

not true. We know there are 31 nations that currently have troops deployed to Iraq. British troops are leading a multinational division, as are the Polish troops; and the President hopes to have at least one more international division helping to bring stability and security.

I think those people claiming the President has lost opportunities to make his case before the American people ignore the many times the President has spelled out his case and argued his case before the American people, to this Congress, and, indeed, multiple times now to the United Nations.

The President's opponents continually move the goalposts further and further, so that never is there enough detail or never are there enough specifics. But we have these claims. These claims are specious; they can be rebutted one by one.

I think the most powerful rebuttal is what the Iraqi people feel and what they say. Finally free to speak their own minds in a remarkable poll—the first of its kind—conducted in August and published by the Wall Street Journal, the Iraqi people themselves say loudly and clearly that they want us to stay and they want us to finish the job.

They are optimistic about the future. Seven out of ten say they expect that their country and their personal lives will be better 5 years from now. A third say much better. When asked about which country they would prefer as a political model out of five—Syria, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Egypt, or the United States—the most popular by far is the United States.

A majority of those who hold an opinion have a negative view of terror leader Osama bin Laden, and 74 percent of respondents want to see Saddam's henchmen punished. They want us—not Saddam or Osama bin Laden—to stay and help make their country whole.

The President has submitted a reconstruction plan to us with three clear objectives: to improve security by aggressively hunting down the terrorists; to expand international participation; and, finally, to help Iraq and Afghanistan become free, democratic, and stable nations.

This week, there are a number of hearings being conducted on both the Senate side and the House side to closely examine the President's proposal and to assess what is needed in a thoughtful way. These proceedings give us all the opportunity to ask questions and allow the administration to demonstrate how, when presented accurately, carefully, and clearly, we can achieve the objectives we have set out in the war on terror.

The debate, I hope, will continue to be dignified and serious, and in good faith I believe we can complete consideration of this emergency request by the end of next week. There are a lot of questions being asked. I encourage that. Ultimately, I am confident we will overwhelmingly support the President's request.

Mr. President, we will stand by the Iraqis. We will help them build a free, prosperous, and democratic country. Their future security—indeed, our security—and the security of civilized people everywhere depends on it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, for not to exceed 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee, and 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

Who seeks time?

The Senator from the great State of Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to call on the Senator from Mississippi for the first 10 minutes or so of my time, after which Senator MCCONNELL and then Senator SESSIONS will speak, all of them for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT BUSH AND OUR TROOPS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise this morning in support of President Bush and our troops as this Nation continues to fight and win the war on terrorism in Afghanistan, Iraq, and around the globe.

We all know there are many great attributes in our United States of America. The people of America will rise to any occasion and will do what is necessary to protect freedom and opportunities for themselves and future generations. But there are some attributes on which sometimes we fail a little bit. One of those is we are a bit short sometimes in our memory, remembering back to what happened a few years ago. Sometimes our patience is a little short and we want immediate action. We will rise to any occasion, fight off any chaos, but then we want to deal with that situation and move on to something else.

I think that is a little of what we are seeing now as we listen to what I consider to be sometimes overheated rhetoric in questioning motives and resisting doing what is necessary to complete the job: a little patience, a little commitment to support freedom and democracy which we are trying to assist in Iraq and in the war on terrorism.

I said we seem to have forgotten. What happened to that era of the great Senator Vandenberg who stood up and

said, when it comes to foreign policy and war, partisanship ends at the shoreline, or something to that effect; that when we are dealing with an international problem, a conflict, a war, we are all together. Or even more recently, Lyndon Johnson aggressively supported the policies of President Eisenhower even though the leader of the Republicans at the time, Senator Taft, did not necessarily go along with it. But there was a bipartisan policy.

We have had that in our efforts to deal with these very difficult issues in Iraq and Afghanistan and homeland security, but it seems to be a little frayed right now. I think that is dangerous. I don't think it is good for America. I don't think it is good for what we are trying to achieve in fighting terrorism around the world. I don't think it is good for our troops.

