the Oman Free Trade Agreement]—fails to include any meaningful labor and environmental protections. The lack of effective labor provisions in OFTA is particularly significant in light of the recent revelations of massive labor abuses in Jordan—a Nation with which the United States has a free trade agreement. These violations involve widespread human trafficking, 20-hour workdays and widespread failure to pay back wages. More troubling is the fact the Oman FTA contains weaker labor provisions than the Jordan FTA.

Let me describe what is going on in Jordan. This is actually a New York Times piece. I have actually spoken to the people who went to Jordan and saw these sweatshops.

Propelled by a free trade agreement with the United States, apparel manufacturing is booming in Jordan, its exports to America soaring twenty-fold in the last 5 years.

But some foreign workers in Jordanian factories that produce garments for Target, Wal-Mart and other American retailers are complaining of dismal working conditions—20-hour days, of not being paid for months, and of being hit by supervisors and jailed when they complained.

Here is what happens in Jordan. They fly in so-called guest workers from Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, put them in a corner of Jordan in sweatshops, in factories with closed doors, and then they fly in Chinese textiles, and in sweatshop conditions, with imported workers from Bangladesh and imported textiles from China, they produce products which they ship to the United States.

Let me describe some of the conditions. Some of these workers imported from Bangladesh were promised \$120 a month but in some cases were hardly paid at all. One worker was paid \$50 for 5 months of work. Forty-hour shifts were common. Let me say that again. Forty-hour shifts—not weeks—were common. Forty-hour shifts in those sweatshops apparently replaced the 40-hour workweek. There were frequent beatings of any workers who complained.

What is the relevance of all this to an Oman Free Trade Agreement? First of all, the country of Oman has about 3 million people. Of that rather small population, over one-half million are actually foreign guest workers. The majority of Oman workers involved in manufacturing and construction are not from Oman. The majority of the workers in Oman are foreigners brought in from Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and other very poor Asian countries, under labor contracts to work in construction and in factories.

Here is what our own country's State Department's 2004 Report on Human Rights said about Oman. We are doing a trade agreement now with Oman. Our own State Department reports that:

The law prohibits forced or compulsory labor, including children; however, there were reports that such practices occurred. The government did not investigate or enforce the law effectively. Foreign workers at times were placed in situations amounting to forced labor.

Our own State Department talks about forced labor in Oman. It doesn't matter to the people who put this agreement together. They could care less. They do not intend to put in strong labor provisions with respect to this trade agreement.

There are no labor unions in Oman that would be protective of workers or negotiate for workers. In 2003, the Sultan of Oman issued a Sultanial decree which categorically denies workers the right to organize and join unions of their choosing. In some circumstances, workers in Oman can join "representative committees," but those committees, just as is the case in China—China is now advertising a lot of unions—those committees are not independent of the employers or of the Government. China now has unions that

are part of the Communist government, and the Sultan of Oman allows representatives of workers to get together but not independent of employers or the Government.

By the way, the Sultan of Oman has written to our U.S. Trade Ambassador and promised that he will improve Oman's labor laws in October of this year. That would be next month. How do you calculate that? That would be after the U.S. Congress votes, wouldn't it? They are going to improve their labor laws after we have voted. Yes, I guess I have heard that before. Maybe this country ought to be suggesting that some of these things be improved before they negotiate free-trade agreements.

Under fast-track rules, the Congress, in its own lack of wisdom, said: We would like to put ourselves in a straightjacket. We can negotiate agreements and treaties on nuclear arms without fast track, but on trade agreements, we must negotiate in a way that says when we come back to the Congress, we are prohibited from offering amendments. So the Congress actually votes to put itself into a straightjacket and prohibit any amendments. I don't vote for that. I lead the fight against it because I think it is fundamentally undemocratic. But the Congress has already done that. That is why there will be no amendments to the Oman Free Trade Agreement.

Let me describe one other provision in the Oman agreement, and it has been in a couple of other agreements as well.

