

Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction.

Documented in these reports are assessments of the precarious and deteriorating security situation on the ground, which has dramatically slowed the pace of reconstruction and resulted in significant additional costs. This picture is in stark contrast to the rhetoric coming from the administration that we are in the last throes of the insurgency and that reconstruction is moving forward at a rapid pace.

The reality is that because of the security problems in Iraq, the results of reconstruction are falling far short of what the administration optimistically predicted and what we were told to expect. While there has been important progress in building schools and hospitals and providing clean drinking water in some areas, exorbitant security costs are forcing the scale back or cancellation of reconstruction projects. Unfortunately, there is little reason to be optimistic that the situation will improve in the short term.

According to today's Washington Post, the GAO reported that "in March, the U.S. Agency for International Development canceled two electric power generation programs to provide \$15 million in additional security elsewhere. On another project to rehabilitate electric substations, the Army Corps of Engineers decided that securing 14 of the 23 facilities would be too expensive and limited the entire project to nine stations. And in February, USAID added \$33 million to cover higher security costs on one project, which left it short of money to pay for construction oversight, quality assurance and administrative costs."

Furthermore, the Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction reported that after reviewing several reconstruction contracts, it determined that more money was going to Government contractors involved in the rebuilding process than was necessary. The formula used for disbursing special monetary awards, which are above and beyond basic fees, was producing excessively high awards. In some instances, contractors were paid hundreds of thousands of dollars despite not winning a contract or delivering a single service. Once again, these reports shed light on the lack of oversight and accountability given to contracts in Iraq.

Given the enormous amount of money the United States is spending in Iraq, the many reports of waste and profiteering by unscrupulous contractors, and the President's request for additional hundreds of millions of dollars for Iraq reconstruction in the fiscal year 2006 budget, it is incumbent on the administration to respond to these reports in a forthright manner so that Congress can make informed decisions about the use of these funds.

#### INTERNET GOVERNANCE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, on July 14 the United Nations' Working Group on Internet Governance, WGIG, issued its final report. WGIG was formed following the December 2003 U.N. World Summit on Information Policy with the intention of simply developing a consensus definition for "internet governance" and identifying relevant public policy issues. Ultimately the task force exceeded its mandate and laid out four policy recommendations for the future of Internet governance. One unifying theme for all these options is that there should be "a further internationalization of Internet governance arrangements" because of WGIG's belief that "no single government should have a pre-eminent role in relation to international Internet governance".

In other words, this U.N. task force report suggests that the historic role of the United States in overseeing the Internet's growth and shepherding its development should be terminated and that Internet governance should be politicized under U.N. auspices. The most extreme of the options laid out by the WGIG would transfer the authority and functions of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, a respected nonprofit organization which is currently overseen by the U.S. Department of Commerce, to a new body linked to and controlled by the United Nations. This would put international bureaucrats in charge of the Internet and relegate the private sector to a mere advisory role. And it raises the very troubling possibility that the United States would have no more say over the future of the Internet than Cuba or China.

I am firmly opposed to any proposal to hand control of Internet governance over to the United Nations. The continuing investigation of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations into the scandal-ridden Oil-for-Food program has revealed management of the U.N. to have been at best incompetent and at worst corrupt. Any suggestion for a greater U.N. role over the Internet is hopelessly premature. The first priority for the United Nations must be fundamental reform of U.N. management and operations rather than any expansion of its authority and responsibilities.

The Internet was created in the United States and has flourished under U.S. supervision and oversight. The United States' fair and lighthanded role in Internet governance has assured security and reliability. While the roots of the Internet lie in the ARPANet project launched by the Department of Defense in 1969, the true birth of the modern Internet began 10 years ago, in 1995, when the National Science Foundation opened the Internet to commerce, and the Netscape browser became available so that the general public could "surf" the World Wide Web. The explosive and hugely

beneficial growth of the Internet over the past decade did not result from increased Government involvement but, to the contrary, from the opening of the Internet to commerce and private sector innovation. Subjecting the Internet to the politicized control of the U.N. bureaucracy would be a giant and foolhardy step backwards.

