

all and will continue to go on as they have. Furthermore, those who aren't—the younger people—it is a choice they will make. Those are some of the things that need to be looked at to go forward.

I am personally very much in favor of encouraging people to have savings benefits of their own. After all, Social Security was designed to be a retirement supplement. In order to make it work really well, we have to have a program that is cost effective.

Medicare and Medicaid are in real financial difficulty—not only some of the Government programs themselves as they go forward but, because the impact of the cost of health care is not always fully paid by Medicaid and Medicare, the costs are shifted to people who have private insurance. That the entire cost is going up, the entire program—a great health care program in this country—becomes limited in access because of the costs. We have to do something about that.

As I mentioned, we have literally thousands of programs that are in place. I am not suggesting they are not useful. I am suggesting, however, that there needs to be some kind of a process. It is my understanding that OMB is talking about something that has some kind of a commission which would review the programs from time to time. I think that is a great idea. I don't know whether those programs are the ones we ought to have, and whether the Congress ought to appoint a commission, but there ought to be a way of evaluating. No. 1, how appropriate it is to continue those programs the same as we did 10 or 20 years ago, and whether those programs are being as effectively operated as they could be.

Sometimes when we talk about efficiency, we get a lot of feedback from people. But why shouldn't there be more efficient Government programs? We ought to ensure that, indeed, they are.

I think that is something we ought to take a look at to see if we can't have some kind of evaluation. I know it could be very time consuming. On the other hand, I think we could find ways to take a look periodically at the programs.

I wish we had some kind of a criteria for what kinds of programs are appropriate for the Federal Government. Particularly with programs that have some political clout for a Member, we find ourselves bringing it up and going with it. Some things you would really have a hard time saying they are an appropriate function of the Federal Government. There are so many things that could be done much better by State and local governments or by the private sector, but if it has some political appeal, we want to hop in there and do that.

I don't know exactly what it would be, but it would seem to me it would make sense if we had some criteria to say these are the kinds of conditions

that would justify Federal involvement, not only because of the cost but most of us would like to see some control.

We talk about deficits, but we never seem to talk about holding down the activities and the size of the Federal Government. I know these are easy things to talk about but difficult things to resolve.

I guess the President is suggesting that as we go about our work we hopefully will keep in mind a couple of thoughts. One is periodic evaluation of programs to make sure they are, in fact, efficient, effective, and still necessary. The other is that we take a look at some of the various prospects which are brought up.

For example, I chair a subcommittee which deals with national historic sites. We have a long list of national historic sites. Some of them, quite frankly, you would have a hard time justifying in terms of any national significance. There are very likely to be some things which are good for the main street of someone's hometown. Of course, we all want to do that. But there needs to be some criteria so it fits into this program.

These are some of the things I hope we can take a look at and make the Federal involvement a little less widespread and make sure what we are doing is done efficiently.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I look forward to working with my good friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Wyoming.

There are common grounds on issues that he has raised. I certainly agree that we need to always be on the alert for ways to find efficiencies in our Federal budget. However, I think we also need to keep in mind the reality that the domestic discretionary share of the Federal budget is now about 16 percent of that budget.

As we look at ways to get our Federal budget back into equilibrium, one of the best solutions I believe would be to return to the budget rules which existed throughout the 1990s—the so-called budget rules which require a Congress any time it attempts to raise the spending above a certain baseline or cut taxes simultaneously to explain how it is going to be paid for so that the end result is budget neutrality, allowing the Government to grow its way out of budget deficits. That is the reason we had three consecutive years of budget surpluses in the 1990s. I believe we need to return to that kind of budget discipline. Regrettably, the administration opposes that discipline. But I believe, given the massive size of today's budget deficit, we need to create that structure once again.

It concerns me when people allude to the Social Security trust fund as though it were some fictitious entity. The Federal Government borrows the money currently out of surplus dollars

that come in through Social Security taxes—FICA taxes—and then issues to the trust fund a Treasury bond. It is no different than all the other borrowing the Federal Government does. The Federal Government has never in our entire Nation's history reneged on its bonded indebtedness. We would never dream of doing that and destroying our creditworthiness internationally. It would be, I believe, an immoral act to do so.

The only reason there could be a long-term crisis in Social Security is if this administration and future administrations determine not to pay back its bonded indebtedness to the Social Security trust fund. It would be an unprecedented step. We need to make sure that is a step that is not taken. One of the best ways of doing that is to get our overall Federal budget back into equilibrium.

