

expiration of the assault weapons ban will not be noticed by foreign terrorists, then we are hiding our heads in the sand.

Found in the rubble of a terrorist training camp in Afghanistan was a manual. It is entitled, "How Can I Train Myself for Jihad?"

The placard contains a quote from that manual:

In other countries, e.g., some states of the USA, South Africa, it is perfectly legal for members of the public to own certain types of firearms. If you live in such a country, obtain an assault rifle legally, preferably AK-47 or variations, learn how to use it properly and go and practice in the areas allowed for such training.

That is training on how to kill innocent people.

This placard also says:

"How Can I Train Myself for Jihad," a guide originally published on the Azzam.com, a website dedicated to the worldwide jihad (now shut down). The guide was found in the ruins of a terrorist training center south of Kabul, Afghanistan, after it was destroyed by U.S. air strikes in late 2001.

Those are the people who want to get their hands on these weapons. Those are the people who say that the United States is easy pickings if you want to buy a gun and kill a lot of people.

Terrorists know, they are aware of our weak gun laws. It just became weaker. For all of President Bush's statements on terrorism, he has chosen to stand with the NRA rather than protecting our communities from this brand of terror.

In my view, the President's behavior on the assault weapons ban is one of those things we call a flip-flop. It is when you say one thing and do something else. We saw an angry U.S. Senator on the floor of the convention a couple of weeks ago when he said that the worst thing to do is say something and do nothing. That is his definition of a flip-flop.

This is a flip-flop of the worst order. It endangers our families, our children, and our Nation's law enforcement officers. I wish it were not so, and apparently there is not going to be any going back on the assault weapons ban. I wish there were a way to resurrect it. We are where we are. What we have done is we have encouraged the sale of these weapons. I heard there are gun manufacturers who were preparing for a burst of sales activity when these weapons were available. I ask myself: Who wants to buy these kinds of weapons? What are they going to do with them? They are going to endanger our families and our kids and other innocents. That is what they are going to do.

It is too bad because we are now in the midst of a terrible situation with the war, with the casualties continuing to escalate, and with a situation totally out of control in Iraq. I was there shortly before the government was turned over to an interim group to be followed by an election in January. The fact is that it does not look like there is going to be an election in Jan-

uary. I heard statements from those in leadership in Iraq who suggest an election might be tough to hold. But one thing is for sure, this is not a mission accomplished. This is a mission that is still underway, and the cost is terrible.

I went to visit some wounded from Iraq at Walter Reed a few weeks ago, after a burial at Arlington Cemetery, to meet young people who will never function the way they used to. There was a man who was blinded from an attack who said to me: I will never see my 28-month-old daughter, but I still want to hold her.

That is the condition that continues to develop each and every day: Over 1,000 killed, many more thousands wounded, and we just hope and pray they will recover and we will be able to conclude this effort in Iraq successfully but quickly.

I yield the floor, and 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. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

LEGITIMACY OF NEWS STORIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if I might reminisce for a moment as a predicate for what I am about to say. I go back to a time in my career when I was the center of considerable national press attention. The occasion was the 1970s. The issue was Watergate. I will not bother to describe why I was there; I will just tell my colleagues of a phone call I received one night just before the "Evening News with Walter Cronkite" came on CBS.

A reporter called me to say that Dan Rather was going to be speaking about me that night, and he read to me the piece that had been written for Dan Rather to give on the evening news. Frankly, it terrified me because if it had been delivered in just the way it was read to me on the phone, it would have destroyed my business, destroyed my career, made it impossible for me to continue to represent the various clients I had in my public relations and consulting firm.

I said that to the reporter. I said: This is terrible, it is not true, and you will destroy my career. We had a brief conversation about the details of what it is he had in his report, and he said, well, I see your point, I will do the best I can, and hung up at about 10 minutes before the news broadcast was to begin.

As anyone can understand, I watched the news with great interest that night, and Walter Cronkite began by

saying: Tonight, Dan Rather has important new information about the Watergate scandal that he will be bringing us from Washington. It was about 20 minutes after the hour when he got around to Rather, and Dan Rather then gave a report, mentioned me by name but said the things that I had said to the reporter, along with some of the things he had already prepared. It was not a pleasant experience for me, but it was nowhere near what it sounded as if it would be some half hour before.

Within 10 minutes after the news broadcast ended, the phone rang again at my home, and it was Dan Rather. I thanked him for paying attention to the points I was trying to make, and he said: Well, you had a strong advocate, referring to the reporter who had been talking to me. Then he said: I have been in this town long enough to know the difference between a legitimate news story that has somehow come out and a situation that is being laid on me for the purpose of getting the information forward. He said: Mr. BENNETT, this was not a legitimate news story. This is something that was laid on me by someone who obviously wishes you ill. Who do you think your enemies might be in this situation?

