

Now, if safety lapses can lead to the *Columbia* Shuttle accident and the failure to guarantee the safe return of our brave astronauts from mission STS-107, just how much are we willing to gamble on the safety of the 2 million Americans who travel in our skies every day?

The lessons of privatization are hard learned and should not be ignored. Other countries have tried this already and they have paid the price. Australia, Canada, and Great Britain all have privatized systems that did not live up to the promised benefits of privatization. Just to clear the air, privatization means that these tasks will be handed over to companies whose mission it is to make a profit and who will try to do the job at the cheapest prices.

A member of Parliament of the British House of Commons named Gwyneth Dunwoody said this:

The privatization of the United Kingdom's air traffic control system was a grave mistake, and one that the United States can still avoid making. British air traffic controllers are among the best in the world, and they fought tooth and nail to keep ATC in the public sector.

The public sector means in government.

They insisted that the sale of the national air traffic services would lead to a collapse in morale, the unwise introduction of inadequate and unreliable equipment, and an increasing danger of catastrophic accidents. The Government did not listen and went ahead. They were wrong and the air traffic controllers were right.

Costs have gone up and safety has gone down since Great Britain adopted privatization. Near misses have increased by 50 percent and delays have increased by 20 percent. Do we want to risk near misses in the skies over America? Do we want to take a chance because we can buy security on the cheap? I do not think so, and I am going to do whatever I can to prevent that from happening.

The British Government has already had to bail out the privatized air traffic control company twice. When is this administration going to take off the ideological blinders from its eyes and learn the lessons taught to our British friends?

President Bush himself should be quite familiar with the importance of our air traffic control workforce. Last month, on September 10, the day before the second-year anniversary of the most tragic attack on our soil, the President traveled to a fundraiser in Florida. As Air Force One, the President's airplane, approached for a landing, air traffic controllers noticed an unidentified car on the runway that Air Force One was attempting to land on. Disaster was avoided because of the quick reaction of those air traffic controllers in Jacksonville.

Despite these lessons, the administration has pushed hard to privatize through the contract tower program which has been beneficial to many small airports across the country. Most

of these 200 or so small airports would not otherwise have an air traffic control tower.

There are many more. Some 4,000 small airports exist that could use this program, but the administration wants to use the program to privatize some of the busiest airports in the country. Examples of some of the busiest airport towers: They want to privatize the eighth busiest airport in the country, Van Nuys, CA, almost a half a million flight operations in 2002; the 18th most busy, the Denver Centennial Airport in Colorado, over 400,000 flight operations in 2002. In fact, those two airports are busier than Washington Dulles, which was 23rd with 392,000 flight operations in the year 2002. We look at Arizona, the 24th busiest airport, Phoenix/Deer Valley Municipal Airport, 390,000 flight operations in 2002. The list goes on. We are looking at the 50 busiest airports in the country.

Some may notice that two airports were dropped out of the list, both in the State of Alaska. Now, why is Alaska exempted? The chairman of the Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives is Congressman YOUNG. He is chairman of the committee because he has seniority. Well, he made sure that the two Alaskan airports that were listed for privatization were taken off the list. They are smart in Alaska. They know they have to fight to protect themselves. They are a long distance from the mainland, but they are smart enough to exempt themselves from this dangerous privatization scheme.

I do not believe the safety of every other airport in our national aviation system is any less important than the safety at Alaska's airports.

The White House interfered in our process and altered language in the FAA conference bill so they would be explicitly allowed to privatize some of the busiest air traffic control towers in the world. It is for this reason that I and many of my colleagues are not going to agree. We are not going to accept any FAA reauthorization conference report without language prohibiting privatization of our air traffic control system. I am going to fight until the will of the Senate is heeded. Others have pledged to do the same thing.

I want to make clear to my colleagues that we passed legislation to prevent privatization of the air traffic control system. It was bipartisan. There were 11 Republicans and the remainder Democrats who passed that bill.

The system is made up of many important parts, including the air traffic controllers themselves, those who run the towers, the technicians who have the responsibility to certify that the equipment is working, and the flight service station controllers who communicate directly with the pilots as they make their way to their destination.

As FAA conference leaders did not abide by the will of both the Senate

and the House to prohibit privatizing our air traffic control systems, my colleague, Senator ROCKEFELLER, the ranking member of the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Aviation, and I, introduced S. 1618. It is the Temporary Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2003. This legislation extends funding for reauthorization for all aviation programs, including the AIP program, for 6 months, and it also addresses the immediate safety and security needs while FAA conference leaders work with us to go back and fix the problems they created for themselves in the FAA conference report.

