

Many of the initial difficulties in Iraq have been encountered elsewhere. Somalia, Haiti, Kosovo, and Afghanistan also experienced the rapid and utter collapse of their prior regimes. In each of those instances, the local police, courts, penal services, and militaries were destroyed, disrupted, disbanded, and/or discredited. They were consequently unavailable to fill the post-conflict security gap. In Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, extremist elements emerged to fill the resultant vacuum of power. In all five cases, organized crime quickly developed into a major challenge to the occupying authority.

In Bosnia and Kosovo, the external stabilization forces ultimately proved adequate to surmount these challenges. In Somalia and Afghanistan, they did not or have not yet, respectively.

Throughout the 1990s, the management of each major stabilization and reconstruction mission represented a marginal advance over its predecessor, but in the past several years this modestly positive learning curve has not been sustained. The Afghan mission cannot yet be deemed more successful than the one in Haiti. It is certainly too early to evaluate the success of the Iraqi nation-building mission, but its first few months do not raise it above those in Bosnia and Kosovo at a similar stage.

Over the past decade, the United States has made major investments in the combat efficiency of its forces. The return on investment has been evident in the dramatic improvements demonstrated from one campaign to the next, from Desert Storm to the Kosovo air campaign to Operation Iraqi Freedom. But there has been no comparable increase in the capacity of U.S. armed forces, or of U.S. civilian agencies for that matter, to conduct post-combat stabilization and reconstruction operations.

Nation-building has been a controversial mission over the past decade, and the extent of this controversy has undoubtedly curtailed the investments needed to do these tasks better. So has institutional resistance in both the state and defense departments, neither of which regards nation-building among its core missions. As a result, successive administrations tend to treat each new such mission as if it were the first and, more importantly, the last.

This expectation is unlikely to be realized any time soon. In the 1990s, the Clinton administration conducted a major nation-building intervention, on the average, every two years. The current administration, despite a strong disinclination to engage American armed forces in these activities, has launched two major such enterprises in a period of eighteen months.

Post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction with the objective of promoting a transition to democracy appear to be the inescapable responsibility of the world's only superpower. Therefore, in addition to securing the major resources that will be needed to carry through the current operation in Iraq to success, the United States ought to make the smaller long-term investments in its own institutional capacity to conduct such operations. In this way, the ongoing improvements in combat performance of American forces could be matched by improvements in the post-conflict performance of our government as a whole.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004—Continued

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know my colleagues will be coming to the floor to speak more about the situation in Iraq, but I take a moment as one of the managers of the DC bill to give a few closing remarks on that subject and wrap up a couple of issues this morning. Then I understand the Democratic leader will come to the floor. When he does, I will be happy to yield. And I see one of my other colleagues.

For the record, I follow up a couple of comments from my friend from Missouri who spoke just a few minutes ago on the subject.

One, he referred to a letter from Secretary Paige. We on our side do not have a copy of that letter. It has not been submitted to us. We would be pleased to receive it if there is such a letter indicating support for this three-sector approach, because all we have is the "Statement of Secretary of Education Rod Paige On the DC School Choice Initiative Before the House Committee on Government Reform," dated June 24, 2003.

I have spent the last 30 minutes reviewing again the statement, which I had read once before, and there was no mention at all in this statement of any three-sector approach. It is approximately 20 pages long, and I have highlighted every reference to the choice initiative fund proposed by the President, and there is no reference in here for charter schools or for education reform for traditional public schools.

So I want to submit this statement for the RECORD. That is all we have on this side. If there is a new statement from the Secretary, we would be happy to review it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Secretary Paige be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF EDUCATION ROD PAIGE ON THE DC SCHOOL CHOICE INITIATIVE BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, JUNE 24, 2003

Chairman Davis and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Bush Administration's proposal to initiate a program to expand school choice in the District of Columbia in fiscal year 2004. I welcome the opportunity to describe our proposal and explain our reasons for putting it forward. I am also very pleased to appear at this hearing with Mayor Anthony Williams, who has been, and will continue to be, our partner in developing this initiative. I truly appreciate the Mayor's willingness to work with us, and the relationship we have developed around the simple idea that wider educational options can benefit the children of the District of Columbia.

This hearing occurs very close to the anniversary of a very historic moment in the history of educational choice in America. On Friday, we will observe the one-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in

Zelman v. Simmons-Harris, the case that determined that a properly structured school voucher program is constitutional. When the Court announced that decision, I hailed it as one that could open doors of opportunity to thousands of children and could transform the educational landscape in our country. That statement is worth repeating today, as we think about how to improve and reform elementary and secondary education in Washington, DC.

