

you for that and may you look forward to many happy years with Lois. I know that your father Ezra, and I know that your mother, God rest her, would be proud. I know that your father Ezra has watched you all these years and continues to be very proud of you. From Crowley, LA, from a young man who ran when he was 28 years old on the theme of experience matters, and was brash enough at 28, having never served a moment to say that experience matters, let me say, experience does matter, and we are proud to have had a Senator with the kind of experience and legacy of my senior Senator from Louisiana, JOHN BREAUX.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. BYRD. 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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes.

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

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, while we are continuing to try to resolve our current situation, I will speak for a moment about something else today. Today is National Adoption Day. The Senator from Idaho and I spoke at some length yesterday in anticipation of today, so I will not go into too much detail, but I thought maybe some of my colleagues would be pleased because they worked so hard on this issue. It is an important issue. One out of six Americans has been touched by adoption.

While we were working in Washington, in our capitals and cities all across America, over 4,000 children were adopted today. That those children found forever families and parents who have prayed and hoped for either their first child into their family or children added into their family through adoption was made possible today because our country honors this day as National Adoption Day.

Both President Bush and President Clinton before him were wonderful advocates of promoting a better system of foster care and child care in our Nation for the children of America. We believe, as Members of the Senate, there is no such thing as unwanted children, just unfound families. Many of us do a lot of work in this area in terms of legislation to try to make our system work more effectively and efficiently so that all children can have the dream of a family, a mother, a father, at least one parent, to raise them, to bring them up.

We think that governments do a lot of things well—I, at least, think governments do a lot of things well—but one thing it does not do well is raise children. Families raise children. That is where children belong, in families. When they are separated from their birth parents for one reason or another—and there are many: war, famine, disease, and sometimes having to be separated from parents because of gross abuse and neglect—our work is to get them reconnected as soon as possible to a relative, to a responsible, caring adult, to at least some family in the community right there where they are and, if not, somewhere in the world.

I have a heartwarming and also heartrending story about a little boy from Louisiana. For the sake of time, I will quickly tell the story because it truly is touching.

Eight years ago, a little boy was born at Tulane Hospital. I am not going to say his name for the record. That was the wonderful news about being born, but the sad news was he was born with AIDS. He was so sick, so fragile and frail that his birth mother basically abandoned him and no one stepped forward for him.

The nurse that cared for him fell in love with him and basically took him home to her house. She and her husband raised, nurtured, and loved this little boy for many years. She tried through our system to adopt this child for years. I am not exactly sure if I could explain to Members why this never took place when the child was 2 or 3 or 4 except for bureaucracy or that people did not care enough.

Here is a little boy, dying of AIDS, wanting parents, a parent wanting this child, but the system did not work fast enough.

The happy part of the story is one judge in my State, Judge Taylor, after this came to his attention, decided to take action, and action he took. He brought all the court, which is unheard of, all the clerks, all of the lawyers to the hospital room where this little 8-year-old boy was lying in a frail condition, and he brought the prospective parents to the hospital room and they conducted the adoption ceremony right there in the hospital room. This is the only time I have ever heard of this. Maybe it has happened before, but this happened in New Orleans, LA, just in the last year.

He was so frail that his doctors insisted that the heart monitor be kept on the whole time that this was going on. When the judge said the words, this child is now adopted, his heart rate went up to normal for the first time in his life. The child could not speak, but the monitors said what the child was feeling when he was adopted because his last wish was that he would be adopted. Through the Make a Wish Foundation this all happened.

So the child was adopted, and his now new parents stood by his bedside and hugged and cried. That is the

happy part of this story. I do not know what kind of system was not working that would leave this little boy without these parents so long, but the happy news is he was adopted and they became his parents. The sad part of the story is that his little life did not go much further than that, and within basically a day of that ceremony, he passed on.

The great thing that I want to say today about National Adoption Day is that this child did not die an orphan. He died as a son. For this child and for the parents who adopted him, it was a wonderful ending.

