

Syrian Accountability Act gaining so much support, it is my hope that your Government will respond to the concerns outlined in this letter before the U.S. Government resorts to sanctions.

I call these matters to your personal attention with the hope that prompt action can be taken by Syria to resolve these problems. The United States greatly appreciated the help that Syria provided to our intelligence services after September 11, 2001 in our flight against el-Qaeda.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 and additional time having expired, we will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate soon will be taking action on the Syria Accountability Act. Much work has been devoted to this legislation, and I believe that we are ready to pass the bill. I would like to thank the majority leader for his support of this bill and the process that led to it. I also would like to thank Senators SANTORUM and BOXER for their commitment to this bill and their bipartisan cooperation in reaching agreement of an important amendment. A critical component of this amendment provides the President with the ability to calibrate U.S. sanctions against Syria in response to positive Syrian behavior when such adjustment is in the national security interests of the United States.

On October 30, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held an excellent hearing on U.S. relations with Syria. Among other witnesses, we heard from William Burns, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, and Ambassador Cofer Black, the Counter-Terrorism Coordinator.

These hearings underscored the difficulties presented by recent Syrian behavior. Hopes that reform could take root in Syria after the fall of Saddam Hussein have dimmed considerably. Instead, tensions have increased between the United States and Syria, and a cycle of retaliation and revenge has derailed possible progress in the "Road Map" to peace for Israelis and Palestinians. The Israeli retaliatory attack on an Islamic Jihad terrorist camp in Syria has underscored that the "no war and no peace" status quo in the region cannot be taken for granted.

Many experts thought that when President Bashar al-Assad replaced his father 3 years ago, he would adopt a more pragmatic approach to negotiations with Israel and to internal polit-

ical and economic reforms. Syrian cooperation with the United States in relation to al-Qaida terrorists held promise for cooperation in other areas. Assistant Secretary Burns noted last June in Congressional testimony that "the cooperation the Syrians have provided in their own self-interest on al-Qaida has saved American lives."

But Syria's subsequent failure to stop terrorist groups, including Hezbollah, Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, from using Syria as a base for training and planning suicide bombings in Israel has continued. Syria also has failed to withdraw its forces from Lebanon or take concrete steps in support of the Road Map peace plan. It reportedly has continued to maintain stockpiles of chemical weapons and to pursue development of lethal biological agents.

Moreover, Syria is working against the U.S. and Coalition forces in Iraq by refusing to release assets in Syrian accounts that Saddam Hussein's regime stole from the Iraqi people.

These and other Syrian transgressions have led both Houses of the U.S. Congress to support the bill before us today, which stiffens the economic and diplomatic sanctions already imposed on Damascus for being a state sponsor of terrorism. I support this bill, which is based on the presumption that modifying Syria's behavior requires a tough response. But as we give the administration additional sticks to use against Syria, we should be careful about restricting our government's flexibility in responding to new diplomatic opportunities. Syria has shown the ability to make better choices—for example, supporting U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441 in November 2002, which held Iraq in "material breach" of its disarmament obligations and voting for the more recent Resolution 1511, which calls upon all nations to support the U.S.-led effort in Iraq. I believe the amendment to this bill provides the President with the necessary flexibility.

Even as we tighten restrictions on Syria, we should be emphasizing to the Syrians why it is in their interest to recalculate their approach towards the United States. Syria shares a 400-mile border with Iraq. With more than 135,000 U.S. troops deployed in Iraq, Syria needs to reconsider where its future security interests lie. This is not a threat of U.S. military action but a statement of the new reality on Syria's borders. Moreover, Syrian forces that continue to occupy Lebanon are draining the Syrian economy while providing few positive returns. Continued Syrian occupation of Lebanon invites further possible military action from Israel.

The Syrian leadership also must adjust to the end of its "under the counter" oil deals with Saddam Hussein. Syria must negotiate new and transparent arrangements to meet its energy needs. Syria's economy will not thrive without opening up to investment and trade, particularly with Iraq.

Significant benefits could accrue to Syria from an economically vibrant Iraqi trading partner, increased trade with Europe and the United States, and even possible membership in a Middle East Free Trade Agreement down the road.

In this context, Syria may find motivation to return to the negotiating table. An agreement on the Golan Heights that would provide security guarantees for Israel while respecting Syria's sovereignty could be the key to resolving a host of other problems, including Syria's occupation of Lebanon, its support of Palestinian terror groups, and its economic and political isolation. Although success of such an agreement would depend ultimately on the parties themselves, the United States must seek to leverage obvious Syrian interests in pursuit of a viable settlement.

The Syrian regime has some difficult choices to make. It can continue to harbor and support groups devoted to terror, or it can act in ways that will help restore stability and peace in the region and thereby create a better economic future for its people. It cannot do both. This bill, as amended, adds to the tools available to the President to move Syria toward a more responsible course. I commend the bill to the Senate and hope that we will pass it by a strong vote.

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. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor to express my strong support for the Syria Accountability Act. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership and the efforts he has made on this legislation to bring us to this point. Let me also thank my colleague from California, Senator BOXER, for her tireless and effective advocacy of this legislation. I am very pleased this legislation is now pending. I congratulate my colleagues as well as others who have made the effort to bring us to a point where I believe on a strong bipartisan basis this legislation will pass this afternoon.

This day has been a long time coming. We have heard administration officials argue that this straightforward response to the behavior of the Syrian Government reduces the President's flexibility to deal with the "bigger picture." We believe that it is not only morally right, but will actually strengthen the President's hand in explaining the "big picture" to the Syrians.

Had our years of entreaties to the Syrians not fallen on deaf ears, and had promises from Syria over the last several years not turned out to be little

more than empty rhetoric, this bill might not have been necessary.

However, it appears to many of us that the point where we can continue to sit back and hope for Syria to change course has passed. The time has come to show Syria that continued inaction will no longer be tolerated and will come at a price.

The behavior we seek from Syria is not different than what we expect of every other country in the world community—an end to its support for terrorism, and enforcement of its own international agreements and United Nations Security Council resolutions.

Syria simply has failed one too many times to live up to these obligations, and this legislation backs up our hopes for Syrian compliance along with the very real threat of sanctions.

The Syria Accountability Act holds Syria accountable for its behavior by imposing sanctions unless the Syrian Government certifies that: It is no longer providing support for terrorists and terrorism; it has withdrawn all of its military and intelligence personnel from Lebanon; it has ceased its attempts to produce, acquire, or transfer weapons of mass destruction; and it has ended its support for terrorists in Iraq.

I am pleased with the bipartisan process that produced this landmark legislation, and I especially want to commend Senator LEVIN for his leadership in ensuring that the President maintains the maximum flexibility to wisely wield the tools created by H.R. 1828. The national security waiver, which allows the President to waive certain sanctions if they are deemed counterproductive to U.S. security interests, will allow our government to effectively press for reform in Syria without endangering our efforts in the global war against terrorism.

There are three reasons we need to pass this unambiguous statement of U.S. intent.

First, as remarkable as it is to imagine, the Government of Syria still provides safe haven and material support for some of the most objectionable terrorist organizations in the world.

Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, PIJ, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine General Command, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Abu Musa Organization, and the Popular Struggle Front all maintain offices in Damascus. Members of the Syrian Government have, on occasion, condoned suicide bombings against civilians within Israel, calling them legitimate military operations.

Syria alternates between defending these offices in Damascus as solely for press purposes, uninvolved in the conduct of terrorist attacks, and promising they will shut the offices down. To date, its promises have amounted to nothing. Meanwhile, its defense of these offices is as unfortunate as it is inaccurate. It is simply not acceptable

to provide support for an office whose sole purpose is to call attention to, and encourage support for, attacks on innocent civilians.

Moreover, reports indicate that planning for the recent and horrendous attack at a restaurant frequented by Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs in Haifa is connected to offices in Damascus.

We are also beginning to learn from the intelligence community that Syria may have allowed military equipment and personnel to flow into Iraq on the eve of and during the war, both of which were used against our troops in that country.

Although the administration reports that the situation on the Syria-Iraq border is "improving," the international community should expect nothing but full cooperation from Syria on something so basic as stopping the flow of terrorists through its territory.

Second, in signing the 1994 Taif Accords, Syria pledged itself to the "security and independence of Lebanon." To date, it has helped with neither. Instead, it continues to support the Lebanese Hezbollah and undermine the democratic aspirations of the people of Lebanon by occupying that country.

In 1999, Israel withdrew its forces from southern Lebanon after being told by the international community that doing so would increase its security. Cynically, Syria exploited the resulting security vacuum and permitted attacks on Israel from that region, all in contravention of Security Council Resolution 425. It is especially disappointing that we have to come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to call on a member of the United Nations Security Council to enforce its own resolutions.

Third, the Syria Accountability Act—a clear statement of America's resolve—should help put an end to the series of mixed signals coming from the Bush administration. Over the course of the last 3 years, we have heard various policies from the different spokespeople for different agencies of the U.S. Government. In fact, we have even heard competing policies and concerns from offices within the same State Department.

As I said at the beginning, I wish this bill were not necessary. Unfortunately, we all recognize that it has become necessary. This bill will make clear to Syria what we expect of it. If it is not willing to end its support for terrorism or uphold its agreements, it should not be accepted as a full partner in the international community.

