

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the failure of the United Nations. The U.N. is failing to promote liberty, democracy, and human rights for all citizens.

The world has changed a great deal since the United Nations was formed some 59 years ago. The dangers of Nazism and communism have been replaced by an ever-evolving, ever-increasing threat of terrorism.

The United Nations is not up to the challenges of this new century. The U.N. now has sponsors of terrorism and repression overseeing the protection of human rights around the world. The countries of Sudan, China, and Cuba currently serve as members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Yesterday, the United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, lectured the world body that the rule of law in Iraq is being disrupted as much by the United States as by the terrorists who ravage the country through bombings and beheadings.

Any person or group who cannot decipher the moral difference in this struggle against terror and repression cannot and should not be trusted to lead. In a BBC interview last week, the Secretary General stated that the liberation of Iraq by the United States and its coalition partners was illegal and a violation of the U.N. Charter. This declaration comes on the heels of his earlier statement that "there should have been a second resolution" authorizing the invasion.

Today, Mr. Annan seems to be saying that the only way force can be used legitimately in the modern world is to first obtain the unanimous permission of the U.N. Security Council.

I am pleased President Bush does not adhere to this line of thinking. And I am proud every time I hear him say that he will never wait for permission to defend the United States.

The Secretary General's latest posturing is far from harmless. The U.N. has been given the lead role in organizing the elections in Iraq in January. But Mr. Annan's comments that we have acted illegally in Iraq, comments which have been replayed across the Arab world, have given an added feeling of legitimacy to every jihadist hoping to disrupt the vote.

I believe the U.N. has lost its way. It has ceased to be able to judge the difference between right and wrong. The Secretary General's speech to the General Assembly yesterday illustrated his belief that there is a moral equivalence between the terrorists and those who are fighting them. That is disturbing, and that is wrong.

However, the Secretary General is not alone in expressing it. It is extremely disturbing that a former United Nations official, Anna Di Lellio, has been named as the Director of Communications for the Volcker panel, a supposedly independent panel investigating the Oil For Food scandal. Why

is this so disturbing? Because Ms. Di Lellio has compared President Bush and key U.S. ally, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, to Osama bin Laden. This shows, again, how the United Nations is failing in the essential tasks for which it is responsible.

There is a difference between right and wrong. And words do have consequences.

I also want to read a quote the Democratic nominee made yesterday. It is in the Washington Post today. It says:

Kerry did not directly answer a question about whether he agrees with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, who called the Iraq war illegal. "I don't know what the law or legalities are," Kerry said.

The U.N. Secretary General says the Iraq war is illegal because the United States didn't have United Nations' Security Council approval.

And JOHN KERRY can't give a clear answer that the United Nations Secretary General is wrong? This is a person running for the President of the United States.

Increasingly, the United Nations does not advocate the interests of those pursuing peace, freedom, and democracy in the world. If the United Nations spent more time working for liberty and less time coddling dictators, the world would be a better place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to help frame the issue in Iraq. The American people deserve straight forward answers on issues of war and national security; especially when their lives are directly threatened and our military forces are engaged around the world in the war on terrorism. And it is not just our military forces that are at risk; our diplomats, intelligence professionals, and ordinary civilians working in war zones all face enormous danger from a very treacherous and barbaric enemy.

The recent, brutally grotesque beheadings of innocent Americans Eugene Armstrong on Monday and Jack Hensley yesterday are just two of many examples of the kind of evil that we face and why it must be eradicated.

Ambiguity is something we probably should expect in a heated political campaign, but anything less than total candor on national security issues is not acceptable.

The junior senator from Massachusetts has accused President Bush of "colossal failures of judgment" on his plan for Iraq. He then went on to lay out his own four-point plan for handling the conflict in Iraq. His four points were, No. 1, to get more help from other nations; No. 2, provide better training for Iraqi security forces; No. 3, provide benefits to the Iraqi people; and No. 4, ensure democratic elections can be held next year as promised.

I have no problem with this plan, because it is the short term and long term plan now in place by the Bush administration. Our President has consistently and assiduously worked with our allies to get more help in Iraq.

Sure, we would like to get more countries on board with us, but this is tough business and it takes bold, visionary leadership—like we see in Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, and dozens of our closest allies. To imply, as some of my colleagues have, that the United States is not getting help from our international friends is simply untrue. As terrorism spreads to other countries, as it did recently in Russia, we should expect—and provide—even more help.

