

Before I get to the subject of trade, I first want to mention that this morning in the Congressional Daily, there is a lead story that says:

Growing GOP resistance might doom farm money in homeland funding bill.

It says here that House Republican leaders are digging in against a package of drought assistance that Senators added to the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

The House Republican leaders say that the drought amendment doesn't have a head of steam.

I am wondering how is it these leaders seem to think that spending is very important when it comes to funding the reconstruction of Iraq—which ran through here like a big old truck in fifth gear—but when it comes to spending here at home to help people, in this case helping family farmers through a real tough time, they say we don't know that we can do that. They are going to dig in our heels.

The Senate passed disaster relief for farmers. We also supported disaster relief for the victims of hurricanes. I have never in all the time I have been in Congress opposed disaster relief for those who have been victims. It seems to me, whether it is the fury of a hurricane that hits your area or drought or some other act of nature or God, when people are victimized, the rest of this country will extend its hands and say, you are not alone, we want to help. And we have always done that.

For those poor folks in Florida and the rest of the Southeast who have been hit by hurricane after hurricane, we have a responsibility to help them and we did and we will. We will do more. But it is also the case, for example in my State, where torrential rains meant that 1.7 million acres of ground couldn't even be planted and family farmers who rely on that planting to make a living will lose their opportunity and perhaps lose their farm if they don't get help. In August there was a freeze, and that freeze dramatically injured crops. And there was a drought in the southeast part of my State, where between January and July they received 2.2 inches of moisture in 6 months, and they too need some hope.

So when we pass disaster assistance, whether it is for the hurricane victims or for those in agricultural areas that suffer weather-related disasters, and then we hear that there is opposition to this by the GOP in the House of Representatives, I ask myself this: Why is it that they are so anxious to help everybody except the people in this country?

I offered an amendment last year on the floor of the Senate to strip about \$20 billion out of the bill for Iraq reconstruction which the President sent to us. That was the single largest cut in spending proposed on the floor of the U.S. Senate last year. Why did I offer that amendment? Because the President said, let's spend this money for reconstructing Iraq, when, in fact, Iraq has plenty of money to reconstruct

itself. Iraq has the second largest reserves of oil in the world. It is perfectly capable, especially with oil prices where they are. Iraq is now pumping slightly less than 3 million barrels a day—about 2.5 million. But they clearly have the capability to pump oil and sell the oil and raise the money to reconstruct themselves.

Instead, what we have is a roads program in Iraq paid for by the American people; we have an education program in Iraq paid for by American taxpayers; we have a jobs program in Iraq paid for by American taxpayers; we have a health care program for Iraq paid for by American taxpayers. You name it, We have all of these programs in Iraq paid for by us, the American taxpayers. The supporters of that bill were rushing to get that through the Congress and couldn't get it through quickly enough.

Now when some folks in this country are hurting and we pass a disaster relief bill to say, you are not alone, we want to give you some help, we have the GOP leaders in the House saying, you can't do that. Why not? That is investing here at home, at least. You were so quick to rush \$20 billion to Iraq to reconstruct Iraq; how about returning some money to help those family farmers who have suffered weather-related disasters?

This isn't over. There is going to be a big fight. If that is the attitude of other side, we are going to have a big fight about this because we owe it to those producers across the country who live on the land, who go to the fields in the morning alone to plow with nothing but hope that somehow things will work out. When they have weather-related disasters, they too need some help. They too deserve our help. So this is going to be a big fight.

We are not going to sit idly by and have GOP leaders in the House say that this isn't going to happen. It is going to happen one way or the other. We are going to make this happen. If we can spend nearly \$20 billion on reconstruction in Iraq, this country can surely open up its pocketbook and provide some much needed help for family farmers in a significant part of this country who have suffered weather-related disasters. That is a fact.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the Senate floor to speak about international trade, a subject about which I've spoken many times before.

I have just finished reading a book by Lou Dobbs. It is a quite remarkable book. And I wanted to share some of its observations with my colleagues.

At the outset, let me say that Lou Dobbs describes himself in this book as a lifelong Republican. This issue of trade is not the ideas of one political party or the other; the book is about a failed trade strategy which undermines the strength of this country by shifting

American jobs overseas. The title of his book is "Exporting America: Why Corporate Greed is Shipping American Jobs Overseas."

