

tells the CIA later on, that the documents are likely forgeries.

On January 13, 2 weeks before the State of the Union, a State Department analyst sent an e-mail to the CIA about the documents, outlining his reasons why the uranium purchase agreement is probably a hoax. This is a State Department analyst who sends an e-mail to the CIA saying these are probably a hoax, forgeries.

So between the Cincinnati speech in October and the State of the Union speech in January, there is even more reason to doubt the credibility of these uranium purchase claims. Nonetheless, these mysterious 16 words—"The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa"—were left in the State of the Union speech.

Here is where we come full circle. Who is the individual responsible for vetting national security issues before the State of the Union speech? Mr. Stephen Hadley oversees the State of the Union speech. Mr. Hadley was vetting national security concerns.

Let's loop back. It was Mr. Hadley who talked to Director Tenet in October and who got these memos saying these claims were not real. Stephen Hadley in October took them out of the Cincinnati speech. Mr. Hadley in January leaves them in the State of the Union speech. It is the same individual. He could not have forgotten this. He had to have known this.

Why, I ask, was this left in the State of the Union Message? Was it left in to help the President make his case for an invasion of Iraq? After being told it was dubious by the CIA Director himself, after the State Department said these were probably forgeries, the issue is, Why the White House still has not been held accountable for breaking the law and betraying the intelligence community by exposing Valerie Plame, all done in an attempt to discredit her husband Joseph Wilson and his criticism of the uranium claim.

The President says he did not know anything about it. Ken Lay of Enron last week claimed he did not know anything about what was going on in his company, either. He is the CEO, and what is his defense? "I didn't know it was going on." Either the CEO of a corporation knows what is going on and he is not being truthful or he did not know anything about it. Either way, it is inexcusable. If the President of the United States says he did not know anything about it, that is inexcusable. If the President did know about it and left that claim in his State of the Union Message, that is inexcusable. Either way, the buck stops on President Bush's desk. It is time to quit passing the buck. It is time for the American people to learn who committed these crimes and to have these people prosecuted.

What is going to happen in the future if this is swept under the rug? Does that mean some other administration,

the next one, whatever it may be, Democratic or Republican, that a President or his people under him in the White House can break the law and not be held accountable?

Again, I take you back several years to when President Clinton was put under oath and filmed. We watched it right here on the Senate floor during the impeachment proceedings. Regardless of how one may have felt about that, it sent a very powerful message to the American people: No President is above the law; no President is above the law, neither Mr. Clinton nor Mr. Bush.

So I ask, Why hasn't President Bush, why hasn't Vice President CHENEY been put under oath and asked these questions under oath? Again we will let the American people know that no President is above the law and no one who works for a President is above the law.

This is serious business. I see that in a column by Mr. Novak of July 15—Mr. Novak's whole column is about Joe Wilson—he said:

It's as though the Niger question and Joe Wilson have vanished from the Earth.

No, they have not, Mr. Novak; no, they have not. But Mr. Novak is all on whether Mr. Wilson was telling the truth, whether he was misinterpreted, whether his wife recommended that he be sent to Niger. Nowhere is it claimed Ms. Plame was in a position of authority to actually send him to Niger, but Mr. Novak goes on about how a State Department analyst told the committee about an interagency meeting in 2002 by Wilson's wife who had recommended that he go there because he had contacts there.

What does all this mean? It means what Mr. Novak is trying to do is to take the focus off of a clear violation of the law by individuals in the White House in exposing a covert agent's identity; take it off that and focus it on all this stuff about whether she recommended her husband, or whether her husband gave an honest analysis. I am sorry, Mr. Novak, that is not the issue. The issue is, someone in the White House broke the law, clearly, unequivocally. The point is, the President of the United States has expressed not one iota of outrage. The point is, the President and the Vice President, neither one, have sought to get to the bottom of this. Neither the President nor the Vice President have been put under oath to be questioned about this.

