

now they need the support, the resources, and the right troops to defeat the significant pockets of guerilla opposition that remain.

Unfortunately, unless we adjust our course, the management of postwar Iraq may well be viewed by history as the most consequential mismanagement of an international crisis by any U.S. administration since Vietnam.

Notwithstanding the deaths of Qusai and Odaï Hussein, the joint U.S.-UK mission is in deep trouble. Nine months ago, I called for the administration to enlist NATO in comprehensive planning for postwar Iraq. What we are seeing now is the costs of failing to plan and refusing to internationalize our approach.

The departure of Saddam Hussein from power is an opportunity to change the course of history in the Middle East. That is one reason I supported and celebrated Iraq's liberation. It could have been, should have been, and still might prove a victory for people everywhere who respect human rights, cherish freedom, seek to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and believe that peace between Arabs and Israel is both achievable and essential.

To succeed, we will need all the help we can get—from NATO and other allies, the U.N., and friends within the Arab and Muslim communities. The President apparently believes that we can succeed largely on our own.

The American people are starving for some straight talk. There is no reason except failed Presidential leadership that 90 percent of the foreign troops in Iraq are American. As commander in chief, he should be able to assure the families of our Armed Forces in Iraq that absolutely everything is being done to help them achieve their mission and come home safely and soon. He could not honestly provide such an assurance today.

Our troops won't get the help or protection they need unless the administration offers to share authority and responsibility for reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The President should not let past disagreements or misguided ideology stand in the way. The administration has little patience for diplomacy, so they argue that a U.N. framework means a loss of American control.

That is simply untrue. Like we did in Kosovo, we should ask the U.N. to provide a mandate for a coalition-led force that will work in consultation with, but not under the control of, the U.N. civilian administration. That will preserve the absolutely essential American control of our forces, but create a framework in which many nations can participate comfortably.

The Bush administration must level with the world and with the American people. A new consensus must be built on the truth. Winning the peace in Iraq will require many months, probably several years. It will cost tens of billions of dollars more than can be accounted for by Iraqi oil revenues. It

will entail grave, ongoing risks to our Armed Forces. But it is a necessary, even noble, mission in which every law-abiding and freedom-loving country has a stake, and to which each should be invited to contribute not as a favor to America, but as a gift to our common future.

EXECUTIVE NOMINEES TO DOJ

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to state that I object to proceeding to the consideration of two executive nominees to the Department of Justice. The first nominee is Mr. Christopher A. Wray, who is nominated to be the assistant attorney general of the criminal division at the Department of Justice. The second nominee to which I object is Mr. Jack Landman Goldsmith III, who is nominated to be assistant attorney general, office of legal counsel at the Department of Justice.

I have placed holds on these individuals because I have numerous outstanding issues that have yet to be resolved by the Department of Justice. More specifically, I have several outstanding written requests before the Department of Justice. Some of these requests are more than 6 months overdue. In addition, I am presently working with the Department of Justice to overcome a number of procedural issues directly affecting my ability, as a member of the Judiciary Committee to, among other things, conduct oversight of the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2004 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I want to congratulate the members of the new Appropriations Subcommittee on successfully completing the first annual appropriations bill providing funding for the new Department of Homeland Security.

Just as the Department of Homeland Security has made momentous progress in protecting our citizens while simultaneously creating a new government agency, the members of the Homeland Security Subcommittee have moved expeditiously to recommend funding in a responsible manner. There is no bill more important to the citizens of Utah, and we recognize the committee's important efforts.

The bill's appropriation of \$28.5 billion accomplishes many things. One of the most important is continued support of the Office for Domestic Preparedness. This office, which awards grants to State and local agencies to assist them in preparing our first responders, has had a 1,500 percent increase in funding since September 11, 2001. Today's recommendation of \$3.6 billion will bring the total amount spent on first responder preparedness to \$8.8 billion since that fateful day.