#### ELECTION IN IRAQ

Mr. JOHNSON. Another issue about which I will share some thoughts with my colleagues today is my hope—and I think it is shared by our entire Nation—that this election in Iraq is the beginning of a new era, beginning of a greater era of stability and opportunity for the United States to diminish its presence in that very troubled place.

My own oldest son served in combat in Iraq, and I appreciate profoundly the sacrifices and the risks and the courage of so many who have served our Nation there and in other dangerous places around the world.

We have this hope while at the same time recognizing that one election does not a democracy make; that the potential for ongoing violence, for chaos in many parts of that difficult country remain, and the election will be viewed more credibly by some than by others. I am pleased the turnout seems to be significant, seems to be supportive, certainly, in the Kurdish and Shiite regions; less so in the Sunni areas where most of the violence has centered. Nonetheless, it is our hope this is a beginning, a start, at least, to the point where we can begin to take troops at some near rather than later time back home to the United States.

We have paid a dear price. We are expending in the range of \$2 billion per week in Iraq, in a country that was a regional threat, was not involved in international terror, but which was a regional threat to its neighbors at one time. It certainly is our hope the efforts that are ongoing there will lead to the "Iraqification," if you will, of that country and the development of some self-governance in Iraq. The expenditure has been immense. We have not seen President Bush's budget for the next fiscal year yet. I am told to anticipate we will be spending \$1 billion per minute on defense. This is a remarkable undertaking, an obligation that we are going to have to deal with. It is my hope we will in the future approach these conflicts with a greater

eye toward multilateralism, toward cooperation with our allies—whether it be NATO, the U.N. or other regional security groups—and that we understand the reality that it is much easier to win wars than it is to win peace. It is certainly our hope that perhaps today marks some beginning in the progress toward if not peace, at least greater peace and greater stability than currently exists in that nation.

I commend the troops who have served with such courage and such distinction, their families. I have contacted two South Dakota parents just today about the loss of their sons' lives. It is something that strikes home to me in a very profound way because of the experience of my own son. These families will never be the same. These losses are devastating. We sometimes see the numbers in the newspapers and treat it as though it were just another daily event, but each and every day these losses constitute a life-shattering experience for so many parents, so many families, so many spouses, so many children. We should never look lightly on the contributions, the courage, the distinction, the professionalism exhibited by these troops, and let us, as a Senate, do still more to see to it that to the degree we put these young men and women in harm's way we do so selectively where no other recourse is realistic and that when they are in harm's way they have the equipment, the ammunition, the body armor, the other resources they need to minimize what is already an enormous risk to each and every one of them each day they serve in that country.

I express gratitude to our troops, their families, and caution that we still have a long way to go. The administration has indicated we may have troops in Iraq for another 5 years. I hope it is not that long. I hope we can see progress that will allow us to get every single one of our troops home sooner rather than later; that we can get this massive expenditure off the shoulders of America's taxpayers and be able to devote more of those dollars to the domestic needs we have in the United States, but at the same time recognizing yesterday was a day of some hope and expectation that perhaps better times will come in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me acknowledge my colleague from the State of South Dakota, who is unique in this Chamber. Those who voted on the question of whether America should go to war in Iraq were certainly representing our constituents in thinking of the American people in that historic and tremendous decision. My colleague from South Dakota, TIM JOHN-

SON, was the only Member of the Senate who understood that decision would affect his family directly. I am glad your son is home safely. I am glad he is now living in Illinois. I hope he is still enjoying that experience and happy about his recent marriage to a Lithuanian-American woman, and I wish them the very best.

For those who ask the question, and it has been asked by some, How can Members of Congress appreciate what a war means if none of their children are serving, my colleague, TIM JOHNSON from South Dakota certainly understood that personally as others have in the past.

What a great triumph yesterday. There was a possibility that all the violence in Iraq would discourage people from voting. One can understand that when they are lobbing mortar shells in the green zone, the protected zone in Baghdad where American soldiers a couple weeks ago were eating a meal. One can understand the vulnerability of life in Iraq.

Each citizen had to make a decision yesterday in Iraq, whether to risk their life to vote. It appears millions were prepared to do so. As Senator LOTT of Mississippi said earlier, after they voted, they dipped their finger into this indelible ink, an indication they had already voted so there was no duplication voting, and that ink was on their hands today, testimony, as well, for the insurgents that these Iraqis had defied the insurgency to cast a vote for their future.

It was a great triumph, a triumph of human spirit, and a triumph for the Iraqi people, all that they have been through, to finally have this moment to have an election. A great deal has to be said for the men and women of our American military who made it possible. They risked their lives again yesterday, as they do every day in Iraq, to try to bring this to a peaceful end. They were successful yesterday in creating the zone of safety so that the Iraqi people could be part of this triumphant moment in their history.

