

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, in that case, I will withhold for our majority leader to make a decision about what the time allocation would be, and I yield up to 5 minutes to Senator SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. And I thank the Senator from Texas.

Having reflected on this debate on Iraq and postwar Iraq, a lot of what I am hearing—the rhetoric I am hearing about this administration not having a plan, this administration not preparing for all the contingencies, this administration not having an exit strategy or an end strategy—reminds me of a couple of things. No. 1, it reminds me about the same people making the same criticism about the same administration about a month into the war that the generals didn't consider all the different problems they were going to confront, they didn't have a plan, didn't have an exit strategy, et cetera—and then 2 weeks later the war was over.

I am not suggesting that 2 weeks from now everything in Iraq is going to be settled, but this idea that every contingency had to be considered is ridiculous. No one is smart enough anywhere to consider every contingency. What you are smart enough to do is put a basic game plan in place, and then, as things develop, have that game plan flexible enough to adjust and meet those contingencies. It is exactly what Tommy Franks did when he put the game plan together for the war in Iraq. As things changed and developed, as new things came up, they adjusted. It is exactly what is going on with Jerry Bremer over in Iraq today.

I also harken back to postwar Germany after World War II. A lot of analogies are being made by both sides about the importance of this reconstruction of Iraq as was the reconstruction of the Axis powers after World War II. I remind my colleagues that this plan Truman gets a lot of credit for, Marshall gets a lot of credit for, was not in place until 2 years—2 years—after Germany fell. It was not passed in the Congress until 3 years after Germany fell.

I remind my colleagues of some of the comments some Members of this body made and some Members of the House made back then. A House Member, a Mr. Vursell, from Illinois, said—this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

There is little question in my mind but that the launching of the Marshall plan asking 16 nations to gather in conference and determine how much aid they needed from the United States was a colossal blunder in the very beginning.

Does this sound familiar—"a colossal blunder"?

He said:

It will be less disastrous to this country if the Members of this Congress will now take over and have the courage to try to salvage what we can in the interest of our Government and the [American] people.

Now you are hearing the same thing today.

History proved that great leadership and great vision have their place in the world. Sometimes Members of Congress, with very narrow vision and very parochial interests, don't necessarily do what is in the best interest of the Nation or the best interest of the world.

What the President is doing is providing true leadership at a time when leadership is at a premium. He provided in the Iraq war a great plan. He stuck to it in spite of criticism and followed that plan to its successful conclusion.

There were speeches in the Senate, both sides of the aisle, about how difficult not the war was going to be but how difficult postwar Iraq was going to be, that it would be the difficult and long challenge. Yet here we are a few months afterwards and we are already carping, saying it is not finished, it has not been accomplished. Yet by every measure, we are doing much better in postwar Iraq than they did with the most successful reconstruction plan in the history of the world, the Marshall plan. We are moving forward with economic reforms, currency reforms, banking reforms, money to be put in to restore their infrastructure at a much faster and more effective rate than what occurred after World War II. This is a plan that needs time to work.

I understand the pressures of the 24-hour news cycle. Thankfully, in 1947 they didn't have that. But we have it today. And so the need is always immediate. There can be no room for delay or failure. We are in a push-button world, and we have to solve the problems today.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, what is the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 14 seconds left.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the majority side. And how much on the minority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes 41 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am going to use the 1 minute 14 seconds to say that there is one thing I must object to that was said recently by Senator KENNEDY, when he said that the war is "a fraud that was made up in Texas to give the President a political boost." I have great respect for Senator KENNEDY and every Senator who represents his or her State in this body. But that is a slur on my home State of Texas, to say this plot was made up in Texas.

I remind the people of America that Texas is a patriotic State, that Texas has 1 in 10 Active-Duty military. On the very day that statement was made, a plot in Texas to help a political campaign of a President, in fact, on that very day, three Texas soldiers were ambushed in Iraq and lost their lives serving our country. Those are great Tex-

ans. The 4th Infantry Division from Fort Hood, TX, is there now, as we speak.

