

not add up and people will be hurt and doctors and health facilities will be hurt. Yet, consistently, when we have tried to put forward plans on this floor, even plans that have passed the Senate have not made it all the way because this administration will not support efforts to help our States and to help Medicaid.

Finally, there was a commitment made to double the National Institutes of Health funding by 2003. The administration supports funding cuts that will not meet that goal.

Unfortunately, the Bush record on health care to date has been bad medicine for the American people. I ask the President today, rather than moving forward with the proposals we are hearing about attempting, essentially, to privatize Medicare, this evening I urge him to reassess and to join us in bipartisan efforts to make sure our citizens have the health care they need and our businesses can afford.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. STABENOW. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the Senator two brief questions, but first I salute her for her leadership. Since she has arrived in the Senate, she has been the most outspoken advocate for making health care affordable and accessible for Americans.

Let me make certain I understand. As you describe it, President Bush's proposed Medicare reform will say to seniors: If you want prescription drug coverage, you have to leave the Medicare Program and go into an HMO.

Because we have not passed the law giving people in an HMO the right to pick their own doctor, what he is saying to seniors is: If you want to have your choice of prescription drugs, then you have to give up your choice of a personal doctor.

Is that what the choice is?

Ms. STABENOW. That is absolutely correct. I thank my friend from Illinois, who is always in the Chamber fighting on behalf of the people of his State and the country.

There is no doubt about it, while the President is talking about increased choices, what he is really saying is, if you want to get help with your exploding prescription drug costs, if you want to stop having to pick between meals and your medicine, then you are going to have to go into a private insurance company, an HMO, where they will decide about your doctor. In fact, he is not willing to support a Patients' Bill of Rights to make sure they get what they need while they are in the HMO.

Mr. DURBIN. One last question. I know the Senator has more to add. Is there anything you heard about what the President is going to suggest that will lower the cost of health insurance for families and businesses across America, an exploding item in terms of their expenses which is pushing more and more people into the situation of being uninsured, underinsured, or put-

ting more and more of their paycheck, every week, into the cost of their health insurance? Has the President suggested anything that will address that?

Ms. STABENOW. Unfortunately, no. We have seen a consistent effort to put forward plans that are supported by the brand name pharmaceutical industry itself or by the insurance companies, but not those things that will lower prices and make health care more affordable and more available.

Last summer, with a very rigorous debate on the Senate floor and a strong bipartisan vote, we passed a bill that would create more competition to lower prescription drug prices; it went to the House of Representatives where it did not see the light of day. Unfortunately, without the President's support and leadership, it will continue to be that way. We need the President to step up and say that the fact that prescription drug prices are going up three times the rate of inflation every year and that is too much.

It is too much. Our businesses cannot sustain that. They cannot sustain seeing their health care premiums double. At the same time, if you are an uninsured senior in this country, you are paying top dollar. Isn't it ironic that of all those who pay for prescription drugs around the world, the people who pay literally the most for their medicine are uninsured people, most of whom are seniors, because they do not have anybody negotiating on their behalf. They do not have Medicare right now coming in and saying: We are going to negotiate a group price. So they pay the highest price.

Why wouldn't it make sense to have Medicare coverage? The brand name companies do not want Medicare negotiating on behalf of 40 million seniors and the disabled to lower prices. So what they have come up with is this scheme that would essentially not allow the clout of buying power because Medicare would not directly be providing the prescription drug coverage. But they want to act as if they would like to have prescription drug coverage for seniors, so they come up with this plan that would say: We will help you with your medicine if you go into a private-sector HMO.

By the way, in Michigan, now we have seen, since the inception of what is really Medicare+Choice—which is the plan that has already been out there for private sector Medicare HMO coverage—more than 51,000 seniors in Michigan have been disenrolled because plans have withdrawn from Michigan. In fact, we do not have any HMOs in the Upper Peninsula. We have very few plans in Michigan.

