

spirit of our men and women in uniform, and that of the Iraqi people, was reassuring and inspiring.

While the progress made in Iraq is substantial, it must be viewed in the context of the entire Middle East. Iraq can serve as an example and a beacon of hope, but much more complex issues must be addressed.

During my recent trip to the region for consultation with both U.S. and foreign leaders, there was a consistent expression of concern about the continuing conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. The lack of progress toward a peaceful resolution continues to fan the flames of discontent across the entire region. The continuing violence breeds more violence that will undermine positive developments anywhere else in the region. We must redouble our efforts to find common ground on this difficult issue, if we are ever to achieve a peaceful world and triumph over terror and violence.

There are more challenges ahead, and there will be disappointments. That is clear. It is equally clear that President Bush and his national security team are up to the challenge. President Bush has provided steady, strong leadership in troubled times and will lead us to a safer, more secure future.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Six minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask Senator ALLARD if I could proceed for 3 minutes and then he could finish the balance of the time.

Mr. ALLARD. That would be fine.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that that be so.

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

THE 9/11 COMMISSION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I stood in this general area a couple years ago and spoke out against the need for the 9/11 Commission. I am not generally an advocate of commissions. I think it is an abdication of our responsibility when we do it repeatedly. As a matter of fact, we in the Senate should do the job of investigating what happened or what didn't happen that perhaps should have been leading up to the events of 9/11 and in the aftermath, as we went into Iraq. That is why we have the Armed Services Committee. That is what Senator WARNER, the chairman, is working on. That is why we have the Intelligence Committee. I serve on that committee. We work assiduously to take a good look at the intelligence, to see where the problems have been and see what the solutions are.

Having said that, I think this Commission has shown a great deal of calm and maturity. The leadership of the two senior members, former Governor

Kean and former Congressman Hamilton, has been thoughtful. Members on both sides of the Commission have asked good and tough questions. I may regret saying this when their final report comes out, but I think they have been doing a good job. It is not an easy job because you are trying to deal with hundreds of witnesses and thousands of pages of evidence.

That leads me to the real point. I have had occasion to watch a number of national security advisers to Presidents over my 32 years in Congress, seven different Presidents and their national security advisers. There have been some good ones of both parties but none better than Condoleezza Rice. This is an outstanding individual with a brilliant mind, tremendous insight into what is going on in the world. I could give some anecdotes of why I believe that. For that reason, I am pleased she is going to come before the Commission. She is going to take every question on and give a thoughtful, complete, thorough, and convincing argument. She will do fine. I think it is unnecessary. Maybe this whole process of whether she would testify has been unnecessary.

From a public relations standpoint, yes, she should have gone from the very beginning. But there are some important separation-of-powers principles involved. Executive privilege is not insignificant. It is something that is woven in the very fabric of this country. We cannot have a process where slowly but surely, in President after President after President, executive privilege and separation of powers have been eroded.

I have watched it. Yes, former national security advisers have waived their executive privilege and gone before Congress. I thought it was a mistake, regardless of party. I have always spoken out against that. So I do think it is important we say this is not a precedent. It should not and cannot be a precedent, or you are not going to have men and women willing to give in confidence the best advice to the President or to give him the information he needs to hear without concern that some day some congressional person will have that person before them testifying.

This is not an insignificant matter. It is very significant. Under these extraordinary circumstances, we need to have everybody we can testify in full, not so we can blame somebody but so we can plan for the future and do a better job next time.

Condoleezza Rice will be the key to that effort.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I thank the Senators from Virginia and Mississippi for their comments. I want to talk a little bit about the economy.

First of all, I want to point out this President inherited a bad economy. When he inherited this bad economy, he could have taken the old solution to all of our problems: You increase taxes and spending and somehow the other things are going to be better.

He took a new approach. The new concept was you need to cut taxes. By cutting taxes, you are going to stimulate productivity and the economy is going to grow. So the President courageously stepped forward, got his tax package passed out of the House and the Senate. The major tax packages were in 2001 and 2003. We did some in other years. We did a little dribbling and working to reduce taxes. The fact is, by reducing taxes during a time when we had taxes at an all-time high, we have helped the economy.

There is a lot of talk on the floor about how bad the economy has been, but that reaches back into the bad economy this President inherited when he moved into the Presidency.

The President's tax package is now beginning to work. Look at the economic indicators put out by the Joint Economic Committee in February of 2004. We talk about the unemployment rate, and that is going down. Employment is going up. Wages are going up. We have a chart that shows real gross private domestic investment going up. Corporate profits are going up. We have another chart here that shows farm income is going up. We have sources of personal income. That is going up. Total output, income and spending, those are going up. Production and business activity is now going up. Common stocks, prices, and yields are all going up in response to the President's economic package.

I went on the Internet this morning to see what was being said there: Consumer spending strong, and business investment rebounding. It had a chart showing how those factors were coming together. That is this morning. Then we see another chart that shows jobless claims continuing to trend downward. It shows an increase in the jobless rate at the time the President inherited this economy, and now we see, as his tax package has had an opportunity to go into effect, the jobless rate is going down.

The President's package for stimulating our economy has worked. It would be a shame if we walked away from that and went back to the old solutions which were to increase spending and raise taxes. That is the wrong solution at the wrong time.

The right solution is what the President has talked about. We need to cut taxes and spending in order that this economy continues to prosper, as we have seen in the figures from the last several months.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on our side, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, be recognized for 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Rhode Island for 6 minutes.

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

The Senator from California.

ECONOMIC REALITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have heard all these glowing figures from the other side of the aisle about this economy. I want to give a little dose of reality.

