

As I and so many others have said for months, we cannot succeed in Iraq by ourselves. Not when the rationale for going to war has been exposed for the pretext that it was. Not when we are widely perceived as occupiers. Not when photographs of uniformed Americans abusing naked Iraqi prisoners have become the symbol of that occupation.

We saw, with the horrifying murder of Nicolas Berg by al-Qaida, the incredible depravity and determination of the enemy we face. Only weeks ago there were images of dismembered American corpses hanging from a bridge.

We are united in our revulsion, and in our commitment to bring to justice those responsible for such despicable acts. The question is how to do it effectively.

Last October 13th, in a memo entitled "Global War on Terrorism," Secretary Rumsfeld asked, "Are we capturing, killing or dissuading more terrorists every day than the madrassas and radical clerics are recruiting, training and deploying against us?"

Since then, he and the President have called Iraq the main front in the war against terrorism. It certainly did not used to be. Last week, I asked Secretary Rumsfeld how he would answer the question he posed last October—whether we are winning the fight against terrorism. He said he didn't know.

That speaks volumes. We are spending more than \$1 billion a week in Iraq, and the Secretary doesn't know if we are winning.

President Bush's Iraq policy has been discredited not only among the world's Muslims, but among most of our friends and allies. Not only have we lost the moral authority that is necessary to defeat terrorism, we have been unable to even secure the country we liberated. As I have said repeatedly, we need a radical change of course, and that decision can be made only by the President of the United States.

The President has reaffirmed his steadfast support for the Secretary of Defense, and at this point it appears that Secretary Rumsfeld has no plans to leave. But many are seriously questioning whether we can succeed in Iraq, or against terrorism for that matter, so long as he and General Myers, and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz, who are so closely identified with this discredited policy, remain at the helm.

At the same time, the President needs to articulate credible, achievable goals in Iraq, beyond "staying the course" and the usual clichés about remaking the Middle East.

We and the rest of the world need to know what those goals are and how he plans to achieve them, to whom we are going to turn over sovereignty that can effectively govern, how the President plans to secure the support needed from other nations to effectively address the deteriorating security situation, how long he expects our troops to stay in Iraq, and how many more billions of dollars it may cost.

Unless the President can answer these questions, more and more Americans will question how much longer we can ask our troops to risk life and limb in Iraq and the taxpayers to continue to pay for a policy that is not working.

END THE BLOCK AND BLAME GAME

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to make an appeal to our Democratic colleagues to end this obstruction of legislation vital to our Nation. I am appealing to my Democratic colleagues to abandon this harmful, politically motivated, election year strategy of gridlock, and if I may be so bold, to suggest a different election year political strategy that will not hurt Americans.

The Democrats' obstruction strategy is no secret in Washington, although it may not be so obvious to those outside the beltway.

We have all heard of the old "blame game." Well now, Congressional Democrats have taken it to a new level and created a new game. I call it the "Block and Blame Game."

According to a lobbyist, a few weeks ago one of the Senate's Democratic leaders gave a briefing to campaign contributors. First, all were assured, naturally, that the Democrats would take over the Senate. Second, they were told that to help secure this Democratic victory, they were implementing a strategy to block all major legislation, except for some appropriations measures.

So how does blocking legislation elect Democrats? The answer came within days as a Senate Democrat blasted away, charging that while Republicans control the White House, the Senate and the House of Representatives, the GOP is getting nothing done. The block and blame game.

Democrats must think that as long as no one outside Washington can figure out the nuances of the legislative procedures of obstruction, then as they say, "the proof is in the pudding," nothing is getting done, the Republicans are in control, and therefore the Republicans are to blame.

Who is really hurt by this strategy? Republicans? Maybe, if they are unable to explain the complicated procedures that are being used by Democrats to block the business of the Senate.

Clearly, it is the American people who are harmed. And for what reason? Simply, the interests of Americans are being sacrificed upon the altar of the selfish, political power struggle.

Please understand that I refuse to insult my Democratic colleagues by suggesting that they should not vigorously compete for control of Congress and the White House.

But they can do it in a way that helps Americans, not hurt them.

I do strongly urge them to abandon the block and blame game strategy and instead to join Republicans in making this closely divided Government work.

Let's all acknowledge that there are precious few legislative days left in the 108th Congress, that we have a large number of bills very important to our country, and that we do not have the luxury of debating and voting on each and every amendment we desire.

Let's recognize that no legislation will be perfect in everyone's mind, but let's not block it simply because we don't get everything we want.

Instead, let's work hard together to get these important bills to the President's desk to be signed into law.

And that is the basis of a better campaign strategy for Democrats, and one that will not undermine the vital interests of Americans.

Simply, Democrats could share credit for all the legislation enacted this year, but then they are free to argue with voters that had they been in control of the Congress and the White House, they would have done much, much better.

