

Vice President Bush Casting An "Yea" Vote, 9/22/87, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2355, CQ Vote #124: Motion Agreed To 66-29: R 38-6; D 28-23, 5/11/88, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2355, CQ Vote #125: Motion Agreed To 50-46: R 38-7; D 12-39, 5/11/88, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2355, CQ Vote #126: Motion Rejected 47-50: R 38-6; D 9-44, 5/11/88, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2355, CQ Vote #128: Motion Rejected 48-50: R 6-39; D 42-11, 5/11/88, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 2355, CQ Vote #136: Motion Agreed To 56-37: R 9-34; D 47-3, 5/13/88, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 2355, CQ Vote #137: Motion Agreed To 51-43: R 38-5; D 13-38, 5/13/88, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 4264, CQ Vote #251: Motion Rejected 35-58: R 35-9; D 0-49, 7/14/88, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 4781, CQ Vote #296: Motion Agreed To 50-44: R 5-39; D 45-5, 8/5/88, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1352, CQ Vote #148: Motion Agreed To 50-47: R 37-6; D 13-41, 7/27/89, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 3072, CQ Vote #202: Rejected 34-66: R 27-18; D 7-48, 9/26/89, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 3072, CQ Vote #213: Adopted 53-47: R 39-6; D 14-41, 9/28/89, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2884, CQ Vote #223: Adopted 54-44: R 2-42; D 52-2, 8/4/90, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 2884, CQ Vote #225: Motion Agreed To 56-41: R 39-4; D 17-37, 8/4/90, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2884, CQ Vote #226: Motion Agreed To 54-43: R 37-6; D 17-37, 8/4/90, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 3189, CQ Vote #273: Passed 79-16: R 37-5; D 42-11, 10/15/90, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 5803, CQ Vote #319: Adopted 80-17: R 37-6; D 43-11, 10/26/90, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 4739, CQ Vote #320: Adopted 80-17: R 37-6; D 43-11, 10/26/90, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1507, CQ Vote #168: Rejected 39-60: R 4-39; D 35-21, 7/31/91, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1507, CQ Vote #171: Motion Agreed To 60-38: R 40-3; D 20-35, 8/1/91, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1507, CQ Vote #172: Motion Agreed To 64-34: R 39-4; D 25-30, 8/1/91, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1507, CQ Vote #173: Rejected 46-52: R 5-38; D 41-14, 8/1/91, Kerry Voted Yea; H.R. 2521, CQ Vote #207: Motion Agreed To 50-49: R 38-5; D 12-44, 9/25/91, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2403, CQ Vote #85: Adopted 61-38: R 7-36; D 54-2, 5/6/92, Kerry Voted Yea; H.R. 4990, CQ Vote #108: Adopted 90-9: R 34-9; D 56-0, 5/21/92, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 3114, CQ Vote #182: Motion Rejected 43-49: R 34-5; D 9-44, 8/7/92, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 3114, CQ Vote #214: Rejected 48-50: R 5-38; D 43-12, 9/17/92, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 3114, CQ Vote #215: Adopted 52-46: R 39-4; D 13-42, 9/17/92, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 5504, CQ Vote #228: Adopted 89-4: R 36-4; D 53-0, 9/22/92, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1298, CQ Vote #251: Adopted 50-48: R 6-36; D 44-12, 9/9/93, Kerry Voted Yea; S. Con. Res. 63, CQ Vote #64: Rejected 40-59: R 2-42; D 38-17, 3/22/94, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1026, CQ Vote #354: Motion Agreed To 51-48: R 47-6; D 4-42, 8/3/95, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1087, CQ Vote #384: Rejected 45-54: R 5-49; D 40-5, 8/10/95, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1087, CQ Vote #397: Passed 62-35: R 48-4; D 14-31, 9/5/95, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 1530, CQ Vote #399: Passed 64-34: R 50-3; D 14-31, 9/6/95, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 2126, CQ Vote #579: Adopted 59-39: R 48-5; D 11-34, 11/16/95, Kerry Voted Nay; H.R. 1530, CQ Vote #608: Adopted 51-43: R 47-2; D 4-41, 12/19/95, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1635, CQ Vote #157: Rejected 53-46: R 52-0; D 1-46, 6/4/96, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1745, CQ Vote #160: Rejected 44-53: R 4-49; D 40-4, 6/19/96, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1745, CQ Vote #187: Passed 68-31: R 50-2; D 18-29, 7/10/96, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 936, CQ Vote #171: Rejected 43-56: R 2-53; D 41-3, 7/11/97, Kerry Voted Yea; S. 1873, CQ Vote #131: Motion Rejected 59-41: R 55-0; D 4-41, 5/13/98, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 1873, CQ Vote #262: Motion Rejected 59-41: R 55-0; D 4-41, 9/9/98, Kerry Voted Nay; S. 2549, CQ Vote #178: Motion Agreed To 52-48: R 52-3; D 0-45, 7/13/00, Kerry Voted Nay)

