

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we won't make any predictions. We will get started and do our best. I thank my good friend and look forward to working with him again next year. We have truly formed a unique partnership, the two of us together. I thank so many Senators who recognize that he and I have a trusting partnership and resolved a lot of problems that otherwise could prove contentious and maybe not had a resolution. So to the next year.

I must say, I have consulted with the Senator from Michigan. Both of us have great concern about the IED problem. We are going to have one more hearing, in all probability a closed hearing, on this subject, listening to some viewpoints in the private sector. We regularly meet with those in the Department of Defense who have the primary jurisdiction over this problem. This is one issue on which I am gravely concerned and over which I lose sleep at night, as I am sure all of us do, about the frightful weaponry the insurgents are employing and how best we can put the entire country to work to resolve this problem.

I thank my good friend.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if I may very briefly respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I commend our chairman for the initiative which he has shown on the IED issue. We had a hearing a few weeks ago on this issue which was one of the most fascinating and I think one of the most important hearings our committee has held, at least that I can remember, exclusively on the IED issue. It was under the chairman's leadership that we did this. I think it was a significant hearing.

This committee has been absolutely dedicated to doing everything we possibly can in addressing this threat. We have done everything we know how to do, but we still have not solved the problem. As the chairman mentioned, we are looking for additional technologies, additional ways in which this problem can be addressed.

I did want to mention that hearing because I thought it was unusually important.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my good friend; again, a partnership effort to achieve that.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2862

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2862, the Science-State-Justice appropriations bill. I further ask that there be 75 minutes of debate, with 22½ minutes under the control of Senator SHELBY, 37½ minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, and 15 minutes under the control of Sen-

ator COBURN. I further ask that following the use or yielding back of time and at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to a vote on the adoption of the conference report, with no intervening action or debate.

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

RECESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we will now go to the standing order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, following the vote on passage of S. 1042, the Senate stands in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:22 p.m., recessed until 2:29 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RE- LATED AGENCIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2862, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, that the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill, signed by a majority of conferees on the part of both Houses.

(The conference report was printed in the House proceedings of November 7, 2005.)

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking Senator MIKULSKI, the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee. The Senator from Maryland and I have worked in a bipartisan manner to produce the bill that is now before the Senate.

I thank Chairman WOLF and Congressman MOLLOHAN. They have worked with us to resolve some considerable differences in our two bills, and I commend them for their efforts.

Finally, I thank Chairman COCHRAN, the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

The bill before us today is the conference report for H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice and Commerce appropriations bill. Overall, this is a very good bill. Make no mistake, this was a lean year, a very lean year. The subcommittee's 302(b) allocation did not account for several sizeable programs which were proposed for termination in the administration's budget, which this subcommittee restored.

In the Senate, the subcommittee that I chair is called the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, CJS, Appropriations Subcommittee. The Senate CJS Subcommittee no longer has jurisdiction over the operations budget of the State Department, which has been merged with the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Under a previous arrangement, however, the State Department is being considered under the House framework, therefore the bill before the Senate is the Science, State, Justice and Commerce Appropriations conference report.

The bill that we are considering today provides a total of \$61.8 billion in budget authority to agencies under the bill's jurisdiction, including the State Department. For those agencies under the Senate subcommittee's jurisdiction—the Departments of Commerce and Justice, NASA, NSF, and others—approximately \$52.2 billion in budget authority is provided.

The bill includes an increase of just over \$1 billion above the budget request for the Department of Justice. The bulk of this increase is due to the restoration of many of the proposed cuts to State and local law enforcement grant programs.

The bill provides \$6.5 million for the Department of Commerce. Several programs within the Department of Commerce were proposed for termination in the President's fiscal year 2006 budget. This bill restores funding for these programs, among them the Economic Development Administration and the Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction grants.

The bill provides increases for NASA to move forward with the vision the President has proposed, while fulfilling our commitments to important existing programs.

At a time when there are so many demands being made on scarce Federal dollars, difficult decisions had to be made. We have tried to address the priorities that so many of our colleagues brought to our attention. Though we were able to accommodate many of our colleagues' requests, we were obviously not able to do everything everyone has requested.

I believe that we endeavored to produce a bill that is bipartisan and that, we feel, serves the need of this country and we were successful.

I yield to Senator MIKULSKI, my esteemed ranking member, for her statement.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, Senator SHELBY and I have worked on a bipartisan basis to bring this bill back to the floor as a conference report. We are in agreement with the principles of the bill so we are able to bring the bill forward. On our side, we estimate that we have three other speakers. We note the Senator from Minnesota is in the Chamber and he wishes to speak. There are two others whom we expect to speak.

This is a new subcommittee. The VA-HUD Subcommittee on Appropriations

was dismantled and farmed out to different subcommittees, so some parts came to the Commerce Committee and the Justice Committee, and now we call it the Science Committee. It has a fantastic jurisdiction. Its jurisdiction is focused on saving lives and saving livelihoods. It is about investing in innovation through science and technology for our country's future, and it is about looking out for our communities and justice system.

Despite a tough allocation, I believe this bill, as completed, is fair and we have done the best we could. The Commerce Department oversees many agencies, some of which are very important Federal labs such as NOAA and the National Institute of Standards. The Department of Justice is on the front line. It funds the FBI, DEA, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the U.S. Marshals Service, and the U.S. Attorneys.

These are not just agencies; these are men and women who every single day are trying to find those people who are often criminals in our country, those who have committed terrible acts of arson. In my own home State, they detected the sniper who held the capital region at bay a few years ago. It is our U.S. attorneys, America's DAs, who are prosecuting drug dealers, organized crime, and white-collar crime, and also chairing the task forces on homeland security.

The Justice Department tries to protect us from terrorists and protect our neighborhoods and our communities. It also provides grants to State and local law enforcement and helps fight gang violence. This year, this bill provides \$21 billion to the Justice Department. That is \$800 million more than last year. The Justice Department accounts for almost 50 percent of the entire cost of our bill. The FBI, with tremendous responsibility to fight both crime and to find terrorists, will receive \$5.7 billion. This is a \$500 million increase over last year. It will focus on things such as counterterrorism, in which we then try to use this as a domestic agency to fight terrorists.

We also remember we have other obligations, particularly for missing and exploited children. We are working very closely with the President of the United States and our Attorney General to make sure we have a hotline and a way to identify those sexual predators who have been released from prison who come back to our communities, and also to recover missing children and to prevent abduction and sexual exploitation, whether it is on the Internet or in our communities. They are doing a great job.

Also, they have been used to identify those children who were missing after Katrina. So we not only look for the kids on AMBER alert—as terrible and as chilling as that could be—but after the hurricanes hit we could not find a lot of our children. Moms and dads put their children on some of the last buses leaving Louisiana and now, thanks to

the way we work, we have helped bring about family unification.

At the same time, we have a new menace sweeping our country and that is gangs. We have certainly seen an increase in my own home State. We are providing Federal funds for initiatives, particularly focused in Montgomery County and Prince George's County.

Our way of fighting gangs is going to follow a three-point strategy of suppression, intervention, and prevention. We believe this bill will work with law enforcement in our communities and community support groups to do that.

At the same time, we have substantial funding to deal with the methamphetamine scourge that is sweeping our country. Many of my colleagues have spoken about that.

While we are busy fighting criminals, though, we also have to protect the judges as we bring those criminals to justice. We are all aware of the great threat that often happens to our judges as they try to do their duty. So we have increased the funding for the Marshals Service to capture fugitives and protect judges in our Federal court system. Just this past week, the marshals captured a convicted murderer who escaped from a prison in Texas.

Where we had a tough fight was in State and local law enforcement. The President's budget cut that by \$1.4 billion. Working on a bipartisan basis, we did increase that budget by \$1.1 billion, but that left us \$300 million down. I am sorry that had to happen. We did the best we could, and I know others will talk about it.

We put a great deal of effort into making sure we have a national effort that will be funded locally for the growing problem of methamphetamine—and, gosh, how it is affecting not only urban but rural communities is shocking—and also to fund counterterrorism and counterintelligence. These growing problems are facing us. We did the best we could.

I know some of our colleagues will ask: Senator MIKULSKI, how did it all work out with the methamphetamine in conference? When the bill left the Senate, it was pretty good.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we have provided a record amount of money, over \$60 million, to fight meth abuse. Meth abuse is one of our biggest problems and we hope this is a significant downpayment in dealing with this problem.

While we are busy fighting crime, we also want to fight for America's future. We believe we need to focus more on innovation. A country that does not innovate stagnates. We are worried that we are losing ground in terms of our ability to innovate. We believe one of the ways to strengthen innovation is through our Federal laboratories. That is why this year we have funded an increase of \$62 million at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, raising their appropriations to \$761 million. The NIST partners, working with industry, develop new tech-

nologies and new breakthroughs that create jobs. At the same time it creates standards for new products coming to the marketplace so they can file patents, they can be exported, and they can meet the demands of the EU and the WTO.

In terms of our Federal labs, we want not only new ideas but also those ideas that protect America. So this year we have increased funding for NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Everybody knows NOAA; they are known for their weather reports. We know them for their hurricane reports. We know them for their tsunami alerts. NOAA generally saves lives and saves livelihoods.

The weather service has given us important forecasts and warnings so we can secure our property and get people out of harm's way. Also, we made a particular note that the conference prohibits the consolidation or reducing of hours of those weather forecast offices. For us coastal Senators, it supports our fisheries which are critical to our economy.