But, unfortunately, my unanimous consent request to pass this extension was objected to by the majority. In the meantime, our Government operates under a continuing resolution that means we couldn't get our work done in time, that as fiscal year 2003 ended we were not prepared, though we knew a year in advance that the new fiscal year was going to start with October 1, 2003. I find it outrageous that the Republican leadership in Congress would effectively punish our economy with further job losses in order to afford the opportunity to the White House to wage their ideological battles.

I am appalled they would intentionally zero out the Airport Improvement Program, again, the program that keeps updating our airports across the country. It is over \$3 billion. I am appalled they would intentionally zero that out, zero out the opportunity to put Federal funds in there for airport construction programs, to muscle their plan through the Congress. It is not going to happen.

Our economy cannot stand to lose any more jobs, and using a continuing resolution to cancel a program which will provide \$3.4 billion in AIP funding is just irresponsible.

I hope when we get this bill up my colleagues will work with us so we can do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

IRAQ

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to share a few thoughts. I will probably talk about it next week on the supplemental for our activities in Iraq.

I congratulate and will be forthright in my support for the military men and women who are serving so extraordinarily well and Ambassador Bremer for his leadership in an effort to create a new government in Iraq where the

people can live and progress and have the benefits of progress that have been denied them for so long.

I am exceedingly pleased with what they are doing. They are operating at risk, particularly in certain areas of Iraq—at less risk in other areas. Progress continues to be made throughout the country. I am proud of that.

I was a Federal prosecutor and attorney general of Alabama. I served in law enforcement for over 15 years. I went to Iraq in August and asked specifically to visit the Iraqi police training center, which I was allowed to do. From the beginning of this effort, it was clear to me that the key to a prosperous and healthy and stable and peaceful Iraq is the bringing on of a capable police force.

It is not as easy as you would think. The Iraqi police were functionaries under Saddam Hussein. He had a tough secret police that did the heavy, vicious work, and he had other police who were poorly trained, and many of them not functioning at the level at which we would expect police in the United States to function. So it is not an easy thing.

Originally the plan was to bring on a smaller police force. I urged them to go to a larger police force, and they certainly are doing that. We now have 35,000 police up and operating in Iraq. These are Iraqis. The goal is going to be to double, or more, that number.

We also have plans to bring on an Iraqi Army, which is exactly the right thing. Our numbers were smaller but now we are looking to have a 40,000-person army. We could go more. I would have thought at first glance that we would have a larger army. But the truth is, Iraq is not subject and not expecting and we should not worry too much about an invasion of Iraq. What we have in Iraq is a suppression of pure and simple crime—criminals, thugs, gang members, and that sort of thing. We have the remnants of a Baathist regime that is attempting to sabotage a new and free government in the hopes they can at some point in the future recapture control of Iraq. Then we have Islamic extremists, not out of the heart of Islam but this extremist element that is slipping into the country and participating. So this is quite a different thing than what normally an army would confront.

These comments are relevant because a large part of the supplemental that the President has asked for has been for the training of police and security forces. The administration, Ambassador Bremer also plans to bring on a substantial number of security forces. Those would protect sites such as the oil companies or the electricity or the water companies that may be subject to sabotage and may require a different kind of training; maybe less training.

I point out these officers are being paid less than \$100 per month. And I suppose for the most part they pay their own food, rent, and that kind of

thing. But in salary alone, we could hire 20 Iraqi police officers for the cost of one American soldier there on salary, not counting the support group that has to keep that soldier there, not counting the food they have or the retirement benefits or any of those things. So we can probably do 30 or 40, maybe 50 Iraqi soldiers for the cost of 1 American soldier. The price, as I understand the salaries for the soldiers and police, are not a lot different, and run, generally, under \$100 a month. This is the right way to go.

I had the opportunity when I visited in Iraq in August to go to the base, the operating base of a military police unit from my home State of Alabama. They were first rate. Over half of them were police officers in the State, patrolling State Troopers and sheriff's deputies and others. They have real-world experience. They told me they were patrolling with Iraqi police officers on a daily basis. They go to the Iraqi police station, they buddy up, and go out and patrol in that fashion. That is precisely what we need to see more of.

There are a lot of reasons for that. Our soldiers, the mere presence of them, sends a clear message that we will not allow any organized group to assume control or domination over any area of Iraq.

Really, they are not good police officers because they can't speak the language.