In fact, my own mother, who was in an HMO and enjoying the coverage under Medicare+Choice, was dropped because the plan withdrew from Michigan. So we only have four private sector HMO plans in Medicare left in Michigan, and they only serve 2 percent of the eligible Medicare bene-

ficiaries in the State—2 percent—and the majority are in nine counties in southeastern Michigan, with the rest of the State not being covered. By the way, none of those plans are accepting new people or new enrollees.

So the President says: Let's take this plan that covers very few people, where it is not working, and let's say if you want Medicare prescription drug coverage, you have to go through this failed plan. I, for the life of me, cannot understand why this approach is being put forward except for the fact that certainly from the prescription drug industry's standpoint, it is better than going under Medicare.

So, Mr. President, I would ask this evening for you to please speak to the anxiety, the anxiousness that we all feel, that Americans feel for our families, for our businesses, that workers feel when they now find their pay being frozen so their employers can afford the explosion in the health care crisis. I would like you to speak to those issues in very real ways. Do not offer failed plans just to be able to speak about this issue. Join with us in bipartisan efforts that we know will work, efforts that have been supported by the private sector as well as the public sector, efforts that are supported by workers, by seniors, by all of those who have a stake in making sure that health care is affordable and available.

We had a plan. We had a bill, S. 812, that passed this Senate last summer. I commend all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who voted for that legislation. We can cut prices that lower premiums for our businesses. We can provide Medicare coverage. And we can do it in a real way.

I urge, tonight, that the President speak to us. And I invite him to join with us in a plan that will work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Delaware is recognized.

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, as President Bush prepares to address the Nation on the state of the Union, we stand, to state the obvious, at a precipice of a momentous decision: War, war with Iraq.

The American people, and the world, for that matter, are waiting to hear what the President's decision is and his rationale for it. They are waiting to hear a clear explanation of why war may be the only remaining alternative and what will be expected of them not only in winning the war but what will be expected of the American people for us to win the peace.

A generation ago, I and my entire generation learned a very important lesson. That lesson was: No matter how brilliant or how well thought out a foreign policy may be, it cannot be sustained without the informed consent of the American people.

To date, there has been no informed consent. That is not a criticism; it is just an objective observation. For the President, to date, has not had the requirement, in the hope of avoiding war, to inform the American people in detail of what the consequences of war will be and what will be expected of them.

To date, the American people only know that Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator, who has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, and that he is the man who invaded Kuwait, and we expelled him. They are not sure as to whether or not he is an imminent threat; that is, a threat to those security moms, not soccer moms, who are in their living rooms and are worried about the health of their children and the safety of their homes.

The American people are confused, I would respectfully suggest, by the President's talk and the administration's talk of a new doctrine of preemption, and whether or not this is the basis upon which we are arguing we should act, or that we are acting to enforce, essentially, a peace agreement, a peace agreement signed by Saddam Hussein at the end of the Kuwaiti war that said: In return for me being able to stay in power, I commit to do the following things.

They are under the impression—the American people—because of the signals being sent by the Secretary of Defense and his civilian subordinates, that this war will be short, essentially bloodless, and, just as in 1991, Johnny will come marching home again in several weeks, if not several months, after a decisive, bloodless military victory.

The American people are assuming we will lead a very broad coalition of other nations and have the world behind us in our effort. They further assume, contrary very much to the hard evidence, that the defeat of Saddam Hussein will be a major setback for Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida and other terrorist organizations.

In short, they are under the assumption that one of the reasons we are moving against Saddam is that we will literally make terrorists' actions much less probable in the United States of America than they are today. For why else would we use all this power we have assembled in the gulf to go after Iraq rather than using all this power to go after Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and in northwestern Pakistan where he most probably is according to our intelligence community?

They put it together. Obviously, the President would not take 250,000 forces, invade, if we must, Iraq, if he didn't think that would materially affect what I, as an American man, or woman thinks is the greatest threat to me, another 9/11. They also assume, contrary to any hard evidence, that Saddam Hussein is months away from developing a nuclear weapon that could strike American soil, for which he has no capacity, nor in any reasonable prospect in the future would he have

any capacity to send a nuclear weapon airborne from Iraq to the United States.

