

appreciation to you and Senator MIKULSKI, who was so enthused about this man when she told us who the chaplain was going to be.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the comments by the assistant Democratic leader. I will just briefly add to that, because so many of our colleagues do have the opportunity to be with the Chaplain in many ways that America doesn't see. Just two nights ago we were at an event for adoption from foster homes. Our colleagues and others see the Chaplain open this body every day. That is something that is apparent. What they don't see is the fellowship, the contributions, the nights, like two nights ago, where the Chaplain represented, yes, the Senate; yes, the Congress; but indeed the United States at events at night, giving the invocation before 900 people, 6 blocks from here in the Reagan Building.

He is the 62nd Chaplain, a great heritage to follow. We are delighted to be able to have his fellowship, his leadership, and his counsel as we go forth each day.

#### 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 be a period for morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes of the time under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee, the second 30 minutes of time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. On behalf of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE CONFIRMATION HEARING FOR GOVERNOR LEAVITT

Mr. INHOFE. It is my intention, Mr. President, to come down here and share something that happened last Tuesday that has never happened before in the history of this institution. I chair the Environment and Public Works Committee. We had a confirmation hearing for Governor Leavitt from Utah, a highly qualified nominee by the President to be administrator of the EPA. The Democrats boycotted the meeting. They obstructed the meeting just by boycotting it, not showing up. I am going to be talking later on today about that, but it is my intention now to talk about the subject the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Texas

have before us, because it has such great ramifications to our Nation's security.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ SECURITY

Mr. INHOFE. The whole issue of the \$87 billion is so misunderstood by most of the American people, I would like to try to put it in a context that is more understandable. First of all, you are talking about \$87 billion, of which \$66 billion is going back into the military. Most of that is rebuilding the military for what happened to the military during the 1990s, and to rebuild it, to get us up to be able to meet the challenges that are very serious today. I would like to go into more detail on that, but there is not time in this 5 minutes.

But I would say this, of the \$87 billion—and you take away the \$66 billion—we are talking about \$20 billion, less \$5 billion. It is very important we understand this; \$5 billion of this will be going toward border security, having nothing to do with rebuilding infrastructure, rebuilding any of the water systems, electrical systems, the highways, the other infrastructure systems we are going to have to get done.

It leaves \$15 billion.

The big discussion here is—and I know it sounds good to the American people and it sounds good to my wife—with all of the potential oil revenues, why don't we restructure this as a loan as opposed to a grant? There is very good reason for that.

CSIS has come up with an analysis of the debt that is owed currently by Iraq. It is not just \$140 billion or the \$200 billion figure you have heard. When you put the claims in there that would have to be subordinate to the \$383 billion, if we do restructure this as a loan, it would come in only after \$383 billion has been repaid by some source. We all know logically that would never ever happen. But the rewards of expending this \$15 billion and doing it quickly, as the President is requesting, are immense. To have a friend in that country of Iraq in the Middle East would have a great benefit for us.

When you stop to think about just the cost of petroleum for the no-fly zone, that amounts to \$15 billion each decade. If we don't do this, we are going to be right back in that box where we didn't finish the job we should have finished in 1991 and 1996. Now is the time to finish the job.

I suggest to you that the greatest disservice we could do to our troops on the ground over in Iraq would be to stall this thing, to not get over there and put the necessary money in to fix the infrastructure.

I am not sure how many people in this body know how much our troops are doing. They are actually putting roofs on buildings, they are actually constructing houses, and they are doing things on their own with their own labor. They desperately need to have us come in and make the necessary fixes.

We have had a success story. My gosh, we have had over 5,000 businesses started. The hospitals and clinics are now open. The schools opened 2 days ago, and 56,000 Iraqis are now working in the security control system.

All of this can continue only if we get the \$15 billion over there for the reparations and to take care of the infrastructure. If we don't do that, we are leaving our troops out there in a very dangerous situation.

I would like for everyone to remember their history a little bit.

The Treaty of Versailles was in 1919, at the end of World War I. France insisted on leaving \$32 billion in debt for the Germans to pay. As a result of being covered up with debt and knowing there was no possible way out, they became ripe for Hitler to come along. And we know the rest of the story.

