

1st Cavalry Regiment helped an Iraqi schoolgirl cut the ribbon at a ceremony celebrating the first day of school. These children are so excited, as they see their world opening up. Iraqi children at Dufaf Al-Neil school hold up the markers they received along with other gifts from soldiers of the 1st Cavalry Regiment. Everyone can see that these school supplies have opened a new world for these children. Their liberation cannot be overemphasized.

Aside from the new facilities, there is something else the American forces have provided for these children. They have ended the fear and terror that Saddam Hussein instilled in Iraqi schools. I want to read an excerpt from a National Review article from October 13. This is stunning.

... there will be no mysterious disappearances from the classrooms. No teachers and pupils will be found dead in school doorways. ... Teenage school girls will not be abducted and taken to one of the many harems maintained by Uday, Saddam's sadistic elder son. ...

We could hardly imagine how these children went to school living in fear that they might be abducted and taken into Uday's harem; that their teachers might be killed in the doorway for something that they could not even imagine they had said or done wrong. Not only are we opening these schools with new school supplies and painted walls and lighting, but we have taken the fear from these children that when they go to school, something horrible will happen.

Our Armed Forces are performing heroic acts every day, trying to ensure that the Iraqi people are free and working toward self-government. Step by step, normal life in Iraq is being established as basic services are restored and hope is reborn.

What we are doing in Iraq is going to change the Middle East. It is going to give people in this country a taste of freedom, and others will see it. It will be a message bigger than anything we could say would happen. It is the results that we are working for, and the President is committed to that result.

That is why we are debating a supplemental appropriation that would bring freedom to this country and begin to spread it throughout the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Under the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATION BUILDING IN IRAQ

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wanted to add a couple of thoughts this morning regarding the plan for nation building in Iraq. I had supported vigorously the amendment by Senator DORGAN last evening, but because of the time constraints I was not able to speak on that particular amendment. I plan to offer a similar amendment—and there are others—that will try to help the Senate focus again on the op-

portunities and possibilities for sustaining a successful effort in Iraq—a successful effort of nation building—by shifting the burden from the American taxpayers to the Iraqi people and their great resources.

As you know, Mr. President, I supported the use of force; I supported the overthrow of that regime. I believe that a lot of the information that was given to us has proven not to be true and accurate; nonetheless, I support the effort because this was a regime that needed to be overthrown. I am also here to say and agree that in order to be successful we have to sustain a long-term commitment, not cut and run, not window dress, not put lipstick on a pig, not pretend that things are going well—but have things really go well. The verdict is still out. I am sure it is not as bad as it is portrayed by the media. Usually nothing is as bad as that. The stories tend to be one-sided in many instances. The fact is, this is a very difficult undertaking. We have undertaken it only seven times since World War II.

There is a very interesting report that I want to mention at this time. I will give more detailed comments about it later. It is an extensive Rand report just finished on nation building. The title is, "The Inescapable Responsibility of the World's Only Superpower." This is bipartisan; it is not a Republican plan, not a Democratic plan. This is a bipartisan American view of this issue, a very balanced approach. It says, basically, there are seven lessons that we have learned since Germany and our successful Marshall plan effort. I will read excerpts from them quickly and talk about it later.

It says that:

Multilateral nation-building is more complex and time-consuming than a unilateral approach. But the multilateral approach is considerably less expensive for individual participants.

So there are tradeoffs. We are doing this in a more unilateral way. I don't necessarily have a problem with that. I understand we have made efforts to reach out to our multinational partners, and we have not been able to reach agreement. Sometimes the United States has to lead alone and lead decisively. I am, for one, not opposed to that. I just understand that it is more expensive. So let's find a way to pay for it. Further, the report says:

Multilateral nation-building can produce more through transformations and greater regional reconciliation than can unilateral efforts.

That is an argument for multilateral involvement. It also says:

Unity of command is essential. . . .

I believe unity of command is one element we have to preserve in Iraq. It seems as though we are on the path to that end. There are problems, though, that this report points out. One of them is:

There appears to be an inverse correlation between the size of the military stabilization force and the level of casualties.

In other words, the more troops and peacekeepers you have on the ground, the less soldiers you lose. One of the objectives I have as a Senator from Louisiana is to lose as few soldiers as possible.