*Kerry Then Claimed To Support Missile Defense.*

I support the development of an effective defense against ballistic missiles that is deployed with maximum transparency and con-

sultation with U.S. allies and other major powers. If there is a real potential of a rogue nation firing missiles at any city in the United States, responsible leadership requires that we make our best, most thoughtful efforts to defend against that threat. The same is true of accidental launch. If it were to happen, no leader could ever explain not having chosen to defend against the disaster when doing so made sense. (Peace Action Website, "Where Do The Candidates Stand On Foreign Policy?" <http://www.peaceaction.org/2004/Kerry.html>, Accessed 3/10/04)

*Now Kerry Campaign Says He Will Defund Missile Defense.*

Fox News' Major Garrett: "Kerry would not say how much all of this would cost. A top military adviser said the Massachusetts Senator would pay for some of it by stopping all funds to deploy a national ballistic missile defense system, one that Kerry doesn't believe will work.

Kerry Advisor Rand Beers: He would not go forward at this time because there is not a proof of concept. (Fox News' "Special Report," 3/17/03)

#### FLIP-FLOPPED ON 1991 IRAQ WAR COALITION

*At The Time, Kerry Questioned Strength of 1991 Coalition.*

I keep hearing from people, "Well, the coalition is fragile, it won't stay together," and my response to that is, if the coalition is so fragile, then what are the vital interests and what is it that compels us to risk our young American's lives if the others aren't willing to stay the . . . course of peace? . . . I voted against the president, I'm convinced we're doing this the wrong way . . ." (CBS' "This Morning," 1/16/91)

*Now Kerry has Nothing but Praise for 1991 Coalition.*

Sen. John Kerry: "In my speech on the floor of the Senate I made it clear, you are strongest when you act with other nations. All presidents, historically, his father, George Herbert Walker Bush, did a brilliant job of building a legitimate coalition and even got other people to help pay for the war." (NBC's "Meet The Press," 1/11/04)

#### FLIP-FLOPPED ON VIEW OF WAR ON TERROR

*Kerry Said War on Terror is "Basically a Manhunt."*

Kerry was asked about Bush's weekend appearance on "Meet the Press" when he called himself a "war president." The senator, who watched the session, remarked: "The war on terrorism is a very different war from the way the president is trying to sell it to us. It's a serious challenge, and it is a war of sorts, but it is not the kind of war they're trying to market to America." Kerry characterized the war on terror as predominantly an intelligence gathering and law enforcement operation. "It's basically a manhunt," he said. "You gotta know who they are, where they are, what they're planning, and you gotta be able to go get 'em before they get us." (Katherine M. Skiba, "Bush, Kerry Turn Focus To Each Other," Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 2/13/04)

*Two Weeks Later, Kerry Flip-Flopped, Saying War on Terror is More Than "A Manhunt".*

