

oil could fund the massive rebuilding of the country—or at least the needs of its people in the immediate future—have not been met.

Iraq's oil output is less than half the pre-war level of 2.3 million barrels per day and only about one-third the 3.2 million barrels produced by the nation before the 1991 Persian Gulf War and the subsequent United Nations embargo.

Experts differ on when Iraq's fuel production capacity will reach 1990 levels. The Coalition Provisional Authority, which oversees the U.S.-led occupation, has said that production could reach 3 million barrels per day by later summer of 2004. Private analysts have said it could take at least a couple of years to reach that level.

For the foreseeable future, the occupation authority will have to spend massive amounts to underwrite the fuel used by Iraqis. And conservation seems unlikely in a country where decades of cheap gasoline have created a culture in which driving around in aging, fume-spewing cars is seen as a form of recreation.

"Iraqis always loved to drive, and there are more cars than ever now—cars from Kuwait and Jordan that have come in since the war," said Mohammed, the Mansur filling station manager.

Even on Friday, the Muslim holy day, lines formed at the city's fuel stations.

"We used to be open 24 hours a day before the war, so there were no lines," Mohammed said. "Now we have a curfew, and people don't feel safe to wait in line after dark because of the explosions."

The 10-person staff at the Mansur station provides its own security, and a stack of AK-47s is kept handy in the main office.

Not all the city's fuel stations are owned and operated by the Oil Ministry, though none is a truly private business.

Meqdam Abdullah, 30, runs a station near the Sheraton Ishtar Hotel in central Baghdad that his family leases from the Oil Ministry. In exchange, officials sell fuel to the station at a slightly reduced price. By averaging sales of more than 100,000 liters a day, the station ekes out a small profit, Abdullah said.

But it is a tough business. During the war, the station got caught in a firefight between U.S. soldiers and armed looters, as evidenced by patched bullet holes.

Since the war ended, thieves have struck more than once, taking, among other things, the station's generator that is needed to produce electricity. Abdullah's family had to pay the looters to get the generator back. It was a necessary expense, because officials provide electricity to Baghdad in sequences of three hours on, three hours off.

Like many other Iraqis, Abdullah said the failure of U.S. authorities to provide security is his biggest complaint in the post-Saddam era. The lack of consistent electricity is the second.

He attributed the sporadic power to some inscrutable form of manipulation similar to the times, he said, that Saddam cut off fuel to disfavored minorities.

"America," Abdullah said, "is the world's great superpower, and it can't get the electricity back? I can't believe that."

The generator briefly failed at the service station on Friday. Ironically, dirty fuel provided by the government because of poor refining was believed to be the cause, Abdullah said.

For a while, the station was quiet. But as the generator sputtered back to life, cars immediately veered into the lanes besides the pumps.

The only types of gasoline transaction not largely controlled by the Oil Ministry here are the bootleg operations like those of Ali and his uncles.

"It is illegal, but no one bothers with them," shrugged Mohammed, the Mansur station manager.

On Friday, business was slow as Ali and his uncles offered large plastic jugs of fuel for sale.

"It is always slow like this on Fridays, because it is the holy day," Ali said. "But we'll be back tomorrow. We always do well on Saturdays."

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, my question flowing from what we have learned and the various issues we have been exploring throughout the days since we learned about this is, Were U.S. taxpayer funds spent to keep the cost of gasoline in Iraq at this heavily subsidized low price?

I am of the view that our taxpayers deserve to get answers to these questions. I think we deserve to get them before Congress votes on the Bush administration's funding request.

I can tell my colleagues in the Senate that when I read page 29 of this particular report with respect to oil products purchased, I was very concerned. My citizens and the folks I represent in the Pacific Northwest consistently pay some of the highest gasoline prices in our country. Oregon, Washington, and California have been very hard hit with respect to gas prices. It amounts to a quasi-monopoly in 27 States in our country. We have red lining. We have zone pricing, and a whole host of anticompetitive practices. Now we have outlined on page 29 of this request for supplemental funds what appears to be a request from the administration to have the hard-earned tax dollars of our citizens go to subsidize the cost of gasoline in Iraq so Iraqi citizens will only have to pay 10 cents a gallon. I can tell my colleagues there are people we represent here in the Senate who are not paying that kind of money.

That is why I want to get the details on this proposal. I am amplifying on the questions I am asking today in a letter to the President of the United States. We also come away with a concern that the administration seems to be willing to support creating a reserve in Iraq to protect Iraqi citizens against interruptions in gasoline and diesel fuel supplies when there is no gas and diesel reserve in the United States to protect our citizens in the event of terrorist activity or other disruptions.

