

the House gives us and work through that. That way there can be amendments that can be offered without points of order being issued to those. Otherwise, we are stuck offering amendments, points of order, then coming back with the House bill and doing the same thing again.

I see the distinguished Democratic leader on the floor and I certainly will not speak anymore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Mexico is ready to speak, as well, and I will be brief.

We had a caucus last night, and I don't know that I can recall ever having witnessed the depth of anger and deep-seated frustration expressed by all of our membership as a result of the scheduling decisions made with regard to the supplemental next week. It started with the decision that may have been necessary but made last week with regard to calling Ambassador Bremer to a hearing on Monday, the very day the hearing was scheduled in the afternoon. No Senators were notified ahead of time. Senators had very little time to prepare. Very few Senators could attend because they were out of town. Many expressed the view that this was orchestrated in a way to minimize the amount of scrutiny and attention Mr. Bremer would receive.

Throughout the week, similar experiences have been noted. And now we have a markup on Monday, when, again, Senators have made travel plans and the real prospect for a good attendance is minimal at best.

The frustration, the anger, the venting that I witnessed, and that most people felt, was as palpable as any caucus I can recall holding in the 9 years I have been leader. I have not had the opportunity—I just tried to call the majority leader, and I will talk to him in private in, hopefully, a couple minutes, but I would ask that we reconsider holding that markup on Monday. I would ask that in the name of comity, but also in the name of just ensuring that there be an opportunity to do this right, it be postponed until Tuesday. I think we would actually accelerate the prospects of completing the work.

I will guarantee you, there will be very little prospect for comity and accommodation as we go through this already very vexing and controversial supplemental request by the administration—in order for the Senate to complete its work, it is going to take cooperation. But when our caucus feels as jammed as they do, as shut out as they are, it will be very difficult to reach some degree of procedural accommodation. So I will tell you that this matter needs more thought. I would hope we could have more consultation. But I will say, unless some-

thing changes, this is going to be exceedingly difficult.

So I only put the Senate on notice. And, again, as I said, I attempted to call the majority leader prior to the time I came to the Senate floor to impress upon him privately the same message I am sharing with our colleagues in this public way. We will have more to say about it later. But this matter has generated far greater anxiety and anger than virtually anything I have seen in a long time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I note the Senator from New Mexico wants to comment on the guest Chaplain and he has to be at a funeral.

We will talk privately. We have not had the opportunity to talk since their caucus, so we can handle our discussion privately and then come back to the floor.

Again, my goal is simply to address this request in a manner where both sides are heard. We have done our very best this week to schedule it in terms of the hearings, and we have talked further about that.

I do ask you to consider—because how much time we spend in hearings or in markups or on the floor does not matter to me as much as having people heard over a period of time—if the markup were delayed, will the Democratic side at least consider finishing this before we go out on our recess, given the fact that this is an emergency request from the President of the United States? We can, whenever it comes to the floor, start early, work late; if it is Monday morning, coming in, or Tuesday, or as soon as you would say, "Well, the markup is OK," so we could finish this before we go out on vacation or recess when we have this emergency request here. Can we finish it next week?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, again, I would respond to the distinguished majority leader in several ways.

First of all, the Ambassador, in speaking to our caucus on Tuesday, noted he does not need this money until January. Now obviously one could make the case that there really is not any rush to do this in September.

I would also say the House has not acted. Until the House acts—and they are not going to act until next week—many of my colleagues wonder what the rush is. If we are denied the right to offer amendments, there are those who could make a point of order that many of the amendments we will be offering involve legislating on appropriations because of the germaneness questions. And if that becomes an issue, then I doubt very much that there will be any way we can finish next week.

As I think I heard the distinguished assistant Democratic leader note, this bill will come back, and we will have to have a second debate when the House bill comes to the Senate if points of

order are raised on the amendments, denying us the opportunity to have this debate in the first place.

So I guess my answer to the distinguished majority leader would be threefold: No. 1, will we have an opportunity to offer the amendments without points of order being raised against them? No. 2, when will the markup actually occur? And if it does occur on Monday, I fear there could be some procedural delays involved in bringing the bill up. No. 3, we need to have a clear understanding of just when this legislation needs to be passed to accommodate the schedule Ambassador Bremer noted to our caucus. If we do not need to finish this until January, that is another matter. So some clarification with regard to the urgency of this issue also needs to be provided.

I certainly will work with the majority leader as we follow through with these questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me turn to the Senator from New Mexico. I know he has a comment on the guest Chaplain, as well as other comments.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, could I make a unanimous consent request prior to the Senator from New Mexico beginning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by the Senator from New Mexico not be counted against the morning business time of the Republicans, and that the full 30 minutes be granted to each side due to this late start.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first of all, might I say to my friends on the other side, I came with the intention of speaking about the guest Chaplain, who is from New Mexico. But I want to note we have an important event, a funeral for a 27-year-old son of one of our staffers from the Energy Committee at 10:15, so I will not be able to come back during that Republican time. So I would ask if I can—

Mr. REID. That was my request. You have it right now.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if I could just give my speech on the guest Chaplain and also my other comments now.

Mr. REID. That is what I asked in my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, might I say, as I note your presence in the chair—and you are also the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, about which we are talking this morning—I compliment you. I have not seen

more difficult hearings than you have endured in getting started on this process. I think you have been eminently fair. I have great confidence that what you choose to do, and how you choose to handle this, will be fair to everybody. And I say that to you in all honesty.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce Rev. Sheila Gustafson from First Presbyterian Church of Santa Fe, NM. She has devoted her life to the ministry of God and within her work has touched many lives.

