going to have a real high school, we are going to hire teachers, and we will have all the kids go to school.

Look at the benefits we have reaped as a nation because of that kind of forward thinking, that kind of vision that said in 20th century America will be different, our commitment to education will be different. And look what we have seen as a result of it. We have gone from the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk to a space program; we have gone from Henry Ford's tin lizys* moving across that assembly line to the point where we have the most modern computer chip factories in the world here in the United States.

I don't think it is a coincidence. I think what happened here is the fact that we dedicated ourselves to improving our work force and elevating the intelligence and training and skills of Americans. And look at the benefits we reaped. We had an American century in the 20th century. Will we have an American century in the 21st? If we take a view that it is a hands-off subject and we can't talk about that in Washington and the people at the local level can't raise the money we are missing another opportunity.

But to bring in talented teachers to have smaller classroom sizes, to have more modern classrooms, has to be an investment of the 21st century to continue what has become the American way of doing things. I want to salute not only Senator MURRAY and Senator REID by those who have joined us in supporting the President's program. I think it is a program that is balanced, a program that takes a portion of this surplus, a surplus we worked hard to put together, and says we are going to put that portion into education. It's an investment that will pay off in generations to come. At this point I don't know that any other Senators are seeking time on the issue of education, and, Mr. President, I would reserve the remainder of my time or yield perhaps to the Senator from Florida if he would like to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Colton Campbell, Mr. Bryan Giddings, Ms. Lisa Page, and Ms. Marilyn Lewis of my staff be afforded the privilege of the floor during the duration of my remarks.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM pertaining to the introduction of S. 483 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. GRAHAM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERREY. 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. KERREY. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business and Senators are permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KERREY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as necessary to get through this stack of paper.

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

A NEW GOVERNMENT IN IRAQ

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, on the heels of passing a much-needed pay and benefits increase for the men and women who give up their freedom to serve us in our armed services, I want to direct my colleagues' attention to one longstanding military mission these men and women have been assigned. That is the mission of containing the threat of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

Mr. President, I do this for a couple of reasons. First is that I have argued for a stronger military operation in Iraq. Indeed, I have argued to change the objective from containment to replacement. And oftentimes people come back and say, well, if we do that, we will risk lives.

I would like to describe to my colleagues—in fact, we have a military operation going on today, have had since 1991; and this military operation is costing us dearly both in lives and in money.

Mr. President, last Tuesday I had the opportunity to give a speech to the cadets at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and they asked me to speak on patriotism, for which I was only too anxious to oblige.

I talked to them about something that I think is causing the decline in enrollment—in addition to the inadequate pay and retirement benefits—and that is that Americans are less willing to volunteer for service in our Armed Forces as a consequence, in my judgment, of our not doing enough to tell them —especially our younger citizens—the stories of heroism which are being written every single day by the brave men and women who wear the uniform of one of our services. Instead of role models of people who have given themselves to a higher cause, Mr. President, unfortunately our young people are being told an increasing number of stories, especially on television, of self-gratification and indulgency. It is no wonder as a consequence that a patriotic decision to serve seems like a nonmainstream choice.

Before I gave my speech at the Academy, the superintendent warned me I needed to remember how young my audience was. ''Half your audience,'' he said, ''wasn't even 10 years of age when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990.'' Mr. President, I must tell you that gave me some pause because that seemed like yesterday that happened, but, in fact, a great deal of time has expired since then.

For me, the statement was more than just a reminder to be careful what language I used when talking to these young people, but also a wakeup call not to take for granted the military mission that we have in place in Iraq today. It is a dangerous military operation. It is a military operation that costs us a great deal of money, and I hazard a guess that most of us who have looked at the objective of containing Saddam Hussein would say that the mission is dangerously close to unraveling.

This military strategy began in August 1990 when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. In response to this active aggression, the United States, under President Bush's leadership, assembled and led an international coalition of forces against Iraq. It was a costly war, both in terms of our financial commitment but also in terms of the human cost to the more than 540,000 men and women in our military forces deployed to the Persian Gulf. Sixty billion dollars was spent prosecuting the war, but this does not compare to the price paid by 389 American families who lost loved ones in Operation Desert Storm.

At the end of the war, most Americans assumed our military commitment to Iraq would come to an end. After all, the war had been fought. We had been victorious. Saddam Hussein had sued for peace. It was time to bring home the troops. But almost from the beginning, Saddam Hussein refused to abide by the terms of the cease-fire agreements his government had signed. From violating the no-fly zones to obstructing the work of weapons inspectors to provoking troop deployments, Iraq's continual challenges and our policy of containment forced us to maintain a very strong military presence in the region. With each crisis generated by the Iraqi regime, the United States and our allies responded to the deployment of more troops and at times with the use of military force. While it is difficult to quantify the monetary cost of the numerous redeployments and military confrontations that have taken place with Iraq over the last 8 years, it is even more difficult to quantify the effect these deployments have had on our troops. How many families have had to be separated for months at a time? What has been the cost in morale for troops deployed to the Desert?

We must also examine the broader costs of our military strategy in Iraq. The continual need for large numbers of American troops in Saudi Arabia has created a strong sense of resentment throughout the Arab world, and it has also increased the danger of terrorist acts against Americans.

Again, I have urged a different military strategy with a different objective