I urge adoption of the legislation and again congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Democratic leader for his speech and for his thoughtful comments.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania as much time as he should require, with the time allotted to our side on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I, too, thank the Senator from Indiana for working very closely with Senator BOXER and me on this very important piece of legislation, which is a very timely piece of legislation.

The House passed this legislation a few months ago and sent it over here. We have been working diligently with both Senator LUGAR and Senator BIDEN, and they have been most cooperative in working with the administration to craft a bill that I think meets some of the concerns the administration has, some of the concerns the committee has experienced in dealing with sanctions bills, and particularly the issue of the waiver authority of the President.

The House-passed bill did not allow the President to waive sanctions on military or dual-use items—"dual use" meaning they could be used for civilian or military purposes. I think the chairman of the committee rightly expressed concern about that, that the precedent generally is that the President have waiver authority in the case of vital national security interests or national security interests.

We negotiated as to what that standard should be. We obviously wanted the highest level of scrutiny before the President could waive that which would be vital national security interests. The lowest level would just be sort of a national interest test. And we compromised on a national security interest waiver. It is sort of a midlevel, if you will, waiver authority or waiver standard. We think that is appropriate here for all of the items, all of the potential sanctions that may be imposed by the President under this act.

So the President, under the revised bill we have before us, does impose sanctions, but it gives the President the flexibility to waive. But he has a threshold he must meet and make the case that that threshold is made in order to waive these sanctions. So we give the President the hammer that I think is necessary and that so many have talked about here.

Syria is a bad actor in the region. It is part of the "axis of evil," in my opinion. It is a country that sponsors terrorism, that supports terrorism, that encourages terrorism, not only against American interests, not only against Israel, but it is occupying, through setting up these terrorist organizations, as well as their own military force, what was a very moderate and progressive Arab country, Lebanon.

That is a heinous act, and I find it somewhat remarkable that the rest of the Arab world does not continue to condemn it and do what we do: try to ratchet up the pressure on Syria to get

out of Lebanon, to allow the people in Lebanon to determine their own government and to freely elect people who could serve the best interests of the Lebanese people, not the dictator in Damascus.

So we have, really, a purpose beyond our national security interest, although I would argue that a free and prosperous Lebanon—and given the history of that country, and being a bridge between the Middle East and West—that would be a very stabilizing presence in the Middle East, to have a country with a democratically elected government, and not being the threat Lebanon now poses, not because of the people themselves but because of the terrorists who reside in southern Lebanon, because of the other heinous acts that are conducted by the terrorist groups based in Lebanon that they project throughout the world.

This is a very important issue for national security. It is a very important issue for the peace in the Middle East.

I am very gratified that the Senate could come to a conclusion on this bill and bring it to the floor of the Senate and have it pass on a day when we honor our veterans, as we should. We had people fight and lose their lives in Lebanon, and they did so bravely and courageously. But I have to say, it was not one of the proudest moments for me as an American to see our troops withdraw from Lebanon and not stay there to fight another day, with the oppression Syria was imposing upon that country.

This is a chance for us to begin the process of reengaging in Lebanon, reengaging the Syrians who have been nothing but trouble and fomenting trouble throughout the Middle East and being disruptive of the peace process in the Middle East.

I say to the Senator from Indiana, thank you for the time. Thank you for your willingness to bring this bill to the floor and to move this bill forward.

I will enter into a colloquy with Senator BOXER to discuss our desire and our hope that the President not immediately think about waiving these provisions; that he think carefully about any kind of waiver; that we try to impose some sanctions and send a message. Given the activities of the Syrians in the Middle East and the activities of Syria in Iraq, it is such an important and relevant discussion, that the President use these sanctions that are available to him for him to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, Senator BOXER of California, concerning the waiver authority extended to the President for the sanctions contained in the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003.

Mr. President, as the original cosponsor of the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003, I want to clarify the bill's intent with the original sponsors, Senator BOXER. Is it the Senator's understanding that—given the seriousness of

the charges against the Syrian regime and the fact that the highest levels of the U.S. Government have already made it clear that there will be consequences to the Syrians if there is no change in their behavior—the national security waiver contained in the bill is meant to address only those circumstances where United States national security interests are indeed severely threatened?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, that is my clear understanding and the clear intent of the legislation. The bill lays out in great detail the serious threat Syrian actions pose to United States interests. Our expectation is that, unless the President can make the certification described in section 5, subsection (d) of the bill, he must impose sanctions on the Syrian Government. The national security waiver was only included to address currently unforeseen instances where U.S. national security interests would truly be threatened should such sanctions go forward. We expect the President to use the waiver only for such exceptional circumstances, and not on a routine basis as a way to circumvent congressional intent as so clearly expressed in the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 2148

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SANTORUM, proposes an amendment numbered 2148.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make technical and other corrections)

On page 2, strike lines 8 through 15.

On page 9, strike lines 21 through 24.

On page 15, line 1, strike "will be held responsible" and insert "should bear responsibility".

On page 15, beginning on line 6, strike "shall impede Syria's ability" and insert "will work to deny Syria the ability".

On page 15, strike lines 18 through 20.

On page 16, line 17, insert after "citizen in Iraq" the following: "if the Government of Syria is found to be responsible".

On page 18, strike lines 15 through 20 and insert the following:

(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or both if the President determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the reasons for the determination.

On page 20, beginning on line 6, strike "withdrawn all Syrian military, intelligence, and other security personnel from Lebanon" and insert "ended its occupation

of Lebanon described in section 2(7) of this Act".

On page 21, beginning on line 15, strike "the attacks against the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001, and other".

On page 21, beginning on line 20, strike "given the recognition that Hizbullah is equally or more capable than al Qaeda" and insert "and other terrorist organizations supported by Syria".

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2148) was agreed to.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair. I now yield time to the Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, who does such an outstanding job on so many issues and really is a national treasure for us on international affairs and international issues, for allowing me recognition to speak on this bill. I thank the cosponsors, Senators SANTORUM and BOXER, for their work in bringing this issue in front of the body. I urge its passage.

I urge usage of the Syria Accountability Act by the President. Several of these issues have already been covered. I wish to address them with some specificity by saying 43 and counting—43 and counting. That is the number of dictatorships that are left in the world. There were 45 at the start of this year. Two have changed over. Dramatic changes are taking place in some other countries. But there are 43 dictatorships.

One of the harshest is Syria. It is a state sponsor of terrorism, one of five countries in the world that we recognize is a state sponsor of terrorism. We are facing terrorists coming from Syria on a daily basis in Iraq. You can hardly visit with any of our leadership working on the issue of Iraq and bringing democracy to that country without hearing them talking about foreign terrorists coming into Iraq. The largest percentage of those is coming through Syria. Another percentage is coming from Iran, which is another country that needs to go through a democratic metamorphosis and become a democracy. Iran is not a democracy today. We need to confront that.

We need to confront, for the safety of our troops, these foreign terrorists coming in from Syria who are being sponsored by the Syrian Government.

We know for some period of time Syria has sponsored Hezbollah, one of the leading terrorist organizations in the world, certainly very active in the Middle East, active in Lebanon, active in Israel, active, it appears, in support of going into Iraq. We know the historical legacy of Syria associated with Iraq and the Baathist Party regime that controlled both countries. It did control Iraq; it doesn't now. It is a ruthless, dictatorial, Stalinesque type of organization. They use political prisoners, torture, all sorts of means to

maintain control by the Baathist leadership. The Syria Baathist leadership is the same sort of leadership we saw in Iraq. They are a bad lot. It is time we put pressure on Syria to change.

President Bush last week made a beautiful speech to the National Endowment for Democracy calling for democracy throughout the world and saying that is the natural state of mankind, to be free and at liberty. Yet we see a dearth of liberty and freedom throughout much of the Middle East, particularly in countries such as Syria.

I hope the President will use the Syria Accountability Act to bring greater pressure on the dictators in Damascus, on bringing them a clear point that we will not tolerate this use of terrorism; we will not tolerate their attacks on our troops; that we will not tolerate a regime that is a dictatorship; that the people of Syria deserve better. The people of Lebanon deserve better than to be minding the dictator paymasters that exist in Damascus. The President really needs to use this power that is being given by the Congress to the administration for these sanctions in Syria.

I urge that we pass this act. I urge the President to use these sanctions. And I urge us to use all the means at our disposal to tighten the noose around the leadership of the dictators in Damascus. What they are doing in Syria, what they are allowing to flow out of their country, that would stop. This is one of the few countries left in the world that continues to be state sponsors of terrorism on a very aggressive basis. It must stop. We must show resolve in that.

I state my support for the bill and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his important argument.

How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be counted against the side of the opposition to the bill as opposed to our side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, there have been consecutive Republican speeches on this amendment. We will be prepared to recognize the distinguished Senator from California. She will ask for her own recognition, but we hope she will have an opportunity to speak at this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, under the order, I have how much time remaining on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 18 minutes 24 seconds left for Senator BIDEN's designee.

Mrs. BOXER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to make a few comments? How much time does he need?

I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Illinois, and then I will use the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor in strong support of the Syria Accountability Act.

Syria plays a key role in the Mideast region and it could play a constructive role, but all too often, it has not.

After September 11, Syria offered to share information that could help in the U.S. fight against terrorists. It joined us in the first Gulf War to oust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait in 1991, and it joined in peace negotiations with Israel in the 1990s. But Syria has taken steps and pursued policies that have undermined regional peace and damaged U.S. interests.

Syria was opposed to the US invasion of Iraq and it certainly has a right to that opinion but Syria has not taken robust action to keep foreign fighters from crossing its borders to fight Americans.