Or, Democrats might try to persuade voters that if they are elected, provisions that Democrats view as ill-conceived, will be repealed or modified.

Republicans are happy to engage Democrats in the debate this fall over the issues, our goals and our vision for our nation's future. And Democrats should be just as enthusiastic.

In short, there is no need to obstruct legislation. It makes no sense, it is totally irrational, for Democrats to be blocking critically needed legislation, crucial for their own constituents, simply because they fear that Republicans might get credit for passing and enacting legislation.

The ongoing fight over the Energy bill is a perfect case study that underscores my point of how the vital interests of Americans are being sacrificed on the altar of political ambition.

Last year, lobbyist working hard for either the medicare prescription bill or the Energy bill, were telling me that the Senate Democratic caucus was struggling with the following question: "Which, if either bill, should we allow to pass? We definitely cannot let the President have two victories."

Let me repeat, Congressional Democrats concluded that they could not let the President have two victories. So as it happened, Medicare was passed first, but then Democrats mounted a successful filibuster against the Energy bill.

They wanted to deny the President a victory.

Where did they get that crazy notion? What genius political consultants and pollsters are advising them?

Enacting the Energy bill would be a victory for all Americans, not just the President! It would be a victory for people of all political stripes.

There are provisions in the Energy bill that would help increase oil production, which would reduce gasoline prices.

Do you thing Americans, who drive up to the pump today, having to spend well over two dollars a gallon for gasoline, give a hoot whether or not enacting the energy bill could be considered

a victory for the President? Do you think for one moment that even the most dyed-in-the-wool Democrats living outside of Washington, DC say to themselves, "Well, we may be paying \$2.50 for gasoline, but thank goodness Congressional Democrats denied the President a legislative victory"?

Why don't Democrats do to the Energy bill, what they did to the prescription drug bill? Let it be enacted into law, and then go out and tell everyone what a terrible bill it is. Tell voters that the Energy bill is just terrible, but that Republicans are in control, and if that's their idea of good energy policy, so be it. But if you elect us, we will do this and that differently, and you will be far better off.

That type of political strategy does not undermine Americans. That strategy sets the stage for vigorous campaigns that will we won or lost based upon who have the best ideas and vision.

Perhaps, therein lies the problem for Democrats. Perhaps the block and blame game is easier to play for those who are not confident that they have better ideas and winning arguments about their goals and vision.

We came within two votes of shutting off the Democrat-led filibuster against the Energy bill. There are provisions in that bill of vital interest to virtually every part of our country, let alone establishing critically needed energy policy for our Nation as a whole.

For the upper Midwest's farm country, it contains renewable fuel provisions that will expand farm markets for corn and soybeans which in turn will increase income for farmers and rural Americans while expanding job opportunities. It contains provisions that increase our sources of oil and gas which will reduce the production costs of farmers as well as save money for all consumers throughout our country.

Each and every one of us can point to things we did not like in the bill, but instead of passing it for the greater good, it has fallen prey to the Democrat's block and blame game.

Just 3 weeks ago, Democrats sacrificed the renewable fuels section of the Energy bill to the block and blame game.

It is inconceivable that the renewable fuels amendment offered by the Democratic leader on April 27 could have been designed any better to assure its failure. It was guaranteed to fail. If you understand Senate procedures, and the importance of passing a regionally attractive, comprehensive Energy bill, it is obvious to you that this amendment was designed to fail.

Let me offer the proof.

First, everyone knows that any energy bill that has any hope of passing this Congress must be a comprehensive package that addresses a wide variety of energy issues and that draws bipartisan support from all regions of the country.

This fact has long been recognized by ethanol and farm organizations who

have been working hard for approval of the renewable fuels standard. Moreover, these groups recognize that the comprehensive energy bill has provisions beyond ethanol and biodiesel that are very important to their members.

So why did the Democratic leader fail to offer instead the comprehensive energy bill, which included the renewable fuels standard, as an amendment?

He has been around here long enough to know Senators from other parts of the country, who want to pass pro-energy provisions more important to their states than ethanol, are not likely to vote to strip ethanol out. After all, such an effort would unravel the energy coalition, and thus reduce the likelihood of passing their preferred energy provisions.

So the Democratic leader offered an amendment that he knew was less likely to pass.

The second bit of evidence that this effort was part of the block and blame game, is that no pro-ethanol Republican ally was contacted in advance to help develop a strategy to assure that we secure enough votes.

We have always counted on bipartisan cooperation to support ethanol legislation, and for the first time that I can remember, neither I nor any other pro-ethanol Republican was contacted.

Third, and even more telling, the Democrat leader failed to contact the ethanol and corn grower lobbyists in advance. That, I know, has never happened. If you really want to pass renewable fuels legislation, every one of us in this body knows you better have the National Corn Growers and the Renewable Fuels Association ready and able to help you line up the votes.