Earlier this year, there was a big fight in this country about Dubai Ports World, which is a company owned by the United Arab Emirates, taking over major seaports in this country—six major U.S. seaports—New York, New Jersey, Baltimore, New Orleans, and Miami—taken over to be managed by a company owned by the United Arab Emirates. There was a huge blowup as a result of that, a massive firestorm of protest. The President had already approved it, said: It is fine; don't worry about it; we think American ports can be managed by the United Arab Emirates or the company it owns, Dubai Ports World. I didn't think so, but the President said it is fine.

Brushing aside suggestions from Republicans and Democrats alike, President Bush endorsed the taking over of shipping operations at six major seaports by a state-owned business in the United Arab Emirates. He pledged to veto any bill Congress might approve to block that amendment. But still, in all, there was such a storm of protest by the American people saying: With all of the terrorist threats, maybe we ought to manage our own seaports; there was such a storm of protest that Dubai Ports World announced they had reached an agreement and they decided they would sell or negotiate to sell their interests in managing our ports.

Michael Chertoff, Homeland Security Secretary, said during that period that

the proposed takeover of terminal operations at five U.S. ports by a Dubai company would give U.S. law enforcement a better handle on security at U.S. terminal operations. Let me talk about terminally bad judgment here. Here is the guy in charge of Homeland Security who says that allowing foreign interests to take over the management of America's ports will fully actually provide better security for our country. You talk about unbelievably bad judgment. Everybody has a right to be wrong, including the head of Homeland Security. Let's just hope that when he is wrong, it doesn't result in another terrorist attack on this country.

Here is what is in the Oman Free Trade Agreement, a provision that says that the U.S. government cannot block Oman's acquisition of the following activities:

Landside aspects of port activities, including operation and maintenance of docks, loading and unloading of vessels directly to or from land, marine, cargo handling operations and maintenance at piers.

That is the managing of a port. That provision says that we can't block Oman from acquiring or an Oman company from acquiring—that is in the trade agreement. This agreement says we will not be able to block, without abrogating this trade agreement, a company from Oman from operating America's seaports. This alone should defeat this trade agreement. It will not because there are 60 or 65 Members of this body who will vote for any trade agreement, almost. This provision alone should defeat this trade agreement.

Let me finish by talking about the consequences of this senseless trade policy on jobs in this country. I know it is tiresome to some of my colleagues to keep hearing about this, but I believe it is worthy to describe where we are headed in textiles, manufacturing, high tech, and other areas.

You will remember the television commercials advertising Fruit of the Loom underwear. It ran a lot of commercials talking about how wonderful Fruit of the Loom underwear would be for each of us. They paid someone to dress as green grapes and someone to dress as red grapes. I guess that is the little logo on Fruit of the Loom underwear. They danced, the green and red grapes danced and sang and played music and various things. I don't know who would actually accept money to dance as grapes, but they found actors to dance as grapes, and they danced right out of this country. They don't make one pair of Fruit of the Loom underwear in this country anymore, not one.

If you want Mexican food, go to the grocery store and buy Fig Newton cookies. They left this country. They went to Monterrey, Mexico.

Every Member of this Senate, I will bet, once had a Radio Flyer, a little red wagon. It was made in America for 110 years. You can still buy them here, but

they are not made here anymore; they left for China—all made in China, the little red wagon, the Radio Flyer.

If you wear Tony Lama cowboy boots, you might be wearing Chinese shoes. I have told this story until everyone is tired of it. Americans used to make them, but they lost their jobs. When they were fired, the last job they had was to take the "American made" decals off existing inventory. They had an hourly job plus benefits. The jobs left our country and went to China.

They still sell these Huffy bicycles in this country, but they are made for 33 cents an hour by people working 7 or 8 days a week, 14 hours a day. The last thing those American workers did on their last day of work and leaving the parking lot was to leave a pair of empty shoes in the parking lot. They left a pair of empty shoes in their parking space. It was a way for workers to say to the company: You can ship our jobs to China, but you are not going to fill our shoes.

It goes on and on and on—yes, with product after product, textiles and manufacturing, high tech. One-half of the Fortune 500 are now doing software development offshore, overseas. It is pretty unbelievable.

