

When combined with his continuing pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, that seemed to pose exactly the sort of threat that the Bush administration rightly focused on as part of the war on terrorism.

Continuing costs. The difficulty of rebuilding Iraq is huge. The steady stream of U.S. dead and wounded is agonizing. The strain on the U.S. military, its reserves and the families at home is growing. But these developments, while troubling, are not altogether surprising—except maybe to those who believed the Bush administration's shallow prewar rhetoric. The calculation on intervention required a weighing of risks: the risk of allowing Saddam Hussein to remain in power, defying U.N. demands, versus all the well-articulated risks of intervention. Before the war, these were frequently said to include starvation, an outpouring of refugees, a fracturing of Iraq, a descent into ethnic conflict or simple chaos. We believed that reconstruction would be long, costly and risky, and we judged nonetheless that intervention would be less risky than allowing Saddam Hussein to remain in power.

Were we wrong? The honest answer is: We don't yet know. But at this stage we continue to believe that the war was justified and necessary, and that the gains so far have outweighed the costs. Each of the 326 American servicemen and women who have died in Iraq represents an irretrievable loss for family and friends. But the nation already has reaped great benefit from their sacrifice. One of the most aggressive and brutal dictators in the history of the Middle East has been eliminated, along with his proven programs to acquire deadly weapons. Millions of Iraqis have been freed from fear, and an opportunity has opened to bring much-needed political change to a region that is the source of the greatest security threats to the United States. Polls show a sometimes grateful, sometimes grudging willingness by most Iraqis to go along with U.S. plans for reconstruction.

Many Americans understandably have been surprised by the continuing casualties months after the president's appearance on an aircraft carrier under the banner "Mission Accomplished." Mr. Bush's abrupt submission last month of a large and poorly explained spending request to Congress also has strengthened public support for the idea that the Iraq mission must be failing. Yet the president's missteps have merely obscured the facts that these costs were inevitable, and that outside of the Sunni towns where support for Saddam Hussein was strongest, there is no quagmire—only a slow, slogging progress forward.

Continued progress is far from guaranteed. In our view, the administration could improve the odds of success by forging a broader international coalition. For that to happen, the administration must drop its insistence on monopolizing power over Iraq's political transition, as well as the contracts for reconstruction. It must compromise with those well-meaning allies who want Iraq to succeed but disagree with U.S. tactics.

Success or failure in the effort to stabilize Iraq under a reasonably representative government that poses no threat to the world will provide the ultimate answer to the question of whether the war should have been undertaken. Because we continue to believe that U.S. security is at stake, we also believe that the United States must be prepared to dedicate troops and financial resources to that goal until it is achieved, even if it takes years. In our judgment success is possible, but much will depend on whether the administration and Congress face the magnitude of the challenge and summon the political courage and diplomatic skills necessary to meet it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, I rise this morning to pay special tribute to a special man whose life ended exactly as he lived it—in service to others. LTC Dominic Rocco Baragona—"Rocky" to his family and friends—passed away at the age of 42 on May 19, 2003, near Safwan, Iraq. He had been deployed to Iraq and Operation Iraqi Freedom on March 16, 2003.

Lieutenant Colonel Baragona, originally from Niles, OH, was commander of the 19th Maintenance Battalion based in Fort Sill, OK. As commander, he was in charge of nearly 900 soldiers. At the time of his death, he was the highest ranking U.S. service member killed in Iraq.

Rocky Baragona dedicated his life to his country. After graduating from West Point Military Academy in 1982, he spent the next 21 years serving our Nation. He served with distinction, upholding what GEN Douglas MacArthur called the soldier's code—a code of duty, honor, and country. During his military career, he was stationed in Germany and twice in Korea, where he was the Terrorist Force Protection commander. He also served as an officer in the 101st Airborne and with the Green Berets.

Rocky was brilliant in regard to logistics. He received many honors while in the Army, including the Meritorious Service Medal, the Joint Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Joint Achievement Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Parachutist Badge, and the Bronze Star.

His superiors relied on Rocky. As BG Richard Formica, a commanding general of the Third Corps Artillery at Fort Sill, said:

I could count on him to tell me what I needed to hear, not what I wanted to hear.

