

Another example is the advanced computing program, the use of which this budget continues to underfund.

The budget for the engineering campaign, which develops capabilities to improve the safety and reliability of the stockpile, is kept at the fiscal year 2009 level, which is a reduction from the fiscal year 2008 level. Again, between fiscal year 2011-2014, the engineering campaign budget is cut, and it is cut more significantly than the science campaign budget.

The effect of the administration's budget is to continue, and even accelerate, the brain drain at the labs.

The Commission is not alone in warning about the effects of this brain drain.

The recent Los Angeles Times article was based off of, in part, a recent GAO study that pointed out that the lifetime extension programs on the W-76 and the B-61 were in some cases affected by the fact that we have forgotten some of the key processes involved in building our nuclear weapons.

The administration would also be wise to consider that there was bipartisan consensus on every aspect of the Commission's report save one, the CTBT.

The administration has said that it intends to push hard to get the Senate to ratify this treaty, even though the Senate has already rejected it once, by a significant margin.

I know of no information that suggests that the matters that led the Senate to reject the treaty have changed for the better. In some respects, like the deteriorating condition of our strategic deterrent, they have gotten worse.

Lastly, it is worth pointing out that the Commission articulated real dangers from nuclear terrorism and the "tipping point" of a proliferation cascade on which we are now perilously perched thanks to the impotent response of the world community to the illegal Iranian and North Korean nuclear weapons programs.

The President also recognized this threat in recent remarks in Prague when he stated: "in a strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of a nuclear attack has gone up."

I think that is exactly right.

My concern is the initial steps the President has chosen to deal with this threat, the threat also identified by the Commission, are not at all tailored to provide a solution to these grave threats.

It is important to ensure the verification measures of START do not expire, but that treaty would not deal with the threat of terrorists obtaining nuclear weapons technology or material.

Likewise, CTBT, a bad idea shrouded in good intentions, would not even be capable of detecting political tantrums like the North Korean test, even when the international monitoring system is told where and when to look.

Yet, these are the measures the administration has chosen to spend its capital on.

I urge the administration to look for areas to work with the Congress: globalizing the Nunn-Lugar program, dealing with the threat posed by the spread of civilian nuclear technology, strengthening our nuclear intelligence, attribution and forensic capabilities to name a few.

Mr. President, the Commission on the Strategic Posture, led by two of our most esteemed experts on U.S. national security, has just completed more than a year-long review of the role that nuclear weapons play in our national security.

The 12 Commissioners have done what no one thought was possible: they have found a bipartisan consensus.

They have presented their findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

It now becomes our turn, the elected political leaders, to take the fruit of the Commission's labor and move forward on the necessary and long overdue steps these experts have deemed necessary, regardless of party affiliation, to protect the American people.

GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, finally, I wish to refer to a debate that occurred on the floor, I believe it was last Thursday, following remarks of the distinguished minority leader and concerning remarks made by the assistant majority leader. This has to do with Guantanamo Bay, the prison there, and the people whom we have kept in prison there.

I want to specifically address the chorus of false claims and insinuations about that facility, noting it has grown louder, in tandem, I suspect, with growing American opposition to closing the facility and bringing the terrorists to U.S. soil.

A majority of Americans now oppose the closure of Guantanamo. This is according to a USA Today poll of June 2. This is by a margin of 2 to 1. Many of the arguments we have heard recently to dissuade them, frankly, give off more heat than light.

My friend and colleague, the majority whip, recently gave a speech in which he claimed arguments opposing the closure of the prison at Guantanamo made by Senator MCCONNELL and others are "based on fear." I contend these arguments are based on concerns about both the safety of Americans and the logistical obstacles to closing the facility.

Last month, before the House Judiciary Committee, FBI Director Robert Mueller testified that transferring the remaining Guantanamo detainees to U.S. prisons—even maximum security prisons—would entail serious security risks. He said this: "The concerns we have about individuals who may support terrorism being in the United States run from concerns about pro-

viding financing, radicalizing others," as well as "the potential for individuals undertaking attacks in the United States."

