The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Connecticut and I wanted to enter into a very short colloquy about an unrelated matter. Therefore, if it would be all right with the chairman, I ask to amend the consent to allow for a brief colloquy between Senator Dodd and myself on an entirely different matter.

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection. Just, when Senator McConnell yields the floor, I do not think I will get the floor. I did commit we would set aside some time for him to make a statement. He has not made a statement on the bill yet.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1874

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments will be set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1874.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. SHORT TITLE.

SEC. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) That on October 7, 2001, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations in Afghanistan, designated as Operation Enduring Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of the Taliban regime, the elimination of Afghanistan’s terrorist infrastructure and the capture of significant and numerous members of Al Qaeda;

(2) That on March 19, 2003, the Armed Forces of the United States and its coalition allies launched military operations, designated as Operation Iraqi Freedom, that quickly caused the collapse of Saddam Hussein’s regime, the elimination of Iraq’s terrorist infrastructure, the end of Iraq’s illicit and illegal programs to acquire weapons of mass destruction, and the capture of significant international terrorists;

(3) That success in those two campaigns in the Global War on Terrorism would not have been possible without the dedication, courage, and service of the members of the United States Armed Forces and their coalition partners;

(4) That throughout the proud military history of our nation, we have recognized our brave men and women of the Armed Forces by awarding them service medals for personal bravery and other leadership actions and for their service in military operations abroad and for support operations at home and abroad;

(5) That historically the President has relied on senior military officers to recommend the personal and theater campaign medals and that, in keeping with these long-standing traditions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combatant commanders, including General Tommy Franks, U.S. Army, former Commander of the United States Central Command, recommended the awards described below in recognition of the worldwide nature of the current conflict;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE AWARD OF CAMPAIGN MEDALS.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, on an expedited basis, issue the necessary regulations to implement these awards and ensure that any persons who rendered qualifying service with the Armed Forces in those phases of the Global War on Terrorism including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle should promptly receive these awards.

HELP AMERICA TO VOTE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut and I wanted to address the Senate just for a few moments on another matter. I yield the floor and suggest the recognition of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

Very briefly, I had intended to offer an amendment at an appropriate time, most reluctantly, because it is unrelated to the subject matter at hand. But all my colleagues can relate to this frustration from time to time. When there is something you want to get done, you get opportunities to get it done, you pick any vehicle coming along which might help you get it done. Recognizing that this was going to be one of the last funding measures to move along this year, I had intended at the appropriate time to offer an amendment that would have provided additional resources for the Help America Vote Act, on which my friend from Kentucky and Senator Bond and many others played a very critical role almost a year ago when it became the law. As a result, the administration requested for the fiscal year 2004 Supplemental Appropriations to be provided to support voting activity in Afghanistan and the Global War on Terrorism earmarked at least $35 million for voter registration and elections in Afghanistan.

I accept that priority. All countries must have the resources to establish and maintain their democracies and to administer and conduct elections for their citizens. The voice of the people, exercised at the polls, secures the future of any democracy, whether abroad or at home. And we are convinced that all of the funding in this bill is truly an emergency—such as for $3,000 computers or $50,000 dump trucks—when it comes to election funding. I will agree with the President. Funding to ensure the system by which a nation establishes and preserves a democracy is an emergency.

But if it is an emergency in Afghanistan, it can be no less of an emergency in America. The voice of the people, the voice of democracy is the voice that is expressed through the vote. And it is not enough to count the vote, but the vote must be counted. If America is to be the example for emerging democracies, whether in Afghanistan, or Iraq or any other part of the world, then our system of giving our citizens an equal voice—our system of elections—must mean what it says.

But what we learned in the elections of 2000 was that not all American citizens enjoyed an equal voice. In fact,
This content appears to be a clean and structured version of a legislative speech discussing the importance of full funding for the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). The speaker emphasizes the need for comprehensive voter registration, fraud prevention, and the importance of bipartisan support to ensure fair elections. The text also highlights the need for full funding to meet the requirements of the act, pointing out that the $1.86 billion authorization for HAVA is insufficient and that additional funding is necessary to meet the needs of all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The speech underscores the need for action, noting that the integrity of our elections is at stake and that full funding is critical to ensuring the reforms Congress has approved are implemented. The speaker criticizes those who have failed to provide the funds to States, pointing out that the promised funding for the 2004 and 2005 fiscal years has not been provided. The speech concludes with a call to action, urging colleagues to support full funding of HAVA and to continue working towards fair and secure elections.
Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say to my friend from Kentucky that was a grand quest on which we were mutually engaged over a year ago to enact new election reform legislation, a major piece of civil rights legislation, along with Senator BOND and others. Both of us are committed to getting it fully funded and both of us agree the current supplemental appropriations is not the place to do it. But we are committed to trying to achieve that, and to believe it; soon, and at a more appropriate time.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut for not offering the amendment on this measure and pledge to work with him to achieve the goal we both desire.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky. I thank Senator REID as well, the minority whip, Senator STEVENS, and Senator INOUYE for interrupting his prepared statement. I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I stepped off the floor. Just so I understand, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, is going to speak for approximately 20 minutes. Senator STEVENS indicated to me that there were two or three amendments on the majority side that they want to do. And I have several amendments this morning. They wanted to, in effect, catch up. We want to reciprocate with amendments. Following that, we will offer an amendment. I don’t know how many amendments the Senator from Alaska wants to offer prior to going back to our side. If we just had some idea so we can have our folks lined up here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had an amendment with Senator DURBIN. Are we ready for that amendment?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to talk to the Senator off camera, so to speak. But we have a plan, if the Senator will approve. I will talk off camera momentarily.

Could Senator STEVENS give us an idea of how long the work on your side is going to take so we can have an amendment lined up after that?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I really can’t tell how long it is going to be. We haven’t put any time limit on amendments today. I won’t do it on this side. They wouldn’t take them on the other side. There will be no time limit on these amendments: Senator HUTCHISON has an amendment, Senator WARNER has an amendment. I think there is an amendment on the list for Senator NICKLES. There are a series of Senators on this side who still have amendments that could be raised. My understanding is that once we have measured about the same number of amendments presented by the other side so far today we would come back to our side of the aisle.

Mr. REID. The only thing I would say is that everyone knows we have a lot more amendments than the other side. We have at this time I think still 29 or 30 amendments. It doesn’t seem fair,
for lack of a better word, that the majority is going to get rid of basically all of their amendments leaving us with all of ours when we still have to finish this bill tomorrow. That is looking more remote all the time. I don’t see how in the world we can do that under the circumstances I apologize to my friend from Alaska for not being able to get a time agreement on one of the amendments. That is the only one. On the rest of them, we worked out time agreements.

I think, again for lack of a better word, in basic fairness we should have some idea about how long it is going to take on the other side until we are ready with amendments over here. Otherwise, I would have no alternative but just say go ahead with regular order and start offering the amendments that are already pending.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that may be the alternative because I have tried all day to speed up that side in terms of the presentation of amendments—all day long. I started at 11 o’clock this morning. We have just finished handling five amendments on that side of the aisle. We haven’t had one from this side of the aisle yet. I don’t think I would say fair or unfair. We have had Senators who notified me they want to bring up their amendments that it is time for us to bring up amendments on this side. We couldn’t get any agreement on time over there. I don’t know of any reason why we should have time agreements over there.

If the Senator wants to proceed with regular order, I am all for it. There are 16 amendments. We will be on those until midnight. Some of them may not be called up at all. But we can call them up, if the other side wants to do that.

I believe, in balance and fairness, we have been compelled to be balanced on this side now for 5 hours. I think we are now going to be on this side for about 4 or 5 hours.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, everyone here should know that this bill will not be finished tomorrow. Understand that it will not be finished tomorrow. If it is going to be 4 or 5 hours on amendments on the majority side when they have just a few amendments, this bill will not be finished tomorrow, period. Take however long they want. We have done everything to cooperate. There was one amendment that we didn’t get a time agreement on but we still finished that in a reasonable period of time.

I have the greatest affection, respect, and admiration for the distinguished manager of this bill. But to take 4 or 5 hours, that is 9 o’clock. To think we can finish this bill tomorrow is hallucinating. We can’t do that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I remember my good friend from Nevada saying just let things work out this morning at 11 o’clock when I tried to get things done. He said to me that we were going to move as quickly as we can and turn to some of the amendments on this side for a while.

Mr. REID. There is a basic difference. If I may say, there are some people over here who really don’t care much about this bill ever passing. That is the way the Senate is.

Senator DACHELLE has used his good office because of a gentlemen’s agreement that he had with the manager of the bill and Senator Frist to move this along as quickly as possible. We are trying to do that. It is one’s fault, but one of the Senators had a medical problem that held us up for several hours before we were scheduled to vote. It seems there is always some problem here.

We have tried as much as we can to be responsible in our ability to move this bill.

Four or five hours—I just repeat, we can’t finish this bill tomorrow. Everyone should understand that. That isn’t done with any animosity. It just can’t be done.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senators on this bill have not received any calls from the Senate on the phone to come in and get their amendments, all the amendments that we didn’t get a time for us to bring up amendments on that side. All I am asking for is balance and fairness in terms of what we allowed the other side to do in handling their amendments until now. If that means we have to go to regular order, I am prepared to call for regular order. If that is the case, I am saddened to hear my friend from Nevada say a gentleman’s agreement exists on the basis that the Democratic side of the aisle is allowed to call up amendments whenever they want and for how long they want but they want time agreements and assurances on our side. That isn’t the agreement we made. That is not the gentlemen’s agreement which I understand we made.

If the gentlemen’s agreement is broken and we do not finish by tomorrow, we should know that right now. If that is the case, then I can assure the Senate that we will be back in session Saturday and we will be here Sunday. We are going to finish this bill this week. That word I took as a word of a Senator. All leadership agreed that we would finish this bill tomorrow to the best of our ability. I am still relying on that word.

Mr. President, I suggest we proceed with Senator INOUYE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Under the previous order, the Senate is now in recognition. Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the current situation in Iraq and the growing concern that many of my colleagues have expressed regarding our policies in this most volatile and dangerous region of the world.

Last October, I was one of 23 Members of this Senate who voted against a resolution to authorize the war in Iraq. I voted against going to war for five main reasons.

First and foremost, I did not believe the administration had made a compelling case that attacking Iraq was in our vital national interest.

Second, I was not convinced that the classified information presented to the Senate offered conclusive evidence that Saddam Hussein provided a threat to the American people or that he would use weapons of mass destruction if he possessed them.

Third, I was not convinced that his regime was aligned with al-Qaida terrorists or was in any way involved with the September 11 attack on the United States.

Fourth, I did not see that the administration had presented a well-thought-out plan for dealing with Iraq.

Finally, I believed that attacking Iraq when many of our closest allies and virtually all of the Nations in the region opposed it to it would cast the United States as the aggressor in the world and deal a terrible blow to our international reputation and prestige.

I was convinced that going to war under these circumstances would almost certainly sacrifice the almost near universal support and good will this Nation had gained following the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. I regret today I still have many of the same concerns about the policy.

Mr. President, according to the Senator, the majority of my colleagues disagreed with me, and Congress approved an attack on Iraq. I know this is not to second-guess but only because it sets the stage for where we are today. The question for the Senate is what should the Congress do at this point? Our principal responsibility as Senators is to protect the people of this great Nation. Particularly, it is my belief we must fight for those who defend us. I have often said less than 1 percent of our population protects all the rest of us by wearing our Nation’s uniform. I will say once again, I strongly believe it is our sacred duty to serve them. We simply must support the men and women willing to serve in harm’s way.

Our forces fought gallantly in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Our military strategy proved to be effective in war even if the rationale for war and post-war strategy can be questioned. Our forces proved once again that they are the most effective fighting force in the world.

Today, more than 125,000 U.S. military personnel remain in Iraq. While
all of us would like to know how long they will stay and how long they will be needed, I am confident each and every one of my colleagues agree they deserve our support. To guarantee the support, we must ensure that we provide sufficient funding for our forces to be adequately prepared to meet the challenges they face in Iraq.

Many in this body question the administration’s policy. They want to criticize the war because we have not yet found that weapon of mass destruction. Our debate should not be focused on whether Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. Regardless of how we came to be in Iraq, I ask my colleagues what do we want to do now? Should we punish the administration for putting us in this position? I would only say in seeking to mete out punishment on those political leaders with whom we might disagree, we will most likely only punish our sons and daughters who have volunteered to risk their lives and to let happen.

The question we must ask at this moment is, How should we proceed? The cost of the ongoing war on terrorism is staggering. As has been mentioned often in the Senate, $87 billion is an enormous amount of money. Since September 11, the Congress has approved the supplemental defense funding in excess of $100 billion in response to the terrorist attacks on our Nation and for the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, most of these costs were coupled with the impact of large tax cuts, we no longer are running a surplus. Instead, we have a deficit estimated to exceed $500 billion.

I understand my colleagues’ frustration and understand why they demand better accountability. In seeking solutions, they have argued that we should not have to pay for the reconstruction of Iraq. They want Iraq to use its oil re-
serves to pay for its own infrastructure. I am all for Iraq paying as much as it can. Its country, strategically, it is not in any position today to do much of that.

So should we wait? I would argue no. Our sons and daughters are in Iraq and the conditions are not good. The infrastructure to support our military and Ambassador Bremer and his staff is not conducive to getting Iraq back on its feet. We cannot turn our backs on our men and women in the military who are doing what we required of them.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental request to support our military forces to help end this conflict quickly and do all we can to get our sons and daughters home sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we turn to discussion of the amendment currently pending before the Senate.

Today, we call on the Department of Defense to finalize regulations that will ensure that the Global War on Ter-
rorism Medal, the medal that the Joint Chiefs of Staff picked and that the President has authorized for military operations, will be awarded on an expedi-
ted basis to the men and women of the Armed Forces who serve in the global war on terrorism.

Recently, on this bill we dealt with an amendment that would have created a congressionally mandated medal when a medal already authorized by the President and recommended by the military was already in the works and awaiting final approval of the necessary regulations. That medal awarding final approval is the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal. It can be awarded to all who serve in Oper-
ation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission against further terror-
ist attacks and recognizing duty in areas that do not qualify for the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

We all know of the fine work that is going on to preserve our homeland security. We know of the efforts to guard our borders, hunt down terrorists, and secure our airports. There are those who have volunteered to risk their lives on the other side, and we must support that effort. We also must support the right stuff. I would like to point out, if my colleagues have difficulty getting this money, we will make sure that the right staff sending you the right stuff—having the right staff sending you the right stuff. Without a competent, capable, and talented support staff in the Global War on Terrorism, our men and women in the Armed Forces would not have the right tools for the job. Their lives would be at greater risk and so, too, would the freedom we cherish here at home. It is right that we recognize all that they provide for our soldiers, our sailors, and our airmen, as well as what they do for all of us.

Yet the implementing regulations for eligibility for both these medals have not been issued by the Secretary of De-
fense.

So today, what will we do, if my amendment is adopted, is we, in the Senate, will call upon the Secretary of Defense to complete action as soon as possible on implementing regulations so these awards can go to any person who renders qualifying service with the Armed Forces in those phases of the
global war on terrorism, including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle.

This amendment says the regulations providing for a medal already in the works—by the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps—and authorized by the President should be implemented as soon as possible and, in doing so, should also recognize those who serve in Operation Noble Eagle and in support roles for our military abroad. These are the critical distinctions: those who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle.

Mr. President, I know Senator McCain and Senator Warner would also like to speak to my amendment. They are not in the Chamber at the moment but would like to speak. And I believe there is another Senator on our side of the aisle who would like to speak on this amendment as well.

So pending their arrival, I suggest the adoption of this amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to address the sense of the Senate on behalf of men and women in the Armed Forces offered by our distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of the resolution.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to give strong support to this and I want to say against the background—and the other day we had a similar matter before the Senate and I rose to address that. It was a technical problem, primarily, with that resolution. This one, which I have read carefully, in a very straightforward manner, reiterates the history of personal decorations and theater awards and, in particular, how these matters, throughout the military history of this country, have been actions taken by Presidents upon the recommendation of the senior officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and, indeed, the Coast Guard. Furthermore, this legislation has moved to put in place those recognitions—most deserving, I would say—of men and women who have gone to the farflung corners of the globe and accepted the risks, together with their families, of going to those areas for the cause of freedom and to protect the security interests of the United States of America.

That region of Iraq is very much in our hearts and minds every day. I have had the privilege, as have many in this body, to travel to the region and visit with our troops. Likewise, I have had the privilege to go and visit with our forces in Afghanistan. Most recently, I went to Liberia, where the strike task force—largely composed of U.S. marines but under the control of a very fine Army officer—performed extraordinary duties on behalf of the people of Liberia, who have suffered a decade-plus of civil war turmoil. I went on assignment, but others are equally enthusiastic about this.

The point I wish to make is these decorations are proudly worn on the uniform of the men and women in the Armed Forces. They are coveted items of families for generations. In my office, I have proudly displayed the decoration earned by my father who volunteered as a young Army doctor in World War I to go to France where he served in the trenches. I remember as a young person of his telling stories to me about life in the trenches, the extraordinary devastation he witnessed, the loss of life, and the carnage. But there on the wall was his World War I Victory Medal. It had on it three bars of the three major conflicts. He was proud to wear it on the uniform of the United States when he saw service.

It is a carefully thought through process that we cannot award a separate medal for every conflict. We have to recognize the theater of operations. For World War II, it was the European theater and it was the Pacific theater. There was a medal given to those in the continental limits in training commands. There were three basic theaters of operation, and then stars were awarded for the major conflicts in the theaters of Europe or the Pacific.

It is not a wise course of action to award a separate medal of decoration for each of the many theaters we are engaged in today. Rather, there should be just the principal decoration which, as we say in the final paragraph of this resolution, I will read that:

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should, on an expedited basis, issue the necessary regulations to implement these awards and ensure that any person who renders qualifying service to the Armed Forces of the United States in the course of the Global War on Terrorism, including Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Noble Eagle should promptly receive these awards.

That is a category of awards given primarily for Iraq and Afghanistan and contiguous areas where the men and women of the Armed Forces are serving actually in the front lines or, indeed, in a support phase.

I strongly urge the Senate to adopt this amendment. I hope there are 100 votes in recognition of this course of action.

To those who, with the best of intentions, have recommended specific theaters, specific zones, such as Iraq, we then have to think of Afghanistan, we have to think of Liberia, although, fortunately, that was an operation that was successfully performed in a relatively short period of time. I could go throughout the world.

It is better there be theater-of-operations awards and individuals singled out. I know, for example, if I may say, when I was Secretary of the Navy and heavily involved in the subject of awards. I remember so much working with the father of the distinguished Senator from Arizona who was commander in chief of all military forces in the Pacific, ADM Pumpin’ Jack McCain. I know a lot about him. I learned a lot from him.

The Senator from Arizona will recall from his earlier experience how theater recognition is given and then the star to recognize those engagements in which one participated. That is a process carefully supervised by the senior military, primarily the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I am quite interested in the views of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on this subject. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Virginia.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Virginia that perhaps for a week or two of what happened yesterday and what we are trying to do under the leadership and initiation of Senator McConnell.

Yesterday there was, as part of the $67 billion assistance package to Iraq, an amendment that was proposed which would have bestowed a specific decoration on those who fought in the Iraqi conflict. There was a provision also that prohibited others, those eligible for that medal, from being eligible for other decorations, as I understood it. Then that provision was voluntarily removed by the sponsor of the amendment. I ask my friend, isn’t it a little appropriate to remember what happened?

On March 12, 2003—that was a number of months ago—the President of the United States, by Executive order, which is the proper and accepted methodology for this kind of designation of awards, established the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal to be awarded to service members who serve in military operations to combat terrorism on or after September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to, actions in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, in such locations as Afghanistan, Iraq, the Republic of the Philippines, and elsewhere in Southwest Asia, in recognition of sacrifice and contribution.

In addition to that, in that same Executive order the President established the service medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal recognizing service in Operation Noble Eagle and the homeland defense mission and the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal for those—forty-five military duties here domestically—in providing security and much-needed service here.

In other words, isn’t it the Senator’s understanding there were two medals? That by Executive order, following the advice of senior military and civilian defense leaders, President Bush established two different medals for men and women of the Armed Forces offered by our distinguished Senator from Kentucky.
Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is very correct in the recitation of the facts. I add one other perspective, and that is how well the Senator from Arizona understands with his distinguished career the identification of the branches of the military service and should a special award be made for Iraq, think of the families of those who served in Afghanistan, particularly who lost life and limb. They would think: Why is not the sacrifice of our serviceperson, those who lost life and limb, who served in Afghanistan, particularly Iraq, think of the families of those who lost life and limb in the process, I found this needed a little more of the focus, I am perhaps remiss. I thought that by now they were in being, but in fact when I went directly to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and those involved in the process, I found this needed a little more of the focus. This is the very basic reason for this amendment that is laid down today. We have their attention now, and they are going forward with these decorations.

So for that reason, we must say to Senator Bingaman that that was a very fortunate development.

Mr. MCCAIN. Again, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his desire and motivation to honor these brave young people.

I say to my friend, President Bush signed this Executive order on March 12. The way I count, that is 7 months ago. I am deeply disturbed that the Secretary of Defense has not acted to implement these regulations. I would like to tell my good friend he fails to mention that I still have people who work over there. The Secretary of Defense is busy and I know the Secretary of Defense is busy, but I think we have every right to expect immediate action on this so that these men and women can go about receiving this recognition because they cannot until these papers are signed.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is absolutely correct. As I said, we have brought this matter and the urgency of it to their attention, and that is one of the very positive results from the efforts of our colleagues on the other side and the initiative taken by the distinguished whip on this side in this amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I mention to my friend from Virginia, too, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, perhaps we should look at whether individual medals should be given for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and perhaps individual medals should be given for the conflict in Afghanistan, as two prime examples. Perhaps it is not sufficient to just have an expeditionary medal and a service medal.

I had hoped that when we had acted in order to separate those two conflicts from others, we would get input from the Secretary of Defense, that there would be proper consultation and hearing and scrutiny before the Senate Armed Services Committee before we act.

I think the Senator from Virginia pointed out that if we only gave an Iraqi freedom medal, what about those in Afghanistan? Is there an Afghanistan freedom medal, too? No, that was not mentioned in the Secretary's. That is why these things with noble motivation have to be thought through. I hope that with this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which we will all vote on, we will send a message that was in support to give to the chain of command the importance of recognizing the service and sacrifice of the young men and women of our Armed Forces today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleagues who have known the McCain family. I served with the Senator's father and have followed the distinguished Senator's career, and it stands in parallel to the finest careers of those who have served in this body in years past, today, and who will serve in the future, who have worn the uniform of this country. So I value greatly the views of the Senator from Arizona and I thank him.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say to my good friend he fails to mention that I served under the distinguished Senator from Virginia when he held the position of Secretary of the Navy. I might say I served way under. Given the chain of command, there were probably at least seven or eight individuals who separated the two of us, but I certainly appreciate the honor and pleasure of having served under then-Secretary of the Navy Warner. I have appreciated the relationship we have enjoyed in the intervening 30 years.

Mr. WARNER. I do not know. I fail to count the number of years. It is 30 plus. But I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. My career is so inconsequential in the U.S. military compared with his. I do believe I received the good conduct medal. To the best of my knowledge, the Senator never received the conduct medal either. I do not think I was ever considered for that.

Mr. WARNER. I do not think the Senator was eligible then and he is not eligible now. I think it is likely the Senator will never be eligible.

Mr. MCCAIN. If it was up to a vote of our colleagues, I doubt I would be eligible today.
Mr. WARNER. Well, maybe we should cease this colloquy at this moment. I see others who perhaps would like to speak.

Again, we commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his initiative on this matter. I was somewhat saddened yesterday that we had to have a division of views on what I believe was the best of intentions by the Senator from New Mexico. I think now this is an opportunity for us to shake hands on this and move on and resolve this matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Corrny). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I note the presence of the Senator from New Mexico. I hope he was able to hear our remarks concerning our appreciation for his motivation to honor these young men and women who have served and sacrificed. We look forward to and anticipate we will continue working together on this worthy cause.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I understand the majority leader will be coming to the floor shortly to address our current legislative circumstances. I have become increasingly concerned about our ability to finish this bill. We have noted that concern to the majority leader, as well as to the manager of the bill.

Our concern stems from two real issues: One, the unwillingness on the part of some to have votes on the pending amendments. I am told now there are eight or nine amendments that are pending, that have been offered and that have been set aside. Tomorrow is Friday. We wanted to have votes on all of those amendments. Yet for whatever reason, we have been unable to get to the votes.

The second issue is the issue involving the amendments to be offered by the Senators from Indiana and Wyoming, Mr. BAYH and Mr. ENSIGN. I am told, for whatever reason, many of our colleagues on the other side are unwilling to allow that amendment even to be brought up. If that is the case, obviously we are not going to be able to finish this bill. We can't have completion of the consideration of this legislation until that amendment has been offered and we have an opportunity to debate it and vote on it.

So, for whatever reason, we are stymied this afternoon at 5 o'clock with, I guess, some 30 amendments pending.

We had indicated all along we would make our best good-faith effort to try to finish this. But it seems to us that we are not going to be able to do so.

So, for whatever reason, we are stymied this afternoon at 5 o'clock with, I guess, some 30 amendments pending.

We had indicated all along we would make our best good-faith effort to try to finish this. But it seems to us that we are not going to be able to do so.

Now we are here Thursday afternoon at 5 o'clock with nine amendments we are told cannot have votes on, and one of them that cannot even be offered. So we are going to have to come to some understanding about how to proceed. I must say, with each passing hour the likelihood that we will be able to complete our work as we had hoped we could—by the end of the day tomorrow—dwindles and diminishes to a point where it will soon be nonexistent.

I call these concerns to the attention of my colleagues in both parties. I want some clarification about the schedule and about our ability to deal with these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend, the Democratic leader, we agree that the amendment to which you referred is one of the last—I hope the last important amendment to be offered. I don't know whether there are other amendments on that side of the aisle that will have a need for debate at some length. But the amendment to which the Democratic leader referred is obviously one a number of people are calling the amendment to speak to. I think we will be able to go to it sometime in the early evening because there are people here who are going to want to speak on that amendment. I know people on your side are going to want to speak on that amendment.

I am still optimistic that we can press on into the evening. It is still our hope to finish the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am gratified to hear the distinguished assistant Republican leader is optimistic. I was optimistic. I hope I can have that optimism restored. As I noted just a moment ago, there are about 30 amendments pending, but we really believe that a lot of the amendments that are still pending on the outcome of the amendment to be offered by Senators BAYH and ENSIGN. So it is hard for us to move forward on the other amendments until that one has been resolved.

So we are in a situation where we cannot move forward until our Republican colleagues acknowledge the need to, not only offer the amendment, but to have it debated and voted upon, so we can clear the way for whatever additional amendments along the lines of the subject matter that the Bayh-Ensign amendment addresses.

That is the issue. That is the concern we have. I hope we can clarify it soon. But I only raise this concern because I suggest the hour, while it is not late, is getting later, and we do not have a lot of time to finish all the work that is left.

I believe we made our commitment, kept our commitment, and I hope we can accomplish what many of us had hoped we could do 2 weeks ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Not to prolong this, because I think we are at essential agreement, but it was hard to get anything going during the day today, as is often the case around here. This is quite a nocturnal institution. The Sun goes down and we get busy working.

But I certainty should have listened to the Democratic leader the amendment to which he referred is a significant amendment. It is certainly our expectation we will be able to go to that amendment sometime early in the morning. According to some reports, we are told now there is some discussion on some of the other amendments, and so we may have the vote on the amendments tonight or tomorrow morning. So we will continue working on this bill.

I say to my good friend, that doesn't mean we have a whole lot more amendments coming from that side of the aisle that are going to require extensive debate. I heard the Senator from South Dakota and others say that is the last significant amendment. I certainly hope that is the case because then I think we have a chance of wrapping it up sometime soon and moving on to other matters.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I hope I didn't say that this was the last significant amendment because I know many of my colleagues who have amendments to offer certainly view them as significant. I wouldn't want to characterize their amendments as insignificant. If I led the Senator from Kentucky to that conclusion, I want to clarify that was not my intention. I think then I think we have a chance of wrapping it up sometime soon and moving on to other matters.

But I also reiterate, we have eight or nine amendments pending that would require votes. We are basically in a quorum call with no real expectation of a vote on many of these amendments for the foreseeable future.

There are two issues. One is this amendment on loans offered by Senators BAYH and ENSIGN. The other is clearing the logjam of amendments that already have been offered, including one by this Senator, that awaits a vote. So the sooner we can get on with those votes, the sooner we can get on with the consideration of the Bayh amendment and the sooner we can address the other backlog of amendments that are waiting to be offered.

