

martial will be forthcoming. We are in the process of making the changes—not just the change of command but the change in procedures to see to it that this will not happen again.

As we have done in the past, we must get through this and not let it deter us from our overall goal of why we are in Iraq. We must not fixate on this stain on our honor to the point that we become so muscle-bound that we cannot proceed forward in our mission.

What is our mission? Speakers who have addressed this before me have made that clear. Our mission is to provide freedom and security for the people of Iraq. I believe that means freedom and security for the Middle East generally. I believe that means transforming the world in which Americans live and an increase of freedom and security for our Nation as well. These are worthy, indeed noble goals, and we must not be deterred from seeking them by preoccupation with this particular outrage.

I close with a conversation I had over the weekend. Like many of us over the weekend, I went home to Utah and I participated in Armed Forces Day. It was a poignant Armed Forces Day for a variety of reasons, because many of the people who were there were families of those in the military who were there without their family member—that is, children, husbands, wives, mothers and fathers of Utahns who are serving in this war and who are not home with their families to enjoy the delightful spring day at Murray City Park where everyone was having a picnic and a good time. Set up in that area was a series of flags, one flag for each individual who had fallen in either Iraq or Afghanistan. Of course, the majority of flags were American flags, but I was struck by the number of British flags, Italian flags, Polish flags, Spanish flags—one I did not recognize, an Ukrainian flag, an Estonian flag. We are providing the leadership, but many countries in the world are responding to us as we launch on this mission.

On Armed Forces Day I sat next to a colonel. He was not a Utahn; he had come to participate in the activities. We visited over lunch. With the Army, he has been in Kosovo, he has been in Bosnia, he has been in Afghanistan, he has been in Iraq, and he was on his way back to Iraq.

I said to him: Colonel, tell me what it is like. You have been there, you have been on the ground. Tell me what it is like. He gave me an answer we hear a lot. Indeed, it was the first sentence out of his mouth that comes out the same as many others. He said: Well, things are not nearly as bad as the U.S. press would have you believe. Things are really going fairly well in many parts of the country. But we have problems.

We talked about some of the problems. He made this observation that I think should keep us thoughtful as we address our mission in Iraq. He said: You know, whether it is Bosnia,

Kosovo, Afghanistan, or Iraq, the same thing is true: Those people are just like us in that all they want is to have their children be able to walk out of the door and be safe on the street, to be able to go to school without intimidation and learn what they need to learn to get a decent job and live a decent life. That is all they want in Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan, or Iraq—just like us. That is what we want in America. To bring that to Iraq and give the people of Iraq that opportunity, with their wives and their children and their grandchildren, unfortunately requires force of arms. Americans, British, Italians, Poles, Spaniards, Ukrainians, Estonians, are willing to risk their lives to bring about that goal. We must never lose sight of the importance of that mission or of the sacrifice that has gone into achieving it. We must never turn back simply because there are those who have put a stain on American honor by the way they have behaved.

I pay tribute to the Armed Forces. I pay tribute to the chain of command that is dealing with these challenges. I pay tribute to those who are willing to face the problems and not back away from them or cover them up. We must support them in their efforts. We must not smear the entire establishment because of the actions of a few.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OREGON'S ECONOMY

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege to sit in that chair during much of the morning hour and I heard many of the speeches of our colleagues and friends on the other side. The theme of the day was, Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago? Those are the words of Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter. Now they are being applied to George W. Bush. I can say as an Oregonian that the answer in my State is yes, we are now better off than we were 4 years ago.

When I watched George W. Bush take his oath of office on a cold and rainy January day 3½ years ago, I was very mindful that Oregon was not going into recession; we were deep into recession. We had spent 8 years of the Clinton administration watching the dismantling of 70,000 family-wage jobs in many of the natural resource industries in my State, specifically, timber industry, fishing, farming, and others.

We were told we did not need low tech, we had high tech. But the bubble of high tech had already popped in Oregon. Billions of high-tech values, equities, were disappearing because they

were no more than the blue sky in the end than they were in the beginning.