And let me point out the obvious about some allies, like France, who have not been supportive of our policies in Iraq. Their foreign policy decisions are based on internal political considerations and not on the personality of the President of the United States. For some of my colleagues to imply that some countries will change their policies toward Iraq if we change our President is ludicrous and misleading. The French will change their foreign policy when they change their President, not when we change ours. I have a great deal of trust and confidence in the common sense of the American people and I am sure they will understand exactly what I am saying.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts has also called for better training for Iraqi security forces. I am glad that he also agrees with President Bush on this point. Training Iraqi security forces is a high priority of this administration.

Let us look at the facts. The Iraqi Army has more than 62,000 members. Of these, almost 46,000 have been trained and another 16,000 are currently in training. All 27 battalions of the Iraqi Army will be operational by January 2005.

Speaking at New York University recently, the Democratic Presidential candidate said, "Of the 35,000 police now in uniform, not one, not one, has completed a 24-week field training program." Just yesterday, however, The Washington Post reported that the head of strategic plans and policy for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lt. Gen. Walter Sharp, said that Kerry's accusation was just not accurate. According to Gen. Sharp, who is in a position to know, basic training for new Iraqi police officers is eight weeks, followed by 26 weeks of "on-the-job" field training. The Post article went on to say that Gen. Casey, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, estimates that Iraqi security forces will be in 'local control' of the majority of Iraq by the end of December, which is just 3 months away. Gen. Casey defined 'local control' as a combination of having Iraqi security forces in place, plus an assessment of the ability of local political leaders to govern

and to manage economic reconstruction efforts.

Others have criticized the President for not getting NATO involved in Iraq. Too bad they didn't read yesterday's London Financial Times. If they had, they would have read that, "NATO is close to a deal to establish a military training academy in Iraq. The academy, which would have a staff of about 300, is intended to give substance to a decision by a NATO summit in June to provide training to the war-torn country as it seeks to build up its institutions." I hasten to add, that this NATO initiative was put forward by our President. So getting NATO involved is another area where the Democratic Presidential candidate agrees with the administration's policy in Iraq. Let me also add that 15 of 26 NATO member states are sharing the military burden on the ground with us in Iraq.

Charles Colton's famous quotation, "Imitation is the sincerest of flattery," certainly applies to my colleague, Mr. KERRY. His four-point plan is not new and it certainly is not original. A careful review of President Bush's policies in Iraq clearly shows that the administration has been implementing all the points addressed by Senator KERRY well before he even articulated them.

We need to judge the President's policy in Iraq, not by the rhetoric of his detractors, but by those who know the facts. Tomorrow, the Congress will welcome, in Joint-Session, the interim Prime Minister of Iraq, Dr. Allawi. Let us hear from him how things are going in Iraq. Let us listen to him to find out what the Iraqi people think of our policies and programs for restoring security and getting the Iraqi economy going.

Let me close by quoting from President Bush's speech, which he gave at the UN yesterday. I believe it clearly shows why we are in Iraq, something that others do not seem to grasp. The President said:

Our security is not merely found in spheres of influence, or some balance of power. The security of our world is found in the advancing rights of mankind. These rights are advancing across the world—and across the world, the enemies of human rights are responding with violence. Terrorists and their allies believe the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the American Bill of Rights, and every charter of liberty ever written, are lies, to be burned and destroyed and forgotten.

He went on to say:

We are determined to destroy terror networks wherever they operate, and the United States is grateful to every nation that is helping to seize terrorist assets, track down their operatives, and disrupt their plans.

The Acting Secretary of the Army, Les Brownlee, has eloquently framed why Iraq is important in the war on terrorism when he said:

This is not simply a fight against terror—terror is a tactic. This is not simply a fight against al Qaeda, its affiliates and adherents—they are foot soldiers. This is not simply a fight to bring democracy to the Middle East—that is a strategic objective. This is a

fight for the very ideas at the foundation of our society, the way of life those ideas enable, and the freedoms we enjoy.

Thank you Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is said that politics is the art of the possible. And while certain things are simply not possible, it is our duty to try all the same.

So today, I will try to explain the unexplainable. The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has made so many statements on this country's involvement in Iraq that he has taken every conceivable position possible, and many that are simply not possible. The result is a record of "dizzying contradictions," as Charles Krauthammer recently wrote, so confusing that the more he speaks, the less we understand.

Mr. President, JOHN KERRY has spoken on so many aspects of the liberation of Iraq. He has been on both sides of just about every coin in this entire debate. I want to address just four different positions he has taken.

What is more disturbing is that he has taken these four positions on the most basic question of the liberation of that country. The question is not nearly as difficult as the multiple answers we continue to get.

The question is: Would you have used force to remove Saddam Hussein?