We then had that discussion. That is neither here nor there, but obviously I always will remember that time. We do remember the times in our lives when trauma comes upon us. I remembered it fondly, with respect for Dan Rather and his willingness to listen to something other than the preconception that had been handed to him, and for his journalistic instinct to tell him that this just might not be a legitimate story, this just might be something that someone was feeding to him for a purpose and a hidden agenda.

We now know about the great controversy that has surrounded the documents that have come forward with respect to President Bush's service in the Texas National Guard. I regret, from my personal experience, to find that this newsman whom I have respected all these years is in the center of this particular controversy. It would seem to me that this time, Dan Rather's instinct has failed him. The instinct that told him some 30 years ago, again in his words, that "something was being laid on him" deserted him this time. It is very clear that documents were forged, they were laid on him, and this time he bit.

I do not join in the chorus that is arising on talk radio and elsewhere that he must somehow be driven from the air. I don't think he deserves that. But I do think this is a cautionary tale and we need to spend a little time talking about it because it represents a new phenomenon in the information age where someone has used information-age technology to forge documents and then insert those forged documents and the false information they contain into the political debate at a time that is crucial.

This is the first indication I know of where we have seen that sort of thing,

a deliberate attempt on the part of a forger to change the course of an election and a situation where respected organizations, such as the Boston Globe and CBS News, have been conned by that forger and have become unwitting participants in foisting a forgery and a fraud upon the electorate.

I believe I am something of an expert on forgery. In this same period of time, back in the 1970s, I worked for Howard Hughes. I was working for the Hughes organization when we had two of the most significant forgery attempts of the last century. The first one was the autobiography of Howard Hughes. The second one was the will of Howard Hughes.

We now know, looking back, that the autobiography of Howard Hughes was written by a man named Clifford Irving, who had never met Howard Hughes, never spoke to him, never had any contact with him at all. But, perhaps a parallel to today's situation, two very respected and prestigious national organizations bought the Clifford Irving forgery, paying \$1 million to Clifford Irving for that manuscript. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company was going to publish the book, and Time-Life, the publishers of Time and Life magazines, now part of Time Warner, was going to publish excerpts from the book.

I won't go into the details of that, but I do remember very clearly when the leading investigative reporter for Life magazine came into my office to discuss the Howard Hughes autobiography, and I said to him there is no way in the world that Howard Hughes has ever met Clifford Irving. That is absolute, provable, irrefutable. Clifford Irving and Howard Hughes had never, ever met each other.

The reporter said to me: That may be true. Irving is probably lying about how he got the manuscript, but the manuscript itself is genuine. The evidence is overwhelming.

I said: What evidence?

He said: The handwriting experts. The handwriting experts have looked at the handwriting on the note that Clifford Irving put forward—supposedly written by Howard Hughes—validating the manuscript, and he said the handwriting experts are unanimous, Howard Hughes wrote that note.

Now we know, of course, Howard Hughes did not write that note. Clifford Irving wrote that note.

In the course of his trial, one of the prosecutors said to Clifford Irving: Is it really possible that you were the man who wrote that note? Is it really possible that you had the skills of forgery so that you could write something that would fool the best experts in the country on handwriting analysis?

Clifford Irving took a legal pad, wrote out a letter from Howard Hughes to this particular prosecutor, signed it "Howard Hughes," and handed it over to him. The prosecutor had it framed and it is hanging on his wall.

One of the major lessons I learned from that experience is that the ex-

perts can be wrong. The experts can be fooled. A good forger who concentrates in the right area can, in fact, come up with forgeries that can get by some forensic experts.

I don't think that is the case with the forgeries with respect to President Bush's Texas National Guard service. I think the forgeries are fairly clumsy and the expert that CBS has quoted validated only the signature and not the document as a whole.

But the thing I have learned from dealing with the Hughes forgeries, the fake autobiography and the fake will, is that one must look at a forgery not only for the forensic side of it but also for the content and ask this fundamental question whenever something magically appears: Why did this appear at this particular time?

If, indeed, Howard Hughes was planning to write an autobiography, why did it appear just after there was a major shakeup in the Hughes organization and there was a tremendous amount of publicity about Howard Hughes' reclusiveness? Isn't that coincidence a little bit too close?

The will that would have left hundreds of millions of dollars to a service station attendant in the state of Utah, why did that appear just as the press was reporting that Howard Hughes had died without signing a will? What caused this to come forward at just that moment? Isn't that content suspicious? Doesn't that suggest that somebody has an agenda that is not just a coincidence?