In all of this, we give a tax cut, tax break. We not only manage bad trade agreements to make it easy to ship jobs overseas, we say: If you do that, we will give you a big fat tax cut. Four times I have tried to eliminate that in the Senate, and four times the Chamber of Commerce and others who support that tax cut rounded up enough votes in the Senate to preserve it. I find that appalling. Nonetheless, that is what is happening with trade.

Ultimately, this country will not long remain a world economic power if it does not retain a world-class manufacturing base. This country will not continue to expand the middle-class workers if it continues to incentivize the shipment of jobs overseas. The construct of many big companies of saying: We want to produce where it is cheap—China, Indonesia, Bangladesh; we want to sell in the established marketplace of Los Angeles, Chicago, Denver, Fargo, Pittsburgh, and run the income through the Cayman Islands to avoid paying taxes—will undermine the economic interests of this country.

This country made great progress by expanding the middle class with good jobs that paid well. We debate a lot of things in this Senate, but there is nothing we debate with respect to a social program that is more important than a good job that pays well. We would do well to remember that as we take a look at bad trade agreements and prepare ourselves, once again, as the majority of this Chamber—but not me—votes yes in favor of trade agreements which pull the rug out from under workers, pull the rug out from under farmers, and undermine the long-term economic interests of this country.

We have the same chorus of a tired song that is being sung today in the

Senate about the virtues of another bad trade agreement. This one was with a very small country of 3 million people. I have never been to Oman. I don't know much about Oman. I am not opposed to the country of Oman in any way. I am interested in standing up for the economic interests of this country. This is one more chapter in a book of failures on international trade. This country, this Senate, has a responsibility, finally, to start getting it right.

I will vote against the trade agreement with Oman and hope that, even as this trade agreement will likely pass, as other trade agreements have, an agreement that undermines our country's economic interests, in the next nine trade agreements, all of which are being negotiated now, we will finally see some negotiations that stand up for our interests.

It is long past the time, when we have a \$68 billion-a-month deficit and nearly \$800 billion-a-year trade deficit, it is long past the time to ask the questions: What is wrong? How do we make it right? What is not working? How do we fix it?

This Congress, this administration, seems content, as has been the case now for the last dozen years, in snoring through all of this, saying it will be handled by someone else, sometime later, pretending somehow the consequences do not matter.

The consequences do matter. There are significant consequences.

One can make a case when the Budget is debated here that whatever the budget deficit is, it is money we owe to ourselves. One can make that case. Economists make that case. It is not a case I make, but it is money we owe to ourselves. We cannot make that case with a trade deficit. That is money we owe to others. Over one-half of our trade deficit is now held by the Japanese and the Chinese, which is used to buy American property, American stocks, bonds, to buy part of this country—drip, drip, drip, every day, \$2 billion a day.

I will vote against this trade agreement and hope the next trade agreement that comes to the Senate will be an agreement that fixes previous problems rather than negotiates new agreements. The problems in the previous agreements are legend: NAFTA, CAFTA, United States-Canada. It is absolutely legend, the problems that exist, and not one of them has been fixed. All of them continue to exist. We turn a blind eye to all them as we negotiate new agreements. That disservices this country's economic interests.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, two-and-a-half months ago, the Senate passed the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. We did so because we expected that this agreement will benefit our economy. That is still true. And we should pass it again today.

Under the agreement, virtually all American merchandise exports will

enter Oman duty free. Oman will eliminate most of its duties right away. And Oman will liberalize the remainder of its duties within 10 years. This agreement gives free access to the growing Omani market to American industrial equipment, medical devices, frozen beef, and snack foods.

Oman has also agreed to go beyond its multilateral commitments to provide greater American access to its services markets. It has committed to protect intellectual property. It has committed to combat corruption and bribery. And it has implemented reforms of its labor laws to address American concerns.

I support this trade agreement on its merits. It is a good agreement. And it will strengthen our ties with a valuable partner in the Middle East. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Some may wonder why a small agreement like this has generated any controversy. In part, that is due to the process by which this agreement came before Congress.

The Finance Committee unanimously adopted an amendment to the Oman implementing legislation. Then the administration rejected that amendment outright. This disregard for the constitutional authority of Congress over international trade only weakens support for the administration's trade policy.

