

dictatorship to democracy, so the argument goes, then Iraq will follow a friendlier foreign policy toward the United States.

To make his case, Bush has a powerful historical experience to draw upon: the end of the Cold War. Regime change in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union fundamentally enhanced American national security. If Iraq possessed Russia's nuclear arsenal today, the United States would be in grave danger. Two decades ago we feared this same arsenal in the hands of the Kremlin. Today we do not. The reason we do not is that the regime in Russia has become more democratic and market-oriented and therefore also more Western-oriented. Unfortunately, the task of promoting democratic regime change in the former Soviet Union is not complete. In rightly focusing on how to promote democratic regimes in the Muslim world, the Bush administration is failing to complete the consolidation of capitalism and democracy in the former communist world and the integration of these new democracies into the Western community of democratic states.

To assume that this process of democratization and integration will march forward without American prodding is misguided. First, the lines between East and West in Europe are beginning to harden, not fade. After the next round of expansion, the European Union is very unlikely to offer membership to countries farther to the east in the near future. Bureaucrats in Brussels simply laugh when the idea of Russian or Ukrainian membership in the EU is raised. NATO has moved more aggressively to extend its borders eastward, but it too will become fatigued and inwardly focused after the next round of expansion. If the prospect of membership in NATO and the EU can no longer be considered a foreign policy goal for those left out of the next wave of expansion, then the pull of the West will diminish.

Second, democratization on the periphery of Europe has stalled. A dictator who praises Stalin and Hitler runs Belarus. President Vladimir Putin has weakened democratic institutions and grossly violated the human rights of his own citizens in Chechnya in his attempt to build "managed democracy" in Russia. In Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma aspires to create the same level of state control over the democratic process as Putin has achieved in Russia to ensure a smooth—that is, Kuchma-friendly—transition of power when his term ends in 2004. In contrast to Russia, Ukraine has a vibrant democratic opposition, whose leader, Viktor Yushchenko, is likely to win a free and fair presidential election. This vote in 2004 will be free and fair, however, only if the West is watching. Only in Moldova has authorization creep been avoided, but that's because of the weakness of the state, hardly a condition conducive to long-term democratic consolidation.

Over time, the combination of a closing Western border and growing authoritarianism on the Eastern side of this wall spells disaster for American security interests in the region. As the United States gears up to create new regimes with a democratic and Western orientation in the Middle East, it may be losing the gains of similar efforts of democratic promotion in the communist world during the Cold War.

Obviously, President Bush's foreign policy team is overworked and focused now on Iraq. Nonetheless, the United States should be able to conduct more than one foreign policy at the same time. In numerous speeches, Bush has already outlined his grand strategy for foreign policy. He has stated repeatedly that the United States should champion freedom and liberty for people around the world, and when necessary even promote regime change in those countries that do not offer

their citizens basic democratic rights. To be a successful and credible doctrine, however, this strategy must be applied consistently.

When diplomatic historians look back on the 1990s, they should describe it as the era of European integration. They will do so, however, only if the project is completed. As the Bush administration begins the process of promoting democratic regime change along a new frontier in the Muslim world, it must also finish the job on the European frontier.

The writer, a Hoover Fellow and professor of political science at Stanford University, is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

STEPHEN AMBROSE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of Senator LANDRIEU's resolution honoring the life of Dr. Stephen E. Ambrose, a distinguished historian, storyteller and treasure of the State of Wisconsin. Born in Whitewater, WI, Dr. Ambrose attended the University of Wisconsin for both his undergraduate and his doctorate, molding a career in American history and embarking on a path he almost didn't take. From his first book, "Wisconsin Boy in Dixie," published in 1961, Dr. Ambrose went on to publish more than 30 books, captivating audiences, young and old, for 41 years.

Dr. Ambrose once said, "When I'm writing at my best, I want to share my own discoveries with the reader. I want to take people to a new understanding of an event, an individual or a story. I want them to be as amazed as I am." It was with this great love for storytelling Dr. Ambrose catapulted readers into the horrific, yet glorifying days of World War II, reigniting old memories and sparking new compassion among those who lived through the era and those who have only read about it in history books. He dedicated numerous books to the courage and sacrifice of the men and women who fought in World War II and is the founder of The National D-Day Museum in New Orleans, LA, the only museum in the country dedicated to "all of the 'D-Days' of World War II, and to those at home who supported these efforts."

