

called the Reconstruction Finance Authority, and that that authority use Iraqi oil as collateral for loans, or as security for bond issues. That financing would then be used to reconstruct Iraq. This is Iraqi people, using Iraqi oil, to invest in Iraq. It has nothing to do with the United States getting its hands on Iraqi oil. But it does have to do with relieving the burden on the shoulders of the American taxpayers, the responsibility to pay \$21 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq.

When I asked Ambassador Bremer about this, I said: Mr. Ambassador, why can we not collateralize or securitize Iraqi oil, and let Iraq oil pay for the reconstruction of Iraq? His answer was: Senator, Iraq has a very substantial foreign debt. It owes a lot of money to other countries, such as Russia, France, and Germany, he said. Therefore, it can't pay for the reconstruction.

After the hearing, I did some research on Iraq's debts. I discovered, in fact, that Iraq does owe a fair amount of money. It was Saddam Hussein, of course, who committed his people to those loans and other things. Saddam Hussein's government doesn't exist now; he is not there; he has vanished. But it is true that Saddam Hussein had foreign debt. The largest debt, however, is not—as Mr. Bremer suggested—to Russia, France, or Germany. The largest debt the country of Iraq owes is to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Oh, they owe some to Russia, France, Germany, and others, to be sure. But the largest debt is to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

Wouldn't it be perverse if, as Ambassador Bremer suggested, Iraq oil had to be pumped out of the ground to provide the cash that would allow Iraq to send money to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait—two of the wealthiest countries in the world—so that the U.S. taxpayer could come in on the back side and reconstruct Iraq? In other words, does it make sense for the American taxpayer to ante up the money to reconstruct Iraq because Iraq's oil has to be used to send checks to the Saudis?

I am sorry, I came from a really small town, but I recognize something really stupid when I see it. Has this town lost all common sense?

Perhaps we can pump a little common sense back into this system when we have this debate on the floor of the Senate tomorrow. I intend to offer the same amendment tomorrow on the floor of the Senate, and I intend to get a vote on it. I know it will be second-degree and we will have all kinds of machinations. I intend to hang in there and get a vote eventually on the amendment I offered in the Appropriations Committee.

I intend to ask this question on behalf of the American taxpayers: Do you really think this burden ought to belong to the American taxpayer? Don't you believe a country with the vast resources that exist in Iraq ought to be able to produce these resources from their oil and invest back into that

country? The answer is clear to me, and I think it is clear to a lot of Americans.

We have debates on a lot of issues here, and I find it interesting that sometimes there is an issue of \$2 million, sometimes \$20 million, sometimes \$200 million, or perhaps \$2 billion, and we spend countless hours debating that. Well, this is \$20 billion. This is a \$20 billion "urgent emergency" that is being moved without a lot of debate.

The Administration has proposed a whole list of things for Iraq as part of this \$20 billion request, including English as a second language training, advanced business classes, computer literacy training. The Administration wants to improve Iraq's sewer systems, because only 6 percent of Iraqis have good plumbing. Under the Administration's proposal, about 12 percent of Iraqis would have good plumbing.

Another interesting item the Administration is proposing is marshland restoration in Iraq. I find it really interesting that they would describe marshland restoration as an "emergency."

There are so many things in this 55-page document, that I hope all of my colleagues will read, which represent the urgent menu for reconstruction in Iraq, and the question that will be asked, or should be asked, is: who bears the burden?

I am not suggesting reconstruction is not necessary. It is very likely that when Iraq has this reconstruction—and perhaps that should happen sooner than later—Iraq will be a safer and a better place with an expanded economy, and perhaps we will be able to bring our troops home earlier. And I obviously want American troops to be able to come out of Iraq as soon as possible and let Iraq control Iraq's destiny.

I believe reconstruction will be a part of the key to doing a lot of important things in the future of Iraq.

But I believe the question of how do you function with this reconstruction issue hanging over our head, as to who should finance it—I think that is a critical question.

