

and \$4 million in outlays below the 302(b) allocation. The bill provides \$155 million or .8 percent more in discretionary budget authority and \$1.0 billion or 5.6 percent more in discretionary outlays than last year's bill. The bill provides \$72 million more in discretionary budget authority and \$93 million more in discretionary outlays than the President's budget request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be inserted in the RECORD. I urge the adoption of the bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1391, INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 2004—SPENDING
COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
(Fiscal year 2004, \$ millions)

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays	19,359	70	19,429
Senate Committee allocation:			
Budget authority	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays	19,363	70	19,433
2003 level:			
Budget authority	19,472	64	19,536
Outlays	18,340	73	18,413
President's request:			
Budget authority	19,555	64	19,619
Outlays	19,266	70	19,336
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	19,627	64	19,691
Outlays	19,393	70	19,463
Senate Reported bill compared to:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority			
Outlays	(4)		(4)
2003 level:			
Budget authority	155		155
Outlays	1,019	(3)	1,016
President's request:			
Budget authority	72		72
Outlays	93		93
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority			
Outlays	(34)		(34)

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent that the Interior appropriations bill move to third reading.

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

If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the passage of the bill, as amended.

The bill (H.R. 2691), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Again, I thank my good friend from North Dakota. We worked very closely on this bill. I think we set a record. Actually, we started last Thursday and everyone shuffled out of

town for some reason or other—Isabel or something. But we actually have only worked on this bill—this is Tuesday—we did not have votes yesterday and we got some work done.

I appreciate the Senator's contribution to this bill. His staff has been very good.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on the amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The Presiding Officer (Mr. TALENT) appointed Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

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

IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee with Ambassador Bremer, who has just returned from Iraq and is here for the week to talk about the needs in the country of Iraq, especially to talk about the requested \$87 billion that is the part of the President's request he says is necessary for both the military needs in Iraq, to support the troops stationed in Iraq, and now completing their mission in Iraq, and also \$20 billion for the reconstruction of Iraq. I want to make a couple of comments about that because, since our hearing yesterday, I have been doing some research.

At the hearing yesterday I said to the Ambassador: It is quite clear to me the Congress will respond affirmatively. First of all, it is unthinkable to send America's sons and daughters wearing our military uniform to war anywhere in the world and not provide all the support that is necessary and that is requested. The military portion of that request, in my judgment, will be granted, should be granted completely and quickly.

Second, on the question of reconstructing Iraq, the \$20 billion necessary for the reconstruction of this country,

I asked Ambassador Bremer a number of questions. I want to make a comment about that and some of the research I have done since that time.

It is the case that the campaign that was called "Shock and Awe," which we all saw on the television, of bombing and the ensuing military action with smart bombs, smart weapons—that campaign did not target Iraq's infrastructure. It did not target the electric facilities, did not target the power facilities or dams or roads or bridges. It targeted military targets, palaces, and other items of strategic value, but it specifically did not target infrastructure in Iraq. So the damage to the infrastructure in Iraq is not damage caused by America's military action in Iraq. It is caused now, increasingly, by the insurgent movement in Iraq, the terrorists and others who are engaged in destruction in Iraq.

But the question I was asking the Ambassador about reconstructing Iraq is, If we did not destroy Iraq's infrastructure, then why should the American taxpayer be paying money to reconstruct the infrastructure? I suggested the infrastructure obviously needs to be dealt with, but should not the oil reserves in Iraq be used to pump the oil and produce the revenue for the reconstruction of this country? Iraq has the second largest oil reserves in the world. Those oil reserves, it seems to me, ought to be used for the reconstruction of Iraq. Let Iraqi oil pay for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Ambassador Bremer said to me: One of the problems with that approach is Iraq has a substantial amount of accumulated debt.

Since yesterday I began to research what is this debt that Iraq owes the rest of the world. My guess is it is the Saddam Hussein government that owes the rest of the world. That government does not exist. He is in hiding somewhere. The government doesn't exist any longer.

Here are the countries that Saddam Hussein presumably owes money to: Kuwait, probably somewhere around \$20 billion; Saudi Arabia, \$25 billion; the other gulf states, probably \$25 billion; Russia, \$10 billion; France, \$6 billion. These are not specific amounts that are tied down very well because the World Bank Debtor Reporter System tells us there are no collated figures available from Iraq because Iraq is one of the few countries which did not report its debt statistics.

So no documents exist in the Iraqi Ministry of Finance. None of it has yet emerged. They may well have been lost in the chaos. But would it be ironic if the American taxpayer is told that they must use their money to reconstruct Iraq and the Iraqi oil wells will pump oil, the proceeds of which will be used to pay Saudi Arabia and Kuwait for debts incurred while Saddam Hussein ran the Iraqi Government? You talk about a Byzantine result, that is it.

I believe reconstruction is necessary. But I also believe that reconstruction

ought to be paid for with Iraqi oil. The Ambassador will say, Well, there is not enough money left for the operation of the Iraqi Government, but the Ambassador also said yesterday with some satisfaction that they just put a new tax system in the country of Iraq. He said with some satisfaction that the top income tax rate is 15 percent.

So we are going to ask the Americans who will pay a top rate of 39-percent income tax to send reconstruction money to Iraq whose economy is generating an income tax against that with respect to its wealthiest citizens at a rate of a 15-percent tax rate. I don't think that makes much sense.

My only point is this: Of the \$20 billion, \$5 billion is for security. So there is \$15 billion for security and reconstruction above the military needs. I believe that what we ought to do is have the Ambassador and the administration work very hard to resolve these debts. It seems to me one might well tell the Saudis and the Kuwaitis: You loaned the money to the Saddam Hussein regime. You know that debt is owed to you by Saddam Hussein. Go find him and go collect it. If you think you can find him, tell us where he is. But go find him and collect it. That ought not be a burden on the country of Iraq. The government with which you engaged in this credit transaction no longer exists.