Lastly, they seem to think the financial cost of this war will be manageable and not cause any further economic disruption, for why else for the first time in American history is the President of the United States calling for war, the possibility of war involving 250,000 American troops, at the very same time he is going to call, tonight, for a \$650 billion tax cut? That has never been done in the history of the United States of America. Obviously, they think the President wouldn't do that unless this was going to be pretty costless, this war.

In short, I don't think the American people have been told honestly what will be expected of them and what additionally may be asked of them if things don't go so well. I think they will go well. I am one who has not been happy in the way we have proceeded, who thinks this war will be prosecuted in a way that will absolutely, to use the expression younger people use, blow the mind of the world in terms of our military prowess. But it may not.

Why is it so critical to inform the American people? Why, beyond their democratic right to know, is it so vital? I will answer that by telling you a story.

On December 8, 2002, I was in Qatar being briefed by General Franks, witnessing the preparation for war, and the war games were being carried on. There were assembled in this secure room—a gigantic hangar with a movie screen literally larger than the size of the wall behind the Presiding Officer, probably somewhere around 30 feet high and 40 feet wide—200 generals. I have never seen so many stars in my life, other than when I was a little kid lying on my back looking up on a crystal clear night in the middle of the summer.

I was asked, after being briefed by these warriors, whether or not I would address the assembled crowd, all active military personnel planning this war. These men and women to a person were ready to go and were secure in their knowledge that they would successfully complete their mission if asked to by defeating Saddam Hussein, if ordered to do so. What they were unsure of was us, the politicians, and whether we were willing to tell the American people exactly what was likely to be asked of them and were the American people willing to continue to give them the support they were going to need over a long haul, not the short haul? And it will be a long haul, regardless of how quickly and successfully we wage this war.

For those fighting men and women in this room know it is going to be necessary to stay in Iraq for a long time, to have tens of thousands—I predict over 75,000 American forces remaining in Iraq a minimum of a year and a half and, I predict, 5 years after we secure victory. And they wanted to know

whether or not the American people knew that, for they don't want to be over there a year from now when the debate comes up and it is between another \$20 billion to stay in Iraq and \$20 billion for education or for a tax cut. We have no right to put them in that squeeze again, as happened a generation ago.

They also wanted to know if Saddam, as some suggest—and I am revealing nothing; I am not speaking from classified reports—and his 120 to 150,000 Republican Guard, the only ones we are really worried about, their capacity, if they retreat to Baghdad, a city, a city of 5 million people, are the American people prepared to continue to support our military when they see the inevitable happen? Innocent women and children being killed. We know what will happen. We know if they retreat to Baghdad they will retreat to hospitals, apartment complexes, and our fighting women and men, if this happens—and it is not sure it will—would have to go door to door. They were worried that the response would be the same response that occurs seeing Israelis knocking down a building or seeing a child killed in the crossfire.

They are worried they will become the bad guys, particularly, as I said, if the Republican Guard falls back to a city of 5 million people. Imagine going house to house in Philadelphia or Houston, routing out 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 70,000 fighters. I told them that I believed this generation and the American people would pay whatever price and pledge its support to them, but only if they had informed consent. But that has not been done yet, and it must be done.

For while it is reasonable to expect the best, it would be irresponsible not to prepare for the worst. Iraq could lash out against Israel, Saudi Arabia and/or Kuwait in an effort to start a wider war. It could use weapons of mass destruction against our troops or its neighbors. It could destroy its oil fields and those of its neighbors. It could start giving away its weapons of mass destruction to terrorists.

It could create a humanitarian nightmare among the Kurds in the north and the Shia in the south, denying them food or medicine, even using chemical weapons against them, as Saddam has done in the past, and as I saw for myself when I met the survivors a month ago in northern Iraq.

Maybe none of these unintended consequences will occur, but there is a decent chance that one or more will. We must put every chance on our side and prepare the American people for what is bad as well as what is good. Hopefully that will be done tonight or sometime soon by the President, but not after the fact. The world, our allies, also are waiting for a clearer explanation of why war.

