

only after Jay Bybee was confirmed to a lifetime appointment to the Ninth Circuit that we learned of his involvement with the infamous Bybee memo seeking to justify torture and degrading treatment. I had asked him what he had worked on while head of the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel, but he had refused to respond. This former Defense Department and Justice Department insider now sits on the Ninth Circuit for life.

Finally, there is the more recent nomination of Michael Wallace to a vacancy on the Fifth Circuit. Mr. Wallace received the first ABA rating of unanimously "not qualified" that I have seen for a circuit court nominee since President Reagan. Yet that is one of the controversial nominations we can expect the Republican Senate to target for action given their track record.

One of the most important checks and balances to unprecedented overreaching by the Bush-Cheney executive branch is an independent judiciary. I have sought to expedite consideration of qualified, consensus nominees and urged the President to work with us to make selections that unite all Americans. When the White House fails to make those kinds of selections, I hope that the Republican-controlled Senate will stop rubberstamping them and stop using controversial judicial nominations to score partisan political points. Our courts are too important. The rights and liberties of the American people are too important. The courts are the only check and balance left to protect the American people and provide some oversight of the actions of this President.

SUSAN C. SCHWAB TO BE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Susan C. Schwab, of Maryland, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate on this nomination shall be as follows: Senator DORGAN for 30 minutes, Senator CONRAD 15 minutes, Senator BAUCUS, 10 minutes, Senator GRASSLEY, 30 minutes.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Iowa be recognized. I believe the Senator from Alabama wishes to be recognized. I am happy to proceed following those two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Susan Schwab to serve as U.S. Trade Representative.

It is almost 7 months to the day since the Senate unanimously con-

firmed Ambassador Schwab to be Deputy U.S. Trade Representative.

During her service in that position, Ambassador Schwab has amply demonstrated her qualifications to take over as our next trade representative.

She successfully concluded negotiations of trade agreements with Peru and Columbia and has been actively engaged in the ongoing negotiations of the Doha Development Round of the World Trade Organization.

Given her strong background in trade policy, it is not surprising, then, that Ambassador Schwab has served so well in her current position.

Ambassador Schwab formally served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service. That is an agency within the Department of Commerce with people on the ground in foreign countries pushing for the interest of U.S. businesses.

She, herself, worked abroad to advance U.S. trade objectives while serving as a trade policy officer in the U.S. embassy in Tokyo.

Her first job in Washington was as an agricultural trade negotiator for the Office of U.S. Trade Representative. Ambassador Schwab thus knows full well the importance and the challenge of advancing the trade interests of U.S. family farmers.

Ambassador Schwab also has extensive experience working for the Congress of the United States, the very committee that I chair. She spent 8 years during the 1980s as a trade policy specialist and then as legislative director for then-Senator Danforth at a time when he chaired the trade subcommittee of this Committee on Finance.

Ambassador Schwab is well aware of the important role Congress plays in U.S. trade policy. I look forward to working closely with her in advancing U.S. trade objectives.

In addition, Ambassador Schwab has experience working on trade issues also in the private sector. At one point, she was director of corporate business development for Motorola. In that position, she engaged in strategic planning on behalf of Motorola in the continent of Asia.

More recently, she served as dean of the University of Maryland School of Public Policy. That was from 1995 through the year 2003, and then as president and CEO of the University System of the Maryland Foundation, as well as serving as vice chancellor for advancement.

Her academic and private-sector experiences complement her strong background in Government service. She is well rounded, in other words. Given the major challenges we face in advancing a robust trade agenda, it is especially important we have someone of Ambassador Schwab's caliber serving as U.S. Trade Representative dealing with 149 countries that are members of the World Trade Organization.

We need to achieve substantial progress in Doha Round negotiations,

and soon, if we are going to succeed in getting an agreement before trade promotion authority for the President of the United States expires next year. We still have a long way to go on those negotiations to reach an ambitious outcome that would be acceptable to me as chairman of the committee, but I think I can speak for the entire Congress on that point.

We are also in the process of negotiating free trade agreements with a number of important trading partners, including South Korea and Malaysia. These are going to represent terrific challenges. These are going to represent yet new challenges for her, particularly in addressing regulatory and other nontariff barriers to trade.

It is essential our bilateral negotiations with South Korea, Malaysia, and other nations conclude in time to be considered under trade promotion authority which expires July next year.

In addition, it is important our next trade representative continue to encourage meaningful regulatory reform in other major trading partners, especially Japan and China.

I expect Ambassador Schwab to continue to push our trading partners to come into compliance with their existing trade obligations such as and not limited to these: Mexico's obligation under NAFTA and the World Trade Organization regarding the importation of U.S. agricultural products and China's obligations to protect intellectual property rights.

Separately, I expect any bilateral agreement on Russia's access to the World Trade Organization will be concluded on strong, commercially meaningful terms and will not be rushed to meet some artificial deadline. Russia must demonstrate its willingness, its ability, and its commitment to abide by World Trade Organization rules.

It is important we remind ourselves of the tremendous benefits we derive from open international trade because too often we hear criticism of our trading regimes. As an example, on average, over the past decade, our economy has created a net of 2 million jobs each year. In 2005, our unemployment rate dropped to 4.7 percent, which is well below the averages of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

An important part of our economic success is due to our trade. During the last decades, our exports have accounted for about one-quarter of U.S. economic growth. Jobs created by exports are estimated to pay 13 to 18 percent more on average compared to jobs unrelated to exports.

With respect to agriculture, approximately one-third of the acres planted in the United States are exported. Our service sector, which accounts for almost 70 percent of the U.S. economy, is anxious to break down barriers to our exports of services around the world.

Today our services exports account for a little more than a quarter of the total U.S. exports of goods and services, so breaking down barriers to our

services exports would go a long way toward helping us improve our trade deficit.

Therefore, we in the Congress need to recommit ourselves to securing improved market access for our exporters, both in the Doha Round negotiations and by means of bilateral and regional trade agreements.

