

Bush was not particularly interested in the war on terrorism or in going after al-Qaida. But interestingly enough, back in an August 2002 interview with the news media, Mr. Clarke himself said the Bush administration, in the spring of 2001, sought to increase CIA resources for covert action fivefold to go after al-Qaida. Back in 2002, he was singing an entirely different tune than he was portraying either in his testimony yesterday before the 9/11 Commission or in his new book, which I am sure he hopes will be a best seller and help defeat President Bush.

But before he had some epiphany and went in a different direction, in August 2002, he said the Bush administration plan was actually more aggressive than Clinton's, and that the Bush administration changed the strategy from one of rollback by al-Qaida over the course of 5 years, which it had been under the Clinton years, to a new strategy that called for the rapid elimination of the al-Qaida terrorist network.

That is what Mr. Clarke was saying in August of 2002—quite different from what he said yesterday before the 9/11 Commission or in his new book.

Also in this August 2002 interview, Clarke noted the Bush administration, in mid-January of 2001—before the 9/11 attack—decided to do two things to respond to the threat of terrorism: "One, to vigorously pursue the existing policy, including all the lethal covert action finds which we have now made public, to some extent; the second thing the administration decided to do was to initiate a process to look at these issues which had been on the table for a couple of years and get them decided."

In other words, what Clarke was saying in 2002 to members of the press was that the Bush administration's response to the war on terror was much more aggressive than it was under the Clinton years.

Now he is singing an entirely different tune. This is a man who lacks credibility. He may be an intelligent man, he may be a dedicated public servant, but clearly he has a grudge of some sort against the Bush administration. If he was unable to develop a more robust response during the Clinton years, he would only be able to blame himself. He was in charge of counterterrorism during those 8 years. How could the Bush administration be to blame in 8 months for the previous administration's failure over 8 years to truly declare war on al-Qaida?

Let me be clear, I do not believe the Clinton administration is responsible for September 11. Rather, I believe Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaida terrorist network are responsible. I also believe there exist other terrorists organizations that share al-Qaida's goal of murdering innocent civilians who oppose their violent and extremist ideology. These terrorists don't hate us because of our policies. They hate us because of who we are. And if we don't work together to bring the fight to the

terrorists, they will almost certainly bring it to us.

Bringing the fight to the terrorists is, of course, exactly what President Bush has been doing.

Instead of partisan finger-pointing, we should instead be working to bolster our intelligence infrastructure, continue our aggressive efforts to monitor, apprehend and bring to justice terrorists around the world, and improve our ability to defend America and its ideals from attack.

Although work remains to be done, I believe the Bush administration has made truly admirable progress in the war on terrorism. Who could argue with a straight face that America is not safer today than it was on September 10, 2001? The Taliban is gone. Saddam Hussein is gone.

We have destroyed all—not just one—all of al-Qaida's training camps in Afghanistan. All of them are gone from that country.

We have apprehended or killed two-thirds of al-Qaida's leaders.

We have launched international efforts to make it difficult for terrorists to raise or transfer their funds to fund their deadly activities.

We have worked with allies across the world to break up al-Qaida cells and other terrorist networks.

We passed the PATRIOT Act, which provides U.S. law enforcement better capabilities to monitor, apprehend, and bring to justice terrorists plotting in the United States.

We have won new allies in Pakistan and Uzbekistan. And by engaging these countries we have scored further victories against terrorists.

As I said earlier, there has been the end of the regime of Saddam Hussein who provided direct material support to Palestinian terrorists and who offered safe haven to other Islamic terrorists.

We have rounded up and continue to kill foreign terrorists in Iraq. These terrorists would rather be blowing up buses in midtown Manhattan. Believe me, that is where the terrorists would rather be on the attack. Instead they are in Iraq. That is where the war on terror is going on, right in Iraq.

While we mourn the loss of every American soldier and innocent Iraqi citizen, we are glad we are dealing with al-Qaida over in the Middle East and not on American soil.