This war isn't just a manhunt—a checklist of names from a deck of cards. In it, we do not face just one man or one terrorist group. We face a global jihadist movement of many groups, from different sources, with separate agendas, but all committed to assaulting the United States and free and open societies around the globe." (Senator John Kerry, Remarks At University Of California At Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 2/27/04)

#### FLIP FLOPPED ON INTERNET TAXATION

*In 1998, Kerry Voted To Allow States To Continue Taxing Internet Access After Moratorium Took Effect.*

Kerry voted against tabling an amendment that would extend the moratorium from two years to three years and allow states that currently impose taxes on Internet access to continue doing so after the moratorium takes effect. (S. 442, CQ Vote #306: Motion Rejected 28-69: R 27-27; D 1-42, 10/7/98, Kerry Voted Nay)

*In 2001, Kerry Voted To Extend Internet Tax Moratorium Until 2005 and Allow States To Form Uniform Internet Tax System With Approval of Congress.*

(H.R. 1552, CQ Vote #341: Motion Agreed To 57-43: R 35-14; D 22-28; I 10-1, 11/15/01, Kerry Voted Nay)

*Kerry Said "We Do Not Support Any Tax on the Internet Itself."*

"We do not support any tax on the Internet itself. We don't support access taxes. We don't support content taxes. We don't support discriminatory taxes. Many of us would like to see a permanent moratorium on all of those kinds of taxes. At the same time, a lot of us were caught in a place where we thought it important to send the message that we have to get back to the table in order to come to a consensus as to how we equalize the economic playing field in the United States in a way that is fair." (Senator John Kerry, Congressional Record, 11/15/01, p. S11902)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, do I have 20 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask the Chair to remind me when I have 4 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

#### THIRTEEN REASONS WHY WE ARE NOT SAFER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my friend from Mississippi attempted to describe my friend and colleague's position on a variety of different issues. As we know around here, one of the favorite techniques—we have just seen it—is to distort and misrepresent someone's position and then differ with it. That is what has been done with regard to Senator KERRY's position on the issues we just heard about. I know about the No Child Left Behind Act. I know JOHN KERRY's position, and I know his position on health care. We talk about his position on health care. What he wants for the American people is the same thing President Bush has for himself. When he talks about the No Child Left Behind Act, the fact is 4½ million children aren't getting the benefits of it. He can defend himself.

It is always interesting to me to listen to distortions and misrepresentations on his record. Read the Web site.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky talk about Senator KERRY on Iraq. The fact of the matter is this President can't solve that problem. He has had his turn, and it is time to have someone new. You can ask, Why? Because he has burned his bridges with

the international community. He has insulted the world community and shattered and shredded all of the treaties of the United States with the world community on the matter of dealing with Iraq. They don't trust him. And they won't. And they will JOHN KERRY. You have had your time, Mr. President. You have had your turn to try to do it. JOHN KERRY has a plan to be able to do it. He has outlined that and it offers the best reason and the best hope for us to be able to achieve it.

Twenty-four years ago, the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, posed the defining question to the American people in that election when he asked, "Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?" That simple question is given greater relevance now than when Ronald Reagan asked it.

The defining issue today is national security. Especially in the post 9/11 world, people have the right to ask Ronald Reagan's question in a very specific and all-important way. Are we safer today because of the policies of President Bush?

Any honest assessment can lead to only one answer—and that answer is an emphatic no. President Bush is dead wrong and JOHN KERRY is absolutely right. We are not safer today and the reason we are not safer is because of the President's misguided war in Iraq. The President's handling of the war has been a toxic mix of ignorance, arrogance, and stubborn ideology. No amount of Presidential rhetoric or preposterous campaign spin can conceal the truth about the steady downward spiral in our national security since President Bush made that decision to go to war in Iraq.

No issue is more important today. The battle against terrorism is a battle we must win. Even those of us who opposed the war in Iraq understand that this is now an American commitment and we must see it through. But to remain silent in the face of mounting failures by this President and this White House is to weaken our security even further, and we cannot let that happen.