While we are busy working on some of the new ideas, such as at NASA and the National Science Foundation, which I will talk about in a minute, I want to talk about the issue of intellectual property, as I have talked about NIST. In America, we often invent great ideas. We win the Nobel Prizes, but we have to win not only the Nobel Prizes, we have to win the markets. When we go out there to win those markets, we have to protect our intellectual property. It is as important as defending the homeland because it is our jobs, our future, and our source of revenue. All around the world, particularly in southeast Asia, they are trying to steal our ideas. Well, we are not going to allow it. We have to make sure we fight it in our trade agreements, we have to fight it in our trade enforcement, but we have to begin at home to make sure we have a patent office that protects this intellectual property. We have increased their funding 30 percent to reduce the backlog of over 500,000 patents.

Who knows what those patents are. It could be the next generation of pacemaker. It could be the next generation of hybrid for an automobile or for a truck. Most of all, it is going to be the next generation that hopefully keeps jobs, and jobs in manufacturing, in the United States of America.

So while we talk about labs, this is not some wonky legislation. We believe it is our ideas that are saving lives, saving property, and saving jobs.

We do know we need to be on the cutting edge of science. We believe that cutting edge comes from the National Science Foundation, which we have funded at \$5.6 billion, \$180 million more than last year. The National Science Foundation funds a lot. It funds our basic research in chemistry, biology, and in physics. We all know about the National Institutes of Health and salute them, but at the same time we

need to know it is the NSF that is doing the basic science and also breakthrough science such as in nanotechnology and in global warming. It also funds the post-doctorates and the graduate school stipends so our young people can go on to graduate school. That is that next generation.

Then, of course, near and dear to my heart is NASA. This year, we have provided \$16.4 billion, \$260 million over last year. I know many people are wondering what is going to happen to the Hubble. Is the Hubble going to run out of steam? Will the Hubble stop discovering all that wonderful new science?

Hang on. Hope and help is on the way. We have increased the funding for the Hubble budget to accommodate a servicing mission into space to rescue the Hubble. It will take new batteries. It will take new operating and optical equipment. What we do need, though, is to make sure the shuttle makes two more flights so it is safe for the astronauts to go up. We are helping our astronauts. We are providing full funding for the Space Shuttle, the space station, and the development of crew exploration vehicles. All science programs are funded at the President's request.

We also have funded the Census Bureau at \$812 million, which allows the census to move forward with the 2010 census. The census is America's database, and we need to keep it contemporary.

What I have just given sounds like an accountant. I will submit a statement later on that will talk about what this means in terms of innovation. But today Senator SHELBY wanted to brief our colleagues on the numbers and on the money.

We think we have done a good job. What we have done is take our appropriations allocation, put 50 percent of our money into protecting America from terrorists, from crooks, from thugs, and from the exploiters of children. At the same time, we have used the other 50 percent to promote innovation in science and technology and also to protect our intellectual property. We think we have done a very good job.

I thank at this time my very good friend, Senator SHELBY. Senator SHELBY and I came to the House of Representatives together and served with the Energy and Commerce Committee. We came to the Senate at the same time. He is an excellent colleague to work with. We share the same priorities for this country. I want America to know that we do work together, and when we work together we always do better.

I thank staffs who really function with collegiality and with great civility. I thank the Shelby staff: Katherine Hennessey, Art Cameron, Joe Long, Christa Crawford, and Allan Cutler.

My own staff who worked so hard, I thank Paul Carliner, Gabrielle Batkin, Alexa Sewell, and Kate Fitzpatrick for all of the hard work they have done.

This is kind of a thumbnail sketch for our bill in the interest of time. There will be Senators who will be coming to speak on the bill.

I will yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON. Later on in the afternoon I will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN; to Senator OBAMA, from Illinois, for 5 minutes; and 5 minutes to Senator SARBANES, my esteemed and cherished colleague from Maryland.

I now yield the floor to our excellent colleague from Minnesota, Senator DAYTON, who, himself, has been an enormous advocate for local law enforcement and has been a real strong voice for increasing funding for fighting the meth scourge. We are so sorry it is going to be his last year with us, the great guy that he is. We know he will do well. We certainly wish him well, and I look forward to hearing him this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. I thank the distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Maryland, for her kind words. I commend her and the chairman of the committee, Senator SHELBY, for their outstanding work on this conference report. I know it was under very difficult circumstances.

There are many good features to the report, as the Senator has just described. Again, I thank her for her leadership and her tenacious fighting on behalf of these efforts, whether they were successful or whether they were not.

Tragically, however, the House and the administration largely prevailed in this conference report in cutting funding for the law enforcement programs to only 38 percent of the Senate's position. Senator CHAMBLISS from Georgia and I cosponsored a bipartisan amendment to the Senate bill that passed the Senate unanimously, which increased the Byrne grant funding from \$900 million for fiscal 2006. Yet the House and administration, in the conference, slashed that appropriations to \$416.4 million, which is a one-third reduction from fiscal year 2005.

Byrne grants fund local law enforcement to combat the most urgent public safety problems in their own communities. In my own State of Minnesota, Byrne grant programs have provided the critically important funds to fight the scourge of methamphetamine, which is an illegal drug crisis in many States, as the distinguished ranking member has outlined. She has been in the forefront in efforts to increase the Federal funding to fight this catastrophe that is afflicting our citizens, afflicting people of all ages—I am told by chiefs of police, those as young as 10, and senior citizens in their eighties, from all parts of Minnesota and from all walks of life and backgrounds. While the burdens on local police and sheriffs and other local law enforcement officials have been increasing, Byrne grants to Minnesota have de-

creased from over \$8 million in 2000 to \$7.5 million last year. This year's cut in this conference report will mean that Minnesota's share of Byrne grant funding will drop to less than \$5 million next year, which is a 40-percent reduction from the year 2000.

In addition, the COPS grants in this report are cut from \$606 million to \$416 million, another one-third reduction, with zero dollars provided for the hiring of new law enforcement officers, which was the program's original goal. Byrne grants and COPS are the two most important sources of Federal funds to boost police and sheriff forces throughout our country, to increase the drug prevention programs or drug court interdictions. They are programs that keep our neighborhoods safer, our communities safer, and our rural counties safer.

Why do the administration and the House want to drastically cut Federal support from local law enforcement; to cut funds from the brave men and women who are on the frontlines against the forces of evil in our society, who are risking their lives day and night to defeat the evil predators who are destroying the lives of our citizens? Why? It is unconscionable, it is incomprehensible that the House and the administration are defunding local law enforcement.

Here we have an administration that preaches national security but will not fund it at home. It is an administration that preaches the war against terrorism but will not fund the war against drug-dealing and drug-pushing terrorists on our streets and in our schools. How mistaken, how short-sighted, how wrong-directed could anyone be?

Again, I thank the Senate's chairman and ranking member for doing their best against the administration, which would like to eliminate these programs because they were the good ideas of the previous administration and their allies in the House. Congress should be providing more money, not less, but more money to strengthen local law enforcement in their fight against organized crime, drug dealers, and other predators. For that reason, I regretfully cannot support this report.

The citizens of America deserve better law enforcement and more Federal support to make it possible—not the lower, the cut position of the House and administration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, first, I commend both Senator SHELBY, the chairman of the subcommittee, and my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, the ranking member, for their hard work in bringing this conference report to the Senate this afternoon. I do want to express my regret that this report does not contain an important provision, to provide emergency housing vouchers to victims of the recent hurricanes.

On September 14 of this year, the Senate unanimously approved an amendment to this bill to provide \$3.5 billion in emergency spending to be used to ensure that any person displaced as a result of the hurricanes could receive a housing voucher. These emergency housing vouchers would have enabled displaced families to find and afford safe, decent, and stable housing.

While FEMA and HUD are providing some housing assistance to evacuees, it is clear from news reports, as well as from people in the affected areas, that the promises of housing assistance from the Federal Government are falling far short of what is necessary. Just in the past week, there have been articles about the lack of stable housing for evacuees. The titles alone indicate the stress evacuees are under. For example:

Hurricane Evacuees Face Eviction Threats At Both Their Old Homes and New;
Displaced in Crisis of Affordable Housing;
FEMA Housing Slow In Arriving.

The administration's housing policy for the victims of the recent hurricanes is unclear and inadequate. HUD is only assisting people who were assisted by HUD previously in the disaster areas, while FEMA has the responsibility for the vast majority of the evacuees. FEMA, an emergency management agency which is overwhelmed in the face of this unprecedented disaster, is now being tasked with the job of housing hundreds of thousands of people. This is not a job for FEMA. FEMA has provided people with 3-months' worth of rental assistance. However, it is clear that not all evacuees have received this assistance. Second, it is also not clear how evacuees and the landlords renting to them can be guaranteed that rental assistance will continue. Indeed, some Katrina victims are being threatened with eviction. FEMA seems to be handling the continuation of rental assistance on a case-by-case basis, with no clear rules or principles guiding these critical decisions.

In the words of an editorial in yesterday's *New York Times*:

The woefully inadequate program for housing put forward by the administration is tantamount to stonewalling the Katrina victims.

The emergency housing voucher proposal, which was adopted by the Senate, was, regrettably, not included in the conference report now under consideration. The Senate conferees met implacable resistance, apparently, from the House conferees and from the administration, as I understand it. But the emergency housing voucher proposal which this body adopted would have ensured that every evacuee in need would receive at least 6 months of rental assistance with an additional 6 months of assistance available if necessary. The assistance would have been distributed by HUD and the existing housing network, which houses millions of people around the Nation. There is extensive experience at HUD.

I am disappointed, very disappointed that this critical assistance is not included, and I hope that we can find some other way to provide the needed housing assistance to hurricane victims.

