

that time when we see changes at the agency that will promote competition in our gasoline markets. Ms. Majoras has given no indication at her confirmation hearing or since then that she is going to change the Federal Trade Commission's oil companies' merger policies, which the GAO found in an independent review have increased gasoline prices for consumers.

Ms. Majoras didn't even believe high gasoline prices were enough of a problem for consumers to mention them in her opening statement at the confirmation hearings. When I and others pressed her at the hearing to say what she would do to protect consumers from higher gasoline prices, we were not given one example of how to address this urgent issue. She subsequently offered the committee a blueprint for inaction. Out of seven so-called commitments she wanted to make, three are a continuation of the status quo, and three essentially are public relations activities. Only one would involve something new—an investigation of a refinery closure using a subpoena, which is sort of like sending a search party after a horse that was turned loose years ago.

Since her recess appointment more than 4 weeks ago, Ms. Majoras has made it clear that protecting consumers from getting gouged at the gas pump is simply not a priority.

For these reasons, I have placed a public hold on the Majoras nomination. I intend to continue to object to any unanimous consent request for the Senate to consider this nomination, until we see that there are going to be some changes at the Federal Trade Commission to protect gasoline consumers, particularly the ones I represent on the west coast of the United States, who are now getting mugged at the gas pump.

I yield the floor.

THE ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN IRAQ

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, it has been another interesting week in the public debate on Iraq. Yesterday, a joint session of Congress was convened to hear the address of the Interim Prime Minister of Iraq, Iyad Allawi.

I have heard many foreign leaders address joint sessions, and I have found many of those addresses compelling, powerful, historic. Last year we heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Tony Blair, give a riveting speech, where a leader of a famous center-left democratic party forcefully supported our President and his administration on a question that has always been best served when the parties join together: the question of war and security.

We all remember the speech Prime Minister Blair gave, and the rationale he reiterated for joining his nation's forces to the cause of the coalition's liberation of Iraq. Prime Minister Blair and I come from two different political traditions, and we represent two dif-

ferent political philosophies, but I respect him and I admire him. His speech was one of the best speeches I have heard given in a joint session.

But yesterday's speech by Interim Prime Minister Allawi was truly one of the most historic speeches by a foreign leader before this Congress.

Prime Minister Allawi was direct in his gratitude for the U.S. contribution and sacrifice to liberate his country from tyranny. He was compelling in his declaration that the Iraqi people are determined to move forward in assuming their security and in conducting free and fair elections. And he committed his Government's partnership to fighting terrorism in that region and throughout the world. The House Chamber was fully packed by my colleagues from both parties. The Prime Minister received much applause and, to the best that I could see, that applause came from all of us. I am happy to recognize this because Prime Minister Allawi is not the Republican's ally in Iraq, he is America's ally in Iraq.

As we know from his biographies in the press, the Prime Minister has worked with American administrations before this one, including a Democratic administration. He is not beholden to Democrats or Republicans. He is beholden to the cause of an Iraq that is free from terror and tyranny. And he has the scars to prove that.

This is why I was so appalled to hear some of the criticisms of Prime Minister Allawi that emanated from the other side yesterday. None was so appalling as this statement, quoted in today's Los Angeles Times, by Joe Lockhart, a senior adviser to the Kerry campaign:

The last thing you want to be seen as is a puppet of the United States.

Now, what a thought to put out. What a condemnation of a man who risks his life every day for freedom in Iraq and freedom throughout the whole Middle East and freedom throughout the world.

"The last thing you want to be seen as is a puppet of the United States," said Mr. Lockhart who, last I checked, was not known for his foreign policy expertise. He continued:

You can almost see the hand underneath the shirt today moving the lips.

Now, Madam President, this quote will be read in Iraq today. The reason it can be read in Iraq today is because today Iraq has freedom of the press.

The reason there is freedom of the press today is because a brutal totalitarian dictatorship was deposed by a U.S.-led coalition. The reason there is freedom of the press today is because the United States has sacrificed over 1,000 of our young men and women to free a country from a dictator who tortured his people, gassed his subjects, invaded his neighbors, associated with terrorists and al-Qaida, built and hid weapons of mass destruction, repeatedly violated international law requiring him to reveal the whereabouts of

those weapons of mass destruction, never allowed international inspectors to confirm the destruction of those weapons, and never—never—ceased his virulent and hostile rhetoric against the United States, and who caused the death of at least 300,000 of his own fellow countrymen who now or did lay in mass graves.

