

the floor at the end of last week in colloquies going back and forth, late nights are to be expected.

We are at war. There is a war against terrorism. We are talking about security in Afghanistan and Iraq. It deserves the focus of this body. I have asked my colleagues to make their schedules available so we can have full participation. It does mean that during the days and, I suspect, well into the evenings this week, we will be participating in that debate. We do want to finish this emergency appropriations bill this week.

Again, as I mentioned, next week we will be out on recess and into the week after that. The President has made it very clear that the urgency demands we address this bill as soon as possible. That will be this week, and it is our intention to complete that this week.

I thank my colleagues in advance for what will be a challenging week for all of us. I expect the American people can be proud this week as we deliberate on the many complicated issues on which we will have votes to decide those issues and we will then complete our work on this request by the end of the week.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Alaska, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 2 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Alaska, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUTTING \$87 BILLION INTO CONTEXT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my remarks will not be lengthy, but I entitle them as follows: "Putting \$87 Billion Into Context."

The Senate will soon consider the President's request for an additional \$87 billion to fund the U.S. occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan and to aid in their reconstruction.

The \$87 billion supplemental brings to a total of \$194 billion the amount the United States is spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let me repeat that. The \$87 billion supplemental brings to \$194 billion the amount the United States is spending in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than twice what the administration had led the public to believe just a few months ago.

The 1991 Persian Gulf war, by contrast, cost \$61 billion, of which the United States paid only \$7 billion. That is \$7 billion spent in 1991 compared to \$194 billion today, almost 28 times higher.

The Bush administration's \$87 billion supplemental request is the largest emergency spending request since 1977. The \$87 billion request, just for Iraq and Afghanistan, just for next year, roughly equals, in current dollars, the total amount of money spent to rebuild the entire continent of Europe after World War II. The request is larger than the \$74 billion the Defense Department plans to spend on all new weapons purchases next year. The request is more than twice the administration's entire \$35 billion homeland security budget for next year. That means that for every \$2 spent on the President's supplemental request for Iraq, the administration will spend less than \$1 on homeland security here at home.

The \$20 billion the President is seeking for Iraq's reconstruction is \$2 billion more than we are spending for foreign assistance for every other nation on the planet. The \$87 billion request is 50 percent more than we spend on education for the entire United States. Let me say that again. The \$87 billion request is 50 percent more than we spend on education for the entire Nation.

With \$194 billion spent or requested, the President's war spending in 2003 and 2004 already exceeds the inflation-adjusted cost of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Persian Gulf war combined. The cost of the war and postwar occupation of Iraq will soon surpass the \$196 billion inflation-adjusted cost of World War I. The monthly bill for the United States military missions in Iraq and Afghanistan now rivals spending during the Vietnam war.

At \$87 billion, the President's request is larger than the economies of 166 countries. It is larger than the individual economies of almost half the States of the Union. That is a lot of money.

If approved, the President's request would increase the Federal budget deficit for fiscal year 2004 to \$535 billion; in other words, more than half a trillion dollars. I will say that once more. If approved, the President's request would increase the Federal budget deficit for fiscal year 2004 to \$535 billion.

The White House is now in danger of violating its own self-imposed limit for budget deficits, 6 percent of gross domestic product or \$600 billion.

The administration hopes it will receive an additional \$30 billion to \$55 billion from other countries and Iraqi oil revenue over the next 2 years, but that money may never materialize. Iraqi oil production is 1 million barrels per day less than before the war. The oil infrastructure has been hobbled by severe looting and sabotage. Certain pipelines have been struck by a series of attacks since the United Nations lifted sanctions this summer. Iraq's oil revenues are likely to fall short of even the most modest expectations of this administration.

As for the tens of billions of dollars the Bush administration is hoping to receive from other countries and international financial institutions, President Bush's request has fallen on deaf ears. The Bush administration has alienated most of the international community. After the Presidential swallowing of pride and having asked the United Nations for help, the Washington Post summed up the President's fundraising efforts with the headline, "Bush Fails To Gain Pledges On Troops Or Funds For Iraq."

Increasingly, it appears as if we are on our own in financing the occupation and the reconstruction of Iraq. I urge my colleagues to exercise patience before approving this request. This is not just an ordinary supplemental bill. This is not just a token amount of money. It is the beginning of a major commitment of resources in behalf of the American taxpayer. Before we act, we should make sure that taxpayers understand the size and consequences of this request and what will be asked of them in paying for it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call, which will be shortly announced, be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAQ APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, one of the most important issues we may face all year is an issue we are going to be working on this week, and that is the urgent supplemental appropriations to continue and, we hope, wind up our efforts in Iraq. I know there are many different views. I think a little historical perspective may be in order. Some people are even questioning why we are in Iraq. I run into people in my home State who think, as some of the German media apparently does—I saw a report today—that September 11 was just a conspiracy of the United States, and that we really were not under a terrorist attack.

Well, we have known for some time the dangers that terrorism present to the world and to those of us here in America. It was very clear back in 1998:

One way or the other, we are determined to deny Iraq the capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. That is our bottom line.

President Clinton, February 4. Then again on February 17:

If Saddam rejects peace, we have to use force. Our purpose is clear. We want to seriously diminish the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program.

President Clinton, February 17.

And even better, here is a quote from a day later:

Iraq is a long way from here but what happens there means a great deal here. For the risks that the leaders of a rogue State will use nuclear, chemical or biological weapons against us or our allies is the greatest security threat we face.