Also, how short is our memory that we don't even remember the debate that was going on 1 year ago? We were discussing what to do about Iraq. The President was then going to the United Nations, and Secretary Powell had been to the United Nations. We were demanding more information. We were saying the President needed to go to the United Nations. And in each incident, he actually did what people were asking him to do. He did it. He went to the United Nations. He made the plea. Unfortunately, the United Nations didn't support what they said for 10 years in a dozen resolutions. They said: We can continue to negotiate; more inspections, more inspections. They would not step up and take action against this brutal tyrant, Saddam Hussein. But we did. America did. The President did. The Congress did. That is the point I am trying to make.

We had this debate. We knew what we were going into. We had looked at the intelligence. Was the intelligence perfect? No. Is it ever? It is always subjective. But we voted in this body 77 to 23 for the Iraq resolution. The House of Representatives voted almost 300—296—to 133. So we should not forget that vote. We should not forget the tremendous successes that have been enjoyed in terms of getting Saddam Hussein out of his position where he was spending money on palaces and allowing the people to suffer. He was murdering his own people and his neighbors. The infrastructure was just decaying beyond repair. We stepped up, and we did the same in Afghanistan. Our troops did a great job. Now are we going to say, It's your problem? Do we really expect the French to do the job? I don't think so. We are going to have to stay the course. We are going to have to do this job, and there is nobody else going to do it for us.

Oh, when the problem is in their immediate neighborhood, such as Bosnia or Kosovo, the Europeans say: You must lead; you have to come in. We supported that operation. Almost every action that was requested by President Clinton we supported, sometimes very reluctantly. I remember thinking: OK,

I support the bombing of the site in Afghanistan and the Sudan, because we thought they had chemical precursors. They didn't have them. But generally we came together and we provided leadership.

I saw a lady from England on TV this morning. Somebody asked her: Why do the Europeans and other people in the world not feel good about Americans right now? She said: It is because you are leaders; the world expects you to do the job. You do the job, and they are jealous of you. They want it, but they don't like it. It is human nature. We should not be too hard on them. I called on cooling the overheated rhetoric, and I want to remember that myself. We all overspeak and overstate our positions sometimes, but this is serious stuff with which we are dealing.

We called on the President a month ago: Mr. President, you have to step up and remind us what the vision is. He did. He went on TV. He rocked us back on our heels. He didn't ask for \$55 billion or \$65 billion to do the job as we thought he would. It was \$87 billion. Oh, yes, I was a little stunned. I don't like the deficits we are beginning to have. They were caused by the economy, 9/11, by the stock market problems—all kinds of situations. Still, that kind of money deserves some close examination.

I have been saying for several days now I want some answers. As representatives of the people, we should ask for answers. We deserve that. Exactly how is this money going to be broken out? Fifty-one billion dollars will go for the Iraqi campaign; \$11 billion for the Afghanistan campaign. It is not over. Are we are going to follow the example of generations of failure in Afghanistan or are we going to finish the job there? Of course, Noble Eagle, \$4 billion for homeland defense. The job goes on.

We have the list of where the money would go for reconstruction, and I have asked questions. Mr. President, there is \$5 billion for border enhancement. We need that because terrorists are coming into that country from all over the region to attack our coalition troops—the Americans, the British, the Poles, and the United Nations. We need to do more—basic electricity services, water and sanitation services, transportation, oil infrastructure.

Some people have said and I have said: Why don't the Iraqis do more on their own? They are going to have this oil coming in; they are going to have oil. They don't have it. They are broke. The infrastructure is more decimated than we ever dreamed. So I have questioned this money, but I have looked at it. I have thought about it. I listened very carefully to Ambassador Bremer yesterday, and I am convinced we have to do this. We have to have the money for our troops to do the job, for homeland security, for the reconstruction, and we have to do it now. It is a critical part of restoring security right now.

Leaders who are working with us are being intimidated, assaulted, and murdered. People from whom we had been getting information, who were helping us get people into the police and developing a force for the future, have withdrawn because they are a little concerned whether we will stay the course.