I am confident Ambassador Schwab will effectively meet each of the many challenges she will face as our next trade representative. Her experience and her skills make it quite evident she is the right person for the job. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination. Once confirmed, I look forward to working with her to advance an ambitious trade agenda and would expect her to consult under the law trade promotion authority with our committees when we ask her to and when she thinks it is necessary for her to make advances to us on that sort of communication because consultation between us prior to a negotiation being signed is the basis for the success and the opportunity to get such an agreement through the Congress.

Mr. SHELBY. Would the Senator from Iowa let me speak for 2 or 3 minutes as in morning business?

I support the nominee. There is no objection by Senator DORGAN.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator can have whatever time he desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

(The remarks of Mr. SHELBY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. SHELBY. 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. CONRAD. 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. CONRAD. Mr. President, what now is the business before the body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Schwab nomination.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Let me indicate as a member of the Finance Committee that we had hearings on the Schwab nomination. Let me stipulate that she is well qualified for the position. She is a lovely person, well educated and well trained. With all that said, after her testimony before the Finance Committee, I decided reluctantly that I would oppose her nomination. I want to share very briefly with the Members why I made that judgment.

When Ms. Schwab came before the Finance Committee, I put up a chart showing what has happened to the trade deficit of the United States. The trade deficit soared to over \$700 billion last year. I had another chart that showed what has happened to the trade deficit with Mexico since the NAFTA

agreement. Before the NAFTA agreement, we had a trade surplus with Mexico of several billion dollars. Now we have a massive trade deficit with Mexico.

I asked Ms. Schwab: Is this a successful trade policy?

Her answer was: Yes.

I told her: If this is a success, I would hate to see a failure. Because this trade policy is proving to be a disaster for the financial health of the United States. We are spending \$700 billion a year more in purchases than we are in sales. A country cannot do that for very long.

Then I asked her about agricultural trade policy. I asked her about the strategy of our trade ambassador going into the trade talks and making unilateral concessions, offering to cut support for our producers by 60 percent on the notion that then the other side would make concessions to us. I told her this is the strangest way to negotiate that I have ever seen. Unilateral concessions on the hope that the other side will follow suit—who has ever seen that in a negotiation? That is like going to the car dealership and agreeing to pay the sticker price. Why would you ever do that?

Ms. Schwab told me this is actually a smart trade tactic, a negotiating tactic, that you make big concessions on the front end and then you get tougher at the end. I don't think that is smart. I think it is a disaster. We are in a circumstance in which the Europeans provide five times as much support for their producers as we provide for ours. They account for more than 90 percent of the export subsidy in the world. We are about 1 or 2 percent. So they have us outgunned there 70 or 80 to 1.

Our idea of a negotiation is to make major unilateral concessions and then hope the other side gives in. What happened with this strategy? Did Europe then follow and make major concessions in response to ours? No. They made none.

I fear we are pursuing a trade agenda that is simply not working. I would present as exhibit No. 1 record trade deficits, the biggest in our history and growing dramatically.

Exhibit No. 2, NAFTA: We signed on to the NAFTA agreement. Our leadership told us this was going to be a great success. At the time we had a positive trade balance with Mexico. Now our trade deficit is measured in the tens of billions of dollars a year. This is a trade policy that is not working.

I cannot support as our trade ambassador somebody who clearly believes that is a success. How could anyone define this as a success?

I have reluctantly concluded that if we were to have a vote, and apparently this will be on a voice vote, I want it clearly recorded that I would vote "no."

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understand there is an order with respect to my presentation on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has been allocated 30 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this reminds me of Madam Tussaud's wax museum. It looks like there are people here, except there is no movement. Month after month after month, we hear the results of unbelievably bad trade agreements that pull the rug out from under our workers and farmers, pulling the rug out from under our economy, ringing up the highest trade deficits in the our history, shipping American jobs overseas, even as we import cheap labor through the backdoor, and no one says a thing. No one does a thing. We today have a proposal before us to approve the nomination of a new U.S. trade ambassador. For what purpose?

Let me describe what is happening with our trade deficit. This is the trade deficit from the most recent year going back to 1995. We are hemorrhaging in red ink.

These are the largest trade deficits in the history of humankind, by far, not even close with any other country. What does this mean? This means that we are selling part of our country every day to those who live outside of our country. It is called the selling of America.

We seem to think that it is all right to have a trade deficit of \$2 billion a day. That means that we import products more than we export to the rest of the world, and we pay for those imports with our currency or debt instruments. The result is at the moment the bank of Korea holds \$200 billion of our currency; the Chinese, \$750 billion; the Japanese, \$800 billion; the Taiwanese, \$250 billion. We are literally selling our country with these trade deficits every day.

Trade deficits are not just about selling America piece by piece. It is about shipping American jobs overseas and undercutting American workers all at the same time.

Winston Churchill said: The further backward you look, the further forward you can see. So I will look back a little bit. It is surprising to me that we have the nomination of a trade ambassador on the floor of the Senate and no real discussion, save that of my colleague, Senator CONRAD, about the merits of where we are headed. This country is dangerously off-track with wildly inflated and mushroomed trade deficits. It is getting worse, much worse, not better. Yet there is not a whimper here in the Congress about it.

Part of the reason is that the folks who work here are not going to have their jobs outsourced. No one wearing a blue suit and suspenders who hangs around here is going to have their job sent to China. If that were the case, we would have a change in trade policy immediately. But nobody loses their job here. For that matter, no journalist loses their job. That is why all you

read, for example, in most of these major newspapers in support of this trade policy that, as we can see from this chart, is a massive failure. Just take a look at a portion of it. Two hundred billion of that \$700 billion is with China alone. You can take a look at what is happening there, dramatic growth.

Here is the trade strategy we are currently working under: exporting good American jobs and importing cheap labor. We just finished importing cheap labor with the immigration bill 2 weeks ago. I didn't support that. I voted against that. I voted against the trade agreements that have allowed us to export good jobs.

I have gone through at great length in the Senate a range of issues. Let me use a couple to describe what has happened and what our trade agreements are about.