This proposal in the report which I have outlined and referred to specifically so that colleagues can see it raises some very troubling questions.

Given what we already know now that the administration has included in its Iraq supplemental funding request an estimated cost of \$900 million to cover the difference between Iraqi demand in refinery production to establish and maintain this reserve due to possible terrorist activities, I think it is time for the Senate to take out a sharp pencil and review this proposal very carefully. I think it raises fundamental questions with respect to fairness and with respect to how the hard-earned tax dollars of our citizens are

being used at a time when in my State, with the highest unemployment rate in the country, there is a world of hurt.

I urge my colleagues to take a good look at this proposal because I intend to focus more on it when the Senate comes back after having the opportunity to be home and gather with the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

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 that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CHARITABLE CHOICE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in April of this year the Senate passed, with an overwhelming vote of 95 to 5, a bill called the charitable choice bill. It is obviously bipartisan legislation that was shepherded through this body by Senator SANTORUM, and a lot of work, over a long period of time, has been put into the efforts for passage of this legislation.

Two weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed its version, H.R. 7, by a vote—again, it was overwhelming—of 408 to 13.

The regular process of the House and the Senate is that the bill will proceed to a conference on the differences between these two bills. Unfortunately, it is my understanding that we will be unable to reach an agreement today, this afternoon, before adjourning to go on break, to appointment conferees on the part of the Senate.

There is, simply put, an objection on the other side of the aisle, and with so many Members who have left for the day, I will not ask for a formal consent agreement. But clearly, I am disappointed that we were unable to take the next logical regular order step in finishing this bill. I do hope we can clear this agreement with my Democratic colleagues just as soon as we return from this nonlegislative period.

Another disappointment for me, as we prepare to adjourn, has to do with the partial-birth abortion ban bill—disappointment that we are not able to progress with the legislative process until we get back. When we do return, I will seek an agreement for the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 3, the partial-birth abortion ban bill. In fact, it is S. 3 which shows the priority of this body toward this important legislation.

Yesterday the House of Representatives passed the conference report, and as soon as we get back, we will be scheduling it for consideration. The bill passed the Senate on a bipartisan vote of 64 to 33. With the conference complete and with the House having passed the agreement, it is imperative that the Senate consider this measure

in short order so the President can sign this legislation into law.

As I watched yesterday with the House completing their responsibilities on this legislation, I was hopeful that we could do that, pass it today. Why? Because this is a bill that I believe will save lives. It is a ban on a procedure that offends the sensibilities of almost all Americans, a procedure that the will of this Congress said to ban, and a bill the President will sign. Yet we will not be able to, at this juncture, consider it until we get back.

I know discussions have begun on both sides of the aisle as to how much debate time will be needed. I encourage members to move quickly on what we expect to be the final action—the final action—on this important priority. I will speak directly to the issue as soon as we return, but I wanted to put my colleagues on notice that we will be moving forward and will be scheduling this conference report for Senate action as soon as we possibly can.

KURT DODD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate family of the passing this morning of Kurt Dodd. Kurt served as the Democratic clerk on the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee from 1998 to 2000.

Those of us who knew Kurt, and particularly those of us who were lucky enough to have worked closely with Kurt, will truly miss his gracious manner, his soft-spoken style, and his profound dedication to duty. I have said on many occasions that the individuals who hold staff positions here in the Senate are, in my opinion, some of the smartest, most dedicated individuals in government service. Kurt Dodd stood at the head of that line. No one knew more about his areas of responsibility than Kurt. No one was more responsive to the needs of the Members of our committee than Kurt. And no one was more widely respected for his integrity and honor, than was Kurt.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure on behalf of the entire U.S. Senate, I send deepest condolences to Kurt's family.

THE 16TH ANNUAL NANCY HANKS LECTURE ON ARTS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, each year, a prominent member of the Nation's cultural community is invited to deliver a lecture on the role of the arts in the public policy. These annual lectures are tribute to the memory of Nancy Hanks, who served as chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts from 1969 to 1977, and who had the wide respect of all of us on both sides of the aisle.

Robert Redford was honored as this year's Nancy Hanks Lecturer, and he

delivered an impressive address at the Kennedy Center last month.

His remarks emphasized the fundamental importance of the arts in our public policy, as an essential expression of our freedom and as an indispensable part of our national imagination at its best.

The unfortunate reality today is that when the economy suffers, support for the arts and for arts education is reduced. In communities across the Nation, funding for the arts and for cultural programming are facing serious reductions. Robert Redford's address reminds us of the unacceptable price we pay for neglecting the arts.