Mr. Chairman, I know that officials in my Department and Members of Congress have been concerned about the quality of education in the District of Columbia for many years. D.C. public schools are only a short walk from our offices, we see District students going to and from school each day, and we read about the challenges of the D.C. public schools in the newspapers almost daily. We all want the capital of the greatest nation on earth to have some of the finest schools on earth. At one time this city's schools were considered among the best in the entire Nation. But for many years we have been disappointed by the performance of public schools in the District, and at the seeming inability of public school officials to manage schools and programs effectively.

In some respects, the situation in the District may be no different from that in other urban school districts that educate large numbers of children living in poverty, but in other respects the District has sometimes seemed uniquely resistant to reform and improvement. I say that with full respect for Superintendent Vance and with appreciation for what he is trying to accomplish and for some of the things he has achieved, but I think it's the truth.

Let's consider the performance of D.C. students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP as it's called, the assessment that measures the performance of students over time in reading, writing, math, and other core academic subjects. In the most recent mathematics assessment, administered in 2000, only 6 percent of D.C. fourth-graders tested at the "proficient" or "advanced" levels, the levels that show that students have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter. A lower percentage of students in D.C. demonstrated proficiency than was the case for any State. At the other end of the scale, 76 percent of D.C. fourth-graders scored at the "below basic" level, which means that they could not demonstrate even partial mastery of the math skills and knowledge that are appropriate at the fourth-grade level. The 2000 8th grade math results were very similar; only 6 percent of D.C. students tested at the "proficient" or "advanced" levels, and 77 percent were "below basic."

The most recent NAEP reading assessment took place in 2002, and the National Assessment Governing Board announced the results just last week. The results for D.C. students were a little better than the 2000 math scores, but still were completely inadequate. Only 10 percent of D.C. fourth-graders could read proficiently, while 69 percent were "below basic." At the 8th grade level, 9 percent were "proficient" or "advanced" and 52 percent were "below basic."

Looking at the quality of a school system requires more than just reviewing scores on achievement tests. But when we look at other indicators, they too show that D.C. public schools are not providing the education that children in the District need or deserve. The most recent edition of Quality County, the annual review of education trends and data produced by the newspaper Education Week, gave the District a grade of only a D+ for having an acceptable system of academic standards and accountability, a C in the area of success in recruiting new

teachers, and a D+ for school climate. The D.C. public school system has a long history of management problems in such important areas as facilities maintenance, personnel and payroll, food service, procurements, and even in accurately counting enrollments. In addition, the system has historically failed to comply with the requirements of Federal programs, such as Title I and Special Education, to a point where the Department has had to enter into compliance agreements with the District that call for implementation of major reforms within specific timelines. We insisted on these agreements not because some paperwork wasn't being filled out correctly, but because the District was, for instance, failing quite egregiously to provide its disabled students with the free appropriate public education required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

I would like to repeat what I said a few minutes ago: I support and respect the work that Paul Vance is doing in the District. I know that he has taken on the major management problems and having been a big-city school superintendent myself, I know that turning around a system is not easy. And Superintendent Vance has shown some results. The District's Stanford-9 achievement test scores for 2002 showed minor improvements at most grade levels in reading and math. And the proliferation of charter schools in the District, including some that have achieved great initial success, has given more choices and greater hopes to students and parents. But I believe the preponderance of information demonstrates that schools in the District are not achieving what they should and that more needs to be done if children in the District are to achieve to the high levels called for under the No Child Left Behind Act.

The Bush Administration has responded to this problem by including, in our fiscal year 2004 budget request, a school choice initiative for D.C. You might ask whether expanding educational choice to include private-school options is appropriate for the District, whether it is likely to work, whether giving students wider educational opportunities is likely to help the D.C. public school system improve, and whether we should, instead, request more money for D.C. public schools. Let me address those issues.

We believe that the President's budget includes more than adequate support for D.C.'s public schools, including charter schools. Our request for Department of Education elementary and secondary education formula programs would provide some \$92 million to the District in 2004, an increase of 15 percent over the level only two years ago (2002). And let's forget that D.C. already spends, per student, more than all but a handful of urban districts across the country. If money were the solution, then we would have solved the problems of public schooling in the District a long time ago. We believe, instead, that tackling this problem will depend in large measure on giving D.C. students more educational choices.

