

they are spending the best years of their lives in Major League baseball?

Mr. DORGAN. I fully agree. In rodeo sports, something I care a lot about because I grew up with horses and my father was an excellent horseman, they say somebody has a lot of try. It is an interesting way of describing it, saying he had a lot of try.

Well, I hope when we look back in the rearview mirror and get the testing that is necessary in baseball, the achievements of a baseball player in this country will be the result of both skill and try—I mean somebody who had the determination to do well, had the skill, who put in the time, and did well. But when we read the front cover of *Sports Illustrated*, and they have some magnificent baseball player saying, I had an MVP season, but I was on drugs, in my judgment it colors and taints the exploits and achievements of others.

I hope Mr. Fehr and all of those involved will have a vote of the baseball players or do what is necessary to get a consensus. I am certain a consensus of professional baseball players must surely want to remove this cloud. Again, this is not some mysterious issue for which we do not have a solution. The National Football League has solved it. The minor leagues have solved it. So, too, should Major League baseball.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my friend from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN. He has been involved in this issue longer than I have. I appreciate the opportunity of working with him on a variety of issues in the Senate.

I would like to make one additional point. I have seen some comments by some observers of Major League baseball, and they are saying: Look, it cannot be too big a problem because Major League baseball is breaking all records and it is more popular than it was before and ratings are higher, so it probably then should not be such a big deal.

I will make two points. There was a recent Pew Research poll that showed 90 percent of people who identify themselves as baseball fans say something needs to be done about steroids. But maybe more importantly, there was a time when baseball was very popular and had great attendance and was the national pastime and everybody was happy, but baseball was segregated. Baseball was a segregated sport. I would argue today, baseball in America is a lot better off now that it is an integrated sport, and I would argue that baseball will be a lot better off once we have a reasonable, workable testing program as far as performance-enhancing drugs are concerned.

For the good of our national pastime, I urge that Major League baseball owners and players sit down together and resolve this issue and then, as they have asked, we can move on to other issues of the day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 335) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 335

Whereas, the sport of baseball is widely considered America's pastime and an institution inextricably interwoven into the fabric of our culture;

Whereas, anabolic steroids are substances that are chemically and pharmacologically related to testosterone and promote muscle growth;

Whereas, anabolic steroids are Schedule III controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

Whereas, certain products are sold legally in the United States that promote muscle growth in a manner similar to anabolic steroids;

Whereas, medical experts warn that the health consequences associated with the human use of anabolic steroids or other similar performance-enhancing substances can be dire;

Whereas, medical experts warn that anabolic steroids and other similar performance-enhancing substances can have particularly serious adverse health effects on children and teenagers;

Whereas, these adverse health effects include stunted growth, scarring acne, hair loss, dramatic mood swings, hormonal imbalances, liver and kidney damage, a higher risk of heart disease and stroke later in life, as well as an increased propensity to demonstrate aggressive behavior, commit suicide, and commit crimes;

Whereas, the dangerous and anti-competitive effects of anabolic steroids when used by Major League Baseball players were acknowledged but not adequately addressed by the 30 Major League Baseball clubs and the Major League Baseball Players Association in their September 30, 2002, Collective Bargaining Agreement;

Whereas, the September 2002 Collective Bargaining Agreement does not allow for the imposition of a suspension or fine for a first-time violation of the League steroids policy;

Whereas, the September 2002 Collective Bargaining Agreement does not allow Major League Baseball players to be subjected to more than one unannounced drug test per season;

Whereas, the September 2002 Collective Bargaining Agreement does not prohibit the use of certain performance-enhancing substances that, although legal, promote muscle growth and pose a serious health risk to users;

Whereas, notwithstanding the 2002 Collective Bargaining Agreement, the prevalence of the use by Major League Baseball players of anabolic steroids and other performance-enhancing substances that promote muscle growth and pose a serious health risk, at the very least, appears to be significant; and

Whereas, the use of anabolic steroids and other performance-enhancing substances that promote muscle growth and pose a serious health risk to children and teenagers continues to rise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the use of performance-enhancing substances such as anabolic steroids poses a

health risk, especially to children and teenagers;

(2) the use of athletic performance-enhancing substances such as anabolic steroids to gain a competitive advantage is tantamount to cheating;