As I traveled through Afghanistan and Iraq, I met Texans who were serving their country. I don't think there should ever be a slur on another State when we are talking about foreign policy or the policies of a President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ATTACK ON SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are still negotiating with regard to the schedule for the course of the next hour or so. We will ask for some additional time to respond to this attack on Senator KENNEDY. I believe this is getting to be a real practice here. I was the brunt of similar criticism last spring. It seems as if anyone who comes to the floor to express concern or to express his or her views on Iraq is now the subject of attack.

Regardless of one's views, to impugn someone's patriotism, to question the motives, to challenge the integrity is wrong. We ought to have an opportunity to have an open, candid expression of views without challenging—

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am going to finish my statement and I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

We ought to have an opportunity to have this open discussion and expression of views without challenging the motives, the patriotism, or the very right of any Senator to express him or herself. Senator KENNEDY did that. Many of us have done that now over the course of the debate. We may ultimately come to different conclusions about what the facts are or about the specific policies involving Iraq or our involvement in the questions we are facing right now with regard to the \$87 billion. But I must say, let's keep this an open and fair discussion of the facts, without always impugning someone's integrity or personal motivation.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah. I am told we only have a couple minutes left. Until we reach agreement, I will yield at this time to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that the exchange between the Democratic leader and myself not be charged to their time, if he would be willing to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

Mr. DODD. Under the circumstances the Senator from Utah has described, this will not detract from the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. My question is very simple: I ask the Democratic leader if at any time in my presentation did he find where I attacked the motives, the patriotism, or the rights of the Senator from Massachusetts? My intent was—and it is my belief that I stood up to my intent—to challenge the accuracy of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, never having made any reference to his motives, his patriotism, or his rights. If the Democratic leader has instances where I did that, I would appreciate it if he would point that out to me so I can make the appropriate response.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I was not on the floor when the distinguished Senator from Utah spoke. I am relating not necessarily to his comments specifically but to this general approach Members on the other side seem to use any time one of those in the Democratic caucus speaks out, expresses him or herself, raises concerns or in some way criticizes this administration with regard to its policy in Iraq. There is an orchestrated effort to attack those who criticize.

I am not saying that the Senator from Utah may have done so specifically on the floor this morning. I will look forward to reading his comments. But that is the approach. I think it is unfair. I think it is unfortunate. It demeans the debate that we ought to be having in the Senate about these important issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes fifteen seconds.

Mr. DODD. I yield myself 2 minutes. I wish to quickly respond to my colleagues and friends on the other side. I supported the President's request for authority in Iraq. I believed at the time that was the right vote to cast.

But it is important to focus on the war issue and what is going on in Iraq in the construction period, the economic and political efforts there. There is growing concern, both here and abroad, that this is not going well. We can spend all day debating about what our colleagues said or didn't say, what their motives or intentions were, but that diverts attention from what the debate ought to be; that is, we have a request before us for \$87 billion. We will have to vote on that in the coming days. The American people want to know where we stand on that. How is the money going to be spent? Where is it going?

Why are we losing a soldier a day it seems, or 10 are being wounded every

day? Why isn't the rest of the world joining us? What efforts are being made? The President may be giving a speech right now at the United Nations. Spending our time in this great deliberative body arguing over what one of our colleagues said over the weekend in an interview detracts from what ought to be the real debate, and that is whether we are on the right track or the wrong track when it comes to rebuilding Iraq, getting the government turned over to the Iraqi people, getting international support for the efforts and how the taxpayer money is going to be used.

Spending our time talking about what Senator KENNEDY said—I think his spirit reflects where many Americans are. You may not agree with every word. That is not the point. We rarely agree around here on speeches we give, but we ought to be debating how we get it right in Iraq instead of spending time this morning arguing about whether or not we agree or disagree with what our colleague said in an interview in his home State. The American public wants to know what is happening in Iraq, not what is happening in Massachusetts—not what one said but what is the policy of this Government and what is the Senate saying about it. That ought to be the debate.