That is the same situation we are facing in Iraq right now. If we don't come to the table with the \$15 billion and get in there and start repairing the infrastructure and continue the success we have had so far, and do it immediately, then we are going to leave our troops hanging out there to dry.

For the sake of national security, the most significant thing we probably will be dealing with—certainly in this year and maybe during our entire careers—is to get the money in there and get the job done, and this time not do what we did in 1991 or 1996 but finish the job and bring this country back up so it can be our ally in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, one of the anecdotes about politics I enjoy the most and that I think is most illustrative of some of the situation that is going on now with respect to Iraq relates to the late Pauline Kael. She was the movie editor for the New Yorker magazine. In 1972, when Richard Nixon won an overwhelming and historic victory in the Presidential election, carrying every single State except Massachusetts and the District of Columbia, Pauline Kael was terribly surprised. She said when commenting on this: Nixon can't possibly have won. I don't know a single person who voted for him.

There might be some who will say that speaks well of her circle of friends, but it demonstrates that she lived in a very tight intellectual circle and had no real contact with what was happening in the country as a whole.

I cite that because I think that is what is happening with respect to reporting in Iraq right now. I had an experience over the weekend which I will share briefly before I yield the remainder of our morning business time to the Senator from Texas.

An old friend from Utah and his wife came to Washington on a tourist visit, and I took them around to the various monuments. This man and his wife expressed great concern about Iraq. The wife said: We have real problems in

Iraq. I said: Yes, we do. Tell me what they are, from your perspective.

She said: People are dying all the time, and we are making no progress whatsoever, and we have no plan of making progress. We are in real trouble in Iraq. I said to her: Let me ask you a few things. I said: Are you aware of the fact that about 90 percent of the country is peaceful and that the attacks on Americans are taking place only in what is known as the Sunni Triangle, which goes from Baghdad to Tikrit, and that outside of the Sunni Triangle Americans are not being attacked and killed? She said: No, I didn't know that.

I said: Which country do you think is providing the most troops other than America to help fight for security in Iraq? She said: I guess it is the British. I said: No, it is not the British. Not the British? Is there another country that has more troops in Iraq fighting for Iraq besides the British? I said: Yes. It is the Iraqis. She said: What do you mean? Why, there are close to 50,000 Iraqis under arms providing security support for Americans. She said: I didn't know that.

I said: How many schools do you think have been reopened since the war? She said: I assume probably none. I said: No. I said: 90 percent of the schools and hospitals are now operating. She said: I didn't know.

I will not prolong the time because the Senator from Texas wishes to speak. But the point is that we have in the American press today a lot of Pauline Kaels, someone who said, I don't know a single person who voted for Richard Nixon, in the face of the most historic landslide we had with Richard Nixon. We have press people who are telling us what is going on in Iraq who don't know anybody who has anything good to say about what is going on in Iraq.

I have said before and I will conclude with this: During the height of hostilities in Iraq, to watch television, it was clear we were losing the war on CNN. But, fortunately, we won it on Fox. Ultimately, the fact that we won came through even to the CNN executives.

I think the good things that are happening in Iraq will eventually come through, even to the people at CNN and the New York Times and some of the other places that are living in a Pauline Kael world.

I yield the remainder of our morning business time to the Senator from Texas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I inquire how much time remains on our side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the President, and I thank the Senator from Utah for the courtesy and the opportunity to rise to say a few words about the President's budget request.

I want to be clear about this. The sooner we accomplish our mission of securing Iraq and freeing the economy and stabilizing the government, the sooner our young men and women will be able to come home and we can turn Iraq over to the Iraqis so that they can enjoy the blessings of self-government and liberty.

By the same token, the longer we delay in voting on this supplemental request, the longer we delay in getting money that is needed both to support our troops and to restructure that troubled region and the longer it will be before our troops will be able to come home to their families. Slowing this funding request merely delays the return of our troops from harm's way. And that should not be the role of the Senate, either unintentionally or otherwise.

We all know that the Congress voted to authorize the President to use necessary force to remove Saddam Hussein's regime last November. But there are some in this body today who appear to be playing the politics of the moment, making claims that seem to exploit for political gain the hardships that our military is enduring in serving the cause of freedom. This is nothing more than crass political games. They certainly have no place in this body.