But more broadly, the controversy over Oman reflects more general frustration with trade agreements. In Congress, there is deep frustration with the way that the administration has negotiated these agreements. And there is frustration with the way that the administration has handled important issues like labor and the environment.

Americans are concerned about job losses. Americans associate globalization with threats to their jobs. And Americans are concerned that trade agreements might erode conditions in the workplace.

These issues will come to the fore as we approach the expiration of Trade Promotion Authority in the middle of next year. In the wake of the controversy surrounding Oman and other trade agreements, it is high time that we take a hard look at American trade policy. It is high time that we ask ourselves how we can make it work better.

For starters, we have to refocus our trade policy. We have to make sure that it helps American workers and businesses meet the competitive challenges that they face in the global marketplace. We have to rethink the types of trade initiatives that we pursue in the future. We have to build grassroots support for trade. And we have to pay far greater attention to domestic initiatives to increase our savings, reduce our trade deficit, improve education, and help the workers whom trade leaves behind.

I look forward to that debate. I look forward to laying the foundation for a broader consensus on trade. And I look

forward to the day when we can once again join together on the trade agreements of the future.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I oppose this deeply flawed trade agreement. When the Senate passed its version of this legislation a few months ago, I noted that one group had said that this trade agreement is as bad as CAFTA, except where it is worse.

The Oman trade agreement is the latest in a series of agreements that have been based on the failed NAFTA-CAFTA model of trade that has shipped thousands of businesses and millions of jobs overseas, devastating communities across our country. The record of that model of trade is crystal clear. During the post-NAFTA era, our trade deficit has exploded from \$98 billion in 1994 to \$805 billion in 2005. And yet, once again we are debating more of the same.

As I noted in June, the Oman Free Trade Agreement is stamped from the NAFTA-CAFTA cookie cutter. It provides no real enforcement for the labor or environmental provisions. And even the most modest efforts to address the deficiencies of the NAFTA-CAFTA model were rejected by the White House. Most notably, an attempt by the Senate Finance Committee to deny trade benefits for products made with slave labor, approved unanimously by the Committee on an 18-to-0 vote, was rejected by the administration, which submitted this agreement without that reasonable protection.

You don't have to be a trade expert to know that our trade policy is alarmingly bad. When even the most reasonable addition is proposed by the Finance Committee to deny preferential benefits for products made by slaves, the administration refuses to include it.

Mr. President, any consultative role Congress was to have as part of the fast-track process has been shown to be meaningless. I very much hope my colleagues will remember this when we consider legislation to renew fast-track implementing authority. Until then, we should reject this and similarly flawed trade agreements.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to use my 10 minutes that has been allocated to me on the Oman Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5684, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. The United

States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will benefit U.S. farmers, workers, and businesses. It will lead to economic growth and enhance the predictability of the rule of law in Oman, a reliable ally of the United States in the Middle East.

The United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will also serve as a model for other free-trade agreements in the Middle East.

In this way, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will contribute to the formation of a Middle East free trade area, a development that would provide major economic and political benefits for the United States.

Let me begin by discussing the economic gains that this agreement will bring to the United States. On the day that the agreement goes into effect, Oman will no longer impose any tariffs on U.S.-produced consumer and industrial products. The agreement will also benefit U.S. farmers as some 87 percent Oman's tariff lines will go to zero for U.S. agricultural products on day one of the agreement. Oman's remaining tariffs on U.S. farm products will be phased out over 10 years.

In addition, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will result in substantial improvements in market access for U.S. service providers and new protections for U.S. investors.

Given the benefits that it will provide to the United States, the agreement has been endorsed by groups as varied as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Chemistry Council, the Association of Equipment Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, and the United States-Middle East Free Trade Coalition, an entity consisting of over 110 U.S. companies and associations supporting trade expansion in the Middle East.

The United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will result in new market opportunities for farmers, workers, and businesses throughout the United States, including those in Iowa.

For example, the Midamar Corporation—a small business located in Cedar Rapids, IA, that specializes in halal foods—anticipates that the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will lead to new sales of Iowa-produced foods in Oman. Profit margins in the food sector are very low, and Oman's current average applied tariff of 5 percent on many of Midamar's products cuts into the company's profits.

