

INTELLIGENCE REFORM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on leader time—and we will come right into morning business shortly—I want to continue on the intelligence reform bill that is underway and make a very brief statement. Just a few minutes ago, the Democratic leader and I urged our colleagues to come forward and submit their amendments. We just had further discussion with the assistant Democratic leader. Over the course of the day, we must see these amendments.

Today, we continue debate on a bill to overhaul the intelligence community of the United States Government. It is a huge undertaking. The reforms are the most comprehensive since the National Security Act of 1947. But nothing less than the security of the United States of America is at stake.

We have determined enemies who will use any means available to take the lives of as many Americans as possible. They cheered when the Twin Towers fell. They dream of even larger calamities.

They must be stopped. And that requires an intelligence system that finds them, before they harm us.

Under the leadership of Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, the Government Affairs Committee has produced a bill that is worthy of this task. It was passed unanimously out of committee.

It has received support from the White House.

And it is supported by the Senate leadership.

The Senate will examine this legislation in a comprehensive and deliberate manner. We will be focused and expeditious.

We have a unanimous consent agreement that restricts amendments “to the subject matter of the bill or related to the 9/11 Commission recommendations.”

I urge Senators that if they have, or are considering, amendments that they inform or file them with the manager today.

I am confident we will come to agreement on this package in a timely manner. I know that it is ambitious, but my hope is that we can complete this bill by the end of this week. This would give us time to conference with the House.

Reforming the executive branch and the legislative branch is key to improving the security of the American people and our great Nation.

I am proud to say that we have worked in a bipartisan manner at every level, from individual Members, through committees, to leadership.

We have also worked closely with the administration, which has embraced the findings and recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

The administration has taken additional measures to further improve our counterterrorism and intelligence efforts. These efforts deserve our praise.

The committee has worked to produce a bill that addresses funda-

mental issues facing our intelligence community. It contains a number of key recommendations consistent with the 9/11 report.

First, and most critically, the legislation creates a national intelligence director with robust budgetary and personnel authority over the intelligence community.

As recommended by the 9/11 report, the NID will be the President's primary intelligence advisor. This official will be Senate-confirmed and separate from the CIA Director. The NID's primary mission is to break down stovepipes, and knit the intelligence agencies into an agile and effective network.

The NID will develop and present to the President the annual budget request for the National Intelligence Program. Critically, the national intelligence director will receive the appropriation for the program.

The NID also will have parallel authority over major acquisitions funded through the appropriations that the NID will control.

The NID will have the authority to transfer funds within the National Intelligence Program. He or she will have authority to set our intelligence priorities.

The director will set standards for security, personnel, and information technology across the intelligence community.

The director will also play an active role in selecting the heads of the key entities in the National Intelligence Program.

Critically, the legislation requires the NID to provide intelligence that is independent of political considerations. To this end, the legislation establishes an analytic review unit to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the quality of analysis of national intelligence.

The NID will chair a cabinet-level Joint Intelligence Community Council. The purpose of the council is to advise the NID on setting requirements, financial management, and establishing policies across the intelligence community.

The council will help ensure the implementation of a joint, unified national intelligence effort to protect national security.

In addition to creating the national intelligence director post, the committee bill also establishes the National Counter Terrorism Center. Currently, our intelligence agencies are not maximally integrated in their efforts against terrorism. The committee seeks to remedy that through the creation of the counterterrorism center. The center will have a directorate of intelligence—in essence, a national intelligence center to integrate intelligence capabilities against terrorism.

The National Counterterrorism Center will also have a directorate of planning to develop interagency counterterrorism plans, assign agencies' responsibilities, and monitor implementation.

The center's directorate of planning will concentrate on developing joint counterterrorism plans, meaning plans that involve more than one agency. Such planning will be at both the strategic level, such as “winning hearts and minds” in the Muslim world, and at an operational level, such as hunting for bin Laden.

In addition to these two major reforms—the national intelligence director and the counterterrorism center—the legislation also includes provisions to strengthen the FBI and transform the CIA's capabilities.