Finally, I think it is important to remember what is happening in Libya. Prime Minister Blair is meeting with the Libyan leader today. He has been somewhat born again. He is now denouncing terrorism. His weapons of mass destruction are now being eliminated.

It is noteworthy that Qadhafi seemed to have gotten religion in March 2003, the same month we launched the invasion of Iraq, and seemed to have fully converted shortly after Saddam Hussein was found hiding in a hole. Clearly, our Iraq policy is helping reduce or eliminate rogue regimes with weapons of mass destruction.

Let me conclude by saying by any objective standard, the war on terrorism is going well. I think Mr. Clarke's efforts to convince the American public somehow President Bush was inattentive to the war on terror or obsessed with Iraq are simply foolish and erroneous and will not be believed by the American people.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Hawaii.

#### WAR ON TERRORISM

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the war on terrorism and the situation in Iraq on the 1-year anniversary of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I had the honor and privilege of traveling to Iraq and Afghanistan over the recent recess to visit our troops. I had the similar honor of visiting them in the medical center at Ramstein, Germany.

I report to my colleagues the troops with whom I met were in good spirits. They are, of course, eager to return home to their loved ones, but they are also proud of the work they are doing to stabilize Iraq and assist the Iraqi people in building a democratic state. I was proud of them, proud of the leadership of our military, and proud of all the troops there.

As a veteran of World War II, I was proud to see in the troops the same dedication to duty, mission, and country I remember so well from my own comrades in arms. In Ramstein, I was impressed with the wonderful support our wounded were receiving from the medical staff, and I was equally impressed with the eagerness our wounded expressed to return to the sides of their comrades. In that eagerness to rejoin their units, they shared a bond with all their past brothers in uniform.

In Iraq, I visited the newly deployed Stryker brigade in Mosul. This unit is demonstrating in the field for the first time a powerful new capability. But it has also been given the difficult objective of patrolling a large area. They are still waiting for Iraqi forces to be trained and adequately equipped to supplement their effort. Clearly, one reason why the security situation still remains so tenuous is the failure to train and field sufficient Iraqi security forces. But the apparent ambush of two American civilians recently by Iraqi police indicates even some of the newly deployed security forces cannot be trusted.

According to the Coalition Provisional Authority, or CPA, we are only about 30,000 short of the approximately 236,000 security forces planned for Iraq. This may be so in terms of absolute numbers, but it is not a reflection of how well equipped they are, how well trained they are, and how well led they are.

For example, the CPA carries about 60,000 police on payroll, but only 2,300 of those have been fully qualified.

Prior to the war, the Iraqi police had a well-deserved reputation for being corrupt. Reports continue to indicate this remains a problem and, as I mentioned, there are indications the security forces have been infiltrated by terrorists. At the same time, many of the honest policemen are being targeted by terrorists. On Tuesday, 11 were killed in an ambush. So one should view numbers with a healthy skepticism and focus on quality.

I also had the opportunity to visit Balad, about 25 miles north of Baghdad. This will become the future center of air operations in Iraq, and we are now preparing a major airbase to service American troops for the next 3 to 5 years.

Elsewhere, there is the intent to move American troops out of Baghdad and consolidate forces in fewer installations on the periphery, thus reducing the visibility of the American footprint. This is going to be a very delicate maneuver. Reducing the American presence in Baghdad has to be balanced by an increase in the effectiveness of Iraqi security forces inside the city. We could run the risk of having that city of about 6 million become an even safer haven for terrorists while we hunker down in bases on the outskirts.

It also means we are planning for an extended stay in Iraq. While the administration indicates 33 countries are now contributing troops to Iraq, the bulk of the troops is American, and unless there is a change in strategy by the administration or a change in attitude by the international community, those troops for the foreseeable future will remain largely American.

Will there be American troops in Iraq by the time of the next Presidential election in 2008? Right now the answer is yes.

I was able to visit Kabul as well. So much attention and money have been focused on Iraq that I believe Afghanistan has been neglected to the detriment of our goal of defeating the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11.