In the communities across the country that have experimented with publicly and privately funded school choice programs that include private-school options, the results have been extremely positive, for the students directly served by the programs and for the school system as a whole. For example, research by Patrick Wolf of Georgetown University, along with Paul Peterson and Martin West of Harvard, on the first two years of the scholarship program administered by the privately funded Washington Scholarship Fund (WSF), showed that the math and reading achievement of African-American students who enrolled in private schools using support from the Fund was significantly higher than the achievement of a control group of students who remained in

D.C. public schools. This research also found that parents who received support from the Fund gave their children's schools higher ratings than did parents of children in the control group, and that their children were doing more homework. Studies by these and equally eminent scholars in other cities, such as Milwaukee, San Antonio, Cleveland, and Dayton, offer very similar results.

What about the charge that voucher programs "cream" the best students from the public schools and thereby weaken public school systems? We find no evidence to buttress that claim. To the contrary, research by Caroline Hoxby of Harvard and others has found that students who take advantage of private school choice options are typically at least as educationally and economically disadvantaged as students who remain in the public schools. To some extent, this is because existing choice programs have explicitly targeted children from low-income families, as our initiative would do. But even without this targeting, programs that include private-school options seem to attract students who are no more affluent, and have no better an educational profile, than other students. In addition, there is at least preliminary evidence that school districts in which public schools have been exposed to private-school options seem to attract students who are no more affluent, and have no better an educational profile, than other students. In addition, there is at least preliminary evidence that school districts in which public schools have been exposed to private-school competition, through a choice program, have responded by improving educational services. In Milwaukee and in the Edgewood district in San Antonio, the presence of a choice program was associated with gains in achievement in the public schools.

Those findings are consistent with my own experience directing the Houston Independent School District, the Nation's seventh-largest. In Houston, we didn't resist school choice; we embraced it. We created a system of charter schools even before the State did. We let children in low-performing schools take their share of the funding—\$3,750 a year—to a private school. I believe that our acceptance of choice, our willingness to compete with charter and public schools, helped us to make the changes we needed to make in order to achieve the learning gains for which we received national acclaim.

For these reasons, the Administration has put forward our proposal. The outlines of this proposal are very simple. The President's budget request for fiscal year 2004 includes \$75 million for a national Choice Incentive Fund. Under this program, the Department would make grants to support projects that provide low-income parents, particularly those who have children attending low-performing public schools, with the opportunity to transfer their children to higher-performing public and private schools, including charter schools. A portion of the money would be reserved for the District of Columbia.

We anticipate making a grant either to the D.C. public school system or to another, independent entity to operate the program in the District. The grantee would then develop and implement procedures for certifying schools to participate in the program, informing D.C. families about the choices available to them, selecting students to participate, and then monitoring and reporting on the program as it goes forward. The proposal in our budget did not specify the maximum amount of assistance an individual student could receive, but we want it to be sufficient to allow students a good choice of educational options.

We also see accountability as a major feature of this initiative, because it will give parents in D.C. the ability to hold schools

accountable for meeting the educational needs of students. And we will provide for a rigorous evaluation of the project in D.C. (as well as the other projects funded by the national Choice Incentive Fund) by examining the academic achievement of students, parental satisfaction, and other results, so that the lessons can be applied to future programs and initiatives. We want to obtain solid evidence on the benefits of expanding educational options and making schools accountable to parents while respecting the flexibility and freedom of participating private schools.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this proposal has engendered a great deal of attention in the media and elsewhere, including some vociferous criticism. Before I end my statement, I would like to respond to some of the major criticisms, to set the record straight.

We've heard that the Administration is trying to impose this initiative on the District against the will of its citizens and with no input from its elected and appointed leadership. That is not the case. We have met not only with Mayor Williams, but with Councilman Kevin Chavous, who is the Chairman of the Council's Education Committee, and with School Board President Peggy Cooper Cafritz to discuss our proposal, and we look forward to continuing our discussions with these and other local officials. I would like to commend these officials for the courage they have shown in publicly endorsing a D.C. school choice initiative and their willingness to work with us on the details. We want to implement a choice program that reflects the needs of the District and reflects the input of D.C.'s leadership; we don't pretend to have all the answers.