The legislation before us is comprehensive. It is ambitious. And it contains the reforms that are critical to strengthening the intelligence community and protecting our country.

I am confident that this overhaul of our intelligence community—the largest since 1947—and the pending overhaul of the Senate oversight of intelligence—the largest in three decades—will make our country safer and more secure. We have no higher responsibility to our fellow Americans than protecting the homeland. Our lives, our freedoms, our liberties are at stake.

We have made tremendous progress in the days since 9/11. We've taken a hard look at our intelligence system, what it did right, where it went wrong. Many dedicated men and women have spent countless hours examining the facts and finding ways to fix the system. I am confident that the United States Senate will do our part to defend the homeland and make America more secure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I will be offering a unanimous consent request to try to move forward on welfare reform and try to move this vitally important issue that affects millions of Americans out of the Senate and toward passage of an extension. Today, the House is going to pass an extension, and I hope we will also.

I think it is unfortunate that we are left in the position that we are not able to pass a welfare reform bill in the Senate, in spite of the fact that an amendment on the underlying bill passed \$1.2 billion in new daycare spending. That has always been the mantra of those who oppose welfare reform and work requirements, that there wasn't enough money for daycare. Yet \$1.2 billion was added to the welfare bill, and we had attempt after attempt to move that bill to conference. So far, we have not been able to do so. As a result, we are here for another extension.

We have had several extensions over the last 2 years. The problem with these extensions—let me make this point—is that the current welfare system was put into place in 1996. It had very tough work requirements. It had work requirements that were tied to

caseload reduction. What happened is we have had such a successful program over the last 8 years that almost all of the States have met their caseload reduction and therefore no longer have work requirements.

So what we are seeing is that gradually, slowly, a lot of these States that have reduced their caseload are falling back under work requirement—not requiring work and not requiring the transformative value that this new welfare system that was put into place in 1996 has given to millions of women and children in poverty over the last 8 years. If we just continue the 1996 bill, which was great in its time—it achieved what it wanted to achieve and needed to achieve. Now we need to ratchet it up to make sure the work requirement is maintained and that we are still moving people out of poverty into work. So this extension I am going to offer does not accomplish that. That is disappointing.

I hope to later on maybe offer an opportunity to go to conference, but for now, I want to offer a unanimous consent request to extend the current welfare bill for another 6 months and add two minor provisions that the Senator from Indiana, Mr. BAYH, and I have been working on now for quite some time in a bipartisan fashion.

The two provisions deal with fatherhood, money that was not provided in the 1996 Welfare Act to encourage responsible fatherhood. There is \$100 million for that provision and also \$200 million to do a whole variety of things to try to educate and encourage responsible marriage, if you will; responsible fatherhood, responsible marriage, encourage fathers and mothers who are having children outside of wedlock.

Let me give at least one example of how this money could be used. There was a study done at Princeton University which said that when a mother would apply for welfare with a child born out of wedlock, 80 percent of the mothers who applied for welfare in this study, done by a liberal professor from Princeton, said they were in a relationship with the father of the child. When the father of the child was asked, 80 percent said they were interested in marriage. So we have a mother and a father who in 80 percent of these cases that were studied said they were in a relationship at the time that welfare was applied for, which is certainly after the child's birth, and they were interested in marriage. Yet within a year's time, less than 10 percent of those couples were together.

The point here is that Government does nothing, other than attach the father's wages for child support, to encourage that relationship or help that relationship prosper. All we are interested in is getting the money out of the hide of the father, which is not necessarily what nurtures a relationship.

All we are suggesting is that if a mother and a father come in and say, yes, we are in a relationship, and, yes, we are interested in marriage at the

time we are having this child, cannot the Government do something to help that situation? It is a very difficult time in these two young people's lives. They are going through a lot of stresses and strains. It is hard enough to have a child when you are married, much less when you are not married, and the difficulties associated with that. Could we pay for counseling? Could we pay for a faith-based organization to bring them in and help them get through these difficult times to nurture this relationship so the child of these two parents could have an opportunity to have a mother and a father in the home in a stable relationship?