The President keeps saying America and the world are safer today and better off today because Saddam Hussein is gone. Let us count the ways that George Bush's war has not made America safer.

No. 1, Iraq has been a constant, perilous distraction from the real war on terrorism. There was no persuasive link between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaida. All you have to do is read the 9/11 Commission report. There it is on page 66.

Nor have we seen evidence indicating that Iraq cooperated with al-Qaida in the development or carrying out any attacks against the United States.

There it is—9/11 Commission, Mr. CHENEY; 9/11 Commission, Mr. Bush.

It is stated in the staff commission report as well:

Two senior bin Laden associates adamantly denied any ties between al-Qaida and Iraq. We have no credible evidence that Iraq and al-Qaida cooperated on attacks against the United States.

There it is. There it is, and this President indicates that this ties in.

We should have finished the job in Afghanistan. We should have finished the job with al-Qaida and the job with Osama bin Laden.

No. 2, the mismanagement of the war in Iraq has created a fertile and very dangerous new breeding ground for terrorists in Iraq and a powerful magnet for al-Qaida that didn't exist before the war. We can't go a day now without hearing of attacks in Iraq by insurgents and al-Qaida terrorists, and our troops are in far greater danger because of it.

In the month of August, 863 Americans were killed or wounded; 70 attacks every single day on American troops. And we hear the rosy picture of this administration, and the Secretary of Defense saying, "I am encouraged by the way things are going." The President of United States said only a week ago that it is just a handful of insurgents.

Let us get real. This is what is happening. That this violence would occur was abundantly clear before the war.

We find in today's New York Times, pre-war assessment on Iraq shows chance of strong divisions. Is this the same intelligence unit that produced a gloomy report in July that President Bush says is just a matter of guesswork by our intelligence agencies? He changed that to "estimate" but initially called it "guesswork."

About the prospect of growing instability in Iraq, the report "warned" the Bush administration about the "potential costly consequences of American-led invasion 2 months before the war began, Government officials said."

The assessments predicted that an American invasion of Iraq would "increase sympathy" and support for political Islam and would result in a deeply divided Iraqi society prone to violent internal conflict.

There it is. Give it to the President of the United States. We have 140,000 American boys over there, with no tie-in with al-Qaida? And the predictions are right there in front of us that we were going to have this kind of conflict over there. And this administration says: Oh, no, we are a lot better off than we were before.

We should have finished the job against al-Qaida. We should have finished the job in Afghanistan. We should have had Osama bin Laden behind bars instead of Saddam Hussein.

And what did the administration do? They put on their ideological blinders, ignored the intelligence, and rushed headlong into a misguided war that has put our troops in perilous danger.

Mr. President, if we had gone into Afghanistan, we could have either ended or damaged al-Qaida, and captured Osama bin Laden. But al-Qaida is like

a cancer. It metastasized. We had an opportunity to grab it all when we battled in Afghanistan, but we did not. We stepped back. We went into Iraq. And what has happened? Like a cancer, it has metastasized all over the world—in Southeast Asia, in Saudi Arabia, as far as Morocco, all over. It is a fundamental and basic miscalculation, and the American people are in greater danger as a result of that decision not to close the door on al-Qaida.

No. 4, because of the war, the danger of terrorist attacks against America itself has become greater. Our pre-occupation with Iraq has given al-Qaida 2 full years to regroup and plan murderous new assaults on us. We know al-Qaida will try to attack America again and again at home if it possibly can. Yet instead of staying focused on the real war on terror, President Bush rushed headlong into an unnecessary war in Iraq.