The point is, Mr. Novak, a year and 2 days have passed, and this lawbreaking activity in the White House has not been dealt with. No one is saying Ms. Plame broke any law, violated any ethics. No one is claiming Mr. Wilson broke any law or violated any ethics. You can say they may have made a mistake, he may have been wrong, he may have been wrong in his analysis—fine. I am not saying he was right or wrong. I don't know. What I do know is, two individuals in the White House broke the law—to my way of thinking, basically committed treason—and no

one is getting to the bottom of it. And Mr. Novak continues to try to deflect the attention from that, to try to talk about whether Mr. Wilson was right in his analysis.

That is not the point. You can debate that issue if you want. What is not debatable is that someone in the White House broke the law, and they should be held accountable.

As I took the floor yesterday and the day before and the day before, I take the floor today, and I will every day that we are in session, to ask that simple question: Why isn't the President coming clean? Why isn't he getting to the bottom of this? Why, 1 year and 2 days later, has nothing happened in the White House to find the identity of these lawbreakers? The sooner we get to the bottom of it, the sooner we can allow the criminal justice system to do its job.

I call upon the President and the Vice President to get to the bottom of this. I call upon the special prosecutor to put them under oath and to ask them these questions. That may be the only way we get to the bottom of it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBESITY IN AMERICA

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will be closing out for the weekend. I will briefly comment on a couple of current issues before addressing some of the business before the Senate.

The first issue is a brief comment on President Bush's decision or his administration's decision yesterday to have the Federal Medicare Program recognize obesity as a disease.

Earlier today, we were talking about public health issues, and I mentioned in some African countries, because of an HIV/AIDS virus, the total length of life will be 33 years of age. In Botswana, if you were born in 1970, you would live 17 years longer than if you are born today because of that little virus. I mentioned that. That has gotten worse over the last 30 years, which we probably did not know anything about in this country until about 20 years ago. And it is getting much worse.

Another problem, very similar to that, is one that is apparent to anybody who has kids today and picks them up from school. If you just watch, you see the kids are much heavier than 20 years ago, 30 years ago. And that has lifelong consequences. It comes down to obesity.

There are many reasons for obesity, and I am not going to address all the

reasons now. But there are things we can do, and we have a real obligation to do.

It is a brand-new problem—or new in the last 20 years. It is getting worse and worse, and it condemns these kids to a life of poorer quality and shorter length. It is something we absolutely must address.

I applaud the administration's decision yesterday. What they did is said obesity—which before was this kind of vague syndrome or observation—is a disease, and when you call it a disease, people recognize it as a disease, and then you start looking at prevention, care, and treatment to reverse it. That is the significance.

Two things: First, for the first time, a major Federal health program recognizes obesity as a disease. It is a treatable disease—preventable but also treatable. The second is that it demonstrates, once again, that Secretary Thompson and the administration are taking extremely seriously the obesity epidemic which is occurring in this country.

The administration is attacking obesity on a multitude of fronts. It is needed. In my mind, it is long overdue that this Nation address this new but rapidly growing epidemic.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—or the CDC, as we all know it—reports that because of poor nutrition and lack of physical activity, obesity is on its way of surpassing smoking as the leading killer in the United States of America. Obesity is on its way of surpassing smoking as the leading killer in the United States of America.

Obesity contributes to other diseases, the diseases in which I specialize; that is, heart conditions, heart disease. It also affects a whole range of issues: orthopedic, pulmonary injuries as well.

The immediate impact will be twofold. First of all, it will be easier for Medicare beneficiaries and individuals with disabilities who are Medicare beneficiaries to get treatment. The barrier to treatment will be lowered.

When Medicare makes a decision, it has a spillover impact to the private sector. I think the spillover impact will be substantial, although the private sector has already moved ahead. They have already increased reimbursement for appropriate treatment for obesity in many areas. But the fact that the Federal Government speaks with a loud voice will have an impact on the private sector.

The public and private sector have to be very cautious. We talk about this on the floor of the Senate every time there is a new definition of something that needs to be treated. We have to be very cautious in deciding which specific treatments to cover. We need to make sure the interventions are effective, but we need to also make sure they are cost effective.

There are several treatments now for obesity that are available. Science will allow us to determine which of these treatment modalities are most effective and which are most cost effective.