Mr. President, I don't know if any of my colleagues want to be yielded some time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, morning business has expired. I would ask unanimous consent—and I do this with the greatest respect—that we, the minority, be given the next 20 minutes and that the minority have 10 minutes to respond.

The reason I suggest that is that there has been a half hour here directed toward one Senator. We think that we would, with the 7 minutes we have been given and the 20 minutes that I am asking, be nearly balanced—not totally balanced. In fact, it would still be out of balance, with 40 minutes for one side and about 30 to respond to that—in fact, 27. So I would ask unanimous consent that we be given the next 20 minutes; following that, the majority be recognized for 10 minutes, still as if in morning business, and that the work of the Interior appropriations subcommittee, the vote, plus the 10-minute speeches prior to the vote, be set aside for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot suggest the absence of a quorum until he gets time.

Mr. REID. I withdraw my unanimous consent request and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. 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 renew my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. As to the unanimous consent request, for clarification, after the 30 minutes that we have just allocated by unanimous consent, there will be 10 minutes equally divided on the Daschle amendment, after which there will be a rollcall vote. So Members would know that at about 11:20 to 11:25 we will have a vote.

Mr. REID. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am not quite sure. What is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, if I could answer the Senator from Vermont, we have 20 minutes now. The Republicans have 10 minutes. We will allocate that time as if in morning business. I would be happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have listened to my friends on the other side of the aisle who have come to the Senate floor this morning to criticize the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

Last week, Senator KENNEDY, speaking for millions of concerned Americans, challenged the President and his advisers for misleading the country about the war in Iraq.

Every Senator is free to disagree with the views of another Senator. That is the nature of debate. But too often, officials in this administration, and some of my Republican friends, have questioned the patriotism, and the right to disagree, of those who criticize policies they believe are fundamentally flawed.

Senator KENNEDY has asked hard and important questions about a policy that—contrary to what the American people were told to expect—has already resulted in the loss of life or limb of hundreds of American soldiers and is costing billions of dollars with no end in sight.

The reality is that since the fall of Baghdad, practically everything the White House and the Pentagon predicted about Iraq has turned out to be wrong. Yet you would hardly know it from listening to officials in Washington who consistently give evasive and overly optimistic assessments.

The administration's own shifting statements show that the threat posed by Iraq was not what we were led to believe.

Just a few months ago, Vice President CHENEY insisted that Saddam Hussein had reconstituted nuclear weapons. No weapons of mass destruction have yet been found.

Last week, Secretary Powell said the use of chemical weapons against the Kurds was the justification for a preemptive war 15 years later. As much as I admire and respect the Secretary, that is grasping at straws.

For months, the White House and the Pentagon tried mightily to draw a connection between Saddam Hussein and the attack against the World Trade Towers. Last week, the President belatedly conceded that there was no link.

Vice President CHENEY said our troops would be treated as liberators. I am sure that most Iraqis are grateful that Saddam Hussein is gone. I am too. But it is clear the Iraqi people increasingly don't want us there.

We should all be concerned that when our soldiers—who have performed so bravely—are ambushed and killed, there seems to be increasing jubilation in the streets, and not just by the remnants of Saddam's regime.

Then, there is the issue of cost. Five months ago we passed a wartime supplemental with \$2.5 billion for reconstruction in Iraq. At the time, we were told that was all that U.S. taxpayers would be asked for this year. That, we have learned, was a gross miscalculation.

Former-OMB Director Mitch Daniels said the total cost would be between \$50 and \$60 billion. Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz said:

We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon. The oil revenues of that country could bring between \$50 and \$100 billion over the course of the next two or three years.

We now know those predictions were wildly off the mark.

We are also paying other countries to support us. The State Department's own documents show that since April, the United States has provided almost \$4 billion to coalition partners, other nations who supported our efforts in Iraq, and allies in the region. This does not include billions of dollars in loans.

Now the President wants another \$87 billion for Iraq. Within a year, we will have spent far more than \$100 billion, and it is clear that the administration will be back for many more tens of billions of dollars before next year is out.