I acknowledge that a choice initiative that includes private school options will probably not, in the end, be what some of the political leaders in the District want. It is, however, what I believe the parents want. The Washington Scholarship Fund has a waiting list of approximately 5,000 children. One D.C. parent, Virginia Walden-Ford, the leader of the D.C. Parents for School Choice, testified before Councilman Chavous's committee and said the following:

"We have received hundreds of calls from parents who have not been lucky enough to get a scholarship through the many scholarship groups in town, WSF, Black Student Fund, etc., and parents who are camping out for charter schools that are not keeping up the pace of parents' need to get out of failing schools. They contact us looking for better options for their children. Parents here in the District are daily expressing their frustration in a school system that is taking too long to fix itself."

I note also that a majority of people in the District of Columbia support choice, including choice that includes private school options. In a 1998 Washington Post poll, 56 percent of D.C. residents said that they supported using Federal money to help send the city's low-income students to private or parochial schools, while only 36 percent opposed. For African-Americans this support was even stronger—60 percent were in favor—and among African-Americans with annual incomes of under \$50,000, it was even stronger, with 65 percent in favor.

We in the Department have also heard that this initiative will bleed money from the District's public schools. That is also not the case. The Choice Incentive Fund proposed by the President represents new money. It was not obtained by subtracting funds from the other Federal programs that support D.C. public schools. If the initiative does not go forward in the District, my guess is that the money will be used in other communities to expand educational choices and improve educational outcomes in those communities.

We've also heard complaints that we are supporting a voucher program when we could

be supporting the District's charter schools instead. We find this complaint especially interesting since it has recently been voiced by some who were never strong charter school supporters before. But that's all right with us because we strongly support charter schools too. We will continue to fight to make sure the President's charter school funding priorities are fulfilled, especially on the facilities front, so that this vibrant movement can keep flourishing.

And, finally, we've heard that all the Administration cares about is launching a voucher program in the District, that we don't care about the children who will remain in the public school system. That couldn't be farther from the truth. Our Department has a record of reaching out to the D.C. Public Schools, to work with the system on overcoming its problems, of providing it with information, technical assistance, and other resources. We've adopted individual schools in the District and provided those schools with hands-on assistance. In our meetings with D.C. officials, we have said that we will continue these efforts, and I'm happy to state that in public today. The choice initiative should be just one element in an effort to improve education in the District and ensure that all children can achieve to high standards. We want to contribute to the larger effort as well.

Let me close with a quotation from Dr. Howard Fuller, the former superintendent of schools in Milwaukee, currently the Director of the Institute for the Transformation of Learning at Marquette University, and a strong advocate of opening up wider educational choices for children and parents. Dr. Fuller has said:

"In America, it is virtually impossible for our children to bring their dreams to reality without an education. Unfortunately, far too many of our children are not only having their dreams deferred, they are having them destroyed. They are being destroyed by educational systems that are undereducating them, miseducating them, and pushing them out by the thousands every day. We must have a sense of urgency about changing this unacceptable situation."

It is that "sense of urgency" that drives this proposal.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today. I would be happy to respond to any questions that the Committee may have.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, another point I would like to make is that the Senator made a statement that needs clarification. As I started out this morning, I said the details of this are very important, because if you pursue the details and you dissect the details, you will eventually get to the truth. So there is one detail I must repeat. And I guess I am going to have to stand here, I don't know, every day or a month or a year to continue to say this until the other side cries uncle. This proposal is not—it never was, it is not today—limited or designed for failing schools. Let me repeat, this proposal is not—not when it was initially proposed, not last week, not yesterday, not last night, not today, not this morning at 5 minutes to 12—limited to children in failing schools.

Although the proponents say they are interested in helping children in failing schools, the real issue for proponents of vouchers is they simply believe in choice. That, of course, is their prerogative. But to stand behind the visual of poor people struggling in

schools that are failing is absolutely false. This proposal, as written, if anyone reads it, is not limited or directed to failing schools. It gives a preference to students in failing schools, but it is not designed to students in failing schools.

That principle is worth fighting over because the whole accountability system we have put into place is about identifying schools that are failing, and then providing resources to those schools to make them better.

If the other side gets away with saying, "Well, that is what we said, but that is not really what we meant, because we aren't interested in putting resources into failing schools, we are interested in putting resources into all schools, because our job is to make parents happy," I think that is just such a foolish goal.

Let me say why I think it is foolish. As much as I would like to see every parent happy, in my 25 years in public life I don't know how in the heck we would measure that because some parents are real happy, some parents are a little happy, and some parents are happy in some ways and not happy in other ways, and I would have no way of measuring what is a good measure for parental happiness. If someone in this Chamber has any way to measure parental happiness in a way that taxpayers could know if parents are a little happy, just a little happy, happy on Mondays and not on Fridays, and that was our goal, please tell me because I would be open to discuss it.

