

real action that was not in the American interest was the decision to go to war unilaterally without the support of our allies and without a plan to win the peace.

There is no question that the White House sees political advantage in the war. You can see it in Karl Rove's speeches to Republican strategists. Just this morning, the New York Times reports that "the White House goal is to show substantial improvement in Iraq before next fall's reelection campaign." You can see it in the way they attack the patriotism of those who question them.

There are valid questions and deep concerns about the administration's rush to war in Iraq—in its rationale, whether there is a plan for winning the peace, how the money is being spent, and when our troops can come home with honor. Our troops, their families, and the American people deserve answers—not more politics as usual.

The administration has no plan for Iraq, and it shows. American service men and women are paying with their lives. The President's trip to the United Nations this week is now the most important journey of his administration but it didn't have to be this way.

The situation in Iraq is out of control, and American troops are paying the price every day with their lives. We have now lost more troops since the President declared an end to major combat than during the war itself. The administration says it has an international coalition, but it is paper-thin. America has 85 percent of all the coalition troops on the ground, and we are taking 85 percent of the casualties. This administration is muddling through day-by-day, while the lives of our soldiers are at risk and their families worry here at home. The administration has been unwilling so far to make the compromises needed at the United Nations to obtain the support our troops need to ease their burden and bring stability and peace to Iraq. The American people want to know from President Bush, when can their sons and daughters, their husbands and wives, their fathers and mothers, return from Iraq with dignity, having fulfilled their mission?

The White House may be saying things are going well and we should stay the course. But the American people know that major changes in policy are essential. We need a plan from the administration—a real plan—before we write an \$87 billion blank check to pay for this administration's hollow policy in Iraq. Terrorists are sabotaging the reconstruction efforts, lashing out in every way they can. U.S. casualties continue to rise. The headquarters of the United Nations was devastated by a truck bomb that specifically targeted and killed the U.N.'s highly respected chief representative in Baghdad. Nothing is sacred. A key Shiite cleric was assassinated in the bombing of a mosque. Even the Jordanian Embassy

in Baghdad was bombed, in an ominous message to other Middle East nations that cooperate with the U.S. Terrorists are said to be streaming into Iraq to take advantage of the new breeding ground that our failed policy has given them.

President Bush has asked Congress to provide \$87 billion more in the coming year to set it right in Iraq, but it is essentially a blank check. He says he will internationalize the conflict, but he doesn't want to share power on the ground. The administration had a brilliant plan to fight the war, but no plan to win the peace. It had a brilliant plan to overthrow a government, but no plan to deliver on the promise of democracy. The American people are confused about why we fought this war, and what our strategy is for winning the peace.

Last fall, the President said that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons. The, he said Iraq has an active weapons of mass destruction program. This spring, the administration claimed that Iraq was linked to al-Qaida. None of these are true. No one doubts that Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator, but what was the imminent threat to our national security? The administration's rationale was built on a quagmire of false assumptions. In terms of how we will win the peace, the administration also seems confused. The Secretary of State has argued that additional time is needed to establish a new government in Iraq. A few weeks ago, he said, "it will be some time before any new government could take over the responsibilities inherent in being in charge of security." But Secretary Rumsfeld, in an effort to assure that we are not getting bogged down, says that things are "moving at a very rapid pace in Iraq."

Which is it?

These and other facts lead the American people to question whether the administration has an effective plan to share the security burden with the international community, reduce the burden on our troops, and deliver on the promise of democracy. The American people deserve answers.

How will the administration obtain a broader international mandate—through the United Nations—to bring in other countries' troops and provide a greater role for the United Nations in the political development and reconstruction of Iraq? How many additional troops are needed to prevent the sabotage undermining the reconstruction? What nations will supply troops? What is the estimate of the duration of the U.S. military occupation and the likely levels of U.S. and foreign troops required for security? What is the estimate of the total cost of security and reconstruction, including the likely amount of international contributions?

What is the schedule for restoring electricity, water, and other basic services to the Iraqi people? What is the long-term schedule for the withdrawal of foreign and American armed forces?

The administration must answer these questions and provide a credible long-term plan for Iraq. We can't afford to continue our failed strategy of making it up day-by-day as we go along, when our soldiers are paying for it with their lives. We all hope the window to peace will stay open. If it closes, history will have no mercy—it will say this is how we went to war against Iraq, for the wrong reason, and lost the war on terrorism. That is the precipice we not stand on. The administration needs to show the American people and the world a plausible plan to correct this colossal failure in our policy.

In addressing the United Nations, the President should have taken responsibility for his administration's mistakes in going to war without the broad support of the international community. We need to involve the United Nations in a meaningful way in the transition in Iraq. Our policy cannot be all take and no give. The President should work with the United Nations as long as it takes to get an agreement to help our troops and bring stability to Iraq. Our troops are doing their jobs in Baghdad; now President Bush must do his in New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Wisconsin.

HELPING DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to offer some comments on one of the most serious problems we face in this Nation—the severe erosion of our manufacturing base.

This crisis has been well documented, and the statistics are dismaying. According to the Economic Policy Institute, between January 1998 and August 2003, manufacturing employment dropped by three million, and manufacturing's share of total gross domestic product fell from 16.3 percent in 1998 to 13.9 percent in 2002. In my own State of Wisconsin, 77,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost just in the last 2½ years.