I just returned from the World Economic Forum and found myself confronted with the most uniform and significant anti-American sentiment I

have ever encountered in my career of 30 years dealing with foreign leaders abroad. Not a single American diplomat, elected official, American journalist, businessman or labor leader would disagree with the assessment I just gave you.

It raises several questions that need to be answered. Why do they feel this way? Why should it matter? And if it does matter, what should we do about it? Why? There are multiple reasons, and my pointing them out to a predominantly non-American audience of hundreds if not thousands of world leaders was not always appreciated the last 4 days, let alone agreed with. Let me give you some of the reasons why they feel the way they do, not all of which are legitimate, by any means.

There is a lack of strong leadership in the respective countries that has been unwilling to tell their people the truth about Saddam Hussein and the commitment their country and the world made to deal with him when he sued for peace over 10 years ago. There are selfish economic motives on the part of some of our allies with regard to their favored position with regard to oil or telecom and scores of other areas.

Another reason is the resentment of America's predominant position as the world's most powerful military and economic nation as well as our cultural dominance, from Coca-Cola to rap music to English on the Internet, all of which they resent in the same way we would all resent if tomorrow our States predominantly said, we are going to switch to a different language because a predominant number of people in our State speak that language. This is compounded by the belief that the President is being pushed by the right wing of his administration to further leverage this predominant position into an even more dominant position relative to the rest of the world. It is also compounded by an inability to contribute much in the way of a fight, either by augmenting our military strength or their own, as well as a seething resentment at our unwillingness to use the forces they offered us in Afghanistan after declaring that an article 5 breach had occurred under our NATO treaty.

With regard to Iraq specifically, many don't see Saddam as a credible threat to them. Their people don't believe our assertions. They say he no longer has the weapons of mass destruction that we know he has. They believe in the aftermath of victory, we will not stay until there is a stable Government in Iraq—as we have not stayed in Afghanistan sufficiently—and they believe the resulting power struggle within Iraq, in their region, will have disastrous consequences for their Governments because they have all heard this administration say it will not be engaged in nation building. And they all know, and everyone knows, we are going to have to be engaged in nation building after we win the war.

All of this is compounded by the obvious discussion within the administration: The announcement of a new doctrine of preemption that has yet to be explained to us, let alone them; the appearance of a great power being petulant when a President stands before the world and says "I am growing impatient, I am getting tired"; the apparent contradiction in the rest of the world's mind of the treatment of the threat from North Korea, which has weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, has a record of proliferation, and has violated international agreements, and we are talking to them; whereas, Iraq, which has no nuclear weapons—we cannot find the weapons of mass destruction, and there is scant evidence of similar proliferation—they say we speak with two different voices—the feeling that the administration has acted, without serious consultation, unilaterally in unceremoniously withdrawing from further negotiations, from international structures, such as climate control, criminal courts, ABM, and others.

Isn't the only thing that matters whether we make it work in the long run, which is what they hear from some in this administration? Won't it all disappear when we succeed, as we hear some in this administration say, because everybody loves a winner, right? Wrong. It matters what other nations think because our most basic immediate interests cannot be fully secured without a longer term cooperation with these other nations because we must convince them and not coerce them.

Let me give a few examples of what our most immediate vital interests are. Crushing international terror: How can you do that without cooperation from the intelligence services from Jakarta to Berlin, from Paris to Beijing, from Moscow to Rio? Preventing North Korea from escalating its nuclear programs and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and doing so without a war: How can we succeed without the cooperation of Russia, China, Japan, and South Korea, other than through war? All of this leads to the perception that some within the administration argue that it is better to go it alone. They have a belief that is the President's position. I don't believe it is his position, but what do they hear? They hear the theories proffered by some in the civilian Defense Department saying, if we move in the face of world public opinion, the rest of the world knows we will mean business and the more we do it alone, the more we will impress upon the rogue nations that they better change or they are next. They also hear us saying that Europe is tired, indecisive, and ultimately unwilling to do what is necessary to keep the peace and commands too much of our resources and attention, particularly, as the Secretary of Defense said, "old Europe," France, and Germany. They keenly resent these characterizations.