Again, I commend my colleagues, Senators SHELBY and MIKULSKI, for their successful completion of this report. I again underscore that this emergency housing voucher provision was included in the bill which passed the Senate under the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member MIKULSKI. I regret that they met this resistance in conference and were not able to include it in the final version. It is the evacuees of the hurricanes who, unfortunately, will pay the price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before the senior Senator returns to the Banking Committee, I want him to know that I, too, regret that we could not do the housing vouchers, the small business administration loans, as well as the economic development assistance Katrina amendments. These would have really helped rebuild communities and rebuild lives. But the House was so resistant we could not. We were defeated on a voice vote.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the ranking member for that observation. I simply point out, as further stories are heard about the inability to get people back up on their feet and address their needs, it should be remembered that there were provisions in the Senate-passed bill which, if included in this conference report and therefore enacted into law, would have provided very important measures of assistance in a very timely fashion. I, too, regret very much that has not taken place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have addressed this Chamber several times on the subject of global warming. Many times, over and over in the past few years in those speeches I have presented well-documented facts regarding the science and economics of the global warming issue that, sadly, many of my colleagues in the public heard for the first time.

Today, I will discuss something else—scientific integrity and how to improve it. Specifically, I will discuss the systematic and documented abuse of the scientific process by an international body that claims it provides the most complete and objective scientific assessment in the world on the subject of climate change—the United Nations-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC. I will conclude with a series of recommendations as to the minimum changes the IPCC must make if it is to restore its credibility.

When I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, one of my top three pri-

orities was to improve the quality of environmental science used in public policymaking by taking the politics out of science. I have convened hearings on this subject and the specific issue of global warming science.

I am a U.S. Senator and a former mayor and businessman. I am not a scientist. But I do understand politics. And the more I have delved into the issue, the more convinced I have become that science is being co-opted by those who care more about peddling fear of gloom and doom to further their own, broader agendas than they do about scientific integrity.

I am committed to shining a light on their activities. Global warming alarmists will undoubtedly continue to accuse me of attacking the science of global warming—that is part of their game. But nothing could be further from the truth. I support and defend credible, objective science by exposing the corrupting influences that would subvert it for political purposes. Good policy must be based on good science, and that requires science be free of bias, whatever its conclusions might be.

As nations meet again next month in Montreal to discuss global warming, the pronouncements of the IPCC leaders will gain renewed attention as they continue their efforts to craft a fourth assessment of the state of global warming science. If the fourth assessment is to have any credibility, fundamental changes will need to be made.

The flaws in the IPCC process began to manifest themselves in the first assessment, but did so in earnest when the IPCC issued its second assessment report in 1996. The most obvious was the altering of the document on the central question of whether man is causing global warming.

Here is what Chapter 8—the key chapter in the report—stated on this central question in the final version accepted by reviewing scientists:

No study to date has positively attributed all or part [of the climate change observed to date] to anthropogenic causes.

But when the final version was published, this and similar phrases in 15 sections of the chapter were deleted or modified. Nearly all the changes removed hints of scientific doubts regarding the claim that human activities are having a major impact on global warming.

It removes these doubts that were specific in the study.

In the Summary for Policymakers—which is the only part of the report that reporters and policymakers read—a single phrase was inserted. It reads:

The balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate.

The lead author for chapter 8, Dr. Ben Santer, should not be held solely accountable. According to the journal *Nature*, the changes to the report were made in the midst of high-level pressure from the Clinton/Gore State Department to do so. I understand that

after the State Department sent a letter to Sir John Houghton, co-chairman of the IPCC, Houghton prevailed upon Santer to make the changes. The impact was explosive, with media across the world, including heavyweights such as Peter Jennings, declaring this as proof that man is responsible for global warming.

Notably, polls taken shortly afterwards showed scant support for the statement. The word “discernible” implies measurable or detectable, and depending on how the question was asked, only 3–19 percent of American scientists concurred. That is the very best scenario—less than 20 percent.

In 2001, the third assessment report was published. Compared with the flaws in the third assessment, those in the second assessment appear modest. The most famous is the graph produced by Dr. Michael Mann and others. Their study concluded that the 20th century was the warmest on record in the last 1,000 years, showing flat temperatures until 1900 and then spiking upward—in short, it looked like a hockey stick. It achieved instant fame as proof of man’s causation of global warming because it was featured prominently in the summary report read by the media.

Let us take a look at this chart. This is the blade of the hockey stick, and this is what Michael Mann tried to show. Since then, the hockey stick has been shown to be a relic of bad math and impermissible practices.

This chart starts the year 1000, 1200, and so forth. If they had included the three centuries prior to that, that was the time called the medieval warming period. In the medieval warming period, you would find another blade such as this where temperatures were actually higher than they are in this exhibit.

Since then, the hockey stick has been shown to be a relic of bad math and impermissible practices. Dr. Hans von Storch, a prominent German researcher with the GKSS Institute for Coastal Research—who, I am told, believes in global warming—put it this way:

Methodologically it is wrong: Rubbish.

In fact, a pair of Canadian researchers showed that when random data is fed into Michael Mann’s mathematical construct, it produces a hockey stick more than 99 percent of the time, regardless of what you put into it. Yet the IPCC immortalized the hockey stick as the proof positive of catastrophic global warming.

How can such a thing occur? Sadly, it is due to the institutional structure of the IPCC itself—it breeds manipulation.

First, the IPCC is a political institution. Its charter is to support the efforts of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has the basic mission of eliminating the threat of global warming. This clearly creates a conflict of interest with the standard scientific goal of assessing scientific data in an objective manner.

The IPCC process itself illustrates the problem. The Summary Report for Policymakers is not approved by the scientists and economists who contribute to the report.

In other words, the Summary Report for Policymakers is the one for policymakers and for the press. That is how people pick up their impressions as to what was in the report. However, the scientists and the economists who contributed to the report never did approve the Summary Report for Policymakers. It is approved by intergovernmental delegates—in short, politicians. It doesn’t take a leap of imagination to realize that politicians will insist the report support their agenda.

A typical complaint of scientists and economists is that the summary does not adequately reflect the uncertainties associated with tentative conclusions in the basic report. The uncertainties I identified by contributing authors and reviewers seem to disappear or are downplayed in the summary.

A corollary of this is that lead authors and the chair of the IPCC control too much of the process. The old adage “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely” applies here. Only a handful of individuals were involved in changing the entire tone of the second assessment. Likewise, Michael Mann was a chapter lead author in the third assessment.

One stark example of how the process has been corrupted involves a U.S. Government scientist who is among the world’s most respected experts on hurricanes—Dr. Christopher Landsea. Earlier this year, Dr. Landsea resigned as a contributing author in the upcoming fourth assessment. His reason was simple—the lead author for the chapter on extreme weather, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, had demonstrated he would pursue a political agenda linking global warming to more severe hurricanes.

Trenberth had spoken at a forum where he was introduced as a lead author and proceeded to forcefully make the link. He has spoken here in the Senate as well, and it is clear that Trenberth’s mind is completely closed on the issue. The only problem is that Trenberth’s views are not widely accepted among the scientific community. As Landsea put it last winter:

All previous and current research in the area of hurricane variability has shown no reliable, long-term trend up in the frequency or intensity of tropical cyclones, either in the Atlantic or any other basin.

When Landsea brought it to the attention of the IPCC, he was told that Trenberth—who as lead author is supposed to bring a neutral, unbiased perspective to his position—would keep his position. Landsea concluded that:

Because of Dr. Trenberth’s pronouncements, the IPCC process on our assessment of these crucial extreme events in our climate system has been subverted and compromised, its neutrality lost.

Landsea’s experience is not unique. Richard Lindzen, a prominent MIT researcher who was a contributing au-

thor to a chapter in the third assessment, among others has said that the Summary did not reflect the chapter he contributed to. But when you examine how the IPCC is structured, is it really so surprising?

Second, the IPCC has demonstrated an unreasoning resistance to accepting constructive critiques of its scientific and economic methods, even in the report itself. Of course, combined with my first point, this is a recipe for delegitimizing the entire endeavor in terms of providing credible information that is useful to policymakers.

Let me offer a few examples of what I am talking about.

Malaria is considered one of the four greatest risks associated with global warming. But the relationship between climate and mosquito populations is highly complex. There are over 3,500 species of mosquito, and all breed, feed, and behave differently. Yet the nine lead authors of the health section in the second assessment had published only six research papers on vector-borne diseases among them.

Dr. Paul Reiter of the Pasteur Institute, a respected entomologist who has spent decades studying mosquito-borne malaria, believes that global warming would have little impact on the spread of malaria. But the IPCC refused to consider his views in its third assessment, and has completely excluded him from contributing to the fourth assessment.

Here is another example: To predict future global warming, the IPCC estimated how much world economies would grow over the next century. They had to somehow tie this into the economic activity. Future increases in carbon dioxide emission estimates are directly tied to growth rates, which in turn drive the global warming predictions.

Unfortunately, the method the IPCC uses to calculate growth rates is wrong. It also contains assumptions that developing nations will experience explosive growth—in some cases, becoming wealthier than the United States. These combine to greatly inflate even its lower-end estimates of future global warming.

The IPCC, however, has bowed to political pressure from the developing countries that refuse to acknowledge the likelihood they will not catch up to the developed world. The result: Future global warming predictions by the IPCC are based on a political choice, not on credible economic methodologies.

Likewise, the IPCC ignored the advice of economists who conclude that, if global warming is real, future generations would have a higher quality of life if societies maximize economic growth and adapt to future warming rather than trying to drastically curb emissions. The IPCC turns a deaf ear.