We don't have this money in the bank. It is red ink. We are headed for a \$1 trillion deficit, which will fall squarely on the backs of our children and grandchildren. That could very well be our most lasting legacy.

We are spending all this money in Iraq, but there is no supplemental to help the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have lost their jobs here at home. There is no money to fix our dilapidated public schools. There is no money for health care for the millions of Americans who lack health insurance. None for low income housing for Americans living in poverty.

I hope my Republican friends who have rushed here to defend the President's preemptive war and his policy of

nation building, are also concerned about how much it may cost, how long it may take, and how many American troops may be needed in the years to come. They should be asking these questions too.

We cannot continue to drift along, spending more than \$1 billion a week, with no plan other than business as usual, no realistic time table, every week another four or five Americans killed or wounded, and the growing resentment of the Iraqi people.

It is long past time to abandon the same old "go it alone" strategy. We need to get the international community involved. We need to work towards bringing our soldiers home sooner rather than later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank very much the Senator from Vermont for his comments. I think I will simply add that the vast majority of the American people agree with him. I appreciate very much his contribution to this discussion.

Teddy Roosevelt once said:

To announce that there must be no criticism of the President or that we are to stand by the President right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile but it is also morally treasonable to the American public.

There has to be open dialog, candid discussion about the extraordinary ramifications of many of the issues that are confronting us relating to Iraq, or we will be morally treasonable.

The President has requested an additional \$87 billion in money for Iraq over the next several months. Requesting the money is no substitute for a plan, and the President has no plan. In fact, we don't know where the money has gone so far. There is little accounting of the billion dollars a week that we are currently sending to Iraq—\$1 billion a week, with very little if any transparency with regard to that commitment.

Now the President is saying he wants \$87 billion more. General Anthony Zinni recently spoke to a group of Marine officers, and here is what he said:

[Our troops] should never be put on a battlefield without a strategic plan, not only for the fighting—our generals will take care of that—but for the aftermath and winning that war. Where are we, the American people, if we accept this, if we accept this level of sacrifice without that level of planning? Almost everyone in this room, of my contemporaries—our feelings and our sensitivities were forged on the battlefields of Vietnam; where we heard the garbage and the lies, and we saw the sacrifice. We swore never again would we do that. We swore never again would we allow it to happen. And I ask you, is it happening again? And you're going to have to answer that question, just like the American people are. And remember, every one of those young men and women that don't come back is not a personal tragedy, it's a national tragedy.

You cannot say it any more powerfully than that. That was not some politician. That wasn't one of our elected Senators. That was General Anthony Zinni, who knows a great deal about

sacrifice and about what it is to go into circumstances like this without a plan.

So I think it is incumbent upon us to ask the questions: Where is the plan? What will it cost? Why can't we get better international support? How long will our troops be there? When will they come back? What level of cooperation are we getting from the Iraqis themselves?

If you read the papers in the last couple of days, we are not even getting full support from the Iraqi Council.

I think it is critical, especially in these days before the supplemental is brought before the Senate floor, that the level of debate, the questions that we have a right to ask, are asked and answers are given. Where is the sacrifice, you might ask, when the average tax cut for those at the top 1 percent is \$238,000 this year? Where is the sacrifice for those who benefit the most?

We are asking a lot of sacrifice from our soldiers. We are asking a lot of sacrifice for those veterans who come back. Then we tell them we are not going to give them the full measure of support in the budget for the health care needs they have once they are here? You see the bumper stickers: "Support Our Troops." What happened to our veterans? Why don't we see the same bumper stickers with some advocacy, some recognition of the need to support our veterans, too? But it is not in the administration's budget. We are told we can't afford it. We are told they have to just suck it up and sacrifice. The sacrifice is not being borne equally, and that is what many of us have been asking a long time—why not? Why not?

So I look forward to the coming days where we can have an all-out debate. Many of us will be presenting alternatives, amendments to this request by the President. We will have more debate about that matter. I know there are other Senators who wish to be recognized and to speak in the time that we have remaining.