The Internet today is an unprecedented and tremendously beneficial avenue for the free flow of information and commerce. Why would we want to even consider turning any degree of Internet control over to a politicized and failure-prone multinational bureaucracy that cannot possibly move at "Net speed"? Some of the nations involved in the WGIG deliberations have established pervasive Internet censorship and monitoring systems to suppress the ability of their citizens to access the truth, and to stifle legitimate political discussion and dissent. Others maintain a state monopoly over telecommunications services, or subject them to excessive taxation and regulation. Allowing such nations a voice in fundamental Internet governance would be dangerous and imprudent.

The WGIG report also contemplates an expanded U.N. role on cybersecurity matters. This is also deeply troubling. We simply cannot risk a disruption of the information economy by cyberterrorists. One thing we have learned at the start of the 21st century is that some organized groups hate democracy and wish to inflict grave injury upon the people and economies of freedom-loving nations. It would be naive and foolhardy if we did not assume that some of the individuals active in these terrorist organizations possess the technical expertise to plan and execute crippling attacks on the Internet, and that they are pondering how to crash the net with the same diligence that Osama bin Laden gave to bringing down the World Trade Center. The Internet assumes greater economic importance with each passing year, both in the value of the commerce it facilitates as well as the functions it performs. Today, for example, traditional telephone service is making a rapid migration from dedicated proprietary circuits to Voice Over Internet Protocol, VOIP. It is true that the Internet was designed to be resilient against outside attacks, as ARPANet was conceived as a communications system that could survive the exchange of nuclear weapons. But we have learned in recent years that the greatest threats to Internet security are generated from within. The vital national security interests of the United States and our allies demand that we maintain an Internet governance regime capable of taking effective preventive measures against any attack that could wreak havoc upon us.

The continued assurance of competent and depoliticized Internet governance is clearly a matter of strategic importance to the security of the

United States and to the entire world economy. I was therefore pleased that the Bush administration announced on June 30 that the United States would maintain its historic role over the Internet's master "root" file that lists all authorized top-level domains. The U.S. Principles on the Internet's Domain Name and Addressing System issued last month are: (1) The U.S. Government will preserve the security and stability of the Internet's Domain Name and Addressing System, DNS. It will take no action with the potential to adversely affect the effective and efficient operation of the DNS. (2) Governments have a legitimate interest in the management of their own country code top level domains (ccTLD). The U.S. will work with the international community to address these concerns in a manner consistent with Internet stability and security. (3) ICANN is the appropriate technical manager of the Internet DNS. The U.S. will continue to provide oversight so that ICANN maintains its focus and meets its core technical mission. (4) Dialogue related to Internet governance should continue in relevant multiple fora. The U.S. will encourage an ongoing dialogue with all stakeholders around the world, and in the ensuing discussions the U.S. will continue to support market-based approaches and private sector leadership in the Internet's further development.

I applaud President Bush for clearly and forcefully asserting that the U.S. has no present intention of relinquishing the historic leading role it has played in Internet governance, and for articulating a vision of the Internet's future that places privatization over politicization. At the same time the administration has recognized the need for a continuing and constructive dialogue with the world community on the future of Internet governance.

I intend to closely monitor further U.N. actions in this area, especially the upcoming November meeting of the World Summit on the Information Society, WSIS, in Tunisia. I also plan to consult with experts and stakeholders regarding Internet governance, and will assess whether a legislative approach is needed to ensure the principles laid out by the administration remain the basis of discussion on this critical issue.

The growth of the Internet over the past decade, under the leadership and supervision of the United States, has been extraordinary. Over the next decade we can expect to see the global population with Internet access grow far beyond the 1 billion persons who presently enjoy that ability. The population of the developing world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication that the Internet can provide, along with the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government. Inserting the United Nations into Internet governance would be a dan-

gerous detour likely to hinder, if not cripple, the fulfillment of the full promise of the most dynamic and important communications infrastructure in all of human history. We simply cannot afford the delay and diversion that would result from such an unfortunate deviation from the path that has brought the Internet to its present and almost miraculous state of success.

#### AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. President, I rise today to praise the American Veterinary Medical Association for their efforts in ensuring the highest standards for animal and public health in this country. Before coming to Congress, I practiced veterinary medicine, and I appreciate the AVMA's role in helping veterinarians excel and grow in their professions.