If we look at the benefits of marriage, they are overwhelming. Social scientist after social scientist has come in to testify before the Finance Committee in a hearing earlier this year from the left and the right and they said: There is no argument here, marriage is beneficial for children.

It is beneficial for children because they have better school performance and there are fewer dropouts, fewer emotional and behavior problems, less substance abuse, less abuse and neglect, less criminal activity, fewer out-of-wedlock births. Everything we look at, marriage is a benefit to children. Why is the Government neutral on marriage? Why, if a couple is interested in marriage, can't we at least provide them some of the resources they need to build that relationship instead of just saying: Here is childcare dollars; if you want to get married, that is fine, we don't really care one way or the other; here are your childcare dollars and here are your whatever other dollars and that is all we care about. That is a short-term help for moms and children, but to have a stable, loving father and mother relationship is the best long-term help we can provide. But we do nothing. We are silent.

What we are proposing here is to try to do something to provide some resources through responsible fatherhood programs to—in this case, these programs are trying to bring in fathers who have not been involved in their children's lives—find mentoring programs and other programs funded through the nonprofit arena to help bring fathers back into the lives of their children. Children need moms and dads, and responsible mothers and responsible fathers are optimal. Senator BAYH has been a leader on this issue, along with Senator DOMENICI. I have worked also to try to get more responsible fathers back into the lives of their children.

Look at the statistics when it comes to fathers involved in children's lives: A child is two times more likely to abuse drugs if the father is not in the home, two times more likely to be abused if the father is not in the home, two times more likely to be involved in crime, three times more likely to fail in school, three times more likely to

commit suicide, and five times more likely to be in poverty. That is what fatherlessness does to children.

This extension I am asking for is a straight extension, no other changes, simply two modifications: One, \$100 million to help bring fathers back into the lives of these children to help improve some of these horrendous statistics we see here, and, two, to simply have some support where Government is no longer neutral, I would argue even against by enabling, if you will—I won't say survival because it is beyond that—but enabling women and children to go forward without fathers. You can make an argument it is beyond neutral, that we are empowering through Government money mothers not to need fathers as much as they did before all these programs were out here.

What we are saying is let's at least, if they express an interest in marriage, see if we can help them through this process. It is a straight extension, plus \$100 million for fatherhood and \$200 million for marriage programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 714, S. 2830; that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, we on this side note the intentions of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The two programs he talks about extending certainly have merit. I think if we had the opportunity to discuss them, offer amendments, and debate them, we could complete that very quickly.

The problem is that during the consideration of the welfare bill in March, the Senate passed a bipartisan amendment by a vote of 78 to 20 to put in \$6 billion in childcare funding. It is my understanding the amendment my friend from Pennsylvania offers does not include that.

My question is, why should we create two new programs untested—but they appear to have some merit—without extending additional resources for childcare, something we know the Senate agrees to and we know parents need to succeed in the workplace?

I ask my friend, will the Senator modify his request to include the Snowe-Dodd amendment? If this were done, I think we could move forward on this very quickly.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would be willing to offer another unanimous consent request to take care of the very issue the Senator from Nevada has mentioned, which is I will offer another unanimous consent request to simply go to conference on the bill that is still pending in the Senate that has the \$1.2 billion in the Dodd-Snowe amendment and send it to conference, and let's get this bill done.

So I am willing to go to conference on that bill. In fact, if we can first dispense with this first unanimous consent request, I would be happy to offer a second one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the first unanimous consent request?

Mr. REID. To the second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the first.

Mr. REID. To the first? Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard.

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 305, H.R. 4; the committee substitute be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. I further ask consent that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

This is the welfare bill the Senator from Nevada described, the bill with \$1.2 billion in new child care funding per year in mandatory spending. We have had this thing bound up in the Senate. The Senator asked would I be willing to amend my request. I have, in essence, done that.