A lot of it is affected by the people's attitude. Right here, in the DC area, we have people without power. It weakens defenses. So we need to move in there quickly without going through an international organization, without trying to hassle through a loan arrangement, and provide the money so we can get the power back on, so we can get the water flowing.

There should be a process that others join in. Surely, countries of the United Nations, if it is worth anything, will help the Iraqis with their humanitarian needs as they continue to rebuild the infrastructure, as they try to develop their own government. Can the United Nations help with that? I hope so. I would like to give them a chance. I have not seen a lot yet, but they could.

After we get over this initial phase, I think the reconstruction money right now is every bit as important as the security money. It is a part of the security. We want to stop the assault on our troops. We want to begin to get the border under control. We have to do it and we have to do it now. A year from now it will be worse, maybe impossible.

So I came this morning to say I did not just leap to accept this amount of money. I did question how it could be done, but I am convinced if we do not do this, others will not follow suit. We are going to be going to other countries around the world that should be of assistance, Japan and countries such as Turkey that can hopefully provide some troops. We are going to ask them to ante up and kick in. But we are going to have to set an example. If we haggle over the details of this arrangement, they will not do their job. Then we are going to have to go to countries such as Russia, France, and Germany and say they have to forgive the debt that they have accumulated over a period of years because they were working with Saddam Hussein. We have to lead. We have to set an example, but it is tough.

I am going to support the whole package. We should do it quickly because if we do not, this moment could get away from us, and we could just walk away, leave that country and those people, that region, in chaos. In the end, if we do not stop it here, over there it will be here. So I urge my colleagues to stand up; let us do what we did last year. Let us do the right thing; let us finish the job.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks time?

The Senator from the great State of Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the com-

ments of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Mr. LOTT. He has been in this body a long time. He has wrestled with a lot of difficult issues. He knows that a lot of times, one just has to lead. They have to stand up and be counted and do the right thing. Once a nation commits itself, a Congress commits itself, there is no way we can turn around and waffle around next week based on some polling data or some comment from France or the U.N. That is not the way great nations behave.

I am proud of the United States of America. We have stood up. We have been counted. We have been on the side of right in the world. When should look at the wars and decimation that has occurred in Afghanistan. I was there a few weeks ago and they are rebuilding houses, using the same procedure of straw, mud, and brick covered with a mud stucco, that they have used for 2,000 years. They are building everywhere in Afghanistan after 20 years of oppression, war, and destruction, to a degree that few nations in the world have ever seen.

These are good and decent people, but Afghanistan was used as a base from which to attack the people of the United States of America. The Government of Afghanistan would not renounce that, would not say they were going to stop it, so the United States of America led. We have changed that Government. Anybody who has seen President Karzai, as I had the opportunity to do—and we have seen him on television—knows that he is a man of vision, talent, and decency. He loves the people of Afghanistan. He wants to see them succeed and do better.

The same is true of Iraq. I was there also, and I saw the oppression, the total devastation of a country that had every opportunity to be so much better. The people should have had a better life than they did, but Saddam Hussein took his people into war after war. He developed weapons of mass destruction. His megalomania led him to believe that he could be the next Nebuchadnezzar and take over the Middle East, then rule the world. Do not think his goals did not include developing the most dangerous weapons the world has ever known. He was prepared to do that, and he did that.

When he would not renounce these weapons or demonstrate that he did not have those weapons, so we moved against him and his sinister aims. We have liberated that country.

There have been a lot of complaints, and we debated this on the Senate floor many times. Those who complain have expressed concerns of all kinds. They said there were going to be problems in the Arab streets, the Arab nations would all turn against us, there would be street-to-street fighting in Iraq, we would lose thousands of soldiers, it would take months and months to succeed, the weapons of mass destruction would be used against our troops, we would bog down, there would be a humanitarian disaster, there would be

starvation and refugees everywhere by the millions, and we did not have enough troops to win the battle.