Our Nation's airports are infinitely more protected than they were just one year ago. The bill continues this important work by providing \$4.5 billion for passenger and baggage screening and airport security. It also provides \$4.9 billion for securing our borders. The bill funds the US VISIT system development with \$380 million. This new system will allow our Nation to collect, maintain and share appropriate information in order to determine the eligibility of foreign citizens wishing to visit the United States.

I appreciate that the committee has decided not to earmark funding for specific Congressional requests and to leave these decisions to the appropriate agencies. The defense of our Nation and in particular the protection of our citizens will never be achieved by purely political decisions, but through diligent hard work and strategic planning.

However, I would like to bring to the Senate's attention a program that has already proven its effectiveness in protecting our citizens and was initiated by the Office for Domestic Preparedness. Last year, the Office for Domestic Preparedness asked Dugway Proving Ground to develop and teach a Ph.D driven chemical and biological emergency responder course. Dugway Proving Ground is our Nation's chemical and biological defense proving ground. The result of these classes has been an unparalleled success and the student responses were overwhelmingly positive. Participants in the class were unanimous in their praise and the Chief of the Chicago HAZMAT Unit categorized the program as "one that all first responders should attend." A student commented further that "This was the best use of time in my 25 year career." The courses focused on agent characteristics, sampling, protection, detection, decontamination and chem/bio production recognition, such as the difference between clandestine drug laboratories, industrial accidents or chemical/biological production capabilities. Students also learned to assess a situation in order to determine the proper course of action. Clearly, these first responder training courses at Dugway are a national resource and though the Committee did not recommend funding for individual programs, I hope that the Office for Domestic Preparedness will continue to sponsor this important program.

I congratulate the committee on its fine work and urge the Senate's approval of the bill.

CULTURAL BRIDGES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, next week 54 high school students from the Islamic and Arab world will arrive in the United States for a year of study under a new exchange program to help bridge the cultural divide between America and the Islamic and Arab nations of the world. Secretary Powell will welcome the students at a ceremony at the State Department on Wednesday, August 5.

An initial \$10 million for the Cultural Bridges Program was approved last year by Congress for the coming academic year. I commend the State Department for moving so quickly to organize the program and bring the first group of high school students to the United States. By the end of the summer as the new academic year begins, 135 high school students will be here for a year of study in high schools in 23 States under the program.

The students are coming from many nations throughout the Islamic world—Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and Yemen, and from the West Bank and the Gaza strip as well. Each student will live with an American host family, attend a local high school, learn first hand about our society and values, and enable our students to learn about them.

Officials in the State Department are already preparing their recruitment and outreach efforts for the 2004-2005 academic year, when they hope to double the size of the program. If all goes well, that number will double again in the following year.

The terrorist attacks on September 11 and the war in Iraq have brought into sharp focus the many negative images and perceptions of our Nation abroad. Many Muslims believe our country is at war with Islam, not terrorism. With nearly 1.5 billion people living in the Islamic world today, we ignore these pervasive anti-American sentiments at our peril.

If the United States is to win a genuine victory in the war against terrorism, we must respond on many levels. We must ensure that our defenses are strong, our intelligence is accurate, and our borders are secure. But we must also do all we can to dispel the disturbing trend of anti-American rhetoric and beliefs. An effective way to do so is to engage Islamic peoples in the realm of values and ideas.

In a May 3, 2002 speech to the World Affairs Council in California, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz spoke of the need to strengthen voices of moderation in the Islamic world and to bridge the “dangerous gap” between that world and the West. There is “no time for delay,” he said.

As we have seen in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Middle East, some individuals and factions and even governments have supported terrorist organizations, while others have condemned terrorism and pledged to help the United States in combating it. By reaching out in friendship to those who oppose terrorism we can reduce the breeding grounds for terrorism and begin to eliminate the sentiments that terrorist recruiters exploit.

One of the most effective ways to engage the Islamic world is through educational exchange programs, which promote people-to-people contacts between Americans and other peoples.

Exchange programs help to build strong personal relationships and com-

bat the misperceptions about the United States that threaten our security. Unfortunately, exchanges between the Islamic world and the United States are very limited today. Of the more than 500,000 foreign students in the United States, less than 5 percent are from the Arab Middle East.

