

[In millions of dollars]

Current Allocation to Senate Appropriations Committee:	
FY 2006 Budget Authority—General Purpose Discretionary	\$843,020
FY 2006 Outlays—General Purpose Discretionary	916,836
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Mandatory	531,782
FY 2006 Outlays—Mandatory	512,469
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Total	1,374,802
FY 2006 Outlays—Total	1,429,305
Adjustments:	
FY 2006 Budget Authority—General Purpose Discretionary	-309
FY 2006 Outlays—General Purpose Discretionary	-309
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Mandatory	4,300
FY 2006 Outlays—Mandatory	0
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Total	3,991
FY 2006 Outlays—Total	-309
Revised Allocation to Senate Appropriations Committee:	
FY 2006 Budget Authority—General Purpose Discretionary	842,711
FY 2006 Outlays—General Purpose Discretionary	916,527
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Mandatory	536,082
FY 2006 Outlays—Mandatory	512,469
FY 2006 Budget Authority—Total	1,378,793
FY 2006 Outlays—Total	1,428,996

PASSAGE OF U.S.-BAHRAIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, over the past several years the Congress has worked hand-in-hand with the administration to foster greater peace and stability in the Middle East through trade. We have concluded and implemented free trade agreements with Israel, Jordan, and Morocco. We recently concluded negotiations with Oman and negotiations are ongoing with United Arab Emirates. Perhaps soon, we will launch negotiations with our good friend and ally, Egypt.

Yesterday, with the passage of S. 2027, the U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, we took another historic step forward. Once this agreement enters into force, 98 percent of our agricultural exports to Bahrain will enter duty-free and 100 percent of our two-way trade in industrial and consumer products will be duty-free. The agreement sets a new standard on services, with broad commitments by Bahrain to open their service sector to our exports.

Passage of the U.S.-Bahrain FTA will help advance the President's goal of achieving a Middle East Free Trade Area, MEF²A, by 2013. This visionary agenda is a key element in our efforts to help foster economic growth and prosperity in an important region of the world. It also reflects keen appreciation by the Bush administration of the 9/11 Commission Report recommendation that "a comprehensive U.S. strategy to counter terrorism

should include economic policies to encourage development, more open societies, and opportunities for people to improve the lives of their families and to enhance prospects for their children's future."

I am pleased that we are able to take another step toward fulfilling this recommendation with passage of the Bahrain agreement. This would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of many people. I first want to recognize Ambassador Robert Zoellick. As the former U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Zoellick spearheaded our trade agenda, including initiation of negotiations with Bahrain. This year, Ambassador Portman took up the reigns as our U.S. Trade Representative. Ambassador Portman has proven to be an able and effective negotiator who faithfully works with Congress to achieve the best result for America in our trade agreements. Ambassador Portman was assisted by Catherine Novelli, before her departure, as well as her replacement, Ambassador Shaun Donnelly, both serving in their capacity as Assistant U.S. Trade Representatives for Europe and the Mediterranean.

With the passage of this agreement, the Finance Committee continues its tradition of bipartisanship on trade. I appreciate the efforts of my ranking member, Senator MAX BAUCUS, in helping remove any impediments to getting this done. An agreement such as this one also would not have been possible without the professionalism and work ethic of Senator BAUCUS' staff. In this regard, I owe thanks to Russ Sullivan, Democratic staff director, and Bill Dauster, deputy staff director, for their steadfast dedication to the Committee. Brian Pomper, chief international trade counsel to Senator BAUCUS, also deserves special thanks for his efforts as do Shara Aranoff, Demetrios Marantis, Anya Landau, Janis Lazda, and Chelsea Thomas.

I also want to recognize the work of my Finance Committee staff. At the top of the list is Kolan Davis, my chief counsel and staff director. Kolan has been a valuable asset to this committee, lending his counsel and expertise to moving countless bills, including the Bahrain agreement. Everett Eissenstat, chief international trade counsel to the committee, has played an important part in seeing that this agreement is timely implemented. I appreciate his continued dedication to advancing our trade agenda.

Everett manages a strong team of dedicated staff who consistently pull together to achieve our trade agenda. David Johanson, Stephen Schaefer, and Tiffany McCullen Atwell provide valuable support to the team. Their hard work and long hours are much appreciated. I also want to recognize Claudia Bridgeford, international trade policy assistant, and Russell Ugone, who is on detail to my staff from the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection in the Department of Homeland Security.

Both Claudia and Russ have contributed a great deal to the work of this committee.