I thank my colleagues for their attention to this and hope we hear from the majority leader sometime soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. REID. I very much appreciate the Democratic leader's observation and his patience. We have a number of amendments that we have asked Members to withhold offering because there have been other matters on the Senate floor. During this period of time, we have had virtually no quorum calls until the recent episode where there has been movement—speaking only for myself—preventing anything from happening on this bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I will in just one second. So we have basically been without
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are prepared to vote now, if that is agreeable with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I would be happy to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it true?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Is it true that we had a 97-to-0 vote on the Byrd amendment, as I recall?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. REID. I would like to respond to the question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nevada to respond.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it would be totally appropriate to have a vote on this as long as the Senator from New Mexico had 5 minutes to speak. The majority now by the majority is a result of the very important amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I have no problem. My only point is this: There may have been one vote that was 98 to 0. I don’t remember that. There certainly could have been. I assume this will be another one. But I think that will be fine after the Senator from New Mexico speaks, and then vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes equally divided between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Mexico and that at the end of those 10 minutes, the Senate proceed to a rollcall vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object and ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana be accepted, that Senator BAYH be recognized to present his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me speak very briefly on the pending McConnell amendment which Senator MCCONNELL, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator McCAIN have offered.

First, I congratulate them. I think this is a very constructive amendment. It gives recognition to the men and women who are serving overseas in various locations. It puts the Senate on record in support of the Senate amendment, in support of the issuance of appropriate medals to these individuals.

I believe, as I was arguing the day before yesterday when we had this debate on this issue, that an appropriate course is either on the initiative of the Pentagon or through action by the Congress that at some stage fairly soon we authorize combat medals for those who serve in Iraq and for those who perhaps serve in Afghanistan. That seems to me to be consistent with the course we followed previously. We had a medal of that sort for those who served in the first Gulf war. We had a medal of that sort for those who served in Vietnam. There is ample precedent for that.

To lump all military engagements that we have after 9/11 under this large umbrella of the global war on terrorism and say we are going to give you one medal for whatever military engagements you serve in after that date I think is inadequate. I think the men and women serving in Iraq today deserve special recognition for that.

I have seen the suggestions being considered at the Pentagon for putting a star on some designation—on a generic kind of a medal dealing with the global war on terrorism, some kind of star indicating services in Iraq. To me, that would not be consistent with what we have done before. I hope we won’t go that route.

Obviously, this is a step forward. I commend the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Kentucky for putting forward this amendment. I intend to support it. I hope all Senators will support it.

But I hope we will find a way or that the Pentagon will find a way to do...
more to recognize the service of these individuals both in Iraq and in Afghanistan. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER). Mr. President, may I say to my colleague from New Mexico, with whom I have had the privilege to serve now for close to two decades in this body, and who was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and a very valued member, that he has given this Senator's attention. I appreciate what he is doing to support the pending amendment, and I urge colleagues to do likewise.

If I might say first, while he was not present in the Chamber when I brought the attention of the Senate that the debate which followed his amendment the other day did bring about this Senator's personal attention on the status of several decorations, I found that it was the most moving along, in my judgment, in an expeditious and timely manner. That debate the other day served a very important service to the men and women of the Armed Forces who are engaged in these particular theaters.

I would like to work with the Senator and with the Department of Defense to pursue his thoughts about perhaps additional recognition for service in the theaters of Iraq Afghanistan. I am just not prepared at this time to give a definitive answer.

This is the course, as proposed by the amendment which is before the Senate, which has been followed for years. So many places in the world today have often no geographic boundaries and have no identity. Yet people who are on guard wearing our uniform, coalition forces and other nations, are subjected to loss of life and limb in combating that terrorism.

I am not able at this point in time to come up with some definitive suggestion. But I certainly would like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks that there should be an expression of gratitude to those persons serving in these theaters right now for their service and that given by their families. I thank the Senator.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. WARNER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. WARNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1874. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The roll was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 387 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka
Alexander
Allen
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Bond
Boxer
Breaux
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Byrd
Campbell
Cantwell
Carper
Chafee
Chambliss
Clinton
Cochran
Coleman
Collins
Corzine
Craig
Cornyn
Corker
Cooper
Dade
Dayton
DeWine
Dodd

Dole
Domenici
Durbin
Edwards
Enzi
Feingold
Feinstein
Fitzgerald
Frist
Graham (FL)
Graham (SC)
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Harkin
Hatch
Holmes
Inhofe
Johnson
Kohl
Kerry
Kohl
Kyl
Landrieu
Laurence
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lincoln
Lott

Lugar
McCaIN
McConnell
Mikulski
Miller
Markowski
Marrs
Nelson (FL)
Nelson (NE)
Nickles
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Roberts
Rockefeller
Santorum
Sarbanes

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1874) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1869, AS MODIFIED; 1870, AND 1873, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have three amendments that have been cleared by both sides: Amendment No. 1869, as modified; amendment No. 1870; and amendment No. 1873, as modified. I send them to the desk and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1869, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to arm, train, or employ individuals under the age of 18 years for the Facilities Protection Service)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2313. None of the funds appropriated at section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, called or ordered to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, are deployed outside the United States, the deployment shall be considered to have begun on the first day of the active-duty service to which called or ordered and shall be considered to have ended on the last day of the active-duty service to which called or ordered.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BREAUX. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. CANTWELL. I have offered an amendment to this bill that will bring predictability and clarity to our deployment of National Guard and Reserve units.

I thank my cosponsors, Senators BOND and LEAHY, the cochairs of the Senate National Guard Caucus, as well as Senators BINGAMAN, LEAHY, JOHNSON, NELSON of Florida, GRAHAM of Florida, MURRAY, RYAN, PUGH, LAUTENBERG, and KERRY, who are joining me in sending a message that we need to be consistent in how we calculate the deployment times for our Guard and Reserve personnel.

This amendment will direct the Pentagon to consider the full activation time for Guard and Reserve personnel in considering its deployment policies and also to establish a program to
Guard and Reserve officers were calculated from the moment they were actually activated—that is, when they are called to leave their jobs and families to begin pre-mobilization preparation time and included post-mobilization time.

This preparation time can sometimes take as much as 3 to 6 months. As a result, thousands of troops in the theater of operations who were expecting to go home—literally counting the days to return—were just informed that their time would be extended, some by as much as 6 months.

This is just wrong.

As Mark Kimmey, an Army reservist, wrote in the New York Times: “the message to reservists is unmistakable: the Army no longer takes into account sacrifices made to maintain two career lives.”

We absolutely own it to our Guard and reservists to give them predictability in the process and to fully recognize that for Guard and reservists, when they serve when their country calls, the sacrifices made to maintain two career lives are serving from the point they are activated.

My amendment will direct the Pentagon to revert back to the standard practice in considering, for the purposes of deployment announcements, mobilization reports and communications, the clock to start ticking from the point of activation—that is, “boots out of the house.”

If we need our reservists to serve in theater for 1 year and 6 months in preparation time, that’s fine. But let’s be honest, these troops are being deployed for 18 months—not a year. Troops, families, and employers deserve the respect of our acknowledging the sacrifice.

Let me be absolutely clear—this amendment does not, by any means, seek to limit the operational use of the Guard and Reserve, nor are we seeking to limit the flexibility of their use.

This does absolutely nothing to limit the ability of the Pentagon to mobilize, and use our Guard and Reserve units, nor does it limit the length of time that they can be deployed. Moreover, the amendment’s provisions can be waived at any point in the case of dire, unexpected operational needs.

We are simply asking the administration to adopt the standard practice in effect for decades in calculating deployment times so that troops and their families can know when to start their clocks.

Ultimately, this is a very modest amendment. We are asking the Pentagon to be honest, consistent and predictable in the use of our Guard and Reserve. They deserve it; their families deserve it; we owe it to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1876

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 1876.

Mr. NICKLES. 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 express the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt.)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Snc. ... (a) The Senate finds the following:

(1) When Saddam Hussein came to power in the 1970’s Iraq was a prosperous country with no foreign debt and significant foreign cash reserves.

(2) Iraq’s reserves were exhausted during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980’s and Iraq became a debtor nation.

(3) Today, the debts incurred by Saddam Hussein’s regime are estimated to be as much as $150,000,000,000.

(4) A process has been put in place that will establish a new representative Iraqi government based on a democratic political system with a free market economy. The goal is a prosperous Iraq that is not a threat to its neighbors.

(5) For Iraq to be prosperous it must rebuild. In the near term the United States and other donor countries will provide grants to begin the process. In the longer term Iraq must be able to fully participate in the international financial system.

(6) It is impossible for Iraq to borrow funds in international financial markets based on its existing debt. Eliminating that debt will make possible Iraq’s continued rebuilding toward a prosperous and stable nation. A prosperous nation is less likely to be a threat to its neighbors and to be a breeding ground for terrorists. A prosperous Iraq is more likely to be a positive force in the region and participate in the world economy.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that all countries that hold debt from loans to the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein should be urged to forgive their debt.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment urging the countries that presently hold Iraqi debt to cancel or forgive that debt. All of the Iraqi debt was generated after Saddam Hussein came to power in that country.

The history of the Iraqi debt was that, when Saddam Hussein took control, it was a very rich country, and it had no debt. Saddam Hussein started a war with Iran and he incurred a lot of debt. When he came into power, they had no foreign debt. During Iraq’s war with Iran, Iraq incurred debts estimated at about $60 billion. Most of that was to finance the war.

Iraqi arms purchases during the 1980s were estimated from $52 billion to $102 billion. Saddam Hussein used debt to purchase arms. He used debt to build palaces. He used very little debt, if any, to help the Iraqi people.

We asked the Congressional Research Service to give us an analysis of what countries hold or own Iraqi debt.

I ask unanimous consent to print this information in the RECORD.
The Iraqis have a lot of infrastructure needs. They have a lot of rebuilding needs. They have a lot of needs that have been ignored by the previous regime, by Saddam Hussein, for decades. If they had to make payments on this existing debt, I think it would only compound, frankly, their future and their survival.

I urge in this sense-of-the-Senate amendment countries that are holding debt that was incurred by Saddam Hussein’s regime to forgive that debt so that Iraq can move forward and rebuild Iraq without being so tied up with this existing debt. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was interested in the comments by my colleague from Oklahoma. I don’t know if anyone here who would object or disagree with the contention that those who hold Iraqi debt ought to forgive that debt. I have spoken on this subject at some length a couple of times.

Ambassador Bremer appeared before our Appropriations Committee and indicated that Iraq would be producing about 3 million barrels of oil a day beginning in July of next year. I asked the question then about using future proceeds from pumping Iraqi oil for the purpose of repayment. He indicated that that would not be possible because of the encumbrance that existed with foreign debt.

I asked Ambassador Bremer who holds this foreign debt. He said Russia, Germany, France, and others. When I did research later, I discovered exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma discovered. In fact, Russia, Germany, France, and India do hold Iraqi debt, but the larger debt is owed to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Arab states which, incidentally, in combination, equal about the debt that both the Saudis and the Kuwaitis hold with Iraq.

It occurred to me that if we are concerned that Saudi Arabia and Kuwait recover the loans they gave to Iraq, maybe we ought to ask the Saudis and Kuwaitis to track Saddam Hussein down and present him with a bill. The Iraqi government that incurred that debt, the government that existed at that point. It clearly was not a legitimate government.

As you know, in the last election of that government, Saddam Hussein received 100 percent of the vote and those who voted had to walk down an aisle, a long gallery of pictures of Saddam Hussein, and hold their ballot above their head that was clearly marked “Saddam Hussein.”

That is the government we are now told legitimates further to the Saudis and the Kuwaitis. In my judgment, that government no longer exists, and the encumbrance of Saddam Hussein ought not, in my judgment at least, obligate the Iraqi citizens to do anything.

I know there will be people who are tall thinkers with thick glasses who have some thought about international obligations that I may not understand. It may be that I don’t understand all the nuances, but I do understand this: That Saddam Hussein has vanished. The Saddam Hussein government was a government run by a butcher. We are, in the opening of our football season, open-grave with 10,000 and 12,000 skeletons in them, and we are told the only legacy of that government that ought to remain an obligation is the debt Saddam Hussein ran up with other countries.

I don’t think that debt ought to be considered to be existing debt at this point, with all due respect to those countries. If in the 1980s we had countries that were pals of Saddam Hussein, they were lending Saddam Hussein money, at this point it seems to me they ought to track down Saddam Hussein and present him with a bill.

We are told from time to time by intelligence sources that Saddam perhaps has a substantial amount of money squirreled away in Swiss banks. They say he stole that country blind. I don’t know the facts about that. I suspect that is the case. I suspect Saddam Hussein and his government squirreled away a substantial amount of money. In any event, we can’t find him. I suggest to those to whom he owes money or to those whom his former government owes money, they ought to track him down and present him with a bill.

We have had a long discussion here and will, I guess, again, perhaps tonight or tomorrow, about what kind of obligations the American taxpayer should have with respect to the reconstruction of Iraq. It was my belief—and I regret my amendment was not adopted, but I accept the voice of the Senate on that amendment—it was my belief that the countries that held this foreign debt should forgive that debt.

For the Middle Eastern Gulf States, it is much more. Saudi Arabia is reported to hold $25 billion of Iraqi loans; Kuwait, $17 billion to $27 billion; other Gulf States, from $18 billion to $30 billion.

If the Iraqi debt is from $95 billion to $150 billion—let’s say it is $120 billion—what we were making payments even at 5 percent—that is $5 billion. $6 billion, $7 billion a year in interest payments—they could not afford to pay it. These interest payments would consume 80 percent to 130 percent of Iraq’s oil revenues. Clearly, that is not sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries (7)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Gulf States</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Congressional Research Service Memorandum.
I understand we have already decided that question. My amendment did not pass the Senate. But as we discuss further amendments about grants versus loans, I wanted to make a comment following the discussion by the Senator from Oklahoma. I believe his numbers are accurate. And I think the numbers discovered with respect to foreign debt owed by Iraq. More properly, I think it is foreign debt owed by Saddam Hussein's government, a nonlegitimate government, a brutal dictatorship.

In the event that the Iraqi people ought not at this point be burdened by that debt and I would suggest to creditors, including the Saudis and Kuwaitis, that the paper for those debts is worth only that which it will produce once Saddam Hussein is found and it is presented to him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma, and I think perhaps a little discussion about the history of debt and debt repudiation, debts being placed upon countries that have been defeated or liberated, might be in order.

In anticipation perhaps of this debate, a member of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, Melanie Mickelson, prepared a memo for me and other members of the committee entitled "Iraqi Debt and Reconstruction." I ask unanimous consent that this memo be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, when we think of forgiveness of debt or repudiation of debt, we think back usually to Germany, to the debt that was placed on Germany at the end of the First World War by the Versailles Treaty and the great political hay Adolf Hitler was able to make out of this debt as he told the people of Germany that the Versailles Treaty had been a stab in the back and the people who had imposed that debt on Germany were the people who were German primary enemies.

I do not want to make too much out of that aspect of Hitler's rise to power, but there was no question but what the enormity of our debt on Germany at the end of the First World War was destabilizing on the country and made it very difficult for Germany to bring itself back as a viable nation and made Germany potentially vulnerable to the kind of political appeal Adolf Hitler represented.

Let us put this in some perspective with respect to Iraq and what we are talking about here. At this time, the debt that was placed upon Germany was roughly two times Germany's gross domestic product, or GDP. To put that into perspective for the United States, right now our debt is roughly half of America's GDP. If we assume the GDP is running at $11 trillion in round figures, we would say the debt Germany faced by comparison would be similar to putting a debt on the United States of $22 trillion. That, of course, takes one's breath away when you think about the impact of that on the United States. Twenty-two trillion dollars. How in the world, even with as vital and vibrant an economy as we have, would we be able to survive if we had a national debt of $22 trillion?

That was the debt that had such significant historical impact on Germany in the last century.

What are we talking about with respect to the debt Iraq currently faces? Is it half their GDP, as it is in the United States? Would it be as burdensome as the German debt at two times GDP? No, neither of those figures applies. When we talk about the size of the debt Iraq currently carries compared to their present GDP, we are talking about ten times GDP; not two times. Again, to translate that into numbers we can compare to America, that would mean that America, the strongest economy in the world, with our present GDP of roughly $11 trillion, would be saddled with a debt in excess of $120 trillion.

How prosperous would America be if we were faced with that kind of a debt load? Obviously, it would sink us, even though we have the strongest economy in the world.

We have people around here who are worried because our current debt is roughly half of GDP, and to talk about ten times GDP is absolutely impossible. So the logical thing to do is for all of the countries to respond to the call that is represented by the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma and forgive the debt.

Why? Let us go through the reasons. One of them has been raised by Senator Rockefeller. That was the Donner Committee. That was incurred on behalf of a brutal regime which has been overthrown. Some of the debtor countries might say, when there is a coup in a country and the government is overthrown, whoever takes over takes over the obligations. Saddam Hussein was not overthrown by a coup from the Iraqis. He was overthrown by the 82nd Airborne. He was overthrown by the United States of America and the marines, by the British troops, the Polish troops, and the other coalition members that were in overthrowing that government.

So while the Iraqi people are very grateful Saddam Hussein has been overthrown, while the Iraq people rejoice that Saddam Hussein has been overthrown, the Iraqi people by no means are responsible for the debt that survives because he was overthrown. They were the victims of the debt, not the beneficiaries or perpetrators of the debt. For that reason, they should not be held accountable.

There are other reasons. There are sound economic reasons. We have a principle of bankruptcy in this country. When, as a result of circumstances, whether they were caused or just out of somebody's control, someone finds himself absolutely incapable of repaying the debt, we go through bankruptcy court and say we are going to give you an opportunity to wipe the slate clean and move forward. We are going to discharge your debt through bankruptcy.

If any country has been reduced to bankruptcy, it is Iraq. The GDP I described is substantially below what their potential earning power will be, but they can never realize that earning power if they are not free from their past debts by virtue of a bankruptcy action.

What the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing is essentially the countries that hold the debt allow the Iraqis to file bankruptcy; that the countries that hold the debt say, we recognize reality and the Iraqis are never, ever going to get this money.

There are some who might say, yes, but Iraq has all that oil and eventually maybe they will be able to give us this money, so let's just restructure the debt and let's just say you'll get payments for a while, no payments on principal, interest is deferred, we will give you a chance to get on your feet, and then we will collect the debt.

That is not a principle that applies in reorganization with respect to most bankruptcy situations. Even those who have the ability to earn money later on can get everything discharged with bankruptcy if it is clear the existence of the debt as it stands is going to prevent them from earning money later on.

The most significant return that can come to the countries that are currently holding Iraqi debt will come from a vibrant Iraqi economy with which they can open meaningful trade relations.

Think of what the potential of Iraq is in terms other than oil. We held a hearing on this in the Joint Economic Committee. Of course, the primary focus was on oil revenue, but I was interested to discover that Iraq has other things besides oil. Iraq is blessed with fertile soil. Iraq is blessed with water. Iraq has a history, pre-Saddam Hussein, of being a net exporter of food. In other words, an economically healthy Iraq, using its infrastructure, gaining its opportunity to move water around the country through canals and pipelines and starting irrigation can be an Iraq that can have a vibrant agricultural sector; an Iraq that can then create a manufacturing sector to provide the farm implements that are necessary to support its agriculture; an Iraq that can have a middle class that can buy things; that can have a society that is not just based on oil.

Iraq can become primary reconstructed, one of the most vibrant economies in the region. It can outstrip some of the economies around it that are dependent solely upon oil and...
thereby become an example of capitalism in the region, from which we and others around Iraq can reap enormous benefits. Those benefits, properly reaped, will establish greater economic value than the collection of the debt.

This is the prospect you have here. If we wipe out all of the debt, if the countries respond to the plea contained in the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma and forgive their debts so a vibrant Iraq can be built without the shadow of debt hanging over it, those very countries that currently hold the debt can benefit with the opportunity for trade with a vibrant and vital Iraq.

I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma in proposing his amendment. I hope it will pass overwhelmingly as a message to those countries that do hold Iraqi debt, to say to them the United States recognizes the importance of allowing Iraq to declare bankruptcy as if it were, if you will, an American corporation. The United States recognizes that the hope of the future will come from allowing all of this to happen, allowing these debts to disappear, and allowing Iraq to get on with their reconstruction.

EXHIBIT 1

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
Memo: Iraqi Debt and Reconstruction.
Date: October 9, 2003.

THE ABC’S OF IRAQI DEBT

Dealing with debt accrued by Saddam Hussein and the Baath party is a Lynchpin to Iraqi reconstruction. According to Businessweek, Iraq owes $216 billion. Of that, $32 billion is war reparations, owed mainly to Kuwait. Loans comprise $127 billion of the debt. The United States paid $27 billion in war reparations, which was done in 1990, and Kuwait paid $26 billion in 1993. The debt’s creditors include a long list of nations and organizations of British origin dedicated to the termination of British occupation. Iraq faces debt estimated to be ten times national output (BusinessWeek). The payment of such an amount is near impossible, even with the devolution and future revenues of oil resources. Placing this burden on a new government cripples Iraq’s ability to accumulate capital, expand production, and increase the standard of living. Repudiating this debt also sends the red light to creditors who loan to sketchy governments, in this case, nations whose loans were used to amass Hussein’s weaponry and technology. Some may argue the new government will have trouble obtaining loans with such history of repudiation. However, no moral hazard issue exists; the loans forgiven belong to Saddam, not the Coalition Provisional Authority or the government that may follow.

Those on the opposing bench feel repudiating Saddam’s debt will jostle the credit market and create uncertainty now and whenever government turnovers occur. This cannot be the case. Iraq is such a unique situation; few countries, if any, can follow this paradigm.

On a side note, Basil Al-Rahim, founder of the Iraq Foundation, Spoke of creating a debt trading system in Iraq. At the June 11, 2003 JEC hearing on transforming Iraq’s economy, Al-Rahim spoke of trading debt for points in a system that would use the points in dealings of concessions, licenses, and contracts (see p 20-21 of the JEC transcript).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.06-0.1</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.75-4.3</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Club</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
incurred debt will suffocate Iraq and prevent Iraq from really rejoining the world economy, from making significant progress. These are countries, including the United States—Canada, Germany, France, Russia, and others that have something at stake—sure. But they have never been paid a dime on this debt and, frankly, they will not be. I hope they all sadder up and say: We want to have an investment in Iraq’s future. By doing so, we forgive this debt and we will enable Iraq to start to grow and make some progress.

This idea we are going to be debating shortly, that maybe the $20 billion or a portion of the $20 billion should be a loan, that is if this existing debt, is not written off, there is no chance whatsoever any additional debt would ever be able to be repaid. We can act as if it can, we can pretend it will be, but it will not be. So this debt needs to be written off.

We made a mistake at the conclusion of World War I. The victors didn’t write off the debt of the Germans. At the end of World War II, we did write off the debt of the Germans and the Japanese. That was significant. It was controversial but it was the right thing to do, and this is the right thing, not only for the Western countries, the G8 countries, but also for the Gulf States—for Kuwait, for Saudi Arabia. The Gulf States benefitted greatly because we have eliminated a real threat to them. If it had not been for the U.S. protection, the 1991 war and the war just concluded, their future, their freedom would have been in jeopardy. So they benefitted probably more than any country and they have every reason, in my opinion, to write off the debt.
that would be to write off the debt and not saddle the Iraqi economy from being able to rebuild and grow and join the world economy in the future. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if Senator Nickles, before he yields the floor, would just discuss this with me and answer a couple of questions.

Mr. NICKLES. I would be happy to.

Mr. DOMENICI. As the Senator spoke, it dawned on me that none of this debt would be worth 2 cents if the United States had not done what we did.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Where would they get the money, if the United States were not involved in having invaded Iraq, trying to free them and then trying to put their economy back? This debt would not be worth one match that it would take to burn it.

So I don’t think you are just offering a resolution giving some kindly advice. It seems to me you are expressing a reality that these countries ought to be very grateful, and they try to extract from new Iraq, old Iraq’s debt when it would be absolutely useless, based upon the country they lent the money to, and the dictator to whom they lent the money. Right?

Mr. NICKLES. To respond to the statement of my friend and colleague, he is exactly right. If one were trying to take this debt or paper on the international market prior to the U.S. liberation of Iraq, it would be worthless because no payments were made on it before. I think it was generally assumed no payments would be made by the Saddam Hussein regime. My colleague from New Mexico is exactly correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. So the point of it is that whatever they are having this debtor’s conference for, people ought to be thinking about what they are going to be discussing and we ought to be thinking about how we are going to respond.

You are offering some kind advice to us, what we ought to be saying, right? We ought to be thinking: Well, how long has it been since we have been involved in trying to make this country have some money and have it worthwhile? How many billions have we spent? And that I am for. How many more are we going to spend? And they would have the audacity to come to some kind of conference and say, put us on this debtors list; we will take 50 cents on a dollar. Yes, 50 cents on the dollar may be 20 years from now, or 50 cents when everything that has gone into making this country alive again has been taken care of.

There are a lot of messages from this simple resolution to these countries. In simple terms: Forget about it. But in more sophisticated terms, the truth is, for America, what you got is worth nothing. That is what I think is important about the resolution. I think, rather than just being a typical one that we offer as a resolution, I think it is a very important sense of those of us who are sharing, with very few countries, the burden of trying to help that country.

Look at all those countries. Where have they been when we have been going through all this? They have been offering nice words, maybe; call the President and say hello. Maybe they have been sending a little postcard. They have everything yet. Some of them are thinking about it. I hope they keep thinking.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate that.

You mentioned a couple of these countries. Saudi Arabia has the largest, according to CRS estimates it is $25 billion. They say Kuwait may have $17 billion to $27 billion of Iraqi debt. They are Iraq’s neighbors. Our liberation of Iraq eliminates a threat to them. I believe most of that money was lent when Iraq was at war with Iran.

Frankly, they should not be insisting on payment. They were never repaid in the past. Nor should U.S. taxpayers or other people who were in the process of trying to rebuild Iraq be making contributions that will be going to satisfy creditors from the previous regime. That would be a mistake. I thank my friend and colleague from New Mexico.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand we can get an agreement that we would postpone the vote on the Nickles amendment until we consider the Bayh amendment. By a previous order, that is the next business.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Nickles amendment take place following the debate on the Bayh amendment, and the Bayh amendment follow that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. It is my understanding staff is preparing a unanimous consent request; is that right?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, we are preparing it, but that will be the understanding so Members will know there will not be a vote here until sometime, at least I would say, 8:30 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Democratic leader is here. He has agreed, on our side, if we can have the vote at 9 o'clock, have the time until 9 o'clock equally divided between both sides and at that time have 2 minutes for the amendment of Senator Nickles, equally divided on that amendment, and then 2 minutes prior to the vote on the Bayh amendment, equally divided.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the time would be equally divided between now and 9 o’clock on the Bayh amendment. Is that the proposal?

Mr. REID. That is right. There would be no amendments in order to either amendment, and no amendments in relation to each amendment.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, reserving right to object, could I add by unanimous consent that after those two votes I be allowed 30 minutes equally divided?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Senator Byrd has been waiting all day for an amendment which he and Senator Durbin have.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have sent out a hot line for people who want to speak on this amendment. There are 10 Members who want to speak for 5 to 15 minutes. We have really basically 80 minutes left between now and 9 o’clock. I would suggest we ought to at least make the first vote start at 9:30.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the request I propounded be modified to that effect.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me ask this: I ask unanimous consent that the pending Nickles amendment be temporarily set aside and Senator Bayh be recognized to offer his amendment; provided further that the time until 9:30 be equally divided for debate in the usual form.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Nickles amendment to be followed by a vote in relation to the Bayh amendment with no second-degree amendments in order to either amendment, and prior to the votes there be 2 minutes equally divided before each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Ben Nelson, Clinton, Dorgan, Ensign, Collins, Snowe, Graham of South Carolina, the distinguished President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], for himself and Mr. Nelson of Nebraska, Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Dorgan, Mr. Ensign, Ms. Collins, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Graham of South Carolina, and Senator Chambliss, proposes an amendment numbered 1871.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that funds for reconstruction in Iraq be used for certain purposes)

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

Sec. 2313. (a) Of the amounts appropriated under the subheading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND"—

(1) the $5,156,000,000 allocated for security, including public safety requirements, national security, and justice shall be used to rebuild Iraq’s security services;
Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I also neglected to mention that our distinguished colleague, BYRON DORGAN, is an original cosponsor of this amendment, along with the other distinguished Members I mentioned.