Now we can send this bill to conference. We can start working on it with the House and maybe we can get a new welfare bill instead of having an extension, which I would agree with the Senator from Nevada is not adequate because, in the eyes of the Senator, it does not provide enough daycare money. I would say it is not adequate because it does not require work anymore. Most States in the country now do not have to have work requirements because of the way the 1996 law was written.

I agree with the Senator, this is the better solution. So I ask that unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I did not quite get what the unanimous consent was.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would be happy to read it again, but in essence it is to take the bill on the calendar now, which has the Snowe-Dodd amendment in it.

Mr. REID. H.R. 4?

Mr. SANTORUM. H.R. 4. And send it to conference and ask for a conference with the House.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have the timeline on this bill so it is unnecessary to go through it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as to what has happened.

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

BILL SUMMARY AND STATUS

H.R. 4—WELFARE EXTENSION

2/13/2003, 2:35 p.m.: H. Amdt. 2—On agreeing to the Kucinich amendment (A001) Failed by recorded vote: 124-300 (Roll No. 27).

2/13/2003, 2:38 p.m.: H. Amdt. 3—Amendment (A002) in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Cardin (consideration: CF H530-546, H547-550; text: CR H530-542. Amendment in the nature of a substitute sought to expand state flexibility to provide training and education, increase to 70 percent the number that are required to be engaged in work related activities, provide states with an employment credit, maintain the current participation requirement, maintain the time limit on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits, increase child care funding by \$11 billion over the next 5 years, and remove barriers to serving legal immigrants.

2/13/2003, 3:49 p.m.: H. Amdt. 3—On agreeing to the Cardin amendment (A002) Failed by recorded vote: 197-225 (Roll No. 28).

2/13/2003, 3:50 p.m.: Mr. Cardin moved to recommit with instructions to Ways and Means (consideration: CR H550-552; text: CR H550).

2/13/2003, 4:15 p.m.: On motion to recommit with instructions Failed by the Yeas and Nays: 197-221 (Roll No. 29).

2/13/2003, 4:21 p.m.: On passage Passed by the Yeas and Nays: 230-192 (Roll No. 30) (text: CR H499-513).

2/13/2003, 4:21 p.m.: Motion to reconsider laid on the table Agreed to without objection.

2/13/2003: Received in the Senate and Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance.

9/10/2003: Committee on Finance. Ordered to be reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute favorably (Markup report: National Journal, CQ).

10/3/2003: Committee on Finance. Reported by Senator Grassley with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. With written report No. 108-162. Minority views filed.

10/3/2003: Placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. Calendar No. 305.

3/29/2004: Measure laid before Senate (consideration: CR S3219-3254, S3256-3278; text of measure as reported in Senate: CR S3219-3254).

3/29/2004: S. Amdt. 2937—Amendment SA 2937 proposed by Senator Grassley for Senator Snowe (consideration: CR S3260, S3273-3274). To provide additional funding for child care.

3/30/2004: Considered by Senate (consideration: CR S3324-3345).

3/30/2004: S. Amdt. 2937—Considered by Senate (consideration: SR S3324, S3334-3335).

3/30/2004: S. Amdt. 2937—Amendment SA 2937 agreed to in Senate by Yea-Nay Vote. 78-20. Record Vote No. 64.

3/30/2004: S. Amdt. 2945—Amendment SA 2945 proposed by Senator Boxer (consideration: CR S3336-3345; text: CR S3336). To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

3/30/2004: Cloture motion on the committee substitute amendment presented in Senate (consideration: CR S3359; text: CR S3359).

3/31/2004: Considered by Senate (consideration: CR S3407-3448).

3/31/2004: S. Amdt. 2945—Considered by Senate (consideration: CR S3407).

4/1/2004: Considered by Senate (consideration: CR S3529-3538, S3544-3557).

4/1/2004: S. Amdt. 2945—Considered by Senate (consideration: CR S3529).

4/1/2004: Cloture motion on the committee substitute amendment not invoked in Senate by Yea-Nay Vote. 51-47. Record Vote No. 65 (consideration: CR S3538).

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at the time the debate was going forward on this most important bill, an amendment was offered by the Senator from Cali-

fornia dealing with minimum wage. Immediately, cloture was filed. Cloture was not invoked.

