

al-Qaida, ruled by the Taliban, the most cruel of regimes imaginable. The things they did to women and children are unimaginable in our country. Today, Afghanistan is looking at a presidential election this fall. The terror camps are closed. The Afghan Government is helping us to hunt down the remnants of the Taliban. The American people are safer because Afghanistan is now stabilized with a great President, Hamid Karzai, who wants for his people the same thing that everybody wants—freedom, democracy, education, good health care, jobs, and an economy. He is trying to provide it, and we are helping him, and we are safer because of it.

Let us look at Pakistan. Three years ago, Pakistan was a country that openly recognized the Taliban. Al-Qaida was active. They were recruiting in Pakistan. The United States was not on really good terms with Pakistan at that time, but today, we see a great ally in Pakistan. President Musharraf is a friend to our country. He is making reforms in Pakistan and trying to root out the same Taliban/al-Qaida network in the remote regions that have terrorized Afghanistan and, in fact, have hurt the people of Pakistan as well. It was Pakistan that helped us capture Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, the planner of the 9/11 attack on America.

Who could say we are not safer today because we have an alliance with Pakistan and an alliance and a stake in the stability of Afghanistan?

Iraq, 3 years ago; where were the people of Iraq? The ruler of Iraq was an enemy of our country. He was a mass murderer. He had used weapons of mass destruction on his own people.

Today, we see pictures of him in a system of justice which he never allowed his own people. But he is going to have justice. It is going to be given justice by the people he treated so horribly. The people of Iraq are seeking justice.

The people of America are safer because Saddam Hussein is gone. He is not giving \$25,000 to the family of a suicide bomber to blow up a bus in Israel and kill children. We are safer because there will be elections in Iraq. By next January, we will see the people of Iraq speaking about their own government. In fact, U.N. Secretary Kofi Annan has named a career diplomat to the post that has been vacant since suicide bombers blew up the U.N. headquarters in Baghdad last August, killing the last U.N. representative there. America is safer because Saddam Hussein is behind bars and because his sons are no longer torturing and maiming hundreds of people in Iraq.

Saudi Arabia, 3 years ago; Saudi Arabia had terrorists within its midst and they were looking the other way. Today, Saudi Arabia says they are trying to find the attackers. They are finally realizing the growth of these terrorist regimes hurt their people, too. We are going to try to help Saudi Arabia in every way they ask us to help, to root out the terrorists who have fomented in their country.

If there is no place for the terrorists to hide in the Middle East, and if people are starting to see an economy, and if there are democracies emerging in places such as Iraq, it will change the course of the whole Middle East.

Libya, 3 years ago; Libya, a longtime supporter of terror, was spending millions of dollars to acquire chemical and nuclear weapons. Today, thousands of Libya's chemical munitions have been destroyed. The Libyan Government finally saw that the civilized world was not going to sit back any longer and let it continue to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. Muammar Qadhafi, in Libya, said: We are going to abandon any chance for nuclear weapons to be produced in our country.

We are seeing the breakdown of the terrorist regimes, one by one, in the Middle East. Why are we seeing the regimes go away and the beginnings of democracy come forward? Because our President has been focused. He has not relented in the war on terrorism. He has not relented in his responsibility to protect the people of America. Everything he has done has been with one goal in mind and that is to protect the people of America. That is the President's focus and that is why we are as far along as we are.

Let me read from an AP story about the success of the newly emerging Iraq stock exchange. From the AP on Sunday, July 18:

The miniature Liberty Bell clanged. Elbows flew. Sweat poured down foreheads. Sales tickets were passed and, with the flick of the wrist, 10,000 shares of the Middle East Bank has more than doubled in value.

The frantic pace Sunday of those first 10 minutes of trading typified the enthusiasm behind the Iraq Stock Exchange—a new institution seen as a critical step in building a new Iraqi economy.

In just five sessions, trading volume has nearly quadrupled and the value of some stocks has surged more than 600 percent. . . .

The exchange's chief executive, as he eyed the activity on the trading floor, which is housed in a converted restaurant because looters had gutted the old exchange, looked out and said: How can I not be excited about this?

The unofficial figures of the day's trade tell the story. Over 10 million equivalent dollars in stocks changed hands, reflecting the movement of 1.43 million shares—although only 27 companies are listed on the exchange.

That is just one more step in the stabilization of Iraq. America is going to stay to help Iraq as they recover from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein. As long as we are asked to stay to stabilize, we will be there. When we are no longer needed with the allies that are staying with us, we will happily leave that country in the hands of trained military personnel for security and in the hands of elected democratic leaders selected by the vote of the people.

Today, we see the emerging of the temporary government of Sunnis and Shiites and Kurds, working together to create a unified Iraq that will be able to hold elections for that country.