We are now negotiating a trade agreement with Korea. Let me talk about automobile trade with Korea. See if anybody cares about that, see maybe if this new trade ambassador would care about that. Last year we got 730,863 cars coming in on ships from Korea. They loaded all the Korean cars on ships, sailed across the ocean and offloaded 730,000 Korean cars in the United States.

Guess how many American cars we were able to sell in Korea. Seven hundred thirty thousand? No. Four thousand two hundred. Ninety-nine percent of the automobiles on the streets in Korea are produced in Korea. Why? They don't want American vehicles to be allowed into their market. They want to send their vehicles here for sale, but they don't want our vehicles sold in Korea.

This imbalance exists. Does anybody care about it? It doesn't mean a thing to most people. What it means to a lot of families is they have lost their jobs. United Auto Workers have lost their jobs. But nobody cares much about that because nobody in this Chamber is going to lose their job because of this imbalance in automobile trade.

Japan: 95 percent of the cars driving in the streets of Japan are produced in Japan. Why don't we export more cars to Japan? They don't want them. They, like China and many other parts of the world, including Korea, want to exercise their right to send their products to the American marketplace, but they sure don't want to have their marketplace wide open to that which is produced by American workers. That is the last thing they want.

Let me go back a few decades to 1970 or so. The largest American corporation was General Motors. In most cases people who went to work for GM worked there for a lifetime. That was their job. They were going to retire there and did. They worked there for a lifetime, got good pay, good benefits, good retirement. Now, 30 years later, the largest corporation in America is Wal-Mart. Average salary, according to published reports, is about \$18,000 or \$19,000 a year.

A substantial portion of their employees have no benefits. Of those eligible for health care benefits, they pay double the amount that most employees of corporations would pay for health care. Many of those who do have full-time jobs at low salaries cannot afford the benefits that are offered. So have we made progress in these 30 years?

By the way, with respect to Wal-Mart, 70 percent of the products on their shelves is from China. Wal-Mart's pressure will lead their to close their American operations and move them to China. The only way to sell it the way the we want to is have it produced in China, where you can pay a worker 33 cents an hour.

I read a month or so ago that China has finally purchased Whammo Corporation. There are a lot of companies moving, deciding they cannot afford to produce in America anymore. They don't want to pay U.S. workers decent wages. They want to produce in China for 33 cents an hour, where you don't have to worry about health care and retirement. We have seen 4 million to 5 million American jobs gone from our country.

I noticed in the newspaper that Chinese purchased Whammo Corporation—Frisbee, Hula Hoop, Slip 'N Slide. It is sort of the hood ornament on what is wrong with our trade. So Whammo is gone. What about the steelworker in America or the textile worker in America or the metal fabricator in America or the family farmer or the software engineer—their jobs are gone in increasing numbers.

Alan Blinder, the former vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said recently in a Foreign Affairs article that there are roughly are 42 million to 56 million jobs in America that are subject to being outsourced to other countries—China, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and more.

American companies have discovered that this large planet has a billion to a billion and a half people, and perhaps more, where if you move the technology and capital, you can employ people in other parts of the world for pennies. You can hire kids, you can work 12-year-olds 12 hours a day and pay them 12 cents an hour. You can ship the product to Toledo, Fargo, Los Angeles, or Lansing, MI, and say to the American producer and business and worker: Compete with that. The fact is, you cannot compete with that, and you should not be asked to compete with that.

We fought for a century in this country for the standards of production that have made this a great place and allowed us to expand the middle class. I have spoken before about James Fyler, who died of lead poisoning; he was shot 54 times. Earlier in this century, he and others were standing up for the right of people to organize, for workers to be able to organize. We finally became a country in which workers can organize without having to go

to prison, like they do in China. I have the names of people sitting in prison in China because they wanted to organize workers for a fair deal. We signed the Fair Labor Standards Act in this country and established a minimum wage and gave people the right to organize. We did a whole series of things—child labor laws—that have established the conditions of production, that produced a burgeoning middle class and the strongest economy the world has ever known. Now it is systematically being taken apart. I know it is hard to see day by day, but you watch what is happening in this country to the good jobs, the jobs with security that pay well, with benefits. One by one, 1,000 by 1,000 and, yes, a million by a million, they are leaving this country.

No, it is not just the bottom rung of the economic ladder; it is also engineers, software producers, and others. Nobody here seems to care very much. This Congress certainly doesn't. This Congress supports all that. This Congress supports giving a tax break to companies that ship their jobs overseas. Show me a company that fires all the American workers and ships their jobs to China, and I will tell you that this Congress supports giving that company a tax break—\$1.2 billion a year our current Tax Code spends in tax cuts to companies that ship their American jobs overseas. It is unbelievable.

I have offered four amendments in this Senate to shut that perverse tax break down and I have lost four times. In 2005, Bo Anderson, one of the top executives at General Motors dealing with parts and supplies, called 380 parts and suppliers together; he called the executives of the parts suppliers to a meeting. He said to them that you need to be building your automobile parts in China to reduce the cost. In other words, move those jobs offshore, get rid of those American workers. Delphi, which used to be the largest General Motors parts supplier, were paying workers \$26 to \$30 an hour with benefits. Well, that is over. They are in bankruptcy and, of course, it is blamed on the workers. Nobody talked about the executives and what role they might have had. They want to outsource the jobs, and for the jobs they would keep here, they want to pay \$8 to \$10 an hour. I am wondering how you create a country with a growing middle class and a consumer ability to make purchases in this country if jobs are going elsewhere in search of pennies an hour. IBM laid off 13,000 people; they are going to ship the jobs to India. They said to workers, by the way: This is not a comment on the excellent work you have done. See you later. Your job is gone.

The question is, What are we building and what does all this mean? The reason I mention all of this is that all of it comes from trade agreements. We have all of these trade agreements, and one is NAFTA with Mexico. We turned

a small trade surplus into a giant deficit with Mexico. It is pretty unbelievable when you think about it. My colleague says that the current nominee believes that the trade agreement with Mexico is a huge success. She has not lost her job to outsourcing either. But it is not a success by any standard. The trade deficit with Mexico and with Canada and with Europe, with Japan, Korea, and China—it is a disaster. Nobody seems to care much.