Back in 2002, the answer was clear enough. Citing Saddam Hussein's use of weapons of mass destruction, his terrorist-like actions, and the fact that he was part of a global scourge of terrorism, Senator KERRY said he completely agreed with the President to effect regime change in Iraq, unilaterally if necessary. So he voted for the Iraq war resolution in October of 2002. Support in October of 2002.

Nine months later, Senator KERRY started to use another answer. He now claimed that the war resolution he supported in October 2002 did not empower the President to engage in regime change.

By January of 2004, around the time of the Iowa caucuses, Senator KERRY had a new position. He was now the "antiwar candidate." In January of 2004, he was now the antiwar candidate, campaigning in the Iowa caucuses, having been, in October 2002, entirely supportive of the war.

He then went on to lock up the Democratic nomination for President. So we are into the general election season, Mr. President. When challenged by the President to answer whether he would have gone into Iraq and removed Saddam Hussein based on what we now know, KERRY stood on the edge of the Grand Canyon—a dramatic pose facing the Grand Canyon—and said on August 11:

Yes, I would have voted for that authority.

In August of 2004, in the general election, he seems to be back where he was in October of 2002. He has gone from support to oppose and back to support.

But that was last month. A week ago, on the "Imus in the Morning" show, Senator KERRY was asked:

Do you think there are any circumstances we should have gone to war in Iraq?

That is a pretty simple question. Here was Senator KERRY's response:

Not under the current circumstances, no. There are none that I see.

This was last week. A month ago, he was in support of the war, but last week he was back in opposition to the war. He says:

I voted based on weapons of mass destruction. The President distorted that, and I've said that. I mean, look, I can't be clearer. But I think it was the right vote based on what Saddam Hussein had done, and I think it was the right thing to do to hold him accountable. I've said a hundred times, there was a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it. The President chose the wrong way. Can't be more direct than that.

Let's try this one more time. Senator KERRY, on the "Imus" show last week, said, in answer to the question:

Do you think there are any circumstances we should have gone to war in Iraq?

He said:

Not under the current circumstances, no. There are none that I see. I voted based on weapons of mass destruction. The President distorted that, and I've said that. I mean, look, I can't be clearer. But I think it was the right vote based on what Saddam Hussein had done, and I think it was the right thing to do to hold him accountable. I've said a hundred times, there was a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it. The President chose the wrong way. Can't be more direct than that.

When KERRY finished his interview with Imus, here is what Imus had to say about it. Don Imus said:

I asked him a number of questions about Iraq and I can't tell you what he said.

That was Don Imus' summary of JOHN KERRY's position on Iraq on his program last week.

Well, Mr. Imus, you are not alone. The top ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BIDEN, recently stated:

I don't think John should go back and try to explain accurate statements that are unexplainable.

That is our colleague in the Senate, an enthusiastic supporter of Senator KERRY. He said why try to explain the unexplainable, referring to Senator KERRY's various positions on Iraq.

We could all use clarity from JOHN KERRY with regard to Iraq's liberation, but none more than Prime Minister Ayad Allawi, who will be here among us addressing Congress tomorrow morning. Dealing with the terrorists and Baathist insurgents, he needs, more than anyone, to know that the U.S. position of supporting the liberty of Iraq is clear, unequivocal, and steadfast. He would not get that from reading JOHN KERRY's numerous positions.

Mr. President, a Senator's position on Iraq should not be all that hard to explain because it is not a complicated question. It is, however, a tough question, representative of the sort of tough issue any Commander in Chief

frequently gets. In trying to answer and re-answer the most important issue of this election, central to the struggle for freedom today and tomorrow, we have a Presidential candidate who constantly changes his mind. This is not some little issue; this is the biggest issue confronting the country today. We are 6 weeks from the election, and this is a man who flip-flops like a fish on the deck of a boat, back and forth, back and forth, who doesn't know where he stands on the most important issue we are confronting in our era.

For example, when asked if he would have gone into Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein, KERRY recently answered:

You bet, we might have.

Let me read that one more time. When asked if he would have gone into Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein, KERRY recently said:

You bet, we might have.

Not exactly Winston Churchill. Perhaps there is some nuance here, such as an exclamation point or a question mark, that tells whether this is a declaration or a question, but the answer to the most critical issue in this election should not leave the world wondering and more confused than before.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

HURRICANE DEVASTATION

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, so many States have been devastated this hurricane season. My own home State of North Carolina has been ravaged by the effects of not one, but four hurricanes in the last few weeks.

Most recently, western North Carolina suffered extensive damage caused by the torrential wind and rain of Hurricane Ivan. Initial estimates from the storm's destruction in Buncombe County alone are already topping \$100 million. Sadly, this same county had already projected that exact amount in damages following Hurricane Frances.