Mr. President, the question of Iraq has divided our Nation and this Senate for some time now. I count myself in the camp that believes removing Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do.

The evidence of torture chambers and mass graves speaks eloquent to the core of the matter in essence. The fact he invaded his neighbors once but twice and that he would surely have threatened them and the world again which would doubtless require American action at some point in the future is not an excuse. It is better far to deal with him on our terms and at a time of our choosing rather than on his terms and at a time of his choosing.

Finally, the fact he previously had and used biological and chemical weapons, had a nuclear program, and would almost surely seek to reconstitute those programs, even if they had currently been destroyed and even if there is a 10-percent chance that was destroyed, or if he hadfallen into the hands of suicidal terrorists or would be used by regimes like Saddam against a peaceful world, means this is a threat best removed.

But regardless of where Members stood on the question of what to do about Iraq toward the war, we are now there. We have no choice but to succeed in our efforts toward reconstituting and rebuilding a more stable, a more democratic, and a more secure Iraq. There can be no alternative but success.

If we are not successful, the southern part of this country will probably reconstitute itself into some sort of radical Shiite state closely aligned with the nation that funded the permanent sponsor of terror in the world.

The northern part of what is currently Iraq would probably be first a Kurdish entity of some type followed by a Turkish invasion which would create the further chaos in that part of the world.

The central part of this troubled land would undoubtedly develop into some chaotic Sunni enclave serving as a base for terror against both the United States and the rest of the peaceful world.

We must not let that happen. We must not.

I favor, along with my colleagues who have cosponsored this amendment, aggressive steps to stabilize and create a free, prosperous, and diverse Iraq. This means unwavering support for security because we understand security is the foundation which is essential to Iraq's stability and our ultimate withdrawal. But if this reconstruction is to succeed, it must be conducted on terms that maximize our chances of success in Iraq and fail. And I believe the only way to do that is for the American people.

A strong, vibrant Iraqi economy is the foundation which is essential to Iraq's stability and our ultimate withdrawal.

We must not let that happen. We must not.

It also gives us a seat at the table if the other nations are not willing to do the right thing, and it gives us leverage in any further debt restructuring negotiations to insist that they forgive the Iraqi people.

Our proposal gives us maximum leverage toward an equitable and fair outcome, lower debts for Iraq, a fresh start, but fairness to the American people if other nations are not willing to join us in this case.

Second, we must also ask the Iraqi people to do what they can to help themselves. This is not a country that is dead broke like some in sub-Saharan Africa or Afghanistan. In fact, the nation of Iraq has great wealth. It is estimated to be $2.8 trillion to $5.1 trillion. What the nation of Iraq has is a temporary cashflow problem, one we should be employed by international lawyers.

What the nation of Iraq has is a plan, they must now demonstrate similar generosity in the case of another country which I will shortly discuss.

This is compounded by the fact that when the Iraqis finally are able to sell oil in some quantity on the international markets, they will sell it at a price that is not set by a free market but which is instead dictated in large part by a cartel known as OPEC—giving them the ability to reap profits from that not once but twice if our loans are given first in the form of monopoly oil payments and, second, if we just give them the cashflow problem, one we should be able to help them with. But a temporary cashflow problem is no excuse for not doing what they can to help rebuild and improve to the extent they are capable and, as I have just mentioned, they are capable.

This is particularly inequitable if other nations do not forgive their debt and essentially contribute nothing at
all when the American taxpayers are being asked and the American consumers have been asked and required to contribute not once but twice.

Our amendment calls for three steps:

First, the immediate provision of $5 billion to meet the immediate security needs of the nation of Iraq because we understand that we should err on the side of being more aggressive than less when it comes to stabilizing that country, ending the bloodshed and violence, and allowing the Iraqi people to get on with commerce, civil society, free elections, and the other things that will head them in the proper direction.

Second, we would propose providing $5 billion in terms of an immediate grant to meet the eminent reconstruction needs. The World Bank has estimated that this would provide almost the entirety of the funds to be absorbed by Iraq for reconstruction over the next year. It is our proposal to err on the side of being more generous than the United Nations, which agreed to provide $10 billion for reconstruction, a $5 billion jump-start, priming the pump to get things going. The first $10 billion would be $5 billion to meet the immediate security needs of Iraq in the form of a grant. The fact that the people of Argentina, who did not exercise physical adequate fiscal control over their affairs, should at least be good enough for the people of Iraq to make immediate payments imposed upon them by a tyrannical dictator.

Next, it is the principled thing to do. Surely we cannot allow a state of affairs to exist where those who helped sustain the regime of Saddam Hussein are repaid, but the American taxpayers who helped to liberate the country are not. This would be an outrageous outcome and one that our amendment seeks to prohibit.

The second argument offered against our proposal is that there is no Iraqi Government currently in power to take on these obligations. Really? Can it possibly be argued by others that the obligations of Saddam Hussein are more legitimate than obligations undertaken by the newly empowered Iraqi Council? How can that possibly be? Is it possible to say that the obligations of Saddam Hussein should be enforced but those undertaken by the council should not? Obviously not. To seize an elected Saddam Hussein. How can he be given more legitimacy and more credence than the new council of the newly liberated Iraq? Obviously, that is something that cannot be allowed to happen. Our amendment is perfectly consistent with not allowing that to happen.

Finally, the new council is perfectly empowered to apply the freedom of the people of Iraq by enforcing its laws against a variety of criminal activities. They are empowered to hold elections. They are empowered to draft a constitution. How can it possibly be that they are not allowed to take out a simple loan on behalf of the people of their country? Of course, ideological inconsistency to those who adhere to the argument there is no Iraqi entity in power to take on the obligations.

Finally, we hear repeatedly the argument requiring some of these obligations to be undertaken in the form of a loan if other countries are not willing to forgive their debts. That would feed the perception alive in the Middle East and across the Islamic world that our activities in Iraq were solely about the Iraqi oil. This is a slippery and dangerous step in the wrong and absolutely not. To seize that line of argument, no telling where we will end up.

For starters, this is clearly a lie. We all know it. The American people did not shed their blood in Iraq, we have not spent our treasure there to seize the Iraqi oil. This is a malicious falsehood and one that we cannot possibly allow to influence our deliberations in this great body.

Second, and can someone seriously argue that false opinions in other countries should set the public policy of a great Nation like the United States of America? What precedent would this set for this body and for our people? Should we stop the hunt for Osama bin Laden because it is popularly believed in other parts of the world that the attack on September 11 was designed as a Zionist plot against our country? There have been polls on Al-Jazeera indicating that part of that world believe this canard. Should we allow that to affect the activities of our country? Obviously no. That would be outrageous.

Should we end our alliance with the State of Israel and form one with the Palestinians and Yasser Arafat because popular opinion in that part of the world would have us do so? Of course we cannot do that. The policies of the United States of America must be based upon the principles to which our great country has always adhered. We must base our policies upon the truth, upon the facts, and not the misguided beliefs of others.

We know our intentions in Iraq have always been honorable. This amendment perfectly contradicts those intentions. Should we not do the right thing because of the misguided arguments about public opinion elsewhere in the world?

Finally, this argument is obviously a demonstrable mathematical falsehood. This is in repayment, not a confiscation or an appropriation. If I give you $100 and say that I am going to give you $50 of it as a grant, and I am even willing to forgive the other $50 and make that a grant, if another creditor is willing to forgive $100 that he has also given you, how can that possibly be characterized as a confiscation or expropriation of your property? Obviously, it is not.

So, in conclusion, let me say our amendment provides for the aggressive help that the Iraqi people need to meet their pressing security needs. Our amendment provides for generous and substantial help to meet the pressing reconstruction burdens facing that country. It gets them on their feet, provides them with a fresh start, and primes the pump for increased commercial activity there that is important to the success of our endeavor. But it does so in a way that is consistent with the principles of fairness to the American people and in a way that maximizes the prospects for the success of these moneys in the nation of Iraq, without which this endeavor, these funds, the blood and treasure that we have expended to date, will have gone for naught. That is something we must avoid. That is something this amendment will avoid.

Therefore, I ask our colleagues’ support, and I thank my cosponsors.

I am pleased to yield time to others who have so patiently waited to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BAYH. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I thank the chief sponsor of the bill. It has been...
a pleasure working with him and others in a bipartisan manner on this important amendment.

I understand there are deep feelings on both sides of this amendment. This is a fundamental, legitimate disagreement that is the way we go forward for the United States, with the same goals in mind—that goal being that we have a stable Iraq in the future—that is in the interest of all Americans.

It is true doing the $87 billion investment that the President has requested, the rebuilding of Iraq. All who support this amendment are in support of that concept because we think it is important to have a stable type of government, whatever that will be in Iraq, democracy or whatever they choose. It is important to have that for the stability of the region and for the spread of freedom and freedom-loving people, especially in that part of the world which up to this point has only known rule by a dictator. And especially the President has shown great leadership through the entire process. It is incredibly challenging in that part of the world to deal with different cultural problems that we are used to dealing with in this country.

So we are trying to strengthen the President’s hand. And that is what many of us believe this amendment will do. And we are asking other countries to put in grants, we are saying: We, the taxpayers of the United States, are putting up $10 billion in grants. But a lot of countries are also owed money, and so is the United States right now. We are owed money. We, the sponsors of this amendment, believe that Iraq would be best off going forward if they had no debt.

We believe the best way to ensure they will have no debt is if the President had the maximum flexibility with a $10 billion loan from the United States and is able to look at those other countries and say: We gave $10 billion in grants; We have a $10 billion loan here; and we are willing to forgive that $10 billion loan if you join us.

But why should the American taxpayer—when the oil starts producing revenue, when people start actually paying their power bills, when other things start generating revenues in Iraq, why a legal, American taxpayer not be paid back if the taxpayer in France, if the taxpayer in Germany, if the taxpayer in Russia—countries that were not willing to support us when we were doing what was right in the world—why should those taxpayers be paid back and not the taxpayers of America?

That is really the whole point of this, which is, if we can give the President the leverage, he can do the best job he can do, going forward with as little debt as possible. But if these other countries will not forgive the debt, then the American taxpayer will have a chance to be paid back. And that is what the fundamental purpose of the language in the amendment really is.

I want to make just a couple of comments about some of these other countries in the world that are owed this money. Remember, we are loaning this money for government going forward, a free people going forward that the loan is going to.

Who did France, Germany, Russia, and others loan that money to? An illegitimate regime, the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein. And the argument that they should be paid back for loaning a brutal dictator money, and the American people not paid back for loaning a legitimate government money is just as difficult to justify for this Senator. That is why this Senator is so strongly supportive of this amendment.

We hope this amendment is adopted. We think it has a good chance of being adopted tonight.

So I will close by saying that working across the aisle, doing what is right—and I have heard people say, you are just trying to pander to people back home. Frankly, I do not know how many people back home are even paying attention. On a night like tonight, I think most people are going to pay attention to the Red Sox and the Yankees and not to what we are doing here.

In a bipartisan fashion, we are just doing what we believe is right. And the people on the other side of this issue believe what they are doing is right. It is OK to fundamentally disagree. What I hope does not happen in this debate tonight is that we impugn each other’s motives. There are true, fundamental differences of belief on the way we should go forward.

We are presenting one alternative that we believe strongly we should go forward with. So I hope the debate stays on a high ground, and let the votes fall where they may. That is the kind of debate we need to have.

I thank the chief sponsor of this bill for yielding me time, and I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague for his comments and his leadership.

Mr. President, as you know, this has been a truly bipartisan effort, by those of us who supported this effort in Iraq from the beginning, members on your side of the aisle and members on my side of the aisle.

So I commend my colleague for his leadership and his courage. It is a pleasure to work with him.

I now yield time to our distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Indiana for the opportunity to speak in support of this amendment. I thank my colleagues who are cosponsoring this amendment: Senators ENSIGN, COLLINS, SNOWE, LINDSEY GRAHAM, and the President Observer, Senator CHAMBLISS. It is a pleasure to be working with them in a bipartisan way on what I think is an important point to the American people and an important point as a message to the world.

When the President delivered his address announcing the $87 billion he would ask Congress to approve for postwar military operations and construction and reconstruction in Iraq, known as the supplemental, there was clearly a collective gasp from the American people. This was primarily because I do not believe the American public was prepared, before the war, for the cost of reconstruction after the war.

Americans clearly want our mission in Iraq to succeed. We cannot fail. And
we want our young men and women to come home safely. Now our No. 1 priority must be that we do everything in our power to make sure that happens in a fiscally responsible way for the United States and Iraq.

The liberation of Iraq planted the seeds for democracy. The creation of the Coalition Provisional Authority, led by Ambassador Bremer, and the interim Iraqi Governing Council, have laid the foundation for what I hope will be a lasting Iraq, we hope.

Now is the time to seek greater international support for security, perhaps through NATO, as I have previously suggested, and also to seek more international support through the United Nations, to help democracy and freedom in Iraq by the drafting of a constitution, the holding of legitimate elections, and the participation by all Iraqis in the political process.

Funds for military operations must not be used for supporting(prevision) the continuing occupation of Iraq. We have no right to the wealth of Iraq's oil. The President, in the first place, must use the authority that our military forces have given them. They must be given the tools they need to do their job.

Our soldiers should not be held hostage to political arguments over controversial portions of this supplemental.

The reconstruction funding the President requested may be the appropriate amount to accomplish our goals. However, if we all agree, we have concerns with the way the funding is being made to the Iraqis. The President's reconstruction request simply gives money to Iraq as a grant. It asks the American taxpayer to pick up the entire cost for postwar construction with the hope that we will get others to be donors in this process. It asks nothing from the international community at the present time, and certainly it asks nothing of Iraq in return.

The amendment we are seeking to pass asks that the international community provide an incentive to those nations that will work with us to help Iraq. We believe that the international community should be given the opportunity to work with Iraq.

Our amendment is the only amendment that provides an incentive to those nations that will work with us to help Iraq. We believe that the international community should be given the opportunity to work with Iraq. If Iraq is to get the money, it should get only $5 billion for building Iraq's security services. That is a grant. And it provides $5.2 billion in emergency economic assistance. That is a grant. It also asks the administration to notify all relevant congressional committees of every $250 million obligated out of the $5.2 billion so that there is some transparency and accountability on how these dollars are going to be spent.

Most importantly, our proposal asks America to negotiate with the world on behalf of Iraq. Iraq, unfortunately, due to the Saddam Hussein's criminal programs and its Saddam-era debt, owes money in reparations to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. It also has debts to France and Russia primarily for military purposes. France and Russia are owed $6 billion and $6.9 billion, respectively. The $5 billion for Iraq is included approximately $5 billion. This is debt that was incurred by Iraq as a result of the tyrannical forces, powers, and programs of Saddam Hussein.

Our colleague from Oklahoma has proposed a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which will be voted on last evening, as will this amendment. He has asked that we request the countries that own the debt to forgive the debt. I think that is a start that is halfway to the conclusion that we are seeking. It is only halfway. It is asking rather than providing leverage where I think we will absolutely have the opportunity to seek the forgiveness of this debt. So that if France, Russia, and others can forgive their prewar debt, a positive toward independence. This immense gesture would enable the Iraqi economic engine to become energized, freed of a burden most Iraqis never wanted.

It is estimated as well that Iraq's proven oil reserves are worth $2.8 trillion and its potential oil reserves might be worth $5.5 trillion. Freeing the Iraqis of their prewar debt would help them use their oil resources immediately to provide for their people and their reconstruction.

Our amendment is the only amendment offered that directly addresses the issue of Iraqi debt. Our amendment provides an incentive to those nations to forgive Iraq of its Saddam-era debt. It is my hope the administration and the Iraqi Governing Council will be able to satisfactorily and successfully negotiate with the international community to eliminate 90 percent of the prewar bilateral Iraqi debt. If those negotiations are indeed successful, this amendment would provide that the remaining $10 billion in reconstruction funding to the Iraqi people would be in the form of a loan. It would not be convertible from a loan to a grant in exchange for the forgiveness of 90 percent of the prewar bilateral Iraqi debt.

If the negotiations are unsuccessful, which we hope they would not be, then the $10 billion will be appropriated as a long-term loan to the Iraqi Governing Council and all prewar debts will be subordinated to the U.S. postwar debt of $10 billion. This would allow the Iraqi people to get the same jump-start on rebuilding their country while debt financing and the international community will work together to build the world until this Iraqi nation has established an economy and can meet its responsibilities to the world community.

The loan would be secured by revenues from Iraqi oil exports in the future. There are some who will charge that making reconstruction funds available as a loan is evidence that the United States is after Iraq's oil. In my estimation, they will hold that regardless of what we do or don't do in regard to funding reconstruction. In fact, the use of the funds to rebuild within Iraq is evidence to the contrary. But even if we can't prove to the rest of the world that we are not after the oil, we must pursue a loan approach as we are proposing.

I can understand that the administration does not want to add to the debt of the Iraqi people. This isn't, as long as the prewar Saddam Hussein indebtedness is forgiven. We owe it to our taxpayers to be just as concerned about growing our budget deficit as we are about Iraq's deficit.

I hope my colleagues will join in support of this generous and fair amendment recognizing that those who said an entity doesn't exist, that that argument just doesn't wash. If it exists for a grant, it exists for a loan. There are those who have said we are loading it up with debt. It is just the opposite.

I will oppose any amendment that would forgive Iraq's prewar debt. The international community would consider this as a positive step toward independence.

I appreciate the opportunity. It is a pleasure to work with my colleagues. I thank my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we are grateful for the leadership and the eloquence of our colleague from Nebraska. He was a successful businessman, an outstanding Governor, and now a very wise Member of this body. I thank him for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. BAYH. I am pleased to yield time to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I give my remarks, let me thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard to craft this amendment. It has been a great pleasure to work with all of them. I believe the presentation we are advancing this evening not only reflects a great deal of thought and deliberation but is far the best policy we could pursue.

The Senate is engaged in a historic debate: the consideration of the most comprehensive package of military and foreign policy measures since the Marshall plan. The administration has asked the Congress to appropriate $87 billion, some of which would go to
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Afghanistan, but the vast majority
would go for Iraq.

As a member of the Senate Armed
Services Committee, I visited Iraq last
July. I am well aware of the urgent
need for additional funding to support
our troops engaged in Iraq, whether it is the remnants
of the Baathist regime or terrorists from
other countries, endanger our troops
and threaten to undermine our efforts
to establish a prosperous and
democratic society. It is imperative that our
troops have the support they need to be
as safe and as effective as possible.
In that regard, it is indeed heart-
ening that the $66 billion included in
this package that was to be used to sup-
port our troops enjoys widespread sup-
port.

The stakes are very high. We simply
cannot fail in Iraq. The sacrifices of
our young men and women in uniform
cannot be in vain. This funding will
help to support their efforts and to en-
sure their success.

I also recognize that Iraq needs our
assistance in constructing a modern in-
frastructure and rebuilding its security
services. There are $20 billion included
in this bill targeted for those purposes.

I notice in several of that amount:
it is more than our entire foreign aid
budget. So this is a very significant as-
sistance package we are considering to-
ight.

It is vital that basic services be re-
stored to the Iraqi people as soon as possible so that their hardships do not
continue. Without reliable electricity
and clean water, the Iraqi people can-
not rebuild their lives, their country,
and their economy. I believe there are,
however, ways to structure this assist-
ance to provide the Iraqis with the help
they need while lessening the impact
on the American taxpayer.

That is the goal of the bipartisan amendment we have put forth this evening.

While I fully support the President’s
overall budget request, we have an ob-
ligation to explore ways to lessen the
burden on the American taxpayer.

That is the goal of the bipartisan amendment we have put forth this evening.

The American people will be justifi-
ably outraged if one dime of their
money is sent to France while the
American people are pouring millions
of their hard-earned tax dollars into re-
building Iraq. France, Germany, and
Russia should not be paid for the debts
incurred by one of the most despicable
and violent leaders in decades while the
American taxpayer invests billions
in the rebuilding and stabilization of
Iraq.

I also point out that structuring our assistance as loans is not without precedent.

Most of the large-scale in-
frastructure projects undertaken in
postconflict Bosnia have been adminis-
tered through the World Bank in the
form of loans with reasonable repay-
ment conditions. If this approach is not
hindering the reconstruction of Bosnia,
the same surely should hold true for
Iraq, a country with far greater eco-
nomic resources.

That is why we have joined this
evening to offer this amendment. This
amendment ensures that the American
taxpayer will eventually be reimbursed
for a portion of our investment in Iraq.

Under our proposal, $10 billion in our
construction assistance will be made
available for use as loans while the
other $10 billion will be available as
grants.

So you can see we have taken a very
reasonable, moderate approach in con-
structing this amendment. By making
available $5 billion in grants for re-
building Iraq’s security services and
yet another $5 billion to jump start the
reconstruction process, our approach
ensures that the administration has
the funds necessary to address the im-
mEDIATE AND PROVING

Furthermore, the amendment re-
quires the administration to notify
congressional committees after the ex-
penditure of every $250 million of the
funds. This provision will help to en-
sure accountability. The President is
then authorized to use the remaining
$10 billion as loans to the Iraqi Gov-
erning Council or its successor.

Here is an important provision of our
amendment. We say that if, however, 90
percent of Iraq’s bilateral foreign debt
is forgiven, then the remaining assist-
ance will be converted to grants and
the loans already obligated will be for-
given. So this is a very generous pro-
posal.

The American people are very gen-
erous. They only want to give our
troops the support they need but they
want to provide help to the Iraqi peo-
ple. The American people understand
that Iraq cannot repay this money im-
mediately. That is not what we are asking.

But the American taxpayer
does deserve to be repaid eventually for
some of our investment in this coun-
try. And Iraq deserves to be treated as
a country that has considerable eco-
nomic potential that it clearly has.

Structuring our reconstruction assis-
tance as a loan is a reasonable approach
that satisfies both concerns.

Again, I acknowledge the hard work
of the group of Senators, including the
Presiding Officer, who have worked
very hard to come up with what I be-
lieve is a commonsense approach to
this aid package.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the
floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who
yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield
myself 5 minutes in opposition to the
amendment.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I
wish to tell my colleagues who debated
on the other side of the issue that I have
no respect for their position. I just
happen to disagree with it.

I stated some time ago that I had
hoped a significant portion of the $20
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billion for reconstruction of Iraq could be in the form of a loan. I would like to see that that be the case. I just happen to think, upon further review, that it is not possible now. It might be possible a year from now, but it is not possible now, at least in my opinion.

The government in Iraq today. Hopefully, there will be. It is our objective to have a democracy in Iraq. It is our objective to have Iraq run by Iraqis. There is nobody in Iraq who can sign a note and say: We will borrow $10 billion and pay you back. Nobody. I guess one could say Ambassador Bremer could do it.

I listened to Ambassador Bremer, and I have great confidence in him. I think he has done a great job. This amendment is saying we know better than he does. He happens to be living in Iraq. He is working there. He is risking his life daily. I don’t know how many assassination attempts have been made on his life and on the lives of the people working with him. I actually have a former staff member who is working in the Iraqi government. She is fluent in Arabic. I happen to think they have made a good choice.

Maybe in the future loans can be made, but now there is not an Iraqi government. There is no one to sign the note. There is no one who can say: We will make payments and pay this back.

Frankly, if one looks at their current situation—Iraq is a country that was so ignored by Saddam Hussein, so devastated by his terrible plundering of the country for military purposes, that their ability to pay back debt is nonexistent for some time.

Iraq has inherited a lot of debt. I have an amendment we will be voting on shortly that says countries that own Saddam Hussein’s incurred debt should forgive that debt. I hope that amendment will be supported, and I hope he will send a signal to other countries that hold some of that paper.

That paper is worthless. Saddam Hussein did not make payments on it. There is no way in the world future Iraqis could inherit that debt and prosper. So it needs to be written off. If we say, before you write that off, we want to add another $10 billion, even though you don’t have a government, we want to add another $10 billion on top of that, and, oh, yes, we want to pay back, but we want you to write off the $100 billion or the $150 billion of debt previously owned, I think that complicates that message.

Maybe I am wrong, but when we are saying we want to lend $10 billion and we want to be paid off, but you other countries who hold a bunch of Iraqi debt, you should forgive that, I think it will get lost in the translation. This amendment says $10 billion will be released when and if 90 percent of that debt is forgiven. Maybe it is a carrot, maybe it is a bad incentive that $10 billion will never be spent. I do know there is not a government that can sign this note. There is not an Iraqi government that can make the payment. Maybe it will make people feel better to say it is a loan, but there is nobody to sign that note. There is nobody who has the authority and who is supported by the Iraqi people who can say: Yes, we will be making these payments.

Likewise, it greatly complicates our efforts to get other countries that currently hold worthless Iraqi paper to write off that debt. They are going to say: United States, if you are going to take $150 billion of loans and you expect to be paid, then we expect to be paid. I think it will greatly complicate efforts to get other countries to write off their debt.

Let me say this about Ambassador Bremer. He has done a fantastic job. Do we support him or not? I asked Secretary Powell yesterday: Is there a government in Iraq that can pay this note back?

He said no. Is there anybody there who can pay this note back? He said no. That is our Secretary of State.

I asked basically the same questions of Ambassador Bremer. Is this possible?

He said no. He was strongly urging us to go the grant approach; give them the flexibility to get this country going, not complicate their efforts when they are trying to get other countries to write off some of the existing worthless debt.

I have confidence in Ambassador Bremer. I have confidence in Secretary Powell. I think this amendment is very well intended. Again, I have no complaints whatsoever about the authors of this amendment. I respect them greatly as colleagues, but I think they made a mistake, and I urge our colleagues to vote no on this amendment when we vote.

I yield to the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?
Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I am going to start off with a quote from Winston Churchill and people are going to say: Why on Earth are we quoting Winston Churchill in this regard as to whether or not we will come to the assistance of the Iraqis with a loan or a grant? But I think it has application, and it refers back to what the distinguished Senator from Indiana said. I would like to repeat what the Senator from Oklahoma has stated. I have nothing but admiration for the work the Senator from Indiana and others who have spoken to this amendment have done on this issue. Senator Kerry has valued many $10 million the Intelligence Committee.

Let me get back to my point, and that is, Churchill said on hearing about the attack on Pearl Harbor—if you stop and think about it, 9/11 is our modern-day Pearl Harbor, so I think it is an apt quote. He said:

Silly people, that was the description many gave in discounting the force of the United States. Some said they were soft, that they would never be united, that they would never come to grips, they would never stand bloodletting, that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their war effort.

Let me repeat that: that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their war effort.

Now we will see the weakness of this numerous but remote, wealthy and very talkative people.

Then Churchill said:

But, I had studied the American Civil War fought out to the last desperate inch. American blood flowed in my veins. I thought of a remark made to me years before—the United States is like a gigantic boiler. Once the fire of freedom is lighted under it, there is no limit to the power it can generate. It is a matter of resolve.

Let me repeat that:

It is a matter of resolve.

Why do I bring up the Churchill quote and the issue of resolve in regard to whether or not we apply a grant or a loan to the Iraqi people?

I think it is a question of resolve in the eyes of more especially those in the Arab world, more especially the Iraqis. In the last 2 days, I have had visits from three ambassadors. I am not going to go into their names or countries to write off. Obviously, they were countries directly involved in this whole effort. They asked me quite frankly about American resolve. They asked me about the whole WMD issue, whether or not the American people still had the resolve to see this through.

Then they asked me about this loan situation and this grant situation. They were very mindful of the attitude the Senator from Indiana already spoke to there that those in the Arab world, our adversaries, if you will, who will interpret this as a grab that they originally described as to why the United States became involved in this conflict—a grab for the oil of Iraq.

On April 8, 2003, the President and the Prime Minister of Britain said in a joint statement regarding the future of Iraq:

We reaffirm our commitment to protect Iraqi cultural resources, as the patrimony of the people of Iraq, which should be used only for their benefit.

U.S. interests in Iraq lie solely with the development of a free and democratic nation. Congress should not now add a condition of our involvement that suggests the United States had an interest in Iraqi oil all along. Using the Iraq’s oil as collateral for loans would play now into the hands of those who wrongly attributed an oil motive. That is in reference to a statement made by both the President and the Prime Minister of Britain.

Now, the distinguished Senator from Indiana said that is not true. I do not
think it is true either, but I think it is true in the minds of many Arab leaders. I do not know who is paying attention to this debate tonight. There are not many Members present. We are going to have a vote later, but most Americans are probably watching the playoffs in regard to the World Series, so I doubt if too many people are paying attention.