I cannot tell you how many times we have come here to talk about joblessness in this country, people losing jobs. My colleague, the other day, talked about Huffy bicycles. I went to one of these big department stores—I will not describe the one I was at—and I saw a big row of Huffy bicycles. They used to be made in Ohio. Not anymore. All of those jobs are now Chinese jobs. They flat out moved all of those jobs. So if you buy a Huffy bicycle, you are buying a Chinese bicycle. Why? There are lower wages over there.

We have all these issues about job training, joblessness, trade, promotion of U.S. products and commodities, and so on. But when we offer an amendment, we are told we just don't have the money, we are deep in debt. But all of a sudden, when it is Iraq reconstruction, it is Katie bar the door; we have as much money as you need; it doesn't

matter. All of it has to go for that; you cannot take one piece out because it is part of a package, it is symmetrical. Boy, it is one of these things where, when you pull a loose string on a cheap suit, the arm falls off.

So I think we need to rethink the Administration's request with respect to reconstruction.

Now, let's make sure we support our troops. This country should not send its sons and daughters to war and then say we won't support them.

But on the issue of reconstruction of Iraq, let's make a better decision and a different decision, especially with respect to the use of oil revenues and the resources that exist in Iraq.

I will speak tomorrow on that amendment. I see my colleague from Alaska is here. He sat in the chair from 10 o'clock to 5 o'clock this afternoon chairing the Appropriations Committee. While we had some disagreements and perhaps raised our voices a couple of times today, he is a chairman for whom I have the greatest respect. The way he handled that committee today demonstrates his skill in this Chamber. I only wish he would support my amendment. It would be a whole lot easier to adopt it. It probably would not even have a recorded vote if he were supporting it.

I thank him for his leadership in the committee. I hope we will have an aggressive and full debate about these issues tomorrow when he brings the bill to the floor. I will pledge this: I know they want to move along to deal with these issues, so I will come to the floor early and offer my amendments. I want to have a full opportunity to discuss and debate them. The chairman will not have to inquire about whether I am going to come to the floor at some point soon. I will be here when we bring the bill to the floor tomorrow and hope to play a constructive role in improving the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, after a lot of discussion over the course of the day, a lot of progress having been made due to the chairman and ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, the Democratic leader and I wanted to come to the floor and clarify and share with our colleagues how we see the next several days, and actually the first few days after our recess, play out in the sense that our mutual goal is that we address the Iraq and Afghanistan emergency supplemental bill in a

way that allows adequate time, appropriate time for debate, discussion, amendments, and voting.

Knowing this Iraq supplemental would be delivered to us about a week and a half ago, we set out with the plans of last week being very intensive in terms of hearings, the flow of information, with the goal this week of addressing this bill on the floor of the Senate.

Today, a few minutes ago, the chairman and ranking member reported out the supplemental bill through the Appropriations Committee and thus it is ready to be brought to the floor, which we expect to be tomorrow. We will be propounding a unanimous consent here shortly in that regard.

We would see that bill be debated on tomorrow, the next day, and Friday—for the next 3 days—again with adequate time for amendment and debate. Then at the close of business Friday we would begin our recess and spend that next week on the recess, which is through the 13th, and on Tuesday the 14th return and continue with that debate over that week.

The agreement is essentially that we would complete action on that supplemental bill by the end of that week, the week of October 14th through the 17th, by close of business October 17.

In coming to this agreement, it is with a lot of good faith on everybody's part that we will be able to consider all amendments that pertain to the supplemental request, recognizing there will be a lot of amendments on both sides of the aisle and that we deal with those in a way that is fair to both sides. That is the general framework, and I will turn to the Democratic leader to further elucidate on what this general understanding is.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would simply acknowledge that the majority leader has described our understanding very accurately. I believe we are in a position now to agree to the motion to proceed. It would be our expectation we could take the bill up tomorrow morning. I understand the majority leader has suggested maybe an hour of morning business and then we would take up the bill and begin the debate with amendments to be offered by colleagues on both sides.