It is foolishness. We should be directing revenues, if we are going to do that, to failing schools. This proposal is not directed to failing schools. They can say it 1,000 times. I ask you to read the details.

Now my third point. I know my colleague has been very patient, but I have to make this point. My colleague from Missouri asked me, What difference does it make? What difference does all this make?

It makes a huge amount of difference. We, as a Congress, with this President, in a bipartisan way, have embarked upon a new effort, a new journey, to take good public schools and make them great, knowing that some schools are excellent but some schools are really bad. And as a Nation, we are saying since 1965 our general plans are not working as well as they should have, so let's make a big adjustment. We have made a big adjustment, and that difference is worth fighting for, the strengthening of public education in the greatest democracy in the world.

People on my side say to me: Senator LANDRIEU, you have spent a lot of time on this issue. For Louisiana, the State I represent, and for the country I love—and all of us love our country and our States—this is about as essential as it gets.

The fourth point I want to make: My friend from Missouri talks about the single moms. Please help these single

mothers, poor single mothers who are working and can't afford to send their children to school. Please help.

And they show pictures of African-American single moms and Hispanic single mothers, kind of indicating, in a very insulting way—I know they do not mean it to be insulting, but you could interpret it as that; and I know that is not the intention—but there are those of us over here who think we spend a lot of time fighting for poor women. I have spent my whole life, basically, doing that. So it is really hard for me to accept this criticism. But I am not perfect, and maybe I have failed in some way in that effort. But when my friends say things to me, that we need to help single mothers, let me just ask them a question. Is it that party or this party which does not support the increase in the minimum wage for these same women? Is it that party on the other side of the aisle which refuses to raise the wage from \$5.15 to help poor women have more choices in their life, or is it this side of the aisle? Is it that side of the aisle which refuses, year after year, to put more money into day care so the same poor women who are working two jobs—early in the morning until late at night—could have some sense of satisfaction that their children will be well cared for while they are contributing to the great economy of this Nation, or is it our side?

So you have to understand—I hope people understand—this is a very important debate. The facts will speak for themselves. They can run all the ads they want, all the bumper stickers, and all the headlines, but that is what the facts are.

I have this letter we received today. It is dated September 26. It is from Secretary Paige.

I am writing today to express my strong support for the District of Columbia education improvement initiative. . . .

This bill includes a three-pronged initiative to:—

And here it is—

(1) improve DC public schools . . . (2) create new charter schools . . . and (3) provide scholarships.

This is the first official letter we have received.

This letter is a step in the right direction.

I see the leader on the floor. But let me just say, until this administration says they will veto any bill that does not have this in it, the Members who are willing to negotiate on this have no assurance that this is the way it will ultimately come out.

So I thank the Secretary for clarifying the position. I commend him for his innovation. But again, until we have a statement of a veto from the President unless this proposal includes these three provisions, with permanent funding for all three, we do not have any assurance these words will actually match the rule of law. And that is still a problem.

I see my leader and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I appreciate all of her effort in providing leadership to the Senate on this appropriations bill. We will have more to say about it next week.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S LACK OF COOPERATION WITH 9/11 COMMISSION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wish to use leader time to talk briefly about another matter I call to my colleagues' attention.

Late last year, I had the opportunity—indeed the obligation—to work on and support the most important commission that has been established in all my years in public service.

In the aftermath of the terrible terrorist attacks of September 11, the families of the victims and all Americans turned to their elected leaders in the White House and the Congress to help them obtain some answers to how this tragedy occurred and what steps should be taken to prevent future 9/11s.

Senate Democrats, led by Senators LIEBERMAN and TORRICELLI, proposed that the best way to provide these answers was to establish a blue-ribbon, independent panel to carefully sort through all the facts and evidence and interview key policymakers.

The record will clearly show that this commission was strongly opposed by the White House. In fact, Vice President CHENEY called me twice to indicate, incorrectly in my view, that creating such a commission could jeopardize the administration's efforts in the war on terrorism.

Other Bush officials in other settings made it clear to the families and Democratic and Republican members of Congress that they were less than enthusiastic about having a commission examine the administration's actions prior to 9/11.

After it became clear that their opposition was politically unsustainable, the administration switched gears and decided to support a commission provided that Congress remove several key elements of the Lieberman/Torricelli proposal designed to ensure the commission functioned as effectively and independently as possible.