This problem with the economics led to a full-scale inquiry by the UK’s House of Lords’ Select Committee on Economic Affairs. The ensuing report

should be required reading. The committee identified numerous problems with the IPCC.

In fact, the problems identified were so substantial, it led Lord Nigel Lawson, former Chancellor of the Exchequer and a member of the committee, to recently state—in fact, he was here and testified before the committee I chair here in the Senate—Lord Lawson said:

I believe the IPCC process is so flawed, and the institution, it has to be said, so closed to reason, that it would be far better to thank it for the work it has done, close it down, and transfer all future international collaboration on the issue of climate change. . . .

To regain its credibility, the IPCC must correct its deficiencies in all of the following areas before it releases its fourth assessment report. Structurally, there are four ways we suggest changes be made.

The first is to adopt procedures by which scientific reviewers formally approve both the chapters and the Summary Report for Policymakers. Government delegates should not be part of the approval process.

The second thing is to limit the authority of lead authors and the Chair to introduce changes after approval by the reviewers.

The third is to create an ombudsman for each chapter. These ombudsmen should consult with reviewers who believe valid issues are not being addressed and disseminate a report for reviewers prior to final approval which is made part of the final document.

Fourth is to institute procedures to ensure that an adequate cross-section of qualified scientists wishing to participate in the process is selected based on unbiased criteria. The ombudsmen should review complaints of bias in the selection process.

That is structurally what the IPCC should do.

Now, there are many specific issues that the IPCC must address as well. For instance, the IPCC must ensure that uncertainties in the state of knowledge are clearly expressed in the Summary for Policymakers. When you read the Summary for Policymakers, which is not approved by the scientists and the economists, it does not say anything about the fact that there are doubts in these areas. That should be a part of it.

The IPCC must provide highly defensible ranges of the costs of controlling greenhouse gas emissions. They have to talk about how this is going to be done.

They must defensibly assess the effects of land-use changes in causing observed temperature increases. In other words, there are a lot of things we hear about, we are aware of; that is, the heat island effect that takes place in a lot of the major cities, the various agricultural changes where trees are cut down and crops are planted. These need to be considered.

Fourth is to provide highly defensible ranges of the benefits of global warm-

ing. If we know the cost that is going to be incurred, as we learned in the Wharton econometric survey—that for each family of four in America, it would cost them about \$1,715 a year in the cost of electricity, the cost of fuel; everything just about doubling—then people need to know what kinds of benefits the global warming will produce.

The fifth thing is to examine the costs and benefits of an adaptive strategy versus a mitigation strategy.

Sixth is to adequately examine studies finding a cooling trend of the Continental Antarctic for the last 40 years, as well as increases in the Antarctic ice mass.

Seventh is to adequately explain why the models predict greater warming than has been observed, avoiding the use of selective data sets.

Eighth is to ensure an unbiased assessment of the literature on hurricanes.

Ninth is to ensure adequate review of malaria predictions by a range of specialists in the field, ensuring all views are expressed.

Going back to No. 8, I am reminded every time something happens—it can be a hurricane or a tornado—there is always somebody standing up and saying: Aha, it is due to global warming. It is a level of desperation that I cannot believe people are becoming subjected to.

There are dozens more issues, most of which are as important as the ones I have just raised. Instead of trying to list them all here, I intend to post on my committee's Web site this winter a more exhaustive and detailed list of issues that must be addressed in the fourth assessment.

In conclusion, I quote from an article in *Der Spiegel* by Dr. von Storch and Dr. Nico Stehr, who is with Zeppelin University. They wrote:

Other scientists are succumbing to a form of fanaticism almost reminiscent of the McCarthy era. . . . Silencing dissent and uncertainty for the benefit of a politically worthy cause reduces credibility, because the public is more well-informed than generally assumed. In the long term, the supposedly useful dramatizations achieve exactly the opposite of what they are intended to achieve. If this happens, both science and society will have missed an opportunity.

It is my solemn hope that the IPCC will listen to the words of Dr. von Storch and Dr. Stehr and not miss the opportunity to reestablish its credibility, which I believe is totally lost at this time. Only then will its work product be useful to policymakers. If the IPCC remains committed to its current path, however, then Lord Lawson's solution is the only viable one—the IPCC should be disbanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks not be charged against the time on the CJS appropriations conference report.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, we continue to discuss the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations conference report. We note that our colleague from Illinois wishes to speak, and I yield to Senator OBAMA 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank Senator MIKULSKI.

Mr. President, I know I speak for all Members of the Senate when I say we wholeheartedly support our Nation's law enforcement officers and we want to do every single thing possible to assist their efforts to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately, the Commerce-Justice-Science conference report before this body today does not send this message. In fact, it sends the exact opposite message.

The conference report provides important funding for programs such as the Office on Violence Against Women, the National Science Foundation, and important juvenile justice programs. But I am very troubled by the drastic cuts it makes to an important law enforcement program, the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program.

This bill further eviscerates a program that has suffered significant cuts in the last few years, despite providing real results and benefits around the country. The conference report cuts the Byrne Program from the \$900 million we passed in the Senate to \$416 million, which is a 34-percent cut from the fiscal year 2005 funding level.

Now, in Illinois, these cuts will have an immediate and direct effect because law enforcement has been using Byrne grant funds to fight one of the gravest drug threats facing the Nation today—methamphetamines.

In downstate Illinois, as in other rural communities all across the country, there has been a tremendous surge in the manufacture, trafficking, and use of meth. Illinois State Police encountered 971 meth labs in Illinois in 2003, more than double the number uncovered in 2000.

According to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the quantity of meth seized by the Illinois State Police increased nearly tenfold between 1997 and 2003. This surge is placing enormous burdens on smalltown police forces, which are suddenly being confronted with a large drug trade and the ancillary crimes that accompany that trade.

These police departments rely on Byrne grant funding to participate in meth task forces, such as the Metropolitan Enforcement Group or the Southern Illinois Enforcement Group. These task forces allow police in different communities to combine forces

to battle a regional problem. There are a total of seven meth task force zones in Illinois, and these task forces have seen real results with Byrne grant funding.

In 2004, the Southern Illinois Enforcement Group accounted for more than 27 percent of the State's reported meth lab seizures. This group pays 5 of its 12 agents through Byrne grants.

In towns such as Granite City and Alton, cuts in Byrne grant funding will force them to make difficult choices about how to allocate already scarce police resources. Indeed, the chief of police in Granite City told my staff yesterday that cuts in Byrne grant funding will threaten the viability of his meth task force. At a time when meth use is growing, it is inconceivable to me that we would be cutting the resources needed by law enforcement to fight crime and clean up the streets.

This is yet another example of the misplaced priorities of our country. We all know that we are facing a real budget crisis. The deficit is growing, and we need to enforce some fiscal discipline. But I don't believe we should be balancing the budget on the backs of our Nation's law enforcement officers who keep our families and communities safe each and every day.

I am disappointed by this bill. I hope next year we will be able to find the necessary funding that local law enforcement needs. I would ask those who are on the conference and who are looking at this to recognize that it is going to have an impact not just in Illinois but in rural communities all across the country, particularly farming communities in the Midwest that have been devastated by the plague of meth. This has been primarily a program to help prevent it. It is being cut drastically in this bill. It is a bad decision and reflective of misplaced priorities by this Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Since the war in Iraq began, 2,067 Americans have died; 15,568 have been wounded. Today, I joined my colleagues, Senators LEVIN, BIDEN, HARRY REID, and others, in offering an amendment to honor their sacrifice and service and to seek a new course in Iraq in the coming year. I was proud to cosponsor the Levin amendment. I thought it made three critical policy statements about Iraq.

First, the amendment demanded that the administration provide Congress

and the American people with a plan for success and a timetable with estimated dates for the phased redeployment of American forces. Second, the amendment makes it clear that 2006 will not be just another year on the calendar when it comes to the war in Iraq. The next year represents a critical transition period for Iraq, when a newly elected government, as of this December, will take office and must assume the authority and responsibility that comes with sovereignty. This is the year when Iraqi forces must help create the conditions that will finally lead to the phased redeployment of U.S. troops.

The Levin amendment also stated that the administration had to make it crystal clear to the Iraqi people that we were not in Iraq indefinitely. We are neither permanent occupiers nor are we a permanent police force for the Iraqi people. That is a job for Iraq, not for the United States. Building a broad-based and sustainable political settlement is also essential for defeating the insurgency and it, too, is an Iraqi responsibility, not an American responsibility.

President Bush has said over and over again, as the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down. The amendment we offered asked the basic question, When are they going to have capable forces so that American troops can stand down? How many are standing now? How well is the Iraqi Government doing in defending and caring for its people and training its own military and security forces?

This isn't the first time we have asked these questions. Over 40 of us have asked the President over and over again for a report on this war. Sadly, we are still waiting for an answer, unless you count the reply we received from someone at a lower level in the White House stating that he had received the letter and would send it to the appropriate person to take a look at. That was over a month ago. That is not the answer that Senators were looking for. It is certainly not the answer the American people were looking for. The amendment required answers in an unclassified report because we want the American people to know what is going on in Iraq—the challenges, the progress, and, frankly, if there are contingencies we had not anticipated, let us know that.

What we were seeking to do with this amendment was finally to establish that 2006 will not be just another year. I am hoping that no Senator will stand on the floor a year from now and recount that we have lost hundreds more of our best and bravest in Iraq, thousands more injured, wondering if there is any end in sight.