Today, Robert Redford is an American cultural icon, and his accomplishments as an actor and director are renowned throughout the world. His advocacy for the arts is less well known, but he deserves great credit for his impressive leadership and dedication in elevating the national debate on this vital issue. Many of us feel it is his finest role of all.

At the beginning of his lecture, speaking of his own early years, he says:

I grew up in a time when democracy was taken for granted since it was drummed into our minds as a fundamental definition of America and why it was great. I was shaped by WWII and a time when we were all united in its purpose—unlike conflicts of today. Because times were tough, and my family resources slim, we didn't have fancy toys or luxuries and had to be creative in inventing worlds of our own. My imagination was my most valuable commodity and thankfully it became a life force for me at a very young age. I saw the world around me not only as it was. I saw the world around me as it could be. Art and the imagination that give it life became my closest companions.

Before anyone was much interested in what I had to say, they were interested in what I created. As a kid, I remember sketching everything in sight. My parents and their friends played cards and I began drawing them as a group, individual faces and the like. Then I moved under the table and began sketching their feet at which point I think everyone started to worry. Even though they thought I was a bit weird, I got attention and encouragement for my "art" at a young age.

His lecture will be of interest to all of us in Congress and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT REDFORD AT THE AMERICANS FOR THE ARTS' 16TH ANNUAL NANCY HANKS LECTURE ON ARTS AND PUBLIC POLICY

I've been coming to Washington, D.C. for the past 30 years, either filming here, as was the case in All the President's Men, or for lobbying efforts on behalf of issues relating to the environment, energy, human rights and art. In the beginning, it was a heady experience to be in the halls of power surrounded by history and event, feeling what it is like to be an integral part of a democracy—particularly if you were fortunate enough to move someone on an important issue.

In time, you experience changes in political climates, different attitudes and prior-

ities. The strength of the system that controls decisions and compromises became clear over time, and expectations of success had to be tendered with failure relating to these realities. But still, you feel fortunate to have access to the ears that made decisions.

Even though you knew that celebrity was maybe a door opener, it nonetheless cuts both ways in politics. Like the time I was on the Presidential campaign trail and speaking to thousands of kids on a college campus about the importance of their vote and environmental issues. In the roar of their connection with what I was saying, I thought for a moment "I'm really getting through here!" Then I walked off stage and immediately a reporter stuck a microphone in my face and said, "Who do you think is better looking, you or Dan Quayle?"

So, just when you might be feeling your oats, reality has a way of sneaking up and putting it all in perspective. But as a citizen and an artist, I try to remember that it is a right and responsibility to be able to partake in the process of democracy I'm here today because of my belief that art is a great translator of that which is both familiar and unfamiliar and that it is through art that we can come to know ourselves and others. To me, the vitality and insight which art brings to civil society is more important now than ever.

I grew up in a time when democracy was taken for granted since it was drummed into our minds as a fundamental definition of America and why it was great. I was shaped by WWII and a time when we were all united in its purpose—unlike conflicts of today. Because times were tough, and my family financial resources slim, we didn't have fancy toys or luxuries and had to be creative in inventing worlds of our own. My imagination was my most valuable commodity and thankfully it became a life force for me at a very young age. I saw the world around me not only as it was. I saw the world around me as it could be. Art and the imagination that gave it life became my closest companions.

Before anyone was much interested in what I had to say, they were interested in what I created. As a kid, I remember sketching everything in sight. My parents and their friends played cards and I began drawing them as a group, individual faces and the like. Then I moved under the table and began sketching their feet at which point I think everyone started to worry. Even though they thought I was a bit weird, I got attention and encouragement for my "art" at a young age.

While I was a poor student academically, I shined in sports and in art and my third grade teacher was next to recognize that art was a legitimate means of expression for me as I struggled with more traditional approaches.

I remember she had me come to the front of the room and draw a story on this big pad of newsprint on an easel. I think we were studying English and she used it as a basis to make a point. The whole class seemed to get it and all learned a little about sentence structure and storytelling in away that engaged and made sense. I didn't know what "it" was that they got, but it sure felt good.

My teacher's encouragement of my artistic tendencies continued, making me realize art was something legitimate to pursue and that it was integral to how I was finding my way in this world and making sense of things. If not for this, I may have taken a path that wasn't as fulfilling and productive. That's the main reason I'm here, to pay tribute to the work that so many of you do every day, to keep art alive in schools and in communities all across the country.

Being in this hall tonight prompted me to remember some of the writings of President