Syria objects to the U.S. occupation of Iraq, but has itself occupied Lebanon since 1976. More than 20,000 Syrian troops and police occupy much of Lebanon, dominating its politics and government and undermining its independence.

Syria harbors terrorists that promote and organize violence, undermining hope and progress for a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace settlement.

Hizballah, Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command have offices, maintain training camps, and other facilities on Syrian territory and operate in areas of Lebanon occupied by the Syrian army, such as the Beqaa Valley. Some of these groups, Hizballah in particular, receive supplies from Iran through Syria.

The people of Syria are repressed, ruled by a small ethnic minority in a police state. There is no freedom of speech, no political freedom, and no freedom to dissent. The Syrian regime is also run by the Ba'ath Party, but split from Saddam Hussein's branch of this party.

The President has recently spoken about how badly the Middle East needs an infusion of democracy. He has argued that, despite the fact that the United States has found no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, this country's war was justified because of the repressive nature of that regime.

I agree wholeheartedly with the President that one of the most impor-

tant things that this country can do to fight terrorism is to promote democracy in the Middle East.

The lack of democracy in many Middle Eastern countries has led directly to Islamic extremism. There are almost no outlets for political expression in a region filled with kings, emirs, and rubberstamp parliaments—except at the mosque.

It is no accident that most of the terrorists were originally from countries that do not allow dissent or meaningful political participation.

I, for one, do not believe this nation can remove every dictator and repressive regime. We cannot impose democracy from the other end of an M-16.

Mideast countries will not become models of democracy and openness overnight. But we must look to a longer term future where we call on them to embark on a "soft-landing" towards a more democratic future.

The bill we consider today, the Syria Accountability Act, will send a strong message of disapproval to Syria regarding its actions supporting terrorism, undermining regional peace, repressing its people, and undermining the independence of Lebanon. It will send those messages short of going to war.

The bill will broaden U.S. sanctions against Syria unless the President certifies that Syria does not support terrorism; that it has withdrawn its military, intelligence, and security personnel from Lebanon; stopped developing ballistic missiles and chemical and biological weapons; and that it is no longer in violation of UN Security Council resolutions. The bill allows the President to waive sanctions if he believes waiving them would be in the interests of U.S. national security.

I believe that Syria could play a constructive role in bringing peace to the region, ending the scourge of terrorism, and take its place as a regional leader. Syria and the United States could enjoy strong and growing relations. The bill we pass today will hold Syria accountable for its actions and send a strong message that Syria must change.

Syria has a great opportunity to decide whether it will be part of the family of civilized nations dedicated to self-government, dedicated to the principles of equality, and dedicated to peace in the region, or Syria can turn a different course. There has been ample evidence of I guess the experience we have had in Syria to suggest they have decided to chart a course that is not consistent with those values.

After September 11, Syria was one of the first to come to our side and say they would help us fight terrorism in the world. I had a chance to visit that nation and its leader shortly thereafter. He expressed condolences for our losses in the United States and pledged support in our effort to end terrorism.

Sadly, the accumulated evidence since that date does not suggest Syria has made the real commitment we

need, not only for the sake of ending terrorism in our country but for the sake of ending terrorism in the world. In fact, too many times Syria has been on the wrong side of history in the past and the current day.

This Syria Accountability Act basically says to Syria they will be held accountable for their conduct. Frankly, we understand that today Damascus, Syria, is the international headquarters for a variety of terrorist groups. That is totally unacceptable.

The President was right when he said we are opposed to not only terrorists, but those who harbor and support them. Syria has to take those words to heart, and this act is a measure that needs to be passed by Congress and signed into law by the President so Syria understands the importance of the role it plays in the Middle East and how closely it will be watched.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased we are going to vote on the Syria Accountability bill, a bill I first introduced with Senator SANTORUM in April of 2002. It has had a very bumpy ride. I am glad the ride will soon end smoothly; at least that is my sense.

On April 18, 2002, with a list of 45 cosponsors, I introduced this bill with Senator SANTORUM.

On that day, I said:

We cannot afford to rest for one second in pursuing those who believe that purposely killing innocent civilians is a legitimate means to political ends. We cannot give concessions to terrorists nor can we reward them by giving into their demands. This will only lead to more terror.

With that, Senator SANTORUM and I introduced the Syria Accountability Act because we knew at that time—and we know today—that by a variety of means the Government of Syria is supporting terrorist groups. It needs to end.

In the 108th Congress, May 1, 2003, now with a total of 81 cosponsors, we introduced our bill again and at that time we said:

If we are serious about peace in the Middle East and a cessation of terrorism here at home, then we must confront the Government of Syria in a way that will not lead to war but to a diffusing of tensions and a more peaceful world.

The administration opposed our bill very strongly. In fact, Secretary Powell came before the Foreign Relations Committee and when Senator LUGAR and Senator BIDEN said to him, do you support or oppose the Syria Accountability Act, Secretary Powell said it would not be helpful to pass it.

I did not agree with him then and I do not agree with him now. When Secretary Powell went to see the head of Syria, what was one of the first things he said to him? He said, you ought to shape up because there is a bill in the Senate, the Syria Accountability Act, and those folks over there are serious.

It proved my point that, in fact, for us to be tough on terrorism gives the

State Department the backup they need. I think, frankly, it will be very helpful for us to pass this bill today.

Now, the administration has moved off their opposition and they are neutral on this bill. They are neither for it nor against it. The good news is, the leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee, finally I think, have decided that maybe BOXER and SANTORUM have been on the right track. So this is a very big day for us because we have gone through a pretty tough legislative ride. We did not get hearings in the committee. We could not move it.

In addition to Senator SANTORUM, my original cosponsor of this, I do want to thank Senator BYRD, who made suggestions to perfect our bill, Senator LUGAR who worked with Senator BYRD and others, Senator BIDEN, who agreed to let this come up in an expedited fashion, and over on the House side Representatives ELIOT ENGEL and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN helped us quite a bit in moving this bill.

So it is, in fact, a day that is important. What we are basically saying in our bill is that if Syria does not shape up they are going to face sanctions from this Government. If Syria does not stop supporting terrorism, if Syria does not stop the development of weapons of mass destruction, if Syria does not end its occupation of Lebanon and cease support for the terrorists operating in Iraq, they are going to face a series of escalating sanctions.

The fact is that we have 81 cosponsors—and I see Senator SANTORUM on the floor now. He worked his side of the aisle, I have worked mine, and we were able to really get these cosponsors up. On October 15, the House passed its version of the bill 398 to 4. So I have to say we are on to something.

Let me say from the bottom of my heart what I think we are on to. We are on to the premise that the truth shall set you free. We cannot have relationships with Syria and close our eyes to the truth, and the truth is that Syria is, in fact, supporting terrorism in ways that are very clear. They are a major supporter of Hezbollah, an international terrorist organization that has carried out numerous attacks against Americans and Israeli civilian targets. They have operated freely in the Syrian-controlled Beqaa Valley in Lebanon over the past 20 years. Other terrorist groups such as Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command all maintain offices, training camps, and other facilities inside Syria or in areas of Lebanon under Syrian control.

Anyone who has traveled to the region knows that one of the saddest stories in the world is the story of Lebanon and how its people have lost any control over their own destiny. As we fight for democracy in the world, we have to remember that. This was a country at one point that was absolutely considered the Paris in the Mid-

dle East, and it has really been lost because it has been taken over in a hostile takeover, I might say, by the power of Syria.

So all of these issues, getting Syria to turn its back on terrorism and not allow these organizations to operate within their borders, Syria allowing the Lebanese people to have a life of freedom and democracy or at least self-determination, however they determine it, these are issues that are crucial. As long as they keep up the status quo, the goal of Middle East peace is quite elusive.

Twenty thousand Syrian troops and security personnel continue to occupy Lebanon and again, as I said, undermine its political independence. It is a direct violation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 520. What does that say? That resolution calls for strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon.

We also know that Syria is developing weapons that are very dangerous, and that they are not doing enough to prevent terrorists from entering into Iraq. In fact, the terrorist who was attempting to blow up an Iraqi police station was found to be carrying a Syrian passport.

This has to stop. Nations must be held accountable for the proliferation of terrorism and they must be held accountable if they are not doing all they can to pursue Middle East peace or at least allow that peace to take place.

So this legislation has taken a bumpy road. When Senator SANTORUM and I got together to work on it, people said that is quite a combination. They said if those two can get together on anything, eventually we know we are going to win.

It has taken us almost 2 years but we could not be happier. We want to thank the 80 other Senators who are cosponsors of this bill. We, again, thank Senators LUGAR and BIDEN for allowing this bill to come directly to the floor today. We think it is a historic day.

Our goal is to prevent war and to lay out markers for Syria. We do not want to go to war with Syria. We just want to say, in a truthful way, these are the things that you have been doing wrong. Please meet these markers. Help us. Help us in the world. If you don't, we are going to have some sanctions and they are spelled out. I think others have spelled them out. The idea behind this bill is to avoid a confrontation and instead have a relationship that is respectful between our two nations. I think today we will go a long way to that end.

I believe all my time is used up at this point so I will yield the floor and I hope we will be voting shortly on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I will take this occasion to tell the Senate that today we celebrate the birthday of

the distinguished Senator from California. Senator BOXER is a year younger. This is an excellent day for her to offer this legislation, and we commend and thank the Senator.