We have more to do. We all know we have more work to do. Our President

has done so much in 3 years, rebuilding the areas of New York that were hit by terrorists, building up our security network, spending billions for homeland security, focusing on airline, airplane, and airport security, port security.

We live in a big country. We live in a free country. It is hard to get control in a free country of every potential site that a terrorist might attack. But because we are free, the people of our country are stepping up to the plate, too; they are helping. They are being vigilant. They are looking for things that are strange and reporting them. We believe attacks have been averted because of the vigilance of the President and Congress and the people of the United States.

We must remain a united country. When I hear some of the debates in the political arena, it is as if people are saying, we are two different countries; we are a divided country.

We are not a divided country. We need leaders who recognize we are not a divided country. We are a unified country. We need leaders who will unify America and talk to the people about what we can do together that will make us stronger, standing up and celebrating our diversity, showing how it can work in a free and democratic society. That is what we are proving by leading as unifiers.

We have a President of the United States who is leading for security and unification of our country. We must work with the President as a united Congress to combat terrorism for the security of our people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### THE 9/11 COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the imminent release of the final report of the 9/11 Commission. The Commission's report will be the final product of a long and comprehensive process that has at times deeply touched the families of those who were lost on 9/11 and has questioned the ability of our Government to defend against a new terrorist threat.

As the Commission issues its report, the state of the Union on homeland security is not good enough. Are we better off than we were on 9/11, as my colleague from Texas has mentioned? Yes, we are. Are we doing everything we can to protect ourselves? Absolutely not. Are we putting the same energy in the homeland to defend ourselves that we are putting into the war overseas? No, unfortunately not.

Time and time again, on homeland security, we are not doing enough. And the view of the White House is that it takes a back seat to fighting the war on terror overseas. Dollars that are needed for so many projects are not

forthcoming in this administration's budget or from the Congress, for that matter. That is a bad thing and a sad thing for America.

That is why this report that the Commission is issuing is so important. It is my hope, it is my prayer, that it importunes us to do more so that another 9/11 will never happen.

First, I would like to address the Commission itself. They have done a remarkable job. This Commission, as we know, was created with a mandate of exploring how the United States became vulnerable to a terrorist attack as large and as complex as that attack which so hurt us on 9/11. The Commission was resisted by the White House and by some in this body. But it was the families that forced it to happen: the four brave widows from New Jersey who said they would not rest until there was a commission. Those families and many other families of the victims in New York, my State, were relentless in not only forcing a commission to occur, but in forcing it to be a bipartisan commission, a nonpolitical commission that had full power to get to the bottom of what happened.

I can tell you, having spoken to many of the family members, they only had one mission. They are Republicans and Democrats; they are conservatives, moderates, and liberals. Their mission was a simple one. Walking with holes in their hearts because their loved ones had been taken from us in such a cruel event, their mission was a generous one, I might say a noble one: that this never happen again. Their view, which I think America has accepted, is that the only way we can prevent a future 9/11 is to learn of the mistakes that were made before 9/11.

The Commission was led by two remarkably nonpartisan figures: Governor Thomas Kean, Republican of New Jersey; Congressman Lee Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana. They steered the Commission away from finger-pointing, away from blame, away from partisanship but, rather, toward "just the facts, ma'am," as Jack Webb said on "Dragnet." Just the facts is what they wanted to find out so we could then learn of the mistakes that were made—not to excoriate, not to blame, but, rather, to correct and make sure it does not happen again.

The Commission dutifully pursued this task, despite resistance from many quarters in Washington. It did not shirk from even the most troubling aspects of its investigation.

The final report is about to be released this week. It is important that every one of us, that every American, learn of its findings, and we make sure our Government, without delay, examines those recommendations and then acts to make us safer still.

There are a couple of things that have come out already about what the Commission wants. They have recommended there be a Cabinet level appointee of the President to be in charge of all intelligence. It makes eminent

sense, in my judgment. We cannot even count the number of intelligence agencies there are. And so many of them are too interested in turf. One agency finds out something and does not tell another so they might gain a leg up. There is a lack of coordination, even the fact that their computers do not talk to one another. It all hurts every one of us in terms of our desire to be secure and make sure another terrorist attack does not occur.

By having one Cabinet officer in charge of all intelligence, with budgetary authority, that Cabinet officer can enforce a regime which will require all of the agencies to cooperate with one another.

There will also be some structural changes within the agencies. In the FBI, an agency I have been very interested in, I am hopeful the Commission will recommend something I know they considered, and I think may well recommend, which is there be a separate part of the FBI dealing with counterterrorism.