Of course, as shocking as those numbers are, they do not begin to convey the depth of the personal tragedies behind them. Millions of families have had their breadwinner thrown out of work, and entire communities have been ravaged. When the factory shuts down, everybody in town feels the impact. Across my home State of Wisconsin communities are trying to cope with this crisis on a daily basis. There are, no doubt, a number of reasons for this sudden loss of manufacturing jobs, but at the absolute center has been our appalling trade policy. The trade agreements into which we have entered have failed to protect our businesses and workers against unfair competition from overseas competitors. This failed trade policy was the result of an unholy alliance of leaders of both the Democratic and Republican parties over the past decade and more. I opposed those trade agreements, and

until this country's trade policy is changed we will see more and more jobs shipped overseas.

We have seen this most clearly in the manufacturing jobs lost to China, but the problem is broader than just China. People have turned a blind eye to the impact of these trade agreements for too long. It is time for reality to set in here in Congress: These trade agreements have failed the American people. They have taken Americans' livelihoods and shipped them overseas. People in my State are left wondering who these trade agreements were for, if they weren't for America's workers? These men and women are the heart and soul of the economy in Wisconsin, and these agreements have taken their jobs out from under them.

The tool and die industry is one of the hardest-hit parts of the manufacturing sector in my State. In the town of Kewaskum, it was reported that the county board has taken the extraordinary step of making a loan to a local tool and die company to help it stay afloat in the face of competition with China. That is not typical for a county board, but it just goes to show how hard communities across Wisconsin, and across the country, are fighting to keep manufacturing businesses alive. These businesses are the lifeblood of our communities, and we turn our back on them every time we say yes to another one of these kinds of trade agreements.

Mr. President, no single policy can adequately address this problem. If we are to stop this hemorrhaging of manufacturing jobs it will take a concerted effort on several fronts, and over the next few weeks I will come to the floor to discuss some of the steps I think we ought to take.

Today I want to very briefly discuss one, and that is tax policy. A number of my colleagues have advocated changing our Tax Code to help beleaguered domestic manufacturers. In the other body, Representatives CRANE and RANGEL have proposed legislation to help domestic manufacturers by providing them with a tax incentive to keep production here at home, and to encourage those runaway plants that left our shore to return. In our body, Senator HOLLINGS has introduced the Senate companion to that proposal, S. 970, the Jobs Protection Act, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of that measure.

Under this bill, the new tax incentive for domestic manufacturers is offset by repealing the extraterritorial income provisions of the Tax Code. This offset means that the bill is paid for, and won't increase our already exploding budget deficit. I think that feature is essential to any measure we propose to spur economic growth for, as we know, budget deficits undermine long-term economic growth.

The repeal of the extraterritorial income provision deserves at least a brief comment. The foreign sales corporation tax benefit, and its successor, the

extraterritorial income, ETI, tax subsidy, were challenged by the European Union before the World Trade Organization as illegal export subsidies, and the WTO ruled in favor of the EU.

I opposed the ETI provisions when they were before the Senate in the fall of 2000 in part because, as I noted at the time, I fully expected the WTO to rule against them, which would subject American firms and workers to a possible multibillion dollar tax on American products purchased in the EU.

I regret to say that we now face that very problem. If we fail to repeal the ETI provisions enacted in November of 2000, American firms and workers will bear the brunt of billions of dollars in trade sanctions.

This situation is a testament to the failed trade policy that has, in great part, led to the crisis we are seeking in American manufacturing. Our tax policy is being held hostage to the rulings of an international bureaucracy, making decisions largely in secret.

As I noted 3 years ago, while the ETI tax subsidy may be bad tax policy, it is our tax policy—a policy arrived at through the elected Representatives of the people of this Nation. The ability of some international bureaucracy to impose punitive taxes or tariffs on American goods should offend all of us. Unfortunately, that is what we face because of the action Congress took in 1994 to ratify the GATT. And unless we eliminate the ETI export tax subsidy, American firms and American workers are at risk.

Faced with that situation, the best possible choice is to take this opportunity to repeal the ETI tax subsidy and use the additional revenue raised by that repeal to help our domestic manufacturers, many of whom are directly impacted by the WTO's ruling against the ETI tax subsidy.

As I noted earlier, I have cosponsored legislation offered by Senator HOLLINGS, and I was pleased to do so, but that bill certainly is not the only possible model, and I am willing to consider supporting other approaches so long as they are focused on domestic operations and are also fiscally responsible. I understand the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee are developing a measure that may fit the bill. I commend them for doing so, and look forward to reviewing their proposal. Our manufacturers are facing a crisis that is in great part the result of the policies promoted by our Government over the past several years. It is essential that we reform those policies to stop more jobs from being shipped overseas. But we must also take other steps to help American workers, and this sensible change to our Tax Code should be one of them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of

Alabama, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1753

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 1753.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike section 333 relating to a special judicial appeals process for cases involving timber harvesting in the Tongass National Forest)

Strike section 333.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the amendment I offer today is to strike section 333 from the Interior appropriations bill. Essentially, section 333 is an anti-environmental rider which would impose a 30-day statute of limitations for the public to seek judicial review of certain Forest Service timber sales in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. In other words, it is putting on very tough time constraints for the public to follow if they have a problem with timber sales in the Tongass.

I want to show you a little bit of what the Tongass Forest looks like. I was very fortunate to spend a week in Alaska looking at this magnificent park. I think I may well have been right in this area depicted in the photo. You can see how magnificent these pictures are and why this rider could be so