Mr. Smith, was extraordinary, and the outpouring from all across America was equally extraordinary. They set a goal of around $100 million, but it is my understanding they are approaching $200 million, showing the depth and feeling and gratitude of all citizens of our Nation.

With the greatest humility I compliment Senator Dole, Mr. Smith, and others who undertook this task and achieved beyond all possible dreams. The dedication is just shaping up to be one of the great moments in the contemporary history of the United States of America.

Stop to think: It took 11 years to get the legislation through. Hostilities ceased with the surrender of Japan. It is my recollection—I was but a young sailor then in training in the United States—it was in the summer of 1945, August, is my recollection, and the surrender of Germany, I think, occurred previously in that year, if my recollection is correct, May 8 or 9.

That extraordinary chapter and struggle of mankind to preserve freedom came to a quiet and reverent conclusion with extraordinary losses. Over 400,000 Americans alone gave their lives and probably in the millions who were wounded, including our distinguished colleagues, Senator Dole and Senator Inouye.

I am at a loss for words to express the gratitude of this country. We are here today exercising the right of free speech because of those sacrifices and elsewhere in the world, exercising various levels of democracy and freedom of speech solely because of the enormity of the sacrifices of that generation referred to now as ''the greatest generation.''

Madam President, I, at this time, again acknowledge the participation of our former colleague, Senator Dole, and the participation of all Members of the Chamber today and those who served in the 11 years preceding who participated in the legislative steps to bring about and fulfill the role of the Congress as it relates to this magnificent chapter in American history.

Madam President, I see another colleague, a very valuable member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, seeking recognition. Having spoken briefly before, my understanding is that the Senator will be speaking on the bill; is that correct?

Mr. DAYTON. That is right, matters related to the bill.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator may speak for whatever time he wishes.

Mr. DAYTON. Fifteen minutes, if I may.

Mr. WARNER. Whatever the distinguished Senator desires.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask at this time that we return to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is the pending question.

Mr. WARNER. And that the distinguished Senator be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator WARNER, and I certainly want to join in his remarks commending the husband of the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator Dole—both distinguished Senators DOLE—and also to recognize Chairman WARNER, who has been superb in his quest for the truth of what has happened in Iraq that has come to light in recent days.

I know it has been very difficult and there has been a high amount of pressure on him, but he and our ranking member, Senator LEVIN, have led us well on that committee, as they have throughout my 3½ years of service.

We are very fortunate that he has continued his distinguished leadership to our Senate and to our Nation throughout these years and continues to do so now.

This week we are debating the Defense Authorization Act for 2005 and will return to it after the Memorial Day recess. I thank the majority leader, Senator FRIST, for not trying to rush us through this important legislation, because it is complex, and it is also very costly.

This bill authorizes $422 billion of taxpayer money and borrowed funds for our national defense purposes in fiscal year 2005. That does not count the $25 billion supplemental that the President has requested, and it does not count the additional supplemental that we know soon after the November election will also be requested for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq during the rest of that fiscal year, probably another $35 billion to $50 billion. That means a total of almost $500 billion authorized for military operations in the year 2005.

When I arrived 4 years ago, in fiscal year 2001, that comparable figure was $309 billion. That is an increase of over 60 percent in just 4 years.

Obviously, a lot has happened since then. There was 9/11, the war in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq, the war against terrorism, homeland security, costs most of which are not included in this bill. I have supported every defense, homeland security authorization, and appropriations bill during my 3½ years in the Senate, and I sit on both authorizing committees. I will support this bill, as I did in committee. I will support the $25 billion supplemental appropriation, as I have all of the previous supplemental requests.

I want to ask for some answers from our Commander in Chief, President Bush: In return for this $500 billion of taxpayers' money, what is your plan in Iraq? What must be accomplished, and by whom, before we declare victory? How long will that take?

I spent 5 hours in the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings this week, 1 hour yesterday with approximately 40 of my colleagues, with the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the generals in charge of the war efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. I did not get answers to those basic questions. I heard generalities but not answers.

General Abizaid, the excellent general in charge of that region of the war, said it is vital that we ''stay the course.'' OK. But what course are we on? Where does it lead us? Where are you leading us, Mr. President?

I voted against the Iraq resolution in October of 2002 for three reasons. I thought it was unconstitutional for Congress to give up its constitutional responsibility to declare war and give the President that authority 6 months before he himself made his decision. Second, I was not persuaded that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction that threatened our national security. Third, I believed the invasion and occupation of an Arab nation would weaken, not strengthen, our national security. I believe I was right on all three.