One example: in Iraq we hope to field an army of 27 battalions in 12 months at a cost of \$1.8 billion, while in Afghanistan we hope to field an army of 15 battalions in 26 months at a cost of \$569 million. Yet, in Iraq, there is a military infrastructure of garrisons, facilities, and a history of a national army that Afghanistan lacks. There are huge cultural barriers to overcome in linguistics and ethnicity that make Iraq look homogenous in comparison. Our military is doing a great job in trying to stand up an army in Afghanistan, but it is an enormous job, and so far the international community is not providing sufficient resources either to rebuild the country or create a sustainable and professional security force.

Afghanistan has an even greater problem in the lack of a civic administrative infrastructure. Without the creation of a strong local and central government, we run the risk of creating a well trained army that the government

cannot pay for or sustain, further increasing the risk that the Taliban and al-Qaida terrorists could return to power.

We need to give more attention and make a greater commitment to Afghanistan. In Kosovo, for example, 25 times more money was pledged on a per capita basis than to Afghanistan and 50 times more troops per capita were sent. Afghanistan needs an estimated \$20 billion in assistance over the next 5 years but so far only \$7 billion has been pledged and even less received. I worry that, 2 years after the fall of the Taliban, Afghanistan has become the forgotten war even as al-Qaida terrorists and Taliban remnants continue to make it their sanctuary and regroup their forces.

I opposed going to war in Iraq when we did. I did not think that the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction was imminent, nor did I think we had taken sufficient time to prepare for the consequences of a prolonged occupation of Iraq. I was concerned that starting another conflict before we had squashed the al-Qaida terrorist threat in Afghanistan would disperse our forces and expose us to even more terrorist problems. To be successful in both, with the least cost to the United States in terms of lives and resources, required an international coalition and consensus along the lines of the one created in the first gulf war. We have yet to achieve that either in Afghanistan, where there is international support but insufficient resources, or in Iraq where the bulk of resources and personnel are being provided by the United States.

We need to rebuild support for American foreign policy both abroad and at home. A recent Pew Foundation poll indicates that the U.S. image abroad remains negative in most nations. This cannot be good. For Americans to be secure, we need to be respected, and, as both Iraq and Afghanistan demonstrate, we cannot go it alone unless American citizens want to bear the full burden of sacrifice. We need international support. This does not mean sacrificing American interests to foreign interests, but it means working with other nations to gain a consensus in support of our objectives. In many we are one.

At home, too, we need to rebuild bipartisan support for American foreign policy. This has been lost in the last few years. Healthy debate requires a willingness to listen to arguments and to accept those that are valid in order to develop a consensus on American foreign policy. This ability has been lost.

Earlier this week, our former colleague, Bill Cohen, spoke before the 9/11 Commission. He talked about "the kind of poisonous atmosphere that existed then that continues today," referring to the questioning of President Clinton's motives when he launched attacks against al-Qaida in Afghanistan and Sudan. Constructive criticism of

strategy and oversight of its implementation are essential tools in sharpening the tip of our policy weapons. But they need to take place in an atmosphere where such debate is not just another arrow in the quiver of partisan politics.

I pray that one of the successes of the 9/11 Commission and other discussions in this very political year will be a determination to restore comity in foreign policy.

My recent travels in Iraq and Afghanistan have convinced me that, if we are to succeed in either country, we need to be prepared to remain in both countries for a long time, and we need to be prepared for additional sacrifices in terms of lives and financial resources. To accept that burden, there has to be a consensus in foreign policy. To bear that burden will require a determination to establish international support for our policies.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

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. DEWINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1997, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1997) to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning to begin the debate on the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. I would like first to thank our 40 cosponsors for their leadership and support on this issue.

Let me also thank specifically Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who championed this issue on the House side for a number of years before he joined us here in the U.S. Senate. He has worked tirelessly to see to it that the most vulnerable members of our society are, in fact, protected.

Let me also thank our lead House sponsors, Congresswoman MELISSA HART from Pennsylvania, and my friend and colleague from the State of Ohio, Congressman STEVE CHABOT. They have both been great champions of this great cause. They worked tirelessly to help get this important bill passed in the House of Representatives.