Counties in western North Carolina had barely begun to recover from the flooding of Frances before Ivan roared through town late last week. The death toll from the storm, so far, is 10 people. In the town of Henderson, a man and his wife were sleeping soundly when a huge tree crashed through their house into their bedroom. The husband was pinned beneath the fallen tree, which ultimately took his life as the home had to be stabilized before the tree could be removed. In the Peeks Creek community in southern Macon County, a landslide sent homes crashing against each other, killing at least four people, including an unborn child whose mother was forced to have a leg amputated and remains in critical condition.

Houses have literally been washed away, and some left standing have been split in two by fallen trees. Main roads and neighborhood streets have been

shut down from landslides and pavements giving way. Well over 200,000 residents were left without power over the weekend. Needless to say, it will take time before western North Carolina can return to a sense of normalcy.

I have been down to the devastated areas twice over the past two weeks. While my heart broke at the sight of destroyed homes and washed out roadways, my hopes were buoyed by the goodness of neighbor helping neighbor. It was an image played out all over the towns I visited. Local officials and first responders, some from as far as Raleigh and Charlotte, have done—and continue to do—a phenomenal job in the midst of challenging circumstances.

I think of the heroic efforts of families like Aileen and Glenn Holland. They are not strangers to offering aide after a natural disaster. Long time volunteers through the North Carolina Baptists Men Disaster Relief, they have traveled all over the United States. But last weekend, they didn't have to travel anywhere. The destruction came right to their front door. Fifteen homes were annihilated in Macon County, but the Holland's was left standing. When they heard the screams of neighbors, Aileen and Glenn began taking people in. They even found a toddler covered in mud crying from fear. The Hollands remained in their home, providing shelter for friends and family until fellow volunteers from the Baptist Men Disaster Relief arrived on the scene.

I also applaud the efforts of local churches, nonprofits, and groups such as the Red Cross for the helping hands they're extending all over western North Carolina. I had the chance to stop in and thank the volunteers at the Red Cross Shelter in Henderson County. I was touched to see the families finding refuge and reassurance there.

These are the memories I will keep with me as I think back on the far-reaching effects from this hurricane season. Yes, there is destruction. Yes, there is great pain. But I find encouragement in the selfless hearts of North Carolinians who are going to great lengths to help those struggling through the wreckage left behind.

It is my desire that we, too, can add to that goodwill and deliver the financial aide these areas need to get back on their feet. Fifteen Western North Carolina counties have been declared federal disaster areas, including Buncombe, Haywood, Henderson and Macon. This designation means that homeowners and businesses are eligible for assistance in the form of loans or grants from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA or the Small Business Administration. There is a \$60 million request for North Carolina included in the President's emergency budget. We're obviously going to need much more. I would encourage Congress to expedite this aid to those who need it most.

I can only hope the end of this devastating hurricane season comes quick-

ly. The autumn season makes western North Carolina one of the most beautiful places on earth—and the good folks from the mountains are well suited to give some southern hospitality to visitors from around the country. It is important that we get the word out that this magnificent part of the country is open for business during its prime tourism season. My thoughts and my prayers are with every person touched by these hurricanes, not only North Carolina but throughout the southeast and east coast. May God bless each and every one of them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate, as we move toward the end of our session, to take a look at those issues that are before us that are most important. Certainly, we have had a difficult 4 years. Unusual and difficult events have happened which have been very hard to deal with, and they have made this a challenging and difficult time for all of us.

We had an economic downturn starting before the beginning of this 4 years. So we have taken steps to develop and strengthen the economy, which is still a job before us. However, we are making good progress, I believe, with respect to that issue.

We had September 11, which is a tragedy we will all always remember. And then, as a part of and following that tragedy, we have had the war on terrorism.

Certainly one has to understand that we have had a tough time. I think we have done rather well moving through this kind of a background and dealing with this situation that is very unusual.

We continue to face tough decisions and the followup on those decisions. We have made an excellent start in the economy. We have made an excellent start in the war on terrorism and, indeed, are moving forward in that regard. We are faced with responsibilities and issues that have an impact on the movement we are seeking. It is up to us to deal with those issues.

In the short term, we are dealing with the budget, appropriations—those items having to do with spending. One of the impacts of what has happened is a spending deficit. All of us, I think, would agree that under the circumstances, it was a reasonable and necessary thing to do. Most of us understand it is time we begin to do away with that deficit and get back to a balanced budget, about which I certainly feel strongly.

We are going to be faced as well with the reorganization of our intelligence-gathering situation. Today, we will be faced with a new Director of the CIA, which is a place to begin. Obviously, there need to be some changes there.