Now, I want to talk a little about this notion of free trade. It sounds like such a wonderful term, “free trade.” Freedom. Free trade means that you want to substitute that which we have fought for and built, that which people have died for, that which people have debated for a long time—what are the standards of production? What is being an American all about? What is protecting children? What is a fair wage? What is a safe workplace? What is the right to organize worth? It is trading that in and saying none of that matters. The largest corporations can pole-vault over all of it and move their factory to China. We are taking apart that which we built for a century. That is what the trade agreements are doing. I have shown you the red ink. So the trade agreements are an abysmal failure.

I would like to speak now about something that we learned very recently, involving sweatshops in the country of Jordan.

At the outset, let me say that the trade agreement with Jordan was slightly better than all the others. I give credit to President Clinton because they negotiated a free trade agreement with Jordan that had standards with respect to workers' rights, for a change. So it was a step forward—not a giant step but a step in the right direction.

What has happened to trade with Jordan since that time? The New York Times has written an article based on some work by the National Labor Committee. They have done terrific work investigating what is going on in Jordan. Remember, this was supposed to have created the gold standard for labor protection for workers, signed in 1999. But what happened since then is that Jordan has flown in so-called guest workers from countries such as Bangladesh and China to make products in Jordan for export to this country. So we see products in stores such as Wal-Mart, Target, and others, that have now, we know, come from sweatshops in Jordan under our free trade agreement.

Here is how the New York Times describes these sweat shops:

Propelled by a free trade agreement with the U.S., apparel manufacturing is booming in Jordan. Exports to America are soaring twentyfold in the last 5 years. But some foreign workers in Jordanian factories that produce garments for Target, Wal-Mart, and others are complaining of dismal conditions—of 20-hour days, of not being paid for months and months, of being hit by supervisors and of being jailed when they complain.

These factories in Jordan are flying in planeloads of workers from the poorest countries, such as Bangladesh, to work in slavish conditions. They also ship in Chinese materials—textiles in this case—to those manufacturers. What you end up with are Bangladesh workers working up to 120 hours a week in sweatshops in Jordan piecing together Chinese materials to be shipped into the United States under free trade agreements to be sold in a Wal-Mart or a Target.

Is that what free trade agreements are supposed to be about? I don't think so.

The workers at these Jordanian sweatshops testified they were forced to work far below minimum wages, promised \$120 a month, but in many cases they were not paid at all. One worker paid \$50 for 5 months of work. It is unbelievable to see what is going on.

Then when this is exposed in the New York Times, you hear people say: Well, we had no idea this was going on. It is kind of akin to the French police chief in the movie *Casablanca*, he was shocked to find that there was gambling taking place in Rick's Café. Nobody ought to be shocked by this. This is what is going on in the world.

I am going to introduce legislation at the end of my presentation today dealing with these issues of sweatshops and how we try to respond to them. My legislation will establish substantial civil penalties for the import of sweatshop goods. When sweatshop factories abuse workers for profit, the best way to attack the problem is to take that profit away. If the Federal Trade Commission determined that an overseas factory was producing sweatshop labor, it would issue an order prohibiting importation from that factory. Violation would carry a civil penalty, and each separate violation would be a separate offense. Also, my bill would allow U.S. retailers the right to sue their competitors in U.S. courts if their competitors are sourcing their merchandise from these sweatshop factories.

I feel strongly that as we come to talk about trade today and the nomination of a new trade ambassador, we ought to talk about what is going on in the real world. I have described previously so many stories. I was going to talk about Maytag—you know, the repairman who has nothing to do, and part of that is because Maytag is moving its jobs overseas these days.

Here are the dancing grapes in this picture. I love the dancing grapes from Fruit of the Loom. They make shorts and T-shirts that are all over America, and they have these people dressed up as grapes. Who on Earth would dress up as a grape? I guess a job is a job. Who is dancing in grape suits these days? That is the way they advertise this American underwear. Guess what. It may still be all-American underwear, but it is not made here anymore. They danced right out of this country. Fruit of the Loom is gone to Mexico. And it

is not just Fruit of the Loom. The best example I know is Huffy bicycles. They are now a Chinese company. They got rid of all their Ohio workers; they fired them because they made too much money, \$11 an hour. They have now become a Chinese company. You can still buy them here, and they produce a product they call all-American. It is just that they are made in China. I happen to know where. They pay 33 cents an hour there, and all those American workers who lost jobs, who had a long career making these bicycles at the largest bicycle plant in the world, they were told: Your career is over. You make too much money at \$11 an hour, so Huffy has gone to China. If you had a Huffy years ago, you noticed there was an American flag decal on the front. That is gone too. Now it is a decal of the globe.

By the way, on the last day of work at Huffy Bicycles, when their jobs left for China, I was told that when the workers left the parking lot, as they drove out of the lot, they left a pair of empty shoes in the space where their car was. It was a way of saying to the company that you can move our jobs to China, but you are not going to be able to fill our shoes. That is how much they cared about their jobs.

Little red wagon, Radio Flyer—I bet there is not a kid around who hasn't ridden in that little red wagon. Of course, that was American for a century. Gone to China. The list goes on and on. I could talk for hours about companies.

Levi's. There is not one pair of Levi's made in America. Talk about all-American jeans—there is not one pair of Levi's made in America. If you wear Tony Lama boots, you might be wearing boots made in China, by the way. The list goes on and on.

The question for this nominee for the U.S. Trade Ambassador's job is, Do you care whether these jobs are gone from our country? Do you care whether Americans are now asked to compete against those in other parts of the world who make 33 cents an hour? Do you care about that? Do you care that our workers are asked to compete against young kids, some of them locked in manufacturing plants, some of them hand-weaving rugs, some of them whose fingertips were scarred by putting sulfur on the fingertips and lighting the sulfur in order to produce a scar so that when they are using the needles on the rug and they stick their fingers, they won't bleed? Do you care about all that?