I tell my colleagues who will pay attention: Every intelligence community and every Arab leader in the world will go over every word of what we say in this room tonight. I have had three ambassadors come to me wondering about the resolve of the United States and are we reneging in regard to our support for the war. Rightly or wrongly, I think that is a real problem. I think we also have a real problem with the timing of this in regard to the loan, just as the President goes overseas, goes to the donors conference. People say, well, this will allow us a seat at the table. My colleagues, we are the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes. Does he request more time?

Mr. ROBERTS. I request an additional 30 seconds, if that would be possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. In summing up, I support the amendment that has been introduced in the Senator from Oklahoma and would say it is a matter of resolve in the eyes of the Arab world. It is much larger than Iraq and much larger than a $10 billion loan or $5 billion here or $5 billion there. In fact, it will be viewed in the Arab world, in the Arab community, as a test of America's resolve, and I do not want us to fail that test.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, probably by the end of the week, if things stay the way they have been, unfortunately we will have some injured troops and maybe some will lose their lives. I had introduced a Senator from Oklahoma and would say it is a matter of resolve in the eyes of the Arab world. It is much larger than Iraq and much larger than a $10 billion loan or $5 billion here or $5 billion there. In fact, it will be viewed in the Arab world, in the Arab community, as a test of America's resolve, and I do not want us to fail that test.

There is a resolve by the American people and this body to stay the course. If anybody has looked at what we have done in a reasonable, rational manner—and that is all I ask the world to do—they will see great resolve on our part. The biggest contribution we have made to the Iraqi people has nothing to do with money. It is the 350, somewhere in that number, growing by the day, young men and women. That is our biggest contribution. We have spent a lot of money, a billion dollars a week, to try to transform a country from tyranny to civility, and the middle is chaos. We are making great improvements. That is an honest statement.

Having been to Iraq, one can see the resolve in the soldiers' eyes. I dare say there may be some men and women in the Armed Forces who are so decent that they would say, "We are paying the Iraqi people money, we do not want to be paid back. That is the strength of our country."

We are in it for the long haul. There is more dying to come. There is more money to be spent. If we try to build up the infrastructure in the next months, chances are it will be attacked because we have not secured the country yet. To expect it to be secured in 6 months is impossible, because the Iraqi Army and all the bad people who are in it have gone into the civilian population. Senator McCONNELL is right; they are not just killing Americans. They are killing people who are trying to transform the country into democracy. People prove they were over there for our oil. I cannot tell my colleagues how much it bothers me to hear that because my colleagues know it is not true and I know it is not true. Nobody in a rational thought process would send 350 people and climbing to their death, spend $70 billion and climbing, to make a $10 billion loan that may never be collected.

So people can say what they want to say. If our country gives in to that way of thinking, and if we are swayed by people who hate us to begin with and we change our policy based on people who are never going to be with us, we will never get this right.

My hope is that the Iraqi people who see our soldiers on the ground, see the schools being opened and built, and the hospitals being repaired would be the first to reject this kind of reasoning, because God knows we are not there to take them over. We are there to help them, but we are also there to help us.

Why did we go to war? Why did we pick people from South Carolina, California, and all the places in between to go to a foreign land and risk their lives and have some die? To make sure that Saddam Hussein could do no more damage to the region or us than he has already done.

President Bush has shown great leadership. He has said that the 21st century will not be ruled or dictated by terrorists, dictators, and murderers. He is absolutely right. God bless him for his resolve.

This amendment puts $10 billion on the table, unencumbered, to spend however you would like. This chart shows from $95 billion to $153 billion of debt incurred to Saddam Hussein. The reason I am so passionate about this, I do not want to give in to a great lie. We cannot buy our way out of this problem. We cannot take a billion dollars of taxpayer money and people are losing their jobs to buy our way out of a great lie.

It would be terrible if the people of this country, who have sacrificed so much, wound up not getting a dime back for doing a good thing, and all they invested in Iraq to produce profit and money went to pay the people back who kept Saddam Hussein in power. That is what I think is going to happen if we do what the scenario we are charting. Please do not do that. It would be bad for everybody. It would not make the world safer. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to Senator Sessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Graham of South Carolina. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Senator Stevens, and appreciate his leadership in this matter. He has been in this body a long time. He has served his country in the military, and I think he sized up this matter quite correctly. We are at war.

I was at the Walter Reed Hospital a couple of weeks ago. I met with soldiers who served in Iraq. They have been wounded, some seriously. Most who I met were getting better. They were great in spirit and were most impressed young people.

We are in a war. We have an $87 billion request, and $67 billion of that is going to be to fund our military at $4 billion a month. Twenty billion dollars is what has been set aside for infrastructure.

My goal, and I believe the goal of this country, is to stabilize Iraq, create a healthy environment as best we can, and to continue to draw down our troops in a rapid way; get out and come home. The $20 billion gives us the best chance to do that. That means we need money for police.

When I visited Iraq in August, I went to observe the police training. I wanted to do that because I was a Federal prosecutor for a number of years and I wanted to see how they were doing. They are doing very well. They are being targeted now because they are doing so well.

We need money to get electricity. Electricity needs to be on in Baghdad. We need the lights. If we get the money, the infrastructure of this country is going to be better off. It is going to be more stable and there is going to be less violence. That is what the infrastructure money does.

I do not see how this President can ask other countries to not try to collect on debts they have to the Saddam Hussein regime if he is asking that the money we put in for this infrastructure be classified as a debt. I just do not believe that is good policy for him. I think it is going to complicate matters in a dangerous way. Secretary of State Colin Powell indicated those ways to us recently. The entire administration, the Vice President, those
who dealt with this issue so closely, are passionately of the belief it would be a colossal error for us to try to put a mortgage on Iraq in order to get paid back for half. I guess, now of the money we are providing to improve the infrastructure in that country. It does not make any sense to me.

I think the right thing to do is for us to step forward as we are doing, be bold and courageous, complete this job, improve the infrastructure, establish a police force that has ability and integrity, and make it safer, and make those areas of the country that are at risk, and bring on an Iraqi Army.

I visited the training camps for the Iraqi Army. We have the potential to do even more than we are doing, in bringing on those troops even more rapidly than we are doing. If we spend that money for that purpose, I believe this country can be in a position to continue to draw down our troops.

We had 250,000 troops at the peak of this effort. We are now down to 138,000. I see no reason that number cannot go down. Whole areas of the country are doing very well. We have to be pleased with what has happened in Mosul in the north, where the 101st Infantry, General Petreaus have done so well; Kirkuk in the south. Basra is doing exceedingly well.

We have seen reports recently of the economic vitality on the streets of the country. I believe it is just a big mistake for us to try to now come in and worry about whether this ought to be a loan.

I don’t take a back seat to anybody in this Senate on trying to preserve the taxpayers’ money. In fact, most of the people I hear who want to make this a loan and are so worried about collecting this money back have not been counted on a lot of tough votes on spending when we have had some real challenges here, to contain the growth in spending when we have had some real challenges here, to contain the growth in spending which is no, we are not after oil, we are not after oil revenues. But to take the remainder of the $20 billion and to put half of it in the form of a grant to tell the people of Iraq we

I compliment Members on both sides of this issue for the excellent debate, the tone of this debate.

It is a very important debate we are engaged in right now. This is probably the most important decision we will make because it is going to shape our postwar policy of reconstruction that will have a dramatic impact on the national security of this country. So I think people are taking this vote very seriously and I think they should take it seriously because it has incredible ramifications—albeit, I agree with many of my colleagues, we have been generous. The American public has been incredibly generous. But to have those strings attached is going to send a message that is not going to be positive in getting additional contributions from the donor nations. That will have a serious impact on the buy-in we need to make postwar Iraq successful.

It was said by someone in the administration yesterday at our luncheon that the only thing they are holding in Saudi Arabia, local elections for the first time as a result of the model that is being set in Iraq. The impact of a successful Iraq, a democratic Iraq, on that region of the world is like the MasterCard commercial—it is priceless. It is priceless.

Why we, in any small way, would put that in jeopardy or give those who would like to see it not succeed an opportunity to use this vote and this action by the Senate to undermine that objective is to do something that does not make sense.

So I hope my colleagues understand, this is an important vote, one we will look back on throughout history, like I believe those in 1948 look back on their vote on the Marshall plan. I hope we will get a vote to defeat this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired. Who yields the floor?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I say to Senators BAYH, NELSON, GrahAM, COLLINS, SNOWE, and ENSIGN what a pleasure it is to work with all of you on this issue where we know we are doing the right thing for America and the American people as well as for the people of Iraq.

I start out by saying that nobody, according to my political opponents, has been a stronger supporter of this administration and this President than I. Senator from Pennsylvania.

I yield the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding the time, and
are going to give you the money to go in and rebuild your infrastructure is certainly reasonable. To tell them also that we want you to make an investment in Iraq just like we as the American taxpayers are making an investment in Iraq as well. If not, why are we trying to rebuilding our infrastructure in a certain country? Because we care about whom we want to help by forgiving Iraqi debt. The answer is very clear. There is no way you can say that it is true.

Let me give you the three reasons.

First of all, should the American taxpayer invest money in Iraq so that the Iraqi people can have their infrastructure rebuilt and have their economy re-vitalized so that these debts can be repaid? My friend from Maine has already addressed this issue, and I think the answer is very clear.

Second, if America is to invest in Iraq in rebuilding its infrastructure, is it unreasonable to ask the Iraqi people to share in that investment? What is going to happen when we start investing over there and start rebuilding their infrastructure? I can tell you what is going to happen—some of the same things we have already seen happen. We have seen pipelines attacked by the terrorist community in that part of the world. We have seen bombs blown up in front of the hotels in Baghdad. We have seen other entities, including Americans, attacked on a regular basis.

When we rebuild the infrastructure, we can expect the terrorist community, which is alive and well in that part of the world, to continue to come out and attack those investments we are making.

If the Iraqi people share in that investment, are they going to be more likely to help us in preventing those attacks and also in bringing the perpetrators of those attacks to justice? You bet they will. I think there is every reason in the world to ask them to make a joint investment with us.

Third, my goal is that when the American presence in Iraq is gone, all of these debts are relieved. How do we best do that by investing $20 billion and saying: OK, you are going to rebuild your infrastructure? You go out, and because your economy is back up and running, you take care of those debts. No. They are not going to leave them debt-free if we do that.

If the President goes to the donors conference next week or calls up President Putin or any of these other countries, the President will find he is owed $10 billion, we invested $10 billion to rebuild the infrastructure, if you forgive our debt, we will forgive our debt, does that give a moral leverage in what he would have if he went in and said, We put $20 billion in there, why don’t you give a guy who owns a nice plastic bag for $1 billion? The nice people have already spoken—Germany, France, and these other countries such as Russia have already spoken. They are not going to be nice guys. We simply can’t expect that from them.

We need to give the President the leverage he can use to go in and get these debts forgiven. When that happens—and I sincerely hope it does happen in the short term—then our $10 billion will go to be converted to a grant, and it won’t be repaid.

That is what we are here debating tonight—whether or not we are going to give the President the right kind of leverage he needs to deal with these countries that sit in creditor status with Iraq today.

What has been our investment in Iraq? Our investment has been whatever it costs us to this point in time. I don’t know how many billions of dollars—maybe $100 billion. I don’t know what it is. How much is it going to cost us in the future? Is it going to cost us another $21 billion, or is it another $87 billion? That is going to get us through the next year. Next year we will be back here debating on another supplemental on continuing the effort in Iraq.

All we are asking the Iraqi people to do is to take part of that $150 billion, $150 billion, or $170 billion—whichever it has been today—and share part of it with us; share $10 billion with us.

Second, there is not a country on this chart, outside of the U.K., that has lost one life as a result of the conflict in Iraq and freeing and liberating the Iraqi people. As of today, we have lost 332 American lives—just as of today. A young soldier from Valdosta, GA, was found floating in a river. He apparently drowned out there. We have lost 332 brave American men and women. These countries, outside of the U.K., have lost none. They have made no investment of life in the freedom of Iraq.

Let me close by answering my friend from Oklahoma, who is truly one of my dearest friends and a guy I respect so much. But when he says, from the standpoint of whom we are going to lend this money, there is nobody to sign a note, what are we going to do with this $21 billion? Are we going to start a no-fly zone and throw it on the remote of Baghdad? Give me a break. There is somebody in place to give the money to. There is somebody in place to lend the money to. All you have to do is think about what we are going to do with the money. We are going to rebuild the infrastructure in Iraq. There is somebody who owns that infrastructure. I don’t care whether it is the former government or the Coalition Provisional Authority. There is an entity that is capable of signing a note. That is simply a very weak argument, to say that we don’t have the legal capacity to make this loan.

Again, I am very proud of the fact that we have come together in a bipartisan way to do what we think is right for the American people.

Again, I am thankful for the leadership of Senator BAYH, Senator COLLINS, and Senator Ensign, who were so instrumental in this.

I ask my colleagues to think seriously about this because it is maybe the most important vote we will make. The future of our children and grandchildren, particularly when it comes to rolling out terrorism in the world, may rest in this vote. I am very confident that the right vote is in support of this amendment.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BAYH. I ask my colleague: The Senator from Michigan has been waiting quite some time.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to join my well-meaning colleagues on both sides of this debate in trying to determine the best mechanism for not only our leadership in Iraq and getting the Iraqi people on their feet, but also in getting other countries to help by forgiving Iraqi debt.

It is crucial that we in this Chamber send a strong message to the Iraqi people that we will be the world’s most outspoken advocate for Iraqi reconstruction and that the United States will play a leadership role.

Now I don’t impugn the motives of other Members who want to qualify our assistance through a loan formula.

I share my colleagues’ concerns that the funding for Iraq reconstruction is a serious cost that we need to thoroughly consider and oversee. However, I think it is critically important to realize that Americans have already been making a serious investment in this region in order to ensure that we are so close to achieving: A stable, peaceful, democratic Iraq.

We spent billions of dollars to expel Hussein out of Kuwait. We spent billions throughout the nineties patrolling a no-fly zone; and we spent billions to liberate Iraq, and we are spending billions to secure and stabilize the country.

We are now the closest we have ever been to achieving the very goal that we have sacrificed lives and spent billions to achieve.
We are very close to taking the Iraqi people off their knees and putting them on their feet. Yet, the right way to do this is by helping them build a strong economy not by saddling the Iraqis with further debt.

Let me say what we are saying when we ask the Iraqi people to take on this loan. Think about it. Iraq’s annual oil revenues may be somewhere around $15 billion, but we are on the verge of adding to an existing debt level of $200 billion—and expecting them to pay with their oil revenues.

To think that Iraq can pay off a loan by oil revenues when its debt is thirteen times its annual oil revenues is ridiculous. A future Iraq would end up spending half of its oil revenues on interest payments alone.

Is that the message we want to send to the Iraqi people?

Is that the message we want to send to the mayor of Kirkuk who I met?

To the woman of the Iraqi council who spent 16 years in hiding with other women only to rejoice when she found out that the United States was coming to give them an opportunity to meet and express their opinions in public.

These courageous leaders have stepped out to rebuild this country, and are willing to give their lives to do so.

We need to help these people re-build their country, not pile on additional debt.

Now is not the time for the United States to back away from its leadership role in nurturing Iraq’s future.

Mr. BAYH. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. STEVENS, Mr. President, after that, I yield to Senator BURNS 5 minutes from our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana would like to follow the Senator from Michigan, I have no problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I first thank the Senators who have been so deeply engaged in coming up with a bipartisan amendment. It is critically important there be a bipartisan amendment relative to issues of war, peace, reconstruction, and the aftermath of war. I congratulate them on it. I support this amendment.

The administration has requested approximately $20 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq and the entire sum is intended to be a grant. We are told that Saddam Hussein’s debts are so great that we cannot contemplate the new Iraq taking out a loan against their huge resource, the second largest oil reserves in the world, perhaps $1 trillion or more, so that they can become involved in their own reconstruction. Only a grant, we are told, will do, even though this is a country with a tremendous resource. We are told they cannot contribute to their own reconstruction financially.

It was just last March Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz said that “we are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.” And it can. It surely can help finance its own reconstruction and would be far better off if it did help to finance its own reconstruction.

If the Iraqis possessed billions of dollars in gold bullion, I cannot imagine anyone talking about granting them $20 billion. This trillion in liquid goal. Yet the suggestion for us to propose to Iraq that they can stand on their own feet, that they can contribute to their own reconstruction by a tiny fraction of that asset being used, somehow or other that does not mean we are leaving—I reject that. We have led with our lives, almost 350 American lives. Every one of those lives shows resolve. Every one of the 1,700 Americans who have been injured show resolve. And we are going to continue to show resolve with lives on the line.

To suggest that Iraq, with an asset of $1 trillion, somehow or other should not be part of its own reconstruction financially is portrayed here as a lack of leadership. To me, it is a central element of wisdom and recognizing that Iraq has a right to be treated as a country that has great resources, great capabilities and we need to treat them as a partner.

What is missing from the Bremer plan is a sense of ownership by Iraq of its own reconstruction. The money involved in the plan is U.S. money being appropriated to a foreign dictator who is going to spend the money pretty much as he sees fit. That is not the best way to succeed in Iraq. The best way is Iraq having the will to succeed.

There has been a suggestion that somehow or other we do not have the resolve if we become partners with Iraq. It is quite the opposite. Iraq must have the will to succeed and contribute to its own reconstruction with a tiny fraction of its own resources as a reflection of that asset.

If Iraqi money were involved, I don’t think this plan would have proposed new ZIP Codes for Iraq; sending Iraqi students, at huge expense, to business schools; some kind of a big honey pot for U.S. consultants. Is that how the Iraqis would be spending their money? I doubt it. When we talked to the Iraqis who came here, we asked them if they had a role in this plan? We were told, no, this was our plan.

This has got to be their plan for their own reconstruction. They have to own it. It is their country. We can help them. We can be a partner, and God knows we have been. All the blood that we have shed for them has made us a partner. Nobody is going to be able to misconstrue this as our aiming at their oil resource. No one can misconstrue a grant of $10 billion, and a following loan of another $10 billion if other will contribute, as somehow or other targeting their resources. Nobody is going to buy it. There may be an effort made to misconstrue it, but nobody is going to buy that. We shed too much blood. We have spent too much money to let Iraq for this to be misconstrued this way.

One other thing: Our simply giving them billions without their participating, and then our deciding how to spend it, is going to keep America as the target of terrorists, not just because of the military power that we deploy so visibly, but because of the reconstruction projects that we choose so unilaterally. If an electric power plant is built with our money, a visible U.S. target for terrorists. If it is built with Iraqi money—it’s less of a lightning rod.

The distinction is important in another way. Iraqis will have more incentives to protect and to fight what their money builds. For those reasons alone, the future of Iraq will be more assured if Iraqs have the financial stake to succeed.

This has to be a partnership. We must join in Iraq in the reconstruction. We should not dominate. We should not control. We should not determine. Their resources should be
spent on their own reconstruction, with them, surely in part, choosing their priorities as to what is important for them.

That is what we should all want for Iraq. And our simply saying, here is $20 billion, these are the ways we will spend the $20 billion—is not the way to help Iraq get back on its feet. It is the way to signal to the world that we control, we dominate, and that is the worst message that we can send to the world.

Mr. President, do I have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 40 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, my own preference would have been, instead of a direct loan from us, that there be a loan from a third party, guaranteed by us. That is my preference because that would have taken away any possibility of misconstruing what we are doing, any value added value that might be gained by anybody else by saying somehow or other the United States is going to be a creditor, therefore, we have designs on Iraq. That could have been avoided if there were a third party making the loan, and therefore, with our guarantee. If this amendment were not adopted—and I hope it will be—I would offer such a loan guarantee amendment as a preferable way to go. But this amendment is preferable to the grant approach of making the loan, with our guarantee. And I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Maryland, if he wants to ask a question, I don’t see any harm in that.

Mr. SARBANES. No.

Mr. President, does the time then come back to the Senator from Indiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct. The Senator from Indiana can seek recognition at that time. The Senator from Indiana has 13 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I will defer until the Senator concludes, and then I will seek to have an exchange with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Chambliss). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, we just got back from Iraq last Saturday. I just want to share with you a couple of thoughts that I had while I was there and coming back because once you go and you see what we have put in place and what is going on in that country—I am going to oppose this amendment, but I am opposing the amendment, and I am opposing the idea, but not because some of my good colleagues, for whom I have the utmost respect, are promoting this.

There are as many Iraqis and more dying today than there are Americans.

If we lose one American life, it is a tragedy. But their new police department that is on the street is doing a good job, and they are paying with their lives also.

I am not going to get into whether we can’t afford it or whether they can afford it or they can’t afford it. But this investment, my colleagues, is probably one of the biggest ones we will make. The returns in the next 20 years will be way beyond expectation. We are changing something in the Middle East that has not even been touched since the end of World War I.

We went into those communities where poverty is rampant, with trash, garbage. Kids are happy. They come up to you. We talked to parents in refurnished schools. And, by the way, we have refurbished 1,500 of them, done by an Iraqi contractor who hired 30,000 Iraqi workmen to do it.

We talked to parents. I talked to one woman there and asked: Do you want us to go away?

She said: No, absolutely not.

And I asked her: Give me one reason, one reason.

She said: My little girl is going to school.

Little girls did not go to school under Saddam Hussein. Think about that impact on that neighborhood. I am talking ground level, folks. This is not the palaces. This is not the CPA or the SGIC. These are people who are on the street.

What kind of a message is this: “Well, we will loan you the money, but expect you to pay it back”? And they will say: “Gee, thanks. The last thing we need is another loan.”

We have all been down that street. We loan; we lose control of the money. Is it spent where it is supposed to be spent? Does it really build the infrastructure? Or do we see somebody going out and buying a Mercedes-Benz and putting it in their trunk and saying: “Well, I have had enough of this”? We have seen that happen, too. That has been our experience with some of our foreign aid.

We control it. But I want to get back to this issue that we are going to change some things over there on the success of Iraq. We don’t know whether their constitution will be like ours. I daresay it will not. But it will be some form of representative government, which to us is a baby step, but to them it is a giant step.

If you throw a map down on the floor and you take a look at all of the Middle East, here is what we have done: We have invested in a corridor that will be the economic road for not only Iraq but for Jordan, for Egypt, for all the countries that border Iraq because, for the first time, we will have a communications and transportation system that is free and open, and even in the fly zones that run from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the time?

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry, I do not have additional minutes.

Mr. BURNS. Will you give me another minute to close?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the Senator 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, if you think, why is King Abdullah of Jordan so supportive of us? Why is Turkey so supportive of what we are trying to do? It is very simple: because the corridor of freedom is being opened.

Now you tell me if there is not a better investment in this world. And you have cracked closed societies. Would Saudi Arabia announce they are going to have free elections had we not done what we have done yet?

We cannot make it in the form of a loan because we lose control of it. Let’s help those people. They want to do it. Their will for freedom is just as strong as ours. How strong is our will? How strong is ours?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAYH. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to make sure, as I understand the Senator’s amendment, $10 billion of this $87 billion which he proposes as a loan on the reconstruction side, under the very terms of his amendment would be forgiven if 90 percent of Iraq’s outstanding debt were forgiven by other countries; is that correct?

Mr. BAYH. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to commend the Senator for the wisdom of his amendment. If we do not adopt this amendment, the United States presumably will go to a debtors conference trying to persuade people that they should forgive the debt to Iraq. If your amendment passes, the United States is in a position at that debtors conference to say: If you will forgive your debt, we will forgive this debt. In fact, the amendment, by its terms, would require that.

If we make it all a grant, we will go to the debtors conference and we will say to them: We made a grant. Now you should forgive your debt. They are going to say: Well, that is over and done with. That is water over the dam. That grant has happened. What do you have to give us here at this conference?

So presumably at that point, we are going to come up with another chunk of money, would that be correct?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator understands the amendment perfectly. It provides an incentive for the rest of the countries to forgive their odious debt they extended to Saddam, and if they do
not, it puts our country in a position of maximum leverage to insist that they do in any debtors conference.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAYH. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as usual the Senator from Maryland has put his finger on one of the most important aspects of this amendment. It is one of the reasons I rise to support the Bayh-Nelson-Ensign-Collins-Snowe amendment. It is a very sound proposal. It establishes several important principles relative to the steadfast commitment of this Congress to finish a job that has already been started.

As the chief sponsor of this amendment stated in his opening remarks, whether you voted to use force to overthrow Saddam or not, the fact is that we are where we are. We have an important job to complete. This is one of the most challenging tasks ever undertaken by the people of the United States. The Bayh amendment outlines a roadmap that might actually get us to where we need to go. Words such as freedom, education, prosperity, democracy, vibrancy, a free enterprise economy, I have heard my colleagues speak with passion. This amendment is an attempt not only to undermine those principles but also to ensure that we actually get there, to the goal of this whole effort.

I am afraid without this amendment, the plan before the Senate, which we are well aware of, will not get us where we want to go.

It establishes a couple of important priorities. It says Iraqi security is important. It says the Congress, by good faith, will put up the $5 billion which, by the way, dwarfs the contributions of all other nations. And it sets up an incentive, a very important incentive, for the other nations to forgive the debt. It highlights the strength of the resources in Iraq and opens the opportunity to perhaps expand on that by rebuilding with the Iraqi-owned resources, once this plan is laid down.

The Bush-Bremer plan of billion-dollar grants only, and alone, will not get us to where we need to go. Additional debt or encumbrances on future earnings now would be economically disastrous, and send the wrong message to Iraqis and, indeed, the world.

The idea of loans for Iraqi reconstruction, instead of grants, would be a terrible mistake. Iraq already has crushing debt, accumulated during Saddam Hussein's brutal, incompetent reign. Estimates of this debt range from $180 billion to almost $400 billion. Additional debt or encumbrances on future earnings now would be economically disastrous, and send the wrong message to Iraqis and, indeed, the world.

General Jay Garner and Ambassador Bremer have both forcefully argued that Iraq must be granted significant debt reduction or forgiveness. The United States will seek to convince the largest holders of Iraqi debt—Russia, France, Germany and Saudi Arabia—to forgive some or all of these loans. To add additional loans, at the same time we are asking others to forgive loans, would be counterproductive and hypocritical.

Later this month, the U.S. will hold a donors' conference in Madrid to solicit contributions from the international community for Iraqi reconstruction. To ask others to make grants to Iraq after we have structured some or all of our contribution to Iraqi reconstruction as loans would undercut our Government's efforts to obtain international support.

In the conversations with Iraqi leaders I mentioned earlier, they were emphatic in their opposition to reconstruction support being structured as loans, especially if these loans were made in the form of "liens" against potential Iraqi oil revenues. They rightly argued that the Iraqi people and the larger Arab and Islamic world would regard such a move negatively...
and conclude that their earlier sus-

pications that the U.S. was more inter-

ested in Iraqi oil than Iraqi liberation

were true.

We have an opportunity before us to

send a message of full commitment to

Iraq and, if handled, fair U.S. foreign

policy in the larger Middle East re-

gion, by providing this reconstruction

assistance as grants to Iraq. A loan

program using Iraqi oil as collateral

would be viewed as just the opposite,

and would be counterproductive to our

larger goals and interests in this im-

portant region.

There is a perception, I fear, that

this supplemental will fully fund Iraq's

reconstruction. Nothing could be fur-

ther from the truth. The reconstruc-
tion needs of Iraq are enormous—not

because of war damage, but because of

three-plus decades of neglect, mis-

management and greed by Saddam

Hussein's regime. The fund included in

this supplemental will only begin to

address those needs, but adoption

of this package will put the Iraqis

in a much better position to help them-

selves in the future. The Iraqi leaders

I spoke with want nothing more than to
do just that, but they need our help for
now, with crippling conditions at-
tached.

Some have compared this supple-

mental for the reconstruction of Iraq

and Afghanistan to the Marshall plan

that funded the reconstruction of Eu-

rope following World War II. Most

would agree that the investment of our

Nation in the Marshall plan has been

paid back a hundred-fold.

Some have correctly pointed out that

the Marshall plan included loans that

had to be paid back and the require-

ment for matching funds by the bene-

ficiary nations, in some cases. The

bulk of Marshall plan assistance, how-

ever, was in the form of grants. Stu-

dents of history, of which there are

many in this chamber, will recall, also,

that while the Marshall plan began in

1948, it was preceded by a series of pro-

grams over a number of years, to pro-

vide financial support to meet the im-

mediate needs of devastated European

countries, including Germany. In today's

dollar, the equivalent of over $100 bil-

lion in aid was provided by the U.S. to

these nations before the Marshall plan

went into effect. Included in this aid

was over $35 billion in grants to put

these nations in a position to help them-

selves develop assistance.