(3) there is sufficient evidence that children and teenagers tend to emulate professional athletes;

(4) the effectiveness of the 2002 Collective Bargaining Agreement to deter Major League Baseball players from using performance-enhancing substances such as anabolic steroids has been called into question;

(5) Major League Baseball and its players should exercise their collective bargaining authority to negotiate and adopt a more stringent drug-testing policy that is sufficient to effectively deter Major League Baseball players from using anabolic steroids or other similar performance-enhancing substances to gain a competitive advantage; and

(6) taking such a step would help—

(A) to preserve the integrity of the game of professional baseball;

(B) to protect the health of Major League Baseball players; and

(C) to discourage the use of performance-enhancing substances such as anabolic steroids by children and teenagers who seek to emulate professional athletes.

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

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

THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF
THE LIBERATION OF IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to speak for a moment about the historic day tomorrow, which is the 1-year anniversary of the liberation of Iraq, and the experience which Senator MCCAIN and Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator COCHRAN and I just had with a few others in meeting the Ambassador-designate from Iraq, Ambassador-designate Rend Al-Rahim.

She has been a leader in the movement for women's rights in Iraq, and has been designated by the Iraqi Governing Council to represent her country here in the United States at this historic time. In listening to her message, it simply should remind all of us of the importance of what we, as Americans, have been doing in support of freedom for the Iraqi people.

I wish to share a few of the comments which she made to us, and a bit of the response to that. First, she is a remarkable woman in her own right; she, as I said, has been fighting for Iraqi rights for a long time. It is no surprise that someone with her background and qualifications has been selected to represent her country in the United States.

Her first remarks were to thank the United States for helping to free the Iraqi people and making an opportunity available to them to govern themselves. She said that the main

word in Iraq today is the word “democracy,” that is what the Iraqi people are talking about, and they are going to be ready and, indeed, demand that when June 30 comes, they will be able to take control of the political affairs of their country.

This is something they have been waiting for a long time to accomplish, and they are very grateful to the United States for making this opportunity available to them. She made the point that democracy died in Iraq 35 years ago; that under the repressive regime of Saddam Hussein there was no freedom of expression, no ability to debate, political parties ceased to exist; he would not permit anyone to question him. But today she talked about the 150 new newspapers that have cropped up, debating all sorts of issues in the country, and the opportunity for people to present their views on free television.

She said throughout the country of Iraq today there is free and robust debate about the political future of their country; that political parties have grown, and the ability of Iraqis to govern themselves, in her view, is not in doubt.

She made the point the security problems the United States and coalition and Iraqi forces are facing today, while grave and serious, are not representative of any kind of popular uprising in the country as a whole; that in her view they represent a very thin slice of the Iraqi population, and Americans should not view this as the view of the Iraqi people in general. Indeed, the opposite would be the case; that most Iraqis support the presence of the United States, appreciate what we are trying to accomplish with the help of the Iraqi people there, and that this relatively small group of disaffected people does not represent the view of the Iraqi people as a whole.

In fact, her quotation, almost exactly—and she repeated it three times—was that the vast, vast, vast majority of the Iraqi people reject this point of view and support the presence of the United States and assistance to the people.

It was a remarkable performance by the Ambassador-designate who told us about the condition in which they found the Embassy when they came in and simply reminded us that we have a lot to do in supporting this new government and helping it to be a viable force, not just in the country of Iraq itself but in representing itself to the rest of the world, and most especially in the United States.

I was also moved by the strong statement made by my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, who had talked about his experience in Iraq and his experiences elsewhere in admonishing all of us to remember that there is no alternative to victory in this war on terror, and especially in the front we are conducting in Iraq today. Defeat is not an option. The consequences of defeat for the United States and the West and

our position in the war on terror would be catastrophic. Our credibility would be lost, and that credibility is our primary asset in dealing with terrorism around the world.

Our ability to affect the future with respect to the terrorist threat would be diminished significantly if we were not to persevere and complete our job in Iraq. This means, as Senator MCCAIN pointed out, we will have to acknowledge the hard reality that it will not be easy, and it will not be cheap. There will be casualties, and it is going to take a long time.