The third area of forgery with which I am familiar says exactly the same thing. I had friends with whom I went to college who were killed by the forger-murderer Mark Hoffman. Mark Hoffman earned his living over decades forging documents that had relationship to the Mormon Church.

Looking back on it, now that Hoffman is in jail, we should have recognized, once again, the great coincidence that these documents would come forward at just the right time. There would be scholars who would be speculating as to whether the founder of the church had any connection with folk magic, and suddenly, at just the right time, documents saying that he did have connections with folk magic began to appear. We now know they were forged. They came from Mark Hoffman. They were created out of whole cloth.

But they seemed logical because of the context in which they came.

The application of that to these documents relating to President Bush is obvious.

Why, if these documents have been sitting in the records of the Texas National Guard for all of these years, did they suddenly come forward with exactly the right amount of validation of the accusations that are being made by President Bush's opponents at just the right time in the campaign when the Kerry campaign seemed to need a little boost?

That alone, once again, in historic context, says be on your guard. That alone should have alerted Dan Rather's journalistic instincts that this is not really a legitimate leak. This is something somebody is laying on him for the purpose of their own agenda.

The rest of the press has gone in after all of the forensic evidence.

I looked at it with great interest because of my background in forgery. I agreed that the memos that are purported to be true do not fit with the memos that are written in the Texas National Guard. I agree that the typeface is suspect. I agree there can be no explanation other than forgery for the fact that someone sat down at a modern computer and recreated the memo exactly. You cannot do that with memos that are typed on typewriters. You have to go back to the original typewriter to recreate a memo and have it match exactly.

I agree with all of the forensic evidence, and I agree that there is absolutely no question that this is a forgery.

But instead of wallowing in the delight of having caught the Boston Globe or CBS in their gullibility, having caught them in the mistake of having bought this whole thing, let us ask the more fundamental question: Who did it? Who is concerned with the campaign to such a degree that they are willing to falsify documents and peddle them to national media organizations?

I have heard three explanations. There are people who have speculated on this. Frankly, the speculation in its own way can add to the poison of this situation.

The first speculation I heard was that it was done by supporters of President and Senator CLINTON. As they put it, the Clinton supporters want to make sure KERRY didn't win so that the 2008 nomination would be open to Senator CLINTON, and they are the ones who forged the documents and then put them forward in a way that they knew would be embarrassing to the Kerry campaign.

The second speculation is that Karl Rove did it; that the Republicans are the ones who did this; that this is a Republican dirty trick; that they are so anxious to destroy KERRY they are willing to forge documents and foist them onto an unsuspecting CBS and Boston Globe.

The third explanation, to me, is the only one that makes any sense, which is that there is an overzealous KERRY supporter, or, if you will, a Bush hater who is really stupid. This was a really dumb thing for someone who supports Senator KERRY to have done.

I cannot believe it was done by anyone in the Kerry campaign because they are smarter than that. But very often in politics we have the experience called up from my father when someone was trying to help him in the campaign: I can take care of my enemies, may the Good Lord save me from my friends.

But someone who wanted Bush to lose and KERRY to win said if the documents to support the charge on the National Guard issue aren't there, I will see that they are there. I will do it anonymously. This will be my contribution to the campaign.

It is a really stupid thing to do. But I believe that is the explanation of where this came from.

Stupidity trumps Machiavelli almost every time when you are looking for an explanation.

However, I think everyone ought to focus on finding out who did it. Until we do find out who did it, we will continue to poison the atmosphere with the suggestion that maybe the Clintons did it, maybe Karl Rove did it, or the Republicans played a dirty trick. We know there are other forces at work.

We owe it to clear the atmosphere by finding out who it is that forged these documents.

Back to my own history, we cleared the atmosphere with respect to Howard Hughes when we found out and made public the fact that the H.R. Hughes to whom the million-dollar payment was made by McGraw Hill was, in fact, Clifford Irving's wife. She opened a Swiss bank and told them her name was Helga R. Hughes, and asked McGraw Hill to please make the checks out to H.R. Hughes. And then Clifford Irving's wife deposited them into her account. Naturally, the signature card that endorsed the check H.R. Hughes matched the signature card in the bank because Clifford Irving wrote them. Once we knew that, then the air was cleared.

The air was cleared with respect to the Howard Hughes will and who wrote the will. When Melvin Dumar, the service station attendant who would have inherited \$100 million from Howard Hughes, exclaimed he knew nothing about it, yet was surprised when he came forward and was confronted in court by the fact that his thumbprint was on the will inside a sealed envelope when the will was found. Again, the air was cleared, and there was no more mystery as to where this came from.