Now that we are there, I want us to succeed. We must succeed. The stakes are too high for failure or defeat. But what constitutes success? We have already successfully achieved our stated objectives. Our Armed Forces smashed Saddam Hussein's army and toppled his regime in 3 weeks. We won that military victory overwhelmingly. We determined that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction to use against us or anyone else. None were used, thank God. None were found on the battlefields or in caches or in sheds or caves or anywhere else. None were even in production.

For the last year, our Armed Forces have heroically protected the country, helped to rebuild it, and trained and equipped some 200,000 Iraqis as police and militia. On June 30, some measure of authority will be transferred to an Iraqi government, selected by a representative of the United Nations, along with a blueprint for developing a national constitution and holding democratic elections. Success, success, success—a grand slam.

What else must we do? Madam President, 794 heroic Americans have given their lives to achieve that success, and I join with my colleague, Senator COLEMAN, who cited each of those Minnesotans by name. They are truly, like their fallen comrades, American heroes. Thousands more American heroes have been wounded. There are 134,000 American heroes risking their lives every day and every night over in Iraq for some indefinite period of time. And for what? For what, Mr. President?

We can do no more for the people of Iraq than give them back their country. What they decide to do with it is up to them. That is democracy. It is their country. They should administer it, patrol it, police it, and defend it—not us. If we are doing any of that, we are still running their country. We still get blamed for whatever is going

wrong. Our men and women still do the fighting, the bleeding, and the dying. Yet growing numbers of Iraqi citizens and people in other Arab countries hate us, want to drive us out of Iraq, want to retaliate against our troops or against our citizens. The longer we occupy Iraq, the more that hatred will increase.

There is no such thing as a perfect war. War causes deaths and destruction on intended targets and unintended victims. The devastation, the killing and maiming is horrific on everybody—our soldiers, their soldiers, their civilians, innocent men, women, and children who live there. Remember, it is their home. The stakes are inevitable and their ill effects are cumulative.

Last week, it was Abu Ghraib. This week it is a wedding attack. Next week it will be something else. There is no subtraction. There is no better. There is either war or there is peace.

Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

Again, I call upon President Bush to explain to us, the American people and to the world, for what purpose do we now remain in Iraq? What more must we accomplish, and how long will it take? How will the Iraqis learn to run their country except by running their country? How will they learn to police it except by policing it, to defend it except by defending it? It will not be easy for them. It will not be smooth. They have not had those responsibilities for over a quarter century, but it is time they started now, step by step, stage by stage. They should do more, and we should do less.

If we must extinguish every pocket of resistance, we will be there a long time, particularly when it is resistance to our being there.

The responsibility for 5,000 insurgents should be the Iraqis'—not ours. Their police should patrol their streets, protect their property, keep their peace—not our soldiers.

In Falluja, where Marine General Tim Conway turned those responsibilities over to Iraqi command, an uprising of 2 weeks ago is reportedly quieting down. Insurgents battling against us switched sides and joined the local police force. Most of the people fighting against us there stopped fighting against their fellow Iraqis and the rest were told to leave town by other Iraqis. Surely 200,000 Iraqi police and militia can contain 5,000 insurgents without us, without our bleeding and dying.

Our decision is, do we get out of Iraq in months or do we want to stay in Iraq for years? Right now the Bush administration's intention appears to be geared for years, with the assumption that our staying longer will produce a better result, a result more to our liking, for whatever those unstated reasons are.

But what if our staying longer will make things worse, for the Iraqis and for us? More violence, more casualties, more unrest, and more instability? That is not success. The worse conditions become there, the harder it becomes for us to leave because we cannot be considered weak or lacking will. In fact, the world doesn't think we are weak. They don't question our will. They are wondering if we are wise.

Getting out of Iraq in months instead of years is wise. We do it on our stated terms, not on anyone else's. We phase ourselves out, we phase Iraqis in—quickly. First they are made to have responsibility for their cities, for patrolling, policing, establishing law and keeping order; then their highways and other infrastructure; then oilfields and refineries; then their border security. During that transition, up to one-half of our forces could depart, be stationed in a neighboring country at the ready, and the other half could transition, as this transfer occurs, to secure base camps in Iraq where we will make it clear we will not tolerate anarchy or civil war or foreign intervention. The rest of it we allow the Iraqis to work out for themselves, among themselves, by themselves. We enlist other Arab nations and the United Nations to assist with those resolutions while we ensure against catastrophe, and we make clear our intention to leave as soon as Iraq's sovereignty is secure, as soon as Iraq's new government has established law and order. That is their democracy. That is our success.