Not only did they rely on him, they respected and admired him. According to BG Brian Gehan, who commands the Army's First Corps at Fort Bragg:

Rocky was a man of tremendous passion and of tremendous integrity. It was those qualities that set him apart.

I didn't know Rocky Baragona, but I wish I had. I say that because I learned a great deal about this man from listening to his family and his friends describe this man's remarkable life. On June 18 of this year, I had the honor of attending two memorial services for him—a private service, and then his burial on the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery. What I learned is that Rocky Baragona lived life well. He lived it with purpose and he lived it with love of family and of country.

At his memorial services, someone said when Rocky was around, everyone else just seemed happier; there was always more laughing. Others said he

had a positive energy, was never judgmental, and never made fun of people.

He listened. He was a good friend. He looked out for his mom and his dad and he helped others achieve their dreams. He was selfless.

Without question, Rocky Baragona was a good man. He was a nice, decent, generous, hard-working man who loved his family unconditionally. He was always there for them, willing to help anyone, any time, any place. His family called him "the rock." He was the cement that bonded that family. As his father said, "When everybody went their own way, Rocky made sure the family stayed together." Whenever they needed anything, Rocky was there, whether it was at Christmastime to bring the family together and shower them with gifts, or just to watch the Cleveland Indian games with his dad.

Rocky will continue to be there for his family; he will continue to be there in spirit, forever loved and forever remembered.

LTC Dominic Baragona was a brave man who loved his country. He was a brave man who served as a true example of what defines patriotism and service to others. He was a brave man who dedicated his career and his life to helping his fellow man, fighting for a better future for us and for our children and our grandchildren.

Left to cherish his memory are his parents, Dominic and Vilma; his brothers and sisters, Tony, John, David, Pamela, and Susan; and several nieces and nephews. You all remain in my thoughts and in my prayers.

Madam President, I will conclude with something Rocky's brother John wrote when he described Rocky:

Rocky was the smartest of the seven kids. He was the most generous of the seven kids. He was the kindest of the seven kids. He was always there for all his brothers and sisters. He was my dad's best friend and my mom's pride and joy. He was always looking out for everyone else.

That is who Rocky Baragona was, and that is how he will be remembered.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, can the Chair inform us as to the current circumstances involving morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The remaining 30 minutes are under Democratic control.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Chair for the information. I will use my leader time rather than using morning business time to talk about three matters.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, we are back, as all of our colleagues know, on the supplemental appropriations request offered by the administration. There are a number of amendments

pending—as I understand it, five—and there will be other amendments offered today. I urge colleagues to come to the floor to offer their amendments and to ensure we have adequate time by the end of the week to dispose of those amendments that have yet to be offered.

There is a good deal left to be done on the bill. Our focus will be on four areas. The first will be the need for the President to clarify more effectively what our plan is with regard to the use of the \$87 billion, the \$22 billion in particular for reconstruction aid. Today we saw yet another indication of the murkiness with regard to the plan. The administration has made a decision to reverse itself with regard to some of the demands it was making upon the United Nations, and, as a result, we are perhaps more hopeful now that the U.N. could be involved. But without a plan, it makes it very difficult for us to commit the resources. Simply asking for a plan is no substitute for the plan that is required.

Secondly, we want more transparency. Billions and billions of dollars are being spent. Corporations, such as Halliburton and Bechtel and others, have benefited, but we have no way of knowing how much, what will be the profit. When we passed the Marshall plan 50 years ago, we had an explicit prohibition on profiteering. There is no explicit prohibition today. As a result, there is no transparency as well. I think it is critical for us to have a better understanding for the taxpayers and the Congress to know precisely how this money is going to be spent and who is going to benefit and how, if we can, avoid the wasteful expenditures that some have already reported.

The third area we want to concentrate on is the need for a recognition that it ought to be paid for. Whether it is paid for in a way of collateralizing the money requested, if it is asking those at the very top of the income scale to help pay—there has been no request for sacrifice on their part—whether we simply make this a loan, recognizing that somebody is going to have to pay for this, somebody is going to have to be willing to borrow it and give it to Iraq or, the question is, Does it merit at least consideration that we ask Iraq to borrow the money rather than the United States? But somebody will borrow the money. That is the bottom line, and I think we need to recognize that point.