Remember President Bush first told us that when this war commenced, and in his State of the Union speech, pointing out that it would be a long, difficult struggle and that the American people would have to be prepared to persevere. The American people have persevered.

We are at a crossroads now. There are some among us who are raising questions. That, in and of itself, in a democracy is not only fine but critically important. The question is the tone of the criticism and the effect that it can have both on the morale of the Iraqi people and our own troops fighting there, as well as the message it conveys to the enemy terrorists. If the criticism is constructive and goes to questions of how we should be doing what we are doing, it could be very beneficial.

If, on the other hand, it suggests political motives for the President and the administration, suggests there is no support for the position we are taking, and suggests what little support there might be will erode to the point that we will not be able to sustain our position, then people begin to wonder. The people of Iraq who are still not secure, who are still fearful there are those among them who would cause them harm if they only had a chance, including the old Baathists, are going to be less secure and bold going forth with their new government and less willing to continue to support the United States.

Our allies, the same message. Our troops would wonder, Is this a fight worth fighting; their families wondering, Is it worth my son or daughter dying? Of course, the message to the terrorists, if we wait these people out, these Americans have shown that they are willing to only fight for so long, and then they will cut and run if we make life difficult enough for them.

This is a message we cannot afford to send. It is important the tone of the debate, the content of debate, the motives ascribed to leaders in this country all take into account the way the message is portrayed elsewhere, the way it will be played on Arab television, for example. These are not small matters. These are matters of fine-tuning a debate in the United States so that it will not adversely affect the way we can conduct the war on terror generally, and on operations in Iraq specifically.

I think sometimes we fail to take into account how our words are listened to all over the world. I know as a Senator, it is still hard for me to appreciate, knowing who I am and where I came from, that when I speak, my words may have pretty significant consequences to an awful lot of people. It is hard for me to remember that. I don't look at myself any differently than I did when I was a lawyer 20 years ago. But we in the United States tend to forget that others view us very closely, and everything we do they pay a lot of attention. So the words we speak in this Chamber and in other forums are going to be parsed very carefully by others around the world for meaning.

When those words suggest either there is a lack of support in this country for the policies being pursued, that were overwhelmingly supported by the Members of this body, the House of Representatives and, of course, the administration, when there is a suggestion that there is a lack of support for that policy or that support is eroding, and if terrorists continue to ply their trade they can undercut us to the point we will cut and run, when the words are interpreted in that way, then they undercut not just our policy but the people who are fighting for us in that region, and the people on whose behalf we are trying to help secure freedom.

That is why it is so important for us to conduct this debate in a civil and measured and responsible way. I urge all of my colleagues to try to approach the subject in that fashion. I criticize no one for raising questions or even for criticizing the President or the administration. It is perfectly appropriate in our country to do that. There is certainly no right or wrong in exactly how we are approaching each of these issues. The decisions are made in the fog of war. Many of them are somewhat gray.

I would only ask my colleagues, as we conduct this debate, that we consider the tone so it doesn't have an adverse effect on the actual war on terrorism itself.

As my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, said, defeat is not an option. It is impossible, given our military power, for us to lose the war in Iraq, but it would be possible to lose that war at home if we don't conduct ourselves in the same fashion and same spirit we ask our troops to conduct themselves when they are fighting for us abroad. That is an important responsibility we take on.

When I listened to the words of the Ambassador-designate today about looking at the future of her country with such optimism and such courage and such hope, it rekindled in me the desire to come and talk about the fact that we have to do our part. Our troops are doing their part. We have to do our part as well. We need to make wise decisions. We need to support the troops. We need to support the administration

to the absolute extent we can. Our partisanship should stop at the shores, as it historically has.

I know in an election year it is going to be difficult for us to discipline ourselves in that way, but we have to do so because of the stakes involved.

I find after 1 year of the liberation of the Iraqi people, great cause for hope.

We should not minimize the difficulties that lie ahead. I think we need to be extraordinarily candid about the problems we will continue to confront. But at the end of the day, if we persevere as we know we can, if we have the same resolve and strength of character our young men and women do who are there fighting right now—and you only have to talk to a few to be imbued with their spirit—then I have no doubt the United States will stay strong, our great ally Great Britain will do the same, as well as other members of the coalition that have assisted us so strongly; and in persevering and staying the course, we will be able, No. 1, to turn over political control of Iraq on June 30 to the Iraqi Governing Council and, No. 2, we will be able to stay for as long as it takes to help secure that country.