Lou Dobbs has been vilified for writing this book. But it is a rare and wonderful book. I am not in the business of selling anybody's books, but to those who are interested in this issue of what is happening to American jobs, who are interested in what is happening with our trade strategy, this is a good book to read.

We have lost nearly 2 million private sector jobs in this President's term, a fair amount of it to outsourcing. The outsourcing issue is one we need to explore in some depth.

I offered an amendment on the Senate floor not long ago. It says, let us eliminate out of our tax system incentives for American companies to shift their jobs overseas. If companies decide to ship jobs overseas, we ought not give them a tax break. That makes no sense at all.

Now, on page 19 of this book, Mr. Dobbs writes:

... American multinational companies that are outsourcing and offshoring are also essentially firing their customers. India can provide our software; China can provide our toys; Sri Lanka can make our clothes; Japan can make our cars. But at some point we have to ask, what will we export? At what will the Americans work? And for what kind of wages? No one I've asked in government, academia, or even the private sector has been answering those questions.

On page 31, Mr. Dobbs says:

Big business is saying that all we need to do to become the most competitive nation on Earth is to cut wages, throw out our environmental, worker safety, investor protection, product liability, and consumer laws, and eliminate corporate tax obligations altogether—and while we're at it, let's repeal those unfriendly antitrust laws. There's no doubt the result would be sharply lower wages and higher profits, but the result would also be a plummeting standard of living and the shattering of the American dream.

For writing a book that expresses a radical thought that we ought to be standing up for American jobs and try to find ways to stop shipping American jobs overseas, Mr. Dobbs has been wildly vilified.

The executive director of the Business Roundtable says this of Mr. Dobbs:

It's as if whatever made Linda Blair's head spin around in *The Exorcist* had invaded the body of Lou Dobbs and left him with the brain of Dennis Kucinich.

That's from John Castellani, executive director of the Business Roundtable. It is such a colorful quote. But it isn't even original. Daniel Henninger of the *Wall Street Journal* had written those same words about Lou Dobbs just 2 months earlier.

Let me share a few other of Mr. Dobbs' observations. One of the points he makes, which I have also made on the floor of the Senate often, is that the actual rules of trade are now being set by corporations. They have no allegiance to nations, much less individual communities or towns. They certainly

have no allegiance to government. And the corporations set the rules of trade. Mr. Dobbs says:

Corporations have overwhelmed governments in the borderless global economy. And corporate logos in many cases have more powerful symbolic importance than national flags. In part, that's because more than half of the largest 100 economies in the entire world are corporations.

Mr. Dobbs in his book used figures from the year 2000 to come up with his conclusions. At the time, Wal-Mart was equivalent to the 25th largest economy in the world. I have actually looked at the figures from 2003. What you see is that Wal-Mart, when you compare countries and corporations by size, is number 20 in the world. Wal-Mart is bigger than Austria, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Turkey, Denmark, and Poland, to name a few. But, then, the list of top 100 economies also includes ExxonMobil, so is General Motors, Royal Dutch/Shell, Ford Motor, DaimlerChrysler, and dozens of other corporations.

On page 40 of his book, Lou Dobbs says this:

We might begin by reminding our business leaders and politicians that Americans want to be regarded as citizens, not just consumers, and that they need to see this country of ours first as a nation, not [just] a marketplace.

It seems to me it is a good starting point for this discussion. There is so much effort these days to outsource almost everything, not understanding that it begins to diminish and erode the basic economic strength of our country.

Forty state governments are now outsourcing what were American jobs.

Again, this is from Mr. Dobbs's book.

The state of Indiana's Department of Workforce Development is responsible for helping out of work Indiana citizens find jobs. Ironically, the department awarded a \$15 million contract to update its computers to a firm in Bombay, India. The project would have provided employment to sixty-five workers coming from India on L-1 visas.

Why would they do that? Because of the millions of dollars it would save. But I expect the taxpayers of Indiana would have preferred their tax dollars be used to help those who are out of work in Indiana.

Again, this is quoting Lou Dobbs:

Only after a loud public outcry did the governor of Indiana cancel the contract.

A recent survey found that 40 States plus the District of Columbia have food stamp help desks that use operators in foreign countries.

In January of 2004, the Times of India ran a story with this headline: "Silicon Valley Falls to Bangalore." It says:

BANGALORE: The inevitable has happened. Bangalore, which grew under the shadow of America's Silicon Valley over the last two decades, has finally overtaken its parent.