I have the utmost respect and regard for my fellow Senators. Yet I must confess that I am dumbfounded at how soon some have appeared to forget the truth of Saddam's vile regime. The fundamental question we ought to be asking is, Are the Iraqi people better off today than they were under Saddam's regime? The answer to that is unequivocally yes. Are the American people safer today than they were when Saddam was in power? Again, the answer is unequivocally yes. The only remaining question is, Have we finished the job we started with Saddam's ouster? The answer to that question is no. But we must and we will.

I had the honor of traveling to Iraq with members of the Senate Armed Services Committee last June. I was sickened by the inhumanity evidenced by the mass graves, holding some 300,000 Iraqis and others who were victims of Saddam's regime. I was also shocked to learn from a U.N. representative that there are some 1.5 million people simply missing. We do not know whether they are dead or alive.

The suggestion in the face of these silent witnesses that Iraq, the Middle East, indeed the entire free world, are not better off today than before we took Saddam down is simply false.

Today there is religious freedom and human rights in Iraq unlike anything experienced during Saddam's regime. The Iraqi people now have hope, they have a future, something that must have seemed only like a dream to them a few short months ago.

I am proud to commend President Bush for the resolute leadership that he has demonstrated in pursuing the

war on terror both in Iraq and around the world. Everyone who has been engaged in this fight, whether it is the most junior recruit or the Commander in Chief, is doing a remarkable job under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I strongly believe we must remain committed to finishing the job in Iraq by supporting this supplemental.

I ask those who oppose this supplemental or who want to slow it down or who want to cut it in pieces and engage in lengthy delay, what is the message America sends to our enemies in the war on terror if we are shaken in our commitment? Do we doubt our mission so easily? Do our international commitments mean so little? We did not undertake the war against terror because it was easy. We undertook it because it was the right thing to do, because it was necessary to make America safer.

As I said, there are some in the Senate who have advocated separating the moneys requested in this \$87 billion supplemental between assistance to the troops and reconstruction of Iraq. I am opposed to any such separation and I am glad we voted down an amendment yesterday on that issue. Some argue that we should loan the money to Iraq instead of providing it to Iraq in the form of a grant—that is, that portion that should go to reconstruction. If we are to get our young men and women in uniform back home as soon as possible, which should be our goal, and turn the government over to the Iraqi people as soon as possible, which should also be our goal, we should not allow for any delay in the delivery of these funds.

General Abizaid, the CENTCOM commander, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that these reconstruction funds are inextricably intertwined with the security of our men and women on the ground.

I also believe it would be foolish to extract what would be only an illusory guarantee of loan repayment, and the delay in getting such loan funds to those who need it on the ground will likely jeopardize the security of our troops, according to General Abizaid.

The economic assistance and the reconstruction support requested today are essential to the success and security of our troops and essential to our success in Iraq. We must build up Iraqi security, we must gain the confidence of the Iraqi people by improving the infrastructure, and we must begin the capacity to deal with all of the threats they face on the ground.

I share my colleagues' concerns and their sense of fiscal responsibility when dealing with taxpayer dollars. I strongly believe we should be good stewards of the taxpayers' money at all times. I wish this newfound concern pervaded all aspects of our fiscal responsibilities in Congress, not just this one. We cannot preach fiscal restraint on one hand and practice fiscal irresponsibility on the other. True, responsibility cannot depend on political convenience.

The numbers we are dealing with today are hard for many to grasp but boil down to the American taxpayer, according to a recent USA Today article, this way: Each year American households spend about 1 percent of their income on alcoholic beverages, another 1 percent on tobacco products, and we spent about .7 percent of our income on cosmetics. To put it into context, if this request were approved, our combined operations to combat terror in the Middle East and Afghanistan will have cost .8 percent of our income next year, a bit more than we annually spend on makeup and shampoo and a bit less than we annually spend on alcohol and tobacco. Significant? Yes. Budget busting? No. Worth it? Yes.

The American people are well aware that we are engaged in a Presidential election season and they recognize the difference between those with an honest difference of opinion and those who seek to exploit the President's handling of the war purely in order to gain political advantage. I find something particularly unsavory about the comments of those who seek political advantage in questioning our commitment to our troops and our dedication to winning the war on terror. Those who spend their time playing political games with our mission in Iraq, even as our young men and women labor to secure and stabilize that fledgling nation, do a dishonor not only to themselves but to our soldiers in the field and the memories of those who have sacrificed everything they had opposing Saddam's blood thirsty regime.