Then we should have known it, but the tourism industry that we were told would take the place of our basic industries was in risk of peril that maybe we could not have imagined. When September 11 occurred, tourism evaporated, as well. And my State, because of the policy of the 1990s, coupled with the incredible shocks of the high-tech bubble popping, September 11, corporate scandals, began to register some of the highest unemployment rates in America.

Today those rates are falling and falling fast in Oregon. They are nowhere near as good as they ought to be, but with lower taxes, healthy forest initiative, an effort to preserve our hydroelectric dams in the Pacific Northwest, Oregon is coming back, tourists are coming back, high-tech is being restabilized, and trade is being advanced. These are all issues that will be and are part of the Presidential election.

As one Oregonian, I ask, Are we better off than we were 4 years ago? By most indicators, the answer is emphatically, yes. The rule of thumb is it takes 6 months between the kind of economic news we are beginning to enjoy now before that news is fully understood by the American people. If that holds true this time, a majority of Oregonians will be able to answer with me that, yes, we are better off now than we were 4 years ago.

It is not perfect. Gas prices, as my colleague from Oregon, RON WYDEN, pointed out, are too high. There are many reasons for that. I don't know that they will ever come down to what they were. But I do know the contender for the Presidency does not have the answer on this. The truth is, we have to explore for more and we have to conserve more. It is not all one and it is not all the other. It is both.

I understand he is complaining he does not see the President jawboning down the prices. Yet I think what Mr. Woodward said, that the President was talking to Prince Bandar, the men and women would not stand for it. You cannot have it both ways all the time.

The other half of the equation of, Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago, is the whole issue of our foreign policy and our domestic security. Having spent 6 years on the Foreign Relations Committee, I watched President Clinton, well motivated in foreign policy, trying to reconcile what to do with American power in a world in which we were the only superpower.

I learned a great lesson from him as it relates to Kosovo. I was one of the few Republican Senators who voted with him on Kosovo, consistently believing it was in American interests because it was consistent with an American value that we end genocide in Europe's back door. But for our intervention, at the urging and pleading of our NATO allies, they would have lost Kosovo to Mr. Milosevic without American power, President Clinton's leadership, and the support of this Congress

that ultimately turned around that policy of genocide toward a European Muslim majority.

I remember asking President Clinton, Mr. President, can't you go get a Security Council resolution in support of this? He responded, Senator, I cannot because Russia and China have promised to veto.

I learned then how wise is now-President Bush's policy that you do not go to the Security Council of the United Nations in pursuit of the security of the American people. You do not get a permission slip from an institution that in its very makeup is not democratic.

It is a very interesting and historical observation that of the 191 countries of the U.N. members, only 89 would be described today as free and democratic countries. I guess a little more than half of them would be counted as liberal democratic democracies that ensure political competition, respect for civil liberties, significant independence, civic life, and independent medias. This is the same institution that puts Cuba at the head of its human rights commission and Iran at the head of its disarmament commission.

I say we should stay in it in a realistic way, even a skeptical way, using it as it serves America's interests because that is how other members of the U.N. use the U.N. But do not subject our security to a veto by the Security Council.

So when I hear our colleague on the other side run television ads in my State saying the first thing he will do as President of the United States is to return American foreign policy to the international community, I wonder what he means. And then he clarifies, he will go back to the Security Council.

I want the American people to know—I plead with Oregonians to know—that there is no security in that. Understand that permanent members of the Council—France in particular; Russia as well; China; occasionally Germany is a member—these were the primary creditors of Saddam Hussein, and they were also significant beneficiaries of the food for fraud—I am sorry—the Food for Oil Program which enabled Saddam Hussein to rearm and to execute tens of thousands of his countrymen and to build palaces of great austerity and wastefulness.

Regardless of the motives of other countries, the President did the right thing by going into Iraq and removing Saddam's murderous regime from power. We must remember that. He did the right thing for the people of Iraq, and he did the right thing for the American people as well.