I yield such time as he may consume to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in wishing a happy birthday to Senator BOXER. I also thank Senator BOXER and Senator SANTORUM for their tenaciousness in advancing this bill. It is long overdue and it is to be celebrated by all of us.

Senator LUGAR, Senator BIDEN, and the Foreign Relations Committee have worked this bill into a condition where we can bring it to the floor, giving the President sufficient discretion, and make clear that we will continue to engage in diplomacy with the Syrians but we are going to do it on a more realistic basis, a basis that has consequences, a basis that deals with facts, not fantasy, and truly makes progress in the Middle East.

It is a matter of historical record that for a long time, several decades now, the Syrians have occupied the nation of Lebanon, their smaller neighbor to their west. In the course of that, whatever their motives were for going in, they have stayed there for gain. They have denied democracy to the Lebanese people, they have denied them self-determination, and they have been responsible for keeping the breach and the wound alive in Lebanon.

But as it relates to this bill, I also have to take note of the fact it is Veterans Day. We thank our veterans. We celebrate our veterans. We owe them a great debt.

As we think of yesterday's veterans, I am reminded of today's veterans, many of whom, from the State of Oregon, are in Iraq now and who are in harm's way for the cause of American liberty and the safety of the American people and our allies in the ongoing war on terrorism. The truth is, much that is aimed at them today comes from Syria. It comes from car bombers holding Syrian passports. Indeed, just the other day we learned the car bomb that was interdicted and the person pulled out of the car that was filled with explosives was from Syria. Syria maintains a porous border with Iraq that simply cannot remain as it is because if it does, it will mean the death of more of our soldiers. We want them home and we want them safe.

There is more than a porous border that concerns me with Syria. It is the fact that Syria provides a safe harbor, indeed a safe haven, a heaven, if you will, for terrorists. For those who conspire to murder on a massive scale, Syria gives them a place to stay, gives them protection, and a place to hide their money and their weapons before they can bring them into conflict with American soldiers. Who knows what also may be there from the arsenals of

Saddam Hussein. Who knows what weapons of mass destruction may even be there as well.

All of this needs to end. Our President needs to have the tools, the diplomatic tools necessary to prosecute the case with Syria in a way that gets us beyond the status quo because the status quo is unacceptable and the status quo is deadly and the status quo has to be over. I join with Republicans and Democrats alike today in urging passage of the Syria Accountability Act, for the sake of our country, for the sake of the Middle East, for the sake of Muslims, for the sake of Jews, for the sake of Christians, and all who have suffered much.

The road to Damascus has brought so much murder, so much conspiracy, so much weaponry, so much blood money that has been used against the peace process and those who are the advocates of a peaceful resolution in the Middle East.

It is a matter of Scriptural record that a man named Saul on the road to Damascus once saw an awful lot of light, changed his way, and even changed his name. We know him today as the Apostle Paul. What we need now on the road to Damascus is a lot more light because all we have been getting is so much darkness. We need a new beginning with Syria. The President needs a new authority against Syria. This bill is crafted in a way that is helpful diplomatically so we can avoid hostilities. But let us have the courage in this war on terrorism to go where the facts take us. Let us all pray it does not take us down the road to Damascus, but we have to be realistic.

This bill is a very good start. I urge the Senate to adopt it today by a very large margin.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am voting for the Syria Accountability Act because I believe it is important to call attention to Syria's continuing military occupation of Lebanon in violation of international law, and its support for terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah, that are responsible for ongoing, deadly incursions into Israel.

It is well established that the Syrian Government rules through fear and repression. Torture by Syrian security forces is routine. The denial of basic human rights has been widely documented. We should condemn these policies.

And there are allegations that Syria supplied Iraqi forces with military equipment, which the Secretary of Defense has described as hostile acts against the United States.

The United States is justified in seeking to apply political and economic pressure on Syria in an effort to change its policies. That said, there are some aspects of this legislation that I do not support, and I want to take a moment to discuss them as I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about my vote. Most importantly, I do not want my vote for this legislation

to be cited as an endorsement for military action against Syria.

For examples, Section 4, entitled "Statement of Policy," says that it is the policy of the United States that "the United States shall impede Syria's ability to support acts of international terrorism and efforts to develop or acquire weapons of mass destruction." I doubt that anyone disagrees that we should try to do that. But by what means? Will support for this legislation be cited at some point in the future by the administration, or others, as a green light for launching a unilateral, military attack to "impede Syria's ability to support acts of international terrorism?" That is precisely what was done by the White House when it cited resolutions passed a decade ago to justify a unilateral attack against Iraq years later, even though that was not what many, if any of us who supported those resolutions intended at the time. Over and over again, the administration, in an effort to justify their precipitous use of force against Iraq, cited passage of the Iraq Liberation Act in 1998 as evidence that Congress supported the overthrow of Saddam Hussein in 2003. What the administration kept omitting in numerous public statements is that one section of that act made clear that nothing in the act was to be construed as authorizing the use of U.S. military force against Iraq. I am concerned that the Syria Accountability Act could be distorted in a similar way. I do not support military action against Syria, and I am in no way endorsing such action by voting for this legislation today.

The same can be said of the statement that it is the policy of the United States that "efforts against Hezbollah will be expanded given the recognition that Hezbollah is equally or more capable than al Qaeda." First, I do not know if it is true that Hezbollah is "equally or more capable than al Qaeda." Perhaps it is. I don't know, and I doubt the authors of this legislation can be certain that it is, especially given the difficulties we have had in obtaining reliable information about these organizations. In any event, while I might support expanded efforts against Hezbollah, it would depend on what those efforts are. For example, I am not in favor of sending U.S. troops to Lebanon to engage in combat against Hezbollah. I do not want my vote today to be construed as supporting any expanded efforts against Hezbollah regardless of what they might be.

Similarly, the legislation states that it is United States policy that "Syria will be held accountable for any harm to Coalition armed forces or to any U.S. citizens in Iraq if the Government of Syria is found to be responsible due to its facilitation of terrorist activities and its shipments of military supplies to Iraq." Syria should be held accountable. But in what way? The legislation, once again, is silent. My support for efforts to hold Syria accountable, should

the evidence warrant it, depends on what those efforts are.

Finally, the legislation says that it is the policy of the united States that "the United States will not provide any assistance to Syria and will oppose multilateral assistance for Syria until Syria ends all support for terrorism, withdraws its armed forces from Lebanon, and halts the development and deployment of weapons of mass destruction and medium- and long-range surface-to-surface ballistic missiles." We all want Syria to do those things, and I am not in favor of providing assistance to the Syrian Government. But this legislation goes farther. It purports to cut off any assistance to the Syrian people, even through private voluntary organizations. I do not believe in punishing the citizens of a country simply because their government is corrupt or abusive, so I have concerns about this provision.

There are also aspects of Section 5 of the legislation, entitled "Penalties and Authorization," which concern me. For example, among the sanctions that the President could impose are a prohibition on U.S. businesses from investing or operating in Syria. It is not obvious to me how this will penalize the Syrian Government, but it will hurt U.S. businesses. While the record is mixed, there are examples of U.S. businesses contributing to social, economic and even political change in other repressive countries.

Of more concern is that the legislation encourages the President to reduce U.S. diplomatic contacts with Syria. I am uneasy with this approach, as I believe we should consider expanding our diplomacy and people-to-people contacts with Syria. It is in our interest to promote dialogue with a country with which we have such profound differences, and which poses a military threat to Israel. Reducing those contacts could further misunderstanding and exacerbate tensions between us. It is also worth mentioning that after the September 11 attacks, Syria reportedly cooperated with the United States in intelligence sharing about al-Qaida.

I do not believe this legislation will persuade Syria to do any of the things we want it to do. I am aware that the Administration has opposed it in the past. This legislation seems to start us down a road of intensifying tensions between the U.S. and Syria without a clear end game other than invading Syria, which I do not support and I doubt many other Senators support. However, I agree that Syria's support for terrorism and its violations of human rights deserve condemnation, and I will vote for this legislation with the caveats I have mentioned.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I do not support the passage of the Syrian Accountability Act. The situation in the Middle East is a delicate one. It calls for subtle, creative diplomacy as the United States seeks to support its troops in Iraq, promote the Arab-Israeli peace process, and combat terrorism.

While I agree with the goals of the Syrian Accountability Act, I am concerned that this legislation will undermine our ability to achieve those goals. In particular, I am opposed to the act's provisions that would mandate the imposition of new sanctions against Syria. I believe that these provisions would tie this or any future administration's hands in a way that will make the conduct of our foreign policy more difficult. A number of sanctions already exist against Syria by virtue of its designation as a state sponsor of terrorism. In addition, the President already has the authority to impose many of the sanctions set forth in this act. If we are to promote peace in the region and move Syria in a more positive direction, the United States must pursue an approach that is more nuanced and flexible than what is called for in this legislation.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Syria Accountability Act, of which I am a proud co-sponsor of the Senate companion. Syria is listed by the State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism, and yet fewer U.S. sanctions apply to Syria than to any other country on the list. This Act will authorize a range of sanctions against Syria, prohibiting exports to Syria of dual-use items and requiring the President to choose from a set of other sanctions, including prohibitions on exports of most U.S. goods to Syria and on American investment in Syria, restrictions on Syrian diplomats in the United States and on U.S. diplomatic contacts with Syria, prohibitions on Syrian aircraft in the United States, and blocking of transactions in Syrian government property.

