

new entitlement or you are going to cut taxes during a period, especially of deficits, you must offset that event so that it becomes a budget-neutral event that also lapses. If we do not do this, if we do not put back in place caps and pay-go mechanisms, we will have no budget discipline in this Congress and, as a result, we will dramatically aggravate the deficit which, of course, impacts a lot of important issues, but especially impacts Social Security.

Senator GREGG was exactly right then. Why he has done a U-turn I don't know. The fact is pay-go has been a useful discipline in this Congress, and he previously—even he has acknowledged that fact.

Now, the Senator from New Hampshire also criticized the use of the reconciliation process that was just used to extend assistance to college students. He said that was an abuse of reconciliation. I would remind him and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle of what they did when they controlled the reconciliation process. In the bill we just passed, we paid for it completely, and had over \$700 million of deficit reduction. That is what reconciliation is intended to do—to provide for deficit reduction.

Here is what they did when they controlled the reconciliation process. They adopted legislation that was not paid for, tax cuts that were not offset, and they added \$1.7 trillion to the debt using reconciliation, which was designed to reduce deficits and reduce debt. They stood the whole process on its head and used those special rules, those fast-track procedures to explode the deficits and debt.

In using reconciliation, we have not only been able to increase the assistance that will go to college students in this country, but paid for it completely. In the 2005–2006 budget reconciliation our friends on the other side controlled, they increased the deficit by \$31 billion. It is true they had some spending cuts, but they had even more tax cuts, so once again, they added to the deficit and debt.

So let's be clear. In the Senate reconciliation rule we have adopted, we have said reconciliation—which is a special fast-track procedure that has a limited time for discussion and debate and limits amendments—that special procedure can only be used if deficit reduction is the result. That is not what they did with reconciliation. They used it to explode deficit and debt. But on our side, we use the reconciliation process for the reason intended. There is a 60-vote point of order against any reconciliation bill that would increase the deficit or reduce a surplus.

The higher education reconciliation bill that was criticized by my colleague on the other side—which, by the way, passed here with an overwhelming bipartisan vote—but that bill increased the Pell grant to \$5,400 by 2012; cut the student loan interest rates in half; and reduced the deficit by \$752 million. That is in keeping with the spirit of reconciliation that is for deficit reduction. We compare and contrast that

with what the other side has done. When they had the control of reconciliation, they used that fast-track procedure not to reduce deficits, which was the whole reason for reconciliation; they instead used it to explode deficits and debt.

Our colleague on the other side also attacked the children's health insurance legislation that will cover 4 million additional children and is paid for. Let's review what that legislation does. It provides health care coverage to 4 million additional children. It is fully paid for over both 6 and 11 years, as required under pay-go. It is a 5-year reauthorization; Congress will reauthorize in 2012 with new policies and new offsets. Hopefully, by then we will have enacted reform of health care in America and we will have provided coverage, universal coverage. I think there is a growing bipartisan consensus that any health care reform should provide universal coverage, because that is the way we can most effectively run a health care system. It also provides important coverage to kids, while spurring action on broader health care reform.

Let me get back to the simple fact. This bill is paid for. The reconciliation bill for education was paid for. It was paid for because we put in place a pay-go requirement that says: If you are going to have new spending, you have to offset it or get a supermajority vote. We might have been able to get a supermajority vote without paying for these things. We didn't choose to do that. We chose to be fiscally responsible. We chose to pay for an expansion of children's health care. We chose to pay for additional assistance to our young men and women going to college. That was the right thing to do.

I might add, if you compare and contrast what they are complaining about, which is the outyear potential funding for children's health insurance, I am talking about this little line out here. This is what they are complaining about, this little tiny gap, and that is a theoretical gap. It is fascinating, because these tax cuts they want to extend without paying for them creates this chasm. They make no complaint about this chasm. They direct all of their attention to this theoretical gap, this tiny thing you probably can't even see on television. There is no credibility to that complaint. They say nothing about this chasm, and they focus all of their complaint on this tiny difference that is wholly theoretical, because this is a 5-year bill. It doesn't extend beyond 2012. They are talking about what is going to happen in the sweet by and by. Nobody can tell us what is going to happen past 2012. We know this bill is paid for until 2012. What happens in the future will be dependent upon the actions of future Congresses.

So as I have reviewed the remarks of my colleague on the other side criticizing pay-go, criticizing the higher education bill that passed here over-

whelmingly; criticizing the children's health care insurance expansion that is fully paid for, I don't find much merit. A lot of rhetoric there, but not much merit.