There are clearly obstacles to overcome in Iraq and there will certainly be setbacks along the way, as we have seen. I only hope the politics of the moment do not drive criticism that only serves to undermine our commitment to winning the war on terror and American resolve. We must not cut and run. We must not leave the Iraqi people with a promise unfulfilled. We owe it to our young men and women in uniform to give them our unequivocal support as they labor on in a dangerous place for an honorable cause.

Our troops, I am convinced, have the will to win. I only hope our politicians share that will to win.

As President Kennedy said 42 years ago:

Let every nation know whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

I only wish those who are consciously or not intent on denying our troops what they need to finish the job and to get home as soon as possible will stop to reconsider. We have liberated Iraq of Saddam Hussein and now we must simply finish the job. We seek to make Iraq secure, to make it a place where the rule of law can be established so that civilian leaders, including the Iraqi Governing Council, can establish a new government for a new nation. This is not an easy task and it is not

without cost. But it must be done, so Iraq can flourish as a free nation, and so that the victories won, the lives lost, will not be in vain.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CONFIRMATION PROCESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I understand Senator DOLE is coming to the floor, and I just want to, until she gets here, say a few words about what happened at the Environment and Public Works Committee yesterday when the confirmation of Governor Leavitt of Utah was being considered.

I have the honor of serving on four committees in the Senate, including the Judiciary Committee, which, as we all know, has proven to be a particularly contentious committee, with the unprecedented filibuster of some of President Bush's most highly qualified nominees.

But yesterday, for the first time, we saw some of the politics of the Judiciary Committee, the obstructionism there, pervading the Environment and Public Works Committee, for the first time, when it came to considering and voting on the nomination of Governor Leavitt of Utah to serve as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Rather than have a debate, rather than have an honest debate, and then an up-or-down vote on this important nomination, what we saw was simply a boycott. Members of the committee on the other side of the aisle simply decided not to show up, making it impossible for us to achieve a quorum and impossible for us to vote on the confirmation of Governor Leavitt.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how those who claim to be pro-environment would simply obstruct the confirmation of a highly qualified nominee and leave the Environmental Protection Agency headless. Denying leadership to that large agency concerned with the protection of our environment and enforcement of our environmental laws and claiming to be pro-environment strikes me as inconsistent.

So I fear that as the primary season approaches for the Presidential race in 2004, what we are seeing again is the unfortunate intrusion of Presidential election politics into the work of the Senate.

Unfortunately, what that means is the people's work is not being done; the Environmental Protection Agency is denied the confirmation of a highly qualified nominee and is left leaderless.

Certainly that cannot be pro-environment under any stretch of the imagination.

Some said there were 400 questions in writing that had been submitted to Governor Leavitt, which, in fact, he did his best to answer. But at least one Senator said: Well, I don't really care about the answers to the questions. I am going to vote to confirm him, but I want him to go through the exercise of answering those questions anyway so we can get him on record.

Well, the problem is that the nominee is somebody who has not yet served in that position. He is hobbled, to some extent, to be able to answer some of the questions that have been proposed. So he has to say: Well, if confirmed as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, I will do everything within my power to investigate this issue, and to get to the bottom of it, and to respond to your concern, Senator.

But, otherwise, he is left without the opportunity for an up-or-down vote, and the EPA is left without a head—hardly a place where we need to be. We would not be in that condition if it were not for Presidential election politics pervading yet another committee's work when it is concerned with the protection of our environment.

I know in the Judiciary Committee this morning we have another nominee of the President who we are going to take back up, Judge Charles Pickering. It remains to be seen whether Judge Pickering's name will be added to the growing list of those who are being denied an up-or-down vote in this body because a minority of the Senate refuses to allow that up-or-down vote—an unprecedented act of obstruction and something which has not occurred before the obstruction of Miguel Estrada's nomination, that of Priscilla Owen, that of Bill Pryor. I hope that list is not further lengthened by adding the name of Charles Pickering.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time of the majority has expired; is that right?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the majority has expired.

#### CONFIRMATION OF JUDGES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was not planning on speaking this morning. However, my friend from Texas, the junior Senator from Texas, talked about something that I think deserves a response.