No. 5, and most ominously, the Bush administration's focus on Iraq has left us needlessly more vulnerable to an al-Qaida attack with a nuclear weapon. The greatest threat of all to our homeland is a nuclear attack. A mushroom cloud over any American city is the ultimate nightmare, and the risk is all too great. Osama bin Laden calls the acquisition of a nuclear device a "religious duty." Documents captured from a key al-Qaida aide 3 years ago reveal plans even then to smuggle high-grade radioactive materials into the United States in shipping containers.

If al-Qaida can obtain or assemble a nuclear weapon, they will use it on New York, Washington, or any American city. The greatest danger we face in the days and weeks ahead is a nuclear 9/11, and we hope and pray it is not already too late to prevent. The war in Iraq has made the mushroom cloud more likely, not less likely, and it never should have happened.

No. 6, the war in Iraq has provided a powerful worldwide recruiting tool for al-Qaida. We know al-Qaida is getting stronger because its attacks in other parts of the world are increasing. In the 8 years before 9/11, al-Qaida conducted three attacks. But in the 3 years since 9/11, it has carried out a dozen more attacks, killing hundreds in Spain, Pakistan, Indonesia, and elsewhere.

No. 7, because of the war, Afghanistan itself is still unstable. Taliban and al-Qaida elements roam the country. A dangerous border with Pakistan, where terrorists can easily cross, continues to be wide open. President Hamid Karzai is frequently forced to negotiate with warlords who control private armies in the tens of thousands. Opium production is at a record level and is being used to finance terrorism. Our troops there are in greater danger. Free and fair elections are in greater danger. The war in Iraq has stretched our troops thin to the point where we cannot provide enough additional forces to stop the rising drug trade and enable President Karzai to gain full control of

the country and root out al-Qaida. How can we afford not to do that?

No. 8, we have alienated longtime friends and leaders in other nations, whom we heavily depend on for intelligence, for border enforcement, for shutting off funds to al-Qaida, and for many other types of support in the ongoing war against international terrorism. Mistrust of America has soared throughout the world, and we are especially hated in the Muslim world. In parts of it, the bottom has fallen out.

The past 2 years have seen the steepest and deepest fall from grace our country has ever suffered in the eyes of the world community in all our history. We remember the enormous goodwill that flowed to America in the aftermath of September 11, and we never should have squandered it.

Does President Bush ever learn? His chip-on-the-shoulder address to the United Nations last week was yet another missed opportunity to turn the page and start regaining the genuine support of the world community for a sensible policy on Iraq.

In fact, the President's arrogance toward the world community has left our soldiers increasingly isolated and alone. We have nearly 90 percent of the troops on the ground in Iraq, and more than 95 percent of those killed and wounded are Americans. Instead of other nations joining us, initially supportive nations are pulling out. The so-called coalition of the willing has become the coalition of the dwindling.

No. 9, our overall military forces are stretched to the breaking point because of the war in Iraq. As the Defense Science Board recently told Secretary Rumsfeld:

Current and projected force structure will not sustain our current and projected global stabilization commitments.

LTG John Riggs said it clearly:

I have been in the Army 39 years, and I've never seen the Army as stretched in that 39 years as I have today.

As Senator JOHN MCCAIN warned last week, if we have a problem in some other flash point in the world, "it's clear, at least to most observers, that we don't have sufficient personnel."

The war has also undermined the Guard and Reserve. Many Guard members are also first responders for any terrorist attack on the United States. Our homeland security, as well, is being weakened because of their loss.

No. 10, the war in Iraq has undermined the basic rule of international law that protects captured Americans. The Geneva Conventions are supposed to protect our forces, but the brutal interrogation techniques used at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq have lowered the bar for treatment of POWs and endangered our soldiers throughout the world.

No. 11, while President Bush has been preoccupied with Iraq, not just one but two serious nuclear threats have been rising—from North Korea and Iran. Four years ago, North Korea's plutonium program was inactive. Its nuclear

rods were under seal. Two years ago, as the Iraq debate became intense, North Korea expelled the international inspectors and began turning its fuel rods into nuclear weapons. At the beginning of the Bush administration, North Korea was already thought to have two such weapons. Now they may have eight or more, and the danger is far greater.