It is our expectation that we will have an opportunity to offer these amendments and get votes, either on or in relation to—that is a tabling or an up-or-down vote—on these amendments. But it is also our understanding that we will work to finish this bill, as the majority leader has described, by I believe it is October 17, which is that Friday after we return. I think that gives the Senate adequate time to address the bill, to consider amendments. Obviously we need cooperation from Senators on both sides of the aisle with regard to the time requirements because, as the majority leader noted, there are a number of amendments to be offered. The only way we can assure Senators have a voice and have the op-

portunity to be heard is to accommodate all of those who wish to offer amendments by limiting some of the time that will be required for the debate on these amendments.

So it is my hope that working through our managers and my extraordinary partner, the assistant Democratic leader, we can orchestrate the debate with amendments in a way that will accommodate this schedule.

But it is a fair schedule, it is an appropriate schedule, and I think we have the basis of experience now from which to draw the confidence that we can make this work. We have tried this now on several appropriations bills with success without exception. I am hopeful we can demonstrate once again that we can be successful in this—I think the majority leader used the right phrase—good-faith understanding of the way this bill is going to be considered.

I strongly support the effort and hope we can have the good debate we anticipate and expect the cooperation of all Senators as we enter into this arrangement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will simply close and say it is important for our colleagues to understand that the Democratic leader and I and our assistant leaders and the managers have all worked very closely to come to this understanding, working with good faith as we go forward. I appreciate the cooperation on both sides of the aisle in that regard.

With regard to tomorrow, I do ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, October 1, at 10:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill for Iraq and Afghanistan, provided further that it be for debate only until the hour of 12:30, and that the time be equally divided until that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, with that being the case, I think we have a good outline and good plan to address this very important issue, where the difference in philosophies will be expressed and where we can improve where this particular bill needs to be improved.

With that understanding, I think we could announce no more votes for tonight.

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

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

FAA BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Congress, through legislation, has de-

manded that airport baggage screeners must be public employees. That was a conscious decision made by this Congress, and it was signed by the President.

As a government, we should be equally clear that air traffic controllers should also be public employees accountable to the people they serve.

Acting responsibly, the House and Senate both passed provisions in their respective FAA bills that would retain the inherent "governmental function" of the FAA air traffic control towers and employees. But instead of affirming that the safety of air travelers is the responsibility of the U.S. Government, members of the conference committee, at the urging of this administration, passed a conference report that allowed for immediate privatization of 69 air traffic control towers, some of them among the busiest in the country. This was a failure of policy and a failure of process.

Recognizing the committee's mistake, the House of Representatives has now moved to recommit the bill to conference. Hopefully, the conference committee will follow the mandate of the Senate and House and refrain from trying to privatize air traffic controllers.

This is something that boggles the mind of the people of Nevada and I am sure the people of Tennessee and around the country. When the House and the Senate pass a measure by large votes and it goes to a conference committee, which is made up of just a few members, they should not completely change what the Congress did. That is what they have done here, and it is wrong.

In addition, it will be important for the conference committee to readdress issues dealing with the essential air service, cabotage, and flight attendant security training.

It would be a mistake for the House to hastily convene a conference committee that simply strips language dealing with privatization. The conference report must contain language that blocks an administration directive to reclassify air traffic control services as "commercial." This simply clears the way for private contractors to take over.

Keep in mind that private contractors putting things out for bid at the lowest possible price and looking for profit are going to be controlling air traffic in and out of airports. I don't think that is a good idea.

The people who direct air traffic in and out of our airports are performing critical public safety functions. I hope our colleagues in the House will understand that a conference report that simply strips privatization language will not pass the Senate.

This is in no way to threaten or cajole. In fact, it is just the opposite. It is an effort to beg the House of Representatives to do the right thing.

This FAA bill is important. We want to pass an FAA bill. But the conference