The situation is similar in Iraq
today. This is a nation crippled by mul-
tiple wars, mismanagement, and ne-
glect. The Iraqis are not yet in a posi-
tion to help themselves, but they can

be if we follow up.

Providing loans to Iraq is an idea

that may have merit in the future, but

not now. By voting overwhelmingly to

authorize the use of force in Iraq, we

accepted the responsibilities and chal-

lenges of subsequent reconstruction.

We must not now shrink from that re-

sponsibility. We must first provide the

unconditional assistance that will lay

the foundation for full reconstruction.

That is in Iraq's best interest; it is in

America's best interest.

Let us join together to provide the

resources that will meet the immediate

needs of the Iraqi people and best serve

our interests in Iraq and the larger

Middle East region. I have my col-

leagues to defeat this amendment and

send a message to the Iraqi people that

we are committed to their liberation

and reconstruction unconditionally.

I was deeply encouraged and

moved by the Senator from Wash-

ington, Senator CANTWELL. She hit it.

What is the message we send forth

from this Chamber tonight?

I must admit, in the briefings and so

forth that took place today before the

Armed Services Committee, I repeat-
edly heard, we are not getting the mes-

sage out in that part of the world about

what we are trying to do and the suc-

cesses we have had to date in helping

the people. Consequently, a vote that

would not come until sometime next

dozen years later would just not spread

through that world and be inter-

preted by that press. It will undo so

much of what we have been able to

achieve thus far in trying to convince

that world we are there for their own

interest and America's interest.

I would like to put a question to my

good friend, fellow member of the

Armed Services Committee, who is a

strong supporter of the men and

women of the Armed Forces, a simple

question: Does this amendment make

the streets safer for the men and

women of the Armed Forces tonight,
tomorrow tonight, and in the days and

weeks to come, together with their co-

alition partners? If somehow you can

convince me this will bring about a

greater measure of safety—this is the

thing that the Senator and I are above all.

The sacrifices being made by the men

and women of the Armed Forces, their

fam-

ilies here at home, people in the vil-

lages and towns who watched them

march off to take up their stations in

this battle for freedom. I cannot fairly

discern any basis that this will help to

make the streets safer for the uni-

formed people now serving in the coal-

ition forces.

I ask that most respectfully of my

good friend and distinguished member

of our committee.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I appre-

ciate my colleague's question. The

timekeeper informs me I don't have

more time left. I will answer suc-
cinctly if the time is not deducted from

our time.

Mr. WARNER. It should not take

very long.

Mr. BAYH. The chairman of the com-

mittee, for whom I have the utmost re-
spect, I wish to express that regard to his

comments about the message we send. I

think we would agree that there is no vote

we can cast tonight, nor any amount of

money that we can spend that could

compare possibly to the message our

brave men and women are giving to the

Iraqi people every day with their pres-

ence and the heroic efforts they are

making to rebuild that nation. I think

that is eloquent testimony that far

surpasses anything we might do.

As for this amendment, my

answer would be, yes, we provide an

immediate $5 billion to meet every se-

curity need that has been asked for by

the Iraqi government. That is over and

above the $67 billion for all of the

American security costs while we are

there. So there is a complete grant of

every security need.

With regard to the domestic recon-

struction, we provide $5 billion imme-

diately—

Mr. WARNER. I think the Senator

has answered the question. I believe we

just have an honest difference of opin-

ion. I think the press in that part of

the world will be whipped into a frenzy,

with those who will be saying "we are

winning," and those who will be saying

"we are losing." That troubles me. I think

that will endanger the security of our

people in uniform when they are trying
to carry out this mission. This press

will be whipped up, and this will be the

most clear symbol that those who are

against us.

Mr. BAYH. May I ask the question?

The Senator is concerned that those

who wish us ill in that part of the

world may say we are winning. In

what way will they say they are win-

ning?

Mr. WARNER. They will say it be-

cause we are there for oil, and they will

say, oh, they are going to make the

Iraqis borrow the money. They don't

understand the nuances, the technical-

ities of a loan, and so forth.

What they will understand is that the

Senate did not stand in support of the

Commander in Chief, and I am fearful

that the press will seize upon this and

it will endanger the safety of our peo-

ple. I say that as a friend and most re-

spectfully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time

of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield

5 minutes to the Senator from Ten-

nessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Tennessee is recognized for 5

minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President,

President Harry Truman once said that

"the only thing new is what we have

forgotten about history." I am re-
minded of our history when I think

about this debate on giving a loan. I

am thinking of the choices we made

when dealing with Germany after

World War I, and then after World War

II. After World War I, we made a choice

that was a grave mistake. We defeated

Germany, left them in ruins, sent them

a bill, and we went home. What was the

result? Adolf Hitler. As early as 1922, Hitler

was railing against the Treaty of Versailles,

talking about the payments Germany was

forced to make. Eleven years later, in
1933, he became Chancellor of Germany. He was democratically elected. He, again, blamed the Treaty of Versailles and the payment of those debts for Germany’s woes.

Under such a debt with a failed reconstruction policy, we can understand why the same feeling was being felt in Iraq. Our post-World War I policy with Germany was an utter failure. It gave us World War II. After World War II, we almost made the same mistake. We began by making loans. This is a summary of the Marshall plan by the Marshall Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SUMMARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN
(From the Marshall Foundation Chart on Funding from USAID, 1976)

Even now a model for positive economic diplomacy, the Marshall Plan was a rational effort by the United States aimed at reducing the German economic strain, unemployment, and political restlessness. The 280 million people in sixteen nations in West Europe. Marshall Plan funds were not mainly directed toward building individual houses, schools, or factories, but at strengthening the economic superstructure (particularly the iron-steel and power industries). The program cost the American taxpayers $10,820,700,000 (plus $1,065,100,000 in loans that were repaid) over four years and worked because it was aimed at aiding a well-educated, industrialized people temporarily down but not out. The Marshall Plan significantly magnified their own efforts and reduced the suffering and time West Europe took to recover from the war. The program—which official title was “European Recovery Program”—aimed at: (1) Increasing production; (2) expanding European foreign trade; (3) facilitating European economic cooperation and integration; and (4) controlling inflation, which was the program’s chief objective.

The idea of massive U.S. loans to individual countries had already been tried (nearly $20 billion—mainly long-term, low interest loans) during the war’s end but failed to make significant headway against Europe’s social and economic problems. The plan that Marshall enunciated at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, was revolutionary because of its scope and intensity. He likened his efforts in scope and intensity to a campaign for the presidency.

Over its four-year life, the Marshall Plan cost the U.S. 0.2 percent of national income as current foreign aid programs. One would need to multiply the program’s $55.3 billion cost by 10 or perhaps even 20 times to have the same impact on the U.S. economy now as the Marshall Plan had between 1948 and 1962. (Most of the money was spent between 1948 and the beginning of the Korean War (June 25, 1950); after June 30, 1951, the remaining aid was folded into the Mutual Defense Assistance Program.) On December 10, 1953, George C. Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, Norway. He accepted it, not as his individual triumph, but as the representative of the American people, whose efforts and money had made the program a success.

MARSHALL PLAN EXPENDITURES—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, APRIL 3, 1948 TO JUNE 30, 1952 (In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3,189.8</td>
<td>2,805.0</td>
<td>384.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,586.8</td>
<td>1,373.7</td>
<td>213.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (*West Indies) 3</td>
<td>1,083.5</td>
<td>956.8</td>
<td>126.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium-Luxembourg</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>491.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, Federal Republic of</td>
<td>1,390.6</td>
<td>1,173.7</td>
<td>216.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>255.1</td>
<td>240.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>225.1</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3,189.8</td>
<td>2,805.0</td>
<td>384.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>4,407.0</td>
<td>4,007.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Loan total includes $65.0 million for Belgium and $3.0 million for Luxembourg; grant details between the two cannot be identified. Includes all original, plus $1,000.0 million representing a pro-rated share of grants converted to loans under an agreement signed in Brussels.

2 Marshall Plan aid to the Netherlands East Indies (now Indonesia) was extended through the Netherlands prior to transfer of sovereignty on December 30, 1949. The aid totals for the Netherlands East Indies are as follows: Total $318.4 million, Grants $262.4 million, Loans $17.2 million.

3 Includes Netherlands East Indies (EIU) and the Netherlands Rep. (EPU) capital fund, $361.4 million; General Freight Account, $31.5 million; and European Technical Assistance Authorities (multi-country or regional), $121 million.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Marshall Foundation said:

The idea of massive U.S. loans to individual countries may have been tried (right after World War II) (nearly $20 billion—mainly long-term low-interest loans) since the war’s end and had failed to make significant headway against Europe’s social and economic problems. But there was a different idea, a different choice that someone learned from history. It was George C. Marshall. The Marshall plan was a 4-year plan, $13 billion, helping to rebuild the economies of 16 countries. Nearly $12 billion was grants, about $1 billion was loan, and what was the result? A continent that had been fighting itself for a thousand years became democratic, stopped fighting among themselves, and became our allies.

That is why we need a “Marshall plan” for Iraq. We need a 4- or 5-year plan for building a democracy. The Marshall plan was a success. It paid for the building of railroads, water systems, medicines, modernizing factories, restoring ports to allow foreign trade, and much, much more.

We should do the same in Iraq. It cost $13 billion from 1948 to 1952—more than $100 billion in today’s dollars. We can learn a valuable lesson from our experiences with Germany after World War I, a terrible failure, and after World War II, a remarkable success. After World War I, we made Germany pay its debts and we left them in ruins. We sent them a bill. We went home. We got Adolf Hitler. After World War II, we pursued the Marshall plan. It cost us some money. We gave them the money but as a result we got peace, new democratic economies, and our greatest allies.

President Kennedy said it best in 1961. In his inaugural address, he said:

We shall pay any price, we shall bear any burden, . . . to assure the survival and success of liberty.

The people of Iraq need our support. We paid for German reconstruction under the Marshall plan because it was un...
people in order to move forward with the development of the infrastructure in that country, which I happen to believe is essential if we want to get our troops home quickly. We simply have to get that in place along with security forces. In fact, Ambassador Bremer testified before several committees in the Senate, and he has actually sent a letter to the chairman, the Honorable Ted Stevens. I will read from it. He says:

I understand there are various proposals being offered which would convert portions of the funding request to a loan mechanism of some type. Any such proposal would merely add further debt to the already-huge debt currently owed by the Iraqis. As you know from my testimony three weeks ago, I am concerned that, as was the case in the young, fragile democracy in Weimar, Germany, such a situation could destabilize the young Iraqi democracy before it even gets off the ground. Moreover, if the United States makes its contribution in the form of a loan, we will encourage its allies to follow the example at the Madrid Donors Conference next week—further exacerbating Iraq's debt situation. I might add, complicating the eventual process of restructuring the country's overall debt burden.

I sat down with a group of people and I visited with Colin Powell. He also urges us, in the strongest terms, to not make this a loan and that we grant these dollars. It gives us an opportunity to maintain control of those dollars.

We have to keep in mind that Iraq has established trade agreements with many of those countries that opposed our presence in Iraq. If this goes to a loan, they will control the money; they will be the ones letting out the contracts. I feel their inclination would be to be disburse it all over the international community. That means that countries such as France, Germany, and Russia will be looked to also to be involved or have pledged humanitarian assistance; to name a few of them: Kuwait, Spain, Australia, Korea, Germany, Denmark, and the United Arab Emirates; and there are going to be others. They are all going to be at the Madrid Donors Conference next week looking at this United States contribution, and opportunity at around 9:30 p.m. to see if the Senate will join with the Russians, the French, the Germans, and the Syrians to do the right thing and begin to rebuild Iraq.

There are some Senators who have argued that somehow this loan-grant issue really is not that important or they have better judgment than the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State, and others about how to structure this.

It seems to this Senator that those who are skilled at conducting foreign policy have gotten it right, and their judgment is that you cannot go to a donor conference next week in Madrid and ask countries to grant—not loan—grant money to share the costs with us of reconstructing Iraq if we say we are going to try to get paid back.

Let's take a look at what we know is going to happen at the donor conference already. The Japanese are down for $1.35 billion; the British, $900 million; the Canadians, $224 million; the European Union, $234 million. These are all grants, not loans. The Japanese, the British, the Canadians, the Europeans are not saying you have to pay us back. They know Iraq is on its back after 25 or 30 years of Saddam Hussein.

In addition to that, there are over 50 countries that have either already provided or are going to provide coalition assistance; to name a few of them: Kuwait, Spain, Australia, Korea, Germany, Denmark, and the United Arab Emirates; and there are going to be others. They are all going to be at Madrid next week looking at this United Nations resolution that passed 15 to 0 today, with the support of the Russians, the French, the Germans and, for goodness sake, the Syrians. This is the time to speak with a united voice.

The administration has united the world. The War on Terrorism has united the world. It's divided about whether this war should have been fought in the first place, but on the issue of reconstruction of Iraq, we are moving toward world unity, and we ought not to disrupt that here tonight. I had an opportunity last week, along with Senator Thomas, whom I see in the Chamber, Senator Burns, Senator Craig, and Senator Chafee, to go to the Baghdad Hotel and talk with senior officials there. They sat down with them and talked with them. They are brave people.

In the violence area where obviously there is still much to be done, the Iraqis themselves are providing a lot of security. The attack on the Baghdad Hotel was thwarted. Some people were killed, indeed, but the bomber wanted to get into the hotel and blow it all up. He was thwarted by Iraqi security.

Part of this Iraqi security force is up to 50,000 people now and growing on a daily basis. The attack on the Turkish Embassy was thwarted, not by us but by Iraqi security. We are on the way to putting the security force in place so that the Iraqis can carry this job forward.

Let's compare it to Bosnia. I was one of a minority of Republicans who supported President Clinton on Bosnia and Kosovo. I met the head of the 101st headquartered in Kentucky and Tennessee in Bosnia, too. General Petraeus said we made more progress in Iraq in 6 months than we made in Bosnia in 6 years—more progress in 6 months than in Bosnia in 6 years. Great progress is being made.

This is a time to unify behind the reconstruction policy in Iraq. Now is the time to do that.

The last stumbling block is this amendment in the Senate tonight. The House is going to finish up tonight, and we have to finish up tomorrow. This is probably the last vote with any real drama attached to it. No matter how long you have been in the Senate, you haven't cast a more important vote than this one. We are casting votes all the time around here, and if you are in my job, you are twisting arms every day on some issue, but it reminds me of what Orwell said in "Animal Farm." He said all pigs were equal, but then some pigs were more equal than others. All votes are equal, but some votes are more equal than others. This is a more equal vote. This is a big vote, one that makes a difference for America and for the world.
and certainly for the Iraqis for whom this policy is so important. There are 170 newspapers in Iraq. I do not think anybody in America knows that, but there are 170 newspapers in Iraq. They have by far more newspapers in Iraq than we have in my hometown. Some of them are even more credible than the New York Times, arguably. The streets are crowded with people engaged in commerce with their little businesses, which the Iraqis are quite good at when allowed to be, but that way they can have a new currency. I happened to have picked up a souvenir, the last of the previous currency. It has a picture of Saddam Hussein on it. I can tell my colleagues this: The new currency being issued over the next few weeks in Iraq has no picture of Saddam Hussein on it.

Today we heard—Senator Thomas and I were at the same meeting—that international bankers are interested in coming into Iraq. So everything is heading in the right direction. Let’s not get off track tonight by leaving the impression with the Iraqi people that we came into the country to help them and then to send them a bill for it. I hope this amendment will be defeated. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ensign). Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I congratulate all of my colleagues on a very important and well-conducted debate. I strongly oppose the Bayh amendment because its enactment would undermine the central purpose of our mission in Iraq. It is to empower the Iraqi people to build a prosperous and secure future in which their country’s natural resources support progressive government and economic prosperity, not additional debt payments to rich Western powers.

I oppose the amendment because I believe decisions on how to finance Iraq’s reconstruction should be made in Washington, not in Moscow, Paris, Berlin, or Bonn, whose leaders’ decisions, if that amendment were enacted, could determine what form United States assistance takes. I cannot accept the prospect that the United States, with our British allies, who liberated Iraq, would now cede our leadership on reconstruction to Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schroeder.

Let’s talk about what is at stake. Things are not going as well in Iraq as we would hope. They are not going as poorly as some would argue. In the northern part of Iraq, in the southern part of Iraq, democracy and reconstruction are proceeding aspace. As I said, things are not going as well in some parts of Iraq but they are going very well in other parts. The fact is that every few days, tragically, we lose additional American lives. This is the result primarily of a concerted effort in what we know of as the Sunni triangle, of a rare combustible mixture of ex-Baathists, criminals who were released from outside the country of Iraq who have infiltrated into the country, and former military people who really know that they will never attain their goals unless the United States is driven out of Iraq. This is a bad time to start having things. We know all about them. We hear about them or see them every single day.

What are they telling the people of Iraq? They are telling the people of Iraq the following: The United States of America is not on your side. The United States of America supported Saddam Hussein all during the 1980s. They propped up his regime, as a matter of fact. They turned a blind eye to his support for terrorism twice, once against the Iranians and once against his own people.

In 1991, the Americans told the people of Iraq that Saddam Hussein was on his way out the door. That turned out not to be true. Saddam Hussein remained in power and slaughtered thousands of people who rose up against him in places such as Basra. In the 1990s, the Iraqi economy was crippled by economic sanctions imposed by coalition forces of the United States of America, and now the United States of America is about to do what they came for, and that is to take your oil.

Now, I can rebuff every single one of those arguments that these bad people are making to the people in the Sunni triangle, but, frankly, I am not there to talk to them. Nor is there much besides Al-Jazeera for them to watch.

The battle for the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people is not over by a long shot. Nor is this amendment will send a clear signal that the United States is really there for what they came for, and that is to take your oil.

The Washington Post, on October 15, 2003, stated that Iraq is already burdened with $200 billion in debt. Either much of that will be forgiven, in which case the United States reconstruction loan will prove mostly symbolic, or Iraq will struggle for years under a crushing debt burden—by the way, the estimates are that the interest on that debt is as high as $6 billion or $7 billion a year—in which case, another loan only adds to the memory. To make a loan in these circumstances is like swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10-pound weight. That is from the Washington Post on October 15, that well-known, conservative, right-wing periodical.

I do not know who is going to volunteer to go to the donors meeting if this amendment is passed. If we go to the donors meetings and say, my dear friends, we want you to give money for Iraq but, by the way, we are only going to loan it to them, the rest of you give the money but we are going to loan it to them, I am sure there is somebody who is highly paid in the State Department who will carry out that task, but it cannot be a pleasant one because it is hypocrisy. How can we ask other countries to give money when ours is in their face?

I would like to express a little sympathy for my colleagues who support this amendment. It is tough going home when people are without jobs and the economy is still stumbling along in some parts of the country, we are going to give this money to Iraq and, by the way, I know that the local highway needs to be fixed and a bridge needs to be built. It is tough, but I want to tell my colleagues what is at stake here.

The reason these bad guys came from all of these other countries into Iraq, the reason the Muslim extremists all over the Middle East are doing everything they can to incite people against America, the reason we are seeing such a wave of radicalization in some quarters, is that they know that the day democracy flourishes in Iraq, their day is over. The day of the Middle East despot is gone. The day of the Muslim extremist is gone. No longer will the Wahhabis, funded by the Saudis, fun-
Bayh-Ensign amendment. I do it because it meets four of my principles on supplemental spending.

No. 1, there must be international burden sharing.

With international burden sharing, if the United States of America is in the world's interest, then the world should help pay for the reconstruction. If we say we are going to go it alone, they are going to let us go it alone. If we say we are going to go grants, they will say fine with us.

We need a coalition of the willing. We need a coalition of the wallet.

No. 2, in helping Iraq, we should have loans, not giveaways.

Iraq has the world’s largest oil reserves, capable of pumping out millions of barrels a day. These profits should help pay for reconstruction.

There are those who say Iraq has debt. Well, so does America. America has a lot of debt and we think that this debt, the very balanced approach of the Bayh-Ensign amendment, will provide 50 percent as a grant for $10 billion, including $5 billion for police and military, but the other will be converted to a grant only if 90 percent of Iraq's preliberation bilateral debts are absolved.

That is what I call burden sharing. We need the world’s help. Iraq needs the world’s help. I am glad we have a legislative framework to do it.

No. 3, is accountability to stop waste, cronyism contracting, and profiteering.

No. 4, the administration must lay out a plan to end the occupation of Iraq. There was a plan for the war. Now we need a plan for the peace.

What will this amendment do? Half the requested aid to Iraq will be provided as a grant, a total of $10 billion, including $5 billion for oil revenue. Iraq's infrastructure. Iraq already has a very developed infrastructure and suffered relatively little damage during the war.

It's certainly the complete opposite of the situation in Afghanistan, where that's a country that has no prospect of being self-sufficient for quite some time to come . . . We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon.

That's not just me talking. That's the testimony of Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz back in March.

Iraq has the world's second-largest proven oil reserves and could produce even more oil and natural gas. Iraqi oilfields are already producing close to 2 million barrels a day. That means billions of dollars a year in oil revenue. According to Ambassador Bremer, by 2005, Iraq will produce enough oil to take care of its basic needs and have additional funds.

I understand that Ambassador Bremer doesn't want to delay reconstruction in Iraq until after Iraq has a constitutional and an elected government. I remind the Senate that we have already provided aid to meet Iraq's immediate needs. Just this April Congress provided $75 billion requested by the President. That supplemental bill covered ongoing military operations in Iraq. It also included $2.5 billion for Iraq Relief and Reconstruction. That was grant aid.

I believe the aid we provide now should be all loans, but half is better than none. America's taxpayers stand to get $10 billion back from Iraq's oil revenues under this amendment.

I appreciate the efforts of the cosponsors, my Republican colleagues, Senators ENSIGN, SNOWE, COLLINS, GRAHAM, and CHAMBLISS, and my Democratic colleagues, Senators BAYH and NELSON. They worked together on a bipartisan basis to improve this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this bipartisan amendment to promote burden-sharing and to provide loans, not giveaways. Mr. SNOWE, Mr. President, I rise today in support of fiscal year 2004 supplemental appropriations request for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am also pleased to cosponsor this amendment with my colleagues Senators BAYH, BEN NELSON, CHAMBLISS, ENSIGN, DORGAN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, and my fellow Senator from Maine, Senator SMITH.

This amendment directs that $10 billion of the amount requested for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Iraq's infrastructure be provided as loans rather than grants.

It is incumbent upon us as stewards of the public trust to scrutinize this $87 billion supplemental legislation, to assure ourselves of the soundness of the purposes and to understand that it is the American people who are being asked to provide. I believe that we all fundamentally agree that the $65.6 billion requested to support our military forces in the field must be made available immediately. As our troops continue to root out the remnants of Hussein's horrific regime and work to ensure stability in Iraq, we must do no less than provide them with the most advanced technology, the most reliable force protection equipment, and the best personal care available.

Rather, the amendment before us focuses on the $20.3 billion designated for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Iraq. I have maintained during this debate that a portion of these reconstruction funds should be in the form of loans, and this amendment designates $10 billion of the $20.3 billion toward that very end. At the same time, the amendment contains a “trigger with a purpose” —designed to both encourage existing creditor countries to forgive at least 90 percent of the debt owed on loans that were made to the former regime of Saddam Hussein, and to foster within Iraq itself a greater sense of responsibility toward, and a stake in, their own long-term rebuilding success.

I know some have said that loans simply aren’t feasible. My colleagues would take a look at the totality of what we’re talking about. While American men and women are putting themselves in harm’s way day in and day out in securing the liberation of the people of Iraq, we are also in the process of spending $100 billion and more for that very same purpose.

And let there be no mistake—the American people aren’t making a distinction between the money we are spending to support our troops and the additional funds being proposed to rebuild Iraq when it comes to the total measure of our Nation’s sacrifice toward this cause. So asking Iraq to repay one-tenth of that $100 billion in the form of loans hardly seems unreasonable.

But what about those who have argued there is no legitimate government in Iraq that can obligate the nation to the repayment of loans? Well, just today, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1511 which specifically determines that the Governing
Council and its ministers are the principal bodies of the Iraqi interim administration which "embodies the sovereignty of the State of Iraq during the transitional period until an internationally recognized, representative government is established." So his interim administration discussed in Resolution 1511 will be that legitimate government to which U.S. loans are made, while Iraq moves forward toward complete self-governance.

Still it has to say that providing loans to Iraq would be counter to the U.S. policy of shifting away from loans for development because of the ineffectiveness of such programs in the past. But that policy is predicated on the fact that many heavily-indebted, poor countries do not have the resources to both service debt and institute economic and social reform. Iraq, in contrast, is tremendously rich in resources to an extent sufficient to service this debt and continue to make future investment in their own infrastructure. Of course, as I have mentioned, there is also that "trigger with a purpose". What exactly is that purpose? Well, I would hope we can all agree that long-term stability in Iraq is a global concern that requires global action and global commitment. A secure, stable Iraq is not only in the best interests of the Middle East, it is also unquestionably in the best interest of freedom-loving nations everywhere.

What exactly is that "trigger with a purpose"? Well, I would hope that this amendment is, we have been willing to send our American men and women to liberate Iraq . . . we have been willing to spend $100 billion—and undoubtedly that figure will only climb in the future—for that worthy cause . . . and we're even willing to make that ten percent we expend as loans into full fledged grants—if only those nations who loaned money to the horrific, corrupt Hussein regime in the past will forgive loans that only ultimately enriched a criminal, self-aggrandizing regime that can have a positive role in ensuring a better future for Iraq, not only by lessening Iraq's debt load by the forgiveness of their own loans, but also by triggering our provision that transitions our $10 billion loan into grants. This is a win-win for the international community and for Iraq—and in the long run, with the reduced debt burden for Iraq, it may even save some additional American taxpayer dollars that would have otherwise been expended for further Iraq rebuilding.

Frankly, I don't believe for a moment that taxpayer money sent to Iraq for reconstruction should in any way, shape or form be used to pay back loans made to the heinous regime of Saddam Hussein. So I hope that with the passage of this amendment creditor nations will do the right thing and vitiate their claims against Iraq.

Moreover, I've insisted that the amendment provides $5.1 billion in direct funding for the purpose of re-establishing the rule of law through the establishment of fire and civil defense forces, police forces, a more fully developed judicial system, and the deployment and enforcement of public safety requirements.

The fact is, the sooner we can transfer the responsibility of providing basic police, fire and first responder services to the Iraqi people, the sooner we can begin to remove our troops from the front line and focus them on the missions they are trained for—conducting combat-type operations against the forces bent on attacking American interests at home and abroad. Additionally, we have learned in Eastern Europe and Latin America, the rule of law is critical to the effective transition of a state-based economy to a free-market economy.

Finally, this amendment would provide $5 billion immediately to Ambassador Bremer as "seed" money for the infrastructure projects he identified in the request. In closing, I do not believe that the provision of $10 billion in loans to the Iraqi people for the reconstruction of their nation will unduly burden them or their economy. Instead, by investing, these loans in Iraq, we are working to restore their national pride and enhance their sense of responsibility as we work toward the common goal of a free and stable Iraq. Furthermore, I do not believe it is too much to ask that, as we stand willing to turn our loans into grants, creditor nations who loaned money to the Hussein regime help that cause by wiping their debt slate clean. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am an original co-sponsor to the Bayh-Nelson amendment to this Supplemental Appropriations bill. This amendment would authorize the President to lend $10 billion in reconstruction funds to the Iraqi Governing Council or its recognized successor. These funds could be converted to grants if it is indeed 90 percent of Iraq's pre-liberation bilateral debts are absolved, including loan forgiveness for any funds obligated as loans. It also provides the sense of the Senate that it is the strong preference of the United States that all countries forgiving their pre-liberation bilateral debts owed by the Saddam regime and provide robust levels of reconstruction aid to post-liberation Iraq at the October 23 Madrid Donors Conference.

The American people are being asked to contribute over $20 billion of their taxpayer dollars for the reconstruction of Iraq. Before the war against Iraq, the administration was vague about how much security and reconstruction funding would be needed in Iraq. Instead, Congress was told by administration officials, as my colleague Senator DORGAN has pointed out, that we could expect Iraqi oil revenues to pay for Iraq reconstruction or that other nations would join us in shouldering the burden of rebuilding Iraq.

Now the administration argues that it needs over $20 billion for Iraq's reconstruction. The administration argues that this money must be given as grants and not loans. Once the money is used to rebuild Iraq's infrastructure and economy, the Iraqi government will then be obligated to pay back other nations who hold Iraqi debt. Nations like France and Russia, who loaned money to Saddam Hussein's regime, will receive debt payments off the backs of the U.S. taxpayer.

