

want people who are desperate for change. We are not going to let them win. That is why this bill is so important.

I am pleased to talk about the important accomplishments and the importance of what we are doing in Iraq. The President and Congress must come together and do what is right for the security of the American people, and doing what is right means we will give the President the money which he has asked for the rebuilding of Iraq and for the protection and support of our troops in the field.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas. She certainly expresses the view of at least all of us on this side of the aisle in terms of the challenge we have before us and our willingness to take on that challenge and to complete this task we have begun in the protection of our country.

There are probably a number of questions that are frequently asked with regard to this issue. They should be discussed, and indeed they have been discussed. So, frankly, I hope we do not string this issue out any longer than it needs to be. We should have a reasonable debate and get on with what we need to do. I am very hopeful, as well, that the idea of some of the discussion is not designed to be political. Unfortunately, many issues do that. These are genuine issues. They are not political issues.

Some of the questions that are asked: Why can we not provide the resources for the troops and let the Iraqis do their own thing with their infrastructure? I think one of the differences we have, that we might not have with some other place, is Iraq has suffered from decades of corruption and mismanagement from Saddam, where he built dozens of lavish palaces for himself and his family and funded destruction programs. He involved himself in war in Kuwait, and he failed to invest in the country's critical infrastructure. As a result, more than \$100 billion in debt is unable to be tapped for their own resources. The stability of Iraq and Afghanistan is what is important so that they are no longer the breeding grounds for terrorism.

So it is important that we are helpful in restructuring the things that have not been done for many years prior to our involvement there.

Some ask: Why is rebuilding Iraq costing more than the administration said it would? Has the administration been honest about their analysis of the costs?

Again, that is a legitimate question. Under Saddam, Iraq was one of the most tightly controlled and secretive societies in the world. Until the country was liberated, it was hard to know exactly how much internal damage or neglect had been suffered in everything from the electrical grid to water and sewage. In addition, rebuilding efforts

have been hampered, of course, by the remnants of the regime and foreign terror groups that are there. It has been very difficult, in the long term, to understand what these costs would be.

What are other countries realistically going to contribute to the reconstruction effort, and what are the expectations for the Madrid donor conference? It seems as if there is now more support for doing something in terms of restructuring than we had in the combat stage. We expect that many members of the community will participate, as well as some international financial institutions and organizations, such as the United Nations. Quite frankly, when we start doing this I believe we will see some of the European economic interests there. Some of them were there before in a business sense, and they will return again. We have had discussions with these donors individually, and they are planned for the conference. We also need to review the assessments being done by the U.N.

What is our exit strategy? Again, that is a very difficult issue, particularly on timing. We know what we want to accomplish, but it is not always easy to know how long it will take to achieve those kinds of things.

After 9/11, the President told the American people that he would confront the threats to our Nation before they reached our shores. Our troops are performing a vital task right now, and that is what they are doing. They are liberators, not occupiers. We bring freedom to those oppressed people and help the Iraqi people. It is interesting that all we hear about are the difficult times—and there are difficult times, and I understand that. The media, or whoever it is, speaks of those difficult and tragic things at the top of the news. The improvements that are being made and the support that is there is not always as well understood as are the difficulties.

So I think we are making good progress. As we have pointed out, in just 5 months many things have happened that need to be done. The more that happens, the more support we will have from the Iraqi people, and we can begin to move rather soon.

We have enough forces in the region. That is always a question that is being asked. I mentioned it before, but in the professional judgment of the military commanders, who are the ones who really know, the 130,000 troops recently in Iraq can carry out the mission. Some of the marines have been sent back to the United States, knowing that if they are needed, of course, they could go there.

One of the last figures I heard was about 25,000 troops from other countries are there, and that is a good thing. Of course, we are dealing with an action at the United Nations, so there will be more input from the United Nations into what we are doing, and I think that is good.

So these are some of the questions that are asked, and I think they are indeed legitimate questions.

No one wishes we were there. We all wish the whole terrorism thing had not happened, but it has, and the Senator from Texas mentioned why we do not want it to happen in our country. We need to deal with terrorism where it exists and not to let it happen here. I am hopeful that this is an issue we can deal with, and deal with it in a timely way.

#### THE UNFINISHED AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. We have a lot of work to do. We have six or seven appropriations bills that we have passed. We have 13 total to do. This is the last day of the fiscal year. We will have to pass a continuing resolution to go on into October, but we certainly need to continue to work on that and get that completed as soon as we can. It is very important we do that.

There are several other bills, of course, that are pending that all of us feel strongly about. The Medicare bill is pending and we need to do something with pharmaceuticals. There is a great difference of opinion as to how we do that. The bottom line is that everybody knows we need to do something for Medicare, particularly pharmaceuticals, to make them available at a reasonable cost to as many people as we possibly can. So those issues are pending.

I have a particular interest in energy because of my committees and because of where I live. Wyoming is an energy-production State. We look forward to being able to do more of that. We are in the process of an energy policy and had planned to get that completed this week. The House and the Senate have both passed energy bills. Most everyone knows we need an energy policy. We have not passed one for a good many years, and things have changed substantially. So we really need to deal with it.

One of the issues I believe is important, that we are talking about, is an energy policy. We are not talking about every detail. We are not talking about everything tomorrow. We are talking about an energy policy that will give us some guidance into where we are 10, 15, 20 years from now. Obviously, things are going to change and indeed have changed. We have seen a number of the problems: the blackouts, the cost of gasoline, the shortage of natural gas, the things that happened in California. Those are part of what we are talking about, but we are also talking about the future. In this bill, we have things that have to do with renewable energy, finding ways to use wind energy, finding ways to use ethanol to extend the use of gas. We are talking about renewables. We are talking about doing some things with hydro and making that more accessible to much of the country.