So stated by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, February 18.

Well, after the tragedy of September 11, 2001, President Bush very forcefully outlined a program to deal with terrorists. He said: We are going to bring terrorists to justice or we will bring justice to the terrorists. He pointed out that we would no longer permit States to harbor terrorist groups, to provide safe havens for terrorists who need the opportunity and the time and the money and the financing to build their terrorist operations through which they could strike the United States.

Well, during the 1990s we did not respond—Khorbar Towers, our embassy bombings, USS *Cole*. We treated them as isolated instances when, in fact, they were part of a terrorist scheme. You cannot retaliate against a suicide bomber. You have to deal forcefully. That is why President Bush said we will go after the terrorists, wiping out terrorists where we find them and undoing the governmental structure which protects them.

Well, we have been successful. Magnificent military efforts in Afghanistan disbanded the Taliban. A magnificent, unbelievable effort in Iraq totally shredded the Saddam Hussein government of tyranny and authoritarianism, a government of rape and poisoning of their own citizens. But now we face what President Bush said is going to be an ongoing battle, a continuing battle,

the battle against terrorism itself—not just this particular Government or location.

We have before us a request from the President of the United States for \$87 billion. Most of it, about \$67 billion, is to protect our troops and to keep them there and to keep them safe. Another \$21 billion will help the Iraqi people build a country free after 30 years of terrorism, torture, and repression and to develop their own military, their own police force, their own security, their own justice system so they can be safe and start to rebuild the economic structure of their country.

Now, \$87 billion is a lot of money. Make no mistake about that. That is really a huge sum. But last week we had extensive hearings with Secretary Rumsfeld, General Myers, and representatives of the State Department and the Department of Defense. I asked them, What was the cost of 9/11? How much did it cost?

We know it cost 3,000 lives or more in the Twin Towers, in the field in Pennsylvania, and here at the Pentagon, and that is a huge tragedy. But when you take a look at the monetary side, the best estimates are a couple hundred billion dollars because we did not deal with terrorists before they dealt with us. They struck us on our territory, on their terms.

The President of the United States came to the Senate and, by a vote of 77 to 23, the Senate authorized him to wage war in Iraq. We did that. We won. But the terrorists are there. The terrorists come back into Baghdad like a roach motel. All the low life, the hideous assassins, the suicide bombers are coming back. And we are fighting with them, we are dealing with them there. We need \$66 billion. It costs well over \$4 billion a month to keep our troops there.

The people of Iraq, in response to opinion polls, have clearly said, by an overwhelming majority, that they want us there because they see the difference that has happened in their country. They know with the Baath Party still functioning, remnants of the Republican Guard, al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups coming in there, they are not safe unless they have a security shield. Right now, we are that security shield. And we are doing some good things as well.

One of the things Secretary Rumsfeld pointed out was the tremendous progress we are making to help Iraq get back on its feet so it is safe. In less than 5 months, virtually all major Iraqi hospitals and universities have been reopened. They are taking down huge caches of weapons that have been stored away by the Saddam government and by terrorists.

Mr. President, 70,000 Iraqis have been armed and trained and will be graduating into the military, and 40,000 Iraqi police are conducting joint patrols with coalition forces. A new Iraqi council has appointed government cabinet members. Iraqi municipal councils

are functioning in almost all towns and villages, and some 8,000 civil affairs projects have been undertaken by our troops.

Now we need to do something more. We need to win the peace, and this \$21 billion is the best investment we can make in winning the peace. Because only when we have won the peace and put in place an Iraqi military and police force and government that is able to protect itself can we safely bring our troops home and not worry about having to go back 5 or 10 years later, after they have rejuvenated their chemical and biological weapons programs and perhaps achieved the goal of nuclear explosives. We will not have to go back again and do what we just did.

The terrorists are firing at our troops over there. The war on terrorism is going on in Baghdad. But make no mistake about it, they are not just shooting at our soldiers and innocent Iraqis and Iraqi police; they are shooting at American public opinion because their greatest hope is they can sow discord in the United States and force a pull-back of our forces before the peace is won, to allow all those horrible terrorists to regroup and come together and launch another attack against their neighbors, against those who have been friendly with us, and, yes, against the United States.

I hope we will have a good, vigorous debate. I hope we can move quickly to pass the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Let's vote on it up or down. Let's get it moving and support our troops, but let's also get it moving so we can win the peace. Right now, with our forces over there, the battle in the war on terrorism is focused on Baghdad. It is tragic it has to be anywhere, but we have carried the battle to them. Because of the strong leadership of this administration, we are fighting the battle of terrorism in Baghdad—not in Boston or Boise or Ballwin, MO or Belton, MO.

I believe that reports from our troops in the field, who say, "Yes, this is dangerous, this is deadly, but we would rather be fighting them here than on our homeland," are right on. The people who are over there know what their mission is. They know how important their contributions are to safety and security, not just in Iraq, and in their neighborhood in the Middle East, but to our own safety, our own well being.

Mr. President, 62 percent of the Iraqis in Baghdad, according to a Zogby poll, believe the hardships they have faced since the war have been worth it to rid the country of Saddam Hussein, his evil sons, and the brutal regime. That is an incredible vote of confidence for what the United States has done.

In a different poll, when asked how long U.S. troops should remain in the country, two-thirds of the Iraqis said the U.S. troops should stay at least another year. I am afraid those numbers are higher than we would get in the Senate right now, but it tells you what