Just as we have had the opportunity to govern ourselves, the Iraqi people will have the same opportunity. That will, in turn, show others in the region how they too can govern themselves democratically, they can live in an environment of freedom, and that is infectious and probably would do more than any other single thing to ensure that region of the world can enjoy peace, and that peace can even come to the troubled relationship between the Palestinians and Israelis. It is something to be hoped for. It all depends on our ability right now to persevere, stay the course, and to maintain the hope and optimism we had when we began this operation.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the order before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to recommit S. 1637.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

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

THE EASTER PROMISE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will soon enter a period of recess prior to the Easter holidays. I am a bit like Samuel Adams, I believe it was, who said that he could listen to anyone speak of his religion. I am that way. I

can listen to a Methodist, to a Baptist, a Presbyterian, Seventh-Day Adventist, a Jewish rabbi, a Catholic priest. I have no problem in listening and paying rapt attention to anyone speak of his or her religion.

My own religion is the Christian religion. I grew up in a Christian home. I was raised by an aunt and uncle who took me after my mother died during the influenza epidemic in 1918. I was a bit less than 1 year old at that time, my mother having died on Armistice Day 1918. I was brought to West Virginia and grew up in the coal camps of southern West Virginia.

At this point I should say that the woman who raised me was a very religious woman. She did not go around wearing religion on her sleeve or claiming to be better than anybody else; she simply was a kindly lady who believed in religion, the old-time religion. She practiced it and many times I used to hear her pray after the old kerosene lamp was out and the rooms were dark. I heard her praying on her knees. I could say that my uncle, Titus Dalton Byrd, was also a God-fearing man who died when he was 82 years of age, a coal miner. He never owed any man a penny when he passed away from this Earthly life. I never heard him utter the Lord's name in vain in all the years that I lived with him. So that is the way it was. They were poor folks.

I recently heard someone say—I believe one of the Democratic Presidential candidates—that he was the first in his family to attend college, or some such thing. Well, I am the first in my family to have gone to second grade in school. About the only books that were in my home when I grew up as a child were a Montgomery Ward catalog, perhaps a Sears Roebuck catalog, and the Holy Bible, King James Version. The man who raised me could read the Bible. I do not know how he learned to read, but nevertheless there was a Bible in that home, and here is the Bible on my desk at this moment.

Now, why do I have this Bible here? Well, Easter is coming on and I am going to read from chapter 20 of the book of Saint John. I will not make any comment on the Scriptures, except to read very briefly from them. I do not claim to be a minister. I am not a minister, but I am fortunate enough to have the gift of being able to read, and as we approach Easter, I think it appropriate to read into the RECORD the following excerpts from the book of Saint John, chapter 20:

The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.

Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.

Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.

So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.

And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.

Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie,

And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.

Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed.

For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.

Then the disciples went away again unto their own home.

But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre,

And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.

And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.

And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.

Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.

Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

Easter Sunday, Mr. President, is the holiest day on the Christian calendar. On that first Easter Sunday, so long ago, a momentous gift was given to the world. It was a promise of life everlasting, of immortality.

For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son,

That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

It is easy to overlook the magnitude of this great but invisible gift amid all the brightly colored cellophane and foil-covered chocolates, amid the soft nests of translucent plastic grass nestled around sugary jelly beans and luminous dyed eggs. The talents of advertising agencies and merchandisers effect a powerful sleight of hand, drawing our focus away from the moving story of Easter with the dazzle of sugary commercial products that have been divorced from their historical and religious meaning.

It is difficult to ponder the end of life and death while surrounded by a quickening Earth under a warm Sun. These lovely spring days are each a small gift, too. In West Virginia, the trees are just in bud, allowing the warmth of the Sun to reach all the way into the shadiest hollows. In Washington, the 92nd annual Cherry Blossom Festival is underway, as the cherry trees along the tidal basin and the Jefferson Memorial create a lovely vista of blossoms.

Loveliest of trees, the cherry now
Is hung with bloom along the bough,
And stands about the woodland ride
Wearing white for Easter.