The amendment made it clear as well that we were holding Iraqis responsible. It is their country. It is their future. They need to take control of their own fate and future with their own security force and a political arrangement that works.

Third, we want accountability from this President. It is not good enough for the President to make speeches about staying the course when the course has led to so many lives being lost, so many dollars being spent. Senators WARNER and FRIST saw our amendment when it was offered. It is interesting because I think what they did is probably a very positive thing. They took the amendment, which we had prepared, and basically made changes on its face. If you take a look at this amendment, this is what we offered. Senators WARNER and FRIST scratched out the names of all the Democratic sponsors and put their own names on there on the Republican side. Then they went through, without even retyping, and made handwritten changes on the Democratic amendment. Some of the changes are innocuous, but some are not.

One of the changes is significant. We made it clear, in language the Iraqis and the American people could understand, what the future course will be. Let me read what Democratic language said:

The United States military forces should not stay in Iraq indefinitely and the people of Iraq should be so advised.

Simple and declarative. The Republican change: They struck the word "indefinitely." Now it reads:

The United States military forces should not stay in Iraq any longer than required and the people of Iraq should be so advised.

That is quite a difference. Our sentence was clear and more decisive. Theirs is ambiguous, leaving open the possibility of American permanent military bases in Iraq, something I hope does not occur. But the most important thing that they did was to delete the last paragraph of this amendment. In the last paragraph, we have asked for President Bush, every 3 months, to report to the American people on scheduled changes in Iraq: How many soldiers were to be trained to replace American soldiers; how many policemen were to be prepared to provide for the defense of and order in their country; what progress is being made when it comes to basic human services, whether it is electricity, water, employment, the guideposts that we use to determine whether we are establishing a civil society, a stable society.

The Republicans accepted most of those, but they did not accept what I consider to be one of the key paragraphs of the Democratic amendment. That said: We expect a report from the President of a campaign plan with estimated dates for the phased redeployment of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq as each condition is met, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may occur.

That was critical because it says to the President and to the administration: Let us start talking now about bringing our soldiers home. We are not setting a date to cut and run, which the critics said, but we are saying to the President: We have to take seriously the 161,000 Americans risking

their lives every single day, and many—sadly, too many—losing their lives and being injured in the process.

It is interesting to me that this morning's news tells us that the Iraqis are now saying to the British: You can start thinking about going home now. That is great. I am glad they can. I am glad that they will return to the safety of their families and their homes. Shouldn't that same conversation be taking place about American troops, and shouldn't the President be telling us that we are going to move forward in a phased, orderly redeployment of our troops back home, as the Iraqis take over responsibility of their own country?

That is what the Democrats offered. That is what the Republicans refused. The vote came down. There were about 40 who voted for the Democratic amendment. Then there was a following vote. That vote is significant. It was a vote on the Warner-Frist amendment, an amendment which was offered to the Defense authorization bill. It is true that it was an amendment which was a cut-and-paste job on the original Democratic amendment. I have in my hand the original amendment and the changes that were made. It didn't go as far as I would like to have gone. It didn't say American troops will not stay in Iraq indefinitely. It didn't talk about the phased redeployment of American forces. But it did say several important things that were included in the original Democratic amendment.

It did say 2006 is a year of significant transition. It did serve notice on the Iraqis that they have to accept responsibility for their own fate and future. And significantly, this Republican amendment called on their President in the White House to report to the American people, on a quarterly basis, as to the progress being made in Iraq so we can monitor whether the President truly has a plan that can lead to success.

That is significant, maybe historic. The President's own party overwhelmingly voted today for this amendment, an amendment which started on the Democratic side but became bipartisan in the end, an amendment which calls on this administration to be held more accountable in terms of this war in Iraq.

Now, the President did something on Veterans Day which is unusual. The President used Veterans Day, of all days, to make a political speech. He criticized the Democrats who were not agreeing with his war policy, on Veterans Day. I can tell you that I was back in my home State of Illinois visiting communities with Veterans Day celebrations in Carlyle, in Flora, and in Paris, IL. It didn't even cross my mind to make a partisan speech. You don't do that on Veterans Day, for goodness' sake. We don't ask our soldiers their political affiliation. We don't designate on their tombstones what political party they belonged to. Soldiers and veterans serve their country regardless of political affiliation.

But the President used Veterans Day to raise a political issue, and then flew to Alaska yesterday and repeated it, saying that his critics are somehow undermining the morale of the troops and showing they don't appreciate the contributions of the troops. Nothing could be further from the truth. Whether you are Democrat or Republican, whether you voted for the war or against it, as I did—I have given this President every single penny he has asked for for our troops. I have always thought in the back of my mind if it were my son or my daughter in uniform, I would want them to have everything they needed to be safe, to come home with their mission truly accomplished. So for the President to suggest that anyone who questions his foreign policy is not respectful of our troops is just plain wrong.

It is up to us as policymakers to make critical decisions about the policy of this country. But we have learned through bitter experience that even if you disagree with the policy of this country, for goodness' sake don't take it out on the troops and, I might say the flip side of that, don't use the troops as a shield so that you don't have to defend your own public policies. This administration has to stand up to defend those policies for what they are.

So this amendment, with some changes, passed. And what does it say? Well, the purpose of the amendment as it passed says to clarify and recommend changes to the policy of the United States on Iraq. It is significant. For those who said stay the course, make no changes, they lost today. For those who wanted change on both sides of the aisle, we prevailed. I think that is important. I think the national dialog is going to change because of this vote. I sincerely hope it is a good-faith effort. I hope it doesn't go into a conference committee and disappear. I hope it is part of the Defense authorization bill ultimately signed by the President.

There is another thing that concerns me as we get into this whole debate, and that is this question about intelligence. You may recall that when we decided to invade Iraq it was not just the decision to invade that country but to change America's foreign policy. The Bush administration, for the first time in our history, said we can no longer afford a policy of defense. We can no longer say to the world, If you attack us, we will attack you back tenfold. We have to be preemptive, have a policy of preemption.

What is the difference? The difference is the President believes we should be prepared to attack countries even before they attack or threaten us. Well, that is a new course in American foreign policy and one which is dangerous. It is dangerous if the information you are receiving about potential threats and potential enemies is wrong. And what happened when it came to the invasion of Iraq? Virtually all of the intelligence was wrong.

It is true we knew Saddam Hussein was a dictator and a butcher and a tyrant, that he had precipitated a war against Iran that went on for years, claiming thousands of lives. We knew that he invaded Kuwait. All of that was part of history. But before the invasion of Iraq we were told by this administration that based on the intelligence that they gathered, there were other compelling reasons for us not to wait for the United Nations, not to wait for other allies, not to wait and exhaust all possibilities but to move decisively and invade.

What were those reasons? Weapons of mass destruction, which we later learned didn't exist; the possibility that Iraq was becoming a nuclear power, as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said, mushroom clouds in the Middle East and around the world from Saddam Hussein's nuclear weapons; the aluminum tube controversy, evidence that they imported aluminum tubes which the administration said was proof positive that they were reinstituting, reconstituting their nuclear weapons program; connections with Saddam Hussein and al-Qaida, Osama bin Laden. It was argued that 9/11 and Iraq were the same story.

All of these were given to us together with the assertion that somehow the Iraqis were importing this yellow cake from Niger in Africa to make nuclear weapons. We were told all these things to reach a high level of intensity and anxiety to lead to an invasion of Iraq. We found after the invasion virtually every single statement was false, was not true.

We analyzed what the intelligence agencies did in the first phase of our investigation and found utter failure. The agencies we most counted on to tell us of threats against America and how we could defend against them completely dropped the ball. I was part of the Senate Intelligence Committee at the time, and I listened as our staff people went over and reported to us about what they found at these intelligence agencies.

In the ordinary course of events, before you invade a country there is a very careful analysis of intelligence data. You just don't start a war without looking at every possibility and understanding information that has been collected.

Well, that National Intelligence Estimate was not even prepared when the administration started talking about the invasion of Iraq. It was ordered, prepared in a manner of 2 or 3 weeks, just a fraction of the time usually required, and when we finally saw it in the Senate Intelligence Committee, it was embarrassing. It was a report given to us which really didn't carefully evaluate the intelligence data that had been collected, and it is one of the reasons we made this colossal error in judgment when it came to evaluating intelligence.

That was the Senate Intelligence Committee investigation. The President has been saying repeatedly that

those who are critical of his decision to invade Iraq today had the same intelligence he had, and so if he made a mistake, they made a mistake, too. I disagree. The President of the United States receives what is known as the daily briefing. Each day he sits down with intelligence officials, including the head of the CIA and others at the highest level, for a briefing about intelligence gathered around the world and what the threat is to America on that given day. He has more information than anyone, as he should, as President, as Commander in Chief. By the time you come to Congress, that information has been filtered and chopped and divided and diced and very little of it makes it to Congress. Most of it comes to the Intelligence Committees. Then it goes to the chairman, ranking member, and then down the chain less information is given to members of the Senate Intelligence Committee and even less to the regular rank-and-file Senators and Congressmen. That is just the food chain, if you will, on intelligence data.

So for the President to suggest that Members of Congress had the same information he did is just not factual. He is given much more information. He was before Iraq; he is every single day given more information. So if Members of the Senate relied on the President's representation, the President's statement, the Vice President's statement, and they were misled into it, it is because they believed the President and Vice President had more information about it than they did.

