

Some critics, such as the junior Senator from Massachusetts, have argued that the war in Iraq is a distraction and that the global war on terrorism has actually been set back as a result of draining the swamp in Iraq. Senator KERRY's reversal on Iraq was wrong and his refusal to support \$87 billion for U.S. troops for reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan stands as a stark rebuttal to President John F. Kennedy's call to "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

This war is not an isolated fight against al-Qaida but a global competition with a shadowy evil that lurks on every continent. It is a fight against the very enemies of freedom. We must never ever shrink from that fight. Terrorists do not reside in Afghanistan alone. It would be dangerously irresponsible to focus single-mindedly on al-Qaida while neglecting the other real threats facing our Nation. There is no doubt that terrorists reside in Iraq. We see evidence of this fact every single day on television.

Those who claim that Iraq is a distraction in the war against terrorism have very short memories, conveniently short memories. They have already forgotten that the Clinton administration State Department listed Iraq as a state sponsor of terrorism—that is the Clinton administration: Iraq as a state sponsor of terrorism—and that Saddam Hussein provided safe haven to international terrorists. We all know he made cash payments to families of suicide bombers among Palestinians.

Now the terrorists are currently making a desperate stand to prevent the establishment of an oasis of freedom in the heart of the Middle East. If we fail to eradicate the terrorists in Iraq, we will fail to defeat terrorism anywhere.

Waffling on our commitment to Iraq would convince the terrorists that America is little more than a paper tiger, and it would undermine our global efforts to deter other rogue states, such as Iraq and North Korea, from supporting terrorism.

We must not allow Iraq to become another Somalia. Going home early is the surest way to embolden the terrorists and to ensure the failure of our efforts to bring peace and security to the Middle East.

It was said the other day that Iraq is Bush's Vietnam. Nothing could be further from the truth. It may be Japan or Germany or Korea, but it is not Vietnam. We face lingering threats and challenges in those conflicts, but by staying the course we heralded in decades of freedom and prosperity in places such as Japan, Germany, and Korea. That is what will be done in Iraq.

Victory in Iraq is now central to our war against terrorism, and not only because it is preferable to fighting terror-

ists in Iraq rather than in New York. A free Iraq represents a mortal blow to the terrorists' goal of a radicalized Middle East.

Until you change the politics of the Middle East, Islamic fundamentalists are going to keep trying to kill Americans, and not even the best defenses will be able to prevent every conceivable attack against us here at home.

Establishing a democratic and economic beachhead in the backyard of radical Islam is itself a major success in the war against terrorism. Indeed, that is precisely why foreign terrorists are so committed to preventing the Iraqis from building a democracy in the heart of the Middle East.

The war against terrorism must be fought outside of Afghanistan, and it must continue after bin Laden is dead or behind bars; otherwise, we will find ourselves as vulnerable as we were on September 10. We cannot keep America safe by distinguishing between terrorists who have attacked us and terrorists who want to attack us.

In conclusion, I close with a quote from Michael Kelly, who died a year ago in Iraq while covering the war from the tip of the spear as an embedded journalist with the Third Infantry Division. He wrote in February before our liberation of Iraq about our cause in Iraq and the challenges we would face. Here is what Michael Kelly had to say:

There is risk; and if things go terribly wrong it is a risk that could result in terrible suffering. But that is an equation that is present in any just war, and in this case any rational expectation has to consider the probable cost to humanity to be low and the probable benefit to be tremendous. To choose perpetuation of tyranny over rescue from tyranny, where rescue may be achieved, is immoral.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

IRAQ

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would say I agree with my friend that the situation in Iraq is not a Vietnam. But it is Iraq. I would hope the comparisons made to Korea and Japan and Germany do not apply. We, of course, in Korea lost 55,000 troops there who died, with hundreds of thousands wounded and in Japan and Germany there were over half a million dead.

I agree with my friend from Kentucky that we have to do what we can to come out of the situation we have in Iraq. We certainly are there. We have to give our troops everything they need. They are under tremendous pressure. The situation there in the past week has been very difficult. We have to, as a Congress, do everything we can to let them know we support everything they are doing, and to make sure they have all the equipment and supplies they need to do the very best they are trained to do.

JOBS ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have worked very hard on this side of the aisle to pass S. 1637, which is the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to comply with World Trade Organization rulings, the so-called FSC bill. I want everyone to understand on our side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle that Senator DASCHLE made to the majority leader, last night, I think, a proposal that should have been accepted last night; that is, from the 75 amendments that have been proposed on our side, that has been reduced to approximately 20 amendments, with very short time agreements on the 20, nothing more than 30 minutes, and one amendment is for as little as 5 minutes.

I also suggest that if we look at what has happened with this piece of legislation, there has been nothing on our side that has been dilatory. We have wanted to move forward on this bill, but in the entire time we have worked on this bill we have voted once. If you go back to years past, when a tax bill comes before the Senate, it is not unusual to have more than 100 amendments offered and disposed of here in the Senate.

I think the good-faith offer made by the Democratic leader to the Republican leader is something that should be accepted. This is a proposal that would be good for the country, and it is in keeping with what we have tried to do on this piece of legislation—let the Senate act in accordance with the traditions of the Senate. It is a far cry from what we should have been doing this past 2 weeks. We could have worked our way through all of these amendments, but that has not been done.

I would suggest it would be in the best interests of the country that the offer made by the Democratic leader to the Republican leader be accepted at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2305 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, in 2 weeks, this Nation will celebrate Earth Day. The first Earth Day was in 1970, 34 years ago. For three and a half decades, people from all walks of life have gathered on April 22 to celebrate the environment.

Since the first Earth Day, our Nation has had seven Presidents, including our current leader, President Bush. Four of the six former Presidents were Republicans: President Nixon, President