Paradoxically, in life the more you try to control events to get what you want, the more you become controlled by those events and you don't get what you want. The administration picked their favorite Iraqi-in-exile and paid him reportedly millions of dollars to do their bidding. This week, American troops raided his headquarters and arrested his cronies. We don't know who the right Iraqis are to lead their country. Iraqis may not know yet themselves. But they will have better ideas than we will.

Our challenge, and our opportunity, will be to befriend their chosen leaders rather than to make our chosen friends into their leaders, only to discover they are not friends at all.

Instead, we should focus our efforts on aiding Iraq's new leaders to succeed, to rebuild and improve their country. That will make their leaders our friends. That will make their citizens our friends. That will help make more people in the Arab world our friends. And that would strengthen our national security much more than would more war.

To date, only $3.7 billion of the $15 billion Congress provided to help rebuild Iraq has been expended. Obviously, the lack of security has limited those expenditures. But so has the lack of commitment by the Bush administration because they have eschewed nation building. They have spent even less than that for rebuilding Afghanistan, a country which has a credible leader, President Karzai, with whom I met in Kabul, Afghanistan in January of 2002. He was desperate for our help in rebuilding his destitute country. What an opportunity to show the people of Afghanistan and the people of the Arab world what American knowledge, technology, capitalism, and compassion can do to make their lives better. It is an opportunity so far squandered by the Bush administration which, as I said, scorns nation building.

Nation building is better than nation bombing—better for them, better for us, and better for the world. A better world is our best national security. People whose lives we are helping to improve, who we are teaching and aiding to improve their own lives, become our friends, not our enemies. They will not harbor our enemies or help them. They will stand with us and the rest of the civilized world in rejecting terrorism and expelling terrorists from their own countries and their havens in the world.

Paradoxically, every day we are fighting the war in Iraq we are weakening our defenses against terrorism. Every day we make peace in Iraq, help rebuild Iraq, help rebuild Afghanistan, we are strengthening our defenses against terrorism.

The war against terrorism will be won by building a peaceful world, by building a prosperous world, for the multitudes, not just the millionaires. Raising standards of living, social justice and the rule of law—all that will foster democracy; not military occupation or provisional authorities, not prisoner abuses or more armored tanks.

So, tell us your plan, Mr. President, as we approach Memorial Day. Tell us how you will bring our 134,000 troops in Iraq safely home, and when. And tell us what course we are on; military escalation or peaceful cooperation? Nation bombing or nation building? Financial bankruptcy or global prosperity?

You are asking your fellow citizens for 4 more years, Mr. President. Tell us first what course we are on.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 to expand the Mentor-Protégé program to include service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses and qualified HUBZone small business concerns as eligible participants. Four years ago I worked closely with Chairman WARNER to extend the benefits of this successful program to women-owned small businesses.

As chair of the Small Business Committee, it is my responsibility to create an environment where small businesses can flourish and apply their talents to the many pressing needs facing our government. The primary issue for small business is access to the Federal marketplace and the opportunity to compete. When small businesses are denied the opportunity to participate in the Federal procurement process, the result for our government is a dramatically reduced contractor base, and the mounting lost opportunity cost of choosing among fewer innovative firms

to deliver products and services at lower prices.

For the past several years, the Department of Defense has had a program in place to try to develop and maintain small disadvantaged- and women-owned vendors as a vital part of our Nation's defense industrial base. This program has also been a principal source of opportunity for these firms by offsetting some of the other Federal procurement practices, specifically contract bundling, that have squeezed small business out of contracting.

Small businesses play a critical role in our Nation's economic and homeland security. Small businesses are currently the leading job creators in our Nation's economy and are responsible for more than 75 percent of net new jobs in America.

However, millions of Americans today continue to struggle to find jobs. Hardest hit are the Nation's inner cities and depressed rural areas that face poverty year after year.

By locating in a historically underutilized business zone—HUBZone, more than 10,000 small businesses have responded to the call to make a difference in these underserved communities and to strengthen our economic security. Congress needs to do its part by making the DoD a frequent customer of these small businesses, so we can help them compete effectively in the marketplace and create more jobs.

The Federal government, including the DoD, can and should also do more to meet its commitment to small businesses owned by veterans, including service-disabled veterans. As committee chair, I am dedicated to ensuring that these individuals who have sacrificed so much to defend free competitive enterprise are provided with increased opportunities to perform Federal contracts, especially contracts for weapons, equipment, and services for our warfighters.

