

that runs Burma. The situation in Burma is dire. Suu Kyi and the other NLD prodemocracy leaders remain in prison; a crackdown on democracy activists continues; and the SPDC's—that is the name the military thugs who run the country have given themselves—inhumane policies of child and forced labor, rape as a weapon of war, narcotics, human trafficking, and the use of child soldiers remains unchanged.

The swift passage of this resolution, which we did a few moments ago, matches words of support for freedom in Burma with concrete actions. It is past time to judge the military regime in Burma not by what it says but by what it does. The junta misled governments throughout the region into thinking that the May 17 constitutional convention would be a step forward in the reconciliation process, but it was not. The convention was nothing more than a summer camp for the sycophants of the military regime.

I am pleased our allies are increasing pressure on the junta. The European Union recently cancelled the Asia-Europe meeting because of Burma. It is an important step in the right direction. The EU should consider additional sanctions against the military regime.

More must be done. The U.N. Security Council should take up Burma for a discussion and for sanction and ASEAN should abandon the outdated policy of noninterference in member states' affairs.

One common subject must remain and that is the full and unfettered participation of Suu Kyi and the NLD, her political party, and ethnic minorities in a meaningful reconciliation process. I have two words for the regional neighbors of Burma: ASEAN 2006. That is the year Burma takes over chairmanship. That is 2 short years from now, which would result in a tremendous loss of face for that association.

Despite their worst efforts over the past 14 years, the SPDC has failed to smother the flames of freedom in Burma. I continue to be inspired by reports of activists who bravely and non-violently defy the junta's illegitimate rule, like the handful arrested last month for distributing pamphlets in several Burmese townships marking the 1-year anniversary of the Depayin massacre.

It would be wise for the SPDC to accept the time-tested fact that Suu Kyi and the NLD are not going anywhere. They, and the ethnic minorities, are an integral part of the solution to the Burmese problem.

To wit, the NLD and their supporters made the courageous and correct decision to boycott the sham SPDC-orchestrated constitutional convention last month. I am pleased that international condemnation by the United States, United Nations, European Union and regional neighbors of the hollow convention was rightly aimed at the SPDC. The generals in Rangoon made

any number of assurances to foreign diplomats that the process would be inclusive. It clearly was not.

This only underscores the imperative to judge the SPDC not by what it says but by what it does.

The convention turned out to be nothing more than a summer camp for SPDC sycophants. According to the Washington Times, the junta required their handpicked delegates to "bathe at reasonable times, avoid junk food and live in self-contained camps where they can enjoy karaoke, movies and golf."

Import sanctions by the United States alone will not help facilitate a meaningful reconciliation process in Burma. We need the U.N., E.U., and regional neighbors to fully commit to the cause. This was made clear by the NLD in a recent plea to U.N. General-Secretary Kofi Annan to "take this matter to the Security Council".

The U.N. should help the NLD and the people of Burma by examining the clear and present danger Burma poses to the region. This must include narcotics production and trafficking, the spread of HIV/AIDS throughout the region, the gross human rights violations of the SPDC, the plight of Burmese refugees and IDPs, and alarming reports of the junta's interests in North Korean missiles and Russian nuclear technology.

The E.U. should help the NLD and the Burmese people by examining its sanctions regime and imposing further punitive measures against the junta. I am pleased that our allies in the E.U. recently canceled the upcoming Asia-Europe Meeting, ASEM, dialogue in Brussels over the attendance of the SPDC. The junta has no place at this multilateral table.

Regional neighbors should help the Burmese people by reconsidering the Association of Southeast Asian Nation's, ASEAN, outdated policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of member states.

Asian leaders must recognize the regime for what it is, wholly illegitimate to the people of Burma, the international community and the region. The SPDC's export of illicit drugs and HIV/AIDS is, literally, burying the children of Asia. All of Asia's youth, not only those in Burma, face a future that is undermined by Burmese-spread drugs and disease.

The region cannot ignore the fact of the junta's chairmanship of ASEAN in 2006. There could be no greater loss of face for that association than being under the guidance of the SPDC.

Let me close by thanking all 53 of my colleagues who joined me in sponsoring the sanctions resolution. I want to recognize in particular the efforts of Senators FEINSTEIN and MCCAIN and their respective staffs to support freedom and justice in Burma. The Burmese people have no greater friends in the Senate, or in Washington. I also appreciate the efforts by Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS and their respective staffs

to expedite consideration of the legislation.

I would be remiss if I did not note the words of support of the NLD made by former Mongolian Prime Minister Tashika Elbegdorj, the Same Rainsy Party in Cambodia, and the cross-party Burma Caucus formed by Malaysian parliamentarians. Although they are engaged in their own efforts, and, in some cases, struggles, for democracy and human rights in their respective countries, they stand in solidarity with the people of Burma.