I yield such time as he may wish to the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. REID. I ask Senator DODD be given the last 2 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in baseball you have seen the teams pile onto each other. That only happens on one occasion, generally, in baseball, which I understand quite well. One of the pitcher's weapons is to throw a ball inside, and that happens all the time to keep the batter loose. But you never throw at someone's head. That, in effect, is what happened here, and that is why we have had the Senators rallying here because, in effect, someone threw a ball at the head of one of our Senators, and that is not right.

I appreciate very much Senator DODD, whom we all know is a close personal friend of Senator KENNEDY—I

would expect nothing less—defending his close personal friend. But he also defends the institution itself. He is in the process not only of defending his close personal friend but the institution.

As we have said, people who deliver a message that this administration doesn't like are attacked. There is no better example of that than Senator DASCHLE, who has been attacked personally with TV ads being run against him in his own State by people who are just voicing the administration's line. There have been many other ways he has been attacked.

When it comes to rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure—the electric grid, the water supply, the highways—I think there are a number of questions that need to be answered for the American people. People may not have liked how Senator KENNEDY phrased his objection to what has gone on and what is going on, but he said it. He raised issues. Let's not attack him; let's talk about the issues.

I have some questions. What are the assumptions underlying the President's request for \$87 billion, and how many months for reconstruction will it cover? Why haven't we done more for Afghanistan? That is a question I have. What is the best case scenario for international contributions? What will the administration request next year? What is going on with Iraqi oil revenue, which we were led to believe would pay to rebuild the country? What happened to their seized assets?

Another question is, Why is the contracting process less transparent than U.S. law requires, and which companies are profiting from these contracts? What is the status of the Iraqi Army and the police?

The American people deserve answers to these questions. That is why Members of Congress, including decorated Members such as Congressman MURTHA and Senator HAGEL, have been raising these and other questions. No one should question their patriotism. They are doing their duty just as Congressman MURTHA and Senator HAGEL did when they wore the uniform of the American military.

No one should dream of questioning the patriotism of Senator KENNEDY, who has served the body for four decades. He doesn't have all the answers of what is going on in Iraq, but he has a right to ask questions. The responses to his questions, unfortunately, have all been too familiar. Whenever someone has the temerity to criticize the actions of this administration, the response is a personal attack.

A former Member of this body, Senator Max Cleland, was the first to recognize the need for the Department of Homeland Security. But he didn't agree with every detail of the administration's plan for that Department. So this man was attacked and his patriotism was questioned during the 2000 Presidential race. Even Senator MCCAIN, who served 7 years in a pris-

oner of war camp in Vietnam, was attacked because he did not agree with the President on every issue.

The list goes on. It should trouble any of us when Americans feel free to raise questions about the policies of their Government and then are criticized. What troubles me is when those questions go unanswered and personal attacks take place.

I have asked questions about today's plan in Iraq because my ultimate concern is the protection and safety of our troops. I will do anything I can to support our troops in every way possible. They will get every dollar they need for security and ongoing military operations. But I don't want to give Iraq a blank check, while our children get a bounced check for education, while our efforts to rebuild our own roads and power grids go begging.

The President has the responsibility as commander in chief to bring the international community together and rally our allies behind a comprehensive plan that will complete our mission in Iraq. We cannot continue to fight a war without a plan for victory.

Mr. President, we have a lot of questions. It has nothing to do with one's patriotism. We have a right to ask these questions. I say to the administration, please don't attack the person who asked the question. Answer the question.

I yield whatever time I have remaining to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 4 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip, Senator REID, for their comments, and Senator LEAHY for his comments as well.

As I said a few minutes ago, I voted to give the President the authority to use force. Others didn't. I respected that decision but reached a different conclusion. I am just concerned when I hear the debate shift, as it has this morning, from what we need to be doing in Iraq to get this right, to those who take a different position or question the motivations that led us to this particular point. By the way, going back looking historically, the comments Senator KENNEDY made—whether you agree or disagree with them, and I don't think they ought to be the subject of the debate; the debate ought to be about Iraq—go back to January 19, 2002, and Karl Rove, Chief of Staff of the White House addressing the Republican National Committee. I quote him while speaking to that group. According to the Washington Post story, his top political advisor said this:

... Republicans will make the President's handling of the war on terrorism the centerpiece of their strategy to win back the Senate and keep control of the House in this year's midterm elections.