All of those things and more were raised. We talked about them. We debated them, and everybody had their say. We had open hearings and closed hearings. We read, we talked, we debated for months on end. There was not any secret about it. It was not any plan hatched in Texas. It was a plan voted on and debated in this body. We voted 77 to 23 to commit the United States of America to this action. Our military performed better than anybody could ever have imagined. Decisively and swiftly they defeated the Iraqi army, ousted them from power completely, put Saddam Hussein on the run, put an end to his evil sons, and have set about to establish a good government there.

I was in Mosul and was introduced to the city council. They have an Arab, a Turk, a Christian, and others on that council. They were men of ability and wisdom. We talked. They love the city of Mosul and the country of Iraq, and they want an open, free society where people with whatever beliefs can be able to function. They want to renounce and turn away from the past of Saddam Hussein. That is true all over this country, but it is difficult. It has proven to be a challenge for us, no doubt about it, to completely have peace and order in that large country.

I am pleased when I go and see soldiers from my State of Alabama, many of them National Guardsmen—I had dinner with them and talked with them. They believe they are making a difference in this area of the Middle East, where there has been so much disorder, so much oppression, so much killing, particularly in Iraq. Millions have died as a result of Saddam Hussein's wars and oppression at home. One can go there and see the graves. With the energy and dedication of these fine soldiers, I think we are going to be successful.

I am glad President Bush went to the United Nations. It is an organization that deserves our respect. It is entitled to courtesy, and President Bush has given it that. The Christian Science Monitor today said President Bush went to the U.N. yesterday with a message of both reconciliation and resolve, and that is exactly what he ought to do. Reconciliation, we want to talk to them and deal with their concerns, but we are resolved.

What then is our difficulty with the U.N.? I will share a couple of thoughts. The first is, the U.N. is incapable of taking decisive action. It has not done so in Iraq. It has never done so in its history. Why? Well, the Security Council requires unanimity in order to act. Russia is on the Security Council, as well as France, Germany, and others. Some rotate on each year or two, and they serve a period of time. The idea that they can get a unanimous vote is almost impossible. So decisive action is not possible. It has never happened, and it is not going to happen with the

U.N. But President Bush did get a resolution that Secretary Colin Powell worked so hard on, which in my view—authorized us to take military action.

Then they said they wanted another resolution, and we sought that. Then France flipped on us, and Germany said no. France even lobbied other countries around the world and blocked a further vote.

What were our options then? Do we just stop and not defend our legitimate national interests? Do we not carry out the foreign policy we believe is in our interests? Should we make it our policy to cede the decisionmaking authority the American people have vested in us, our elected President, our elected Congress, to some world body that has proven incapable of decisive action? I don't think so.

I believe we are on the right track in with the U.N. The President is showing respect to this group, but we are not going to allow the decision making power of our country to be shifted to the U.N. We are not going to turn over our military that the American people have supported, funded, and created, the finest military the world has ever known—we are not going to turn it over to them. In Kosovo, that is basically what we did. The NATO nations met to deploy our Air Force. We did that, and they kind of liked that. Maybe they think that is what the world is going to be like from now on, but it is not. We have a responsibility to lead.

As Tony Blair asked the question: Why America? Why now?

He said: My answer to you is that it is your destiny, it is your time. Who else can do it?

I believe in the values of this country. I trust our wisdom. I trust our good judgment. I believe in what we are doing, and I believe it is good for not only America but the world. I don't apologize for that, and I don't believe some socialist leftover Marxist veto in the U.N. should stop us from doing what is necessary for the world.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we all watched with great interest the President's remarks at the U.N. yesterday. When one looks at the U.N., it is impossible not to have kind of a mixed view. Certainly the U.N. has, on many occasions over the years, done worthwhile work. But rarely, if ever, has it taken the lead on anything of significance.

The reason for that, obviously, is that the membership is so diverse. Many of the governments that are represented there of course are not democracies; they are not particularly interested in what America stands for, so it is not entirely surprising that the President's decision—and the support of Congress for that decision was 77 out of 100 votes to change the regime in Iraq—was viewed with mixed reactions at the U.N.

Had the United States waited on the U.N., Saddam Hussein would still be in power. But that is not what the President decided to do. The President led a coalition of 19 willing governments to liberate the people of Iraq. Although many in the U.N. actively opposed and many others were just completely ambivalent about that effort, there is no question that the world is better off with Saddam Hussein gone.