Today, Bangalore stands ahead of Bay Area, San Francisco and California, with a lead of 20,000 techies, while employing a total number of 150,000 engineers.

Service jobs are being exported from this country. It is true in almost every single area.

Massachusetts General Hospital had a firestorm on its hands when it was learned that the hospital was sending x rays and MRIs to India for examination, even though it is illegal for technicians in India to diagnose U.S. patients. And even though Medicare does not pay for work done outside the United States, hospitals have found a way around that. They just have an American doctor do a cursory review of the work and then sign off on it.

This again is from Lou Dobbs's book.

Recently, we had a statement by Mr. Greg Mankiw, who is the head of domestic policy, the top economist in the Bush administration, that caused a great deal of consternation. He said that this administration supports outsourcing.

Lou Dobbs, I think correctly, points out in his book that both Democratic and Republican administrations have done very little to address these issues and, in fact, in many cases have made them worse. So this is not about one party or the other. Neither political party, in my judgment, has developed a set of policies that would address this. I think both political parties have largely been silent on this issue or have done things that have made this problem worse.

But the current administration has said that outsourcing is really a good policy. In February, the Los Angeles Times reported that the administration, the White House, was endorsing outsourcing.

This is what Lou Dobbs had to say about Mr. Mankiw. He said:

A number of people on Capitol Hill thought Mankiw should have resigned, but I disagreed. On my broadcast . . . I called for the President to fire him. Not merely because I obviously disagreed with him, but because Mankiw's statement raised the administration's support of overseas outsourcing to a declaration of government policy.

To drive home the point, Mr. Mankiw, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, told reporters that the President plainly supported shifting jobs overseas, provided those jobs could be done more cheaply overseas. This is what Mr. Mankiw said to reporters:

Outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade.

More things are tradable than were tradable in the past. And that's a good thing.

Maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does that mean? Well, maybe the next generation of doctors will train fewer radiologists and will train more general practitioners or surgeons. . . . Maybe we have learned that we don't have a comparative advantage in radiologists.

And the President's report said this about outsourcing:

One facet of increased services trade is the increased use of offshore outsourcing in which a company relocates labor-intensive service industry functions to another country.

In fact, the President's report says when it comes to trade, white-collar jobs should be no different from manufacturing jobs.

Well, after many of us raised some real questions about this, including Lou Dobbs, the White House spokesman, Scott McClellan said:

We certainly don't want to do anything that would undermine free trade.

Mr. Dobbs concludes: I believe this is a declaration of Government policy with respect to outsourcing.

So this is what is happening in the private sector with respect to the outsourcing of jobs.

The Wall Street Journal ran a feature article that I read some while ago that was interesting to me. It was an article on IBM's outsourcing practices. It described internal company memos which described a strategy to systematically outsource American jobs overseas.

This is from an IBM memo. It says: "Do not be transparent regarding the purpose/intent" and cautions that the "Terms 'On-shore' and 'Off-shore' should never be used." The company expects to shift about 3,000 jobs from the U.S. overseas. So they advise managers on how to communicate the news to the affected employees. The memo says that anything written to employees should first be "sanitized" by human resources and communications staffers.

The plan IBM had, according to the Wall Street Journal, would move jobs from U.S. locations, including Connecticut, New York, North Carolina, and Colorado. It would transfer them to India, to China, and to Brazil. It says:

Some of the foreign programmers will come to the U.S. for several weeks of on-the-job training by the people whose jobs they will take over.

That's an aspect of offshoring that many high-tech workers regard as particularly humiliating.

So this internal memo directs managers to say this to workers about to lose their jobs:

This action is a statement about the rate and pace of change in this demanding industry. . . . It is in no way a comment on the excellent work you have done over the years.

So see you later. We are going to move your job to India or China or Brazil. Thank you. You have done excellent work. The fact that you have lost your job is in no way a comment on the excellent work you have done.

Now, what are our trade officials doing about this? I will tell you what—they are trying to facilitate even more outsourcing, by enabling corporations to use even cheaper overseas labor.

Let me review some of the trade agreements we have been doing recently. Let me talk about CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement. This would integrate our economy with that of El Salvador, among others.

This is from a recent news story, describing how El Salvador is scarred by child labor. Subsistence work in sugarcane fields leads to injuries, continuing poverty.