Madam President, you know what is underneath the shirt of Prime Minister Allawi? Scars from an ax attack by Saddam's henchmen. And do you know what is underneath those scars? A brave and patriotic Iraqi heart, beholden to no one but the cause of a free Iraq.

The Democratic spokesman's statement was a calumny, pure and simple. It was a cheap and pathetic shot from a man whose only combat experience is bullet points in 10-point font. It was a cheap jab to a man who barely survived an ax attack ordered by a tyrant we have deposed, and who has been four times—four times—targeted by the terrorists and gangsters who kill our troops and the Iraqi people and who would kill us if they could.

But let me be plain. The statement was worse than a calumny. It was a deliberate attempt to undermine our mission in Iraq. And I am sick and tired of some suggestions I have heard in the press recently that we cannot speak plainly about these matters.

Prime Minister Allawi is as legitimate a politician as anyone in Iraq today. He has fought for the cause since before Joe Lockhart chose the pencil as his weapon of choice. He can list more fallen, tortured, vanished comrades than Joe Lockhart can list maitre d's. He is the Iraqi Interim Prime Minister because he was chosen last June by the Iraqi Governing Council—Iraqis, if you will—to lead his own country. He is the man we are relying on to lead us to elections in January, which is a key aspect of our policy in Iraq.

We are not there but to liberate these people. And we have done so, so far. And I am getting sick and tired of some who have found fault with this in the most discouraging of ways. I think some of those comments undermine our young men and women over there. How would you like your sons or daughters over there to have to read this drivel that not only has been said by Mr. Lockhart but others who have continually maligned this war, continually maligned our cause, continually maligned our leaders, and, by implication, our efforts in this war?

When a Democratic spokesman publicly says Prime Minister Allawi is a puppet, which Prime Minister Allawi clearly is not, and he says so in a way that Iraqis under fire from terrorists and gangsters can read, there is no way we can conclude that this is not undermining the Interim Prime Minister.

When the Interim Prime Minister is undermined, our political ally in Iraq is undermined. And when our political ally in Iraq is undermined, the work of

our soldiers—whose mission is to create the security to support our political strategy—is undermined. Their work is undermined.

Recently, there has been some tut-tutting in some of the press and the antiwar movement that such declarations as I have just made are beyond proper discourse.

Let me be clear: A state of war should give no cause for inhibiting free speech in a democratic society, and I would tolerate no restriction of free speech here or anywhere in the country.

After all, Michael Moore is free to denounce every manifestation of American foreign policy; is he not? And we are upholding his right to do so, as ridiculous and inane and asinine as his comments are. His antiwar work includes Serbian propaganda clips in defense of genocide in “Bowling for Columbine” to nice pictures of playful Iraqis peacefully flying kites in the halcyon days of Saddam Hussein, which is in his latest virulently anti-Bush creed, and, of course, cheered on by some of our colleagues on the other side. The man is not an idiot, but he acts like an idiot, and he is undermining our young men and women over there.

But likewise, honest policy debates—and the comments on the role rhetoric plays—should also not be restricted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I thought I had 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with 10-minute grants.

Mr. HATCH. I think I can finish in the next 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HATCH. When a Democratic spokesman calls Prime Minister Allawi a puppet, that is not a suggestion as to what the Prime Minister could better do in his difficult job. That is a statement that undermines the Prime Minister, our ally in a war against terror and tyranny. And when you undermine our principal ally in a war against terror and tyranny, you are undermining our cause.

Madam President, I buried my brother-in-law at Arlington Cemetery last week. I spoke of him on the Senate floor yesterday. He was a tough sergeant in the Marines. He had that unique pride that I have come to so admire in the Marines. His modesty over his sacrifices for his country was surpassed only by his love of his country. He was a true hero. He fought in Korea and Vietnam, and he bore the wounds of Vietnam through his life. Agent orange exposure killed him. And to his dying day, he thought the cause he fought for in Vietnam was just.