By liberating the Iraqi people, we have provided hope to people not only in Iraq, but throughout the Middle East, that democracy is an option available to them. Civic movements throughout the region have emerged calling for political change, even in countries such as Egypt and Saudi Ara-

bia. The Washington Post has reported that the individuals involved in these movements have widely credited President Bush's democratization policy for allowing them the opportunity to operate in a climate that, up to now, has been unfriendly to their aspirations. This is a real accomplishment, one that is not often touted, but that serves as a harbinger of what is to come if the United States continues to press for democratic change in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, the shameful images being broadcast around the world of a few American soldiers abusing Iraqi prisoners undermine the hard work and dedication of so many Americans who are serving honorably in Iraq. These abuses are abhorrent, and those who are responsible for them must be punished.

But in no way should we equate the actions of a few Americans with the widespread, government-endorsed terror inflicted by Saddam upon his own people. The prisoner abuse was wrong, but the United States has laws and military codes that these soldiers violated—and under which they will be held accountable. You can hardly say the same thing about Saddam's Iraq.

The tragic murder of Nick Berg should remind the American people of the kind of world in which we are living. People who are willing to brutally decapitate an innocent man for the crime of being an American citizen are not individuals who respect international law, or the founding principles of the United Nations. They respect force, and power, and resolve, and determination. President Bush understands this critical fact, and is willing to deal with these evil men in those terms, not under conditions that we wish existed but do not.

I understand that to some, the burden of responsibility we have in the world may seem too much to bear. "Internationalizing" conflicts seems, on the surface, to be an appropriate way to reduce our commitments abroad. I disagree. The answer is not to abdicate our responsibilities, but to embrace them.

Next week I am traveling to Madrid, Athens, and Bratislava to discuss these very issues with our NATO allies. It is my preference that we act in conjunction with them, but let me reiterate, we should act consistent with our principles. If in doing so we are at odds with our allies, that is a price I am willing to pay.

I would simply say, as the Presiding Officer has noted, there is bad news, but there is much good news, and many of us would sure like a little equality of treatment because our goals in Iraq, our goals in the war on terrorism, are noble. Short of those goals, we are left with a more moderate tyrant in the Middle East governing Iraq.

I yield the floor.

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

PROJECT BIOSHIELD ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 15, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 15) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the payment of compensation for certain individuals with injuries resulting from the administration of smallpox countermeasures, to provide protections and countermeasures against chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents that may be used in a terrorist attack against the United States, and to improve immunization rates by increasing the distribution of vaccines and improving and clarifying the vaccine injury compensation program.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

S. 15

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Biodefense Improvement and Treatment for America Act".]

[(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

[Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.]

[TITLE I—PROTECTION FOR SMALLPOX EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

[Sec. 101. Short title.]

[Sec. 102. Amendment to the Public Health Service Act.]

[TITLE II—PROJECT BIOSHIELD

[Sec. 201. Short title.]

[Sec. 202. Biomedical countermeasure research and development authorities.]

[Sec. 203. Biomedical countermeasures procurement.]

[Sec. 204. Authorization for medical products for use in emergencies.]

[Sec. 205. Developing new countermeasures and protecting existing countermeasures against bioterrorism.]

[TITLE III—IMPROVED VACCINE AFFORDABILITY AND AVAILABILITY

[Sec. 301. Short title.]

[Subtitle A—State Vaccine Grants

[Sec. 311. Availability of influenza vaccine.]

[Sec. 312. Program for increasing immunization rates for adults and adolescents; collection of additional immunization data.]

[Sec. 313. Immunization awareness.]

[Sec. 314. Supply of vaccines.]

[Sec. 315. Communication.]

[Sec. 316. Fast track.]

[Sec. 317. Study.]

[Subtitle B—Vaccine Injury Compensation Program

[Sec. 321. Administrative revision of vaccine injury table.]

[Sec. 322. Equitable relief.]

[Sec. 323. Derivative petitions for compensation.]

[Sec. 324. Jurisdiction to dismiss actions improperly brought.]

[Sec. 325. Clarification of when injury is caused by factor unrelated to administration of vaccine.]