These sanctions are appropriate, and, in my view, long overdue. Despite recent U.S. efforts to engage in dialogue with Syria, Damascus has refused to renounce its support for terrorism. It provides terrorist organizations with political and material support. It has turned away from negotiations with Israel. And it continues to occupy southern Lebanon, where its forces destabilize the Middle East by supporting Hezbollah and undermining Lebanese sovereignty.

Syria acts as the safe haven for a broad array of terrorist organizations and Palestinian groups committed to the destruction of Israel. Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command are all active in Damascus. The Syrian government has not only refused to sever ties with these organizations; it has defended their use of Syrian territory to disseminate propaganda that attacks Israel, thereby undermining efforts to bring peace to the region. Worse, the offices maintained by these groups provide operational support for terrorist activities, notwithstanding the Syrian government's claims that they are engaged only in

political and informational activities. These activities include the deadly and despicable suicide bombings, conducted by Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, against civilians in Israel.

Syria is also a supporter of Hezbollah, which is responsible for the killing of hundreds of Americans and is one of the biggest obstacles to our efforts to combat global terrorism. Throughout much of southern Lebanon, occupying Syrian forces support and protect Hezbollah, allowing it to deploy thousands of rockets that threaten Israel and destabilize the region, and to launch attacks against civilian targets in Israel civilian areas. Syria also permits Hezbollah to receive assistance from Iran.

The Syrian occupation of Lebanon represents a long-standing threat to stability in the Middle East. While Syria has reduced its forces in recent years, it still maintains as many as 20,000 troops and security personnel in Lebanon. In addition to harboring Hezbollah, those forces exert undue influence in Lebanon and prevent the Lebanese government from deploying its own troops to southern Lebanon, as required by U.N. Security Council Resolution 520. It is long past time for Syrian forces to withdraw from Lebanon and for Lebanon to cease to be a refuge for terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah.

Syria has not moderated its unrelenting hostility to Israel, nor has it demonstrated a commitment to negotiations. Moreover, it has used its position on the world stage and within the Arab world to undermine efforts to bring peace and stability to the region. As a frequent sponsor of U.N. resolutions related to the conflict in the Middle East, Syria has consistently promoted a perspective that castigates Israeli security measures without condemning the terrorist threat faced by Israel.

While I have long supported this act and welcome its passage, I believe that our ability to influence Syria's behavior and deter its support for terrorism also requires a multilateral strategy. The effect of this act will unfortunately be limited by the lack of support for sanctions against Syria among our friends and allies. It is critical that the administration demonstrate global leadership on this issue as well as other aspects of the war on terrorism. By reaching out to the international community and by appealing to our common interest in curtailing global terrorism and achieving peace in the Middle East, we can ensure that the sanctions we are imposing today are truly effective.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Since September 11, the bar for assistance in our war against terrorism has been raised, and the Syrian Government is no longer entitled to a free pass. The United States must no longer allow Syria to get away with taking with the right hand what it gives with the left.

Unfortunately, the Government of Syria remains an obstacle to peace in Iraq, settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—indeed, Syria has rebuffed repeated Israeli offers to make peace between Israel and Syria—democratic development and sovereignty for the Lebanese people, regional security, and the protection of human rights of the Syrian people themselves.

There is no doubt that Syria actively supports international terrorism. The evidence supporting this contention is overwhelming:

The U.S. State Department has certified Syria on its list of state sponsors of terrorism continuously since the 1970s. Syria's dubious company on this list includes Hussein's Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Communist Cuba.

Syria provides material support and safe haven to numerous international terrorist groups, including Hezbollah, Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and Islamic Jihad.

Syria allows terrorist groups to maintain training camps on Syrian soil. Indeed, in October, after a terrorist bombing in Haifa, Israel retaliated against a known Islamic Jihad terrorist training camp near Damascus.

Syrian-controlled southern Lebanon is a haven for anti-Israel terrorists and a staging ground for terrorist rocket attacks against Northern Israel.

Syria has facilitated the transfer of military equipment from Iran to terrorists operating in Syria-controlled Lebanon.

Syria maintains a robust chemical weapons program, raising the risk that Syria could transfer such weapons to terrorists.

In addition to Syria's long-time efforts to support the deadly aims of international terrorist groups, its government has played a decidedly unhelpful role in regional security. Most notably, the Syrian Government illegally collaborated with the Hussein regime to circumvent United Nations resolutions and has worked to undermine Iraqi democracy in the wake of the liberation of that country.

Although Syria voted for the recent U.N. resolution on Iraq, ostensibly expressing its support for the reconstruction of a free and democratic Iraq, Syria has used nearly every other opportunity to undermine the American-led coalition's efforts to liberate the people of that country from the brutal reign of Saddam Hussein. Furthermore, recent media reports indicate that Syria may have accepted and hidden Hussein's weapons of mass destruction before the U.S.-led invasion.

In addition, there are credible reports that Syria provided material support to Iraqi troops during the war and currently provides safe haven to former Hussein regime officials and loyalists. U.S. investigators have located \$3 billion hidden by the Hussein regime in Syrian banks, and Syria has refused to return this money to its rightful owners: the people of Iraq.

During the 1990s, Syria repeatedly defied U.N. sanctions against Iraq by participating in enormous black market purchases of oil from the Saddam Hussein regime. The proceeds from these sales directly supported Hussein's military regime and opulent lifestyle.

Syria has not acted sufficiently to curb cross-border movement of foreign terrorists, including a significant number of Syrian nationals, into Iraq. Indeed, in some circumstances, the Syrian Government appears to have facilitated their migration to that country; Syrian passports have been found in the possession of international terrorists arrested by the U.S. military there. These terrorists seek to wage jihad against American troops and undermine democracy in Iraq and throughout the Middle East.

In addition to Syria's unhelpful policies in Iraq, it remains a spoiler for the development of peace and democracy in Lebanon, a country it has forcibly occupied for decades. Its military occupation of Lebanon undermines Lebanese efforts to create a sovereign democratic state and furthers instability in the region. Syria, a dictatorship, wields considerable political control in Lebanon, thereby distorting Lebanon's officially democratic process and making that country a de facto puppet state of the Syrian Government.

Unconditional U.S. engagement of Syria has failed to encourage true moderation in Damascus; a new approach is necessary to encourage the Syrians to cooperate or face the consequences. Other Arab governments who say one thing and do another—such as Egypt—would be wise to pay attention to the congressional debate about, and support for, the Syrian Accountability Act.

I believe the Syrian Accountability Act will give the administration the tools it needs to highlight to the Syrian Government the risk of choosing the wrong side in the global war against terrorism. The Syrian Government has an opportunity to reform itself, to provide its people with the economic and political freedoms they seek, to end its support for murderous terrorist organizations, and to become a proponent of peace in the Middle East.

If Syria's leaders decide to embark on a moderate and peaceful path, it will find the United States to be a benevolent and helpful ally. But if it continues to support international terrorism, Syria's leaders will find themselves international pariahs, with fewer resources or friends to help them maintain their increasingly tenuous grip on power.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Syria Accountability Act of 2003, a bipartisan piece of legislation of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The time has come for the Senate to send a strong message to Syria that its support for terrorism, its occupation of

Lebanon, and its development of weapons of mass destruction are unacceptable and will not be tolerated.

This legislation, introduced by my friend and colleague from California, Senator BOXER, and Senator SANTORUM provides the President with maximum flexibility to target specific sanctions against Syria subject to a national security waiver.

Specifically, it requires that sanctions be imposed on Syria unless the President certifies that Syria: is not providing support for international terrorists; has withdrawn all military, intelligence, and other security personnel from Lebanon; has ceased the production, development, acquisition, or transfer of weapons of mass destruction and long range ballistic missiles, and; has ceased support for terrorist activities inside of Iraq.

If the President does not make such a certification, the bill requires the President to prohibit the export to Syria of military items and dual use technology and impose two or more sanctions from a list of options including: prohibiting the export of products of the United States—other than food and medicine—to Syria; prohibiting United States businesses from investing or operating in Syria; restricting the travel of Syrian diplomats in Washington, D.C. and New York; and reducing diplomatic contacts with Syria.

I, for one, believe that sanctions should be imposed only as a last resort and that all avenues should be explored to change another state's behavior before taking such action.

With regard to Syria, Congress has passed numerous resolutions calling on Syria to change its ways and Republican and Democratic administrations alike have made it clear that Syria's actions are wholly inconsistent with a peace-loving and productive member of the international community.

Nevertheless, words have not achieved the results we are looking for and as a result, we must take further substantive action.

Syria's behavior and actions leave a lot to be desired and have severely hindered the Arab-Israeli peace process.

First, it continues to be listed as a state sponsor of terrorism by the State Department and is reported by the Secretary of State to provide "safe haven and support to several terrorist groups" including Hizballah, Hamas, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

Despite repeated calls by Secretary of State Colin Powell that Syria cease its support for terrorism and close the facilities and offices of these groups, it has refused to do so.

Second, for over 20 years Syria has ignored United Nations Security Council resolutions and has failed to withdraw completely from Lebanon, maintaining 20,000 troops and security personnel in that sovereign country. The presence of those troops restricts the political independence of Lebanon and harms relations between Israel and Lebanon.

Finally, Syria has continued its development and deployment of short and medium range ballistic missiles and biological and chemical weapons. It has not signed the Chemical Weapons Convention and has one of the largest missile inventories in the Middle East. It is reported to have three production facilities for chemical weapons and has a stockpile of the nerve agent sarin.