Congress was effectively asked to take it on faith that the executive branch would work with the commission on a nonpartisan effort to shed light on the tragedy of 9/11.

Regrettably, that promise has not been realized as the administration continues to throw roadblocks in front of the commission's work. In July, the Chairman Kean and Vice Chairman Hamilton stated publicly that the Bush administration has been slow and unresponsive in producing information sought by the commission.

Shortly after receiving this report, the Senate unanimously approved an amendment offered by myself and sev-

eral other Senate Democrats urging the President to immediately and publicly call for all executive branch agencies to provide their fullest and most timely cooperation to the commission.

Unfortunately, no such call was issued, 2 more months have elapsed, and we have another report from the chairman and vice chairman that should provide no comfort to those seeking the truth about what happened on 9/11. While stating that administration cooperation has improved, at the half-way mark of the commission's life, Chairman Kean said, "We have not got everything. We have not gotten everything that we feel we need to do our job."

Chairman Hamilton indicated that the commission's work is at a crunch point and that unless the commissioners receive satisfactory cooperation from the White House the Commission will be unable to meet its May, 2004 reporting deadline.

Other commissioners have been more stark in their assessment. According to a recent article in the Los Angeles Times, two commissioners said, "the investigation is still hampered by heel-dragging by the White House and federal agencies."

Despite the administration's attitude toward the creation of this commission, all of us who supported it hoped that once established the administration would recognize the significance and importance of its work and cooperate fully.

We all owe an immense debt of gratitude to the commissioners for their hard work and dedication to this effort. Each of them has already spent countless hours on this task and the families and the nation appreciate their work. It would be a shame if the administration's lack of cooperation prevented them from completing their important task.

As Vice Chairman Hamilton's remarks indicate, time is running out on the administration to reverse course and do right by this investigation. Time is running out on the commission to get the information it needs to complete their work. And time is running out on the families and all Americans to get the answers they deserve. I urge the administration to immediately and completely cooperate with the commission so this work can be completed successfully to the expectations of those families who have given so much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have just come from a meeting to discuss the Appropriations Committee work beginning next week on the request from President Bush for \$87 billion in urgent supplemental appropriations for Iraq. Of that \$87 billion, roughly \$66 billion is in support of the military and the mission in Iraq; \$21 billion is for

the reconstruction of Iraq. We will begin writing an appropriations bill in response to all of this next Tuesday morning at 10.

I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention a couple of things with respect to this issue. First, when America sends its sons and daughters to defend our interests, when America puts its soldiers in harm's way, it has an obligation to provide the resources and funding needed to support their mission. I will support that. I will vote for that. I believe the Senate, the entire Congress will do that. But, there is a difference between providing the funding on an urgent basis for support of our troops to carry out their mission in Iraq and Afghanistan and the request for the reconstruction of Iraq. I want to describe that difference.

Iraq is a country with substantial resources. It is not a country desperately impoverished. It is a country with 24 million people. It possesses the second largest oil reserves in the world. Ambassador Bremer told us this week that when pumping at capacity, by next July he expects the Iraq oil fields to be pumping at about 3 million barrels per day. That produces about \$20 billion in revenue per year, \$16 billion of which is available for export; therefore, the development of currency as a result of the export sales of \$16 billion a year of oil, each year, from the country of Iraq. This is not an impoverished country. This a country with substantial wealth under its sands. Pumping that wealth in the form of oil and selling it produces substantial revenue for the 24 million people.

With respect to the question of the reconstruction, I want to go back to April of this year and to a "Night Line" program in which Ted Koppel had on one of the top folks in the Department of State who is in charge of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Andrew Natsios. He was asking Mr. Natsios about what would be required of the American taxpayers for the reconstruction of Iraq. I want to read this exchange because it occurred on the ABC television network 5 months ago.

Ted Koppel says: You are saying that the top cost for the U.S. taxpayer will be \$1.7 billion with respect to the reconstruction of Iraq?

Mr. Natsios, one of the top officials in the Department of State, who heads the USAID which has the mission for projects for reconstruction: Yes, for the reconstruction. Then there is \$700 million in the supplemental budget.

He was referring to something we had done earlier this year for humanitarian relief.

Koppel says: But as far as reconstruction goes, the American taxpayer will not be hit for more than \$1.7 billion, no matter how long the process takes?

Mr. Natsios: That is our plan. That is our intention.

Koppel says: And these figures, outlandish figures I have seen, there is a bit of hoopla in all of this?