

not true. We know there are 31 nations that currently have troops deployed to Iraq. British troops are leading a multinational division, as are the Polish troops; and the President hopes to have at least one more international division helping to bring stability and security.

I think those people claiming the President has lost opportunities to make his case before the American people ignore the many times the President has spelled out his case and argued his case before the American people, to this Congress, and, indeed, multiple times now to the United Nations.

The President's opponents continually move the goalposts further and further, so that never is there enough detail or never are there enough specifics. But we have these claims. These claims are specious; they can be rebutted one by one.

I think the most powerful rebuttal is what the Iraqi people feel and what they say. Finally free to speak their own minds in a remarkable poll—the first of its kind—conducted in August and published by the Wall Street Journal, the Iraqi people themselves say loudly and clearly that they want us to stay and they want us to finish the job.

They are optimistic about the future. Seven out of ten say they expect that their country and their personal lives will be better 5 years from now. A third say much better. When asked about which country they would prefer as a political model out of five—Syria, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Egypt, or the United States—the most popular by far is the United States.

A majority of those who hold an opinion have a negative view of terror leader Osama bin Laden, and 74 percent of respondents want to see Saddam's henchmen punished. They want us—not Saddam or Osama bin Laden—to stay and help make their country whole.

The President has submitted a reconstruction plan to us with three clear objectives: to improve security by aggressively hunting down the terrorists; to expand international participation; and, finally, to help Iraq and Afghanistan become free, democratic, and stable nations.

This week, there are a number of hearings being conducted on both the Senate side and the House side to closely examine the President's proposal and to assess what is needed in a thoughtful way. These proceedings give us all the opportunity to ask questions and allow the administration to demonstrate how, when presented accurately, carefully, and clearly, we can achieve the objectives we have set out in the war on terror.

The debate, I hope, will continue to be dignified and serious, and in good faith I believe we can complete consideration of this emergency request by the end of next week. There are a lot of questions being asked. I encourage that. Ultimately, I am confident we will overwhelmingly support the President's request.

Mr. President, we will stand by the Iraqis. We will help them build a free, prosperous, and democratic country. Their future security—indeed, our security—and the security of civilized people everywhere depends on it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, for not to exceed 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee, and 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

Who seeks time?

The Senator from the great State of Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to call on the Senator from Mississippi for the first 10 minutes or so of my time, after which Senator MCCONNELL and then Senator SESSIONS will speak, all of them for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT BUSH AND OUR TROOPS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise this morning in support of President Bush and our troops as this Nation continues to fight and win the war on terrorism in Afghanistan, Iraq, and around the globe.

We all know there are many great attributes in our United States of America. The people of America will rise to any occasion and will do what is necessary to protect freedom and opportunities for themselves and future generations. But there are some attributes on which sometimes we fail a little bit. One of those is we are a bit short sometimes in our memory, remembering back to what happened a few years ago. Sometimes our patience is a little short and we want immediate action. We will rise to any occasion, fight off any chaos, but then we want to deal with that situation and move on to something else.

I think that is a little of what we are seeing now as we listen to what I consider to be sometimes overheated rhetoric in questioning motives and resisting doing what is necessary to complete the job: a little patience, a little commitment to support freedom and democracy which we are trying to assist in Iraq and in the war on terrorism.

I said we seem to have forgotten. What happened to that era of the great Senator Vandenberg who stood up and

said, when it comes to foreign policy and war, partisanship ends at the shoreline, or something to that effect; that when we are dealing with an international problem, a conflict, a war, we are all together. Or even more recently, Lyndon Johnson aggressively supported the policies of President Eisenhower even though the leader of the Republicans at the time, Senator Taft, did not necessarily go along with it. But there was a bipartisan policy.

We have had that in our efforts to deal with these very difficult issues in Iraq and Afghanistan and homeland security, but it seems to be a little frayed right now. I think that is dangerous. I don't think it is good for America. I don't think it is good for what we are trying to achieve in fighting terrorism around the world. I don't think it is good for our troops.

Also, how short is our memory that we don't even remember the debate that was going on 1 year ago? We were discussing what to do about Iraq. The President was then going to the United Nations, and Secretary Powell had been to the United Nations. We were demanding more information. We were saying the President needed to go to the United Nations. And in each incident, he actually did what people were asking him to do. He did it. He went to the United Nations. He made the plea. Unfortunately, the United Nations didn't support what they said for 10 years in a dozen resolutions. They said: We can continue to negotiate; more inspections, more inspections. They would not step up and take action against this brutal tyrant, Saddam Hussein. But we did. America did. The President did. The Congress did. That is the point I am trying to make.

We had this debate. We knew what we were going into. We had looked at the intelligence. Was the intelligence perfect? No. Is it ever? It is always subjective. But we voted in this body 77 to 23 for the Iraq resolution. The House of Representatives voted almost 300—296—to 133. So we should not forget that vote. We should not forget the tremendous successes that have been enjoyed in terms of getting Saddam Hussein out of his position where he was spending money on palaces and allowing the people to suffer. He was murdering his own people and his neighbors. The infrastructure was just decaying beyond repair. We stepped up, and we did the same in Afghanistan. Our troops did a great job. Now are we going to say, It's your problem? Do we really expect the French to do the job? I don't think so. We are going to have to stay the course. We are going to have to do this job, and there is nobody else going to do it for us.

Oh, when the problem is in their immediate neighborhood, such as Bosnia or Kosovo, the Europeans say: You must lead; you have to come in. We supported that operation. Almost every action that was requested by President Clinton we supported, sometimes very reluctantly. I remember thinking: OK,