I would be remiss if I did not take this time to thank Mike Smythers, Special Assistant to the President for Senate Affairs from the White House Office of Legislative Affairs. I also want to thank Matt Niemeyer, Counselor and Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Congressional Affairs. Matt will soon be leaving the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. Throughout his tenure, he has been a valuable ally in passage of much of our trade agenda. I appreciate his hard work and service to the American people.

Matt was assisted by David "Andy" Olson, who provided critical support in moving this agreement. Jonathon Kallmer from the Office of General Counsel at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, also played a key role in working with Congress to ensure faithful implementation of the agreement. I appreciate both of their efforts. Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank Polly Craghill senior counsel in the Senate's Office of Legislative Counsel, for her role in passing this agreement. Polly never falters in her efforts to provide timely technical expertise to this committee and her work is much appreciated.

This is a good day for the United States and Bahrain. I hope President Bush will soon sign this bill and that we will see quick implementation of this historic agreement.

BAHRAIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I oppose this agreement. It is more of the same flawed trade model that has undermined the standards that our firms operate under and has helped ship millions of jobs overseas. From inadequate protections for workers, the environment, and public health and safety, to lax rules of origin, this trade agreement continues the appalling trade policies of the last decade and more.

We should be working to strengthen our ties with Bahrain and forge a trade agreement that is sustainable and that will enhance the welfare of consumers, businesses, and workers in both countries. This agreement will not do that. Tragically, the record of this trade model has been just the opposite.

My own State of Wisconsin has been hit especially hard by this trade policy. Nor have our trading partners fared well under this flawed trade model. Eleven years of NAFTA have lowered living standards in Mexico, both for urban workers and in rural areas. As I have noted before, Professor Riordan Roett of Johns Hopkins has noted that at least 1.5 million Mexican farmers have lost their livelihoods under NAFTA.

And while this agreement with Bahrain may not have the same devastating impact that NAFTA has had

and that CAFTA will have, it is cut from the same cloth as those two trade agreements. Certainly neither the United States nor Bahrain is likely to benefit when the trade agreement's rules of origin provisions invite gaming. As Robert Baugh, executive director of the AFL-CIO, testified before the Senate Finance Committee, the provision permits multinational corporations to manipulate production and purchasing "to ship goods made primarily in third countries through Bahrain for a minimal transformation before entering the U.S. duty free. The rule of origin fails to promote production and employment in the U.S. and Bahrain, and it grants benefits to third-party countries that have provided no reciprocal benefits under the agreement and that are not subject to the agreement's minimal labor and environmental standards."

Mr. President, Wisconsin has paid a heavy price for our trade policy in recent years. Since 2000, Wisconsin has lost nearly 92,000 manufacturing jobs. NAFTA, the GATT, and Most Favored Nation treatment for China have devastated local businesses and punished working families, taking away family-supporting jobs, and offering lower paying jobs, if any, in return. I regret that this trade agreement promises more of the same. Instead of building on this failed model of trade, we should scrap it and establish a new model of trade that is fair to American businesses, workers, and farmers, as well as the small businesses, workers and farmers of our trading partners.

PATRIOT ACT IMPROVEMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the people of Vermont are proud of the important role that Senator PATRICK LEAHY is serving in trying to improve the USA PATRIOT Act.

My colleague from Vermont rightly believes that security and civil liberties need not be mutually exclusive objectives. We can and we should advance both goals. As the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY worked closely with Chairman ARLEN SPECTER in helping to produce a bipartisan bill to renew and improve the USA PATRIOT Act. That bill was unanimously approved both by the Judiciary Committee and by the Senate. Now he is working with Senators of both parties in trying to win further improvements in the proposed conference report on that bill.

Just as he did in 2001, then as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the leader of the Senate's negotiations with the administration in crafting the initial USA PATRIOT Act, Senator LEAHY now, once again, has worked tirelessly to ensure that we do not hastily pass flawed legislation. Back in the fall of 2001, the Bush administration had demanded that Congress pass the PATRIOT Act in 1 week. The Senator from Vermont knew that rushing such an expansive law through Con-

gress was a mistake, and he secured more time, allowing Congress to add crucial checks and balances to the law. In the best tradition of the Senate, Senator PATRICK LEAHY has championed effective law enforcement and the rights and freedoms that we cherish as Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that two recent editorials which have spotlighted these issues and Senator LEAHY'S role be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Bennington Banner, Dec. 9, 2005]

A REAL GREEN MOUNTAIN PATRIOT

Much has been said about what makes someone a patriot. Sadly much of it has come as a result of the response to the terrorists attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on Sept. 11, 2001. What makes that sad is that an outside attack should have—and did for a brief time—brought the country closer together.