With Oman's tariffs on many of Midamar's products going to zero on day one of the agreement, Midamar will have significantly improved access to the Omani market immediately upon implementation of the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

At least two other Iowa businesses expect to benefit from the free-trade agreement. The HNI Corporation of Muscatine is the second largest manufacturer of office furniture in North America, and HNI is specifically targeting the fast-growing market of the Middle East. HNI anticipates that the

agreement will provide improved opportunities for it to sell its products in Oman.

Likewise, Lennox—which manufactures residential heating and cooling products in Marshalltown—predicts that it will gain from the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. Thus, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement could have a direct impact on Iowans in Cedar Rapids, Muscatine, and Marshalltown. This agreement will benefit people in other States as well.

I am confident that the Oman Free Trade Agreement will ultimately lead to new market access opportunities for American products in yet more Middle Eastern countries. President Bush is advocating the development of a United States-Middle East free trade area by 2013, and the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement is another building block toward the accomplishment of this goal.

The United States has already implemented free-trade agreements with four other countries in the Middle East—Bahrain, Israel, Jordan, and Morocco.

A completed United States-Middle East free trade area would result in significantly improved market access for U.S. farm, consumer, and industrial products in a region of the world populated by 350 million people that is growing quickly.

Such an arrangement would also benefit people throughout the Arab world by providing needed economic reforms. So a United States-Middle East free trade area is in the best interests of the people of the Middle East, and it would advance American interests as well.

In addition to providing new economic opportunities for the United States, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will contribute to the security of our country. Oman is a consistent ally of the United States in an unstable part of the world. Given that the United States is currently engaged militarily in two countries in the region, now is a particularly appropriate time for us to further cement our close ties with Oman.

By improving economic conditions in Oman, I am convinced that the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement will contribute to the stability of that country. Such stability will help solidify Oman's position as a moderate Arab country and a friend of the United States.

The United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement is a strong agreement. It will provide economic benefits for the United States. It will also benefit Oman, a consistent ally of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5684, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

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

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

Under the previous order, the question is on the third reading of the bill. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. SUNUNU. 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) would each vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Enzi	Murray
Allard	Frist	Nelson (FL)
Allen	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Grassley	Obama
Bennett	Gregg	Pryor
Bond	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Salazar
Bunning	Hutchison	Santorum
Burns	Inhofe	Sessions
Cantwell	Isakson	Shelby
Chafee	Jeffords	Smith
Chambliss	Kerry	Specter
Clinton	Kyl	Stevens
Cochran	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lieberman	Talent
Craig	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	Lugar	Thune
DeMint	Martinez	Vitter
DeWine	McCain	Voivovich
Domenici	McConnell	Warner
Ensign	Murkowski	

NAYS—32

Biden	Dole	Lincoln
Bingaman	Dorgan	Mikulski
Boxer	Durbin	Reed
Burr	Feingold	Reid
Byrd	Feinstein	Rockefeller
Carper	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coburn	Johnson	Schumer
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Conrad	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Dayton	Leahy	Wyden
Dodd	Levin	

NOT VOTING—6

Akaka	Coleman	Kennedy
Bayh	Harkin	Menendez

The bill (H.R. 5684) was passed.

CHANGE OF VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on rollcall No. 250, I voted "yea"; it was my intention to vote "nay". I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to change my vote since it will not change the outcome.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ALICE S. FISHER TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alice S. Fisher, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of a person from my hometown of Louisville, KY, Alice S. Fisher, who has been nominated to be Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division at the Department of Justice.

As I remarked at her confirmation hearing last year, Ms. Fisher is a battle-tested veteran of the war on terror. For the last year, she has again been on the front lines of that struggle.

She has, really, an outstanding and impressive record. She first joined the Justice Department in July of 2001 as a Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division. She was placed in charge of its counterterrorism efforts. Just 2 months later came September 11.

After that horrific day, our Government responded forcefully and quickly. Ms. Fisher's role was absolutely vital to that fight. She was responsible for coordinating all matters related to September 11 investigations and prosecutions. In addition, she headed up the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act.