From a little-known history professor came this thunderous voice for the thousands of Americans who fought to preserve the freedom of this country. His contributions to the historical education of the American people are both priceless and unmatched. His knowledge, enthusiasm and dedication to the preservation of hometown heroes and history enthusiasts alike will be greatly missed. Speaking on behalf of the state of Wisconsin, this country has certainly lost one of its finest historians.

HOLD TO H.R. 4125

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to inform my colleagues that I have requested to be notified of any unanimous consent agreement before the Senate proceeds to the consid-

eration of H.R. 4125. I have some concerns with this bill and would like to review it further. In addition, there are other Federal courts improvement measures that could be added to make this bill better, such as my Sunshine in the Courtroom legislation, which would allow federal judges discretionary authority to allow media coverage of Federal court proceedings with appropriate safeguards.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise yet again to address the Senate on the subject of military construction projects added to an appropriations bill that were not requested by the Department of Defense. This bill contains over \$900 million in unrequested military construction projects.

I did not object to the unanimous consent request to proceed to a voice vote on the fiscal year 2003 Department of Defense Military Construction appropriations conference report because on the day that this funding bill passed, I had managed the floor for more than 16 hours while the Senate proceeded with the serious matter of debating and finally approving the Iraqi War Resolution.

America remains at war, a war that continues to unite Americans in pursuit of a common goal, to defeat terrorism. All Americans have, and undoubtedly in the future will make sacrifices for this war. Many have been deeply affected by it and at times harmed by difficult, related economic circumstances. Our servicemen and women in particular are truly on the front lines in this war, separated from their families, risking their lives, and working extraordinarily long hours under the most difficult conditions to accomplish the ambitious but necessary task their country has set for them.

Every year, I come to the Senate floor to highlight programs and projects added to spending bills for primarily parochial reasons. While I recognize that many of the projects added to this bill may be worthwhile, the process by which they were selected is not.

There are 26 conferees of the Appropriations Military Construction Conference report who represent 19 States. Of those 19 States only one, Wisconsin, did not have projects added on this appropriations bill. Of 119 projects added to this bill, 60 projects are in the states represented by the MILCON Appropriations Conferees, totaling over \$530 million. Those numbers, needless to say, go well beyond the realm of mere coincidence.

By adding over \$900 million above the President's request, the Appropriations Conference Committee is further draining away funds desperately needed for enhancing our warfighting capability. Commonsense reforms, closing military bases, consolidating and

privatizing depot maintenance, ending "Buy American" restrictions, and ending pork-barrel spending—that I have long supported would free up nearly \$20 billion per year which could be used to begin our long-needed military transformation.

We are waging a war against a new enemy and at the same time undertaking a long-term process to transform our military from its cold war structure to a force ready for the challenges of tomorrow. A lack of political will had previously hamstrung the transformation process, but the President and his team have pledged to transform our military structure and operations to meet future threats.

The reorganization of our armed services was an extremely important subject before September 11, and it is all the more so now. The threats to the security of the United States, to the very lives and property of Americans, have changed in the last decade.

In the months ahead, no task before the Administration and the Congress will be more important or require greater care and deliberation than making the changes necessary to strengthen our national defense in this new, uncertain era. Needless to say, this transformation process will require enlightened, thoughtful leadership, and not the pork-barreling of military funds if we are to best serve America in this time of rapid change in the global security environment.

I look forward to the day when my appearances on the Senate floor for this purpose are no longer necessary. I reiterate, over \$900 million in unrequested military construction projects were added by the Committee to the defense appropriations bill. Consider how that \$900 million, when added to the savings gained through additional base closings and more cost-effective business practices, could be used so much more effectively.

The problems of our Armed Forces, whether in terms of force structure or modernization, could be more assuredly addressed and our warfighting ability greatly enhanced. The American taxpayers expect more of us, as do our brave servicemen and women who are, without question, fighting this war on global terrorism on our behalf.

But for now, unfortunately, they must witness us, seemingly blind to our responsibilities at this time of war, going about our business as usual.

SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to indicate my resolve that our men and women in uniform have this Senate's full support in whatever actions might be taken regarding Iraq and in our ongoing war against terrorism.