I encourage other neighbors to find their voice in support of the Suu Kyi and the NLD during these troubling times.

I thank the 53 cosponsors of this resolution, in particular Senators FEINSTEIN and MCCAIN. Burma has no better friends in Washington than DIANNE FEINSTEIN and JOHN MCCAIN.

I also appreciate the efforts of Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS and their respective staffs to move the bill in an expeditious manner.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary of State Colin Powell indicating the State Department's support for the continuation of the sanctions we earlier today imposed with our vote in the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2004.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to reaffirm the State Department's support for the continuation of the restrictions on imports from Burma, as I stated in my testimony before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on foreign operations on April 8. Our sanctions represent a clear and powerful expression of American disapproval of the developments in Burma. This action is a key component of our policy in bringing democracy and improved human rights to Burma, as well as supporting the morale of Burmese democracy activists.

I support wholeheartedly passage of the Joint Resolution you introduced along with Senator Feinstein. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL.

THERE IS A PRICE TO PAY FOR FREEDOM'S STRUGGLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, almost a century and a half ago, the abolitionist Frederick Douglass spoke:

The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that all concessions yet made to her august claims, have been born of earnest struggle . . .

If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground, they want rain without thunder and lightning.

They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.

We could find no wiser counsel as we approach the historic transitioning of

Iraq to self-rule on June 30. Mr. Douglass' words which rang true in 1857 continue to do so through 2004. As one dark chapter closes and a new, brighter one is set to open in Iraq, we recall his words that the freedom of man has not yet been fully attained, nor is it freely conceded. There is a price to freedom's struggle that tragically includes loss.

In short, freedom is not free. As Iraq struggles to transition from dictatorship to democracy, we all suffer with the loss of each soldier. We all bear the pain of Iraqi men, women, and children suffering from terrorist attacks and Hussein holdovers. But not all shrink back from freedom's struggle upon hearing, feeling, and understanding its price.

The risks and travails of securing freedom are too easily forgotten by a complacent humanity. Yet, we do not need to leap back centuries to comprehend the expense of freedom's attainment. Just a few years ago, we understood that freedom has a price.

In 1983, the head of Solidarity in Poland, Lech Walesa, spoke of freedom's price when receiving his Nobel Prize:

With deep sorrow I think of those who paid with their lives for the loyalty to "Solidarity"; of those who are behind prison bars and who are victims of repressions. I think of all those with whom I have traveled the same road and with whom I shared the trials and tribulations of our time.

Nor did the struggle for freedom end with the cold war. In his 1999 address to NATO, Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia stated:

The fact that a former powerful strategic adversary has disappeared from the scene does not, however, mean that in the world of today, human lives, human rights, human dignity, and the freedom of nations are no longer in danger. They are, unfortunately, still being threatened, and collective defence of the democratic states of the Euro-Atlantic sphere of civilization, therefore, still remains a valid concept.

History did not end with the end of the cold war. Yet, despite the attack of 9/11, some want to believe that history has ended, or that struggling for freedom is unnecessary or obsolete. They believe either that mankind enjoys all the freedom that it is due, or that freedom cannot be preserved or expanded by means of force or combat.

In either case, any would-be leader of the Free World cannot both profess such beliefs and still claim the determination to protect freedom in the post-9/11 world.

Not for this Nation, not for this time, and not for this struggle.

President Bush believes otherwise. He understands what Frederick Douglass meant when he said:

Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will. . . .

While we have not yet witnessed the conclusion of this most recent struggle for freedom, we have seen the trials and tribulations this President faces.

I believe President Bush is trying to wage the War on Terrorism against unprecedented and incredible words and deeds of disunity here at home. Every

citizen is ensured the right to dissent. Every President who volunteers to serve in that high office understands and is sworn to uphold that right to dissent. While this Nation has had great leaders who have stood at the helm through many challenges to our national security, I wonder if they could have been successful without the support of those who put the best for their Nation ahead of the best for their party. For such is the unique challenge to victory this President confronts. Consider a historical comparison of the challenges this President faces now against those of a President in our recent past.

In World War II, President Roosevelt stated the national goal of "unconditional surrender." In the War on Terrorism, President Bush similarly outlined the national goal of "regime change" in Iraq. The paramount national goal in wartime should be a unifying force in any nation. In World War II, it was. Republicans echoed President Roosevelt's demand for the "unconditional surrender," not just of Japan, but of Germany and Italy as well.

In the War on Terror, Democrats have echoed President Bush's call for "regime change," but not in Iraq. Instead, they called for "regime change here at home." Democrats contend it is the President of the United States, not the dictator of Iraq, that's the "regime" that needs toppling for the world to be safe.