In the post-September 11 world, we all understand the dangers posed by states who sponsor terror and seek weapons of mass destruction.

I had hoped that Syria would realize that it is in its best interests to turn a new page in its relations with the United States and the international community and cease its support for terror, withdraw from Lebanon, and halt its pursuit of chemical and biological weapons.

It has not done so and it is time for the United States Senate to respond. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, for decades, the United States has engaged the regime in Syria in the hope that Damascus would play a constructive role in bringing about Arab-Israeli peace. The U.S.-Syria relationship has been ongoing despite the fact that Syria has been ruled by dictatorship with an uninterrupted record of support for terrorism, specifically directed at Israel.

The results of U.S. engagement with Syria have been anything but positive. Throughout the years, Damascus has continued to support international terrorism directed at America and Israel, occupy Lebanon, develop a weapons-of-mass-destruction program, acquire ballistic missiles, and pursue policies counter to U.S. interests.

Since the liberation of Iraq, Syria has played a destabilizing role by allowing terrorist fugitives to enter Syria and by allowing mercenaries to cross into Iraq—or at least not stopping them—to engage U.S. troops. Syria has been able to conduct its policies—which are antithetical to U.S. interests—with near impunity. They have resulted in the loss of hundreds of American lives—especially when you consider the bombing of the U.S. Marine Corps barracks in Beirut in 1983.

Although Syria is listed—and has been since the 1970s—by the State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism, along with Iran, Libya, Iraq, Cuba, and North Korea, it has not faced the same degree of diplomatic and economic isolation that has been directed at other terrorist states. In fact, Washington maintains full diplomatic relations with Syria, making Syria the only designated state sponsor of terrorism to have such relations with the United States.

Syria's special treatment despite its support for terrorism should be over.

The events of September 11, 2001 have offered a window of opportunity to review many U.S. bilateral relationships and determine whether it is necessary

to change the dynamic—and often the status quo—that has characterized these relations. The administration and Congress have done this most notably with Saudi Arabia in seeking greater cooperation in the elimination of terrorist activities operating from Saudi soil.

Now is also an ideal time to reassess U.S. relations with Damascus and demand accountability in our relationship. Equally important, it is time for the Syrian leadership to make a tough choice: it is either with the United States completely in the war on terrorism, or it is not. Either way, shielding Syria from the same economic and political isolation directed at other terrorist states is unmerited and runs counter to U.S. principles in the war against terrorism.

As Under Secretary of State John Bolton stated in testimony before the House International Relations Committee on September 16, 2003, "Syria remains a security concern on two important counts: terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." Bolton added: "There is no graver threat to our country today than states that both sponsor terrorism and possess or aspire to possess weapons of mass destruction. Syria, which offers physical sanctuary and political protection to groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Palestinian Jihad, and whose terrorist operations have killed hundreds of innocent people—including Americans—falls into this category of state of potential dual threat."

Since the 1970s, the U.S. State Department has listed Syria as a state sponsor of terrorism. Specifically, in its "Patterns of Global Terrorism, 2002" report, the State Department found that the Syrian Government "has continued to provide political and limited material support to a number of Palestinian groups, including allowing them to maintain headquarters or offices in Damascus," although the Syrian Government insists that the groups' Damascus offices undertake only political and informational activities, not terrorist operations.

Syria maintains close relations with Iran, another autocratic regime listed by the State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism and a prominent financial, political, and military backer of these Palestinian terrorist organizations.

Moreover, Syria remains the de facto ruler of Lebanon, which it has forcibly and illegally occupied since 1990. Lebanon, the country in which more than 200 U.S. Marines died in 1983 following a terrorist attack on their Beirut barracks, remains a breeding ground and training center for terrorist organizations.

Terrorism has spawned in Syria due largely to Syria's opposition to the existence of Israel and its subsequent objection to an Arab-Israeli peace process. Although the United States has engaged Syria—and given it a prominent place in discussions—during the past

few decades, Damascus has long been an unwilling and uncooperative partner in bringing about Middle East peace. In fact, Syria did not endorse President Bush's Middle East "roadmap."

Syria also appears to be in the terror financing business. In April 2003, an Italian government study found that Syria functioned as a hub for an al-Qaida network that moved Islamic extremists and funds from Italy to north-eastern Iraq, where the recruits fought alongside the recently defeated Ansar al Islam terrorist group.

And, on October 21, it was reported that U.S. Treasury Department investigators have evidence that \$3 billion that belonged to Saddam Hussein's government is being held in Syria-controlled banks in Syria and Lebanon. The Syrian Government has not yet granted Treasury officials access to these accounts, nor has it been willing to share any information about the account holders.

Let's review past U.S. policy toward Damascus. Despite all of Syria's irresponsible and threatening policies, successive U.S. administrations have been willing to engage the Syrian Government. For decades, the United States has pursued a policy of engagement with Syria, trying to win Damascus' support for Middle East peace but to no avail.

As part of this strategy, the United States has maintained full diplomatic relations with Damascus. It also has allowed U.S. companies to invest in Syria, something that cannot be done in other terrorist-sponsor states such as North Korea, Iran, Cuba, and Libya.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in 1999—the last year there was reliable data available—direct investment of U.S. companies into Syria was \$6 million, with 13 U.S. businesses having offices in Syria. While this may seem minuscule in terms of the dollar amount, it is notable because it is tolerated at all.

With the death of Syrian President Hafez Assad in 2000 and the ascendancy of his son Bashar to the presidency, there were high expectations that Syria would depart from its anti-Israeli policies and pro-terrorist support of the past and enact political and economic reforms, as well as become a positive influence and player in achieving Middle East peace. Three years into Bashar's term, such developments have not materialized—and without a catalyst to encourage such reform, it appears unlikely that Bashar will proactively change Syria's course.

We need a new approach toward Damascus. Continuation of the current U.S. policy toward Syria must end. For too long, it has been too ineffective and has allowed Syria to pursue with near impunity policies counter to U.S. interests. Moreover, it is unproductive and antithetical to the principles associated with the President's war on terrorism.

The U.S. must pressure Syria to play by the rules. Given that the government of Syrian President Bashar al-

Assad is relatively weak, and recognizing that Bashar deemed it necessary, or least desirable, to provide some assistance to the United States in apprehending al-Qaida, it should be possible to pressure Damascus into changing its policies. That said, Washington must demonstrate that it is serious about having Damascus drop its support of terrorism and its pursuit of policies that endanger peace and stability in the Middle East.

Therefore, to demonstrate American commitment, the United States should adopt the following measures in pressuring Syria: Enact the Syria Accountability Act now. Among the numerous provisions contained in the bill, the most notable include the calls for Syria to immediately and unconditionally halt support for terrorism; withdraw from Lebanon and provide for Lebanon's full restoration of sovereignty; halt development of certain weapons; and enter into serious unconditional bilateral peace negotiations with Israel.

This bill also states that Syria "should bear responsibility for attacks committed by Hezbollah and other terrorist groups with offices, training camps, or other facilities" in Syria or Lebanon. Further, the bill states, that being in violation of key United Nations Security Council resolutions and pursuing policies which undermine international peace and security, "Syria should not have been permitted to join the United Nations Security Council or serve as the Security Council's President, and should be removed from the Security Council.

Pursuant to the legislation, the United States is empowered to "will work to deny Syria the ability to support acts of terrorism and efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction, WMD." In addition, the United States will not provide any assistance to Syria and will oppose all forms of multilateral assistance to Syria until Damascus withdraws from Lebanon and halts its pursuit of WMD and ballistic missile accumulation.

Until Syria enacts these measures, the President is required to prohibit: the sale of defense articles to Syria that require the issuance of an export license—dual-use items; U.S. businesses from investing in Syria; and export of any goods other than food and medicine to Syria. Diplomatic relations also must be reduced but the degree of that is not defined. The President is given waiver authority for 6-month periods for all of these categories, except the export of dual-use items if it is determined that "it is in the vital national security interest" to do so.

The Bush administration should apply uniformity in its policies toward terrorist-sponsoring states. Therefore, the administration should not allow U.S. companies to invest in Syria because it sends the signal that Syria is receiving special treatment from Washington. A fairly dramatic reduction of

U.S. diplomatic representation would perhaps strongly suggest to Syria that it is not an American ally and will not be one until it starts acting like one.

Sending a strong message is key.

The United States should apply the proliferation security initiative, PSI, and sanction WMD suppliers. The administration has successfully developed and employed a plan, known as the proliferation security initiative, PSI, to interdict illicit weapons shipments and contraband. PSI was announced by President Bush on May 31, 2003. It involves robust cargo inspections and possible interdiction of WMD materials and illegal arms, based on pooled intelligence among participating countries. To date, 11 nations form the core PSI group: Britain, France, Germany, Australia, Japan, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, the Netherlands, and the United States. While most of the initial PSI activities have focused on North Korea, attention should be paid to Syria—and Iran—with the goal of halting the flow of weapons technology both in and out of Syria.

A critical complementary strategy to PSI is using sanctions on countries that supply Syria with weapons and WMD technology. The People's Republic of China, Pakistan, Russia, Iran, and North Korea are known proliferators of these materials, with Russia and North Korea being key suppliers to Syria.

As part of a wider U.S. policy, the administration should attempt to convince its PSI allies to also use sanctions against WMD suppliers.