Obviously, one of the questions we have is how to move energy around the country. It has to do with the blackouts and has to do with California. We

are talking about, how transmission can be operated, how to get new transmission incentives to invest in transmission costs. We find ourselves in a position of using more electricity, for example, but not really keeping up production to meet our demands. In some parts of the country—for instance, Wyoming—where we have lots of coal, we could generate a great deal of electricity, but then there has to be a way to move it to the market. Those have been very difficult things.

We have to have research. I mentioned coal. We ought to have more research so we can ensure that coal is clean and we can have clean air as we generate that fossil resource that is the most abundant resource we have in fossil fuel. We need then, of course, in the shorter term, to continue to encourage production. We find ourselves almost 60 percent dependent on foreign oil. We have a good deal of oil in our country and we need to find ways to extract more of that, keeping in mind at the same time the protection of the environment.

We can do that. There is ample evidence we can do that. So we have to deal with things such as incentives for unusual kinds of oil and gas that are more expensive to discover and to produce. We have to look at what we can do with the potential resources in Alaska, for example, whether it be having gas available from there, build a pipeline down so it is there, or whether we talk about ANWR. These are places where there are substantial sources of energy but they are not really available to us. These are some of the things we need to talk about.

We had a bill last year in both Houses. We had a committee working on it last year. We were not able to produce a policy. This year, the same thing is happening. We passed something in the Senate; there was something else passed in the House. We need to put together the differences, and there are differences, quite a few in terms of the amount of ethanol we use and the subsidies that are there for ethanol.

We have been talking about what to do about electricity and how much authority they have in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. That is controversial—how we can develop techniques, given regional differences in energy, without having the Federal Government in charge of everything we do. These are called regional transmission organizations, where the States can make the decisions within that for interstate movement. Then when you move between the RTOs, there has to be some Federal involvement.

These are some problems that are not insurmountable. We can get them done. Of course, not everyone is going to agree on every detail, but that is not uncommon in the Senate. We have to give away some things. Some things are different in Alabama or Oregon, and we need to reconcile those dif-

ferences and put together a national energy policy.

That is our challenge. I mention that to emphasize that hopefully we will not be here forever. We will be able to adjourn this session, hopefully in November sometime—early November, if we are lucky, or later. We have a lot to do prior to that time, but we can do it if we will bring it to the floor, if we have our legitimate concerns voiced in legitimate debates, but not just hold up legislation for various political reasons. I think that makes us look inefficient and unaware of what we have to do, and we have a great deal to do.

I believe our time has expired. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business.

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

#### FUNDING FOR IRAQ

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to discuss the pending administration request for \$87 billion, including some \$20 billion for the rebuilding of Iraq. At the present time, the Appropriations Committee is considering this request and soon the matter will be on the floor. I urge my colleagues to give consideration to the proposition that the \$20 billion to be advanced to rebuild Iraq ought to be in the form of either a loan or a loan guarantee. I understand this is contrary to the administration's position at the present time, but there may be some receptivity in the administration or, in any event, it is my thought that the Congress ought to consider this as an alternative in the spirit of trying to be helpful to the administration in working through the very difficult issues we are facing at the present time.

There is no doubt that the appropriation for the military is a matter of necessity as it has been outlined by the President. There is a strong universal commitment in the Congress to backing our troops. We compliment them on the extraordinary job they have done in the military victory in Iraq, and we compliment them further on their ongoing efforts to try to restore law and order, try to establish a peace to maintain. It is a highly regrettable situation that our military find themselves in a position of being police, responsibilities for which they are not trained and responsibilities which ought to be undertaken by others.

It is my hope that there will be assistance from countries such as Turkey

and Pakistan, Muslim countries, to give more confidence to the Arab world, or that we will work through an arrangement with the United Nations so that there will be some sharing of the burden of rebuilding Iraq, so that when it comes to the funding for the military, there is universal agreement and certainly my support for that appropriation.

The issue as to rebuilding Iraq, I submit, stands on somewhat different terms. As I think through the issue of funding the rebuilding of Iraq, I think about the analogy of a bankruptcy proceeding. There is no doubt that Iraq as a country is bankrupt. They have latent assets, sitting on the second largest oil pool in the world, but they do not have a government in existence. They cannot function. They are bankrupt.

When the argument is made that we should not further burden Iraq beyond the \$200 billion in debts which they have at the present time, the analogy to bankruptcy would say that those debts are owed to creditors that are general creditors, unsecured. When there is a bankruptcy, there are no funds to pay those creditors. They come last in line. If there are no funds, they simply get no funds.

On that subject, while not dispositive and not critical, I think it ought to be noted that some of these debts were incurred in a context where the lending parties knew they were supporting a totalitarian and dictatorial regime which had used chemical warfare on their own people, the Kurds, had used chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, a regime which was brutalizing the Iraqi people.

In a very realistic sense, people who were loaning money to Saddam Hussein in a context knowing that is where the funds were going were accessories before the fact to some very heinous conduct. In a very fundamental way, as a matter of public policy, they are not entitled to be reimbursed for funds advanced in that context.

Some of those moneys are owed by way of reparations to Kuwait and others. They stand on a somewhat different footing. But all of those funds are in a category, if it were a bankruptcy proceeding, of creditors that would take no assets when there are no assets to be taken. There is a further argument advanced that if the United States makes loans, then there would be no motivation or no leverage for the United States to get other donor nations to make contributions.

In a meeting, as I understand it, scheduled in Madrid for October 23, the United States will be pressing other nations to make contributions. If we are to have a chance to get contributions from other nations, it seems to me that we ought not to make a blanket grant at the present time of \$20 billion but ought to condition any such grant on getting cooperation and getting support from other countries. If the United States is to put up the \$20