Now, I sat on the Senate Intelligence Committee shaking my head day in and day out listening as the members of the administration would debate issues like nuclear weapons. This is all unclassified now, but there was a serious disagreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy as to what those aluminum tubes meant. The Department of Energy said: We don't think they have anything to do with nuclear weapons. The Department of Defense said: Oh, yes, they do. And the two of them would have at it in front of us. Then I would walk outside the Intelligence Committee room and hear Vice President CHENEY and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice saying aluminum tubes equal nuclear weapons, and I am thinking to myself: They are not suggesting there is a difference of opinion even in their own administration.

It was frustrating because serving on that Intelligence Committee I could not discuss what was being debated in that room, but I knew in my heart of hearts that many things being told to the American people were just not backed up with sound, concrete evidence, and that is what is at issue here.

We believe the American people deserve the truth, and the truth comes down to this: The Senate Intelligence Committee promised us over 20 months ago that they would do a thorough investigation to see if any elected official

made a statement about the situation in Iraq that could not be substantiated with background intelligence. In other words, did any elected official in this administration, or even in this Congress, deliberately or recklessly mislead the American people?

Is that important? It could not be more important. I cannot think of a greater abuse of power in a democracy than to mislead the people into a war, and to ask the people of a country to offer up the people they love—their sons, their daughters, their husbands, their wives, their friends and their relatives—in defense of the facts.

That is what this investigation is about. We have been waiting 20 months, 20 months for it to take place. I don't know what it will find. There is certainly a lot of questions that need to be asked and answered about statements made by members of the administration. But as of today, we still don't know. We are not certain as to whether that investigation will take place.

I would like to know why, on February 7, 2003, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld told the U.S. troops in Aviano, Italy:

It is unknowable how long that conflict in Iraq will last. It could last 6 days, 6 weeks. I doubt 6 months.

Secretary Rumsfeld, February 2003. That was over 2½ years ago. The Defense Secretary was not just overly optimistic, he was profoundly wrong. His failure to plan for the conflict that could last years and not weeks has had tragic consequences.

On my first visit to Walter Reed Hospital to visit a soldier whose leg had been amputated, who was from an Ohio Guard unit I asked: What happened?

Well, I was in one of those humvees, Senator. It didn't have any armor plating on either side, and one of those homemade bombs went off and blew off my leg.

Were we ready? Did we have a plan to win, to protect that soldier and others? Clearly not. It was not until recently, and all of our findings after 3 years they finally had the armor plating they needed.

On May 1, 2003, that banner on the aircraft carrier proclaimed that the Iraqi mission was accomplished and President Bush landed on the carrier and celebrated the end of the war.

Tragically, at that time the real war was just beginning. Of those Americans who paid with their lives in this war, only 140 were killed during the phase the President called major combat. We have lost almost 2,000 since then. That means 93 percent of our troops who have been killed in Iraq died after Saddam Hussein was overthrown and his army defeated and since that banner was displayed on that aircraft carrier.

Last May, Vice President CHENEY said the Iraqi insurgency was in its death throes. Well, I can tell you, as we see the casualty reports coming from Iraq, it is clear that the insurgency is not in its death throes. I truly wish it

were. Our generals don't agree with that statement. I do not understand what the Vice President used as his basis for making it.

There is one other element I would like to raise which is contemporary, timely, and troubling. For the last week we have had a visit by a foreign Head of State. His name is Ahmed Chalabi. Mr. Chalabi is rather well-known in Washington circles. For years and years he was an Iraqi expatriate who was critical of Saddam Hussein, and he created an Iraqi national congress organization of defectors and those who felt as he did that Hussein should be replaced. That is a good thing. I don't know of anyone who was applauding Hussein in those years, and certainly Chalabi was on the right track in that area.

He ingratiated himself to some of the leaders in this administration, people making policy in this administration, and became, sadly, a source of information. I say "sadly" because we have come to learn that much of the information given by Mr. Chalabi to members of our administration turned out to be just plain wrong.

Ahmed Chalabi helped weave a web of deceit about what turned out to be nonexistent weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. He helped provide the infamous and aptly named source known as "Curveball," who fabricated information about biological weapons labs. This information became a cornerstone, sadly, of Secretary of State Colin Powell's speech and slide show to the United Nations, and it turned out to be all wrong. I suspect that in his decades of distinguished service to the United States there are very few moments that Secretary Powell regrets more than being led into repeating some of these assertions by Ahmed Chalabi and his followers. Chalabi seems to have no such regrets.

I took a look at Mr. Chalabi, who was confronted recently. It was in February of last year, as a matter of fact. He was confronted with the fact that many of the things he told the United States about Iraq turned out to be false, completely false. And here is what they wrote in this article on February 19 of 2004 in the London Telegraph:

Mr. Chalabi, by far the most effective anti-Saddam lobbyist in Washington, shrugged off charges that he deliberately misled U.S. intelligence. "We are heroes in error," he told the Telegraph in Baghdad.

He goes on to say, and I quote Mr. Chalabi:

As far as we're concerned we've been entirely successful. That tyrant Saddam is gone and the Americans are in Baghdad. What was said before is not important. The Bush administration is looking for a scapegoat. We are ready to fall on our swords, if he wants.

Unrepentant, giving bad information to the American Government, which it followed in planning this invasion of Iraq. Ahmed Chalabi, no regrets. He achieved what he wanted to achieve: Saddam Hussein is gone. The Americans are in Baghdad. The fact that the

American people were misled obviously does not trouble him, but it should trouble others.

What about Mr. Chalabi today? He has a title. He is Deputy Prime Minister in Iraq, and he received a hero's welcome from this administration over the last 7 days.

The other part of this story I haven't mentioned is that on May 20 of last year, the Iraqi security forces raided Mr. Chalabi's home in Iraq, seizing documents and other evidence, and charging him with having sold American secrets to Iran, one of the countries in President Bush's axis of evil, a code that could have endangered American troops and American security.

That is a high crime, as far as I am concerned, the kind of thing which no one can excuse or overlook. In fact, the FBI initiated an investigation of Chalabi for selling or giving those secrets to Iran, and twice last week the FBI told us it was a continuing active investigation. It is ironic they told us that while Mr. Chalabi was the toast of the town in Washington, moving from one Cabinet official to another, from Treasury Secretary Snow to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, where he was greeted as warmly as a dignitary from overseas, and then going to visit with Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and finally, of course, with Vice President CHENEY.

This man under active investigation by the FBI was being warmly received as a Head of State in these agencies. Why, one might ask, isn't the FBI doing its job? Why aren't they calling him in for information, whether he sold secrets that could have endangered American lives? Mr. Chalabi is no hero to me. He seems to be one to some members of the Bush administration. This is a man who should not be treated like a hero. He ought to be treated like a suspect. That is what the FBI said he was last week. The fact he is being vetted by high-ranking officials rather than being questioned by the FBI speaks volumes. Mr. Chalabi went on to say when he was asked about this during his visit to Washington:

As far as we're concerned, we have been entirely successful. That tyrant Saddam is gone and Americans are in Baghdad.

He said: Let's look to the future. Let's not look to the past.

I think it is clear, as the New York Times editorial stated on November 10, 2005:

Mr. Chalabi is not just any political opportunist. He more than any other Iraqi is responsible for encouraging the Bush administration to make two disastrous mistakes on the Iraqi intervention. Basing its justification for war on the false premise that Saddam Hussein had active unconventional weapons programs and falsely imagining that the Iraqi people would greet the invasion with undiluted joy.

Even after the invasion when people were beginning to ask where are these weapons of mass destruction, Chalabi insisted the U.S. forces were simply in the wrong places and asking the wrong people.

In spite of all these transgressions, Mr. Chalabi is being warmly received by this administration.

Mr. President, I know Senator STEVENS is on the floor to deliver a eulogy for our former Sergeant at Arms, and in deference to him and his purpose for coming—

Mr. STEVENS. No, I am not going to deliver a eulogy.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will close and give the floor to Senator STEVENS for whatever purpose brings him here.

We believe what happened on the floor of the Senate is significant. We said there must be a change of course in Iraq; we cannot continue. This failed policy brought us to this point. We owe it to our servicemen and their families and the American people to have a plan for success that will bring stability to Iraq on a timely basis, give them responsibility for their own future, and start to bring American troops home.

Our critics say we want to cut and run. No, we want to stop the loss of life by Americans in Iraq. We want to make sure the Iraqis know it is their responsibility for their future.

I certainly believe, as others do, that someone such as Ahmed Chalabi is one of the reasons we made fatal errors in the beginning of this invasion of Iraq. He should not be treated as a hero. I didn't vote for this war. In the fall of 2002 when we were debating use of force, I offered an amendment to defend the United States from an imminent attack by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. That amendment got to the heart of the matter with the intelligence of weapons of mass destruction so cloudy. It would have raised the threshold for war. It failed.

Now we have to move forward making certain that we keep in mind first and foremost our commitment to our troops and our commitment to our mission. This is a historic vote today with the adoption of the Democratic amendment as changed by Senators WARNER and FRIST. I sincerely hope this vote will mean a change in policy to bring our troops home safely.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy. I do intend to attend the ceremony to eulogize the former Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2012 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Republican-controlled time on the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations conference report be reserved for later in the day.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

WAR ON TERROR

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I was just across the way in my office working on several things that I think are important to the country. We were working on a bill to stop the increases in taxes that will occur unless we act immediately. This is another bill that the Democrats are trying to obstruct, but it is critically important that we pass this stop-the-tax-increase bill in order to keep our economy growing and to keep creating jobs in this country.

I was also working in my office, with some of my staff, on some of the things we can do to move this country more toward energy independence. But I kept listening to my distinguished Democrat colleague from Illinois and heard him talking about our President and this war. The more I listened, the more frustrated I became. As a matter of fact, I would have to say I became very angry because what I was hearing was baseless accusations and shameless criticisms, things that were said that I think diminish the Senate as an institution, which I feel must be refuted.