Following that, it seems to me that it would be reasonable to securitize or collateralize Iraqi oil. We know they will by next June or July be pumping 3 million barrels per day. The amount that is not needed in Iraq but that is available for export will yield revenues of about \$16 billion a year. That is \$160 billion in 10 years, or \$320 billion in 20 years, this for a country of 24 million people. If you can't securitize or collateralize \$320 billion over 10 years to pay for a \$20 billion reconstruction of Iraq, then there is something wrong with all the financiers and all the tall thinkers who are working on this.

I believe the money requested is necessary. But I believe the construct of the reconstruction in Iraq and the payment for that reconstruction should not be a burden on the shoulders of the American taxpayer—not taxpayers who are paying more than double the rate the top taxpayers in Iraq will be asked to bear and not taxpayers who should pay taxes so Iraqi oil wells can pump oil to send money to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. What a perverse result that would be.

We are going to have a lot of discussion about that, and we should have. The President has made a request and said the money is necessary. He is right. The money is necessary. The question is not whether it is necessary on the military side because we ought to appropriate that money. We ought to do it now, and we ought not delay.

On the reconstruction side, let us understand the money is necessary but it ought to come from the resources from Iraqi oil. By my calculation, those re-

sources would be \$320 billion conservatively in the next 20 years. It is easy to collateralize or securitize that with the private sector. Or, for that matter, if you do not want the private sector with the IMF or the World Bank in order not to impose this burden on the American taxpayer but instead rely on Iraqi oil, once again the second largest reserves of oil in the world under the sands of Iraq, a country with 24 million people, they surely can afford to construct a plan—that is, the Iraqi council, and also the allies that are involved, including this country—can surely construct a plan by which we use that resource to reconstruct and reinvest in that country. It is Iraq's resource. It is Iraq's oil. It ought not be an obligation of the American taxpayer to pay for that portion of the emergency request.

My hope is, as we begin these discussions in the coming days, that two things will emerge: No. 1, the President and others will understand that Congress is going to respond and respond affirmatively to the needs that exist, especially for our soldiers but also with respect to reconstruction, and, No. 2, that Congress does not, should not, and will not respond by imposing a burden on the taxpayers of this country for the reconstruction needs that should be financed with Iraqi oil. That is a debate that we must have.

I hope the result will be positive for the American taxpayer and positive for the people of Iraq, for that matter, because they have substantial resources with which to reconstruct the infrastructure of Iraq, which, by the way, was not destroyed by this country. That infrastructure in Iraq was not destroyed by this country's military campaign. This country's military campaign removed a brutal dictator. We are now opening football-field-size graves containing 10,000 and 12,000 skeletons.

That campaign, however, while removing the Saddam Hussein government, did not destroy their country's infrastructure, and there are plenty of resources under the sands of Iraq to produce oil with which to produce revenue to reinvest in that infrastructure and in the future without having the American people bear that burden.

NOMINATION OF GOVERNOR MIKE LEAVITT TO HEAD THE EPA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I rise to commend President Bush for nominating Gov. Mike Leavitt to be head of the Environmental Protection Agency. Governor Leavitt's hearing was this morning and, from all accounts, he performed admirably, as I would expect. He is a distinguished public servant who has worked diligently to address the environmental problems in Utah and the Western States.

I believe the President has found the right person for the job of leading the EPA. The EPA Administrator must es-

tablish realistic regulations that often require compromise and balance. In my experience, almost all of the issues that deal with our environment require a good sense of balance because there are so many competing interests. Governor Leavitt has demonstrated his ability to work with all groups affected by environmental regulation. He pulled together, for example, Governors, tribal leaders, industrial leaders, and environmental activists to get behind a comprehensive plan to clear the haze obscuring the scenic views in the West, including the Grand Canyon.

For nearly 11 years, Governor Leavitt managed to bring together a diverse group of State and tribal officials, industrial leaders, and environmental activists who focused on developing a plan which led to action that is clearing the air in the West.

I hope that a similar plan can be developed to clear the haze in the great Smoky Mountain National Park, which is about 2 miles from where I live. It is the Nation's most visited national park, and it also has earned the unwelcome distinction of becoming the most polluted national park in America.

We welcome the help of Governor Leavitt as head of the EPA in coming up and working with our Governor and Federal delegation and our communities in Tennessee, who are very concerned about this, to help get on a long-term path that would clear the haze in the Smokies and restore its natural beauty.

This will require cooperation among local, State, and Federal Governments and industry and environmental activists. I believe Governor Leavitt is the right person to help lead that effort. He has demonstrated he can do this by getting collaboration among groups instead of polarization.

As Governor, Mike Leavitt has encouraged results-oriented environmental action. I strongly support his views that policy should encourage outside-the-box thinking in solving problems rather than just complying with Federal programs.

Our environmental problems are complex. They require examination of many strategies to achieve our Nation's goals. The EPA Administrator plays a crucial role in balancing our desire to protect the environment and our desire for jobs and prosperity.

I believe we can have good jobs and strong industry and clean air and clean energy. The solutions are not easy, and in most cases—many cases—require new technology. However, with Governor Leavitt's leadership, I believe we will be able to develop the solutions and partnership to meet realistic environmental goals.

The job of protecting the environment is a difficult one, one in which I take a great personal interest. The President of the United States—this President—has distinguished himself by making a number of superb appointments. He has made another such nomination, and I look forward to the