Iran, too, is now on a fast track that could produce nuclear weapons. The international inspectors found traces of highly enriched uranium at two nuclear sites, and Iran admitted last March that it had the centrifuges to enrich uranium. The international community might be more willing to act if President Bush had not abused the U.N. resolution passed on Iraq 2 years ago, when he took the words "serious consequences" as a license for launching his unilateral war in Iraq. Now, after that breach of faith with the world community, other nations now refuse to trust us enough to enact a similar U.N. resolution on Iran because they fear President Bush will use it to justify another reckless war.

No. 12, while we focused on the non-existent nuclear threat from Saddam, we have not done enough to safeguard the vast amounts of unsecured nuclear material in the world. According to a joint report by the Nuclear Threat Initiative and Harvard's Managing-the-Atom Project, "scores of nuclear terrorist opportunities lie in wait in countries all around the world"—especially at sites in the former Soviet Union that contain enough nuclear material for a nuclear weapon and are poorly defended against terrorists and criminals.

As former Senator Sam Nunn said:

The most effective, least expensive way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to secure nuclear weapons and materials at the source.

How loudly—how loudly—does the alarm bell have to ring before President Bush wakes up?

No. 13, the neglect of the Bush administration of all aspects of homeland security because of the war is frightening. All we have to do is look at today's paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to notify me when I have 1 minute remaining.

It says in the paper that the FBI is said to lag on translations. It talks about 3 years after 9/11 more than 120,000 hours of potentially valuable terrorism-related recordings have not been translated by the linguists at the FBI. Then it talks about that the al-Qaida messages "tomorrow is zero hour" and "the match is about to begin" were intercepted by the National Security Agency on September 10 but not translated until days afterwards.

Homeland security? Why aren't we getting this done in terms of securing our homeland? We are pouring nearly \$5 billion a month into Iraq. We are grossly shortchanging the urgent need

to strengthen our ability to prevent terrorist attacks at home and to strengthen our preparedness to respond to them if they occur.

As former Republican Senator Warren Rudman, chairman of the Independent Task Force on Emergency Responders, said: "Homeland security is terribly underfunded."

That is a Republican Senator who is saying that. That isn't a Democrat. "Terribly underfunded."

We see what happens as a result. Our hospitals are unprepared for a bioterrorist attack. Our land borders, our seaports, our shipping containers, our transit systems, our waterways, nuclear power—none of these have sufficient funds for protection against terrorist attacks, even though the Bush administration has put the Nation on high alert for such attacks five times in the last 3 years.

You can't pack all these reasons America is not safer into a 30-second television response ad or a news story or an editorial. But as anyone who cares about the issue can quickly learn, our President has no credibility—no credibility—when he keeps telling us that America and the world are safer because he went to war in Iraq and rid us of Saddam Hussein.

President Bush's record on Iraq is clearly costing American lives and endangering America and the world. Our President won't change or even admit how wrong he has been and still is. Despite the long line of mistaken blunders and outright deception, there has been no accountability. As election day draws closer, the buck is circling more and more closely over 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Only a new President can right the extraordinary wrongs of the Bush administration on our foreign policy and our national security.

On November 2, the American people will decide whether they still have confidence in this President's leadership. When we ask ourselves the fundamental question, whether President Bush has made us safer, there can only be one answer. No, he has not. That is why America needs new leadership. We could have been, and we should have been much safer than we are today.

We cannot afford to stay this very dangerous course. This election cannot come soon enough. As I have said before, the only thing America has to fear is 4 more years of George Bush.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Wisconsin.

#### THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WILDERNESS ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, September 3, 2004, marked the 40th anniversary of the Wilderness Act. I have introduced a resolution, S. Res. 387, commemorating this important milestone, and I hope the Senate will approve this resolution, which has 18 cosponsors, before we adjourn for the year.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the many people who have