Make no mistake about it, that regime is no more. The only Iraqis who are not immensely better off are those who perpetrated crimes against humanity on a massive scale and abetted in the murder of 300,000 innocent Iraqi civilians. Not since Saddam Hussein was in power have innocent Iraqis been hauled off in the middle of the night to rape rooms and torture chambers. Not since Saddam Hussein was in power have innocent Iraqis been summarily executed. Not since Saddam Hussein was in power have ethnic and religious minorities been gassed or murdered at will by a tyrannical regime. And, yes, Saddam Hussein no longer provides succor and support to international terrorists who plot the murder of Israelis, Americans, and everyone who opposes their radical interpretation of Islam.

There are no more terrorist training camps in Iraq, and Saddam Hussein no longer cuts checks to support suicide bombings in Israel. The Iraqi regime is no longer pursuing weapons of mass destruction, and it will never be able to use them against its own people, not ever.

Are there problems in finishing the job in Iraq? You bet. But free Iraq remains hostile to terrorists and to tyranny. President Bush noted yesterday that there are still challenges in Iraq and they are challenges that confront all free nations. The terrorists are making a desperate last stand in Iraq and, frankly, I would rather be fighting them there than fighting them here.

The world's challenge now is to secure Iraq. We know nobody else is going to do that job for us. That is an American responsibility. We would like to have help from others, and we are going to get help from others, whether the U.N. officially endorses some kind of American effort here or not. But we are going to lead this effort and we are going to finish the job.

We are going to have a great debate here next week about providing the funds to finish the job. There will be a lot of amendments offered, a lot of amendments voted on, a lot of speeches made. But at the end of the day, with a bipartisan, overwhelming majority, the Senate is going to give the President the money to finish the job. We are helping the Iraqis round up terrorists and the Baathist thugs who oppose liberty for the Iraqi people. We are helping the Iraqis to rebuild roads and schools and hospitals. We are helping the Iraqis to build for themselves a multiethnic moderate democracy in the very heart of the Middle East.

This is a great cause. We ought to be rallying behind it. This is everything for which America has stood for several hundred years. Everything we believe in, we are promoting in Iraq. The Iraqis will be better off. The world will be better off when we finish this job.

Failure is not an option. Waffling around here just because the going is a little tougher than some had expected—and others had anticipated—is not what is called for at this particular time. Going home early is surely the way to reinvigorate al-Qaida and to make it possible for some other kind of tuggish regime to come to power there in Iraq.

Given the magnitude of the threat the proliferation of Islamic radicals and terrorism pose, not only to us but to the entire world, I am a little mystified that this seems to have become so controversial. As Senator LOTT was pointing out just a few moments ago, we have very short memories. Just 2 years ago, 3,000 of our people were killed in New York and in Washington. That is what this is all about: Taking the war to the terrorists where they are rather than here on the streets of the United States.

So, yes, we will have our debate. It will be vigorous. But at the end of the day, I am confident that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, is going to do what is right for the Iraqis, for the United States, and for the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I heard and appreciate Senators LOTT, SESSIONS, and MCCONNELL speaking this morning about the importance of what we are doing in Iraq. We are preparing in the Senate to take up a supplemental appropriations bill at the request of the President to try to make sure we do two things:

First and foremost, to give support to our troops in the field. I visited them in the middle of August. I have seen how they live, and I have seen what they are doing. They deserve to have the troop support which allows them to do the job—the equipment, the living conditions, and troop protection. Everything we can do to allow them to do their jobs more effectively we are going to do. That is what the major part of this supplemental appropriations will do. We are going to support our troops in the field.

The second thing the President is asking for is money to rebuild Iraq. We will not be able to rebuild Iraq if we continue to have the ongoing terrorist attacks that tear down everything we have built. So we want to go in there with a full plan to get the electricity grid going, to get the water supply going, and to try to start building the economy by rebuilding the oil infrastructure.