So the work that we do in the Senate, whether it is on finance, tax, health care, or military, there is not too much work that we can do that is more important than connecting children to families, families who will love them, nurture them, and give them the best opportunity. We cannot promise our children rose gardens. We cannot protect them from harm or injury or disease, but we can give our children love for as long as we have them and, of course, they give us back so much more.

In honor of National Adoption Day, I thank all of our great leaders in Louisiana that made this wonderful story happen, and I congratulate the judges on our bench in New Orleans, the social workers who were on the positive side of this story, the parents themselves, the medical staff at Tulane University, and my sister Madeleine, who is a wonderful judge, who shared this story with me.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 2004]

AGENCIES PRESS EFFORT TO SPEED ADOPTIONS

(By Kristen A. Lee)

In 1998, Judge Michael Nash, the presiding judge of the juvenile court in Los Angeles, had a disturbing realization: Foster children were languishing too long in the system before their adoptions were completed.

So with the support of a team of lawyers working pro bono, Judge Nash opened his court on a Saturday and completed 130 adoptions in one morning. Buoyed by that success, Los Angeles courts have had about 20 more Saturday sessions, handling the adoptions of 7,000 children.

Under the leadership of the Alliance for Children's Research, the program initiated by Judge Nash's court has expanded into a national drive. On Saturday, the fifth annual National Adoption Day, child welfare groups and family courts across the country plan nearly 200 events and hope to complete more than 3,000 adoptions.

Nationwide, 129,000 foster children are waiting for permanent homes, according to a study released yesterday by the National Adoption Day Coalition, a group of child welfare organizations and private companies. Inadequate communication between state child welfare agencies and the courts, crowded court dockets and heavy caseloads were the most significant obstacles cited to placing children in permanent homes. And states

continue to report that finding adoptive parents is a challenge—especially for older children and those with special needs, like behavioral problems or disabilities.

But the study also found that state child welfare agencies and juvenile courts were taking innovative steps, as Judge Nash did, to better serve children and families.

The number of adoptions in the United States has increased significantly in recent years. In 1998, 37,000 children were adopted. In 2002, the number rose to 53,000.

The analysis was conducted by the Urban Institute, a nonpartisan economic and social policy research organization. The data was culled from federally mandated reports.

According to the study, the adoption process is complicated by the constant coordination required between child welfare agencies and family courts. Scheduling difficulties can slow the process, as can differences in outlook between agencies and the courts. The overwhelming majority of state agencies reported such differences led to delays in terminating the rights of birth parents.

“The courts may have one perspective and the agencies may have another,” said Rob Geen, director of the Child Welfare Research Program at the Urban Institute. These disagreements, he added, “lead to breakdowns and delay the adoption of children.”

Senator Mary Landrieu, the Louisiana Democrat who is co-chairwoman of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, described the system as “somewhat broken.” Federal financing for foster care should be funneled to the states in a more focused way, she said, adding, “The passion is there, the people’s support is there, but the system itself needs a tremendous amount of shoring up.”

Many states are already taking steps to address delays in the adoption process by reorganizing staff, scheduling more training and working better with the courts.

Judge Nash credits the special Saturday sessions for cutting the number of children under his court’s jurisdiction to 28,000, from 54,000 in 1998. “We have to move faster in taking care of those kids,” he said.

But Mr. Geen said that there can be good reasons for delay. “The system is set up to address the birth parents’ rights,” Mr. Geen said. “It’s not just finding a car,” he said of adoption. “There are reasons why the process should take a considerable amount of time.”

I yield the floor.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. 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. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, I understand we are in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

INTELLIGENCE REFORM

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, we are now in a serious quandary and a quagmire in some part due to the fact this institution, and our counterpart across the Hall, has difficulty in effective collaboration. With that said,

I want to talk about what I think is really one of the outstanding examples of what can happen when our Chamber and our friends in the House of Representatives decide there is an issue important enough to collaborate on to do something important for the people of America.