Finally, we also need to recognize important domestic priorities. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND, as I understand it, will be offering an amendment to provide the resources necessary to fully fund the Veterans' Administration budget for this year. We are over \$1 billion short. Their message is simply that if we are going to support the troops, we ought to support the veterans—the veterans who are coming home needing health care, veterans who are now being asked to wait up to 6 months for health care, in some

cases. But there are important domestic priorities that ought to be addressed as well.

It is our hope that through this amendment, and other amendments like it, we will be in a better position to say, yes, we want to be supportive of the need to reconstruct, to provide the resources to Iraq, but we also need to recognize the importance of providing those resources as well for important needs here at home, especially those involving veterans.

That will be the debate for the week. I am hopeful that many of these amendments will be adopted; that we can improve the legislation as it was offered and proposed, and, at the end of the day, we have the assurance we know where the money is going; that at least in part it will be paid for; that it recognizes domestic priorities; and that there is a plan, a recognition that we are not going to be there interminably; that we need a clear and much more precise way of analyzing our success or our shortcomings as we commit these resources for the course of the next several months.

CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, there is another issue I wish to mention. It has to do with a requirement by law that the administration issue a report on currency manipulation by October 15. That is the law. There is a requirement passed by the Congress, signed by the President, that the administration needs to provide a clear understanding of the circumstances, especially involving China and Japan.

We have good reason to believe there is dramatic currency manipulation underway in those two countries; perhaps as much as 40 percent of the current strength of the Chinese yuan can be directly attributed to currency manipulation.

When we passed the law, we said the Congress needed, first, to receive the report from the administration and, second, that the administration needed to lay out its specific plan for dealing, confronting, and effecting ultimately this manipulation so that the extraordinary impact it is having on our trade balances and, therefore, on our economy could be dealt with.

We currently have a \$103 billion trade deficit with China and a \$70 billion trade deficit with Japan. We have lost over 2.5 million manufacturing jobs just in 3 years. A lot of those jobs are going directly to China and Japan, to places in Asia.

The hardest hit industries in the last 2½ years include 67,000 jobs lost in the plastics industry, 15,000 jobs lost in machine tool manufacturing, 21,000 jobs lost in tool and die manufacturing, 100,000 jobs lost in furniture manufacturing, and 139,000 jobs lost in the textile manufacturing industries.

What we are suggesting is that, first, the administration do what the law requires. I come to the floor this morning

very concerned with the reports I have heard that the administration has no intention of releasing its report on time; that there will not be the report required by law that they will provide us with as clear an understanding of the circumstances involving currency manipulation as they can.

We also ask, not only do they offer the report, do they present the report to the Congress, but that they do what the law also requires, which is to enter into formal negotiations with all of those countries for which we are concerned as it relates to currency manipulation.

Finally, we also propose that they pursue a section 301 trade law investigation to set the stage for WTO and further action by the WTO in these cases, unless first we report and, secondly, provide specific and direct bilateral action and then pursue the laws as they are affected in this 301 matter.

There is no way we can begin addressing the very serious problems we have with regard to the manufacturing and service industry job loss we have experienced now in the last 2½ years. October 15 is upon us. The report needs to be provided, and I hope the administration will follow the law and do what the law requires and give us the report and allow us to work with them to enter into formal investigations at the earliest possible date.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr. DASCHLE. Finally, I will talk about our grave concern with regard to the ongoing investigation in the Department of Justice with regard to the leak of CIA agent Valerie Plame. In a letter to the administration, we have noted they need to address five specific missteps we think directly hinder and perhaps may adversely affect the outcome of this investigation.

First, the Department of Justice commenced this investigation on Friday, September 26, but did not ask the White House to preserve all relevant evidence until September 29. No one knows why. For those 4 days, the investigation went on without any formal request of the White House or anybody else to preserve all relevant documents.

Second, after the request, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales asked for yet another delay, until the following day, before any of the relevant evidence would have to be provided. This is a significant departure from standard practice and, again, mysteriously inexplicable.

Third, no request was made of State and Defense Department agencies until October 1, almost a week following the request made of the White House. Again, that is completely inexplicable. What is even more troubling is that the Wall Street Journal reported that a request would be made to the Department of Defense and the State Department the very day it was done, again