I think this is an inaccurate description of where President Bush is, but I do believe, though, that his choice of words and failure to clearly explain his choices and basis for action when we do act has been dangerous to our standing in the world, which leads me to a second question.

Why should it matter what our standing is—what the rest of the world thinks of us? I believe it matters a lot. Preventing a nuclear war on the subcontinent between India and Pakistan matters. But as we announced a unilateral pronouncement of a "new" doctrine of preemption—whatever that means is yet to be explained—that leads to the conclusion in India and Pakistan that if we can act preemptively, why can they not act preemptively against one another? Conveying our values to the rest of the world so as to diminish the misunderstanding of our motives runs constantly into some of the assertions that come from some in this administration.

Let me get right to it, Mr. President. It matters what other nations think, and it matters that although we can force other nations to do things, it matters how we do it. Here is an example. There is a new Government in Turkey—newly elected represented by an Islamic Party. That Islamic Party recently won the election, and the Prime Minister is a guy named Gul. The real operator is a guy named Erdogan. They were leading this Islamic Party and they have decided they want to have Turkey remain a secular state and they want to be integrated into Europe with regard to the EU. It is very much in the interest of the United States of America—very much—that that happens. We do not want an Islamic state; we want a secular state looking west.

So what is the problem? We can offer \$5 billion and essentially buy the support to allow us to launch from Turkey. But if we do that in the absence of a worldwide consensus that what we are doing is right, we may meet our immediate goal and lose a heck of a lot. Here is an example. Right now, in Turkey—which I recently visited and I know the Presiding Officer knows this—over 85 percent of the Turkish people are unalterably opposed to a war with Iraq and unalterably opposed to Turkey cooperating with us in being able to successfully prosecute that war. So what happens if we go to war and we launch from Turkey with the support of the new Islamic leadership without having changed the minds of the people in Turkey and/or the world, to suggest that this is not merely us, but that it is sanctioned by the world that we do this? Well, the roughly 35 to 40 percent of this Islamic Party that is radical Islamic will play to its populist instincts and cause incredible trouble for the existing administration in Turkey and, I believe, force them to move away from their commitment to a secular state.

So that old biblical proverb, what does it profit a man if he gains the world and loses his soul—paraphrasing

it—what does it profit us to move prematurely on Iraq from Turkey if the end result is that we radicalize a government that is represented by the Islamic Party.

What have we gained?

I will answer the third question, and then conclude. So what should we do? I have argued that out of our self-interest it matters what other nations think. So what should we be doing? I begin by saying, given where we are now, coupled with Saddam Hussein being in material breach—that is a fancy phrase for saying not explaining what he has done with the weapons of mass destruction we know he has—those two things may force us to choose between the better of two not-so-pleasant options.

The option I would choose in this circumstance, if we do not get world support, is that Saddam is in material breach of the latest U.N. resolution. Yesterday's damning report by the U.N. inspectors makes clear again Saddam's contempt for the world and it has vindicated the President's decision last fall to go to the U.N.

The legitimacy of the Security Council is at stake, as well as the integrity of the U.N. So if Saddam does not give up those weapons of mass destruction and the Security Council does not call for the use of force, I think we have little option but to act with a larger group of willing nations, if possible, and alone if we must. Make no mistake about it, we will pay a price if that is the way we go. We will have no option, but we will pay a price, a price that could be significantly reduced if from this moment on we act, in my humble opinion, more wisely.

What should we be doing from this point on? I will be very brief now and expand on this later. One, we should lower the rhetoric. We should not appear to be the petulant nation, wondering why the rest of the recalcitrant world will not act with us, showing our impatience. It does not suit a great nation well. It would not suit my father well, were he alive. It does not suit someone of stature well—and we are a nation of stature.