How about a trade policy that stands up for the interests of our country? Yes, I think we ought to trade. Yes, I think expanded trade is good for our country. But it must be and has to be fair trade. You cannot say to companies: All right, we have decided over a century what the conditions of production are in this country that represent a growing middle class and a growing economy and a humane way to do things. We have decided that, but you

can avoid all of that by just deciding to shut your American manufacturing plant, move the jobs elsewhere, and if somebody messes with you when your plant has moved overseas and they want to organize workers for better wages, you can get the government to throw them in prison. If somebody cares about you putting poisons in the water and the air, pumping effluent and pollution into the water and the air, you don't have to worry about that because you can do that with impunity. When somebody says you can't hire children, you don't have to worry about that because you can put kids in your manufacturing plant. And if somebody says OSHA is going to come, you can say: There ain't no OSHA here; I can do what I want here. And by the way, when I get the product produced, I am shipping it to the United States of America because I have store shelves to fill and I have American customers who want low prices. I know, they are the same customers who are going to drive Korean cars to the store, wear their Italian shoes, wear their Taiwanese shirt, wear their Chinese slacks, and they are going to wonder where all the American jobs went.

I would like to ask one of these days when we have a change in the U.S. trade ambassador's job what they really think success is. Do you really believe this hemorrhaging of red ink, selling America \$2 billion a day to foreign governments, foreign enterprises, do you really believe that can continue? It cannot. That just cannot continue.

And, oh, by the way, the strategy I described earlier that I believe doesn't add up for our country is a strategy by which we tell companies: You can export good American jobs, and you can import cheap labor. That was the immigration bill, the last portion—export good jobs, import cheap labor. I am saying that doesn't add up.

At least a portion of that—exporting good jobs and importing cheap labor—is now attended to by a desire to decide that when you export good jobs and import cheap labor, you can run your profits through the Cayman Islands so you don't have to pay taxes in this country.

This little house, I have told my colleagues before, this five-story white house, called the Uglan House on Church Street in the Cayman Islands, is home to 12,748 corporations. That is right. They are not there; it is just a figment of someone's imagination. Lawyers have established this address for 12,748 corporations for one purpose, and that is to avoid paying U.S. taxes. It is unbelievable, if you think about it.

So export your jobs, import your products here, sell them in the United States, and run your income through the Cayman Islands. I am just saying none of this adds up and none of it works.

I agree with my colleague who described a while ago his opposition to

this trade ambassador. I don't believe the nominee is unqualified, I just believe there our trade policy is terribly misguided. That is pretty troublesome because I don't think this country will have the kind of economic strength that expands so that our kids have jobs, good jobs that pay well with benefits in the future. I don't think it is going to happen. I wish I were wrong. I don't think I am. Yet all this continues in a giant silence. Nobody seems to care very much.

Let's just continue doing this. We will sell a little bit of America every single day, keep shipping jobs elsewhere, not think much about it because we can buy a cheap product at Wal-Mart, and it will be just fine. Be happy. I am just saying I don't think this adds up for our country's future.

I don't support this nomination because I want a nominee at the U.S. trade ambassador's office who is going to stand up for a trade policy that is fair for this country—fair trade.

A colleague just came into the Chamber who comes from a State that has a lot of ranching. We are not getting beef into Japan at the moment. That is a different story. It is unbelievable with the trade deficit that we can't get beef into Japan. Let's assume that problem was resolved tomorrow. Every pound of beef that would go into Japan would have a 50-percent tariff on it, and that's 16 years after we had a beef agreement with Japan. That is just a tiny little example, beef to Japan. That would be considered a failure by any standard, a 50-percent tariff a decade and a half after the beef agreement.

We blithely go along and say: Be happy, it will be fine, drive to Wal-Mart and pick up an Etch-A-Sketch and be happy. It doesn't matter. This will all work out in the end.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 4 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I conclude by describing one of the concerns I have about the silence on these issues. Some long while ago, I was on the floor of the House of Representatives when there was a joint meeting of Congress. A fellow named Lech Walesa was speaking to Congress at a joint meeting.

Lech Walesa told a story—pretty unbelievable—a story, of course, I had known from the history books. He told us this: He said it was Saturday morning in a shipyard in Gdansk, Poland. He had been fired from his job as an electrician from this plant. He went back into the shipyards on Saturday morning to lead a labor strike against the Communist government, believing workers ought to have the right to self-determination. He went back in to lead a strike against the Communist gov-

ernment. They seized him that Saturday morning and brutally beat him, beat him bloody, took him to the edge of a fence that was heightened with barbed wire and threw him over the barbed-wire fence into the dirt on the other side of the fence.

He laid in the dirt face down, bleeding, having been beaten severely. He told us he wondered what he should do next. As he lay there, he decided what to do next. He picked himself up, climbed back over the fence into the shipyard, right back into the same shipyard that morning. Ten years later, this unemployed electrician was identified by the Doorkeeper of the U.S. House of Representatives as the President of the country of Poland—not an intellectual, not a military leader, not a business leader, just an unemployed electrician with the guts to take on the Communist government for a free labor movement.

They called it Solidarity. We all celebrated solidarity. What a wonderful thing it was. We supported Solidarity. He said to us: We didn't have any guns; the Communists had all the guns. We had no bullets; the Communists had all the bullets. We were workers armed with an idea. We were armed only with an idea; that is, people ought to be free to choose their own destiny.

What is the idea here? What is the idea in America by which we fought for 100 years for the basic standards, by which we expanded the middle class, safe workplaces, decent wages, the right to organize? What is that idea, and does it have value now, or have we forgotten that idea and is there someone willing to stand for that idea today?

I hope so. I don't believe we ought to decide that which we created is somehow unworthy as we look to the future of this country, and I believe we ought to continue to build a place that is better for our children. We want a place, all of us want a place we can turn over to our children and grandchildren that is better than the place we inherited. That ought to be the goal.