Jesus Franco, 14 years of age, has scars crisscrossing his legs from his ankles to his

thighs and more on his small hands. For more than half of his young life, he has spent long days cutting sugarcane. He has the machete scars to prove it, and so do his four sisters, age 9 to 19. His story is repeated countless times across Latin America, where children even younger than he are found working in cane fields at subsistence wages, \$75 a month, which isn't even enough to pay for basic food needs.

So we are now going to integrate our economies with those of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica in a Central America Free Trade Agreement and set up our sugar producers for failure. That is what this is about, among other things.

Let me tell you about some kids who came to a hearing we had, who were working in a factory overseas producing rugs. These were kids who were locked in the factories, young kids 10, 11, 12 years old, producing carpets and rugs. We discovered that some of them had gun powder put on the tips of their fingers, and then it was lit so that it would burn the tips of their fingers and create big scars on all their fingertips. They did that so that when these young kids were sewing with needles, when they stuck their fingers, it wouldn't hurt because they had been scarred by the burns. Young kids with scarred fingers using needles to produce carpets to be sent to our stores. Free trade? Hardly.

Let me give some other examples. I have spoken often about Huffly bicycles. They were made in Ohio, manufactured in a plant by people who made \$11 an hour and were proud of their jobs. Huffly bicycles were 20 percent of the American marketplace for bicycles. They were sold in Sears and Wal-Mart and K-Mart. Huffly bicycles had a decal on the front of the American flag.

Well, Huffly bicycles aren't made in the United States anymore. They are made in China. They closed the plant, fired the workers, and said: \$11 an hour is too much for workers in Ohio who make bicycles. We will make them in China. And, by the way, the last job was to take the flag decal off the bike and replace it with a decal of a globe. Now Huffly bicycles, if you buy them, are made in China, made by people who work for 33 cents an hour. They work 12 to 14 hours a day, 7 days a week. Should we compete with that? Can we compete with that, with kids and others making 33 cents an hour? Huffly bicycles are gone. The people in Ohio who made them were fired. And Chinese workers now work 7 days a week at 33 cents an hour to make Huffly bicycles.

Another American company that moved its production overseas is Radio Flyer. They made the little red wagons. Everybody has ridden in a little red wagon. It was American for 100 years. This is pure Americana, except Radio Flyer is not made here any longer. After 100 years, the jobs of the American people who made the little red wagon are gone. The workers were fired. The jobs moved to China for low labor costs.

The list goes on and on. Fig Newton cookies. That is an all-American cookie. Every kid grew up with a Fig Newton cookie someplace on the shelf. But Fig Newton cookies are now made in Mexico. So when someone says to you, let's have some Mexican food, you can say: How about Fig Newtons. They left the United States. The people who made them are out of jobs.

The list goes on and on and on. The question is, Where will it end and when will it end? Should American workers be asked to compete with a 14-year-old working in a sugar field for subsistence wages? Should American workers in a textile plant be asked to compete with a 9-year-old kid who has gun powder burns on his or her fingertips to spare them the pain of the stabbing of needles when they make the carpets? Should an American worker be asked to compete with someone who makes 33 cents an hour working in a plant in China making bicycles or Radio Flyer little red wagons?

Let me describe the plight of a young woman in China and describe the circumstances under which we are asked to compete these days by those who want to find the lowest wages available on the face of the Earth and fatten profits, even while they diminish the standard of living. This is a story from the Washington Post. It is entitled "Worked Till They Drop. Few Protections for China's New Laborers."

This picture is of a girl named Li Chunmei.

It reads:

On the night she died, Li Chunmei must have been exhausted.

Co-workers said she had been on her feet for nearly 16 hours, running back and forth in the Bainan Toy Factory, carrying toy parts from machine to machine. This was the busy season before Christmas when orders peaked from Japan and the United States for the factory's stuffed animals.

Long hours were mandatory, and at least two months had passed since Li and the other workers had enjoyed even a Sunday off.

Lying on her bed that night, staring at the bunk above her, the slight 19-year-old complained she felt washed out. The factory food was so bad, she said, she felt as if she had not eaten at all. "I want to quit," one of her roommates . . . remembered her saying. "I want to go home."

Her roommates had already fallen asleep when Li started coughing up blood. They found her in the bathroom a few hours later, curled up on the floor, moaning softly in the dark, bleeding from her nose and mouth. Someone called an ambulance, but she died before it arrived.