We have had, over the last 15 years, a series of the most serious failures of American intelligence in our Nation’s history. It didn’t just start with September 11, 2001, and it didn’t end with the circumstances that led to the war in Iraq. Going back over the decade of the 1990s we had the World Trade Center attack in New York, we had attacks against our embassies in Africa, we had failure to detect that India and Pakistan had become nuclear powers, we had the loss of the USS *Cole* in Yemen—all of those, which should have been detected, preempted, and the tragedy avoided by the effective professional work of our intelligence agencies. We didn’t get what we thought we deserved.

I wish to particularly commend this evening Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN as well as Senators ROBERTS and ROCKEFELLER for the outstanding leadership they have given in trying to overcome this vulnerability, this unnecessary vulnerability.

When I look at a final piece of legislation, I approach it in this manner. First, what were the problems—or maybe, what were the missed opportunities that led us to believe it was important that we develop this legislation? And now, at the end of the process, how well does the final product solve or at least substantially mitigate the problem that had led to our concern in the first place?

As it relates to the status of our intelligence agencies, we have had a number of problems that have each contributed, in their own way, to this series of failures. We have had the problem of the difficulty in the intelligence agencies adapting to changing adversaries and the changing global threat environment. The Cold War was the most fundamental historic event in the history of the American intelligence. Our intelligence agency had been focused for the better part of 45 years on the Soviet Union. We knew their languages. We knew their cultures. They were an entity very similar to the United States of America. We could almost anticipate what their actions would be.

Today, we have a massively asymmetrical adversary. Groups such as al-Qaida and Hezbollah and Hamas and Islamic Jihad, nations which are not nation states or tribes of tribes driven by extreme religious beliefs. We have not adapted to that change, and we have paid a high price for that failure to adapt. I am pleased to say there are provisions in the Intelligence Reform Act—and I hope we will soon take it up—which will begin to alter that situation.

We are establishing a strong Director of National Intelligence, or DNI, who

will be able to provide overall leadership and direction. He or she will not be responsible for the management of a line agency, as is the case today, where the Director of Central Intelligence is also the Director of the CIA. But, rather, he will be able to focus on those issues that will affect the entire community of intelligence and will have the responsibility to assure that we are sensitive and responsive to new developments.

I believe one of the areas in which we will face the greatest challenge in this responsiveness will be in our domestic intelligence. The FBI has been one of the agencies finding it most difficult to respond to a new environment. There has been a pattern of continuing to follow the culture of law enforcement when we need a new culture of intelligence to best protect our domestic vulnerabilities.

I am pleased at some of the progress Director Mueller has made. I believe we should continue to explore other alternatives to see if they will better protect our domestic security. I am pleased that under this legislation, the FBI, while not a unit of the Department of National Intelligence, will be still under the direct control of the FBI but will be considered part of the intelligence community family. I hope at an early date there will be an analysis of what should be our mission statement for domestic intelligence and then what changes in the FBI or further organizational changes will be required in order to fulfill that mission.

A second major problem has been the failure of the intelligence community to provide the big picture, strategic intelligence. Our former colleague, Pat Moynihan, used to regularly complain that, while we knew a great deal about the telephone system inside the Kremlin, nobody had observed the fact that the Soviet Union was near collapse. We have had similar failures to see the big picture, in terms of the failure to recognize the presence of terrorist cells within the United States, cells which were supported by terrorist entities or those supported by foreign governments. In the runup to the war in Iraq was another massive failure to give appropriate strategic intelligence. It is hoped the strong Director of National Intelligence will now have an opportunity to focus on these strategic issues. It is also hoped, as this legislation gives a heightened priority to source information—that is information that is available through public documents, newspapers, and other means—that it will receive a new importance in terms of arriving at overall intelligence conclusions.

There also has been a serious failure in human intelligence. We have many people in the intelligence agencies who understand the culture and the language of Russia. We are grossly inadequate in terms of people who understand the culture and language of the Middle East and central Asia. This legislation supplements legislation that