She began her service as the first female pastor ever to serve at First Presbyterian Church, and she is devoted to their mission and has served it faithfully for the past 8 years.

Reverend Gustafson demonstrates a great leadership style that endears her not only to the members of her congregation but to the community of Santa Fe. She has taken the lead within the New Mexico Coalition of Churches to create a faith-based organization that fights hate crimes and recently has dedicated her time to the revitalization and modernization of First Presbyterian Church. This project will allow the church to become a mission-oriented building that will provide direct assistance to the community. First Presbyterian Church will be able to provide meeting space for social and faith-based organizations.

I thank Reverend Gustafson for coming to offer our invocation this morning. That is not an easy chore clear from New Mexico, as I know when I take that trip every couple of weeks. It is an honor to have her here today.

PROGRESS IN IRAQ

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to comment on where we are with reference to the war. I was very pleased to read in the New York Times yesterday that a poll had been taken in Iraq. In fact, the New York Times reports so little good news about the theater of the war, I figured it had to be a poll or it wouldn't state anything good.

The poll said two-thirds of the Iraqi people believed they were better off and that they would be better off in 5 years, having gotten rid of Saddam, rather than with him present. If you listen to all the news, you wonder whether the people of Iraq even care about our efforts to help or whether there are very many who are pleased to be part of this transition toward freedom.

In addition, that same article said something rather phenomenal about the distinguished Ambassador who runs the American effort. The poll said—and the New York Times used two words—“remarkably positive”—to characterize the 47 percent of the Iraqis who said he was doing a very good job. That was said almost with in-

credulity that it could be true, but it is, because we are doing a good job.

We have been there 4½ months—not years. For us to already have achieved what has been done is borderline miraculous: Schools opened; hospitals opened; a council formed; a head of government there ready to move step by step toward democratization, with great leadership of the 25-member governing body, 17 of them Ph.D.s in the subjects of the ministries they run. The agriculture ministry is run by an agronomist of real class, the water problems handled by a hydrologist of high quality. These are the kinds of people working with us to put that country together.

One of the reasons I think we should move ahead rapidly—and I don't know what rapidly means on this legislation. Does it mean Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday? I don't know—but we had better send a signal as soon as we can that we are there to get this job done.

I had the privilege of asking questions yesterday of the two distinguished generals, the chief of staff of the military, General Myers, and the general in charge of the entire operation, General Abizaid, who speaks Arabic brilliantly. My questions to them were: Will we win this war, this conflict? Will we prevail, and will it end up positive? Instantly, each answered: Yes.

Can we win?

Yes.

Will we win?

Yes.

Do our men want to win?

Yes.

Are our men happy, pleased? Do they know what they are doing?

Absolutely.

When I was finished with my time with the Secretary of Defense and the two outstanding generals, I was convinced that all we needed to be sure that democratization sets in and takes its footing there is the will to do it. We got into this with the full concurrence of the Congress. Those who continually speak of this as being President Bush's war are stating the facts wrong. It is our war. We voted for it by huge numbers, and we haven't brought a resolution to the floor negating that, to my knowledge.

For those who now think it is not ours, but that it is the President's alone, maybe they ought to bring a resolution here denying that we are involved and that it is just his, and see what the Senate would say. I believe no one will do it, and if they did it, it would overwhelmingly fail, because we want to win and we know it, but the critics are involved in a great game of politics.

Truly, it is time we get politics out of the scene and do what is needed. If there are Senators who know how to do it better, they ought to propose it. This is a very open body. If they have a better plan, suggest it. If they think we ought to spend the money differently, amend it. But we ought to do it. Every-

body involved in this on the ground in Iraq thinks we are on the right path—the men there, the women there, the generals there, the privates. The men whose boots are on the ground think we are doing right. The only people who don't are countries such as France. We will never convince France about this. There is no use trying. They have already forgotten about America and America's involvement in helping them, and they are on some new path of their own.

I remember as a Senator when people such as Helmut Kohl, the former Chancellor of Germany, would give a speech that would make you cry about how much Germany owed America. I heard one. I cried as he told of what brothers we were and why and what great people we were to win a war and demand nothing from them. Here we are engaged in a war against terror that will help all of Europe, and we have France and other countries, for some reasons of their own, out there acting as if America were some foreign power that they don't even know, that has some mission that is adverse to the world, when they know better. They know our mission, they know our attitude, and they know what kind of country we are.

Having said that, I hope, if we can't move this emergency supplemental request on Monday, that we move rapidly, whenever that is, to let the Senate speak. Do we want to abandon this process before it ever has a chance to succeed, or do we want to give it a real chance to prevail? I believe in the end the latter will prevail. It will take some time and some talking, but in the end we will conclude that 4½ months is not long enough to determine the destiny of that country where we had such a fantastic military victory that the world will recognize forever as one of the single most significant military achievements in history with minimal civilian damage and expeditious and maximum annihilation of the real opponent.

We cannot quit after 4 months. We cannot say we will support the men and women of the military but we won't support the effort to provide the minimal service that will bring the Iraqi people into a state where they will want to move forward, democratize, and become free.

To me, it is a simple proposition—and maybe it should not be—that is, do we want to give up or do we want to win? Do we want to abandon this effort after 4½ months and challenge every single move by somebody as distinguished as Ambassador Bremer and his team? I believe the answers are pretty simple. The American people, even with all the negatives thrown at them about what's happening in Iraq, still believe we did right going in, and they still believe we are right in being there now. All that is left is that we do what is right.

I yield the floor.