This amendment directly addresses this problem by requiring 90 percent of Iraq's pre-liberation debts to be forgiven. This, in addition to $5 billion in loans, could decrease the fiscal burden without any hope of recouping these funds. The American taxpayer should not be treated more shabbily than debtors from other nations and we should be encouraging other nations to help rebuild Iraq's economy.

Taxpayers are concerned that we are simply passing on the bill for this and other problems to our children. They are concerned that this Congress can find the resources for Iraq, but at the same time can't find the resources for our schools, for prescription drug benefits, and for rebuilding the infrastructure here at home.

We need to allay some of the very legitimate concerns of the American taxpayers. They are concerned about our ballooning debts and shrinking services while we send billions overseas. We need to address these concerns of every American. By ensuring that taxpayer funds are treated just as dearly as the debts owed to other nations, we can begin to address those concerns. $10 billion could be expected.
abroad on a very important mission. We have been appealed to before, on this side, when Presidents have been traveling abroad, to honor the position of the Presidency and not to take positions that would embarrass him when he is abroad.

I believe there is no question that the problem we face in Iraq is the populace of Iraq that wants to be part of a new government, a new democratic government. Finally, the quandary of what can they do? How can they be involved? How can they get their electricity back? How can they get their police service back? How can they get their banks open? How can they get their hospitals open? How can they get potable water? How can they be sure they have the capability to present a firm, new constitution that will be approved by their people?

The take-home money the President has requested. I believe if we do not take action to get this money into Iraq and get it moving so they can have the momentum of building a new government, the hearts and minds of those people who may not have been against us. As they are hardened against us, we will have more violence in the street and our soldiers, people in uniform, even the people who are there in civilian capacity now, will be at greater risk.

I think what the Senate from Arizona has been saying. The risk we face is, if we do not support these loans, our men and women in uniform are going to be in greater harm’s way. If we support the troops—and I have heard that from every Member of the Senate so far—if you want to support these troops, support the President on this issue and do not approve these loans. As to the concept of loans, I am sure, sometime, there will be some way the people of Iraq are going to under—see the debt they have to the United States when they become a real, strong government.

Look what happened to us after World War II. We did not saddle France and Germany with loans. We forgave all the indebtedness, even the indebtedness we had from prior to that war. We helped them through the Marshall Plan to get going.

These grants that we have in this part of this bill are absolutely essential to the continued safety, improvement of the safety of our men and women in uniform. I appeal to those who say they support the troops to support the President. He is the Commander in Chief of these troops and he has told us, his military commanders have told us, they need this money.

It goes hand in glove with the $66 billion here, to assure they have the right equipment, the right protection, there are they are. But let’s take the actions necessary to get them out of there.

I hope we would have the support of the Senate to do that tonight.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 2 minutes. I believe the leader is on his way to take the remainder of our time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I had the honor to travel last week with the Senator to Iraq and to Afghanistan. Frankly, it was a very interesting meeting, one that makes us feel a little differently, being on the ground, than it is when we hear what we hear.

I wish to make I think a fairly practical point, and that is that when we were there, obviously, we had a lot of security things to do. We have a lot of problems there.

On the other hand, they have a plan that is being put into place for the schools, for the hospitals, for the government. They are making great progress. So we are talking here about $87 billion, $67 of which goes to support the troops. The other goes to try to get Iraq on its own feet.

I have to suggest from a point of view of someone who is inclined not to want to spend a lot of money, if we really want to get them going on their own and get our troops out of there, the best way to do it is for us to take this money and to help them get on their feet.

The biggest cost is maintaining our troops there. We can move that much more quickly if this $20 billion is put in the hands of our folks who are there now and we can move to get the Iraqis on their own feet and get our troops home more quickly than if we have to do this again to support the troops.

I am talking about a very practical expenditure matter. I think we are much better off to go ahead and do this $20 billion as a grant, be able to have authority over how it is spent, and be able to get our troops home more quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remainder of our time to the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have reached a point in this debate where each of us must make difficult decisions. We debated many amendments over the past 2 weeks and we have, in my view, come to a point about which most all of us agree; that is, we are at war against terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq. I believe that we are considering is integral to our victory and the safe return of our soldiers, the men and women who represent us in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I am confident, when the final vote is taken on the $20 billion, that there will be an overwhelming bipartisan majority in favor of this commitment—in favor of this legislation. But now the Senate has moved on to consider the very best way, the very best manner in which to do it, this assistance, which we all know is so important.

How best can we stabilize the country in which our men and women right now are serving us right this very moment, risking their own lives so others and, indeed, we can live in safety.

I respectfully suggest the amendment which we will be voting upon shortly and which we are now considering simply does not help in this regard. In fact, I would argue it has the very real potential of causing, yes, even undermining our ability to do what we all want; that is, to successfully stabilize Iraq.

Let me suggest what this amendment is not. The amendment before us purports to save money for the American taxpayers by insisting on our help and foreign assistance by making this a loan that will be paid back by the Iraqi people. But, as has been discussed on the floor already, the Congressional Budget Office, due to Iraq’s already crushing burden, will score or value this amendment in the same way as if it were a grant. In other words, there is absolutely no savings to the American taxpayer, who might be listening right now, as a result of this amendment.

This amendment purports to provide an incentive for other countries to move toward debt forgiveness, I am confused. If we want others to forgive Iraqi debt, we do not want to add to it. I believe that crushing burden, that $20 billion of debt that is already as we speak on the backs of the Iraqi people. This logic completely escapes me.

As we began this debate tonight, the newly liberated country of Iraq was $200 billion in debt. By the time this debate finishes tomorrow, if this amendment were to pass, Iraq would owe more to France, or to Germany, or to Russia.

The Washington Post I thought captured the essence in the editorial yesterday when it said it is the equivalent of swimming out to a drowning man and handing him a 10-pound weight.

If the idea is that by in some way adding to Iraq’s debt we will create an incentive for other countries to move toward debt forgiveness, I am confused. How is seizing the moral low ground advantageous in that debate? If we want others to forgive Iraqi debt, we must stop piling that debt.

I remain utterly unconvinced by the suggestion that by adding to this burden of Iraqi debt and then tying the forgiveness of our debt to the willingness of France and Russia and Germany to relieve 90 percent of their debt, that we will leverage the desired result. France, Russia, and Germany showed no shame whatsoever in loaning their money to prop up Saddam Hussein, one of the world’s most brutal dictators. Despite the abundant evidence that he used weapons of mass destruction on his own people, and foreign neighbors, and tortured and mass-murdered his own people, these three nations could not find the
resolve to support the coalition’s successful effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power. They will find their conscience now.

Hope does spring eternal.

This amendment purports to talk about what good people should do to help themselves, but it offers them less help than the President proposed. This amendment purports to talk about what our allies should do, but we do not and cannot govern their actions either.

What this amendment and this debate truly speaks to is who we are as a people. Throughout history, the American people have responded again and again to the tyranny of dictators, to defend the name of freedom, to liberate the oppressed, to relieve the plight of the downtrodden. We send our soldiers to fight and to die in foreign lands. We send the hard-earned tax dollars of our citizenry to the impoverished and sick around the world.

And the Russians collapsed in Europe, we were there with billions of dollars in assistance to heal the wounds of tyranny.

When Israel and Egypt found the courage to negotiate peace at Camp David, we were there with billions more to help the people of Israel to stand with the free nations of the world.

Why? We help others because it is good and it is right. We do so without the expectation of gratitude because that is who we are as a people. As the beneficiaries of the blessings of liberty, we understand freedom is not free. The American people are a generous and good people. We do not sell our commitment to liberty, and we do not loan our good will to the needy.

So what are we to do with this amendment and this vote tonight? What are we to do? For me it is an easy question. We vote no. There is nothing in this amendment that will make the President’s job easier or our soldiers safer. Nothing in this amendment will save the taxpayers money or ease the burden upon the people of Iraq. Others of good conscience think otherwise, and that is their right as elected representatives to this body. For those who have not decided, I ask you to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am new to the Senate. This has been a terrific debate in the best traditions of the Senate. I come to this conclusion after having listened to people I admire and respect, such as our leader, the President, the Vice President, and Secretary Powell. I asked myself: Who are you to disagree? I thought about it, and I came to this conclusion. I do disagree. I know they are genuine in their beliefs, but I just do not believe we are being unfair to the people of Iraq. We have lost 323 lives liberating Iraq. We are spending $1 billion a week, and all we are asking for is once the country gets something going — to build schools and hospitals, we are going to do great things for the Iraqi people — but once the oil refineries are fixed, because that is what makes the money, and once we do other things to get you back in business, consider helping us because we are deep in debt. We borrowed every penny of this $87 billion. And I would vote tomorrow to borrow more money to make our country safe.

We have one of the highest deficits in our Nation’s history because our economy has turned down. But we have to win this war. The only way we will lose this war — here is where I am talking — is if the American people leave. It is very hard for me to explain how you have to give $20 billion to a country that is sitting on $1 trillion worth of oil and the net result of this policy we are pursuing is the people who died to liberate Iraq are going to be left holding the bag, and the only people who will get paid back are the people who lent money to Saddam Hussein. If we follow that policy, people will leave us because it is not fair to the taxpayer. We need to make sure we don’t divide ourselves here at home.

This is very important, not just for international politics but for domestic politics.

The French and the Germans voted today for a resolution, but in the same breath they said they would send no troops and no money.

We are pretty much alone for a while. Let us stay together and not ask more of the American people. It would be unfair to ask.

I really do love my country. We give $15 billion to treat and care for those who suffer from HIV/AIDS. Now we stand with billions more to help the people of Iraq to stand with the free nations of the world.

We have one of the highest deficits in our Nation’s history because our economy has turned down. But we have to win this war. The only way we will lose this war — here is where I am talking — is if the American people leave. It is very hard for me to explain how you have to give $20 billion to a country that is sitting on $1 trillion worth of oil and the net result of this policy we are pursuing is the people who died to liberate Iraq are going to be left holding the bag, and the only people who will get paid back are the people who lent money to Saddam Hussein. If we follow that policy, people will leave us because it is not fair to the taxpayer. We need to make sure we don’t divide ourselves here at home.

This is very important, not just for international politics but for domestic politics.

The French and the Germans voted today for a resolution, but in the same breath they said they would send no troops and no money.

We are pretty much alone for a while. Let us stay together and not ask more of the American people. It would be unfair to ask.

I really do love my country. We give $15 billion in aid to Africa and we don’t want a penny back. We are giving $10 billion in grants, and we don’t want a penny back. But if we are going to build your infrastructure to make you prosperous, help us because we are in debt. And if other countries will do the right thing, we need to do the right thing.

The biggest thing we have done for Iraq is give our young men and women, and billions more to help the people of Iraq. We have lost 332 and more are going to die. That is a significant number.

Iraq is give our young men and women, and billions more to help the people of Iraq. We have lost 332 and more are going to die. That is a significant number.
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Mr. BAYH. I thank all the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle for their support and say to my colleagues, all of us are committed to the success in Iraq. To achieve that success we must have the help of the rest of the world and the help of the Iraqi people on their own behalf.

Several arguments have been offered in opposition to our amendment. Let me address them. First, there is no government in power to take on these obligations. Really? Was Saddam Hussein in power to burden the Iraqi people with these loans? I suggest the current council has at least as much legitimacy as Saddam Hussein. If his loans were legitimate, so are the actions of the council.

It is said this is a test of our resolve. That is true. But the surest way to assure the resolve of the American people is to do what is just and fair and right. How can we possibly say to the American people, the French, the Germans, and the Russians may get repaid, those who propped up Saddam Hussein, but those who paid to liberate the country receive nothing. Is that fair? That would undermine the resolve.

There is a perception this is all about that. That is a lie. It is a demonstrable lie. I say to my colleagues, no great power, including our country, can base its policy upon falsehoods and lies. We must base our policy upon the truth and the facts. We know why we are in Iraq.

It is also said this will undermine our effort to achieve loan forgiveness. On the contrary. This will provide an incentive for others to forgive their loan and puts us in a position of maximum leverage to insist they do. If they drag their heels and refuse, it is said we will lose control of this money. No, my friends, we include a specific provision providing Ambassador Bremer with veto power over expenditures.

Finally, this is about American leadership. We lead when we do the right thing. I ask for your support for this amendment. It will accomplish our objectives in Iraq.

Mr. STEVENS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1376

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes evenly divided prior to the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution which urges countries that currently hold Iraqi debt that was incurred by Saddam Hussein to forgive that debt. If they do not, the Iraqi people and the Iraqi economy will suffocate.

The Congressional Research Service says there is from $95 to $153 billion
worth of debt. They cannot service that debt and grow as an economy. That debt is owned or held by Saudi Arabia. They have $25 billion. It is held by Kuwait, $15 to $27 billion; Russia, $3 to $16 billion; Japan, $3 to $7 billion; Germany, $2 to $4 billion; France, $2 to $3 billion.

We urge the countries that took debt, made loans to Saddam Hussein’s regime, to forgive that debt and allow the Iraqi people and their economy to grow.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. Mr. REID. We yield back our time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico and 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the amendment (No. 1876) was agreed to. The amendment (No. 1876) is heard.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, how much time does our side have?

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment (No. 1876) is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1876) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes evenly divided in relation to the Bayh amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it 1 minute a side or 2 minutes a side? I thought I had a standing order there would be 2 minutes before every vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This order says 2 minutes evenly divided.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry. I ask unanimous consent that it be 2 minutes on each side.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the amendment (No. 1876) was agreed to. The amendment (No. 1876) is heard.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, how much time does our side have?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, everything that the Senator from New Mexico asked, this amendment does not take away any of that. The full $20 billion stays within this amendment. The difference is, do we give it all in a grant and does that strengthen the President’s hand or do we give half of it in a grant and half of it in a loan? We believe if you give half in a loan, the President’s hand is strengthened on getting other countries that are owed money from the previous Saddam Hussein regime to forgive that debt. I make no apologies for the American people to say, if France, Germany, and Russia can be paid back, why can’t we be paid back. I hope all of the debt is forgiven. I think that is best for Iraq. But if the rest of the countries don’t forgive their debt, then the American taxpayer should be paid back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it has been said that our decision tonight will determine whether America is perceived as a leader in the world. What kind of message will we send after all the dying and treasure and blood we have expended in Iraq? Can there be any doubt about America’s willingness and about the message we send? When we removed Saddam Hussein, America sent a message that we lead to stand for freedom—the freedom to choose your own government, the freedom to run your own economy. Tonight, again, we lead with $72 billion free and clear in grants for the security of Iraq; further, $5 billion for the immediate reconstruction needs, free and clear to Iraq; further, $50 billion for the long-term reconstruction needs for the people of Iraq is a loan to be forgiven if the rest of the world will join us in this cause.

That is American leadership. That is the message we send. That is why we ask for your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be a 10-minute vote. A number of Senators still hope to offer amendments tonight, and that would save us some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am compelled to object because I think there are some people who have left the building already, I inquired whether it was going to be a 10-minute vote. I was asked the Parliamentarian had agreed, and then I told them we had not. I urge the leader to leave it the normal 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.
The amendment (No. 1871) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there will be no further votes tonight. What we plan to do now is ask Members who still have amendments to be considered to consult with us. We are prepared to accept some of them. We will have an early session of the Senate tomorrow starting at 9. We will start voting on the amendments that are still pending that have not been resolved tonight. There are still a couple of amendments that Members wish to offer tomorrow, but first we will vote on the pending amendments. So all Senators should be on notice there will be votes starting immediately in the morning. After the first vote, I will ask that the amendments be 10 minutes each so that there will be a series of probably 19 to 20 amendments, as I count them right now, that could well be voted on before we will then take up the several amendments that Members wish to debate.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I do yield.

Mr. REID. Senator BYRN has asked me to announce that tonight we would have Senator BOXER offer an amendment. She is going to just take a couple of minutes. Senator LEAHY has an important amendment. He will take a reasonably short period of time. Senator DURBIN has an amendment. He will take a short period of time, and then Senator CORZINE and Senator LANDRIEU, in that order.

Mr. STEVENS. I am not agreeing to any order, Mr. President. We have a list of amendments. We are going to go down the list of amendments and see who is here.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do not know then how to operate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I am perfectly ready to start considering amendments, but I am not going to have any time agreement right now on any amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have not asked for any time agreement. I am trying to help. I am trying to move this along. I personally do not care if we ever finish this bill. I am trying to work and move this bill along. I was asked to have some people offer the amendments who have a vote. I have spent probably an hour and a half getting these people lined up to offer amendments. If we are going to finish this bill tomorrow, then we have to do it this way. Otherwise, count me out of the ball game. Somebody else can figure out how to do it.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senators are at liberty to offer their amendments as they wish tonight. We will be glad to stay as long as Senators want to offer amendments and present them to us. We are trying to work out those amendments with people who want to settle amendments first, not those who want to bring up amendments and demand a vote tomorrow. There are a bunch of Senators willing to compromise on amendments and I want to let them proceed and have them go home before the other people who want to offer amendments, argue, and then have a vote tomorrow.

I think that is a logical progress.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, then I say to Senator BOXER, Senator LEAHY, Senator DURBIN, Senator CORZINE, and Senator LANDRIEU, go home. We will settle them tomorrow.

Mr. STEVENS. That is perfectly all right with me, Mr. President. I am here until Saturday, Sunday, whatever it takes. The bill will be finished sometime before the end of this week.

To stand up and say these people are going to come first before those we have been negotiating with, we told them we will accept amendments and can handle those, I think that is wrong. So if Senators want to go home, go home. If they want to stay here and settle these bills, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska still has the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska still has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, has an amendment that has been cleared on both sides. She wants to make a few remarks on that amendment. I welcome her offering that amendment at this time and discussing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I am happy to work within the system. I have a sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I send up a modified amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Texas is entitled to be heard. If we could have order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order. Senators engaging in conversations, please take those conversations from the Senate floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate is not in order.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Conversations will be taken from the floor. The Senate will come to order.

AMENDMENT NO. 1877, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send a modified version of my amendment No. 1877 to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without object, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 1877, as modified.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on reconstruction efforts in Iraq)

On page 38, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section: (Sec. 2313. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A coalition of allied countries led by the United States entered Iraq on March 19, 2003, to liberate the people of Iraq from the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein and the Baathist party and to remove a threat to global security and stability.

(2) Achieving stability in Iraq will require substantial monetary investments to develop a secure environment and improve the physical infrastructure.

(3) A stable and prosperous Iraq is important to peace and economic development in the Middle East and elsewhere.
Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment (No. 1877), as modified, was adopted. The amendment (No. 1858), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. We have an amendment by Senator NELSON on the table.

The difficulty I have is I think we are going to make a major change in this bill. I think we are going to add a lot of money to the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be brief. As I look around, there is only one person on this floor who has served longer than I have and that is the Senator from Alaska. I know the difficulties—both he and I have gone back and forth, sometimes one is chairman, sometimes the other is, on different committees—how difficult it is to keep a major bill going through. I understand his concern in doing it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will be brief. The sense of the Senate and I feel very bad about this, and I am not going to be cooperating tonight if we are not going to allow this to take on some kind of comity at this late hour where we hear from Senator HUTCHISON, who has a very good amendment, and then we go to our side, and back and forth. I want to do this, but as one Senator to say I feel bad about the way things are deteriorating tonight and I am not going to cooperate.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator from California and I came to Washington together many years ago. We are very close friends. I consider Senator BOXER a sister. I appreciate her saying a few words on my behalf. But I think probably part of the blame was mine. I know the Senator from Alaska very well, and I probably would have been well advised, when he was raising his voice a little bit, for me not to raise my voice. The fact of the matter is, we both have been working this bill for hours and days, and probably we are both a little testy. So I think there is blame to go around on both sides. I do appreciate my friend from California defending me. She has made her point, at least as confirming our friendship, and I think Senator STEVENS and I can work this out and move the bill along.

I do appreciate very much my friend from California sticking up for me as she has done tonight and has done for the last 22 years we have been together.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Can we get this amendment adopted? May we adopt the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1877), as modified, was agreed to. The amendment (No. 1858), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. The procedure we had, and I told people on this side we would do, we have two amendments on this side, one amendment on that side, that have been cleared and we will let them go home. I am perfectly willing to go to anyone else who wants to talk, but as the manager of the bill we have the right to say to people: Look, if you will agree to offer these and make these changes, we will take them up right away, as soon as this vote is over. That I did, so I don't apologize to anybody.

I would like to yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be very brief. As I look around, there is only one person on this floor who has served longer than I have and that is

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I said I wouldn't apologize. I do apologize to my friend from Nevada if I offended him. I did not intend to offend him. He is a valuable Member of the Senate and has worked, whether in the majority or minority, assiduously to see the Senate does its work. I don't argue with that at all. I have great fondness for the Senator from Nevada.

I wish I lived in Nevada. I might even vote for him if I lived there.

I see the current occupant of the chair is laughing at that, but it is true.

The difficulty I have is I think we need a lot of money across this aisle in terms of the plans we each make as manager of our side on this particular bill.

Right now the Senator from Nevada has an amendment by Senator Nelson that is agreed to. I am pleased to yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REID. I send a modification of the Nelson amendment to the desk.

Mr. President, this is an amendment offered by Senator Nelson. He has been in negotiations with the majority staff for several days now.

Mr. STEVENS. It is acceptable.

Mr. REID, I urge its adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge its adoption also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1858), as modified, was agreed to. The amendment (No. 1877), as modified, was agreed to.

At the end of title I, add the following:

Sect. 316. Of the amounts appropriated by this title, $10,000,000 shall be available only for the Family Readiness Program of the National Guard.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.
The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1867**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have the amendment for Senator WARNER, for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. EDWARDS. It has been cleared on both sides. On my information, it is amendment No. 1867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

That amendment is currently pending.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1868 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1867**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I also have a second-degree amendment to that amendment, I ask that amendment be adopted. This is the hurricane flood damage amendment. We are taking out of the bill those items which were not relevant to the bill. I send that amendment to the desk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS, for Mr. KLEIN], proposes an amendment numbered 1868 to amendment 1867.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To designate the amount designated for disaster relief provided in connection with Defense infrastructure damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Isabel as an emergency requirement.)

At the end of line 8, strike "..." and insert the following:

- Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress); provided further, that the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes the designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in House Concurrent Resolution 96, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004, is transmitted by the President to the Congress."

Mr. STEVENS. I ask consideration of the amendment, the adoption of the amendment, and consideration of the amendment as amended.

Mr. President, this amendment is also one that has been reviewed by the two Senators from Maryland. They both think this is good. There has been tremendous damage at the Naval Academy. This covers that also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second-degree amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1868) was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the first-degree amendment, as amended.

Without objection, that amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1867), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1883**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senator from California that on amendment No. 1843 we sent a notice to the Senator that we are prepared to accept that retroactive assistance meal reimbursement amendment, if she is prepared to offer it tonight. That is Senator BOXER’s amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay the pending amendment aside, and I call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment be dispensed with.

The П'RESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make retroactive the relief of hospitalized members of the uniformed services from the obligation to pay for food or subsistence while hospitalized; and to provide an offset for the additional cost)

On page 20, strike lines 9 through line 12, and insert the following:

- (b) Section 1075(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect as of September 11, 2001, and shall apply with respect to injuries or diseases incurred on or after that date.

(c) The amount appropriated by chapter 2 of title II under the heading "IRAQ RELIEF" for fiscal year 2001 is hereby reduced by $1,500,000, to be derived from the amount set aside under such heading for transportation and telecommunication for the Iraqi Postal Authority for the administration of OEF (Operation Enduring Freedom).

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, I am offering an amendment that will help service members who have been hospitalized after being wounded or becoming ill during combat or other operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and during the war on terror since September 11, 2001.

Right now, when one of our soldiers is wounded, they are evacuated to a military hospital. When they are discharged from the hospital, they receive a bill for their hospital food. The current daily rate for those charges is $8.10.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida, Senator BOB GRAHAM, for offering leadership on this issue. Accepted as part of the manager’s package, his amendment exempts service members who are hospitalized from combat injuries and other conditions from having to pay for their meals. His amendment addresses the problem prospectively—in the future.

My amendment supplements his—by closing the loop. It will require the Department of Defense to reimburse troops who paid for meals while hospitalized as a result of either injury or illness while in combat or training for combat since September 11, 2001.

I recently learned about a marine staff sergeant who was injured when an Iraqi dropped a grenade on a Humvee he was driving. As a result of the explosion, he lost part of his leg and had surgery to remove an infected bone. He spent 26 days in the hospital recovering. He was then discharged to return home and to his job as a sheriff’s deputy. He was handed a bill for $210.60 for his food. That may not seem like a lot to some, but
Amendment No. 1807, as modified

The amendment (No. 1807), as modified, is as follows:

Purpose: To provide for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction of Liberia.

Beginning on page 29, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 31, line 5, and insert the following:

**INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE.**

For an additional amount for “International Disaster Assistance” for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance for Liberia, and for payment for military assistance programs for Liberia for which funds were appropriated by title III of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2003 (division E of Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 176), $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $100,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds appropriated in this title under the subheading “Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund” under the heading “Other Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds Appropriated to the President.”

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Senators COLEMAN, DASCHLE, BIDEN, LIEBERMAN, FEINGOLD, REED of Rhode Island, and LAUTENBERG be added as cosponsors.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk reads as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. CHAFEE, for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 1807, as modified.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. This amendment addresses the humanitarian crisis in Liberia. This is a bipartisan amendment, supported by Senators CHAFEE, COLEMAN, BIDEN, LIEBERMAN, FEINGOLD, REED, LAUTENBERG, and LANDRIEU.

Anyone who has read a newspaper or watched CNN over the past couple of months knows about the tremendous suffering in Liberia today.

Three-quarters of Liberians do not have access to safe drinking water.

Three-quarters are living in poverty.

Three-quarters do not have access to acceptable sanitation.

Eighty-five percent of Liberians are unemployed.

These numbers, provided by the U.N., are absolutely appalling. To me, this is more than enough reason to act.

We have deep historical ties to its people. Presidents James Monroe and Andrew Jackson, along with some of the most notable Senators ever to serve in this body, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, helped create the nation of Liberia. Liberia’s flag is nearly identical to our own.

We have heard urgent pleas from the Liberian people for the U.S. to help.
Archbishop Michael Francis of Monrovia, wrote a letter in support of this amendment. He wrote:

[We are at a crucial juncture where an intervention by the United States, renewing its leadership and a comprehensive response is necessary for stabilization of Liberia. It is for this reason that your amendment to include $200 million in the FY 2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill to address relief and reconstruction needs in Liberia is timely and must be supported by the Senate body.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.]

The above objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

Hon. BILL FRIST, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER FRIST AND MINORITY LEADER DASCHLE: Thank you for your leadership on the important issue that faces the American people each day. Your important voice on many of the issues such as infectious disease, conflict resolution, human rights, and democratic transition is incredibly appreciated, particularly by those of us on the ground who are working daily to affect the change necessary to bring peace, justice, and stability to our respective nations.

As you know, the ongoing human rights crisis in Liberia continues to require close examination and a comprehensive response so that the country does not spiral back to the days when Liberia was governed by warlord Charles Taylor. As this transition progresses, it is critical that the United States, working with our international partners, renew its leadership role, which will greatly help to ensure the stabilization of Liberia. Thus, I write to strongly urge your support for the Chafee-Leahy amendment which would include $200 million in the FY2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill to address the relief and reconstruction needs of Liberia.

Liberia has endured years of a brutal conflict. The signing of a peace agreement in Accra in 2003, as the deployment of peacekeeping troops to Liberia have paved the way for the best opportunity for peace and stability in the West African nation since the Civil War in 1989.

We have seen that, despite a peace accord between rebel forces and the Government of Liberia, fighting continues in our war-ravaged nation. The inability of humanitarian organizations to safely deliver aid, given grave security problems, has precipitated a large-scale humanitarian crisis in the small West African nation. U.S. Agency for International Development estimates more than 500,000 Liberian refugees are currently internally displaced and tens of thousands of refugees who fled to Liberia from other conflicts in the region have been cut off from outside assistance. Moreover, the country’s physical infrastructure is in dire straits, and the peace process in Liberia is dependent on investments from the United States, which will help provide good governance, employment, law and order, and basic social services.

In testimony before the House International Relations Committee on October 2, 2003, Foreign Affairs Walter Kansteiner, III, agreed that at least $200 million would be needed to address humanitarian and reconstruction needs in Liberia, and also pledged to work with the Congress to include such funding in the supplemental bill.