We can go to the country on this issue because they trust the Republican Party to do a better job of protecting and strengthening

America's military might and thereby protecting America.

He goes on to say:

The second place we should go to the country is on protecting the homeland. We can go to the country confidently on this issue because Americans trust the Republican party to do a better job of keeping our communities and families safe.

That is the top political advisor to the President in January of 2002 suggesting that in fact we can make this a partisan issue. You may not like the statements of Senator KENNEDY, but there is a genesis here that could draw a conclusion that there have been political motivations.

My view is simply, look, to spend this morning debating what one of our colleagues said on an interview someplace detracts from what ought to be the subject of debate: how do we get it right in Iraq? That ought to be the common challenge. We have a major request of \$87 billion in front of us and there are legitimate questions being raised about how to do this, how to get this right. We ought to be spending our energy and time and that of our staffs on organizing and debating and discussing how we can get this right as a coequal branch of Government, constitutionally charged with the conduct of foreign policy. This body deserves—in fact, its history and the country demand that we do a much better job of focusing on the foreign policy matter before the Nation and the world, getting about the reconstruction, and getting the political and economic questions right in Iraq, and taking our time to debate what one Senator says seems to be, quite transparently, an effort to divert the attention of the country and the media to one of our colleagues rather than the far larger issue, and that is whether we are going to go further into debt without paying for these additional moneys that are deserved for our military, certainly, and questionably on the reconstruction effort.

My hope is we can move away from the debate of what one colleague says and start talking about what needs to be done to get this situation in Iraq on the right track.

Certainly, if you go back and look at the history, as I said earlier, the suspicions that the administration was motivated in part by politics are rooted in the fact that the top political advisers of this administration have made the case to their own party faithful that in fact part of their motivations are to look at gaining political favor. It was a great disappointment then because there was a sense of unity in the country about fighting terrorism together, getting homeland security right together, and certainly getting Iraq right together is what we ought to talk about. There are legitimate issues. Why are we not getting the international support? Where will the money come from? Are we going to get ourselves further into debt? How are our needs at home going to be addressed? How are we going to get the Iraqis back in control of their country?

These are the questions we ought to be working on—not whether some colleague made a statement you disagree with and that we organize ourselves in a structured response to that, rather than take the time we ought to in order to get a situation that the American public wanted to know more about, which is a deep problem that is getting worse. The longer we fail to address it and try to divert attention to other matters, it does a great disservice to our men and women in uniform and to the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I hope any further debate about what one colleague says would be confined to how we can get the Iraq situation on the right track and how we are going to spend the bulk or a good part of the \$87 billion on the reconstruction phase of Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

STANDING UP FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 4 minutes. I think a lot has been said here about the words of Senator KENNEDY. I don't think anyone on the floor has cast aspersions on the Senator. He certainly has a right to say anything he wants to say. But I also think many of us who believe the President is trying very hard to do the right thing for our country have the right to take up for our President, stand up for our President, and talk about the issues.

I think Senator KENNEDY would be the first to say he should stand by his words, he must take responsibility for his words. It is my opinion that when you use words such as "fraud" and "bribery" in talking about the policies of the United States, it is fair game for us to respond to that and say I think it is absolutely wrong to say we are bribing political leaders all over the world by giving them American dollars.

We are giving foreign countries American dollars for a variety of reasons. Is it a bribe that we would make a loan to the country of Turkey after Turkey has just led the command and control of the security forces in Afghanistan, doing a great service for all of the people of the world to try to help keep the peace and security in Afghanistan, which was very costly to a relatively small country? That we would be making loans to Turkey, is that a bribe? I don't think so. Is it a bribe to give money to Russia for part of its economic improvement? I don't think so. I think Russia has shown it can be quite independent. So has Turkey. No one is accusing them of doing everything the United States has asked them to do. But foreign aid is part of American policy and, in most instances, foreign aid goes for buying American products. It gives them the money to buy American products to help our economy.