The FBI's mission in the past has always been to find out who did crimes and prosecute them. The FBI does a very good job of that. But counterterrorism is different. We have to prevent crimes. It requires a different mentality. It is my hope we will rearrange the FBI. Some have recommended a separate agency for counterintelligence. I think that may go too far. But to have a reorganization within the FBI makes a great deal of sense.

Now, these are a few of the recommendations that will come out. There are going to be many more. Let me just say, the tendency of some here in Washington, some in the White House, when they hear news they disagree with or that points to an error that was made, instead of responding on the merits and saying, Here is why you are wrong, or here is why we want to do it differently, they disparage the messenger. They call them not patriotic. They call them political. They call them partisan.

This Commission, if ever, is not partisan and is not political. We should listen to their recommendations, and I hope there is not delay. Some are going to say: Let's wait until next year on their clear-cut recommendations. If the rumors are correct, the Commission will be unanimous. All the Democrats and all the Republicans will have one set of recommendations. So, again, it is not partisan, and there is an equal number of each party on the Commission. We should not wait. To wait until next year—a new Congress, maybe a new President—will delay us. These recommendations should not be put in a political context and should not be looked at in light of the political calendar that is upon us. We should immediately move, in September, when we return, to enact these recommendations. We may choose to modify them. Perhaps the body will reject them.

There is a lot of talk that the Defense Department and the CIA will op-

pose having an overseer above them. We will have to debate that. I hope we listen to the Commission. But to delay would be delaying our safety.

So I hope and pray we will move quickly and move forward and not either kneecap the Commission—because already I saw some column by a very conservative gentleman who said: The Commission, forget about it. All this writer was interested in was saying the President did everything right.

Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, whether you are a liberal or a conservative, we know that neither this President nor prior Presidents of both parties did everything right or we would not have had a 9/11.

So, again, let us not put our defensive shields up and hunker down for a fight. Let us make this one of those rare moments of bipartisanship, as the Commission itself has, and adopt their recommendations.

Now, let me say, as somebody who cares a great deal about homeland security, there are a number of areas where we are not doing enough. I don't know if the Commission will address these, but I hope so. We have done a pretty good job on air security. Flying is a lot safer and less prone to terrorism today than before 9/11. But we have not done everything there. One big problem is shoulder-held missiles. We know terrorists have them. God forbid, they smuggle some of those into the United States and shoot down 5 or 10 planes at once in Boston, or New York, or Houston, or Seattle, or Denver, or Chicago. We are not doing enough there.

We are doing far too little on port security. The percentage of the big containers that come into our Pacific ports, Atlantic ports, and gulf coast ports that are inspected is too few. The technology has not been implemented as quickly as it might be.

On truck security and rail security, Madrid was a wake-up call. We are far behind what we should be doing.

The unfortunate problem is that the terrorists have access to the Internet just as we all do. They are on it diligently looking for where we are weak. If we strengthen air security, they will look to the ports. If we strengthen the ports, they will look to the rails. So we have to have a multifront war. We are not doing enough.

On so many of these issues, as somebody who comes from New York and still lives with the grief that so many of my constituents feel, I can tell you we are not doing close to enough. Oftentimes, it is not that we don't have the technology and not that we don't have the ability; it is that we don't put in the money that is needed. I think if you ask most Americans what their priorities are, homeland security would be at the top of the list. Unfortunately, we get a lot of talk and not much action.

Another place where we are way behind is how we give out our homeland security funds. To its credit, the first

year, the administration really allocated the money on the basis of need. My State of New York got about a third of the funds, which is probably right. But then they abandoned ship. Once Mitch Daniels left, who was head of OMB, a true conservative who didn't want to spend money, these homeland security funds became pork battle and they are spread thin.

I say to the Chair, I know everybody has some needs, but to have his State get, on a per capita basis, far more dollars than mine in terms of homeland security, I don't think seems right, much as I want to protect both. Over and over again, on homeland security funds, we have not allocated it to the places of greatest crisis. That, too, is a problem.

So the bottom line is this: I hope this report will be what it should be, a wake-up call—a wake-up call that, on intelligence, our agencies are too disparate, they don't talk to one another or coordinate with one another. They are not doing the job they should and we have to correct that. I hope it is a wake-up call that here at home on homeland security we are not doing enough. It is common knowledge that, as so many say, to win a basketball or a football game you need both a good offense and a good defense. We have an offense out there all right. I have been largely supportive of that offense. But we are not doing enough on the defense. You cannot win a game without a good defense. I hope it is a wake-up call on defense as well. I hope it is a wake-up call.