In the fiscal year 1991 National Defense Authorization Act, the Congress adopted a provision to help small disadvantaged firms develop the technical infrastructure necessary to perform Federal contracts effectively. This pilot program, the Mentor-Protégé program, provided for prime contractors to either be reimbursed for their added costs in providing technical assistance to certain small firms, or to receive credit for accomplishing their subcontracting plans in lieu of reimbursement. Four years ago, I sponsored legislation that now enables women-owned firms to participate in the program.

Experience under the Mentor-Protégé pilot program has been positive. Mentor firms have demonstrated that they can help train small disadvantaged- and women-owned protégé firms to develop the infrastructure, necessary to be successful in large Federal contracts. As these successful protégés graduate, mentors can open their doors to the next generation of firms eager to contract with DoD as suppliers and subcontractors.

The program clearly has contributed to the success of bringing small disadvantaged- and women-owned businesses into DoD contract work. Over the last four years the DoD has increased the volume of dollars awarded to small disadvantaged businesses by more than 180 percent and the dollars awarded to women-owned firms by nearly 100 percent.

I ask that we expand participation to businesses owned by service-disabled veterans and businesses that locate in severely economically distressed areas. In so doing, we enhance the business competitiveness of these classes of firms and strengthen our defense industrial base by generating waves of small businesses prepared to supply goods and services in defense of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I also have an amendment to Section 833 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 providing for improvements and accountability measures in the test program which permits large prime contractors to develop company- or unit-wide subcontracting plans.

This amendment is designed to ensure that the test program undergoes appropriate evaluation and monitoring in order to enable accurate assessment of the effects of the test approach on subcontracting opportunities for small business.

Currently, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and customary procurement practices require prime contractors to prepare subcontracting plans with a particular contract or potential contract in mind. The test program, which operates as an exception to this rule, was authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for FYs 1990 and 1991. The purpose of the test program was to explore whether comprehensive subcontract planning could prove to be an adequate alternative for achieving meaningful small business subcontracting at lesser cost.

In April 2004, the General Accounting Office issued a report entitled ''Contract Management: DoD Needs Measures for Small Business Contracting and Better Data on Foreign Subcontracts,'' GAO–04–381, where it found the test program's results inconclusive and criticized the Defense Department for failing to adopt measurement metrics to meaningfully evaluate the test program. Despite this report, the Armed Services Committee approved a five-year extension of the test program in Section 833 of the Act.

As chair of the Small Business Committee, I am deeply concerned that the program fails to live up to its purpose as a test, and I question the prudence of extending this test program without proper standards and procedures to measure its success. My amendment provides a certain deadline for the DoD to institute the needed measurement metrics and freezes the expansion of the program until these metrics are in place. The amendment also provides for oversight by the GAO.

PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Ms. SNOWE. Lastly, Mr. President, I have an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 to strike Section 811(b) of the act, which alters disclosure requirements for subcontracting information provided to small businesses through the Procurement Technical Assistance Program of the Defense Logistics Agency.

This amendment will ensure that small businesses seeking federal subcontracting opportunities through PTAP would continue to have adequate point-of-contact information for procurements up to $1 million.

The Procurement Technical Assistance Program assists small businesses by providing training and information about federal business opportunities, both prime and subcontracts. Under the terms of this program, the DLA joins forces with State, local, and tribal governments for the purpose of delivering technical assistance services to businesses that are new to federal procurement.

Current law requires that experienced defense contractors with over $500,000 in contract awards disclose to assistance providers the contact information for their executives with authority to enter into subcontracts. These disclosures must be made only once a year. The cost of disclosures is practically non-existent. However, the disclosure requirement materially advances the purpose of the program by allowing small businesses easy access to potential subcontracts.

Nevertheless, Section 811(b) of the act seeks to exempt experienced defense contractors from these annual disclosures unless they receive over $1 million in government contracts. The need for this change is, at best, questionable. Providing a few names and phone numbers once a year is hardly a significant burden. As chair of the Small Business Committee, I am concerned that this change would needlessly obscure the procurement process for small business. I urge the Senate to retain the current PTAP disclosure requirements.

• Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I wish to clarify the intent of legislation I introduced yesterday, S. 2457. Certainly, I would like to ensure that the record reflects my intention in introducing this bill.

The provisions contained in S. 2457 mirror those contained in Section 3116 of the fiscal year 2005 Department of Defense authorization bill, which pertain to the reclassification of high-level radioactive waste. Let me be clear: I oppose these provisions. I hope the majority of my colleagues will oppose these provisions as well. I introduced this legislation for the purpose of demonstrating to my colleagues that