Also—this applies to the HIV/AIDS virus, which I mentioned earlier today, and to obesity, which I mention now—prevention is a critically important aspect of the equation. Early intervention, especially among children, is the key to preventing lifelong obesity and obesity-related illnesses.

Nonetheless, I want to applaud the administration for this bold step. It will help prevent obesity and greatly improve strategies for helping not only seniors and individuals with disabilities but all Americans.

SUDAN

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, there is a second issue I want to mention that I addressed 2 weeks ago on the floor of the Senate and want to follow up on. It has to do with a tragic situation in Sudan, in the western part of Sudan in the three states of Darfur, Sudan.

The situation there, even over the last 3 weeks, has steadily deteriorated. We have hundreds of thousands of refugees that are currently at risk. We are entering the rainy season there, and that makes the delivery of relief supplies very difficult.

Since my comments on the floor of the Senate, Secretary of State Powell, in the first week of this month, went to the Darfur region and made observations and certain requests. At about the same time, Secretary General Kofi Annan also visited the region and made certain requests. Senator BROWNBACK, our distinguished colleague from Kansas, subsequent to their visit, also visited the region and made observations and with a video camera took some traumatic footage of the devastation going on there. Another delegation from the House will be going shortly.

We have to take action to address this humanitarian problem. The administration is working hard to get relief to these people who are suffering, but there is systematic violence that is going on against the civilian populations in Darfur by the government and by the militias that are supported by the government. That violence must come to an end.

I spend a lot of time in the Sudan and each year go to southern Sudan as part of medical mission work that I do. In the coming weeks or months, I will be returning to Sudan as part of this medical mission work. I look forward at that point in time to seeing if we are having an impact in both the southern part of the Sudan but also in the Darfur region and will report back to this body. Hopefully we will be able to report that we are making progress. Two million people are being affected by this crisis, so it is a large crisis. I do ask the Government of Sudan to take immediate steps to end the violence in that part of the world.

RETIREMENT OF POLICE CHIEF JERRY HOOVER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to express my congratulations to Reno Police Chief Jerry Hoover on his retire-

ment. The City of Reno and the State of Nevada owe this public servant a tremendous debt of gratitude for his hard work and strong dedication to law enforcement and the public safety.

Although Mr. Hoover spent 36 years in law enforcement, his service to our Nation in fact began with his combat service in Vietnam with the 101st Airborne Division. Since then he has dedicated his life to making our Nation's communities safer and has served admirably the people of San Diego, CA; Boulder, CO; St. Joseph, MO; and Reno, NV.

Chief Hoover provided strong and innovative leadership during a very challenging time for the Reno Police Department. Like police agencies throughout the country, the department under Chief Hoover's leadership has significantly expanded its responsibilities in recent years to meet our Nation's homeland security needs.

Reno's police officers have met this new challenge while also policing one of our Nation's fastest-growing metropolitan areas.

During his tenure, Chief Hoover helped create the Reno Model PTO training program that provides post-Academy police training with an emphasis on critical thinking and problem-solving. He also effectively drew on the resources of the entire Reno community to meet the city's law enforcement and public safety needs by initiating the Senior Auxiliary Volunteer Effort program, which trains volunteers 50 and older to assist with park and school patrols and special community projects.

Despite the demands of his position, Chief Hoover still found time to help train the next generation of law enforcement professionals through classes at the University of Nevada, Reno, and Nevada State College in Henderson. Even after his retirement from the Reno department, Chief Hoover will continue his lifelong commitment to effective law enforcement as a consultant to police agencies throughout the country.

Chief Hoover has led a distinguished career marked by generous service. Please join me in congratulating him on his retirement from the Reno Police Department and in wishing him luck in all his future endeavors.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the scourge of human trafficking. Every day, in countries around the world and right here in the United States, people desperate for economic opportunity and seeking to follow their dreams of a better life are lured from home by the promises of jobs and security. Sadly, though, all too often they find themselves trapped in a nightmare, imprisoned by violent criminals, abused, violated, deceived, bought, and sold as chattel. Some of these victims of trafficking disappear, never seen nor heard from again.

Every year, traffickers strip thousands of people of their freedom and