The question has never been whether Saddam should be disarmed but rather how best to accomplish that goal.

I was pleased to join with my colleagues, Senator CARL LEVIN, Chair of

the Armed Services Committee, Senator BOB GRAHAM, Chair of the Intelligence Committee, and Senator DAN INOUE, Chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in supporting a resolution that focused on the creation of an international coalition to enforce a tough inspection regime with real deadlines for Saddam along with the authorization of force to disarm him in cooperation with our allies through the United Nations.

But that is not the approach that was passed by this body. I hope President Bush will wisely use the broad powers that Congress has given him. I continue to hope he will take the time to assemble a worldwide coalition—ready to use force if necessary—that will convince Saddam he has no choice but to disarm.

But we have had the debate. We have had the vote. And it is time for Congress to show there are no Democrats and no Republicans when it comes to supporting our troops.

We have shown that support by quickly passing the Defense appropriations bill. This ensures our troops will have the most up-to-date weapons, fast-moving logistical support and the best pay and benefits of any armed forces in the world. This is essential to support these patriots and their families at home.

This bill does that by boosting defense spending to more than \$355 billion for the fiscal year that began Oct. 1—a \$34.4 billion increase over last year. This new spending will help not only with any action against Iraq, but also in honoring our commitments around the world in the global fight against terrorism.

It is important to recognize that this bill includes nearly \$94 billion to provide for a 4.1 percent pay increase as well as full funding of all authorized benefits for all military personnel.

I think all of us agree that war should always be our last choice.

But, if it comes to that last resort, I promise that I will do everything within my power to ensure that our armed forces have the weapons and materials they need to defeat any enemy and expose our troops to the least possible risk.

We have to remember that it is not just Iraq that poses a threat. We still have troops in Afghanistan and the Philippines. We have seen new terrorist attacks in Kuwait, Bali and against a French oil tanker. The war against terrorism is far from over and our troops need support in that battle as well.

Upon our Nation's shoulders have fallen staggering duties as the world's sole remaining superpower. But Americans already stand on the tall shoulders of our own history and we do not shrink from these burdens.

I believe that if we stand tall for our ideals the world will follow and we can disarm Iraq and defeat world terrorism as part of a broad coalition of allies.

If our country acts alone, our men and women in uniform must always

know that their Nation is united behind them in gratitude for their service, in pride of their dedication to duty and in awe of their bravery.

I yield the floor.

U.S. TRADE LAWS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia. On May 23, during the debate of the trade bill, Senator ROCKEFELLER spoke on some of the provisions in the Trade Promotion Authority provisions relating to trade remedy laws. There has been continued discussion of these issues over the past several months, so I would like to take this opportunity to clarify that the points we made in discussing the Senate bill apply equally to the Conference Bill.

Section 2102(b)(14) of the TPA bill states that it is a "principal" U.S. negotiating objective to preserve, in all trade negotiations, the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade remedy laws and to avoid any agreement that would require weakening of the current U.S. antidumping, countervailing duty and safeguard remedies. The Committee on Finance regards strict adherence to this directive as critical in advancing the economic interests of the United States in future trade agreements.

The directive encompasses any weakening of the existing remedies, whether at the level of statute, regulation or agency practice. This means that the Administration must reject any new international rule or obligation whose acceptance would lead to relief under our existing trade laws becoming more difficult, uncertain, or costly for domestic industries to achieve and maintain over time.

I want to highlight again some examples of new international obligations that have been proposed by WTO members, and that would obviously result in a weakening of U.S. trade laws and therefore must be rejected under the standard set out in section 2102(b)(14).

These include:

No. 1, a "public interest" rule politicizing and encumbering the administrative processes under which trade remedy laws are currently applied;

No. 2, a requirement to exempt from trade remedy measures items alleged to be in "short supply" in the domestic market;

No. 3, a "lesser duty" rule limiting antidumping and countervailing duties to some amount less than the calculated margin of dumping or subsidy, such as the amount supposedly necessary to offset the injury;

No. 4, any extension of faulty dispute resolution models such as Chapter 19 of the NAFTA;

No. 5, changes to the rules for "sunset" reviews of antidumping and CVD measures which would make it more difficult to keep relief in place;

No. 6, additional constraints or criteria for dumping calculations, in areas