

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

Iraq and how to do the right thing for homeland security. But at the same time, all of us are responsible for the words we use and the terms we use and what it conveys not just to the American people but to our allies abroad.

In this regard, I was most concerned about the use of the word "bribery" in reference to foreign assistance. I think that was a mistake. I think that was not just a poor choice of words but a counterproductive choice of words, because to suggest that the funds we provide for reconstruction is bribery suggests that all of the foreign assistance we engage in around the world is misspent, or, again in the worst case here, bribery.

I believe our foreign assistance should be scrutinized, should be debated, and that we should strike the right balance, but in all cases the foreign assistance that we provide around the world should be used to further our national security interests. That is an important issue of substance. The funds we are providing to Iraq should strengthen security in the United States and should strengthen the stability and security of the people in Iraq and in the region of the Middle East.

In all cases, we should scrutinize that foreign assistance budget. But to refer to it as "bribery" I think is a mistake. It sent the wrong message to our allies and to those who are benefiting from our economic support, foreign military financing program, and even our humanitarian aid around the world. It is for our national security interests and the purposes for which we do that, and our debate should reflect that point.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2691, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2691) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 1731, to prohibit the use of funds for initiating any new competitive sourcing studies.

Reid amendment No. 1732, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain lands located in Nye County, Nevada.

Reid amendment No. 1733, to provide for the conveyance of land to the city of Las Vegas, Nevada, for the construction of affordable housing for seniors.

Daschle further modified amendment No. 1734, to provide additional funds for clinical services of the Indian Health Service, with an offset.

Daschle further modified amendment No. 1739, to strike funding for implementation of the Department of the Interior's reorganization plan for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee and to transfer the savings to the Indian Health Service.

Bingaman amendment No. 1740, to ban commercial advertising on The National Mall.

AMENDMENT NO. 1734

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes equally divided prior to the vote in relation to the amendment No. 1734.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will take 5 minutes to talk briefly about this amendment.

I have had an opportunity to come to the floor on a couple of occasions. Basically this comes down to whether or not we mean it when we say we will provide meaningful health care to our Native American population. That is what we are talking about today. Unfortunately, as most people know, we are far from that promise. It would take about \$5 billion for us to fulfill the promise and to live up to the expectations on the reservations that we see with health care delivery in the rest of the country—\$5 billion for the IHS clinical services account.

This year's budget is \$1.9 billion—less than half of what it would take to meet that obligation. As a result, today there is severe rationing of health care on every reservation—rationing so severe that they call it the "life or limb" test. Unless your life or limb is in jeopardy, you often do not get care on a reservation today.

This chart shows as clearly as anything can just what the commitment made to the Native American people is today when it comes to health care.

We spend about \$5,915 per capita on Medicare. We spend about \$5,200 per capita within the VA. We spend about \$5,000 per capita in our population generally for health care. We spend about \$3,800 per capita for every Federal prisoner—\$3,800 a year goes to our Federal prisons on a per capita basis for health care alone. We spend \$1,900 for Indian children and their families, in spite of commitments we have made for four generations.

What this amendment does is very simple. Last spring, when we had this debate and when we offered the amendment to the budget resolution to make whole the Indian health care budget, it was defeated. We proposed that we try to level the playing field. That was defeated.

What the Senate agreed to, reluctantly on my part, but agreed to nonetheless, was \$292 million, one-tenth of the amount required to make the IHS clinical services budget whole, to provide some parity between Indian health and prison health. That was incorporated in the Senate version of the budget.

Now we are simply saying: Let's live up to what the Senate said we would do on Indian health this year during the budget debate. Let's provide that \$292 million, one-tenth of the amount required, if we are going to do this right.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how someone could vote against this, knowing, as we do, we are giving one-half the amount of money to Indian children as we are to Federal pris-

oners. We are giving a fraction to the Native-American population that we give to Medicare beneficiaries.

This amendment simply acknowledges our need to rectify that extraordinary disparity, to deal with it in a way that only we can, to say it is not enough just to talk about it, not enough just to lament it, we have to do something about it. Granted, \$292 million is a far cry from what is required, but at least it is what the Senate said we would do last spring. It is now time to put our money where our mouth was last spring. This amendment is intended to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, this amendment provides an additional \$292 million for the Indian Health Service. There is no offset.

I don't doubt the numbers the Senator from South Dakota presented. They are factual. I do not doubt his passion for this subject. But let's take a look at what is really happening.

Since we have focused on that, over the last 5 years we have added \$725 million funding to the IHS account. In addition, thanks to the work of my colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we have provided \$30 million per year for diabetes efforts. We know that is one of the primary focuses in Indian health for the following 5 years. That amount was increased to a total of \$100 million beginning in fiscal year 2001. Reauthorization of this program has ensured that \$150 million for the next 5 years will be available beginning in fiscal year 2004. In short, over the last 5 years, well over \$1 billion in new money has been provided in order to improve the health care within our Native-American community.

Within the extremely limited resources this subcommittee has been given over the past several years, we have been responsive to the needs of Native Americans and we will continue to make every effort to provide the additional dollars within the overall allocation we were given.

We know well, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know well, what happened last year. Under their leadership, the IHS account was reduced by \$75 million in the final hours before markup in order to reduce the subcommittee's allocation. Clinical services alone were reduced by \$50 million.

Saying that, despite the decrease, we still have a problem even with the additional moneys we put in this year. We understand the problems in the Indian Health Service. We are \$88 million over last year's level, and the adoption of this amendment would exceed the subcommittee's allocation and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the Senator yields the floor, I will be recognized for what remaining time I have.

This amendment is not offset. Yes, we are told we cannot afford \$292 million. We need \$2.9 billion. We are told