We are going to support the President in his request. I have no doubt about it. We must win this war, and we must win the peace. We must stabilize

Iraq if we are going to keep the terrorists out of our country and stop them where they are.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

REBUILDING IRAQ

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, Mr. President. I will use my leader time this morning so as not to take away from the allocated time in morning business for the Democratic caucus.

I wanted to come to the floor this morning to respond perhaps in part to the comments made by our distinguished colleagues.

I will start by emphasizing that there are many areas for which there is absolutely no disagreement. I don't think you will find any disagreement in the Senate today that it was a good thing that Saddam Hussein was removed from power. We acknowledge that it was a good thing. Saddam Hussein posed serious threat to the region, to his country, and to the United States. His absence is a positive development.

There is also broad recognition that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to our troops and to the military overall for the extraordinary challenge they face and the success with which they face it.

Let us also recognize that there is little disagreement that it is important to Iraq and this country that we allow for the reconstruction of Iraq. I think many of us are very concerned. This is where some of the disagreement and differences may begin to arise about the extraordinary lack of planning that went into the reconstruction effort. Some have suggested that we planned for months—maybe years—for the military effort, and it shows. It was a great success.

I have been told—and I will not say that this is confirmed, but I have been told—that we planned for less than a month on efforts to reconstruct Iraq. That also shows, if that is true. I think it is a fact that reconstruction has certainly not met with the same success and with the same degree of support within our own country that the military effort itself has.

That is where we come to our point of disagreement. I regret that the President lost the opportunity that he had yesterday in making his presentation to the United Nations. He lost an opportunity to make the case for broader involvement in the world community. He didn't ask for more troops. For whatever reason, he didn't ask for more resources. He failed to build the broad coalition that will be required if ever we are successful in the future reconstruction of Iraq. There is no disagreement whatsoever that it is in our interest to find ways to engage the world community more effectively and to make a better effort at public relations required to do it successfully in Iraq.

There is a front-page story in the Sioux Falls Argus Leader this morning about an Iraqi businessman from Sioux Falls who, months ago, left Sioux Falls to work in his hometown in Iraq as they began to rebuild. He became very involved in the creation of a new government. He was an ardent opponent to Saddam Hussein. He commented this morning that he comes back with grave regret about what he has seen. He said that, unfortunately, more and more Iraqis are losing their confidence and trust in the reconstruction effort; that more and more we are losing the public relations battle.

While we all want to find a way to ensure that we are successful, it would be wrong for us to bury our heads in the sand, to plow forward, to salute the flag, and say: Look, everything is just great. All we need is more money.

We can't do that. We have to make an honest assessment of our circumstances, acknowledge that there is work to be done, and be honest with ourselves and the world community on how we accomplish all that we have set out to do. To do it successfully requires candor first and honesty second. Unfortunately, we have not seen enough of that today.

We are being told that we are going to rush through this request for resources, \$87 billion—a couple of days of hearings, a quick markup, a couple of days of floor debate and, bang, it is done. I have to say that isn't going to happen. We have to be deliberative.

As the Senator from Kentucky suggested, we have to consider alternatives, offer amendments, have a good debate, and make sure this \$87 billion was committed appropriately.

I say that the President missed his chance to speak candidly yesterday. I would have hoped that he could have laid out a plan, and that he could have been very specific with regard to how we more effectively put this coalition together. We hear so much discussion about the involvement of other communities. We are told that we would expect the world community to produce about \$55 billion in resources to match the \$87 billion requested by the President by the United States. Yet, again, yesterday Ambassador Bremer had to acknowledge that out of that \$55 billion expectation, the world community has only provided \$1.5 billion.

I would have hoped the President could have been more specific with regard to our plan for troops. What will they be doing? How long will they be there? To what extent will we have to keep them there, and for how long?

Over the course of the next couple of weeks, it would be my hope that the President could come to the Congress with very specific requests with regard to that \$87 billion and with regard to the resources he says he needs. I hope he could lay out with some specificity what his plan is for the reconstruction of Iraq. We were told by Ambassador Bremer yesterday that the \$20 billion