The exact cause of her death remains unknown. But what happened to her last November in this industrial town in southeastern Guangdong Province is described by family, friends, and co-workers as an example of what China's more daring newspapers call . . . "over-work death."

The story of her death highlights labor conditions that are the norm for a new generation of workers in China, tens of millions of migrants who flock from the nation's impoverished countryside to its prospering coast.

The question for this country is, Do we want to ask the American consumer

to compete against companies that work a young girl to death, that put a young boy in a cane field with scars on his legs and arms, or put a young child in a factory making carpets? Is that what we want to ask our economy to do? Clearly that is importing low wages to this country. It is not just exporting American jobs, it is importing low wages.

I want to turn for a moment to a Nobel prize-winning economist named Paul Samuelson. I studied Samuelson in college.

Samuelson wrote the textbook on economics. If you went to college in the last 30, 40 years, you studied Samuelson. Professor Paul Samuelson is now 89 years old.

I have such respect for this man, Paul Samuelson. He has, just this month, started weighing in, at age 89, on the issue of outsourcing.

He has always been a free trader, a believer in Ricardo and the doctrine of comparative advantage, and Adam Smith. You know, the common sense notion that if you can produce the textiles in England—the sheep and the wool and the textiles—and you can raise the grapes in Portugal to produce the wine, it makes good sense for England to trade the textiles for the wine, and the English can drink and the Portuguese can wear wool. That is the trade we have all learned in textbooks—classic economics, the doctrine of comparative advantage.

The New York Times reports, however, that Paul Samuelson is rethinking the effects of outsourcing.

At 89, Paul Samuelson, the Nobel Prize-winning economist and professor emeritus at MIT, still seems to have plenty of intellectual edge and the ability to antagonize and amuse. His dissent from mainstream economic consensus about outsourcing and globalization will appear later this month in a distinguished journal, cloaked in clever phrases and theoretical equations, but clearly aimed at the orthodoxy in his profession.

I will give you a couple quotes:

Being able to purchase groceries 20 percent cheaper at Wal-Mart does not necessarily make up for the wage losses.

If you don't believe that outsourcing changes the average wages in America, then you believe in the tooth fairy.

That is Paul Samuelson, speaking today.

The fact is, when we talk about the issue of trade and fair trade, for some reason, we have just lost common sense.

Let me describe our trade with Korea in the area of automobiles. In 2003, we imported from Korea 692,000 cars. Guess how many American cars we sold in Korea? We sold 3,800. I will say that again. Ships brought Korean cars here, nearly 700,000 of them, and we were able to sell not quite 4,000 cars in Korea. Why is that? Is it because we produce a dramatically inferior car? No. The Koreans want access to our marketplace. They want to sell to the American consumer, but they don't want American vehicles in Korea. They just don't.

We sit around thumbing our suspenders and smoking cigars and pontificating about free trade, never willing to say to the Koreans: If you want to trade with us, I will tell you what, then be fair. If our market is open to you, your market must be open to us. If not, sell your cars in Zambia. Go try to sell them there. You don't sell them in the American marketplace unless your market is open to our product.

How about China? It is interesting. We did a bilateral trade agreement with China. I would love to find the negotiator who made that deal for us.

Here is what our negotiator agreed to. After a phase-in, the Chinese will impose a 25-percent tariff on American cars that would be sold in China. And we will only have a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese cars they want to sell in the United States. The Chinese can have a tariff 10 times the size of ours on reciprocal automobile trade.

I think that is stark raving nuts. Who on Earth could have negotiated such an incompetent deal? Do we not have people who will stand up for the interests of this country for a change?

Here is what I suggest for that trade negotiator. That trade negotiator should have worn this shirt during the negotiations.

You know we just finished the Olympics. We asked the Olympic athletes to wear a uniform so we could look down and see where they are from, and it always says USA. God bless them. I would love our trade negotiator, just once, to wear a uniform that says USA.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I would love, just once, to ask our trade negotiators to wear a uniform so at least they know on whose behalf they are negotiating.

I am so tired of what is happening in international trade negotiations. Will Rogers said, 70 years ago, that the United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference. He must surely have been thinking about our trade negotiators. It doesn't matter what it is—the United States-Canada FTA, CAFTA, NAFTA, WTO—all our negotiators have to do is show up and lose. They do it routinely.