We would have no problem going forward with the bill prior to going to conference, assuming the Senate seeks to resume H.R. 4 in the status it was when it was pulled from the floor which is, of course, the pendency of the Boxer amendment. So I ask my friend, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, to modify his unanimous consent to allow us to proceed with H.R. 4 on the floor with the Boxer amendment pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I say to the Senator from Nevada that on March 30, I did that. I actually proposed the unanimous consent to allow a vote in relation to the Boxer amendment, with a substitute offered by Senator McCONNELL on the issue of minimum wage, which I know was an important issue at the time of this discussion. I offered that unanimous consent so we could move forward and dispose of those two amendments and then move the bill to conference, and that was objected to.

There was objection to the extension with some minor modifications to help marriage and fatherhood. There was an objection to a unanimous consent that puts \$1.2 billion into new child care funding to go to conference. We have seen objections—I suspect this will be objected to again, if I would offer it, which is an opportunity to have a vote on minimum wage up or down, and a vote on our minimum wage proposal up or down, and then send it to conference.

I do not know how many times one has to say no to get the idea that maybe there is something other than trying to get votes on issues that are of concern to the minority, that there might be some underlying concern about having an extension of the welfare bill or a modification to it, and I think that is probably where we are.

It is unfortunate because it is important to reestablish work requirements. It is important to give people the best opportunity to succeed in America. We have seen, for example, in this country, as a result of welfare reform which passed in 1996, the lowest rate of black poverty in the history of the country, lowest ever as a result of requiring work and changing the dynamic in low-income families in America. So we have shown success.

It is unfortunate we are not going to be able to continue that success as a result of the blocking maneuvers on the side of the Democrats.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's unanimous consent?

Mr. REID. I have a modification of the request pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. REID. I object to the underlying request and ask the Senator to allow a clean extension for 6 months of this most important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I will object for the moment. I understand the House is working on an extension right now. We may agree later today. Certainly, we need to do an extension and I will check with the leader on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kentucky, taking the floor, I inquire as to how much time is remaining with the majority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 13 minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could on behalf of Senator DASCHLE yield 15 minutes when our time comes to Senator KENNEDY, 5 minutes to Senator DURBIN, and 5 minutes to Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky.

FOUR-PART PRESIDENTIAL PLAN FOR IRAQ

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Presidential campaign is heating up and after considerable flipping and flopping, Senator KERRY claims to have finally presented the American people with something resembling a firm position on Iraq. It is a four-part plan, and frankly it resembles the plan President Bush has been pursuing for the last year and a half. I call it Senator KERRY's "too little too late to gain credibility" plan.

Although Kerry has characterized the administration's policy as a failure, perhaps he simply believes it would be a success were he the one implementing it. I wonder. Let us take a look.

The first part of Senator KERRY's plan is to "internationalize because others must share the burden." Let's leave aside the inconvenient fact that Senator KERRY has denigrated the 19 countries that participated in the liberation of Iraq or the 34 helping to secure and rebuild that country today as a "trumped up and so-called coalition of the bribed, the coerced, the bought and the extorted."

This from the man who is so confident of his diplomatic skills.

Senator KERRY fails to understand that no amount of diplomacy will convince the countries whose interests compete with ours, or the nations that share our interests but lack our will or capacity to act, to join our efforts to bring security and freedom to the Middle East and the terrorists to their knees.

Senator KERRY wants to bring U.S. troops home within the first 6 months of his administration. So his plan is not to share the burden; it is to pass the buck. But to whom would he pass the buck?

The Financial Times reported yesterday that Germany and France will not send troops to Iraq even if JOHN KERRY is elected. Indeed, how could Senator KERRY convince any nation to send troops to a conflict he himself has called "the wrong war at the wrong time"?

It would be nice to see the United Nations pulling its own weight once in a while, but one would have to be living in a fantasy world to believe that it will do so. If it continues to allow tyrannies like Sudan to chair the Human Rights Commission, the U.N. will follow the League of Nations into permanent and deserved irrelevance.