In conclusion, Syria's actions in the Middle East—and in Iraq, specifically pose a clear, near-term threat to regional stability and to the safety and security of American forces serving in the region.

With the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq and the defeat of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, the United States has made clear that state support for terrorism will no longer be tolerated.

It is overdue for the United States and like-minded nations to hold Syria accountable for its actions. Syria's new head of state has had ample time to make the choice whether Damascus is with the United States as a partner or not in fighting the war on terrorism.

If Syria is not, then it should face the diplomatic and economic consequences as set out in the Syria Accountability Act. As a sponsor of the Senate version, S. 982, I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote for this important measure in the form of H.R. 1828, as amended.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I stand in support of the Syria Accountability Act, H.R. 1828, which the House of Representatives passed, 398-4, last month. I am an original cosponsor of the Senate bill, S. 982, introduced by my colleagues, Senators SANTORUM and BOXER, which has over 80 cosponsors as of today. Today, I support the amend-

ment to H.R. 1828 submitted by my able colleague and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, in coordination with Senators SANTORUM and BOXER. I commend my colleagues for their good work.

It is well within Congress's prerogative to write and implement sanctions, but the practice of doing so, as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee knows so well, can raise important points about the overall constitutional prerogative of the executive in its right to conduct foreign policy. The amendment prepared by Senator LUGAR, in cooperation with the original sponsors of the bill, preserves the prerogatives of both branches of government, and, at the same time, I believe, unifies and solidifies our nation's policy on the question of terrorism, and, in particular, Syria's contribution to peace, stability and progress in the Middle East.

Quite frankly, Syria has largely failed to contribute significantly to peace and stability in the Middle East, a stability that U.S. blood and treasure is now invested to achieve. We have watched the administration give Syria ample opportunities, since September 11, 2001, to make its contribution. Quite frankly, Mr. President, the administration flattered the Damascus dictatorship by giving it this time to join with the civilized world in unequivocally renouncing terrorism completely, as well as dismantling all manifestations of material and political support for terrorist organizations.

Some suggest that Syria has played a game of sitting on the fence, when it came to the war on terrorism. However, Mr. President, Syria was never on the fence. Syria is on the other side of the fence, with the other state sponsors of terrorism we have labeled as such since 1979. And today I will agree with what Secretary Powell told President Assad earlier this year: By refusing to cooperate, he was "on the wrong side of history."

Since 1979, Syria has appeared every year on the State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism. It has been so identified for its role in terrorist acts, as well as the support it gave—and continues to give, to this very day—to Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hezbollah, terrorist organizations that, to this very day, organize and commit acts of aggression or terrorism.

Throughout the 1990s, Syria played coy with U.S. administrations attempting to engage it in the Middle East peace process. Who can forget the scene of the long-suffering Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, waiting hours outside of Hafez Assad's office on his umpteenth visit, at the very same time Iranian weapons were being transferred to Hezbollah at the Damascus airport? Who can forget President Clinton's futile attempt in Geneva, near the end of his term and near the end of Assad's brutal life, to re-engage the

dictator in peace talks? On the question of peace or normal relations with Israel, in every aspect but the desire to reclaim territory for itself, Syria has most definitely been a rejectionist state.

There are persistent reports that Syria has a stockpile of chemical weapons, including sarin and possibly also VX, which it could combine with one of the largest missile stockpiles in the Middle East. Coalition forces are not in Iraq to rid that former dictatorship of its weapons of destruction while we look the other way on similar weapons held by another Ba'athist regime. The era of that ideology of Arab oppression, along with the threat of weapons of mass destruction to maintain that oppression, is over.

Syria has not assisted us in our historic mission in Iraq. Joining the Security Council in unanimous approval of Resolution 1441, the Syrians were quick to denounce the threat and use of force to achieve the goals of the resolution. Since the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, our officials—from the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Defense—have publicly criticized Syria for its lack of cooperation. Syria's border has remained open to fleeing Ba'athist officials, and to international terrorists anxious to die fighting against Coalition forces. Our officials believe that Syria holds up to \$3 billion of Saddam's ill-gotten loot, funds that the Governing Council could use for reconstruction, funds that would lessen the obligations we have undertaken in this body this week.

Syria invaded Lebanon more than a quarter-century ago, and maintains approximately 15,000 troops there to this day. Throughout this period, Syria has backed the Shi'ite terrorist organization, Hezbollah, an organization that has been tied to terrorism around the world. Twenty years ago, a Hezbollah suicide bomber killed almost 300 U.S. Marines as they slept in their barracks in Beirut. Hezbollah continues to attack across borders, shelling Israel as late as last week. Nothing Hezbollah does is without Syrian sanction. The Middle East will not see peace, and the United States should not consider itself secure as long as Hezbollah, with its Syrian backers, exists.

So it is time to go to the source and sanction Syria. This bill outlines a series of goals and commensurate diplomatic and economic sanctions to apply to the Syrian regime. It maintains flexibility of policy choice for the administration, but it is clear in stating the Congress's intent, in resolve and policy, to further isolate the decrepit dictatorship in Damascus.

I do not know if this bill will motivate Damascus to cross the fence and join the anti-terror coalition of civilized nations. I suspect that to believe so would be pollyannaish. But I do believe that the way we act today will declare to the Damascus dictatorship that there are costs to being on the wrong side of the fence in the war on terror.

September 11, 2001 began a new era in U.S. foreign policy, and the President's policies since that watershed event have been based on clarity of vision. Against the threat of terrorism, which lurks and breeds in the shadows, we have responded with clarity of purpose. Against the traditional approaches of diplomacy, which balance nuance against process, we have demanded progress. Against previous approaches that part-time antagonism toward a mutual enemy should be rewarded with full-time tolerance of non-compliance with our stated goals, we say today: No longer.

President Assad will receive this message clearly. Perhaps Syria will modify its behavior. If it does not, Syria can join the list of rogue states who failed because they challenged the order of the civilized world.

The American public has read reports in the press about Syria's cooperation with us in identifying, in the months after September 11, members of Al-Qaida. I have read no where, nor have I heard any analyst argue, that such cooperation was because Syria was dedicated to our defense, or to our global war on terrorism. Since then, the American public has heard many members of the current administration express disappointment with Syria's behavior, and they have seen many reports of Syria's lack of cooperation. And one thing is clear in a democracy, Mr. President: Our foreign policy must have the support of the public.

I will always respect the President's foreign policy prerogative, and I have defended the executive's prerogative under Republican and Democratic administrations. I have supported "quiet diplomacy" for small results. But a diplomacy that produces invisible results is not quiet, it is silent. Today, I believe the members of the President's administration agree with me.

For the reasons I have stated here, this bill will pass overwhelmingly, as it did in the House of Representatives. We may consider this the Senate's contribution today to the war on global terrorism.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting on H.R. 1828, the Syria Accountability Act. I would like to explain to my colleagues why I will be voting against this legislation.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee's Near East Subcommittee, I have come to appreciate the great importance of U.S. leadership in working to restart the Middle East peace process. In recent visits to the region—the West Bank, Jordan, Iraq, Turkey and Afghanistan—I heard a uniform chorus in these Arab and Muslim nations that active United States involvement was urgently needed to halt the continuing violence between Israel and the Palestinians. I regret that this administration has not actively responded to these pleas for peace.

I have also learned that our disinterest in becoming involved in Middle East peace has contributed to the

sharply declining image of the United States in the Arab/Muslim world. Indeed, according to the recently released report of the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World—"the Djerejian report"—hostility toward America has reached shocking levels, and the bottom has fallen out of Arab and Muslim support for the United States. The report also documents that "large majorities in the Arab and Muslim world view United States policy through the prism of the Arab-Israeli conflict."

I am troubled by these developments and fear that the administration's emerging hard line toward Syria, in addition to passage of this bill, will only add fuel to this fire. It is true that the Syrian Government can do more to work with the United States in combating terrorism in the region, and the administration has made some very clear requests of the Syrian Government. But if Syria does not respond to our requests, most, if not all, of the sanctions contemplated by the Syrian Accountability Act can already be imposed by the administration. This means that a bill that is widely perceived as a crackdown against Syria has little substantive effect. Indeed, Patrick Clawson of CSIS testified to our committee last week, "Some might say that the act is largely symbolic, but do not underestimate the importance of symbols." And that concerns me, because the symbol of the United States as cracking down on an Arab nation ultimately harms our interests in many very important parts of the world.

So in reality I would describe this bill as a "lose-lose" for the United States: We're getting little additional muscles against Syria while further antagonizing the Arab world. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Syria has long been considered by the United States to be a rogue state. Syria continues to associate with terrorist groups, including those that have carried out ruthless attacks that set back the cause of peace in the Middle East, leading it to be placed on the State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism. Syria has occupied Lebanon continuously since 1976, in violation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 520.

The United States is justified in seeking to apply political and economic pressure on Syria to change its foreign policy. However, I will vote against the Syria Accountability Act.

Of the 22 pages of this bill, only six pages relate to sanctions that the United States may apply to Syria. The other pages contain 51 clauses of findings, senses of Congress, and statements of policy. These nonbinding provisions build a case against Syria, and I fear that those provisions could later be used to build a case for a military intervention against Syria.