Perhaps this is just political sloganeering, but can anyone imagine the Republican candidate for President in 1944 calling for "unconditional surrender" here at home? That would have spurred a firestorm of criticism and probably doomed the candidate. In 2004, it has helped a candidate secure his nomination for President. Many of these critics justify cries of "regime change at home" because they believe the war was unnecessary. They believe that after the terrorist attack of 9/11, the war on Iraq was a diversion from the "real" war on terrorism.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt announced a "Germany First" strategy. In his judgment, Germany was a greater threat than Japan because of its wealth, location, and advanced weaponry. It became the theatre of World War II that commanded most of the attention and resources in that war.

Shortly after 9/11 and the opening operations against al-Qaida's puppet government in Afghanistan, President Bush announced that Iraq was a grave and gathering threat because of its wealth, location, and advanced weaponry.

It therefore has become the theatre in the war on terrorism that demands our greater attention and resources. If today's critics had existed then, President Roosevelt's "Germany First" strategy would have been roundly criticized. Today's critics would have claimed Roosevelt had always wanted

to "get" Germany. They would have claimed that his War Department had been planning war against Germany ever since the previous war. They would claim Roosevelt was engaging in a personal anti-fascism campaign that ignored and diverted attention from the search for the attackers of Pearl Harbor. He would be charged with making America less safe as he failed to focus all resources solely upon Japan. And if Roosevelt had listened to these critics, Britain would have fallen, and likely the Soviet Union too, and the Third Reich would have covered the better part of three continents—Europe, Asia, and Africa. A new Dark Age would have descended.

For those who might have felt the "Germany First" strategy in World War II was misplaced or that the entire Germany effort was an "unnecessary war," one overwhelming discovery confirmed it was the right thing to do.

The horrific evidence of a holocaust was exposed at the end of the war. That gruesome discovery of wholesale genocide granted finality to the righteousness and sanctity that belonged to those who led and fought in the war against the Nazis. But the difference between now and then is that the Iraq holocaust does not justify our action; in fact, by many critics, it is not even noted. Think of that. Mr. President, 300,000 dead in Iraq and that is not a consideration for most critics of the war effort.

I defy anyone to show me where these critics devote even one sentence to this holocaust in the paragraphs and pages attacking this war as wrong, unnecessary, immoral, and unjust.

When did life become so cheap as to be irrelevant?

Thankfully, Roosevelt ignored his few misguided critics and this President should follow his lead. America needs the will of Churchill, not the waffling of Chamberlain. America needs leaders like Roosevelt and Reagan who recognized evil and were willing to call it by its rightful name. They knew the time to talk was over and the time to act was now, rather than never. Upon such will, such resolve, and such simple honesty lies the strength and endurance of our Nation and its precious freedoms. President Bush is a man of such mettle.

No one here or abroad doubts this President will act. He does not waffle, he does not double-talk, and he does not hide behind the timidity of others. Nor is he guided by his critics and their partisan agenda. He is a man for this time. Now, because of his leadership, on this June 30, the time has come for liberty to emerge from struggle and strife, and to again stride forward.

Mr. President, 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. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I know we will be wrapping up in about 30 minutes or so. There is a lot of business with the recess tomorrow—and we will be in tomorrow—and we will be wrapping up tonight. It will take a while to wrap up. We will be doing that in about 30 minutes or so.

Thus, I would like to take a few minutes to come to the floor and take advantage of the time to talk about the fascinating trip I had the opportunity and the privilege to take about 3 weeks ago. I had the privilege of traveling to Normandy, France, to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the D-day landings.

That same week, as my colleagues know, we suspended business on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to President Ronald Reagan—again, a wonderful week in that the messages were delivered and the tributes were shared.

In the midst of that, however, I did not have the opportunity to share with my colleagues some of my experiences from the D-day celebration in Normandy, France, and thus I would like to take this opportunity to do that.

This particular journey took with two of our colleagues, Senator BOB BENNETT and Senator JOHN ENSIGN. The three of us had a truly extraordinary experience. We spent the previous 2 days in Baghdad, Iraq, and in Kuwait, and then flew from Baghdad to the U.S.-French binational ceremony at Omaha Beach.

Back in 1944, in the thick of war, Fortress Europe was the strongest at this point, reinforced with layers of obstacles, mines, and gun positions with hardened bunkers. Some of those structures are still there today. You can see the remnants of others. These remnants stand today almost as ghostly reminders of those battles that I had the opportunity to hear described firsthand by the veterans who had come back for the celebration.

At Normandy, Nazi forces were commanded, as we all know, by none other than Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, the “Desert Fox” of North Africa fame who was regarded as the finest, the very best field commander in the German Army. He won practically every battle he enjoined. His defenses were considered impenetrable.