Why weren't they contacted? Perhaps it is because Democrats knew they would refuse to be part of an effort to splinter the broad energy coalition, sinking all hope of passing any energy legislation this year, including that for renewable fuels.

They would not willingly let themselves become victims of the Democratic block and blame game!

The fourth bit of evidence that this amendment was designed to fail involves Senate procedure. As soon as the amendment was offered, a signed cloture petition was immediately offered by the Democratic leader to his own amendment. This cloture petition, by the way, was signed exclusively by Democrats.

The most obvious reason to invoke cloture is to cut off a filibuster. But who in the world was going to filibuster this amendment? We were trying to pass a long-overdue solution to differences that has stalled the internet tax bill. Moreover, if the Democratic leader's renewable fuels amendment was so popular, why worry about a filibuster? Let's just vote up or down on the amendment.

Although cutting off debate is the obvious, normal purpose of filing a cloture petition, there is another purpose

which is not so widely understood. If cloture is invoked, all amendments to that underlying provision must be germane. If a second degree amendment is not germane, then you have constructed a hurdle requiring 60 votes to overcome.

Could it be, therefore, since no one was filibustering this amendment, that an attempt to invoke cloture was aimed at blocking the more popular, comprehensive energy legislation as a second degree amendment?

Indeed, Senator DOMENICI, recognizing hopes for energy legislation was being jeopardized by this block and blame game, offered the comprehensive energy bill as a second degree.

What most constituents do not know, is that had the democratic leader succeeded in gaining the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture on his amendment, the Domenici amendment would have been ruled out of order as non germane because it was far more expansive than the underlying amendment. It would have taken another 60-vote majority to overcome this ruling. That may not be impossible, but we know that some Senators vote will vote differently on a procedural question than they might on the underlying amendment. So this was another hurdle, another attempt at blocking the more popular provision that, remember, included the renewable fuels standard and had a much higher likelihood of passing.

The fifth piece of evidence that the Democratic leader's amendment was designed to fail is that he offered it to S. 150, instead of the compromise substitute amendment developed and offered by Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Given the long stalemate over the internet tax bill, we all knew that Senator MCCAIN's substitute had broken the impasse and that if anything was going to pass, it was his compromise.

But his amendment, No. 3048 was an entire substitute to the language of S. 150. We all know, therefore, that any amendment to S. 150, including amendment No. 3050 offered later by the Democratic leader, would fall when the McCain substitute was approved.

So you should offer an amendment to the substitute that will prevail. If you did not think you knew which would prevail, then you could offer two amendments—one to the underlying bill, and one to the substitute amendment.

Here is a good way to explain this. Suppose our objective is to get supplies to the space station. Do you load your supplies on the booster rocket, or do you load it into the space shuttle? The booster rocket in this case was S. 150, and the McCain substitute was the space shuttle. And we all knew that.

The next bit of evidence that the Democratic leader's ethanol amendment was designed to fail, is the very fact that he picked a bill, again, the internet tax bill, that is controlled and managed by the Senate's most out-spoken, anti-ethanol Senator.

If everything else failed to fail, adding an amendment to a bill to be taken to conference by Chairman McCain was the iron-clad guarantee it would be rejected. And in fact, that is exactly what Senator McCain stated on the floor of the Senate. He stated emphatically, and quite predictably, that if the ethanol or energy amendment passed, he would drop it in conference.

So the Democrat leader's amendment was designed in so many ways to fail, and thus, to block his own amendment. And guess who gets the blame? Republicans.

Farmers lose. All energy consumers lose. But if the block and blame game works and Republicans lose, too, then it is all worth it, because Congressional Democrats win.

The block and blame game.

An interesting exchange occurred between Chairman McCain and Senator Dorgan during the debate of this amendment. Senator McCain said, "I am sure there may be a headline in South Dakota that says: Senator Daschle fights for ethanol."

Senator Dorgan responded, "Senator Daschle has not offered an amendment for the purpose of a headline in South Dakota."

Guess what. As soon as his amendment failed, Senator Daschle did issue a press release. And not only that, the press release attacked Republicans.

The release, according to the Congressional Quarterly, was headlined, and "Washington Republicans abandon ethanol."

The block and blame game: hurts the farmers, hurts Americans, but helps the Democrats.

I would like to share a statement issued by the National Corn Growers following the vote:

Yesterday, during consideration of legislation dealing with internet sales taxes, Senator Daschle offered an amendment to create a Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS). Senator Domenici offered S. 2095 as a second degree amendment to the Daschle amendment. S. 2095 contains the RFS as well as other energy provisions. NCGA will support all efforts to pass an energy bill that contains an RFS and addresses the serious problem our nation faces regarding energy. We again call upon Congress to set aside partisan bickering and to pass an energy bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with the National Corn Growers Association. We have serious problems facing our nation, and we have several very important bills aimed at addressing these problems that are falling victim to the block and blame game.