I am afraid that my Democratic colleagues are playing the war on terror similar to a political game. It is a dangerous game that endangers our troops, and it is a dangerous game that the Democrats have played before. Over the last 25 years, terrorist attacks in this country and around the world have increased. During the Clinton administration, Americans were killed in our embassies, on our warships and even in New York City when the World Trade Center was attacked by terrorists. From the Democrats and the Clinton administration, there was a lot of talk, but there was no action. It was all left to the next President to deal with. Instead of dealing with it in a way that would help secure our future, the Clinton administration instead decimated our intelligence network with politically correct ideas that greatly reduced our ability to gather intelligence in difficult places around the world. John Deutsch, President Clinton's Director of the CIA created rules that hurt our intelligence community's ability to gather human intelligence.

Now my Democrat colleagues accuse President Bush of using poor intelligence to do what they said needed to be done before he was even elected President.

In 1998, with President Clinton's leadership, we supported regime change in Iraq. This was something that was determined as a national policy years before President Bush took office. There are some reasons we did this. Saddam Hussein had demonstrated that he was a danger to civilization years before 9/11. He not only attacked Kuwait and tried to assassinate an American President, he committed mass murder all over his country using weapons of mass destruction. He was a deadly killer.

He supported terrorism in other countries. If a terrorist in Israel blew himself up and killed Israelis, the family of that terrorist would receive a check from Saddam Hussein.

To suggest that Iraq was not supporting terrorists is not true. Saddam Hussein, as part of the original gulf war settlement, agreed to document and prove the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction, which he acknowledged he had. But he did not disarm. He did not document the destruction. The inspectors had to play a cat-and-mouse game with him. The world did not know what Saddam Hussein had. Our decimated intelligence network had to guess whether he had them. President Bush made the only decision he could.

Knowing the history of Saddam Hussein, having a national policy that was written by the Democrats to remove him from power, he made a decision to take action instead of talking about it. The justification for removing Saddam Hussein from power happened before President Bush was elected and had been supported by Democrats. But now they come down to the Senate floor and suggest that because the President had some bad information that he rushed us to war. In fact, leaving Saddam Hussein in power would not have been acceptable to any administration that looked at the facts.

This country cannot allow murderous dictators who have attacked our allies, threatened civilians and destabilized the Middle East to stay in power.

Now we have Democrats, whose attitude basically embolden terrorists for a decade during the 1990s by talking but not doing, on the Senate floor attacking our President for doing what we knew had to be done. But this is the Democrat pattern. They say anything, but they do nothing.

We are dealing with a serious energy situation in this country today, but for the last decade they have obstructed any development of our own domestic energy supplies. Now they are on the floor blaming President Bush for the high energy prices, while the President and the Republican Congress have managed, despite the Democratic obstruction, to pass an Energy bill that will move us toward energy independence.

The Democrats are on the floor often complaining about American job losses, but when we try to pass legislation that improves the business climate in this country, they obstruct. They obstructed passing our elimination of junk lawsuits and the elimination of fraudulent bankruptcies. They tried to stop that, voting en bloc against it. But the President and the Republicans have been able to pass that and move us along.

There are a whole list of things that Republicans, with the President's leadership, have done from the Energy bill, to class action and bankruptcy reform. We have passed a budget that reduced the growth in spending. We have passed

a number of things that improve vocational training. There is a huge list.

On the back side of this list is what America needs to know about: The Democrat agenda, of which they have none. The reason they are misleading the American people about our President and the importance of winning the war on terror is they have no agenda. They are not willing to step out and take any leadership on any issue. So all they do is obstruct, attack, distort, and complain with their "do nothing" agenda.

It is hard for some of us, as we try to go about our work, to move America forward and address the difficult problems of today and create more opportunities for tomorrow, when we have to carry a concrete block we call the Democrat Party. But when they go across the line and start misleading America about the importance of this war on terror and treating it akin to some kind of political game, when we and our children and future generations are in danger, as is the rest of the world. As we see almost every day, this war on terror is real—we cannot treat it as some kind of silly political debate where they are trying to give the Commander in Chief of this country a time line as to when our troops need to go home. It is like they have not bothered to go to Iraq themselves and meet with the troops, as I have had the chance to do twice this year, and talk with the generals. The President has met every deadline he set for elections, to approve the constitution, and we are moving exactly as he said we would move, to turn more of the defense of that country over to their military. That is happening. They are opening businesses, schools, and hospitals, and we are helping them along the way. When we get them to the point where they can defend themselves, the President will bring our troops home, but continue to stand firm against terror, wherever it exists around the world.

This is not a game. Terror is a real enemy, and many Americans have already died because we did not take the war on terror seriously. It is time to take it seriously and to stop playing political games with the most important issue of our generation.

I do not think we as a Nation should ever yield to terror or the type of rhetoric we have had to listen to today.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the events this morning, the votes we had prior to our adoption of the Defense Department authorization bill, particularly on the Frist, Warner, and Levin amendments, and try to put this in some context.

First of all, I think we would all agree that our young men and women in uniform who are fighting for freedom's cause in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere are doing a magnificent job, one that they have volunteered to do since we no longer have had the draft. Only people who want to be in our military join our military. Certainly we have nothing but honor and respect for those who put themselves in harm's way in order to make us safer and, beyond that, to engage in the noble cause of delivering the blessings of liberty to those who have known nothing more than the boot heel of a tyrant, as 25 million or so have in Iraq, and those who lived under the Taliban—a similar number—where al-Qaida trained, recruited, and exported its terror in Afghanistan before we were able to turn both of those countries toward the path of democracy and self-determination as peaceful states.

I regret that this war in which we are engaged, the global war on terror, with its central front being in Iraq today, has become such a political football. Unfortunately, we see it is just too tempting a target to partisans, some partisans, to try to engage in revisionist history in order to score political points or, as we have seen this morning, an attempt to impose an arbitrary deadline on the withdrawal of our troops in a way that would jeopardize everything that we have invested in terms of our young men and women, the lives lost, the injuries sustained, and the treasure we have invested in an effort to try to restore Iraq to a self-governing democracy.

I wish to be clear that I am not questioning the patriotism of those who supported this arbitrary timetable for withdrawal in voting for the Levin amendment, but I am questioning their judgment. I think it is simply too important for us to engage in the partisan push and shove here on the floor of the Senate when there is so much at stake. To me it seems clear that a vote on the Levin amendment today was a bipartisan rejection of an artificial timetable for withdrawal.

I have already seen some of the Web sites and even fundraising appeals that have taken place ever since these amendments were voted on. That is the kind of world we live in here in Washington, inside this big fishbowl where politics sometimes overtakes people's common sense or sense of duty. This clearly was not a Democrat victory, to change Iraq policy as some have already suggested, the spin doctors, those who attempt to spin the message of what happens here on the floor for some partisan advantage. I regret that some are attempting to use this message for political gain. This should not

be about whether Republicans have scored points or whether Democrats have scored points. Rather, this should be about our military strategy on the ground in Iraq that is being implemented as we speak to restore Iraq to a self-governing democracy.

How are we doing that? By a three-pronged plan that, No. 1, says we need to train the Iraqis to provide the security necessary so democracy can flourish; No. 2, to build basic infrastructure so the quality of life in Iraq is such that people feel they have a stake in the outcome, the success of this new democracy; and No. 3, to build democratic institutions, beginning with the passage of a constitution on October 15 and now leading up to election of their permanent government on December 15.

The people of Iraq have been through a lot in these last years. They have been through, even since the fall of Saddam, a lot of turmoil since government after government has been created in this transition to permanent self-government. It is a shame, it seems to me, that there are those who would call for an artificial deadline for withdrawal, unfortunately to try to generate public opinion in a way that breaks our resolve and increases the likelihood that we will leave before we get the job done.

I am grateful that a bipartisan majority of the Senate rejected that artificial timetable for withdrawal and made a commitment, as I see it, to stay and get the job done until Iraq gets back on its feet and has a reasonable chance of succeeding as a peaceful and democratic country.

Last week, our country celebrated Veterans Day, last Friday, the day we set aside each year to honor the bravery and the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform who serve our country. I had the chance, as did many of us, to return to my home State. I returned to Texas. I went to a ceremony at the Brazos Valley Veterans Memorial to honor these brave men and women. I have must say, I was struck once again at the great chasm that seems to separate the rest of America from the echo chamber here inside the beltway in Washington, DC. I was reminded of the differences in perception of what it is we are about and the obligation we have to support those men and women in uniform who are fighting for what we believe in. We know they are fighting for what they believe in, and they do so even when the going gets tough. They do not cut and run when it becomes politically expedient to do so.

I had the chance to look across that audience. We had a large collection of World War II vets, people like my dad who flew in the Army Air Corps out of Molesworth, England, flying a B-17. Ultimately he was shot down and captured and spent 4 months in a German prison camp before General Patton and his colleagues came along and liberated him and his fellow POWs. But as I

looked across that audience, I saw people like my dad, a generation that is certainly getting older and unfortunately leaving us at a relatively rapid pace. There were those present who had previously served, and there were some there who currently are serving. There were family members of loved ones who are now overseas and families of those who had paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Although the circumstances differed from person to person there in that audience, they all had several profound things in common. I don't know that I could tell you that every single person at that veterans event was in complete agreement with the decision of this President or this Congress to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein, but what I can tell you is that these people were all patriots. They support our troops 100 percent, and they support the ideals upon which our country was founded 100 percent. They know the contributions of our troops represent the Iraqi people's best hope for freedom and for democracy.