They may be some of the best police officers in Alabama or anyplace in the country, and they may have been trained going through the FBI Academy. But if you can't speak the language, you really can't be as effective as you would like to be. What they are effective at is encouraging and strengthening the local Iraqi police officers. They are good at training them, showing them how to keep records and how to maintain intelligence. They can provide integrity, courage, and a sense of consciousness that we are going to be with those Iraqi police officers who stand for a new Iraq, who put on that uniform, and who go out on patrols in neighborhoods where people know them and their families. If they will show that courage and step out there and do the job, they can be successful and create a country that would be quite different than they have had before. I know that can happen. I am really convinced that can happen.

I am pleased that this supplemental has a good deal of money for that. Some Members complain, well, we don't mind helping our American soldiers over there, but we don't want to spend our money on infrastructure or police training.

By the way, the infrastructure money includes training for police and soldiers and for deployment of police and soldiers. I think that is wrong. What we know is this: We know we are spending almost \$4 billion a month to sustain our military forces there at some risk. There is no doubt about it. We have lost 90 soldiers since May 1. I

suppose it has been 120 days since that time. It is very disturbing.

I went by Walter Reed the weekend before last. I talked to soldiers who lost limbs, who had been injured and are rehabilitating. Their spirit was terrific. But it does not cause you to lose appreciation. It causes you to increase appreciation for them. I know the Senator from Texas has lost soldiers from Texas. We have lost 10 soldiers from my home State of Alabama since this war began. I have had the burden of calling families to express my personal sympathy and the sympathy on behalf of our country for their service.

What do we do here? People say let us support our troops. Let us make sure they have the money, but we want to attack this extra money. It is \$60 billion of this \$87 billion for soldiers and maintaining our military presence. It is \$20 billion for reconstruction, which includes bringing on a military and a police force.

I am going to tell you frankly what my view is. I believe we need to help this country create a new country, one that provides opportunities for all Iraqis to succeed.

Dr. Chalabi was the president last month of the council. They rotate. He was here this past week. I note that some have criticized Dr. Chalabi here and there. But he has been very effective as a leader over there, it appears to me. He is outspoken and brilliant. He went to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He majored in mathematics. He went to the University of Chicago and got his Ph.D. in mathematics. He was dean of the American University School in Beirut, Lebanon. He spent 4 years living with the Kurds in northern Iraq as he helped to participate in the effort to overthrow the evil regime of Saddam Hussein. He was sharing his vision of how they have already passed laws to allow economic progress to occur. They have already passed rules that would break down the racial traditions. He said they had a law. Saddam Hussein went back to determine racial ancestries to the fifth generation and completely wiped them out. People are going to be given a chance no matter what background or religion or ethnic group they are from to progress. It is exciting to hear people who have been there talk about it. The key to it is going to be the police.

One Senator said, well, they are not very good. Senator KENNEDY said they are not effective. I asked our MPs in August about Baghdad. Baghdad is a tough area. Some of the areas are very peaceful, and things going along much better than some of the areas in Baghdad. There are tough areas. They said: We like these police officers. They are working with us. We patrol with them on a daily basis. One young soldier told me, with no brass around: We bonded with them.

That is an important concept.

At Walter Reed the week before last, one of the soldiers who was injured was an MP. He is a good-looking young

man. I asked him some questions. I asked him about local police, did he work with them. Yes.

I asked: How good were they? What he said to me really kind of shocked me.

He said: That is exactly what President Bush asked me when he came by here.

The President was at Walter Reed and visited with him and asked him that question. How are the local police doing? He said: Yes, they are not ready to take over the country right now. But he said they are good. There are some good ones. He talked about when they went on patrol. One of the Iraqi policeman was at the rear of the patrol. They took fire. He returned fire in an effective and courageous way. He was impressed with him. He said that he showed discipline and courage under stress. He was impressed.

I also had the opportunity to meet the chief of police in Baghdad. He is a very impressive man; a two-star general under Saddam Hussein who made negative comments about Saddam Hussein which resulted in him being put in jail for 2 years.

When asked by Secretary Wolfowitz at one point why he spoke out against Saddam Hussein, he said he really didn't speak out. He was talking to his closest friend, questioning him, and it leaked back to Saddam Hussein and he goes to jail. That is the kind of life under which they lived. This man is courageous. Some say the police don't have gumption. But he goes out personally on raids. They are doing raids every night seizing weapons and arresting dangerous individuals.

Two weeks before I got there, leading a raid late one night, the chief of police—you will not see that much in America cities—was out on a raid and was shot in the leg and wounded. He came back to work sooner than he was supposed to according to the doctors because he wanted to be there. He wanted to show his commitment and wanted to get the work done for Iraq.

Subsequent to my return, there was a bomb attempt to kill him.