The air was cleared with Mark Hoffman and all of the documents that he forged when the murders occurred and we found out that he was trying to cover up his forgery by killing people who were in a position to expose him.

The air needs to be cleared here. We should not just stop at snickering at newspapers and television stations that seem to have been taken in. We should go deeper than that and find out who actually did it. Then we can lay to rest the conspiracy theory that says it came from all of these other places.

I end as I began by saying, over the years, I have always had a warm spot in my heart and a great sense of respect for Dan Rather because of the way he treated a story in which I was a principal some 30 years ago. I know he is a journalist with the highest professional standards. I extend to him my regrets at this time that his journal-

istic instincts failed him, and he didn't realize this was one that was being laid on him in the hope that he would be taken in. I hope he will recover from this. I know at some point he will recognize that he was taken in and step forward and make that acknowledgment clear.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to my friend from Utah. He always speaks eloquently and brings a different insight than most of us can to issues. It is a remarkable saga which he recounts. It also makes me think that here we are, 6 weeks before a Presidential election, which all parties are describing as one of the most important in our history, when we are at war and we have significant issues of health care, immigration—we could make a list a mile long—and jobs, can we keep our jobs in the competitive marketplace, and the dominant issue of the moment is the media covering the media about something that might or probably didn't happen 30 years ago.

My hope is that we recognize that Senator KERRY served, President Bush served, and they both supported the war in Iraq. It is now at the forefront of American consciousness. And the question before us in the Presidential race is which one of these men is the best prepared to be Commander in Chief to lead us into the future? My hope is the media coverage would be more on those issues, more on the future. I don't want to hear too much more about what happened 30 years ago.

The distinguished occupant of the chair was heroic in his service 30 years ago. We admire that. But he spent most of his time looking toward the future, as I do mine, and I think the American people do. We are not elected to CBS president of the United States.

It is my hope that whatever the circumstances, if they made a mistake, admit it—we politicians have learned the hard way that is the best thing to do—and get on with it. Talk about 30 years from now, instead of the media covering the media about what happened 30 years ago or what might not have happened 30 years ago.

Earlier, the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, came to the Chamber and talked primarily about the devastating hurricane in New Orleans. Having lived in New Orleans a year, at the time of another great hurricane in 1965, I know how difficult that is going to be for New Orleans, Mobile, and that part of the world. Our hearts and support are with the people of the gulf coast. We are thinking about them and their families and hope they are safe.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from Louisiana also mentioned the 40th an-

niversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. She and I intended today to speak together about that. She spoke about it and she will have more to say. She has worked very hard on it for the last several years.

I take a few minutes in honor of the 40th anniversary of what we call the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or the LWCF in this country. Forty years ago, in September of 1964, President Johnson signed legislation establishing the fund. It has been an important factor in preserving open spaces in our country ever since.

The idea began under a Republican President, President Eisenhower, who signed legislation creating a commission to determine what should be done to preserve outdoor space for recreation. Then a Democratic President, President Kennedy, submitted legislation to Congress creating the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In submitting the draft legislation, President Kennedy wrote:

The Nation needs a land acquisition program to preserve both prime Federal and State areas for outdoor recreation purposes. . . . In addition to the enhancement of spiritual, cultural, and physical values resulting from the preservation of those resources, the expenditure for their preservation are a sound financial investment.

Shortly thereafter, it passed the House by a vote voice and the Senate with only one vote in opposition. Then President Johnson signed it into law. This is an idea that has had bipartisan support from the very beginning.

Since that time, 40 years ago, 37,300 Land and Water Conservation Fund State grants, totalling more than \$3 billion, have been instrumental in preserving 2.3 million acres and building 27,000 recreational facilities. For example, one park that was preserved by grants from the LWCF is Fall Creek Falls in Tennessee. Grants from the fund totalling \$376,000 helped acquire land and built facilities at this spectacular park, which I have visited many times, boasts the highest waterfall in North America east of the Rocky Mountains. Chances are pretty good many parks we have hiked would not even exist if it were not for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Yet since the early 1980s, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been consistently shortchanged of funding. During most of the 1980s and 1990s, funding levels were kept to about one-third of the authorized level—\$300 million of \$900 million authorized, for example. By the late 1990s, funding for State grants under the Land and Water Conservation Fund was cut to zero.

In recent years, we have seen some improvements. Funding for State grants averaged about \$100 million since 2001, but it is not hard to do better when you are doing nothing.

While funding has declined, demand for conserved areas has dramatically increased. Since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was first established, the population of the United