In the early morning of June 6, 1944—of course, that was the day so many years later that we were there—American soldiers, mainly from the 1st Infantry Division and 29th Infantry Division, landed at that beach we visited now several weeks ago. They were supported by the Army Air Force flying over and Naval gunfire. They struggled forward inch by inch, out of boats up the beach, as fellow soldiers were literally cut down one by one, wounded, and killed in this hail of enemy gunfire.

We have all read about what went on at that beach, but to have that opportunity to hear firsthand, as we walked along the ridge above that beach, from people who were there. Many of them had not talked a lot—at least they said they had not talked a lot about their experience. They seemed to open up as we were there. Many of them were there at the age of 16, 17, 18, or 19 years of age. And they all described the battle raging. Body counts swelled, and many expressed doubt that they would succeed—they described it as such—that every second seemed like an eternity.

It was clear that in spite of all this, soldiers, through boldness and through courage, persevered.

Further down the beach, the U.S. Army Rangers had scaled the cliffs at Pointe du Hoc and knocked out the German artillery positions that were there to disrupt any invasion force.

By the end of that blood-soaked day, our American boys had pierced that Atlantic wall. They seized their objectives. And, as history would prove, because we had the opportunity to celebrate, they launched the liberation of Europe.

Thousands of American soldiers perished in those few hours. Their heroism today is marked by the familiar pictures today with television and C-SPAN and video—the familiar pictures of all of those white crosses against that green grass and the Stars of David, all in very neat rows. Wherever you stand, you see them lined up parallel, horizontally and vertically, or diagonally. Wherever you stand, the symmetry jumps out at you. It goes on for acres and acres. I have no idea how big it is. But these crosses go on for acres.

There is a little path where the beach is right below. You can walk along these winding paths of the cemetery. As you do so—especially, I think on this day, when the sky was bright blue, the white crosses, the green grass—there were veterans by the hundreds and, indeed, by the thousands with their family members, with, obviously, their daughters, sons, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren huddling around them as they walked along those paths. One could not help but admire their bravery, their boldness at a time in their life when they were very young, at a time they had to be uncertain; they were far away from home, fighting a ruthless enemy. Each cross and each star, obviously, represents a young man, a young person who died on June 6th, 1944, defending his country.

The crowds would gather as we were there. A lot of people had come in. There was a lot of security at the gathering to hear President Bush and President Chirac. As the crowd gathered, we were seated amidst the sea of veterans. Usually they put the officials in one or two rows, separated, but, no, you would sit in the audience surrounded by scores and scores of veterans.

A few minutes ago I called Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL to talk about another bill we will be talking about later tonight. In that conversation I was reminded of the fact that 2 weeks ago he was there. He called me over to meet several veterans from New York. There was another woman, Grace Bender, a neighbor of mine in Washington, DC. I had no idea I would see her there. She was there a few rows away with her father, of whom she was clearly so proud.

The veterans were gathering with their buddies and with their family members, with their shipmates, with their fellow crewmen. Even after 60 years, they clearly regarded these colleagues, these comrades in arms, as brothers, bonds forged over that period of a day, weeks, and those months in the midst of this war.

I vividly remember standing for the national anthem. As we all stood up, the first people on their feet were those veterans, the “greatest generation.” They were the first to stand. I also noted, they were the ones who would be singing the loudest. They seemed to stand the tallest. Their love of country clearly had even grown over time.

President Bush spoke and delivered captivating remarks. President Chirac also delivered stirring remarks. They both recounted specific moments and acts of heroism on D-day. We honored those who gathered and we paid tribute to those who were no longer with us, the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen who had made that ultimate sacrifice for the cause of freedom.

The ceremony ended with a ceremony of honor guards. Again, my heart filled with awe and admiration to be able to walk with those veterans on that D-day celebration. They were then, and they clearly remain today, true heroes.

After the ceremony, my colleagues and I boarded a bus to the town of Bayeaux, a small French village that was spared the heavy fighting and bombing on D-day and of the weeks that followed. As we rode the bus through the countryside, we passed through beautiful green fields, hedgerows, and small towns of the French countryside that were showered in 1944 by the American paratroopers of the 101st and the 82nd Airborne Divisions, the night before those Normandy landings.

I specifically mention the 101st because this past weekend I had the opportunity to be in Clarksville, TN, and Fort Campbell, KY, and had the opportunity to witness an air show in which the 101st Airborne participated. You can see dramatically their training exercises.

While I was in Kentucky last week, again, I was thinking back to what happened in 1944 when these paratroopers of the 101st and 82nd Airborne Divisions paratrooped in the night before. Thousands of those paratroopers, as we all know, were killed. Many of them drowned. Many were wounded that night. Many were wounded on the