I thought about that triumphant moment as I reflected on information I received over the weekend about two Marine Corps corporals from Illinois who died on January 26 of last week in the deadliest day of the war for the United States. That was the day when the Marine Corps helicopter crashed and 31 Marines lost their lives. Among those 31 Marines were Hector Ramos of Aurora and Nathaniel Moore of Champaign, young men in their twenties who volunteered to serve this country, who with great pride joined the Marine Corps, went through the rigorous training, and went off to risk their lives for America. That story has been told and retold thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of times, but we do not appreciate how important that decision is by each of the men and women in the military until a tragedy occurs, as it did with the crash of this helicopter a few days ago.

I read the stories in the paper about the two young men. They were excellent people. I am sorry I did not get to know them. I dropped notes to their families expressing my sorrow about their loss, and I am sure everyone in America will join in expressing sorrow for the loss of some 1,400 now, American soldiers, who have made the supreme sacrifice in this war in Iraq.

What it leads to is this: If yesterday was a turning point in Iraq for their self-governance, the question I am prepared to ask is, Was yesterday a turning point in terms of Iraq's security in its future? We have been trying for almost 2 years to train Iraqis to take responsibility for guarding their own country, and we have had a terrible time of it. The administration gives us inflated numbers, 120,000 Iraqis in their army and security force, and yet other military experts say no, only 4,000 will be willing to stand and fight. Many more have gone through the training, but they are not willing to defend their country.

So what happens? One-hundred fifty thousand Americans risk their lives just like the marines who went down in that helicopter last week and the others who have died since.

My question to this administration in the White House here, as well as the new government in Baghdad, is this: Now that you have reached this new point in your history of self-governance, of the responsibility of controlling your own future and your own fate, will you now step up and meet with our President and our leaders and discuss the day and how soon it will come when Iraq can defend itself? How soon can we expect Iraqis, trained, well-equipped, to stand in and take the place of American soldiers to come home?

Illinois is not unlike a lot of other States. Seventy percent of our National Guard have been activated or have already served in Iraq. I have attended sendoffs and the welcome-homes. They are emotional times. I went a few weeks ago to Litchfield, IL, and saw 80 of our National Guardsmen who were activated in an infantry unit off for 5 months training in Ft. Stewart, GA, and for a 12-month deployment in Iraq. Emotions ran high in the Litchfield High School gymnasium that Saturday afternoon as the troops stood at attention and the families faced them and we all wished them the very best and told them they would be in our prayers, as they should be.

I would like to be able to say to the families who are waiting anxiously back in the United States that the election yesterday meant something. It meant that we have reached a turning point. It meant that Iraq is now going to take responsibility for its own future. We have been talking about it for a long time, for over a year and a half, and have little to show for it. Now is the time for concrete results, for this administration to meet with the new Government of Iraq and to start moving in a specific pattern, in a definable

schedule, toward a real goal of starting to bring American troops home.

When I hear that, then I will be ready to stand up and applaud what happened yesterday; not just for the courage of the voters but the courage and leadership of the new Government in Iraq, that they will stand up for their people so that our soldiers can come home safely, which is what we all pray for.

That is what I took from yesterday's election, a great triumph for the Iraqi people. Tragedies that we have seen involving Americans, I hope, will diminish now. This administration has to move us beyond the promise to the reality of the Iraqis defending themselves.

---

#### ENERGY

Mr. DURBIN. In the New York Times yesterday, Thomas Friedman, their foreign correspondent, made a valuable suggestion that relates both to the Energy Department, which Dr. Bodman will be heading, as well as our challenge in the Middle East. It is a point I have made but not as eloquently as Thomas Friedman in his article.

He said he is now part of what he calls a "geo green movement," and he defined it as follows: The United States of America should be moving toward energy conservation and new renewable sources of energy to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

The vast majority of Americans believe that is a good thing. I certainly do. You would believe that most people in this Chamber would. But not when it comes to the actual votes on better fuel economy and better fuel efficiency for America's trucks and cars. I have tried several times unsuccessfully to pass this.

How can we honestly talk about reducing our dependence on foreign oil when we continue to drive these SUVs and trucks and cars with worse gas mileage every year? Almost 50 percent of the oil we import goes into refineries in indoor gasoline tanks. And unless or until we use less of that oil, we cannot reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The point being made by Mr. Friedman in his article is that when America needs less foreign oil, and the price of a barrel of oil comes down, then a lot of these countries in the Middle East that supply us with oil will no longer be able to subsidize the lifestyles of monarchies and the governments of inequity. They will be forced to open and diversify their economy. Women will go to school. You will have more training of people in the workforce.