Senators Lincoln Chafee (R-RI) and Patrick Leahy (D-VT) have introduced a corresponding amendment to address the humanitarian and reconstruction needs of Liberia. In the supplemental bill, $200 million would come from funds already in the supplemental and would not raise the total amount of the bill. Additionally, these resources would assist by sending a strong, clear and unequivocal message to all the parties, expressing the United States’ determination to play an active and robust role aimed at ameliorating the Liberian crisis. I appeal to you to ensure that this funding remain consistent with our desire to avoid any rush to quick fixes and semi-solutions. Rather, our collective strategy should be aimed at achieving the following strategic objectives:

1. Consolidating the cease fire and stabilizing the security situation on the ground;
2. Ensuring the demobilization of the militia and their proper reintegration into the civil society;
3. Creating a secure environment over the entire country;
4. Contributing to consolidating national unity and assisting in establishing a viable transitional government;
5. Reestablishing the necessary state structures for efficiency and ensuring that they function in a proper and durable way; and
6. Once these pre-conditions have been met, we can move forward in the preparation of free, fair, transparent, and democratic elections.

As you know, the supplemental request, as it was sent to Congress, fails to identify any resources to meet these urgent needs in Liberia. Without adding money to the 2004 supplemental, Liberia will receive no significant funding until FY2005, a full year after the outbreak of a fragile peace. I implore you, on behalf of the Liberian people, to assist us in addressing Liberia’s human rights, peace building, and reconstruction needs. Without strong U.S. support, Liberia threatens to fall once more into violence and chaos, possibly becoming a haven for criminal and terrorist activity on the African continent.

The critical human rights needs of our brothers and sisters in Liberia and West Africa require your uncompromising support of the Congress’s intention to include $200 million for humanitarian and reconstruction needs in Liberia in the FY2004 Supplemental Appropriations bill when it comes to the Senate floor.

Sincerely,

ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL KPAKALA FRANCIS.

Mr. LEAHY. Archibishop Francis is said to be the only man in Liberia that Charles Taylor feared. This is because of the archbishop’s tireless criticism of Charles Taylor and his brutal regime. If we don’t move decisively to help solidify the fragile peace in Liberia, fighting could easily resume and spread throughout the region. Guess who the world will look to help solve the crisis?

The United States. More lives will have been lost, more time will have been wasted and it will be more difficult and expensive to get the peace process back on track.

Mr. President, this amendment gives the Senate a chance to take decisive action to address the crisis in Liberia. This amendment provides $200 million in badly needed aid, and it allows the administration to determine the best way to spend it.

How did we arrive at this figure? Two hundred million dollars is what the Bush administration says we should spend to respond to this crisis. On October 2, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Walter Kansteiner told the House International Relations Committee that $200 million is what the U.S. should contribute to Liberia.

In other words, this is the administration’s own number.

This amendment is fully offset—it does not add one dime to the total amount of the supplemental. It also allows the administration to use these funds for virtually any purpose: humanitarian, reconstruction, or security assistance.

We have an $87 billion bill before the Senate. But there is no money in this bill designated for Liberia. The United States worked to get rid of a despicable dictator who is wanted for war crimes. We sent the Marines to Liberia. The United States has deep historical ties to Liberia. We should do the right thing—not just stick a band-aid on the problem and hope it goes away.

Mr. President, it is up to Congress to show leadership on this issue. The House has acted. It has included $100 million of international disaster assistance for Liberia and Sudan. The Senate should build on this effort. This amendment does that.

There should be no question. We should join together and pass this bipartisan amendment and help the people of Liberia. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I withhold the quorum call.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. STEVENS, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this pending amendment be set aside for the purpose of Senator DURBIN offering an amendment.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1879

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk on Reserve pay which I will be asking to be put in the queue for a vote tomorrow. This amendment was offered 2 days ago. I am not going to belabor the issue other than to say to my colleagues, and for the record, that what it provides is that Federal employees who are members of the Guard and Reserves who are activated would have the difference in their pay—their military pay and their Federal pay—made up by the Federal agency for which they work. This is done by State governments and private companies and local units of government. It is not done by the Federal Government.

Frankly, this amendment was offered in good faith to have the Federal Government establish the standard so that activated Guard and Reserves who are Federal employees will receive this difference.

There are 1.2 million Guard and Reserves in America. Ten percent of them are Federal employees, 14,000 are now activated, and almost half of them have been a cut in pay. Since activation has gone on for an extended period of time, I will ask that that amendment be put in the queue tomorrow.

AMENDMENT NO. 1879

Mr. President, I have another amendment, but before I send the amendment to the desk, let me describe it to my colleagues.

I offered an amendment, earlier today, on the global AIDS epidemic, an amendment which said we have made a commitment as a nation to spend $15 billion over the next 5 years to deal with this epidemic. This is an epidemic which President Bush acknowledged in his State of the Union Message and one that he has spoken of extensively here in the United States and while traveling abroad.

Unfortunately, the administration did not come up, in the first year, with $3 billion to deal with the global AIDS epidemic.

We know there is a serious need across the world to spend the funds necessary. I would say to my colleagues who might ask, “Why would you raise the global AIDS epidemic on this emergency appropriations bill,” consider the statement made by Secretary of State Colin Powell to the United Nations just a few weeks ago. I quote:

AIDS is more devastating than any terrorist attack, any conflict, or any weapon of mass destruction.

The extended quote will be made a part of the RECORD. But what I would like to say to my colleagues is this: I hope—as we consider what it takes to make this a safe world for future generations, as we consider what is necessary in the Middle East and Iraq—we also consider that we are living in a world devastated by AIDS, that AIDS is an epidemic destabilizing countries, making them vulnerable to terrorist takeovers, and creating the kind of instability that guarantees the United States must pay heed.

There is a choice to deal with this, and the way to do it is to keep our word.

My earlier version of this amendment was objected to by Senator STEVENS. He argued it included legislative language. We have stricken all legislative language in this amendment.

Secondly, this would not be subject to a budget point of order because the foreign operations appropriations bill has not passed, and the set-off in the amendment comes in emergency appropriations, so there is no problem with either the budget or the spend-out rate.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) proposes an amendment numbered 1879.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funds for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. (a) GLOBAL HIV/AIDS FUNDING.—

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, in addition to funds appropriated under the heading “Global AIDS Initiative” in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 2004, $879,700,000.

(b) OFFSET.—The total amount appropriated under this heading “OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND” shall be reduced by $879,700,000.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we consider this $87 billion supplemental, and what it is in the interest of our national security, for this generation and generations to come—these words from the Secretary of State about the impact of AIDS have special resonance: “more devastating than any terrorist attack, any conflict, or any weapon of mass destruction.”

AIDS is fast becoming the worst plague the world has ever encountered. Already, 25 million people have been killed by the disease.

Today, another 21 million people around the world face a death sentence from AIDS because they have no access to life-saving treatment that can cost as little as a dollar a day.

As parents are dying, 14 million AIDS orphans have been left without the care and support that they need. Unless we act soon, there will be 25 million AIDS orphans by the end of the decade.

Each year the world loses a population greater than the city of Chicago because of AIDS. Yet, we know how to stop these deaths.

Keeping our promises in the fight against AIDS is in America’s interest. AIDS represents not only a humanitarian crisis on a scale the world has never seen, AIDS also presents a growing security threat around the world.

Living up to the President’s promises on AIDS makes good sense for our national security. It is also important for showing the world that we make good on our commitments.

As the CIA Director recently said about AIDS:

Is this a security issue? You bet it is. With more than 40 million people infected right now, a figure that—by 2010—may reach 100 million, AIDS is building dangerous momentum in regions beyond Africa.

As the disease spreads, it unravels social structures, decimates populations and destabilizes entire nations.

The National Intelligence Council found that in five of the world’s most populous nations, the number of HIV-infected people will grow to an estimated 50 to 75 million by 2010.

AIDS is particularly devastating national armies around the world that provide stability. In South Africa, according to the Rand Institute, some military units have infection rates as high as 90 percent.

Keeping our promises on AIDS is not only the compassionate thing to do, it is the smart thing to do in terms of our national security as well.

Today, we have a chance to change the course of the AIDS pandemic and strengthen our national security by providing $3 billion in the coming year.

In this State of the Union address, the President made a 5-year pledge of $15 billion to help the millions of AIDS sufferers in Africa and around the world. We must keep that pledge today.

The President has said:

We can turn our eyes away in resignation and despair, or we can take decisive, historic action to turn the tide against this disease and give the hope of life to millions who need our help.

Unfortunately the President’s budget fails to live up to the President’s rhetoric. His budget fell nearly $1 billion short of the $3 billion for the coming year.

The President’s shortchanging on AIDS will cost lives. The additional funding which we seek to restore today can put 1 million people on treatment and prevent 2.5 million new infections.

In July, 78 members of this body voted for sense of the Senate language calling for fully funding the $3 billion to fight AIDS this year, even if it meant exceeding the levels authorized in the budget.

The President himself said that “we care more about results than words.
We’re interested in lives saved.” Now is our opportunity to go beyond words and fulfill the pledge that the President made in the State of the Union and that we made in July.

The amendment I am putting forward will close the gap between the rhetoric and the reality. The children of AIDS sufferers by fully funding the $3 billion.

This amendment will provide the $879.7 million necessary to close the gap and fully fund the $3 billion pledge made in the authorizing legislation. It will do so by reducing the $30.3 Billion Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund in the supplemental by a pro-rata $879.7 million. This allows the administration to choose where to take the reduction—and the options are many.

For example, the supplemental contains $2.1 billion for ‘oil infrastructures’—$900 million for importation of petroleum products into Iraq. Perhaps instead of spending nearly a billion dollars to import oil into Iraq, a billion dollars could be spent to pay the $30 million additional people with AIDS and preventing an additional 2.5 million new infections.

The stakes could not be higher. As Majority Leader Frist said recently: “History will judge whether a world led by America stood by and let transpire one of the greatest destructions of human life in recorded history—or performed one of its most heroic rescues.”

Instead of fulfilling this pledge, the White House is claiming that the full amount cannot be spent in the coming year. All the leading development organizations and medical authorities reject this White House claim as baseless and fundamentally false.

Last month in Roll Call, all of the leading relief and development organizations in the United States placed an ad that endorsed the fact that the full $3 billion could be well spent.

The White House is also ignoring the capacity of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and malaria—the most effective tool we have to beat AIDS. The Global Fund, Chaired by Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson, is scaling up successful programs on the ground in Africa and is working to stop the next wave of the pandemic in places such as India and it needs hundreds of millions of dollars more by this fall to fund a new round of grants.

The White House is also forgetting the extraordinary needs of AIDS orphans. According to a soon to be released report by the Earth Institute at Columbia, orphans and vulnerable children need $15 billion each year for basic health, education and community services.

The Global HIV Prevention Working Group found that AIDS prevention spending falls $3.8 billion short of what is needed by 2006. Although we can spare babies a life with AIDS for the price of a Sunday newspaper, only 5 percent of women at risk have access to medication to prevent mother-to-child transmission.

I hope today that the 78 of my colleagues who committed to fully fund the $3 billion to fight AIDS will join me in supporting this amendment. We have a unique chance to change the future and save many lives. Today, a 15-year-old boy in Botswana faces an 80 percent chance of dying of AIDS. If we act now, we can change the future for these children before it is too late.

Mr. President, at this point it is my understanding this amendment will be put in the queue with the others for consideration tomorrow. With that understanding, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1881

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment that has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The pending amendments set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid], for Mr. Nelson of Florida, proposes an amendment numbered 1881.

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

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

The amendment is as follows: (Purpose: To require a report on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020)

At the end of title I, add the following:

SNC. 316.—Congress makes the following findings:
(1) The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate specified in Senate Report 107-151 to accompany S. 2514 (107th Congress) that the Chief of Naval Operations submit to the congressional defense committees a report, not later than June 2, 2003, on the plans of the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2015.
(2) As of October 16, 2003, the report has not been submitted.
(b) REPORT.—AIRCRAFT CARRIER BASING PLANS THROUGH 2020.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Navy for basing aircraft carriers through 2020.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been advised by the majority that this amendment has been approved on both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. It has been approved on our side for Mr. Nelson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1881) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Chair would allow, we now have two amendments we would like to offer tonight and debate tonight, one by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Corzine, and the other by the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. Landrieu. And we have been told that the mother of two small babies is going to go first, Senator Landrieu. I will yield to her if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the courtesies. The children have been long in bed and are sound asleep before this hour. But I appreciate the courtesies extended to allow me to take a few minutes to explain this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1859

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and call up amendment No. 1859, which is at the desk, on behalf of myself, Senator Dorgan, and Senator Levin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is already pending.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Without objection, this is a modified amendment based on a concept that Senator Dorgan, Senator Levin, and others have been working on now for several weeks. It is a very important amendment to consider in terms of shaping a sustainable aid package for Iraq.

It does not address or take any money away from the $20 billion. It simply establishes a framework whereby future reconstruction efforts in Iraq could be financed through a financing mechanism using the great oil wealth of that nation. It does not, in any way, affect the immediate $20 billion which the Chair and others and I were proud to cosponsor and which was shaped and crafted over an hour ago on the Bayh amendment.

This is about the future, not the present. It does not have an effect on the $20 billion.

Within an hour or two of this time, the Senate rose to the occasion. We had a very vigorous and enlightening, at times tough, but very good debate on the way we should put out our reconstruction efforts for Iraq. The Senate is fulfilling its role, shaping foreign policy, being a partner with the executive branch, and, in my opinion, since that amendment passed, improving the original plan.

As I said when I supported the Bayh amendment, the administration’s original plan, which seems to people in Louisiana and to the American people to be billions of dollars of grants often, only, and alone will not work. Not only is it not popular, it is not sustainable in our democracy. Iraq doesn’t have a democracy yet, but we do. In democracy, we have laws that not only will the leadership support but the people support. Because without the people’s support, no plan that
we lay down, either at the White House or in Congress, in the House or the Senate, is sustainable over a long period of time.

What is that important? It is important because every study that has been conducted, by independent think tanks and authorities has said that the work we have undertaken in Iraq is not going to be completed in the next 6 months or 1 year or 2 years. As the Presiding Officer knows, this is at a minimum a 5 to 7-year effort. Does that mean that all we will be there for, probably, 7 years? We hope not. Does it mean all the troops there now will have to be there in that number even 2 or 3 years? The effort itself of reconstruction—helping a country that was cruelly administered by a dictator, taking it to a vibrant democracy with democratic institutions in place, based on the history and the region we are talking about—is not going to be easy. Yes, I think the Iraqi people want that. I think the American people want that. But it is not going to be easy. It is going to take time.

The amendment we spoke about earlier tonight, and voted on by a 52 or 53-vote margin, helps to take the original plan, put sustainability into it, and turn it into something that can be sustainable over time. It targeted the grants. It was strategic. It had strong incentives for debt forgiveness, which is a crucial aspect and principle of a strong reconstruction plan. And most importantly, it put up the $20 billion right now so we can get started and build a strong foundation for a successful reconstruction plan.

This amendment I am offering tonight, and hopefully we will vote on tomorrow, is a complementary piece. It says that because Iraq has some of the richest oil reserves in the world, most people think they are the second largest resource of oil in the world, they could do it first because not all of the fields have been explored and developed. In fact, it has in some instances been barely touched.

Let me show a picture of the country. As you can see, these are the oil fields that are outlined right here in the north, in the center, right outside of Baghdad, and in the southern portion of the country. But the geologists, the industry publications believe that there is as much oil in this section of Iraq, in the southwestern section, as there is in the middle east. As you can see, there is not one designation on this map because it has been totally unexplored.

The reserves we are calculating—and they are in the hundreds of millions, billions of barrels of oil and not even counting the gas—are well underestimated.

The point of this is that when these oil fields come back on line—and they are coming back on rather quickly with the support of the communities and with the support of American ingenuity and technology and know-how, and, by the way, that technology is improving and has improved substantially—there is going to be even more oil and gas found, thus making the possibility of future construction and renovation and reconstruction definitely possible to be refinanced with these resources.

This amendment will help to ensure that the Iraqi people themselves are benefiting from their own oil reserves. It seeks to make that point in no uncertain terms. The reconstruction of Iraq for the benefit of the people of Iraq can be done and accomplished using the Iraqi resources, which are plentiful and quite substantial, to be used in that way.

This is not Senator LANDRIEU's idea. I didn't come up with this idea. I heard about it. I heard administration officials speaking about it. In fact, Secretary Wolfowitz said just a year ago in an interview on this subject:

On a rough recollection, the oil revenues of that country could bring between $50 and $60 billion to Iraq over the next two or three years. . . . We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.

This is what our own Secretary said. This Senate minutes ago to decide that, no, we were not going to move to this system right now. We were going to vote for this amendment that Senator BAYH and others offered. We said we would not move to the reconstruction oil reserves at this time. Let's lay down the $20 billion in the way that we did it, part in a loan that could be forgiven if other debts are forgiven, part immediately for the construction. But, in the future, my amendment says that establishing this financing mechanism could match what the administration originally said they wanted to do, which, of course, makes sense not only to me but to the American people.

The American people want us to be successful in Iraq. This is their challenge. It is not something that belongs only to the leaders here in Washington or the President or the White House. The American people are giving their own sons and daughters to the effort. They are sending their own family members to the effort. They want us to come up with a plan that can make sure they are not sending them in vain. It is not just a matter of getting the troops home. As a mother, as a parent, I can appreciate and understand that if we lost a child, I would want to make sure the death was not in vain, that we actually accomplished what we set out to do.

We have to get a plan that will work. The American people know one thing that won't work, and that is asking the American people to foot the bill, 100 percent of it, with limited help, with us carrying the burden of the troops and the finances over a long period of time. What the American people think would work is that we have an administration that has been jump-start it with some grants, do everything we can to make other nations relieve the debt, and then, over the long run, establish a financing mechanism that the country of Iraq can themselves begin the reconstruction. And let me just say that it is not often that the administration agrees with the U.N. or that the U.N. agrees with the administration. We have been trying to get money for grants for months. The U.N. thinks one way and this administration thinks a different way, so they cannot get together.

Let me tell you one thing they agree on. This is U.N. Security Council Resolution 1483, it says the U.N. itself says the oil resources in Iraq should not be used to pay down debt owed to other countries. It should not be, basically, given away to anyone. But what should it be used for? The U.N. said it should be used for the reconstruction of Iraq. So the U.N. and members of the administration, including the Vice President—and I will show you what the Vice President said just a few months ago, in March. He said in answer to Tim Russert on one of the talk shows:

"In Iraq you've got a nation that's got the second largest oil reserves in the world, second only to Saudi Arabia. It will generate billions of dollars a year in cash flow if they get back to their production of roughly 3 million barrels of oil a day, and in the relatively near future."

He is saying, no, we are not going to have to pick up the $100 billion, which is estimated; the Iraqis have that ability to do so themselves. Mr. President, this is something the U.N. supports. It is something the administration told the American people they would be part of the reconstruction effort. Now we are finding, for some reason, a tremendous amount of resistance to this. It is hard to understand, and so that is why I am putting forth this amendment, which has been modified.

It doesn't try to substitute the financing mechanisms for any part of the $20 billion. It says in the future, after we have allocated this $20 billion, it is the sense of the Senate that the future reconstruction could be paid for using the Iraqi resources, which are plentiful—oil and gas.

Let me make one other point. I know my time is almost up. A lot has been said about the Marshall plan. One of the principles of the Marshall plan, one of the foundations on which the Marshall plan rested was the fact that Germany had more coal reserves than any country in Europe, and that because Germany was rich in coal, in natural resources, the U.S. plan that was fashioned in a way that was sustainable over a long period of time and could be based on the riches and resources of that coal was not to take it from Germany but to help Germany use its resources to rebuild itself, to establish peace and prosperity for itself and its neighbors.

So I don't have any reason to understand or know why the same administration that would say this is the way
we should proceed is now objecting to that amendment I offered in July. At that time, 45 Senators joined in the effort to establish an independent commission, reflecting broad public concern about the potential misuse of intelligence information leading up to the war.

Since then, however, additional troubling information has come out and these concerns have grown considerably in many people's minds. These concerns also have grown in the context of a larger intelligence shortcoming. One need only look at our failure thus far to find Osama bin Laden or Saddam Hussein, to know that we have a long way to go to ensure that our intelligence capacities are as strong as they can be.

Time after time we have seen news stories about the administration's selective use of intelligence. Just last night, it was reported in a very troubling report of "60 Minutes II" that a former aide to Secretary of State Powell, Greg Thielmann, a senior career State Department official, made serious charges against the Secretary and the administration.

According to Mr. Thielmann, at the time of Secretary Powell's dramatic prewar presentation to the United Nations, Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability was so weak that it posed no threat to the United States and little threat even to its immediate neighbors.

According to Mr. Thielmann, the administration adopted a "faith-based approach to intelligence." He went on to say:

They knew what they wanted the intelligence to show. They were really blind and deaf to any kind of countervailing information the intelligence community would produce.

I have a full transcript of that interview which I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD.

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

[From 60 Minutes II, Oct. 15, 2003]

The Man Who Knew: Former Powell Chief of Intelligence and Others Disagree With Evidence Presented to UN for War in Iraq

Scott Pelley (co-host). In the run-up to the war in Iraq, one moment seemed to be a turning point: the day Secretary of State Colin Powell went to the United Nations to make the case for the war. But what do other specialists see when they look at the evidence as it was presented, as we've just seen?

Mr. Pelley. At the end of the speech, the United Nations and the American people had been misinformed, in your opinion?

Mr. Thielmann. That's right.

Mr. Pelley. And you saw virtually everything.

Mr. Thielmann. That's right.

Mr. Pelley. Whether it came in to the CIA or the Defense Department, it all came through your office sooner or later.

Mr. Thielmann. That's right, yes.

Mr. Pelley. Mr. Thielmann told us that he was surprised at State. One high-ranking official called him "honoroble, knowledgeable, very experienced." Mr. Thielmann took a long-planned retirement plans before Powell's big moment at the UN. February 5th was the day the world was waiting for: Secretary Powell would reveal evidence against Saddam. The speech received a change in Powell's thinking. Before 911, he said that Saddam had not developed any significant capability in weapons of mass destruction. But now, two years later, he warned that Saddam had stockpiled those very weapons.

Sec. Colin Powell (State Department).

(From UN Speech) The gravity of this moment is matched by the gravity of the threat that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction pose to the world.
Pelley. Do you believe that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States of America at the point we went to war?

Mr. WOOD. Absolutely.

Pelley. Thielmann says that’s what the intelligence showed. For example, he points to the evidence behind Powell’s charge that Iraq was importing these aluminum tubes to use in a program to build nuclear weapons.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) There is controversy about what these tubes are for. Most US experts say they are intended to serve as rotors in centrifuges used to enrich uranium.

Mr. WOOD. Most experts are located in Oak Ridge, and that was not the position there.

Pelley. Do you know one in academia, in government, in a foreign country who disagrees with your appraisal, who says, ‘‘Yes, these are for nuclear weapons?’’

Mr. WOOD. I don’t know a single one anywhere.

Pelley. Greg Thielmann says the nuclear case was filled with half-truths.

If the secret to success is to take your own information that your own intelligence bureau had developed and turn it on its head, which is what you’re saying, to what end?

Mr. THIELMANN. I can only assume that he was doing it to loyally support the president of the United States and build the strongest possible case for arguing that there was no alternative to the use of military force.

Pelley. That was a case the president himself was making only eight days before Secretary Powell’s speech, but the argument in the State of the Union address turned out to be too strong.

President George W. Bush. From State of the Union) The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.

Pelley. After the war, the White House said the African uranium claim was false and shouldn’t have been in the president’s address. But, it was part of a campaign that painted the intelligence as irrefutable.

Mr. THIELMANN. This is one of the most controversial aspects of the administration taking the intelligence as black and white.

Pelley. Wood reached that conclusion before, Mr. THIELMANN. That’s right.

Mr. HOUSTON WOOD. You’ll see where it intersects. This is the velocity.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Well, if you read a transcript, as I think it didn’t even constitute an imminent threat to its neighbors at the time we went to war.

Mr. WOOD. Yeah. It wasn’t going to work. No, they wouldn’t have failed.

Pelley. Wood reached that conclusion back in 2001. Thielmann reported to Secretary Powell’s office that he was confident the tubes were not for a nuclear program.

Then about a year later, when the administration was building a case for war, the tubes were resurrected on the front page of The New York Times.

Mr. WOOD. It wasn’t going to work. No, they—would—they would have failed.

Pelley. Wood sought for signs I was angry. I think that probably the best emotion that I—best way to describe my emotions. I was angry at that.

Pelley. Wood is among the world’s authorities on uranium enrichment by centrifuging. He found that the tubes couldn’t be what they were, they were, too heavy, three times too thick and certain to leak.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. There must be some other tubes that people were talking about. ‘‘I—just wa—was flabbergasted that people were still pushing that these might be centrifuges.

Pelley. Flabbergasted?

Mr. WOOD. Yeah. Yeah. So it just didn’t— it didn’t make sense to me.

Pelley. The New York Times reported that senior administration officials insisted the tubes were for an atom bomb program.

Was it clear to you that science wasn’t pushing this forward?

Mr. THIELMANN. Yes. There’s a very good way to put it. Science was not pushing this forward. Scientists had made their evaluation and made their determination, and now we didn’t know what was happening.

Pelley. In his UN speech, Secretary Powell acknowledged there was disagreement about the tubes, but he said most experts agreed with the nuclear theory.

Sec. POWELL. (From UN speech) There is controversy about what these tubes are for. Most US experts say they are intended to serve as rotors in centrifuges used to enrich uranium.

Mr. WOOD. Most experts are located in Oak Ridge, and that was not the position there.

Pelley. Do you know one in academia, in government, in a foreign country who disagrees with your appraisal, who says, ‘‘Yes, these are for nuclear weapons?’’

Mr. WOOD. I don’t know a single one anywhere.

Pelley. Greg Thielmann says the nuclear case was filled with half-truths.

If the secret to success is to take your own information that your own intelligence bureau had developed and turn it on its head, which is what you’re saying, to what end?

Mr. THIELMANN. I can only assume that he was doing it to loyally support the president of the United States and build the strongest possible case for arguing that there was no alternative to the use of military force.

Pelley. That was the case the president himself was making only eight days before Secretary Powell’s speech, but the argument in the State of the Union address turned out to be too strong.

President George W. Bush. From State of the Union) The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.

Pelley. After the war, the White House said the African uranium claim was false and shouldn’t have been in the president’s address. But, it was part of a campaign that painted the intelligence as irrefutable.

Mr. THIELMANN. This is one of the most controversial aspects of the administration taking the intelligence as black and white.

Pelley. Wood reached that conclusion before, Mr. THIELMANN. That’s right.

Mr. HOUSTON WOOD. You’ll see where it intersects. This is the velocity.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Well, if you read a transcript, as I think it didn’t even constitute an imminent threat to its neighbors at the time we went to war.

Mr. WOOD. Yeah. It wasn’t going to work. No, they wouldn’t have failed.

Pelley. Wood reached that conclusion before, Mr. THIELMANN. That’s right.

Mr. HOUSTON WOOD. You’ll see where it intersects. This is the velocity.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Well, if you read a transcript, as I think it didn’t even constitute an imminent threat to its neighbors at the time we went to war.
Mr. ALBRIGHT. Certainly.

PELLEY. And what did they find from Haidieri’s information?

Mr. ALBRIGHT. Nothing.

PELLEY. There was a good deal more in Secretary Powell’s speech that bothered the analysts. For example, Powell claimed that Saddam still had a few dozen Scud missiles. Mr. Albright wondered what area they were talking about. We did not have evidence that the Iraqis had those missiles, pure and simple.

PELLEY. Powell warned that empty chemical warheads found recently by the UN could be the “tip of the iceberg.”

Mr. Albright said these were shells that were left over from the Gulf War or prior to the Gulf War from their past program.

PELLEY. Powell did make several points that day that turned out to be right. Among them, he was right when he said Iraqis were removing computer hard drives, he was right that Iraq had drawings for a new long-range missile, and he was right about Saddam’s murder of thousands of Iraqi citizens. But an interim report by coalition inspectors says, “So far there is no evidence of a uranium enrichment program, no weapons of mass destruction found to date and that Iraq’s Kay, the man leading the CIA’s search, was empty.”

Mr. Albright went on to say that every time the claims have proven empty. Each time the claims have proven empty. The British were claiming anything. He said they learned Saddam was attempting to buy uranium, implicitly accepting the charge as fact. The administration apparently in retaliation for public statements by theoperative’s spouse that contradicted the administration’s claims about Iraqi attempts to obtain uranium from Niger.