Two, we should make the case not only privately to our partners by sharing more proof of Saddam's crimes and possessions, but also to our people and in turn to the whole world. Legally, he is in breach, but going to war based on that legal breach will cost us in ways we would not have to pay if we go to war with the rest of the world understanding that there is something there beyond the failure to account.

The third thing we should do is give inspectors more time, for their very presence in Iraq diminishes the possibility of sharing weapons of mass destruction with terrorists or continuing their quest for nuclear weapons. Inspectors are not a permanent solution. We know from our experience of the last decade that Iraq will try to make their mission impossible. We also know that sustaining a massive deployment

of troops is expensive and hard on our men and women in uniform. But right now the inspectors are helping us build support for our policy, both at home and abroad, and we should let them keep working in the near term.

The fourth thing we should do is articulate clearly and repeatedly not only the legal basis for our action, if we must move, but our commitment to stay until we have a stable Iraq, and that means the following: The President should state clearly tonight, we are not acting on a doctrine of preemption, if we act. We are acting on enforcement of a U.N. resolution that is the equivalent of a peace treaty which is being violated by the signatory of that treaty, and we have a right to do that and it is the world's problem. It is not what we hear out of the civilian Defense Department, this cockamamie notion of a new doctrine of preemption which no one understands.

Two, our objective has to be clearly stated as eliminating weapons of mass destruction and not the destruction of Iraq, for that is the President's purpose.

Thirdly, we will in fact participate in nation building; we will seek U.N. support and we will tell the American people what we are asking of them and why, for they have no idea now what is expected of them. They do not know what the costs will be to remove Saddam and they should. They do not know how many troops will have to stay in Iraq to secure the country, and we have estimates, and what it will take to get a representative government that lives up to its international obligations.

Can we count on our friends and allies to share the burden? Can we afford to attack Iraq, fully fund homeland security, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and finish the unfinished war on terrorism in Afghanistan and other places?

These questions should never be excuses for inaction, but they must be answered if we want the American people's support and we want to avoid the mistakes of the past.

I yield the floor.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. Res. 2

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order, notwithstanding the passage of H.J. Res. 2, in the engrossment of the joint resolution, Senate amendments Nos. 139, 166, 172, and 186 be further modified with the changes at the desk.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as a brief explanation for the necessity for these modifications, in the case of amendment No. 139, the instruction line needed to be corrected. For amendment No. 166, in the version the Senate adopted, two pages were missing. With respect to amendment No. 172, there is a word change. And, finally, with re-

spect to amendment No. 186, language which was supposed to be stricken was not in the version adopted by the Senate. These modifications are solely to correct these inadvertent errors.

The amendments, as further modified, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 139, AS FURTHER MODIFIED  
(Purpose: To direct the Corps of Engineers to construct a portion of the modified water delivery project in the State of Florida)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

#### SEC. 1 . MODIFIED WATER DELIVERY PROJECT IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

The Corps of Engineers, using funds made available for modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r-8), may immediately carry out alternative 6D (including paying 100 percent of the cost of acquiring land or an interest in land) for the purpose of providing a flood protection system for the 8.5 square mile area described in the report entitled "Central and South Florida Project, Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park, Florida, 8.5 Square Mile Area, General Reevaluation Report and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement" and dated July 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 AS FURTHER MODIFIED  
(Purpose: To rename the United States-China Security Review Commission as the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, and for other purposes)

On page 713, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 714, line 3, and insert the following:

#### SEC. 209. UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended, to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

(b) NAME CHANGE.—  
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1238 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002) is amended—  
(A) In the section heading by inserting "ECONOMIC AND" before "SECURITY";

(B) in subsection (a)—  
(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and  
(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(C) in subsection (b)—  
(i) in the subsection heading, by inserting "ECONOMIC AND" before "SECURITY";  
(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(iii) in paragraph (3)—  
(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and

(II) in subparagraph (II), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and  
(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security" each place it appears; and

(D) in subsection (e)—  
(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";  
(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";  
(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the first sentence, by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and  
(II) in the second sentence, by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";  
(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security" and