So while there may be some here in Washington—in fact, there are—who, of course, criticize what we are about and armchair generals who want to direct our combatant commanders and those who actually have the responsibility of conducting our national security and national defense operations, I thought it appropriate to point out that even though there are those who dramatically undervalue our efforts in Iraq, there is a huge chasm, it seemed to me, between what I saw there in Bryan-College Station at the Brazos Valley Veterans Memorial Friday night and what I hear argued in the halls of the U.S. Congress, including this morning. I am glad to report the obvious to all of us who live and represent constituencies around the country, that patriotism is alive and well, and our fellow citizens realize that we must continue to support our men and women in uniform in their brave and selfless and noble efforts.

I have come to this Chamber several times during the past few weeks to speak about the situation in Iraq and to do my small part in refuting the false charges by some partisans that the administration has manipulated intelligence in the lead-up to the war. I wish to reiterate my view that we must not let the politics of the moment undermine the path to democracy in Iraq. Such a decision, such yielding to such a temptation would be incredibly shortsighted considering how much has been accomplished in a relatively short period of time and how dear our investment has been, both in terms of the lives lost and the money the American taxpayer has committed to this noble effort. We must stay the course in Iraq.

If our troops were to leave prematurely, what would happen? It is likely that the country would collapse into chaos. Terrorists such as Ayman al-Zawahiri, al-Qaida's No. 2 operative and Osama bin Laden's deputy, and Abu Masab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaida's chief

terrorist in Iraq and the one principally responsible for the terrorist attacks we saw last week in Jordan at the wedding reception that killed other innocent civilians—these are individuals who vowed to destroy America and everyone who stands in their way in their attempt to seize power.

A letter from Zawahiri and Zarqawi makes this threat exceedingly clear. If there is any doubt about who our enemy is and what their goals are—on which there should not be after September 11—all one needs to do is read this letter. It is easily available to anyone who wants to read it. It is found in full on the Web site of the Director of National Intelligence. That is www.dni.gov. In that letter, Zawahiri clearly describes al-Qaida's vision to establish an Islamic caliphate that would rule the Middle East, destroy Israel, and threaten the very existence of our way of life.

The consequences of a United States pullout from Iraq should not be in question, either. In this letter, Zawahiri tells Zarqawi that when the United States leaves Iraq, al-Qaida must be prepared to claim the most political territory possible in the inevitable vacuum of power that would arise.

Yes, that is right; a premature withdrawal of our troops from Iraq would create a safe haven for al-Qaida. Iraq would be more dangerous—not less—if we fail to finish the job. An early arbitrary withdrawal from Iraq would empower and embolden the sworn enemies of America and, indeed, all civilization and anybody who disagreed with them. Failure to stay the course and continuing to lay the foundations of a functioning democracy would result in more—not less—terrorist attacks.

Let me say that again because there are actually some who make the specious argument that our very presence in Iraq results in more terrorist attacks. But the failure to stay the course, the failure to finish the job that we started in Iraq, and to continue to lay the foundations of a functioning democracy, would result in more—not less—terrorist attacks.

This letter from Zawahiri to Zarqawi makes that clear. Once they see America leave Iraq, once they fill the vacuum that exists, that is where they would continue to train, that is where they would continue to recruit, and that is where they would continue to export terror. Anyone who believes there would not be a greater probability of our sustaining another 9/11 on our own soil is kidding themselves.

Some of the administration's critics are now arguing, as we heard this morning, for a timetable to withdraw from Iraq. Their actions are nothing more than an attempt to gain the attention of a concerned nation for political advantage rather than a serious strategy for victory. Armchair generals in Washington, DC, are hardly in a position to know what is the best military strategy in Iraq. We ought to listen to our combatant commanders,

such as General Abizaid, the CENTCOM commander, and General Casey, who is in charge of coalition forces in Iraq. They have told us we have to finish the job, that we can finish the job, that there is no military on the face of the Earth that can defeat the United States of America; that the only one who can defeat the United States of America is the United States itself—by losing our resolve, by prematurely withdrawing, by cutting and running, and leaving the Iraqis to fend for themselves in what would surely descend into chaos.

Our withdrawal from Iraq should be determined by the military commanders on the ground and our Commander in Chief. All of us who have been to Iraq to visit our troops on the ground are confident that over time the 210,000 or so Iraqis who have now been trained to provide security for their own people sooner or later will be able to take this job upon themselves and we can begin to gradually, as circumstances dictate on the ground, bring our troops home.

Do all of us wish our troops could come home sooner rather than later? You bet we do. We want them to come home as soon as we can get them home, consistent with our duty to finish the job we started in Iraq. But we should not under any circumstance impose an arbitrary timetable on our forces, signaling weakness to our enemy, emboldening them to stay with their strategy because it must be working, and we must keep going even though it is tough. Our troops in Iraq are committed to victory.

I mentioned the chasm that separates Washington, DC, and these Chambers from the rest of America when it comes to the perception of what we are about in Iraq and the fight for freedom's cause. There is also a huge difference when you travel to Iraq and talk to our troops. They wonder at some of the news reports and some of the politicalization of what they are about, that they aren't confused about their job, they aren't confused about the nobility of their cause and the importance of what they are about. Our troops in Iraq are committed to victory. I hope our elected officials would show the same resolve here at home.

As every one of our military personnel in Iraq understands, Americans do not cut and run, Americans do not abandon their commitments, and Americans do not abandon their friends.

We must remember that it is in the absence of democracy, in the absence of the rule of law that extremism appears. When the rule of law is implemented, when people have a forum by which to redress their grievances as we do in democratic circumstances, this is when the radical ideologues are stifled and even extinguished.

We have to remember how far the Iraqi people have come in such a relatively short time—from a time when they were ruled by a dictator who

cared nothing for human life and who used weapons of mass destruction on his own people. I have seen, as have others in this body, the mass graves where at last count at least 400,000 Iraqis lie dead because of the ruthlessness of this blood-thirsty dictator. It was only 2 short years ago that the people of Iraq were oppressed by this brutal dictator. Those who privately yearned for freedom kept silent out of fear for their lives and the lives of their family and other loved ones. But that is no longer the case.

We have seen and continue to see that our strategy is working. The Iraqi people will vote in elections next month. I make a prediction that their turnout in these elections will be broad-based, across all the sects in Iraq, and their turnout will exceed the turnout we see in this country in our national elections. We saw that happen with, I believe, the 63-percent turnout in the vote to ratify the Constitution. It now appears that the Sunnis, many of whom boycotted that election, will finally participate in full force in electing their first leaders in a permanent government.

I hope the Members of this body who yield to the temptation to politicize this issue realize their remarks run the real risk of not only dividing Americans but undermining the resolve for the important task we have at hand, and devalue the sacrifice of our brave men and women in uniform and the noble cause they are about.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will not object, but I would amend the unanimous consent request by asking unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS and I have 40 minutes equally divided after the Senator from Kentucky speaks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

CONDEMNATION OF THE AMMAN TERRORIST BOMBINGS BY KING ABDULLAH II OF JORDAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to express my deepest condolences to the families of the innocent victims of the brutal terrorist attacks that occurred in Amman, Jordan, last Wednesday. Homicide bombers, wearing deadly explosives under their clothes, entered three popular and crowded hotels and detonated themselves. Jordanian authorities have determined the attack was the work of al-Qaida.

So far, 57 are thought dead, among them a number of children; many more

are injured. A wedding reception was underway in one of the hotels, and on the day after what should have been the happiest day of their lives, a young Jordanian bride and her groom each had to bury their slain fathers.

I know my colleagues join me in completely condemning the terrorists behind this attack. America will never give in to terrorists and their murder of innocents. Unthinkable evil like that only strengthens our resolve to fight terror and bring those who practice it to justice.

According to our great ally King Abdullah II of Jordan, the targets of these Muslim terrorists were not Americans, but fellow Muslims. The hotels were well known to be frequented by Jordanians and Iraqis.

The terrorists' hope is that by attacking America's allies, like Jordan, they can frighten those countries into abandoning the War on Terror, and divide the grand coalition of free nations who oppose them. That appears to have been the purpose of the Amman attacks.

Well, the terrorists will not get what they want. I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the inspired words of His Majesty King Abdullah, given shortly after the terrorists struck. Before this bombing, King Abdullah was America's steadfast partner in the War on Terror. Today, if possible, he stands even more aligned with our effort to fight terror.

King Abdullah and the Jordanian people will not be swayed by the terrorists.

In fact, we saw the demonstrators in the streets of Jordan—not against the King but against the terrorists.

The day after the bombings, the King declared: "We will not be intimidated into altering our position, nor will we abandon our convictions or forfeit our role in the fight against terrorism in all its forms." He continued, "To the contrary, every act of terrorism strengthens our resolve to adhere to our convictions, and to confront, with all the means at our disposal, those who seek to undermine the security and stability of this country."

We all applaud King Abdullah for his strength and commitment to this fight. He refuses to bend to fear. His vision of a Jordan that rejects terror strengthens the will of every Jordanian, even those who emerged bloody and scarred from these atrocious attacks, to see this struggle through.

King Abdullah also deserves praise for his message that Islam is a religion of peace, and that the terrorists are not protectors of the Muslim faith but defilers of it. He is one of the world's foremost voices for moderation and tolerance in Islam. He understands that the War on Terror is not a war between America and Islam, as some of the most radical terrorists try to paint it, but actually a war between a small, fringe faction of violent extremists on one hand and a coalition of all freedom-loving peoples, Muslim, Christian,