Today the unemployment insurance extension runs out. This Senate refused to act. I don't know how many times Senator CANTWELL has made that unanimous consent request.

In my State, it is estimated if unemployment benefits are not extended, 314,344 workers will lose benefits in the first 6 months of the year. This is outrageous.

This is the first time I can ever remember where a political party in charge could care less about people who are unemployed. Look at the record here. This is real. Let's go back to the Hoover administration, when there was a decrease in job creation. During every other administration—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton—private sector employment increased.

Not now. Here we are at a moment when people are running out of their unemployment extension. I will read you a letter written by Kathleen Fontana of Scotts Valley, CA:

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I am a single parent of two teenage boys and unemployed and unable to apply for the extension of UI. I was laid off July 2, 2004 . . . after 38 years with TWA. Needless to say, I am 60 years old, having been forced to live off my home equity loan in order to make ends meet. The unemployment extension needs to be passed and reinstated for us American citizens that are having these financial difficulties in the career area. More jobs are leaving the U.S. and more money is leaving here, too. Iraq is only one example. Things need to change and people at home need help too. . . . We need your votes to change this and have the extension of UI benefits.

As I go around my State—and I have been doing that a lot—the basic theme I am hearing is this: Senator, it is time for this country; it is time for America; it is time to think about our people and our workers.

I could not even believe it. I went into farm country and the rice farmers there who are sending their sons and daughters off to war—the contracts for rice are for the people of Iraq; they went out of the country. This is taxpayer dollars, American taxpayer dollars. Instead of saying, OK, we are going to rebuild Iraq and do it with American business and farmers, oh, no, we could not do that. Our State Department would not like that.

I am here to tell you there is something brewing in the countryside. People are angry about the fact that they seem to be last in line.

Let's look at some of these job loss numbers since this President came into power. Under Ronald Reagan, we had 165,000 jobs created per month. That was terrific. He was a beloved President. Under George H.W. Bush, 47,604 jobs were created a month. That was not very good. Under Bill Clinton, there was an extraordinary leap, to 236,625 jobs created per month. That is why kids got lifted out of poverty.

I saw a chart Senator SANTORUM had and it is beautiful. It shows how the African-American children are seeing poverty decline—up until last year. It is because during the Clinton administration we did welfare reform and we had a great economy. Then under George W. Bush, 58,815 jobs have been lost per month. It is a pathetic situation. If you translate that to my State, what we see in this situation is, again what has happened here and why we have to at least, A, be compassionate to the people who need extended unemployment benefits; B, we need to raise the minimum wage; C, we need to kill this administration's crazy idea to take overtime away from hard-working people.

Let's get this country back on track. It should be time for America.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

THE COURSE OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my concerns about the course of our military operations in Iraq.

I returned about 10 days ago from a trip to Iraq with my colleagues. After a brilliant offensive campaign to destroy the Iraqi military forces, we have settled into a very dismal and dangerous occupation. In the last few hours, five more American military personnel were killed by an improvised explosion device. There were four more civilians who were killed. Iraqi security forces have died in much higher numbers.

The administration has not responded appropriately to the military demand within Iraq today. One of the leading points that illustrates this, I think, irresponsible approach to Iraq is the failure to budget properly to fund this effort. The operation in Iraq costs approximately \$4 billion a month. Yet in the 2005 budget that was submitted by the administration, there is no money for operations in Afghanistan or Iraq. They are still working off the supplemental that was passed last year. But the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps testified they are seriously concerned that on October 1 they will begin to run out of money. They are already being forced to reprogram funds,

to rob Peter to pay Paul in order to continue this operation.

Having committed ourselves to Iraq, we must prevail, and to prevail, we must fund all of the requirements for our military. We must do it adequately and promptly, and the administration is doing neither. We have a requirement for many pieces of equipment. But probably emblematic of the difficulties of this operation, the two most pressing items of equipment are body armor and armored vehicles, principally uparmored Humvees. When we went into this operation, we did not understand the consequences of the occupation, the threats to our troops, the political rivalries in Iraq, the ethnic and sectarian divisions of the country.

As a result, we found ourselves with troops in the field without proper equipment. Many lacked body armor, the kind of sophisticated armor with ceramic insert plates that provide a margin of safety for our troops. The Army and Department of Defense claimed they fixed it. But as late as March 26, reports in the San Diego Union, Boston Globe, and USA Today stated soldiers in Iraq are calling home and asking their families to buy them body armor and send it to them, or they are buying it before they deploy. That is unacceptable. That is one example.

With respect to uparmored Humvees, last July I got off of the aircraft in Baghdad and approached the military policemen from the 118th Military Police Battalion from Rhode Island. The first request I had was: Get us uparmored Humvees. We are driving through these dangerous cities and we need that protection.

We have not reached the number of uparmored Humvees we need for critical troops in Iraq. This might be accomplished by November of this year, but it is a long time from the need of over a year ago and finally filling the requirement.

We also have to armor other Humvees, and armor kits have been provided to do this armoring. Again, the administration's budget is not sufficient. The Secretary of the Army said: We are going to get all this equipment done. We are going to run the production line at top speed.

Yet the money is not there in the budget. We have to do more.

Last September, Senator HAGEL and I offered an amendment to the supplemental to increase the size of the Army by 10,000 troops. This was vehemently objected to by the Secretary of Defense, but I think they eventually got the message. A few months ago, the Department of the Army announced they were going to increase the size by 30,000 troops. But they are not going to ask for the money in the budgetary process. They are once again going back to the supplemental—to take money from the supplemental, which already is strapped to pay for operations. As a result, we will have, I hope, additional forces in the military,