IRAQ

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, yesterday was 9/11. I think all of us recall that fateful day. I certainly do. Earlier that morning, I had spoken to an education conference south of the Pentagon. I had driven by the Pentagon right before it was struck. I came and parked on the Mall in front of the Capitol. I came up the steps to a leadership meeting. Security people were coming down the steps ordering people out of the building, saying they were concerned about an attack on the Capitol itself. I left here and my military aide met me as I walked back to my offices—I guess, more accurately, I jogged back to my offices because we were being urged to leave quickly. I could hear a fighter plane overhead. My military aide turned to me and said: You know, Senator, those are our guys. Those are the Happy Hooligans from Fargo, ND. The first planes in the air to protect the Capitol were the Happy Hooligans of Fargo, ND. You may be asking yourselves: How can it be that a National Guard unit from Fargo, ND, are the first planes in the sky to protect the Nation's Capital? The reason is they are given that responsibility and they are aircraft flown by North Dakota pilots who are based at a base close by the Nation's Capital. They fly what is called the CAP over the Capitol to protect us, and they were the first planes in the air to provide fighter protection to this Capitol complex. It made me proud at the time to know those were the Happy Hooligans of Fargo, ND.

When I went back to my office, I was doing a national radio interview with a man named Ed Schultz who has a national radio show. We were watching in horror as the Twin Towers started to collapse. Security people ran in again and ushered us out, telling us there was a plane 8 minutes out and they were afraid it was headed for the Capitol complex. That is the plane that ultimately crashed in Pennsylvania. I don't think anyone knows for certain where that plane was headed. Most assume it was either the Capitol or the White House that was the intended target of that plane. I think we will always be forever grateful for the men and women who were on that plane who fought back. You think of the incredible bravery of those people, to know they were hijacked, to have learned through cell phone contact that the World Trade Center had been attacked, the Pentagon had been attacked, and they did not just sit. They got out of their chairs and fought back. By doing so, they may have saved either the White House or this Capitol. That was an act of extraordinary heroism and courage.

Later that day, Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, joined on the Capitol steps, and I will forever remember how spontaneously at the end of the remarks of the leadership we sang "God Bless America." I remember that feeling at that moment: that we are not Republicans, we are not Democrats; we are all Americans, and we stand together and will defend this Nation and we will hold those to account who did this dastardly deed. I hope we all think of ourselves as Americans first.

I also think we have to remember that it has now been 2,192 days since that attack. The President promised we would hold those responsible to account. The President said very clearly that this act would not stand. It is especially painful then to see Osama bin Laden and Zawahiri and the other leadership of al-Qaida go on the air, threatening to attack us again.

This is what the President said then:

There's no question about it, this act will not stand; we will find those who did it; we will smoke them out of their holes; we will get them running and we'll bring them to justice.

The President was right in making that statement. That is precisely what our focus should have been.

Then you see this Newsweek headline: "He Is Still Out There. The Hunt For Bin Laden."

Somehow, we got confused about who attacked us. I just saw an ad being run about Iraq saying they attacked us on September 11. That is not true. Iraq did not attack us on September 11; al-Qaida attacked us. In fact, there wasn't a single Iraqi on any of the planes that hit the World Trade Center or the Pentagon—not one. We know from the 9/11 Commission that the attack was not directed by Saddam Hussein, as evil and dreadful a man as he was.

No, that attack was directed by Osama bin Laden and was carried out by al-Qaida, not Iraq. In fact, the 9/11 Commission tells us and our intelligence tells us that al-Qaida was not active in Iraq at the time. They have become active. Now we have al-Qaida in Iraq, but they were not there at the time.

It is so important that we get these facts right. Al-Qaida attacked us. Osama bin Laden led that attack. He is still on the loose and so is his chief aide, Mr. Zawahiri. It is critically important that we get it right who attacked us and whom we need to hold to account. I hope we will never give up our efforts to hunt down Osama bin Laden and Zawahiri and the rest of the al-Qaida leadership cadre because they are plotting to attack us again.

I have always believed that Iraq was a fateful mistake, a diversion of going in the wrong place, after the wrong enemy, at the wrong time, instead of pursuing the people who did attack us, who did kill Americans, who are plotting to attack us again.

We had, yesterday, very important testimony from General Petraeus and

Ambassador Crocker. Let me say I have high regard for General Petraeus. I thought the ad that was run by some the other day was unfortunate and wrong. General Petraeus is a patriot. General Petraeus is somebody who deserves our respect. That doesn't mean you have to agree with every position he takes. That is not the point. But he is somebody who is among our finest. We should never in this country start turning on our own, those who serve us bravely and well in the military. That is not right. Ambassador Crocker is one of our finest diplomats. I don't agree with every policy prescription they propose, but they don't deserve to be personally attacked. That is not right. We have to remember and we have to keep perspective somehow about how we advance our national interest.