The Guantanamo facility is separated from American communities. It is well protected from the threat of a terrorist attack. No one has ever escaped from Guantanamo.

Why should we feel pressure to support President Obama's arbitrary deadline to close the facility when the administration has yet to offer a plan about where to relocate the terrorists and where, I would submit, a case has not been made for closing this facility and locating those prisoners elsewhere? In fact, other countries have told us they do not want them, with the exception of France, which offered to take one prisoner. And a new June 2 USA Today poll, which I talked about before, shows that Americans, by a measure of 3 to 1, reject bringing those terrorists to the United States.

In his speech, Senator DURBIN also made reference to the "torture of prisoners held by the United States" and the "treatment of some prisoners at Guantanamo."

Regarding the treatment of Guantanamo detainees, I think the record needs to reflect the following: The living conditions at the facility are safe and humane. This is a \$200 million state-of-the-art facility that meets or exceeds standards of modern prison facilities. Following his February tour of Guantanamo, Attorney General Holder said:

I did not witness any mistreatment of prisoners. I think, to the contrary, what I saw was a very conscious attempt by these guards to conduct themselves in an appropriate way.

Numerous international delegations and government officials from dozens of countries have likewise visited the facility. During a 2006 inspection by the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe, a Belgian representative said:

At the level of the detention facilities, it is a model prison, where people are better treated than in Belgian prisons.

Detainees get to exercise regularly, receive culturally and religiously appropriate meals three times a day, and access to mail and a library. Additionally, the International Committee of the Red Cross has unfettered access to the detainees. They have met all detainees in private sessions and routinely consult with the United States on its detention operations.

The facility provides outstanding medical care to every detainee. In 2005, the military completed a new camp hospital to treat detainees, who have now received hundreds of surgeries and thousands of dental procedures and vaccinations. So this idea that the prisoners are treated badly is patently false.

The insinuation—directly or indirectly—that torture has occurred at

Guantanamo must stop. Torture is illegal. It was never permitted at Guantanamo. And torture has never been sanctioned by the United States.

In discussions about torture, we have heard a lot of rhetoric that attempts to draw a straight line between what happened at Abu Ghraib and the legal, enhanced interrogations at Guantanamo. But let's be clear about the distinction: At Abu Ghraib, a few brutal prison guards abused inmates. In doing so, they violated American law and military regulations. And for that they rightly received Army justice.

The methods of legal interrogation used at Guantanamo, which have wrongly been characterized by some as "torture," were used on a few of the most hardened terrorists after all other efforts failed.

At Guantanamo, all credible allegations of detainee abuse are investigated, and the military has not hesitated to prosecute or discipline any guards who violate those standards, regardless of provocation.

Navy RADM Mark Buzby, commander of the Joint Task Force at Guantanamo, said, in 2007, the facility's practices have been in keeping with DOD policies:

We tend to get wrapped up in the greater discussion of detainees down here with those detained elsewhere. There have been many, many investigations conducted of the conditions in Guantanamo . . . and they found no deviations from standing DOD policies.

"No deviations from standing DOD policies."

Then there is the idea that has been floated by the President, Senator DURBIN, and others that keeping Guantanamo Bay open serves as a "recruitment tool" for al-Qaida. By this logic, our fight against the Taliban or our targeted airstrikes against terrorists in Pakistan could be dubbed "recruitment tools" for al-Qaida, since both policies involve planting U.S. forces in Muslim nations to fight jihadists.

This "recruitment tool" idea is the latest incarnation of what Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick dubbed the "blame America first" mentality. It makes excuses for the terrorists and heaps scorn on the United States for fighting back.

Recall that al-Qaida was swelling its ranks throughout the 1990s—before the war on terror and well before the prison at Guantanamo Bay was even created. During that decade, it struck the World Trade Center, the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, and the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Then, in October 2000, it attacked the USS *Cole* off the coast of Yemen.

So by the time the 19 hijackers boarded the four planes that crashed on September 11, 2001, al-Qaida had already identified numerous grievances with America, including its contempt for Western culture, equal rights for women and men, and our support for free speech and the exchange of ideas.