I want to show you a picture—of course, we are touched by many pictures that we see, but I hope the cameras can pick up SGT Rich Armstrong of Lynchburg, VA. This man is not from Louisiana but from Virginia, right across the river. He is a staff sergeant who is saying goodbye to his wife Beth and his 8-month-old daughter Olivia. I hope this soldier can be brought back home so he can spend the rest of his life with his daughter and wife.

This is not about campaigns or politics. This is about trying to lay down the best plan to bring these soldiers home. The more troops you have there and the more police you have there, the less soldiers will come home either wounded or "not" at all.

This reports goes on to say:

Neighboring states can exert significant influence, for good or bad. It is nearly impossible to put together a fragmented nation if its neighbors try to tear it apart.

One of the amendments in the House, I thought, took us a step backward. It took aid away from neighboring states, when we need to encourage them to help in this effort.

I continue to quote:

Accountability for past injustices can be a powerful component of democratization. Such accountability can be among the most controversial aspects of any nation-building endeavor, however, and therefore should be attempted only if there is a deep and long-term commitment to the overall operation.

My contention is that we are going to be there as long as we need to be, but the American people are not going to sacrifice their children or grandchildren's education, or the solvency of the Social Security trust fund, unless we find a better way to pay for it. If we do, then we can be there not just for 2 or 3 years, but like this Rand study says:

None of our cases were successfully completed in less than seven years.

So one of my questions is, How many times is the administration going to come back and ask us to forego college education for our children, support for public schools, and the establishment of a good health care system in Louisiana to rebuild Iraq, when we have the resources in Iraq to do it; when the people of Iraq, in partnership with the United States—friends and allies in a strong partnership—using our know-how and their resources, can rebuild the country? This is not new; this is not MARY LANDRIEU's idea. We did this during the Marshall plan. We used Germany's coal reserves. It was one of the principles of the Marshall plan—how to rebuild Europe. Thank goodness we were dealing with a country—Germany, the aggressor in that situation—that had vast coal reserves. It was one of the reasons we could build the Marshall plan. That was very different

from this. The Marshall plan said that for every dollar the donor nation put in, the recipient nation would put up one. It structured a bipartisan, comprehensive, sustainable program.

What this administration is doing, even if this bill passes this week, is not sustainable because the people in your States and in my State are not going to dig down, putting the debt on the American taxpayers to pay for this. The one way to do it correctly is to use the great oil resources. This is not my idea. This is not just something based on the Marshall plan.

I will show you what Paul Wolfowitz said. Paraphrasing, he said the oil revenues of that country could bring between \$50 billion and \$100 billion over the course of the next 2 or 3 years. He said that we are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon. This is not the Democratic leadership, Mr. President, and this is not Senator LANDRIEU saying that; that is Paul Wolfowitz, on March 27, 2003.

Let's see what Vice President CHENEY said only a year ago. People say, what is the confusion? Why are we not using the oil resources? It is not because it was a bad idea. The administration put forward this idea. Yet for some reason they have changed their minds.

Paraphrasing this, Tim Russert said every analysis said this war would cost about \$80 billion for the recovery of Baghdad, perhaps of Iraq, about \$10 million. Vice President CHENEY said he can't say that, and that in Iraq we have a nation that has the second largest oil reserves in the world, second only to Saudi Arabia. He said it would generate billions of dollars a year in cashflow if they get back to their production of roughly 3 million barrels a day in the relatively near future.

That was before the war. That is the plan the people were told. We would use the oil. Now we have to use our kids' trust funds for college. It is not right.

Let me show the amount of oil that is in Iraq. I know something about this because Louisiana produces a lot of oil. If we export from Iraq 1 million barrels a day, that is \$8 billion a year at \$22 a barrel. The range for OPEC is \$22 to \$29. These are using the most conservative figures. If we would get up to 10 million barrels a day—it is not only possible, it is likely—we could be generating in Iraq \$80 billion.

Why would the American people be picking up the tab when the Iraqis have their own resources, building pride, dignity, independence? Why? I don't understand it. Maybe someone else has their eyes on the profit.