Let me say that yesterday the Washington Post ran a series of polls reporting on what the Iraqi people think is going on. You know, there is a cultural chasm here, I am afraid, between those of us raised in the Western culture and the people we are dealing with in that part of the world. I went to school and graduated from a high school at Wheelus Air Force Base High School in Tripoli, Libya, North Africa. I lived in the Arab world for 2 years. I have some sense of the enormous difference in the way they see things and the way we see things. It is instructive to ask what do the Iraqi people think is happening in their country. After all, it is their country, and what they think has a lot to say about what the outcome is going to be.

The Washington Post reported in depth a poll yesterday. The question was:

Do you think this increase in U.S. forces in Baghdad and surrounding provinces in the past six months has made security better, worse, or had no effect?

In the deployment areas, the areas where we deployed the additional troops, here is what the Iraqi people think. They think, by 70 percent, that the surge has made things worse; 18 percent think it has made things better; 11 percent think it has had no effect. In the areas outside the deployment, elsewhere in Iraq, 68 percent think it has made things worse.

Now, is anybody paying any attention here? We have gone, theoretically, first of all, from eliminating weapons of mass destruction that didn't exist, to eliminating a nuclear program that didn't exist, to deposing Saddam Hussein, who did exist and has been deposed; then we are told we are supposed to be making things better for the Iraqi people. But the Iraqi people overwhelmingly think we have made things worse. Now a substantial majority of the people in Iraq think it is OK to attack American forces. We are caught in what is primarily—not solely or exclusively but primarily—a sectarian conflict, a civil war between the Sunni and Shia. This is a battle that has been going on for over 1,300 years. Why we

would want our young men and women to be refereeing a fight between Shia and Sunni, at enormous cost in lives and treasure, absolutely eludes me.

We have so much else to do—first of all, in terms of our own security, going after the people who did attack us—al-Qaida and going after the leadership of al-Qaida, bin Laden and Zawahiri, who are still on the loose and still plotting to attack us. We are in Iraq being told the idea is now that we are to give breathing room for the Iraqi Government to make political progress to reduce the sectarian violence. Yet the overwhelming majority of the Iraqi people say this expanded deployment has made things worse; 70 percent in the deployment areas say we have made things worse, and only 18 percent say we have made things better.

Who has a better idea of what is going on in Iraq? I think we ought to be paying some attention to what the Iraqi people think is going on there. When a majority of the Iraqi people say it is OK to attack American forces, and we are there, theoretically, to help them, there is an enormous disconnect here. There is an enormous disconnect between what we apparently think we are doing and what we are actually accomplishing.

I am one who does not favor setting a strict deadline for leaving. I don't think that it is militarily wise to say to your opponents that we are leaving by a specific date. But we have to change course in Iraq. We have now lost thousands of brave men and women, with tens of thousands badly wounded. We have committed over a half trillion dollars, and we are told the President is now going to come and ask for another \$195 billion. But the President is telling us we don't have the money, for example, for the Transportation bill we passed. The President says we don't have the money for that. How many more bridges have to collapse in this country before we have the money to take care of our own citizens' safety?

The President says we don't have the money to maintain the COPS program, which put 100,000 police officers on the street. The President said we should cut that 90 percent at a time when crime is rising in America. We have, apparently, \$195 billion to spend in Iraq, but we don't have the several hundred million dollars we need to keep those police on the street in our country.

As I look at this, I am increasingly convinced we need to redeploy our forces; we need to, as a matter of our national security, refocus our effort on going after the people who did attack us on 9/11 and fully intend to attack us again, and that is al-Qaida, not Iraq.

I hope we will think very carefully in the coming days, as the debate intensifies, on what our future policy should be.

NATIONAL DAY OF
ENCOURAGEMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I rise today with great pleasure to commend an exceptional group of my constituents and acknowledge September 12, 2007, as the National Day of Encouragement. The concept behind the National Day of Encouragement was developed in June 2007 as part of the National Leadership Forum at Harding University in Searcy, AR.

The National Leadership Forum, NLF, was composed of a group of enterprising high school students from around the country who were challenged to think of constructive ways to help their respective schools. One group said that discouragement or “the lack of encouragement” was the biggest problem they faced in school as well as in society today. From there, the idea of an official Day of Encouragement as a possible solution was born.

According to Andrew Baker, the co-director of NLF, the students chose September 12 as the National Day of Encouragement in hopes of “balancing the discouraging feelings of 9/11”. The goal was to “challenge people not to just think about the idea of encouragement but to do something that will encourage someone else.”

Since the conception of the National Day of Encouragement, grassroots efforts have been working towards creating a real sense of encouragement in cities, schools, places of employment, and homes. Even the smallest gesture such as a smile, a pat on the back, or a kind word, has the ability to communicate love and compassion that can raise spirits and spur motivation, especially on a day like September 12.