I have sent a letter to the National Security Advisor asking for evidence that keeping Guantanamo Bay open

has created more terrorists than the facility has housed. That was a statement that President Obama made, that the existence of the Guantanamo prison has created more terrorists than the facility has housed. It is an incredible assertion, but it is at the foundation of his claim that we need to close Guantanamo because somehow it represents a valid symbol of American torture or oppression that hurts our efforts abroad. Anything we do is going to cause recruitment of terrorists who hate us. Whether we close Guantanamo or not, the terrorists will still have plenty of reasons to recruit fellow jihadists. I wish to ask again, today, that the administration provide us with the information that backs up the President's claim on this issue.

Ultimately, the debate over Guantanamo has become a debate over geography. Both the new Attorney General and the new Solicitor General have endorsed the government's right to detain suspected terrorists indefinitely. That is correct. Whether we detain them at Guantanamo or at prisons on U.S. soil does not change the fundamental reality that this administration, like its predecessor, will be holding certain individuals without trial.

We have been told that Guantanamo must be closed for symbolic reasons. But America should never make national security decisions based on symbolism or false moral arguments.

I hope as we continue to debate this issue of the prison at Guantanamo, and as the President has been asked to provide a plan for how that base would be closed, and how much it would cost, and as he continues to ask Congress to provide the funding to carry out that plan, we keep in mind these critical points.

The first is you cannot legitimately make the argument that anything has occurred at Guantanamo for which the United States should be embarrassed, should apologize, or should, at the end of the day, close the facility because of some embarrassment that the United States has about our activities there.

Our soldiers who are involved in protecting our interests by guarding those terrorists, the medical personnel, and all of the others who are involved, have done a job which, frankly, we should be thankful for. And rather than slapping them in the face and insinuating they have done something wrong—which makes us have to close that prison down—is a terrible indictment on the military men and women who have worked hard to do their very best at that facility and, as I pointed out, have in all respects conducted themselves in accordance with Army procedures.

At the end of the day, you cannot lie prostrate at the feet of your enemies—in this case, the terrorists—and say: We are sorry that we do some things to offend you, we will stop doing those, and then maybe you will no longer be offended. To suggest that will cause them to no longer recruit colleagues and plan attacks against us is fantasy.

Therefore, I challenge the administration again: Supply the facts on which the President made the allegation that the existence of Guantanamo created more terrorists than have ever been housed there. It is a palpably false statement, and he should not be able to argue to the American people and to the Congress, from which he is requesting money, that we have to give money to shut down Guantanamo because of that false fact. I urge my colleagues, as we continue to debate this issue, to challenge the administration to provide that information to us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"CAR CZAR" AWARD

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here to present the "Car Czar" award for Monday, June 8, 2009. It is a service to taxpayers from America's newest automotive headquarters: Washington, DC.

This is the first in a series of "Car Czar" awards to be conferred upon Washington meddlers who distinguish themselves by making it harder for the auto companies your government owns to compete in the world marketplace.

Today's "Car Czar" award goes to Congressman BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts for interfering in the operation of General Motors. Congressman FRANK is chairman of the Financial Services Committee of the House of Representatives. One might call it the "House Bailout Committee." Congressman FRANK's phone call to General Motors always is likely to be returned since the U.S. Treasury recently purchased 60 percent of GM and 8 percent of Chrysler with \$62 billion of your tax dollars.

According to the June 5 Wall Street Journal:

The latest self-appointed car czar is Massachusetts's own Barney Frank, who intervened this week to save a GM distribution center in Norton, Mass. The warehouse, which employs some 90 people, was slated for closing by the end of the year under GM's restructuring plan. But Mr. FRANK put in a call to GM CEO Fritz Henderson and secured a new lease on life for the facility.

The Congressman's spokesman said that Mr. FRANK was "just doing what any other Congressman would do" in looking out for the interests of his constituency—precisely the reason for these "Car Czar" awards. As the journal put it:

. . . that's the problem with industrial policy and government control of American business. In Washington, every Member of Congress now thinks he's a czar who can call ol' Fritz and tell him how to make cars.