I hope the report will be comprehensive, and that it will talk about so many things—immigration, rail, port, truck security, and air security. It will talk about all of the things that we did wrong before 9/11. Again, instead of finger-pointing, instead of seeking blame, instead of ducking, let's hope this report importunes the Congress, importunes the White House to one of its finest hours in that we spend some time in September, after having had plenty of time to analyze the report, to implementing its recommendations—at least the ones the Congress sees fit. It would be unacceptable for us to just look at the report for a day and then do nothing. That would be a dereliction of our duty to our citizens to do what we are required to do, that which the Constitution requires us to do—protect the security of Americans.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have under the order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ten minutes.

#### LEAK INVESTIGATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor again today to remind my colleagues, and those who may be watching on C-SPAN, that it

has now been 1 year and 6 days since two high-ranking White House officials leaked the name of agent Valerie Plame, a CIA agent, to a columnist by the name of Robert Novak, who then published it in his column. Two high-ranking White House officials leaked this name to more than one reporter. It is interesting that no other reporters reported it except Robert Novak.

Here we are 372 days—1 year and 6 days after this crime was committed. We still have no answers about who in the White House was responsible for this leak. We still have no assurance from the President or the Vice President that those who are responsible do not still remain in high-ranking decision making roles in the White House. They are probably still there.

This administration has failed to find and punish the officials responsible for this criminal action. Ms. Plame's identity was leaked by senior White House officials only 8 days after her husband questioned in print one of the key administration justifications for the war in Iraq; that is, that Iraq had sought to buy uranium ore from the country of Niger.

This blatant defiance of public accountability weakens our country. It damages our international credibility and undercuts our human intelligence efforts at a time when they are needed more than ever. It is just one example of the way this administration has weakened America's standing in the world.

I will speak further to this issue during the remainder of the week. Again, I will continue to point out how this has weakened America. Last month, for example, a group of 26 former senior diplomats and military officials who worked for Presidents of both parties, Republican and Democrat, issued a compelling statement about the damage the administration has done to our security. Their statement said:

Our security has been weakened.

It said further:

[The] Bush administration has shown that it does not grasp the circumstances of the new era and is not able to rise to the responsibility of world leadership in either style or substance.

When a former Ambassador, Joseph Wilson, raised issues that questioned part of President Bush's rationale for the war in Iraq, this administration attacked him politically, and then went after his wife. And the smear campaign continues, as we have seen in recent columns and four statements this week.

I am not here to criticize or defend former Ambassador Joseph Wilson. I am here to make the point that when he dared to question whether one of the President's justifications for the war in Iraq was correct, the White House was so intent on discrediting him that they were willing to expose the identity of an undercover CIA agent in an act of vicious political retribution. They were willing to break the law, and to damage the relationship between the White

House and the intelligence community. This administration purposefully stretched intelligence data they knew to be questionable to justify the war to the American people and to Congress.

According to the Senate Intelligence Committee report, in February of 2002, the CIA sent former Ambassador Wilson to Niger to investigate claims that Iraq had sought to purchase Nigerian uranium ore. His trip and subsequent debriefing neither verified the claim, nor disproved it. Following his trip, the intelligence community continued efforts to verify the claim.

In October of 2002, the White House sought to include that claim—that Iraq had tried to buy uranium ore from Niger—in a policy speech by the President that was to be given in Cincinnati. But the CIA had such serious concerns about this being in his speech that they sent a memo to the White House seeking changes. The CIA did not think these concerns were being taken seriously, so the following day, they sent a second memo that urged the information be deleted from the President's speech.

So now we have two memos to the White House on subsequent days asking that this be taken out of his speech because "the evidence was weak" and that the CIA had told Congress that "the Africa story was overblown." That same day, CIA Director Tenet personally called Deputy National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley to express his concerns about using this information in the speech. And guess what. It was taken out of the President's speech by Stephen Hadley, the Deputy National Security Adviser.

That is how concerned the CIA was about this information and about the credibility of the information: two memos and a personal call from the Director of the CIA to Deputy National Security Adviser Hadley. It was taken out of the President's speech. This is October.

Between October and January, both the State Department and the CIA obtained copies of documents that purported to be a uranium ore purchase agreement between Iraq and Niger. As I heard, these documents came from someplace in Italy. But the State Department determined the documents were probably a hoax.

So between October and January, there was even more reason to doubt the credibility of these uranium ore claims. Nonetheless, when the President took the floor in the House Chamber to give his State of the Union Message, what happened? Those claims were included in his speech.

Who was the person responsible for vetting, for clearing these kinds of statements in the President's State of the Union Message? Guess what, it was Stephen Hadley, the Deputy National Security Adviser. He was in charge of vetting the national security issues for the President's State of the Union speech. This was the same person who just a couple of months before had received two memos and a personal