As for Greg Thielmann, he told us he’s a realist. He said, “It was one of the CIA’s elite intelligence officers, a nonofficial cover agent. Releasing the agent’s name was a betrayal of intelligence apparatus for political purposes, which has likely harmed our national security and has only contributed to a sense among many that the administration is uninterested in protecting the integrity and objectivity of our intelligence operations.

In this case, the administration continues to resist efforts to appoint a special counsel to investigate this criminal act.

Nor has this been the only example of opposition to independent, nonpartisan reviews on national security matters. The administration also seems unwilling to openly share information with the commission established by Congress to investigate the events of September 11. The commission was established on a bipartisan basis. It is charged not only with investigating the events leading up to 9/11 but with producing recommendations to prevent future terrorist attacks.

Their mission is critical. I can tell you as a Senator who comes from a State where 693 people died on September 11—10 in my hometown—this is a serious investigation and review of the failures that led to 9/11. Yet, according to recent statements by several top administration officials, the commission has been stonewalling. Too many of their requests are being ignored. Too much evidence is being withheld. And the commission has been frustrated in its efforts to get the information it needs to do the job.

Again, just yesterday, the commission was forced to issue subpoenas to officials at the FAA for documents that the administration should have been providing voluntarily. By the way, this was not the CIA, not the Pentagon, but the FAA.

The question of accurate intelligence is central to Congress’s ability to make decisions about national security. It is essential that we know the truth about the Bush administration’s alleged nuclear program—the one that administration officials regularly raised when discussing the specter of a mushroom cloud—was only at “the most rudimentary stage.”

Let me give a couple examples of other claims that may have been intentionally misleading.

Last September, President Bush, surrounded by Members of Congress in the White House Rose Garden, claimed that Iraq could launch a chemical or biological strike within 45 minutes. White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer cited this capability as the elusive “smoking gun” when it first came to light. Just 2 weeks later, Congress gave the President authority to go to war in Iraq. Yet this claim, the strongest evidence that Iraq represented an imminent threat, was dropped after the administration consulted with the CIA.

One has to ask: Why wasn’t that consultation done with the CIA before making the claim and before Congress used the information in deliberations about the war resolution?

Similarly, President Bush and his top advisers repeatedly asserted Saddam and al-Qaeda had a strong relationship. On September 25, 2002, President Bush said, “You can’t distinguish between al-Qaida and Saddam.”

The implication was clear: There was a connection between Saddam and the terrorist attacks of September 11. Only in the last month, after the Vice President repeated a similar assertion strongly disputed by the press and security analysts, did the President admit no such connection existed. It is important that the administration has either been grossly wrong in its interpretation of intelligence or has intentionally misused the intelligence produced by the community.

When I offered this amendment in July, the Senate was focused on a particular assertion that was made in the January State of the Union Address. That is:

The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

At the time, there was a flurry of press interests in these words, though lately that seems to have largely been forgotten. The power of the President’s allegation in those words is difficult to overstated. The Bush administration used legalistic language apparently intended to lead people to believe that Saddam Hussein had a nuclear program. The President didn’t say the British had told him so. He didn’t say they alleged anything. He said they learned Saddam was attempting to buy uranium, implicitly accepting the charge as fact.

Although just 16 words, it was a powerful phrase that resonated throughout the Nation and the world. It became a key argument in the case of immediate use of force in Iraq. Only after many months did we learn the statement was based on information that the Government had flagged the White House as inaccurate.

We didn’t learn about this from the administration. We learned about it from the International Atomic Energy Agency and the media. Only later did the administration spokesperson and the President admit the statement was inappropriate for the State of the Union Address. The administration has yet to fully explain it.

Instead, the administration has turned on those who have reported the truth. Recently, unknown senior administration officials publicly disclosed the name of a covert CIA operative. The operative’s spouse said they learned Saddam had a uranium enrichment program which has likely harmed our national security and has only contributed to a sense among many that the administration is uninterested in protecting the integrity and objectivity of our intelligence operations.

In this case, the administration continues to resist efforts to appoint a special counsel to investigate this criminal act.

Nor has this been the only example of opposition to independent, nonpartisan reviews on national security matters. The administration also seems unwilling to openly share information with the commission established by Congress to investigate the events of September 11. The commission was established on a bipartisan basis. It is charged not only with investigating the events leading up to 9/11 but with producing recommendations to prevent future terrorist attacks.

Their mission is critical. I can tell you as a Senator who comes from a State where 693 people died on September 11—10 in my hometown—this is a serious investigation and review of the failures that led to 9/11. Yet, according to recent statements by several top administration officials, the commission has been stonewalling. Too many of their requests are being ignored. Too much evidence is being withheld. And the commission has been frustrated in its efforts to get the information it needs to do the job.

Again, just yesterday, the commission was forced to issue subpoenas to officials at the FAA for documents that the administration should have been providing voluntarily. By the way, this was not the CIA, not the Pentagon, but the FAA.

The question of accurate intelligence is central to Congress’s ability to make decisions about national security. It is essential that we know the truth about the Bush administration’s alleged nuclear program—the one that administration officials regularly raised when discussing the specter of a
The administration was acting in good faith, they should want the facts to come out. If there were systemic problems in our intelligence establishment, its relationship with the White House, we all have an interest in identifying them and correcting them. The commission wouldn't do anything. It would simply provide a mechanism to find the truth and bring it to light. Again I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. In the end, the safety and security of the American people is in the way. What is the safety and protection of our men and women in uniform. They deserve unbiassed, nonpolitical, actionable intelligence to be able to do their job and do it well. Just as much as they need financial support, just as much as they need the support of all of America, they need to have unbiassed, nonpolitical intelligence to do their job.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I can offer this amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CORZINE] proposes an amendment numbered 1882.

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

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

The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. CORZINE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1852

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1848 be withdrawn.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1834

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my notice of reconsideration on amendment No. 1834 be withdrawn.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for a voice vote of the Reed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator referring to amendment 1834, the Reed of Rhode Island amendment? Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1834.

The amendment (No. 1834) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in amendment No. 1834 the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, raises a number of good points about our global commitments, especially those in Iraq. The increased operational tempo is straining the Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves. We do run the risk of hurting recruitment and retention in both the Active and Reserve component. We are committing our troops to such an extent that we may not be able to sustain all of those commitments indefinitely. I am greatly concerned about these and other issues raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. However, I do not agree that increasing the end strength of the Army is the answer to these problems.

The increase in end strength does not necessarily solve our immediate problem of overextended troops. It will take time to get the 10,000 soldiers recruited, trained, equipped, and deployed. We need solutions now. We need more foreign troops in Iraq and we need to work with the international community toward that goal. We also need to work with our allies to fight against terrorism with more than just military might. Most importantly, we need to refocus ourselves on the fight against terrorism instead of diverting our focus to ideologically driven wars of our choosing.

Furthermore, according to rough estimates done by the CBO, increasing the end strength of the Army by 10,000 will cost $409 million this year. Senator REED's amendment fully offsets that amount. However, the following year the cost of this end strength increase will jump to over $800 million a year and it will continue to grow. By passing this amendment, we will either be locking in an increase in Department of Defense spending of over $800 million a year or asking the Army and/or the other military services to simply absorb that cost. Neither option seems good to me.

But the Senator from Rhode Island was right to bring this debate to the Senate. I agree with my colleague that the important issues he raised must be dealt with expeditiously and I look forward to working with him to address these problems.

The amendment (No. 1852)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate amendment No. 1852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. STEVENS. This is the Feingold military family leave amendment. I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1852) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. this morning, the Senate proceed to a series of roll-call votes in relation to the following amendments; further, that there be no amendments in order to the amendments in the below stacked sequence prior to the votes, with 2 minutes equally divided before each vote, and that the sequence after the first be limited to 10 minutes. The stacked sequence is: the Durbin amendment No. 1837, the Daschle amendment No. 1854, the Landrieu amendment No. 1859, the Boxer amendment No. 1843, the Leahy amendment No. 1807, and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

I further ask unanimous consent that other than the above mentioned amendments, the only other amendments in order to the bill be the following, and they shall be subject to second-degree amendments that will be relevant to the first-degree amendment to which they are offered: Byrd amendment No. 1819; Corzine amendment No. 1882; Bond amendment No. 1825; Domenici amendment No. 1864; Senator Brown amendment No. 1852; Senator Collins amendment No. 1864; Senator Boxer amendment No. 1843; Senator Leahy amendment No. 1807; and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

I further ask unanimous consent that other than the above mentioned amendments, the only other amendments in order to the bill be the following, and they shall be subject to second-degree amendments that will be relevant to the first-degree amendment to which they are offered: Byrd amendment No. 1819; Corzine amendment No. 1882; Bond amendment No. 1825; Domenici amendment No. 1864; Senator Brown amendment No. 1852; Senator Collins amendment No. 1864; Senator Boxer amendment No. 1843; Senator Leahy amendment No. 1807; and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I state, as an explanation, that the Senate proceeded to a series of roll-call votes in relation to the following amendments; further, that there be no amendments in order to the amendments in the below stacked sequence prior to the votes, with 2 minutes equally divided before each vote, and that the sequence after the first be limited to 10 minutes. The stacked sequence is: the Durbin amendment No. 1837, the Daschle amendment No. 1854, the Landrieu amendment No. 1859, the Boxer amendment No. 1843, the Leahy amendment No. 1807, and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

I further ask unanimous consent that other than the above mentioned amendments, the only other amendments in order to the bill be the following, and they shall be subject to second-degree amendments that will be relevant to the first-degree amendment to which they are offered: Byrd amendment No. 1819; Corzine amendment No. 1882; Bond amendment No. 1825; Domenici amendment No. 1864; Senator Brown amendment No. 1852; Senator Collins amendment No. 1864; Senator Boxer amendment No. 1843; Senator Leahy amendment No. 1807; and the Durbin amendment No. 1879.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, we were just notified by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Leahy, that he would prefer to have his amendment taken out of the stacked list and brought down to the second group in order for additional debate on the amendment. But we expect it is possible that something could be worked out. So I ask that modification be made in the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. STEVENS. That is acceptable to us, and we will be pleased to move amendment No. 1807 to be just prior to the Byrd amendment No. 1819. As I said, the amendments on the second list are not in any order of sequence.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, to clarify, we would like it to follow the Byrd amendment, not precede it.

Mr. STEVENS. That is not in sequence.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I stand today in support of the President's supplemental appropriations request. This request primarily funds ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it reconstitution assistance to both of those countries, so that fundamental economic and civic infrastructure can be rebuilt. We must all recognize that providing for the initial reconstruction of the infrastructure for both of those countries—before we can begin to withdraw our military forces.

I have not heard anyone here speak of a military failure in either Iraq or Afghanistan, but I have heard a great deal of speculation that we are failing to win the peace. It is not accurate to make this assertion. But I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the peace is not yet won. We are losing precious American lives every week, and we are suffering injuries every day. I see no good reason to downplay this grim reality, in this debate or anywhere else.

But the situation is far from dire: Iraqis, by almost all measure, are thankful for their liberation from the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. Few, very few, declare their wish to return to his dungeon state.

Instead, as we have heard from administration sources, Iraq is still a dangerous place. We are losing precious American lives every week, and we are suffering injuries every day. I see no good reason to downplay this grim reality, in this debate or anywhere else.

But the situation is far from dire: Iraqis, by almost all measure, are thankful for their liberation from the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. Few, very few, declare their wish to return to his dungeon state.

Instead, as we have heard from administration sources, Iraq is still a dangerous place. We are losing precious American lives every week, and we are suffering injuries every day. I see no good reason to downplay this grim reality, in this debate or anywhere else.
challenge, and an immediate security threat. We knew this was a possibility before we invaded Iraq. Saddam Hussein had long associated with almost all of the known terror organizations through the last decades, including, beginning in the 1990s, with Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network.

I, for one, was not surprised when bin Laden called his followers to Iraq prior to our invasion. I was not surprised for a number of reasons, beginning with the reports I read through the years about bin Laden’s associations with Saddam’s Iraq.

But another reason I have not been surprised to see al-Qaeda join the Saddamite resistance is that I have never believed al-Qaeda is about ideology, religious or otherwise. I believe Bin Laden seeks power, and he has hijacked his religion for his attempts to gain power. Bin Laden’s use of religion as ideological appeal is as sincere as Saddam’s use of Arab socialism, in the guise of Ba’athism. Both are about gaining and holding dictatorial power—for personal ends. And the joining of forces of bin Laden’s terrorists and Saddam’s thugs proves this point.

The tools of the Saddamite resistance are the same tools of gangsterism: car bombs and assassinations. Some of these recent horrific bombings have been committed by suicide terrorists, which, we know, is not a common gangster tactic. But in my years of studying international crime and terrorism, I have concluded this: You cannot remain an ideologue—religious or secular—while behaving like and coordinating with criminals.

Saddam’s reign was a criminal dictatorship. There was no ideology but the one that made Saddam more powerful, that enriched his clan and cronies, that crushed all of his real or perceived opponents. When his sons, Uday and Qusay, were cornered and killed, they were not part of a well-organized resistance, protected by a dedicated network of ideologically motivated supporters. They were alone, and they were cornered and killed, like common gangsters, because an Iraqi dropped a dime on them.

By joining with the Saddamite, bin Laden and his fellow jihadists have exposed themselves to be gangsters. They are demonstrating this to all who wish to see: To the masses in the Middle East and around the world, who have been denied fundamental freedom now, that is what this cost is. I agree. America’s ventures abroad have always been costly, never more so than when we pay in the lives of our men and women. The dollar figures pale in comparison.

I am not happy that we are faced with such a financial requirement today. Certainly many of our constituencies are concerned about such a commitment when they worry about the national economy and the economies of their families.

But the budget proposed is not arbitrarily chosen. It is based on providing necessary resources that must be allocated to achieve the goals that the President outlined: to deny terrorists a new sanctuary by creating a secure and stable Iraq, by providing a minimal level of essential services and civic infrastructure which will enhance the stability we need to transfer sovereignty to the Iraqi people.

Over the past weeks, since the President first announced his request, the Senate Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Relations, Intelligence, and Joint Economic Committees have held numerous hearings. We have had the opportunity to review financial and economic recovery. Any delay in rebuilding the economy only improves the chances of terrorists of taking root among the local population.

But I have a more basic reason for opposing all attempts to turn our grants into loans. This would be a radical departure in the conduct of American foreign policy. For the first time in our history, we would be occupying a country and forcing them to incur loans. Far more than a meager attempt to preserve financial capital with such misguided proposals, we would be seriously risking our moral capital.

I note to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that, despite the recriminations and accusations, this administration has done its best to work within the context of international law. I believe that we have been successful in respecting international law, while preserving our sovereign right to defend our national interests. I commend the administration for its success here, for the sober recognition which has been hotly disputed but not discredited, under terms of international law to the herculean efforts going on to advance peace and stability in the region and will enhance the national security of this country.

Some of the Iraqi voices calling for our departure are not anti-American. Some Iraqis fear that we will overstayed, that we will pull out soon enough in a transfer of power and political legitimacy to the Iraqi people. I believe Ambassador Bremer’s seven-point plan to move toward full sovereignty is sound and sensible. I am watching with great interest as the Iraqis begin to draft a constitution that delineate their system of government, with all the protections of the freedoms they have been granted by coalition action and sacrifice.

I wish I could predict the future and declare here how long it will take for us to succeed. We can’t give a finite number on costs, nor give a definite date of conclusion. To do so is to fall into one of the most partisan traps in Washington: If we can not say how much—and we cannot say—how can we not say when we will have achieved our goals, we are accused of having no plans; if we do, we will inevitably be wrong and the opposition naysayers will scream “gotcha.”

Many see the cost of the war is high. The dollar figures pale in comparison. But the dollar figures pale in comparison.

One of the key points bin Laden has tried to convince the world is that enriched his clan and cronies, that was allowed to fall into disrepair by a greedy tyrant. We knew this was a possibility before we invaded Iraq. Saddam’s tyranny had long associated with almost all of the known terror organizations through the last decades, including, beginning in the 1990s, with Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network.

But another reason I have not been surprised to see al-Qaeda join the Saddamite resistance is that I have never believed al-Qaeda is about ideology, religious or otherwise. I believe Bin Laden seeks power, and he has hijacked his religion for his attempts to gain power. Bin Laden’s use of religion as ideological appeal is as sincere as Saddam’s use of Arab socialism, in the guise of Ba’athism. Both are about gaining and holding dictatorial power—for personal ends. And the joining of forces of bin Laden’s terrorists and Saddam’s thugs proves this point.

The tools of the Saddamite resistance are the same tools of gangsterism: car bombs and assassinations. Some of these recent horrific bombings have been committed by suicide terrorists, which, we know, is not a common gangster tactic. But in my years of studying international crime and terrorism, I have concluded this: You cannot remain an ideologue—religious or secular—while behaving like and coordinating with criminals.

Saddam’s reign was a criminal dictatorship. There was no ideology but the one that made Saddam more powerful, that enriched his clan and cronies, that crushed all of his real or perceived opponents. When his sons, Uday and Qusay, were cornered and killed, they were not part of a well-organized resistance, protected by a dedicated network of ideologically motivated supporters. They were alone, and they were cornered and killed, like common gangsters, because an Iraqi dropped a dime on them.

By joining with the Saddamite, bin Laden and his fellow jihadists have exposed themselves to be gangsters. They are demonstrating this to all who wish to see: To the masses in the Middle East and around the world, who have been denied fundamental freedom now, that is what this cost is. I agree. America’s ventures abroad have always been costly, never more so than when we pay in the lives of our men and women. The dollar figures pale in comparison.

I am not happy that we are faced with such a financial requirement today. Certainly many of our constituencies are concerned about such a commitment when they worry about the national economy and the economies of their families.

But the budget proposed is not arbitrarily chosen. It is based on providing necessary resources that must be allocated to achieve the goals that the President outlined: to deny terrorists a new sanctuary by creating a secure and stable Iraq, by providing a minimal level of essential services and civic infrastructure which will enhance the stability we need to transfer sovereignty to the Iraqi people.

Over the past weeks, since the President first announced his request, the Senate Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Relations, Intelligence, and Joint Economic Committees have held numerous hearings. We have had the opportunity to review financial and economic recovery. Any delay in rebuilding the economy only improves the chances of terrorists of taking root among the local population.

But I have a more basic reason for opposing all attempts to turn our grants into loans. This would be a radical departure in the conduct of American foreign policy. For the first time in our history, we would be occupying a country and forcing them to incur loans. Far more than a meager attempt to preserve financial capital with such misguided proposals, we would be seriously risking our moral capital.

I note to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that, despite the recriminations and accusations, this administration has done its best to work within the context of international law. I believe that we have been successful in respecting international law, while preserving our sovereign right to defend our national interests. I commend the administration for its success here, for the sober recognition which has been hotly disputed but not discredited, under terms of international law to the herculean efforts going on to
The 39th Infantry Brigade soldiers are going to sacrifice time away from their family, place their civilian careers on hold, and place at risk the greatest gift provided by our Creator, their very life, to protect the freedoms and liberties we hold so dear. If the 39th Infantry Brigade and other reserve forces are willing to do so much without complaint, I believe it is not too much to ask that we provide the opportunity and possibility to minimize the impact of overseas deployments on themselves, their families and their employers. This amendment provides for this opportunity.

This amendment is straightforward. It starts the deployment period for members of the reserve component as the date of activation. This has always been the standard practice, prior to the administration’s shift in policy on September 9th. This amendment simply makes clear that the Nation to return to the standard practice, tradition of considering the date of activation as the date of deployment for reserve members.

Nothing in this amendment weakens our ability to carry out our reserve forces. In fact the exact opposite is the case. This amendment enhances the ability and effectiveness of our reserve forces by enabling them to plan their lives to reduce the inherent adverse impact of overseas deployment on their families, employers, and community. I thank my fellow Senators for supporting this amendment. It will enhance the ability and effectiveness of our reserve forces and support the men and women who serve in the 39th Infantry Brigade.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate considered amendment No. 1811 offered by Senator CORZINE to lower the age at which members of the Reserve components to which they are assigned can collect retirement pay from age 60 to age 55. This amendment had no offset and would have created a huge bill for the Department of Defense which cannot afford to pay. For this reason, the floor manager of the bill raised a budget point of order against the amendment and I voted to uphold this point of order.

I believe the Congress should carefully review the pay and benefits for members of the Reserve components, including lowering the age at which reservists and guardsmen can receive retirement pay. These men and women provide an invaluable service to our Nation and not only want to provide them pay and benefits which recognize their contributions and help retain them as citizen soldiers in the U.S. Armed Forces. However, I believe there are several options we should consider for lowering the retirement age. Therefore, I think we should consider this issue alongside other benefits in order to offer a complete package that makes sense and accomplishes the goals we are trying to achieve. The Iraqi supplemental is not the right context for a long-term review or make long-term changes in this area, and for this reason I opposed the amendment.

As cochair of the Senate Reserve Caucus, these are issues that I take very seriously. I will continue to work with my colleagues in that caucus and in the Senate to ensure that we make wise financial decisions, and that our and reservists receive the pay and benefits they deserve while recognizing their unique contribution to our Nation.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to discuss the budgetary effect of S. 1689, the Emergency Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction for Fiscal Year 2004, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The pending bill provides $87 billion in budget authority and $36.7 billion in outlays for Fiscal Year 2004 for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and reconstruction of Iraq. Since all funds contained in the reported bill are either emergency funds, the pending bill provides the budgetary effect of S. 1689, the Emergency Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction for Fiscal Year 2004, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The pending bill provides $87 billion in budget authority and $36.7 billion in outlays for Fiscal Year 2004 for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and reconstruction of Iraq. Since all funds contained in the reported bill are either emergency funds, the pending bill provides the budgetary effect of S. 1689, the Emergency Supplemental for Iraq and Afghanistan Security and Reconstruction for Fiscal Year 2004, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Additionally, I would like to remind my colleagues of the criteria for using the emergency designation. Section 502 of the 2004 budget resolution identifies the following criteria for the appropriate use of the emergency designation: that the funding is (1) necessary, essential, or vital, not merely useful or beneficial; (2) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time; (3) urgent and compelling need requiring immediate action; (4) unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and (5) not permanent, temporary in nature.

The reported bill has satisfied these criteria. Given the fact that most of the regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted, we ought to view any further use of the emergency designation with great skepticism.

I also note for my colleagues that we are in a highly unusual parliamentary situation with this supplemental. Instead of doing a 2004 supplemental after all regular appropriation bills have been enacted, we are considering an $87 billion supplemental before most of the regular bills have been enacted. While there is an allocation for each of the 13 regular bills, there is no additional or special allocation for a supplemental. Because this is such an unusual situation, I hope that the way the Senate deals with possible amendments on this bill sets a precedent for the way the Budget Committee will enforce the 302(b) allocations in the future.

As cochair of the Senate Reserve Caucus, these are issues that I take very seriously. I will continue to work with my colleagues in that caucus and in the Senate to ensure that we make wise financial decisions, and that our and reservists receive the pay and benefits they deserve while recognizing their unique contribution to our Nation.

I also note for my colleagues that we are in a highly unusual parliamentary situation with this supplemental. Instead of doing a 2004 supplemental after all regular appropriation bills have been enacted, we are considering an $87 billion supplemental before most of the regular bills have been enacted. While there is an allocation for each of the 13 regular bills, there is no additional or special allocation for a supplemental. Because this is such an unusual situation, I hope that the way the Senate deals with possible amendments on this bill sets a precedent for the way the Budget Committee will enforce the 302(b) allocations in the future.

As cochair of the Senate Reserve Caucus, these are issues that I take very seriously. I will continue to work with my colleagues in that caucus and in the Senate to ensure that we make wise financial decisions, and that our and reservists receive the pay and benefits they deserve while recognizing their unique contribution to our Nation.

I also note for my colleagues that we are in a highly unusual parliamentary situation with this supplemental. Instead of doing a 2004 supplemental after all regular appropriation bills have been enacted, we are considering an $87 billion supplemental before most of the regular bills have been enacted. While there is an allocation for each of the 13 regular bills, there is no additional or special allocation for a supplemental. Because this is such an unusual situation, I hope that the way the Senate deals with possible amendments on this bill sets a precedent for the way the Budget Committee will enforce the 302(b) allocations in the future.
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I beg the forgiveness of my colleagues for this objection, it is so ordered.

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

S. 1689—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN
(Fiscal Year 2004, $ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary spending</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergencies in S. 1689, as reported.</td>
<td>87,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>16,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emergencies in S. 1689, as reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Section 502(c) of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2000, states that any provision designated as an emergency spending requirement by both Congress and the President shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 504 (relating to discretionary spending limits in the Senate) and section 505 (pages point of order) of H. Con. Res. 95.

THE STATEN ISLAND FERRY DISASTER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughtful words of my colleague from Illinois. Many sports fans across my home state have known both joy and anguish from our sports teams, and I assure the Senator that I sympathize with the sorrow that Chicago Cubs fans are feeling today over last night's loss.

And now, Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter that has caused much sadness in our home state of New York. It is with a heavy heart that I come to the floor today to speak about the tragedy on Staten Island that took 10 New Yorkers from us too soon, and changed the lives of dozens who were injured. As you know, the ferry in New York crashed into a pier adjacent to its terminal, with tragic and unforeseen and unprecedented results. We mourn for the families of those who were lost. Staten Island has had a very difficult time in the last several years. We know, for instance, 286 Staten Islanders were lost on 9/11. Staten Island is 5.5 percent of New York City's population, but on that terrible day sustained nearly 20 percent of New York City’s September 11 deaths. Many of those were police officers and firefighters. We had the refinery fire on Staten Island not too long ago, and now this terrible incident.

One thing I can tell you is the people of Staten Island are strong, they are resilient, they are self-reliant. Many of them come from my home borough of Brooklyn and have moved to pastures across the narrows. But they retain the same fightfulness and the same ability to bounce back from tragedy their forebears did, across the narrows in Brooklyn. So Staten Island will bounce back and be stronger and better than ever. But, right now, we mourn them.

The Staten Island ferry's history is so important to our city. It is as long as our history. It has existed in some form since 1713, and 70,000 New Yorkers, mostly from Staten Island, ride it every day. That would be enough people to fill a medium-sized city almost anywhere else in the United States.

It is one of the great symbols of New York City, up there with the Empire State Building, Brooklyn Bridge, Yankee Stadium. It is one of the best ways to see the great symbols of opportunity in New York, the Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island and, sadly, only 2 years ago, the World Trade Center.

The view of lower Manhattan coming into the terminal at Whitehall and landing at St. George has been nothing short of breathtaking, although I must admit, having taken the ferry since 9/11, it now has some sadness to it as we see the empty space on the skyline where the towers once existed.

Ferry service to New York City is a necessity for many Staten Islanders. It is also a great opportunity for tourists to see New York. I might say, also, it is a very good first date, particularly at its price. The Staten Island ferry is free.

I am proud to say this morning, due to the resilience of New Yorkers and their transportation commissioner, ferry service resumed at the St. George terminal at 5 a.m., the site of yesterday’s tragedy, befitting the spirit of New York and the spirit of Staten Island, where we bounce back quickly. The terminal was packed, the boats were crowded, and the people to a one, it seemed, were determined not to shy away but to go on with their lives as best as possible, while remembering those families who are mourning in the wake of this terrible tragedy.

We remember the lives lost, but not to stop living. This attitude is at the heart of what it means to be a Staten Islander: grit, determination to survive and move on, but to never forget what has happened and to never stop trying to make a better world for our children.

I would like to mention the names of those who passed away, and send my condolences to each of their families: Joseph Bagarozza, Pio Canini, John T. Healy, Vincent Ferrante, Darios Marshall, Guillermo Pagvay, Louis Robinson, Frank Sullivan, John Valinski, and the woman—our condolences to her family, too, even though her name has not yet been released.

Today Congressman FOSELLA of Staten Island and I are asking the United States Department of Transportation to pay for the repairs of this ferry. The Federal Government has been actively involved in the ferries. We have received money for them in the past and will ask once again that Washington rise to the occasion of another tragedy in New York. Our budget, as you know, is tight as a drum and these funds will not bring back a single loss of life and, in fact, pale before the loss of life.

We will move forward, hopefully, in whatever way, and make our city and Staten Island even greater than ever.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I also make a note of the fact that we, too, in New Jersey had two of our citizens perish in that terrible accident that took place yesterday, a Mr. John Healy from Middletown, NJ, and Frank Sullivan, from Red Bank, NJ. We send our sympathies to these families, but we are reminded at the same time that ferries play an important role in our region; that while the Staten Island ferry carries as many as 70,000 passengers a day, we have 60,000 people going from New Jersey to New York for their business requirements or their jobs on the