There are many benefits in reaching out to students while they are young and open-minded. Today’s high school students are tomorrow’s leaders. Working with them now can improve their attitudes about our country and build future relationships based on trust and understanding. As Secretary of State Colin Powell said in his August 2001 statement on International Education Week: “I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who have been educated here.”

What makes the Cultural Bridges Program unique is that it enables high school students from other lands to obtain firsthand knowledge of our country, our way of life, and our people. Our Government sponsors many exchange programs for professionals, educators, journalists and academics, but, until now, there has been no Federal program to bring high school students from the Islamic world to the United States.

After September 11, many Muslim countries condemned the terrorist attacks and pledged to help the United States fight terrorism. But in the wake of the war in Iraq, anti-American sentiment is on the rise again.

A June 2003 poll by the Pew Charitable Trust found strong public support for Osama bin Laden’s views in Arab countries whose governments are friendly to the United States. According to the poll, 55 percent of those in Jordan, 58 percent of those in Indonesia, 45 percent of those in Pakistan, and 49 percent of those in Morocco said they had confidence in Osama bin Laden to “do the right thing regarding world affairs,” and so did 71 percent of those in the areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority.

Our military action in Iraq has led to widespread fears throughout the region that we will launch other aggressive action. Majorities of those interviewed in Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan worried that their country might be attacked by the United States. Even in Kuwait—where the public has a generally favorable view of the United States—53 percent expressed concern that the United States could someday pose a threat.

Especially disturbing is the finding of little support in the Islamic world for the war against terrorism—23 percent in Indonesia, 16 percent in Pakistan, 22 percent in Turkey, and 2 percent in Jordan and the Palestinian Authority. In Morocco, only one in 10 back the effort, while in Lebanon, 30 percent support the war. Only in Kuwait and Nigeria do majorities of the population now support the war against terrorism.

Clearly, we need to redouble our efforts to win the hearts and minds of

peoples in the Arab and Muslim world, and change their negative perceptions about our country and values.

There are no better ambassadors for America than Americans themselves, and this new high school exchange program is an important way to begin reaching out more effectively to the next generation of leaders in that world.

Jordan’s King Abdullah is an excellent example of what can be achieved. He is a friend of the United States, a partner in the war against terrorism, and a voice of tolerance and moderation in the Muslim world.

In 1977, as a young Jordanian, he enrolled in a high school in Massachusetts and later came to Washington to study at a university. He is living proof of the value of building bridges of understanding and tolerance with other cultures.

We need to create as many opportunities as possible for young people throughout the Islamic world to spend time in the United States and with our citizens, and we should begin to do so now. I have been delighted to work with Senators LUGAR, LEAHY, CHAFEE, DODD, HAGEL, SMITH, COCHRAN, BROWBACK, JEFFORDS, DURBIN, and FEINGOLD on the Cultural Bridges Program, and I am hopeful that it marks a new beginning in our efforts to build forward lasting relationships with the future leaders in the Muslim world.

FY 2004 ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

SILVERY MINNOW PROVISION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to begin by commending my friend and colleague from New Mexico and the Chairman of both the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, for addressing a difficult situation on the Rio Grande River.

The provision at issue is Section 205 of the Energy and Water Appropriations bill and I would like to take this opportunity to engage Senator DOMENICI on that legislative language as part of the Senate’s consideration of the bill.

We worked on Section 205 together, and it concerns water use in the Middle Rio Grande and compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA). More specifically, Section 205 addresses the June 12, 2003 decision of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of Rio Grande Silvery Minnow v. Keys, and does the following:

Recognizing that importing San Juan-Chama project water from the San Juan River basin to the Rio Grande basin does not jeopardize endangered species in the Middle Rio Grande, Section 205(a) clarifies that the Bureau of Reclamation may not use discretion, if any, to unilaterally reduce or reallocate water to be delivered under San Juan-Chama project contracts for endangered species purposes in the Rio Grande River Basin.