In many cases, the non-binding clauses in the bill appear to gloss over the complex situation with respect to

Syria. For example, on page 11, the bill speaks of "hostile actions" by Syria against U.S.-led forces in Iraq. Yet, the evidence is inconclusive as to the role of the Government of Syria in the attacks that have been carried out against our troops in Iraq. Such insinuations could be used to build the case for a preemptive military intervention against Syria, which, unfortunately, is a very real possibility because of the dangerous doctrine of preemption hatched by the administration.

Other language in the nonbinding clauses may simply be ill-considered. For example, on page 7, the bill quotes an unclassified CIA report that says that it is "highly probable" that Syria is working on biological weapons. In the very next clause, however, the bill quotes an Under Secretary of State as saying that Syria "is pursuing" the development of biological weapons. It is exactly this kind of shading of intelligence probabilities becoming certainties for which Congress has criticized the administration and its intelligence agencies for creating the hysteria that led to war in Iraq. Could Congress be so willing to make the same mistake with respect to Syria?

The United States should use economic and diplomatic leverage to pressure Syria to change its support for terrorism and alter its foreign policy. The sponsors of this legislation have made improvements to several non-binding provisions in this bill, and they have worked to address some of my more serious concerns. While I appreciate their cooperation, I still cannot support this legislation. The findings, statements of policy, and sense of Congress provisions in the Syria Accountability Act could be used to build a case against Syria that could too easily be hyped to imply congressional support for preemptive military action against that rogue state. I will vote against this bill because of that dangerous course that it may portend.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 1 minute 54 seconds.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I note no more Senators on our side of the aisle wish to speak. Therefore, I yield the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 445 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Akaka	Dodd	McCain
Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Mikulski
Allen	Dorgan	Miller
Baucus	Durbin	Murkowski
Bayh	Edwards	Murray
Bennett	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feingold	Nickles
Bingaman	Feinstein	Pryor
Bond	Fitzgerald	Reed
Boxer	Frist	Reid
Breaux	Graham (SC)	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bunning	Gregg	Santorum
Burns	Harkin	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hatch	Schumer
Carper	Hollings	Sessions
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Clinton	Inhofe	Smith
Cochran	Johnson	Snowe
Coleman	Kennedy	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stabenow
Conrad	Kyl	Stevens
Cornyn	Landrieu	Sununu
Corzine	Lautenberg	Talent
Craig	Leahy	Thomas
Crapo	Levin	Voinovich
Daschle	Lincoln	Warner
Dayton	Lott	Wyden
DeWine	Lugar	

NAYS—4

Byrd	Enzi
Chafee	Jeffords

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Graham (FL)	Kerry	
Hagel	Lieberman	

The bill (H.R. 1828) was passed, as follows:

Mr. FRIST. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am proud of my colleagues throughout the Senate for the overwhelming support just given on the Syria Accountability Act. I believe this bill sends an unambiguous signal to the administration and to the Syrian regime that the Congress considers Syrian support for terrorism, its occupation of Lebanon, and its pursuit of dangerous weapons all significant threats to the United States and to global security.

I am particularly concerned that this administration has let Syria off the

hook. Despite the support the Syria Accountability Act just had, there are waivers that concern me. Syria's record is not one that we can look at with any assurances that they are going to do what they have to.

The administration claimed that al-Assad's regime's support for the global war on terrorism is so valuable that he should not be pressed on other issues, including the failure of the Syrians to secure the Iraqi border, thereby permitting the constant infiltration of foreign terrorists pouring into Iraq.

Apparently, the Syrians must have shared intelligence about al-Qaida, and FBI and CIA officials have reportedly met in Syria with Syrian intelligence officers to discuss terrorism. The Syrians have also helped to capture a top al-Qaida figure, a Syrian-born German citizen who is part of the Hamburg cell that planned the September 11 attack.

So while Syria might be sharing information on al-Qaida, at the same time it is deliberately thwarting the Palestinian-Israeli peace process.

Syria harbors leaders who order, plan, and finance terror attacks against Israeli citizens. Operatives of the Islamic Jihad, Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the al Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, which I might add is a terrorist group affiliated with Yasser Arafat's political party FATAH, are regularly receiving training in Syrian camps.

So what is perplexing is why this administration has refused to force the Syrians to stop training Palestinian extremists even as it promotes a resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

No Palestinian roadmap to peace, no negotiations will be successful between Palestinians and Israelis as long as Syria continues to occupy Lebanon and to train and churn out suicide bombers.

I am worried that the administration has made a cynical tradeoff, focusing on supposed Syrian support for the hunt for al-Qaida while ignoring the Syrian's deliberate obstruction of the peace process.

Last month, when the Islamic Jihad successfully blew up an Arab-owned seaside restaurant in Haifa, killing 19 Israelis, including 5 Palestinian Israelis, Israel responded by striking one of the Palestinian training camps, choosing a time when it was empty to avoid collateral damage. The Bush administration responded with a bland statement urging both Israel and Syria to avoid actions that heighten tensions or could lead to hostilities.

Despite President Bush's call for Damascus to expel terrorist organizations from Syria and close down its camps, the Syrians have directly refused. They have made a mockery of President Bush's famous claim that you are "either with us or against us in the war on terrorism."

We in the Senate have just passed the Syria Accountability Act, but Syria will not be held accountable until the administration decides to end its tradeoffs in the global war on terrorism,

prioritizing the fight against some forms of terror over others.

The message we want to send has to be clear and direct. We will not tolerate any support for terrorism, especially among those who purport to be our friends.

Everyone has seen the Syrian action in Lebanon and we know how treacherous that is. They occupy the country and pretend they want to make peace, but they do not want to. They have not indicated by their actions that they want to.

I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—CONFERENCE REPORT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is my hope that we can go next to the Defense authorization conference report. We have some Senators who may want to make closing remarks, and then we would like to adopt this important conference report during today's session. I think it is fitting that the Senate act on this measure today, on Veterans Day.

Having said that, I ask my Democratic colleagues if they are prepared to allow for a 3-hour debate limitation prior to a vote on adoption of the Defense conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have no problem going to the conference report today. We do not need a vote on the motion to proceed. We would go to that. We have our Congressional Medal of Honor winner, Senator INOUE, who asked to be present when we vote on this conference report, and I think we should do that. He is somebody we all look upon as a hero, and he is doing veterans ceremonies in his State. We have no problem debating the bill today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Senator STEVENS told me he would be back here at about 6:30.

Mr. REID. We would be happy to have 4 hours of debate today, equally divided, and a vote on it early in the morning, but we would rather not vote on the matter today. I would be happy to offer a consent request that we would complete our debate on it today, and vote on it, with maybe 5 minutes equally divided, early in the morning, at whatever time the leader chooses.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have a number of Senators who believe strongly that we ought to go ahead and bring this bill up, that we should debate it, and that on Veterans Day we should have that opportunity to vote on that bill, if at all possible. Therefore, I will not agree to put the vote off until tomorrow. We will be bringing it to the floor, and I think then we will have discussion, debate today, on this Veterans Day. We will see how it goes, and we may or may not be voting later tonight.

Mr. President, reclaiming the floor, thus, we have Members who would like this rollcall vote. Having said that, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, could we keep this vote open for a little extra time, maybe an extra 20 minutes? We need 30 minutes because we have a Senator who is 30 minutes away. I know it is unusual to have a vote that long, but maybe this one time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. It would require a unanimous consent.

Mr. REID. I withdraw any request I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1588. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 446 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Akaka	Carper	DeWine
Alexander	Chafee	Dodd
Allard	Chambliss	Dole
Allen	Clinton	Domenici
Baucus	Cochran	Dorgan
Bennett	Coleman	Durbin
Biden	Collins	Ensign
Bingaman	Conrad	Enzi
Bond	Cornyn	Feingold
Breaux	Corzine	Feinstein
Brownback	Craig	Fitzgerald
Bunning	Crapo	Frist
Burns	Daschle	Graham (SC)
Cantwell	Dayton	Grassley

Gregg	Lott	Sarbanes
Harkin	Lugar	Schumer
Hatch	McCain	Sessions
Hollings	McConnell	Shelby
Hutchison	Mikulski	Smith
Inhofe	Murkowski	Snowe
Jeffords	Murray	Specter
Johnson	Nelson (FL)	Stabenow
Kennedy	Nickles	Stevens
Kohl	Pryor	Sununu
Landrieu	Reed	Talent
Lautenberg	Reid	Thomas
Leahy	Roberts	Voinovich
Levin	Rockefeller	Warner
Lincoln	Santorum	Wyden

NAYS—1

Byrd

NOT VOTING—12

Bayh	Graham (FL)	Kyl
Boxer	Hagel	Lieberman
Campbell	Inouye	Miller
Edwards	Kerry	Nelson (NE)

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1588), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of conferees on the part of both Houses.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the RECORD of November 6, 2003)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, together with my distinguished colleague from Michigan, the ranking member, we are proud to bring a conference report on national defense authorization for fiscal year 2004 for final passage.

It is fitting that we consider this important legislation on Veterans Day, a day when our Nation pauses to honor those who serve in the Armed Forces, their families, and those who have gone before them, proudly defending our Nation's freedom.

I was deeply moved earlier today by the number of Senators on both sides of the aisle who spoke out with a sense of reverence and respect on this Veterans Day, November 11, 2003.

This bill provides much needed benefits to those now serving, and their families, in the Armed Forces, as well as addressing longstanding needs of military retirees and veterans. This has been an unusually interesting and somewhat lengthy conference. In my 25 years, I think Senator LEVIN and I