That has been fractured by political opportunists who responded to the attacks with legislation that Americans would never have accepted before their confidence was rattled so vehemently.

One such piece of legislation is the provocatively named USA Patriot Act. The Patriot legislation was drafted to give the government a way to fight terrorism. No one would argue that's an important and necessary goal.

But it contains too many provisions that we find unacceptable despite the fact that we remain staunchly anti-terrorist and pro-America. (We're cutting off that argument at the pass. . .)

The scariest provision is one that allows the government to get warrants that would allow them to find out what books someone is reading or checking out of the library.

That's un-American enough in a society that prides itself on the free and open exchange of ideas. What's worse is that we wouldn't know what books or articles are on that list that makes a reader suspect.

To make it scarier, those warrants are requested and granted in secret.

We know that there are armchair generals who are rushing to point out that this is the kind of action needed to fight enemies like terrorists. We remain unconvinced that such secret warrants would make us much different or better than nations that support terrorists.

Nor can we justify giving a tool like this to the federal government under an administration that can't convince its people or the world that it's not engaging in torture. We suspect there will be more Abu Ghraibs before the War on Terror is finished.

So what makes somebody a patriot? How about standing up against faulty legislation even when a nation that's still in fear may support that law? Maybe it's recognizing the lessons of history and trying to protect our country from another shameful incident like the imprisonment of Japanese citizens during World War II?

That's exactly what Sen. Patrick Leahy, the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, is doing by refusing to sign a version of the Patriot Act that would extend these powers for four years.

We're proud that a patriot like that is serving the people of Vermont.

[From USA Today, Dec. 14, 2005]

QUALMS ABOUT ANTI-TERROR LAW UNITE THE LEFT AND RIGHT

Patrick J. Leahy first made his name in politics as a tough-on-crime, attention-grab-

bing county prosecutor in the turbulent late 1960s and early '70s. His law-and-order aggressiveness propelled him to election as the first—and, so far, only—Democrat to represent historically Republican Vermont in the U.S. Senate.

After the 9/11 attacks, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Leahy helped shepherd the questionably named "USA Patriot Act" through Congress. Reassuring a frightened nation, the Patriot Act granted unprecedented powers to law enforcement, some of which are set to expire at the end of this year.

Federal investigators and prosecutors have welcomed the law as providing a clutch of much-needed tools in the war on terrorism. Indeed, much of the act is a good fit for threatening times.

But it's also something else: cover for sweeping invasions of citizens' privacy, secret fishing expeditions into privately held records and muzzling of targets who want to complain about it.

All are convenient for law enforcement. All have already been abused.

This year's rewrite fails to solve these problems and, in fact, would add provisions that have nothing to do with terrorism (see box at right).

Leahy is a useful barometer of just how troubling the latest legislation is.

Today, the former prosecutor is leading a bipartisan coalition in the Senate seeking to block renewal of some of the PATRIOT Act's most controversial provisions until more is done to curb the potential for assaults on privacy and civil liberties. "This much unchecked power doesn't make us any safer," Leahy told us Tuesday. "It makes us less safe. . . . Ultimately, you're secure only if you maintain basic liberties."

Other Senate critics of the bill range the full breadth of the political spectrum, from Idaho Republican LARRY CRAIG to Wisconsin Democrat RUSS FEINGOLD. Their bid to hold up the legislation is a worthy one.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, using the Patriot Act and stretching authority under other laws, government investigators have collected private information on thousands of people who have no apparent connection to international terrorism. Secret sweeps have been made into library records, hotel bookings, car-rental files and other documents. That material is retained, perhaps forever, in government computers. In at least one case, a lawyer's home and office were searched based on false information.

The Bush administration and its allies in Congress have resisted calls for more meaningful protections against invasion of privacy and abuse of civil liberties. While some of the most troubling provisions have been modified in the latest changes, many of the revisions are cosmetic at best.

The pressure is on because portions of the PATRIOT Act, including several of the most troubling provisions, expire Dec. 31, and lawmakers are trying to get home for Christmas.

Leahy and his allies are proposing to extend the law for three months to allow more time to fix what's wrong. That makes sense. Mistakes made in the heat of post-9/11 anxiety shouldn't be compounded and extended based on an artificial deadline.

As Leahy and others have discovered, there's more to patriotism than the label on an antiterrorism law. True patriotism requires not only giving law enforcement the tools it needs, but also adequately protecting citizens against abuse of that power.