I don't intend to ask for a recorded vote, but I do not support this nomination only because I think we are headed toward a trade strategy—and we have been in the middle of it for some long while now—that is injuring this country and is going to ship jobs overseas.

As I said when I started, Alan Blinder, a respected Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said there are 42 million to 56 million American jobs at this point subject to outsourcing. Those not outsourced are still going to be required to compete with others in the world who make a great deal less money. That is not the way we are going to continue to build the economy we believed we were building for the last century.

I am not suggesting putting walls around our country. I am not a xenophobe. I am not an isolationist. I am not one who believes trade is not worthy. I do. But I think this country

ought to insist and lead in the area of demanding fair trade, demanding trade be fair, standing up for our businesses, standing up for our workers, and saying we insist on and demand fair trade.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I speak today in support of the nomination of Dr. Susan Schwab to be the U.S. Trade Representative. I have known Susan for a long time and have seen her great leadership and vision as dean of the University of Maryland School of Public Policy. As dean, Susan helped the school grow into one of the top public policy programs in the Nation.

I support fair trade, so American workers can compete. Dr. Schwab has demonstrated her commitment to this approach and to ensuring our Nation's economic competitiveness. Our top trade representative needs to be tough, smart, and have experience standing up for American interests. Dr. Schwab clearly fits that bill as well.

Dr. Schwab's qualifications for this position are first-rate. She is a former Foreign Service officer, serving in the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo and as a trade negotiator at the USTR. The experience of serving on the front lines of an office she will now help lead is particularly important. Dr. Schwab also has extensive experience in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. She was legislative director for Senator John Danforth and served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director-General of the U.S. & Foreign Commercial Service in the first Bush administration.

In addition to her practical experience, Dr. Schwab is accomplished academically. While dean of the Maryland School of Public Policy, she taught a variety of graduate courses on U.S. trade policy and international relations. Dr. Schwab received her Ph.D. in public administration and international business from the George Washington University. She holds a master's in development policy from Stanford University and a bachelor's from Williams College.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this nomination.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer my strong support and endorsement of the confirmation of Ambassador Susan Schwab as U.S. Trade Representative. During her long career in public service, Ambassador Schwab has dedicated herself to advocating for the best interests of the United States in the global economy. I was delighted when I learned that the President had nominated her for the position of U.S. Trade Representative, a position for which she is ideally suited.

Throughout the 1980s, Ambassador Schwab was as a trade policy specialist and then legislative director for Senator John C. Danforth, playing a major role in numerous U.S. trade policy initiatives, including landmark trade legislation that Congress enacted in 1984 and 1988. While serving on the staff of Senator William S. Cohen and as staff

director of the Subcommittee on Government Oversight, I worked closely with Ambassador Schwab on a number of trade issues affecting Maine and its industries.

In particular, Ambassador Schwab worked with our staff to support Maine's shoe industry and its workers during the industry's massive dislocations in the 1980s. She was instrumental in helping us develop legislation to address the industry's dire situation in those years, including critical improvements to antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard provisions. She also worked closely with our staff to improve market access for Maine agricultural goods in foreign markets.

Ambassador Schwab's professional and personal record of service will enable her to effectively represent U.S. interests around the world. She will make an outstanding U.S. Trade Representative.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Susan Schwab to be our next U.S. Trade Representative. I have known and worked with Ambassador Schwab for many years. She has had a stellar career as a trade negotiator, a senior congressional staffer, a businesswoman, and a university administrator and professor.

I recently read a piece about Ambassador Schwab in the Washington Post. That article described her as "a hard-nosed pragmatist, well versed in arcane trade economics, and a dazzling strategist and negotiator."

She was described as excelling as "a strategic thinker and consensus builder . . . able to quickly synthesize the thinking of Congress, the administration and special-interest groups."

That Washington Post article is 19 years old. It is from July 1987. By that point, Ambassador Schwab had already honed her reputation in the international trade community.

She had already negotiated tricky agriculture agreements in the Tokyo Round. She had already helped draft provisions of U.S. trade law—like Super 301—that became a fixture of U.S. trade policy for the next decade.

She had already attracted both fear and admiration among many of our most recalcitrant trading partners.

Nineteen years later, Ambassador Schwab continues to demonstrate her skill as a seasoned trade negotiator. In her tenure as Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, she has settled one of the most difficult and complicated trade issues—our dispute with Canada over subsidized imports of softwood lumber.

She has worked tirelessly with our trading partners on trade agreements, and she has worked to obtain consensus among the 149 members of the World Trade Organization in the ongoing Doha Round negotiations.

Ambassador Schwab will need all of her skills to carry out the job as U.S. Trade Representative. We have entered one of the most difficult periods in

trade policy that I can remember—both with our trading partners and domestically.

At the top of Ambassador Schwab's agenda will be shoring up the Doha Round. Unless something changes soon, these talks are at serious risk of collapse.

Our trading partners continue to believe that America alone must make the concessions necessary for these talks to conclude. They forget that negotiations are two-way. They are give and take.

As I have told Ambassador Schwab, I will not be in a position to support any result out of the Doha Round unless several results are achieved: No. 1, the EU must commit to serious and meaningful reductions in agriculture tariffs; No. 2, Brazil, India, and developing world countries must commit to serious and meaningful reductions in industrial tariffs; and No. 3, our key trading partners must agree to open further their services markets.

Ambassador Schwab will also face serious challenges in our bilateral trade and economic relationship with China. China often makes promises—in the WTO and bilaterally—that it does not always keep. For instance, in April, China promised to lift its ban on U.S. beef. But China still has not done so, and it appears to be in no hurry.

In the coming months, I hope to work with Ambassador Schwab in creating a more sustained, structured, and comprehensive dialogue with China that allows the United States to hold China's feet to the fire on the promises that it makes.

And we also need a better framework to seek out ways to cooperate more effectively on issues of mutual economic interest.