I think the Iraqi people should benefit from their reserves. I think the American taxpayers should benefit from these reserves, not a handful of companies, if that is the idea. I am not saying it is, but we are very confused about why the administration said they wanted to use oil and now they don't.

I have an article titled "Iraqi Plans to Increase Oil Output in 2004." This article was in the Wall Street Journal this morning. This is quicker than they thought. Trust me, horizontal drilling and new technologies can produce a lot of wealth.

I am going to finish this speech later in the day. The question Louisiana has is, Why can't we use the resources and riches of that nation to help rebuild it and stabilize democracy in a part of the world that desperately needs it?

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the two sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 20 minutes 53 seconds. The minority has 2 minutes 20 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Does the Senator from Louisiana wish to finish with the 2 minutes?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield to the other side, and I reserve the 2½ minutes for closing this morning on our side.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, what I will do is allow the Senator from Louisiana to have the 2 minutes or the minority side to have the 2 minutes after Senator MCCONNELL, but then I am going to yield, because we have the last 30 minutes, to the Senator from Montana. The Senator from Louisiana can take the time now or take it after Senator MCCONNELL.

Ms. LANDRIEU. If that is the understanding, I have to ask the Chair—I know the time was equally divided—was it also established which side would speak in the last 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order previously agreed to was for the minority to consume their time first.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Then I will take those 2 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to reserve her time after Senator MCCONNELL, I am going to yield up to 10 minutes to Senator MCCONNELL, after which, she can speak; is that acceptable?

Ms. LANDRIEU. That is acceptable. The next 10 minutes will be for Senator MCCONNELL, and I will then take the 2½ minutes that is remaining.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from Texas.

TRIP TO IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just returned from Iraq and Afghanistan. I was accompanied on that trip by Senator CONRAD BURNS of Montana, Senator LARRY CRAIG of Idaho, Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming, and Senator LINCOLN CHAFEE of Rhode Island. I wish to share with the Senate some of my observations about the trip.

First, I am pleased to report that patriotism among United States troops is

alive and well in Iraq and Afghanistan. Soldiers on the frontlines of the global war on terrorism—be they with the 101st Airborne Division in Iraq or the 10th Mountain Division in Afghanistan—serve America with honor and distinction.

This Senator is more grateful than words can express for the professionalism and dedication of our Armed Forces as America continues to bring the war on terrorism to the terrorists. We are fighting this war on our terms—and on their turf.

My hat is off to the President—our capable Commander in Chief—for his stalwart leadership throughout this war. There is no better man that could be at the helm during these dangerous times.

In Iraq, our service men and women are proud to have liberated an oppressed nation and are bound and determined to finish the job they started by turning over Iraq to the Iraqi people as soon as is possible. The bill before us will allow them to do just that—so long as the requested reconstruction funds are fully provided. It might interest my colleagues to know that the Screaming Eagles view these funds just as important as ammunition in destroying the enemy.

In Afghanistan, United States troops continue to pay back al-Qaeda and Taliban forces for the September 11 attacks on our shores. Morale is high, and our soldiers take great pride in constituting a new Afghan army that are already proving to be more formidable fighters than the terrorists they face on fields of battle.

Second, despite news reports to the contrary, America is making significant progress in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In Iraq, U.S. troops and civilians with the Coalition Provisional Authority, CPA, are perplexed by the lack of attention paid to accomplishments made on a near daily basis. More than 13,000 reconstruction projects have been completed in Iraq, with electricity generation exceeding prewar levels and a free press already exceeding those in neighboring countries. By one recent count, 170 newspapers are being published in Iraq. Baghdad residents have access to more local print media than residents of Louisville, KY.

Some 60,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained, and those that patrol jointly with U.S. troops are often cheered by their compatriots. American military and CPA officials are working tirelessly to work themselves out of a job in Iraq as quickly as possible. The shared objective of the interim Iraqi Governing Council, IGC, and the CPA is to draft and ratify a constitution and hold national elections, perhaps within the next year.

In Afghanistan, international efforts are ongoing to build security forces and a new Afghan army. While Provincial Reconstruction Teams and humanitarian organizations have access to most of the country, Taliban remnants, al-Qaeda fighters, and local militias