But as long as we have an inflated cost for a barrel of oil, and they are bringing millions if not billions of dollars from the United States into these Middle Eastern countries, there is no impetus or force for change in that society or lifestyle.

So Mr. Friedman challenges us in Congress and in this Government to move toward more fuel efficiency and

more fuel economy, to lower the price of oil and to create another force toward democratization, toward opening the societies and governments of the Middle East. It is hard to do. It is hard to do without Government action.

My wife and I were recently looking for a new car, so we kind of laid down some rules: We wanted to buy American. We did not want an SUV. We did not need a big car like that. And we wanted something that is fuel efficient.

Well, good luck. In America, there were not many choices. We kept reading about the Ford Escape hybrid. As we read about this possibility of 35, 36 miles a gallon in the city, we went out and put in an application for one. Do you know it took 5 months to get it? Those cars are in such high demand now you cannot buy them.

So there is a market out there, and we need to encourage that market for fuel efficiency and fuel economy. It is not only good for reducing our dependence on foreign oil, it is good for the environment to burn less gasoline.

I gave a speech 2 weeks ago in Chicago to a group of professional engineers and talked to them about energy and about the need for conservation. They stood up and said: We can't understand why the Senate doesn't get it. Why aren't we moving toward more fuel efficiency and more fuel economy?

Well, the honest answer is this: The Big Three in Detroit have been slow to this issue. Once again, they were scooped by the Japanese who offered hybrid automobiles long before Detroit offered them.

Why, with all of our great engineering schools, with all of the great scientists and departments of science in our major universities, do we always run a distant second when it comes to this new technology on automobiles and trucks? I do not understand it. Detroit seems to be a year behind consumer needs and appetites. I hope that changes, and changes soon.

I spoke to Dr. Bodman about this, and he reminded me it is more the province for the Department of Transportation than the Department of Energy. But when we consider an energy bill Senator DOMENICI will bring to the floor soon, look closely to see if there will be one word in there about fuel efficiency in cars and trucks. The last time there was scant reference to this challenge we face.

Well, we have to look at that from a new perspective, an honest perspective that will not only help us and our environment and lessen our dependence on foreign oil but force some changes in the countries in the Middle East which, sadly, will not change unless there is some outside force.

---

#### DARFUR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to an unrelated issue but one which has been of great concern to me for some time and to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; that is, the situation in Darfur.

Last week, the United Nations Commission on Inquiry was expected to issue its report on the Darfur situation in Sudan. Public releases have now been delayed until the beginning of February.

That is unfortunate given the urgency of the crisis on the ground. It is one more delay among so many that have cost lives and delayed justice.

What media attention the Commission's report receives may focus on the question of genocide. That question revolves around whether the tens of thousands of killings, the systematic rapes, the destruction and bombing of villages, the burning of fields, and the poisoning of wells in Darfur constitutes genocide.

I believe it does. Congress has called it genocide in a resolution which we passed on a bipartisan basis last year. President Bush has called it genocide.

The use of that word is significant. President Clinton—and I supported so many parts of his administration—made a serious mistake in foreign policy in not referring to Rwanda as a genocide. Many Americans now are seeing through the movies what happened in Rwanda. They read about it, but it was so far away. This movie "Hotel Rwanda," talks about one man who tried to save so many innocent people during the course of what was clearly a genocide. For reasons I cannot explain, the Clinton administration was reluctant to use the word.

Now comes the situation in Darfur in Sudan. And this administration, to their credit, has used the word "genocide." Why is that important? It is important because civilized countries of the world agreed, decades ago, that if a genocide should occur, we will not stand idly by. Now, why? Because we remember what happened in the holocaust in World War II.

You probably saw the references over the weekend to the anniversary celebration of Auschwitz and some of the surviving prisoners who went back, Jewish survivors who came to that same place where so many lost their lives, remembering what happened 60 years ago, and how they were finally liberated by the Russian soldiers who came to cut the barbed wire and free them. That was a genocide of the Jewish people and others.

We decided after the knowledge of that incident that we would stand as civilized nations and say: Never again. If there is a systematic attempt to kill off a people or a population, we will respond. That is why the use of the word "genocide" by Secretary of State Colin Powell, by the Congress, and by the President has such historic significance—not that we are just acknowledging the problem, but we are acknowledging a responsibility to do something about it.

Think about that. If we accept the moral responsibility of recognizing the problem, do we not have an equally great if not greater moral responsibility to do something about it?