Ambassador Schwab will also be responsible for negotiating the most challenging free-trade agreements to date. Agreements with Korea and Malaysia—our 7th and 10th largest trading partners respectively—hold great promise. But each presents unique and difficult issues that we must address in order to build political support for these agreements at home.

That will be Ambassador Schwab's greatest challenge—building political support for trade at home. It is no secret that support for trade has evaporated.

Since Congress granted this administration trade promotion authority in 2002, Members have been asked to take a series of difficult votes on trade agreements with small countries of limited commercial value.

Since that time, the concerns Members of Congress have expressed about the administration's trade strategy have fallen on deaf ears, and since that time, support for trade among usually protrade constituents has waned considerably.

As a result, when trade promotion authority expires next year, I do not think Congress will renew it without major changes. I do not anticipate new

fast-track authority until Congress, the administration, and all relevant stakeholders are willing to engage in a serious discussion. They need to answer the tough questions that remain unaddressed: questions relating to trade adjustment assistance and other programs to help those who may be hurt by trade, questions about the role of labor in our trade agreements, and questions relating to the relationship between trade and a competitive U.S. economy.

These are hard issues, and Ambassador Schwab will have to face them head-on. But I have full confidence that Ambassador Schwab has the skills, experience, and the guts to tackle them. Indeed, she spent most of the 1980s grappling with very similar issues when she worked for Senator Danforth in both the majority and the minority.

Nineteen years ago, the Washington Post described Susan Schwab as a "strategic thinker" and a "consensus builder." We need these skills at the U.S. Trade Representative, now more than ever.

I look forward to working closely with Ambassador Schwab and urge my Colleagues to vote to confirm her today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to give my complete support for Ambassador Susan Schwab who will become our Nation's Trade Representative.

I have been dismayed that the Senate did not move more quickly on this nomination. I have also been disappointed by the opinions, of some, who state that her nomination is an indication that the administration is de-emphasizing trade policy.

Obviously, these individuals do not know Ambassador Schwab.

I, on the other hand, have had that privilege of working with her and join the vast majority of my colleagues in stating that that Ambassador Schwab is a tenacious, forceful, yet thoughtful advocate of our Nation's trade agenda.

Our Nation is at a critical juncture. In 2005, the United States trade deficit widened to a record \$726 billion, increasing to 5.8 percent of the Gross Domestic Product from 5.3 percent in 2004, and 4.5 percent in 2003.

Many economists now describe the trade deficit as unsustainable. For example, C. Fred Bergsten, Director of the Institute for International Economics, has pointed out "the United States must now attract almost \$7 billion of capital from the rest of the world every day to finance our current account deficit and our own foreign investment outflows."

In order to meet these challenges, we need our best and brightest working on solutions. Solutions that ensure that that the Doha Round lives up to its potential, while ensuring that a level playing field is created for American farmers, manufacturers and service providers.

Solutions that enable the United States to move expeditiously in our

free trade negotiations with Korea and Malaysia thereby providing unfettered access to these markets.

Mr. President, I cannot think of anyone better suited to find these solutions than Ambassador Susan Schwab. I am very pleased that the Senate confirmed her nomination just minutes ago.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, how much time is on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator GRASSLEY controls 20 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to discuss the nominee who is before the Senate. I am chairman of the Trade Subcommittee on the Finance Committee, so I have had an opportunity to deal with some of these issues for some time. I was also chairman of the Foreign Relations subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific Rim. These are areas about which I feel strongly.

Fortunately, I had a good deal of opportunity to visit with Susan Schwab, the President's nominee for U.S. Trade Representative.

Obviously, this is a very important position, the position that Rob Portman had over the past 9 months or a year. He has done an excellent job of representing the United States in a situation that is not easy.

The United States is a little different from most countries in the world. They see us a little differently. They expect more from us than we should be asked to give, but nevertheless that continues to be the case. We have to seek to find equality and fairness.

Based on my discussions with her, I think she is an outstanding selection. Senator GRASSLEY talked about her background, and certainly she is well prepared for the position. Her credentials speak for themselves. That is very important in this issue.

Trade is very easy to talk about. Some of my friends on the other side talk about trade is all bad and there is nothing right about it. There is a lot to trade that we have to figure out. We have a lot of demand for overseas goods and, of course, we are the biggest buyer in the world; therefore, we are the biggest trader in the world. So it feels a little differently. It doesn't mean we should not have fair and equal treatment. That is what we seek to have, and that will be the task she undertakes. She will be a strong voice for American trade policy. I believe that is excellent, and I am so pleased.

We are the largest trading nation in the world, and the world is changing, as we know. Twenty years ago, it was quite different. Everyone was fairly isolated. Now, with the kind of communications we have and the kind of transportation that is available—why, there are billions of dollars moving around the world every day. It becomes quite difficult. The countries are changing very fast.

We deal with China today much differently than we did 10 years ago, as we will have to in the future. Foreign trade is not an easy matter with which to deal. What we need to seek and do seek is fairness. Frankly, that is a little difficult in the world because everyone thinks that because we are such a prosperous country, they should have special treatment. But our effort has been to have fair trade, and that ought to be what we do, and that is what we are seeking.

I have met with Susan Schwab and talked about that point, and the fact that we are the largest trading country in the world should not give others an unfair advantage. We need to trade in a fair way, and I think that is what she is committed to do, and certainly I support her for that.

We are the largest trading nation in the world. So, of course, we are the target of most everyone who wants to increase their sales. We also, however, have some opportunities to increase our sales as well, and we are doing some of that. Our demand, because the size of our economy, of course, is large, and we are interested in pursuing those kinds of opportunities. So trade is going to happen, and it is going to increasingly happen as times change and the world becomes smaller. Simply because of our ability to communicate and our ability to move around the world, it will become smaller.

So the challenge is how we can trade fairly with these other countries. Many of them think, Oh, you are the big, rich country; you ought to be able to give us a lot of things. That really ought not to be what we are dealing with. We ought to be dealing with fair trade. I think that is the point. It is what I have talked to Susan Schwab about, and she certainly is agreeable to that.