Last May, the Democratic nominee in this fall's Presidential campaign was quoted as saying that President Bush “didn't learn the lessons of our generation in Vietnam.” I find this remark staggeringly ironic.

Let me say this, Madam President. I honor the service of all who fought bravely and honorably in Vietnam—everyone, without exception.

But there are two different interpretations of our Vietnam policy. The antiwar movement's view on our Vietnam policy concluded that the use of American power was immoral and not to be trusted. Today, that world view is still very strong, overseas and here among the American left.

It has not changed much, except that, today, the left, which still distrusts the use of American power, believes that that power must be checked by the international community. That view holds that American power is illegitimate without the sanction of other powers, including the United Nations.

There is another view on Vietnam policy that my late brother-in-law held. And that view is that the sacrifices of those who fought nobly and bravely in Vietnam are to be forever honored. That view—my view—is that the American military won that war. When President Nixon signed the Paris Peace Treaty in early 1973, U.S. forces fighting with South Vietnam had secured South Vietnam. The war was lost when the north violated that peace treaty and a Democratic Congress failed to provide the arms and funds to help an ally defend itself from an invasion supported by the Soviets and the Chinese.

We made many policy mistakes in Vietnam, and the enslavement of the south to communism was a sad conclusion whose responsibility must never be borne by those who fought, but by those who failed to hold the course.

Do you know what one of the earliest policy mistakes we made was? It was when, under the Kennedy administration, the decision was made to stop supporting the Diem administration in South Vietnam. When that happened, the south lost a leading figure, a political leader. Diem was no democrat, but he was our political ally. We dealt ourselves a serious political blow when we failed to support Diem. He was assassinated, and our political goals were undermined.

I am not going to stand by and be silent when our ally, Prime Minister Allawi, is undermined by rhetoric from a top spokesman of the other party. Because some people need to understand that rhetoric has consequences.

Let debate rage, I say. Let the antiwar movement have its say, and let Michael Moore collect his fees on college campuses. But I believe that, in a time of war, we need to hold ourselves to higher standards of intellectual content, honesty and clarity.

Recently we have heard a lot about a CIA analysis from earlier this summer. Am I the only one to notice that the people who have been declaring that CIA analyses are unreliable are treating this latest analysis as holy writ? That the people who have taken the good work of Chairman ROBERTS and our committee—which did a stark and

honest review of the failings of pre-war intelligence—and concluded that the CIA cannot be trusted are now asking us to conclude, based on an analysis no one has read, that the President is lying?

A CIA analysis is just that: analysis. It is more than guesswork, but it is a lot less than prediction. Yes, the situation could go bad in Iraq—very bad.

But at no time in American history has an administration conducting a war concluded during a dark hour that success was no longer attainable. That is not leadership. To focus on the course to success is not lying. It is leadership. To focus on the darkness of the hour is not.

The situation in Iraq is difficult, but it will not go bad, because we will not accept failure as an outcome. Failure would endanger our security, and this administration will not allow that.

We are in a charged political season. The American public will choose who they believe will best ensure their security. I would ask all who opine to remember that, while we are in a political season, we are in a war. Let us criticize as best we can, but let us do just that: as best as we can. That standard, is far above the rhetoric of defeat, despair and, in the case of calling Prime Minister Allawi a puppet, self-defeating delusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NORTH KOREA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I believe this body is about to consider and pass the North Korea Human Rights Act and our amendment in the nature of a substitute. It is cleared through the House of Representatives and is on our consent calendar. It is about to clear through here, I believe, and I am thankful to the Foreign Relations Committee, the staff of the committee, the chairman and ranking member, for their work getting this moved forward.

This is about the fundamental human rights of the people of North Korea. It is my hope that this will pass today—and if not today, at least Monday.

It is no secret that North Korea policy continues to be a matter of intense debate at the highest levels of our Government and governments around the world. Reasonable people with good intentions disagree vehemently on various aspects of what an appropriate North Korea policy should be.

This is why I am pleased that the Senate, along with the House of Representatives, will soon be able to come together in unity and speak clearly on one particular set of issues regarding North Korea, and that is the most fundamental rights, human rights, of the