The second part of Kerry's plan is to "train Iraqis because they must be responsible for their own security." Adding further confusion to his inconsistent claims that, first, the U.S. needs more troops in Iraq, that he would bring them home within the first 6 months of his administration, and that this would make America stronger at home and more respected in the world, Senator KERRY now claims the U.S. is not doing enough to train Iraqis to provide for their own security.

Well, about a year ago I traveled to Iraq and I stood with GEN David Petraeus in Mosul where I witnessed the graduation ceremony of an Iraqi security force, a unit trained by the 101st Airborne. I recall being impressed that so many Iraqis were willing to risk their lives to help secure their newly free country.

Petraeus completed his tour as the commanding general of the 101st Airborne in February of this year. After making sure his soldiers returned safely to Fort Campbell, KY, Dave Petraeus received his third star and went back to Baghdad, where he assumed responsibility for training Iraq's army and security forces. He is the right man for the job and, for me, his views carry enormous weight. He had an op-ed in the Washington Post this past Sunday that I would commend to my colleagues, in particular the junior Senator from Massachusetts. In it, he notes:

Approximately 164,000 Iraqi police and soldiers . . . and an additional 74,000 facility protection forces are performing a wide variety of security missions.

Equipment is being delivered. Training is on track and increasing in capacity. . . . Most important, Iraqi security forces are in the fight, so much so that they are suffering substantial casualties as they take on more and more of the burdens to achieve security in their country.

But he cautions that:

Numbers alone cannot convey the full story. The human dimension of this effort is crucial. The enemies of Iraq recognize how much is at stake as Iraq reestablishes its security forces. Insurgents and foreign fighters continue to mount barbaric attacks against

police stations, recruiting centers and military installations. . . . Yet despite the sensational attacks, there is no shortage of qualified recruits volunteering to join the Iraqi security forces.

This is David Petraeus.

So it would seem the training of Iraqis is well underway.

The third part of KERRY's plan is to "move forward with reconstruction, because that's an important way to stop the spread of terror."

I agree. When I spoke with General Petraeus in Iraq last year, he told me that: "Money is ammunition," and that it was critical to get the Iraqi economy working again in order to provide jobs for Iraqis who may otherwise turn to violence. I returned to Washington and lobbied my colleagues to vote for the \$87 billion to supply our troops and for Iraqi reconstruction, because I had seen firsthand how important it was to get Iraq's economy back on track.

It is a shame Senator KERRY was not listening to General Petraeus when he voted against this \$87 billion for our troops. In fact, Senator KERRY still does not seem to get it, because he complained just recently that too much money was being spent on reconstruction in Iraq and too little was being spent in America.

We won the debate on the \$87 billion for our troops and reconstruction in spite of Senator KERRY's—and Senator EDWARDS'—opposition. And although I am heartened Senator KERRY has come to appreciate the importance of this aid, I hope he understands that Presidents, unlike Senators, do not often get second chances to make crucial decisions.

The fourth and final plan in Senator KERRY's plan is to: "help the Iraqis achieve a viable government, because it is up to them to run their own country."

You could call this the "Do as I say, not as I do" plan, because Senator KERRY may have undermined the credibility of Iraq's Prime Minister—who traveled to America to consult with President Bush, to deliver a speech to a Joint Session of Congress, and rebut the criticism of those who believe Iraq and the world are not better off with Saddam Hussein in an Iraqi jail.

KERRY's wrong-headed criticism of Ayad Allawi—who risks his life every day to bring peace and democracy to Iraq—was as repugnant as it was undiplomatic. If a President KERRY were to treat foreign leaders as disgracefully as he treated Prime Minister Allawi, he would find it difficult to live up his campaign promise of being "more respected in the world."

Yet, KERRY has already done diplomatic damage, in my view. By maligning the judgment of America's most important new ally in the Middle East, Senator KERRY has fired a political shot that will be heard more loudly in the streets of Baghdad or Tehran than in Boston or Orlando. His comments were intended to undercut President