I wish that what I was told by a Democratic lobbyist, about the strategy to block everything this year . . . I wish that it were not true. I hope that the Democratic leaders will have a change of heart and a change of campaign strategy that allows vital pieces of legislation to be signed by the President this year, and then let the election be fought over who has the best ideas or who will do better if they take control of Congress or the White House.

SECTION 8 HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators SCHUMER, KENNEDY, REED, and others as an original co-sponsor of this important legislation, which would clarify the intent of a provision in the fiscal year 2004 appropriations law regarding the Section 8 housing voucher program.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, has claimed that language in the FY2004 appropriations law requires it to distribute voucher funding in a manner that leaves no alternative but to reduce assistance by \$191 million nationwide. Subsequently, it issued a notice on April 22, 2004 that put in place a new system for funding Section 8 vouchers that differed greatly from its usual practice. In the past, HUD would reimburse housing authorities for the cost of providing housing to low-income individuals based on their real, current costs. Under the April 22 guidelines, however, the reimbursements will be gauged to August 1, 2003, plus a small adjustment for inflation. In addition, the change will be retroactive to January 1, 2004, which will create even further confusion for those public housing authorities whose vouchers are already issued and whose budget are already finalized.

I strongly believe that that HUD's interpretation of the FY2004 appropriations law is both unduly restrictive and is in sharp contradiction to the intent of Congress to fully fund Section 8 program. Despite HUD's protestations that Congress forced its hand to make these cuts, Congress in fact added funding to the Section 8 program in FY2004 so that HUD could fully fund all vouchers currently in use. Congress appropriated \$17.6 billion in FY2004 to renew expiring Section 8 contracts, or \$1.4 billion above the amount requested by the administration. Although the FY2004 appropriations law did make some modest changes in how voucher funding is disbursed, nothing in the law mandated that HUD take the unprecedented step of cutting housing assistance for senior citizens, the disabled, and working families and individuals with the greatest housing needs.

It therefore makes little sense that HUD would insist on reading the FY2004 appropriations law in such a way as to produce more homelessness across the nation. My own State of Connecticut will be especially hurt if HUD's April 22 notice is not changed to reflect the program commitments of housing authorities. Many public housing authorities in Connecticut are anticipating that the HUD proposal will result in a significant reduction in funds needed to honor existing contracts as well as effectively administer the voucher program. The current average Housing Assistance Payment for many agencies has typically increased beyond the August 1, 2003 "benchmark" plus the Annual Adjustment Factor. In most cases, this result is not due to increases in local rental rates but re-

flects the rise in unemployment among Section 8 participants and thus an increase in the public housing authority's share of the rent.

The impact of the April 22, 2004 rule on Connecticut will be particularly severe given that it has the sixth most expensive rental housing market in the nation and very few vacancies to meet the needs of low-income individuals. Coupled with the administration's proposed FY2005 budget cuts and block granting of the Section 8 program, which could adversely affect over 4,000 existing voucher holders in Connecticut, it is difficult to understand why HUD would be trying to balance its budget on the backs of low-income Americans.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development's April 22, 2004 notice is therefore just another salvo in the administration's war on the Section 8 program. Section 8 provides more than just rent assistance for low and moderate wage individuals in high cost housing markets. It also helps to sustain the employee base in urban markets, keeps wages for jobs in the service and manufacturing sectors competitive, enables corporations to remain and expand in their communities, and reduces the strain on vehicular transportation systems.

In an economy that is creating few jobs and producing scant affordable housing, HUD should be pursuing policies to ensure that no family in America loses its housing assistance. HUD's April 22 notice should therefore be changed, so I urge my colleagues to support this urgent legislation.

MANUEL RODRIGUEZ GOMEZ, MD

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Manuel Rodriguez Gomez, MD, Emeritus Professor of Pediatric Neurology at Mayo Medical School in Rochester, Minnesota, for his lifetime of education and as one of the first physicians in the United States to champion tuberous sclerosis complex, TSC. Dr. Gomez is considered by many to be the "father" of tuberous sclerosis complex research because of his many contributions to the field of TSC research and passionate patient care. Through his work to describe TSC over the lifespan of an individual with the disorder and the extraordinary resources provided by the Mayo Clinic, Dr. Gomez published extensively on his growing knowledge of the multiple organ involvement in TSC. He passionately encouraged his colleagues to not only provide medical care for individuals with TSC, but to also share their knowledge through conferences, publications and the three editions of the book, "Tuberous Sclerosis Complex." This book is considered by his peers to be the premier medical textbook for care of TSC patients. For his dedication to the many individuals he treated throughout his medical practice and his guidance of the Tuberous Sclerosis Alliance, Dr. Gomez made the world a