At this time, I would like to read for the record remarks recently given by the president-elect of the AVMA, Dr. Henry E. Childers, at their 142nd Annual Convention in Minneapolis:

Members of the House of Delegates, the World Veterinary Association, other international guests, friends and colleagues . . . I am honored to be a part of this historic gathering. I am especially pleased to welcome my fellow veterinarians from around the world and to be addressing those participating in the first gathering of the World Veterinary Association in the United States since 1934.

Seventy-one years ago, the AVMA and the World Veterinary Association met to discuss the hot issues of the day: poultry diseases, advances in food animal medicine, food safety and global disease surveillance. Today we are meeting once again and discussing the issues of our day: poultry diseases, advances in food animal medicine, food safety and global disease surveillance.

3,917 veterinarians attended that 1934 meeting in New York City at the Waldorf Astoria hotel, many from the same countries that are joining us today. To each I extend our most sincere welcome, especially to our colleagues from Afghanistan and Iraq. I hope you find this experience to be one of the most memorable of your career.

Well, here we are, 71 years later. And while we may have different languages and customs, different ways of communicating with our clients and treating our patients, we have come together once again precisely because we have more in common than ever before. We are united in our quest for a better world and better medicine for both animals and humans. We are united in our concerns, we are unified in our challenges, and we are unified in the celebration of our achievements. We are what veterinary medicine is all about.

When I told my wife Pat that I was giving this speech, she reminded me of something Muriel Humphrey once told her husband, Hubert, this country's vice president and a favorite son from this great State. She said, "Hubert, a speech does not have to be eternal to be immortal." I will try to remember that.

I come before you today slightly imperfect. As many of you know, I just had a knee replacement.

My recent surgery got me thinking, do any of us truly appreciate our knees? Really appreciate the foundation they provide? I know I did not, not until they both gave out on me. I quickly came to realize, however, that my knees must work together in unity in

order for me to complete the tasks I take for granted. I just assumed they would provide a solid foundation without much attention from me. I was sadly mistaken.

Paying attention to our profession's basic principles is what I would like to talk to you about today. We all assume that our professional unity and our rock solid foundation are perpetual. They are not. Without attention and care, our foundation can slowly begin to erode. That is why I am dedicating my presidency to the care and nurturing of our professional unity—the essential cornerstone of our great profession.

Traditionally, past AVMA presidents have used this time to present you with a roster of very specific recommendations for new programs and initiatives. Many of those recommendations have resulted in impressive and important changes within the AVMA.

But different times call for different approaches. I come before you today with a total commitment to spending my year at the helm of this great organization working to reaffirm our unity.

As president-elect, I have spent much of the past year speaking to a wide variety of veterinary associations and student organizations. In May, when I gave the commencement address at Auburn, I was reminded of my own graduation. I was reminded of my classmates and my professors. Of the long hours and challenges that we faced and survived. I think back to the unity we felt as a class and our coordinated effort to help each other. Doing whatever it took to ensure that each individual met the challenges of the curriculum and graduated.

Unity got us through school and a C+ mean average did not hurt.

And on our graduation day, we became veterinarians. Not equine veterinarians. Not bovine veterinarians. Not small-animal veterinarians. We became veterinarians—members of a select group of professionals that dedicate their lives to ensuring the highest standards in animal and public health.

Why is unity more important today than ever before? Aesop said it better than I ever could: "We often give our enemies the means for our own destruction."

Today our profession is facing challenges, the likes of which we have never seen before. From town hall to Capitol Hill, from the classroom to the laboratory, from the farm to the dinner table, our attention is being pulled in a myriad of directions. In light of those challenges, we must remain focused, we must stay united. While we may practice in different disciplines involving different species of animals, we must be of one vision, one voice. We must maintain the highest standards in medicine and public health, encouraging and assisting others in accomplishing the same. While we may practice in different parts of the world, we must foster unity with our fellow veterinarians from around the globe. Good medicine knows no boundaries, knows no borders. We must cooperate and collaborate with our fellow veterinarians worldwide to make this world a better place for animals and humans alike.

Has there always been perfect unity within the profession? If you look back in the annals of our convention or in the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, you will see many instances where we did not all agree. We are a diverse profession, and there are bound to be differences in opinion. But I would argue that the French essayist, Joubert, was right when he said, "the aim of argument, or of discussion, should not be victory, but progress."

Some of the differences our profession is experiencing today may just be a reflection of what is happening to society as a whole.

For example, we have moved away from an agricultural society. In the past 20 years,