There is a tough, dangerous group out there. How do you get them? We are not going to get them with rolling tanks down the street. We are not going to get them with armored vehicles on the streets with Americans who really become targets. We are going to get them by utilizing intelligence from individuals. We are going to utilize individual police officers who are Iraqi citizens, who believe in a new Iraq, who are willing to step up and be counted, and who can change that country forever.

It is an exciting thing out there. I particularly wanted to share my thoughts today.

I do not agree with the comments of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who suggested that the police in Iraq are not effective and can't do the job. No, we shouldn't walk away from that. We shouldn't leave them out

there exposed. If we stay to back them up, we will be able to draw down our soldiers. And the sooner we can draw down our soldiers, the better we are going to be. That local police force can be the key to stabilizing the country so that a new government can be formed—a free, independent constitutional government that provides legal protection for all.

I think we can be successful. We have made a commitment as a country. We voted in this body 77 to 12 to undertake this activity. We were told that all kinds of bad things would happen. Some have happened. We lost some soldiers. But we lost fewer than most people were predicting. We didn't have the house-to-house fighting in Baghdad. We didn't have the thousands of casualties that many predicted. We didn't have a humanitarian disaster. We did not have a lot of things that were predicted. But the looting that took place exceeded anything I imagined. We found out the infrastructure in Iraq was far more damaged, having had far less updating and improvement in 20 or 30 years of his warring than most people imagined. It will take more money than we thought.

So we get electricity turned on in that country and have it reliable for the first time ever, we get the water on, a healthy water system, a police force, and a continuing strengthening of that government.

We will have a new government and we will have been successful in eliminating a major threat to this world and eliminating one of the most despicable evil leaders this world has seen. I will put him in the top 10 at any time. Any person who sees the graves of people killed by him knows that is true. You see the pleasure the people have of seeing him gone. It is overwhelming. A European poll not too long ago said 87 percent of the Iraqi people did not want the United States to leave right now.

We will be able to help them do something special, create a better life for that area of the world, and in the long run that will be a magnificent advantage to us. We do not want to take over their oil or their land or dictate religious faith. We simply want them to progress, to be successful, to create a good government so their people will be able to live in peace and harmony. That is our goal. It is a great goal and worthy of the United States.

This supplemental is critical. I am a frugal Member of this body. I am proud of the Watchdog of the Treasury Awards I get. I watch closely how we spend money. But right now, let's do the right thing. Step up the effort to create a stable Iraq, step up the timetable of bringing our troops home, and help step up the time the people of Iraq can have a decent government.

I yield the floor.

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.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JOSHUA ALEXANDER BOYCOTT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I stand before you today to speak of a young man who has touched many of the lives here in the Senate Chamber. It is with great sadness that I rise today to talk about a young man from Alaska. Alaska and the country lost this young man last week.

On Friday, just 1 week ago, one of my former Senate pages, Joshua Alexander Boycott, was killed in a car accident in his hometown of Fairbanks. It was one of those mornings. He was driving his younger brother to school. In Fairbanks at this time of year, winter is starting to happen. It was the first snowfall, with slippery, icy roads. Apparently Josh lost control of the vehicle and was killed.

Josh was one of those young Americans, those young Alaskans whom we look at and we can identify instantly as a young man going places. I look at the beautiful faces of the young pages who serve in this Chamber. I look at each one of them and I see the potential and the greatness in each and every one of these beautiful young men and women. Josh had that.

Josh came to the Senate during the 2002 fall semester. He was one of those who so thoroughly enjoyed what he did in the Senate as a page. For those who are not familiar with the routines and rituals of the pages on the Senate floor, it may seem that oftentimes what pages do is a bit mundane—filling glasses of water, standing guard at the door during the votes, getting lecterns for Senators so they may speak, running errands all over. It is not exactly intellectually challenging, high-powered stuff. But Josh enjoyed every bit of it. He would stand there and open the door with a big smile and a "Good morning." It was not just to me, his Senator from Alaska, it was to every Senator who came through. He was so thoroughly enjoying being part of the process. He was well liked by the other pages with whom he worked. He did exceptionally well in the page school.

Again, the pages certainly know the routine they have to deal with on a daily basis: Very early morning hours, attending page school, full, long days, attending to their duties here in the Senate Chamber. And then in the evening, it is not as though you have the night off and can go do what you want; it is time to study and do all that is required of you. It is an extremely rigorous schedule, but there were no complaints from Josh. He was thriving on it because he was doing exactly what he wanted to do.

The last time I saw Josh was in late July. He was one of two Alaskans selected to attend the American Legion