As a Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Ms. Fisher also headed up the De-

partment's efforts to combat corporate fraud just when the collapse of Enron and other corporate scandals were front-page news. She also helped draft the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and worked closely with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In July of 2003, Ms. Fisher left the Department to become a partner at Latham and Watkins, where she concentrated on litigation and white-collar crime.

Last spring, Alice Fisher again answered the call to join her country by rejoining the front lines on the war against terror when the President nominated her to head the Criminal Division.

As I mentioned earlier, the Criminal Division has many important responsibilities, among them national security prosecutions, both counterterrorism and counterintelligence, combating gang violence and organized crime, prosecuting corporate fraud and identity theft, going after public corruption and protecting kids from child pornography.

For the last year Ms. Fisher has impressively led the Department in all facets of its operations while serving as a recess appointment. In this capacity, she has further demonstrated her expertise, determination and integrity. Alice Fisher is a proven leader.

Under her tenure, the counterterrorism section has convicted numerous terrorists, including Zacarias Moussaoui, the 20th September 11 hijacker. She created a new gang squad of experienced prosecutors to combat national and international gangs such as MS-13. She supervised the Enron task force resulting in the convictions of top executives Ken Lay and Jeffrey Skilling. She heads the Katrina Fraud Task Force which combats all fraud and corruption resulting from this national disaster. As of the end of July, the task force has charged 371 defendants. Under her leadership the Public Integrity Section has prosecuted major public corruption cases.

In addition, since the beginning of her tenure, the Department has aggressively prosecuted crimes against children. It is now coordinating 18 national child pornography operations.

Ms. Fisher was born and raised in my hometown of Louisville, KY, and is part of a close-knit family. Her father ran a chemical plant. Her mother worked the night shift as a nurse. She still has a lot of family back home in Louisville.

She earned her B.A. degree from Vanderbilt University and her law degree from Catholic University. Her husband, Clint, also serves our Nation as the Director of Aviation Policy for TSA. Last, but certainly not least, she is the mother of two boys, Matthew, age nine, and Luke, age five.

In a relatively short time, Alice Fisher has accomplished a great deal. She served her country after the September 11 attacks. She rose to become a partner in one of America's most pres-

tigious law firms, and she then chose to forego a more lucrative career in private practice to come back in and serve her country again.

Alice Fisher knows that every day she works on behalf of her country she is working to build a stronger and safer America for her two children and for all of ours. Thanks to her, America is a safer place than it was on September 11, 2001.

A man who held the job for which Ms. Fisher has been nominated is her old boss, Michael Chertoff, a pretty good lawyer in his own right. Alice earned praise when he called her "one of the best lawyers I've seen in my entire career."

America needs Alice Fisher to be confirmed as the next Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division. I look forward to her confirmation. She is a wonderful person, an accomplished lawyer, and a Kentuckian of whom all America can be proud.

She has support from a number of groups I will make reference to, including the support of the Fraternal Order of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association and the National District Attorneys Association. I ask unanimous consent those letters of endorsement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DISTRICT
ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, August 17, 2006.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER AND SENATOR LEAHY: I want to most strongly support the nomination of Alice Fisher as the Assistant Deputy Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Criminal Division and urge her speedy confirmation.

Ms. Fisher served her country well as the Deputy Assistant General in the Criminal Division during a unique and tragic time in this nation's history. During the period following September 11, 2001, Ms. Fisher was responsible for managing the Counter-Terrorism Section and worked on the development of policy issues on criminal law enforcement and national security.

Since her appointment as Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division she has been responsible for the Department of Justice's response to Hurricane Katrina and the aftermath of widespread fraud; the development of a strategic plan to address the burgeoning identity theft problem that confronts this nation; child sexual exploitation issues; corporate fraud; and public corruption issues.

Prior to Ms. Fisher's career in the Department of Justice she also served Congress in her capacity as Deputy Special Counsel to the United States Senate Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development and Related Matters.

Given Ms. Fisher's experience in both the legislative and executive branches of government and her exhibited level of commitment to the Department of Justice I can think of no one who would bring more ability to this position than she would.