This isn't a partisan issue, international trade. I think both Republicans and Democrats have let this country down. We need a new trade strategy.

Globalization is here, that is true. We are not going to turn back globalization, but we at least, by God, ought to have rules that are fair to this country and to the workers of this country and to the businesses of this country that do business here and stay here.

I have one final point. This Senate did not even have the strength and the backbone to at least shut down the per-

verse tax incentives that reward companies that export U.S. jobs. If we cannot take the first baby step in the right direction, it is a pretty hopeless situation.

We will have an opportunity to address these issues next year. I hope Republicans and Democrats today will decide in unison that exporting these jobs hurts this country, and there are policies and approaches we can do to change the fortune of this country's economic future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for so much time as I may consume.

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

IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about the war in Iraq and what I consider to be a larger problem confronting this Nation, indeed, confronting the American people, particularly during an election year. It is really a challenge we all have, and that is how, in a country that is founded on the legitimacy of our laws, being founded on consent of the governed, how do the people know what is happening, not just in their Government but in the world? How do they get good information?

I will give an example. Two nights ago, I received a call from one of my constituents in Lubbock, TX, who said he had heard we were going to reinstate the draft because of concerns about Iraq and Afghanistan and American forces being spread too thin. Of course, I told him we have more than 2.5 million men and women in uniform, including our Active Duty, our Reserves, and our National Guard. I said the phrase I have come to use often, and that is that we are out of balance, but we are not out of troops.

Secretary Rumsfeld yesterday spoke before the Armed Services Committee—the distinguished Presiding Officer, of course, is a member of that committee and heard those remarks as well—that we are in the process of restructuring our military forces so we can access more of those forces, so we can put those troops where they need to be. That is a process that is part of the global posture review and certainly the Base Realignment and Closure Commission process that goes forward next year, all of which falls under the heading of transformation.

Getting back to the question my constituent asked—which is, I am worried because I hear that we may reinstate the draft—I asked Secretary Rumsfeld that very question. Indeed, I alluded to a statement that had been made the day before by the Democratic Presidential nominee where it was said that it was possible that the President would reinstate the draft to handle the

war in Iraq if President Bush was re-elected. This statement followed on a charge last week that the President was planning a surprise postelection callup of additional Guard and Reserve troops.

I asked the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Rumsfeld, for the record: Are there any plans for a postelection callup of additional Guard and Reserve troops, and is there any truth to this rumor that the President plans to reinstate the draft?

He gave a very spirited response, but the bottom line is he said: That is nonsense. It is not true. It is false.

I guess if he could find other ways to try to get that message through, he would do that. I cannot remember if it was Mark Twain who said rumor makes it halfway around the world while the truth is still putting on its shoes, or something to that effect. It is in that vein that I come to the floor of the Senate to talk about Iraq.

Let me start by sharing the results of a recent nationwide poll of the Iraqi people conducted by the Independent Institute for Administrative and Civil Society Studies. I refer to this poll because, of course, like the distinguished Presiding Officer, I am sure she has experienced troops who have been in Iraq and come back to the United States, who read the newspaper accounts, watch TV news, and do not recognize what they are seeing and reading because, indeed, the troops in Iraq, in addition to being everyday heroes, are well disciplined, morale is high, and they know they are doing an important job and they are getting the job done. But they come back to the States, read a newspaper and watch the news, and they are met with gloom and doom and pessimism about our prospects.

I worry—and I expressed this concern yesterday—that particularly in an election season, those of us who are in elected office need to be very careful and very responsible about our statements, even when we are in the heat of political combat, because we do not want to do anything that would have the consequence of demoralizing our troops or breaking the resolve of the American people as we fight this global war on terror.

But this poll of the Iraqi people I believe is important because it consisted of more than 2,300 household interviews and was distributed across Iraq's 18 provinces. Here are just a few of the interesting statistics this survey reveals:

A full 75 percent of the Iraqis expressed hopefulness about the future of the nation, and more than 70 percent say they would not leave their country even if they were given an opportunity to live elsewhere.

While earlier polls show the Iraqis were concerned with security, and that is obvious to all of us that they would be and should be, as we are, the Iraqi police and army are gaining the confidence of the Iraqi people to deal with their transition from a terrible, blood-thirsty dictator under Saddam Hussein