Americans have endured great hardship and heartbreak as a result of the terrorist attacks, but this has not broken our faith, courage and an unshakable commitment to freedom, democracy and, most importantly, each other. Yesterday, we remembered the tragedy of September 11, and we honored its victims. Today, we honor the victims again by remembering the sacrifices made by thousands of Americans to help the victims of the attacks and their families. Their acts of kindness and generosity inspired and encouraged the entire Nation.

I encourage my fellow colleagues, citizens of all ages, as well as those in schools, organizations, businesses, and media outlets, to encourage others on this day, through an act of service, a thoughtful letter, or words of kindness and inspiration to thereby boost the overall morale of all.

I would also like to commend the extraordinary group of high school students who participated in the National Leadership Forum this year. They have shown the ability to analyze critical issues with insight and intellect, and it is an honor to stand here before you today and recognize all of them and their accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION

• Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, children and animals are the most vulnerable of our Nation’s population, as they do not have a voice of their own. Organizations which aid animals or children are very important in creating and maintaining a humane, safe and just society. That is why I rise today to honor and praise the American Humane Association on the occasion of its 130th anniversary.

The American Humane Association is unique in America in that it is not only the oldest but the only national organization with the dual mission of protecting both animals and children. As a true American icon of humanity, the American Humane Association has been the voice of the most vulnerable both animals and children—for each and every one of its 13 decades of existence.

American Humane was formed on October 9, 1877, with the vital mission of protecting both children and animals from abuse, neglect, cruelty and exploitation. Over those years covering much of two centuries, American Humane has actively and successfully promoted humane values and education, built significant public awareness and understanding, and has developed programs and processes that effectively protect both children and animals. It has been a leader in advancing humanity in this Nation and has been a model for the rest of the world to see and emulate.

Among numerous other initiatives, American Humane, based in Denver, CO, originated such programs as “Be Kind to Animals Week,” and “Tag Day,” to educate the public on the need to treat animals humanely and to adequately identify their animals. American Humane is the only organization to monitor and certify the making of movies to ensure “No Animals Were Harmed.” The organization also created “The Front Porch Project,” an initiative to educate communities on how to protect children from abuse, and it was the world’s first organization to identify “The Link” between animal abuse and human violence.

I am grateful for American Humane’s continuing good work in advancing humanity on a national scale. The United States of America is greatly enriched by the ongoing work of American Humane Association, and I congratulate the Association on this significant historical milestone.●

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

HILTON HUMANITARIAN PRIZE TO
TOSTAN

• Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I would like to commend the Senegalese-

based nonprofit organization Tostan, which today will receive the Conrad N. Hilton Humanitarian Prize. Tostan, founded by former Peace Corps volunteer Molly Melching, promotes basic education and helps to empower women and men to change their communities.

As one resident of The Gambia noted, “With this program, people will make change from within for themselves without anyone else’s help.”

The work of Tostan has transformed the lives of residents in Senegal and other African countries. While I was First Lady, I had the opportunity to visit Dakar to meet with Molly and the women and men who were working to address female genital cutting, FGC, in their communities.

I learned in these encounters that an extraordinary power is unleashed when people reach out to their neighbors and find common ground. When men and women begin to lift themselves up, they lift up their families and their communities as well.

Tostan is the catalyst for change in communities across Africa, and it produces results: More than 160,000 individuals have attended human rights and democracy classes run by Tostan; more than 1,000 community management committees—80 percent of which are headed by women—have benefited from Tostan’s guidance; and more than 2 million people in over 2,000 villages have made a public commitment to ending practices like FGC or child marriage.

Indeed, earlier this year, women in Senegal announced that they will be seeking to make that country the first in Africa to eliminate FGC entirely within the next 5 years—a pledge that would not have been possible without the work of Tostan over these many years.

Tostan will be using the award money from the Hilton prize to further its activities in countries across Africa to end female genital cutting, improve literacy, and promote small business and community development. I look forward to learning how these additional resources are used in the expansion of their programs.

The work of Tostan is a shining example of how democracy works; how women’s voices and men’s voices, can be heard, and can lead to change in their communities. I would like to again congratulate Tostan for receiving the Conrad N. Hilton Humanitarian Prize.●

RECOGNIZING APPALACHIAN
STATE UNIVERSITY MOUNTAIN-
EERS FOOTBALL TEAM

• Mrs. DOLE. Madam President, today I would like to recognize the Appalachian State University Mountaineers football team for pulling off one of the biggest upsets in college football history. To recognize this achievement, Senator BURR and I have introduced Senate resolution number S. Res. 309.

On September 1, 2007, the Appalachian State Mountaineers of the