So I think when people use words, they should be able to take responsibility for those words, and I don't think it casts aspersions on anyone's patriotism.

But if anyone questions my right to stand up for my President who is speaking before the United Nations as we are talking on the floor today, then I think they are wrong. Of course, we are going to stand up for him. Why would that be a surprise? We are in a terrible war on terrorism. We are doing everything we can to support the President as he prosecutes that war. It is not for helping other countries exclusively. It is for helping America. It is for American security that we are in Iraq and Afghanistan—to keep terrorists on their soil so they do not come to American soil again.

The President has not forgotten 9/11. Sometimes I think when I hear people talking that they have forgotten America was attacked.

People are talking about an \$87 billion package. It is a big package. Many of us are trying to ask for contributions from other countries to help defray the cost of rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan. But let me remind you about the cost of 9/11. The cost of 9/11 is estimated at \$300 billion, and that was one incident. What will be the cost if we allow terrorists to come in here because we haven't contained them in Iraq and Afghanistan? What will be the cost to the American people?

We have a right to stand up for our President, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are trying to talk about the policies that are important to our country.

I yield up to 4 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, after which I will yield the remainder of our time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Texas noted the irony of our standing on the floor of the Senate at the very moment the President is speaking to the United Nations. He is speaking before the United Nations to rally the world for our efforts in Iraq. As we stand on the floor of the Senate, some Members are calling into question the President's actions and calling into question the President's motives. It is one thing to call into question his action. It is one thing to call into question his plan. But to call into question his motives is one of the things that I think disturbs many people on this side of the aisle, and, frankly, many members of the American public.

The Senator from Nevada said that some Members here have been using the baseball analogy of throwing a high hard one at Senator KENNEDY's head to back him off the plate. Having reviewed what was said here this morning, I think the best thing we can throw is a change-up on the outside

corner. Hopefully, we have gotten a strike since we have been accurate in what we are saying. But it was not put to anybody's head and it was not thrown hard. These were principled statements about the accuracy of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. We did not comment on his motives. We did not comment on his patriotism. We commented on the accuracy of his statement, which is a legitimate discussion here in the Senate. I hope we keep to that.

We have had a debate on the floor of the Senate. Senator DASCHLE again questions the planning and actually questioned whether there was a plan. He used terms which were used back in 1948. A Senator Revercomb said, "I charge tonight that there are no restraints placed upon those who administer this act"—similar to what Senator DASCHLE and Senator BYRD said. In fact, the statement has been made describing it as a "blank check." Senator BYRD from West Virginia has used that term repeatedly on the Senate floor—only this comment is not about, obviously, the Bush plan in Iraq; it was about the Marshall plan of the Truman administration.

It is remarkable as I have gone through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House and the Senate about the debate and the way it happened 3 years after V-E Day. Not 3 months was the plan put into place, not 3 weeks was this plan put into place—it took 3 years for the Truman administration to put a recovery plan into place in Europe and for Congress to act on it.

Back then Members of Congress talked about how this was a blank check which was going to be a failure and it was unwise policy. Of course, it is now seen as one of the greatest foreign policy accomplishments of this country's history. Why? Because we had a President at the time—and who at the time was not popular among the American people for what he was doing—who was seen as someone who was not providing a great plan or strong leadership but he stuck to his guns. He went to the American people at election time, and the American people sustained him in office because he provided leadership at a time when leadership was needed; when Members of Congress were looking at their own parochial interests instead of the interests of the country and of the world such as, again, is the case here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I certainly join my colleagues in underscoring the fact that, of course, this shouldn't be a discussion about motives or patriotism. This is not a discussion about a former Senator, Mr. Cleland, or any other individual. All of us have the right to disagree on issues of substance.

Senator DODD was absolutely right. The issues of substance that we should be discussing are how to succeed in