More than 25 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product is tied to trade, so it is an important aspect of our economy. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States. So in terms of our production, we need to be involved in world trade and we need to make it fair. And that really, of course, is the challenge.

It is easy to be critical about everything we do in trade. The fact is, particularly with some of the commodities in my State of Wyoming, trade is about selling our markets somewhere else. So we need to understand that. Again, the key is fair trade and that is what we are talking about. We need to find ways to open the world market to our goods and our services, and we ought to be able to enter into the market on the same basis as anyone else, and at the same time hold others to the same considerations that we have when they come here. We need to pursue both bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and of course that is what we are doing. And we need strong leadership to do it and to represent our interests in these discussions.

So I think that is exactly what we will be able to do. We are making progress.

My colleague mentioned the fact of the cow business in Japan. Well, that is a problem. Frankly, it is not a trade problem as much as it is a mad cow disease problem. It has been handled wrong, and we are working toward getting that resolved. Our best potential and the largest growth we have in the beef industry and exports has been in Asia. That is where we are now. We have been able to open up the markets in Australia and in South Korea, and we had the markets pretty much open in Japan until the mad cow disease came along, and now we are in the process, hopefully, of getting them open again. So that is very important, and we need to continue certainly to do that.

We need a strong leader to represent our interests. I think that is exactly what we will get with Susan Schwab, and that leadership is what we need. Bob Portman has done a very good job, and she has worked with him, of course, in getting us into this position. So we need to have good leadership to walk away from some of the bad agreements, the tough agreements that we have had. The world is sometimes difficult to deal with, but Susan Schwab will provide that leadership.

During her testimony before the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, she stated:

It will take more than a willing spirit to forge good trade policy in the next 5 years. It will require us to keep the multilateral process on track in the WTO, to negotiate commercially significant free trade agreements, and to enforce vigorously the terms of those agreements and to uphold the rules of trade.

So that is what we are really faced with. These smaller countries, these countries that frankly generally have less economic strength than we do and they always want special treatment: Well, you guys can afford that. What we need is fair trade, and that is what trade is all about, and that is why it takes a leader to do that. So I am very pleased that she is there and that she is willing to do this. She is well trained to do it.

She further stated that her success may require:

An honest, sometimes blunt, but always respectful exchange of views, along with a willingness to compromise when possible and the strength to stand firm when necessary.

The strength to stand firm when necessary. To me, that is probably the most important element of the trade negotiations that we enter into, is to be able to stand firm on what we agree on, and we ought to be in a position to do that when we are as big a buyer as we are. We also need to have some muscle on the other side, and we can do that.

I am pleased with the commitment she has made to reach out and listen and consult with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Engaging Congress in a bipartisan way upfront

and throughout the process will be crucial, and she will do that. Ms. Schwab understands this, and I am confident that she will follow through.

So I look forward to working with her. I am looking forward to one of the important elements of our economy, and that is world trade, and doing it in a fair manner.

Mr. President, I yield back all time on behalf of Republicans and Democrats and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Susan C. Schwab, of Maryland, to be United States Trade Representative?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

A VICTORY IN THE WAR ON TERROR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier today, we witnessed an important victory in the war on terror and in the continued march of freedom and democracy in Iraq.

Al-Zarqawi, like Saddam Hussein, was a mass murderer. I am not sad to say that he has made his last video.

I could not be more proud of our men and women in uniform—our military and intelligence services and those individuals who participated in this particular operation. Our intelligence and military forces have demonstrated their exceptional abilities and reminded us yet again that, through patience and resolve, we will continue to win the war on terror and advance the cause of freedom around the globe.

So I want to say to our military forces and our intelligence community serving all around the world that we support you, we are proud of you, and we know that you will continue to keep up the good work.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, last night the U.S. military, as we know now, working hand in hand with the Iraqi counterpart, located and killed al-Qaida terrorist Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi. We know who this terrorist is. He is a brutal terrorist who has repeatedly encouraged violence against Americans and Iraqi citizens.

Al-Zarqawi is credited with ordering kidnappings, beheadings, and killings

of innocent civilians with insurgent attacks. Al-Zarqawi was the operational mastermind of the al-Qaida network in Iraq. He sought to destroy America and our coalition partners to create a sanctuary for the al-Qaida organization in the Middle East. His death marks the fragmentation of al-Qaida's primary leadership and the silencing of a ruthless terrorist.

The military operation against al-Zarqawi was performed by our dedicated, professional Armed Forces in concert with our coalition partner. Our military servicemembers should be commended for their remarkable efforts in eradicating the enemy of a free and democratic Iraq.

Our war fighters worked tirelessly with our Iraqi counterparts tracking the movement of al-Zarqawi's followers, leading to his demise in last night's airstrike.

We are proud of the success of this operation, but even prouder of the job that our Armed Forces have accomplished in their commitment to peace and stability in Iraq. Although this is positive development and significant step in the global war on terror, our fight in Iraq is far from over. We are making significant strides toward eradicating terrorism, developing a free government, and reviving the economy. But Iraq will not become a democracy overnight. While our involvement continues to be difficult, our resolve must remain strong. We must remain focused on our fundamental goal—preserving the freedom and security of the United States. This is an enormous challenge that will take determination, global cooperation, and fortitude to succeed. I am confident the United States will triumph over global chaos and tyranny, as it always has. But whatever it is, we must back our troops.

RECIPIENTS OF THE "HEROES AMONG US" AWARD

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all of us in New England are proud of the Boston Celtics and their skill on the basketball court. We're also proud of the support they give to those who need help in our communities. Each year, the Celtics organization honors outstanding persons in New England as "Heroes Among Us"—men and women who make an especially significant impact on the lives of others.

The award is now in its ninth year, and the extraordinary achievements of the honorees this year include saving lives, sacrificing for others, overcoming obstacles to achieve goals, and making lifelong commitments to improve the lives of those around them. The honorees include persons of all ages and all walks of life—students, community leaders, founders of non-profit organizations, members of the clergy, and many others.