

In addition, education savings accounts will be increased to \$5,000 and expanded from K through 12, not just college anymore.

We also include additional dollars for States to use to control violence and other crimes in schools because there is no doubt that in our country, if children are not safe and secure in their schools, they are not going to have the optimum learning environment. No doubt about it, they must have secure schools and drug-free schools.

Parents will be given a greater flexibility for their child's best interest. School districts will be given greater flexibility. This will be accomplished by decreasing administrative costs and paperwork. When I do townhall meetings in my State, teachers come in and say: Get rid of the paperwork. Let me teach. Let me spend my time with the students finding out what they need and helping them learn.

One teacher came to a townhall meeting that I had with a stack of papers this big and said that is what she had been working on all week. Instead of being in the classroom or counseling children after class, she was filling out forms this thick. That is not what is going to improve public education. It is the attention a teacher can give to children, to assess what their weaknesses are and bring them up to speed.

We are going to provide technology assistance, and math and science instruction will be reemphasized, as well as basic literacy. Partnerships between schools and higher education institutions will be encouraged, and new Federal initiatives such as Reading First K through 12, and Early Reading First Preschool will offer States incentives to implement rigorous literacy education.

We have solved a problem in my home State of Texas. The University of North Texas has an accelerated math course for high school math prodigies, so that high school students with math aptitude can go to the University of North Texas and take college courses and get their high school degree with accelerated capabilities to go into college. This is so that you don't hold back the students who are already beyond high school competency. You give the child a chance to grow at his or her level and competency capability. It is quite exciting. I would love to see that happen all over our country, where an innovative, higher education institution would offer programs for high school students. I hope we will be able to encourage that by passing the bill that is before us.

We are also going to try to help teachers help themselves. They deserve recognition and assistance. The President's plan will allow teachers to make tax deductions of up to \$400 to help defray costs associated with out-of-pocket classroom expenses. I don't know a teacher that doesn't spend money from his or her own pocket to try to help the child get the tools the child needs in class, the crayons, or a ruler, or a tab-

let to write on, because the child comes to school without the proper school supplies. Many times, the child's family doesn't have the money for the school supplies. The teacher digs in her pocket and puts the money out and buys the supplies for the kids. That teacher does it because that teacher is dedicated. But we want to help defray those out-of-pocket costs. We want to give those young people the opportunity to have everything they need but not at the personal expense of the teachers. We don't pay teachers enough for the work they do anyway. The last thing we should expect is for them to defray the cost of their young people's school supplies out of their own pocketbooks.

Mr. President, as I close today, I want to say that there is nothing more important that we will do in this session of Congress than to reform public education, to make sure that public education gives every child the opportunity to reach his or her full potential. Yes, we think private schools are great and, yes, parochial schools are great, and they are a part of the option that a parent might have. But what we are responsible for is to make sure that every child has access to a public education that is quality and that competes with any other school in the world. That is what will keep our democracy strong, and that is what will fulfill our responsibility as Members of the U.S. Senate.

I can't wait to get to this bill because I have some amendments I want to offer that would provide creativity for our school districts, that would try to encourage more people to come into the classroom with expertise in an area—maybe not a teaching degree but someone with an expertise. I want to offer single-sex school classes in public schools as another option, which is now available in private schools but not in public schools to any great degree. I am going to talk about those amendments later.

I want to get on to this bill so that we can pass these reforms and so that the next school year that starts in September will be a school year that is different from the past 25 years and will have more options and more creativity and more capabilities for the young people of our country to excel.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join my colleague in entreating to get this bill moving. I am proud to serve on the committee. It is badly needed.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I respond to the Senator from Virginia and mention that he, as a very senior member of the Senate, asked to go on the Education Committee because of his interest in improving our public schools. I appreciate he made that a priority. His contribution is very much one that has helped this process this year.

Mr. WARNER. If I may say to my colleague, at the time our conference was allocating that last seat, I knew of the interest of the Senator from Texas.

She extended to this Senator certain courtesies I shall not forget, enabling me to have that as my third committee. I thank the Senator.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BOB KERREY, DISTINGUISHED OFFICER

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I address the Senate with regard to Senator Bob Kerrey. I do this out of, first, a sense of duty. I was Under Secretary of the Navy beginning in February 1969, together with our most beloved and distinguished former colleague who sat behind me many years, Senator Chafee, who was the Secretary. Senator Chafee and I, then Secretary of the Navy and Under Secretary WARNER, were a very close working team. I have searched my mind many times as to what he would say were he here today. I think I can safely represent to the Senate that my remarks today would be very close to, if not exactly, what my dear friend, our former Senator and former Secretary of the Navy, would have said about our colleague, Bob Kerrey, this distinguished officer of the U.S. Navy.

I came to know him in the many years we served together in the Senate. We often sat together on the floor. I remember distinctly going over to his side of the aisle. We reflected on those days together of Vietnam. He shared with me some very personal insights with regard to that conflict and how they affected his life.

I am also very respectful of Senators MCCAIN, CLELAND, HAGEL, and JOHN KERRY. I have, likewise, had the benefit of listening to them and sharing with them my recollections of that incredible period of American history. I served in the Pentagon beginning in February 1969, leaving in 1974, for 5 years plus a few months during some of the most intense periods of that conflict. I visited Vietnam on occasions, as did Secretary of the Navy Chafee, and then when I became Secretary of the Navy, succeeding Chafee, of course, my visits continued. I have been on the fire bases, in the hospitals, where the wounded were brought back.

I remember one story, the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, came to see me just before his confirmation to review various procedural matters with regard to his confirmation. We were there with General Mundy. He was then Commandant of the Marine Corps. We spent an hour together in a very thorough analysis of his background. I was doing it on behalf of then-Chairman STROM THURMOND. General Krulak got up to leave. This is a moment I shall never forget in my career as a Senator.

He said: Senator WARNER, this is not the first time we met. I was a little taken aback. I was thinking, where had I met this fine officer? I had known his father. He said: I was wounded in Vietnam, and I was in the process of being evacuated. I was on a stretcher with other men who had just been wounded, and the helicopter was coming in to take us out. Someone came up and grabbed me by the big toe and shook that toe. He said to me: Captain, you are going to be all right; you are going to make it. He said: I am here today to say, I made it, and you were that gentleman, as Secretary of the Navy, who grabbed me by the toe.

I had no recollection because I visited with so many wounded and injured in that period on my visits to Vietnam. But it is a personal recollection of that period that I shared with another distinguished combat veteran who did a wonderful job as Commandant.

Bob Kerrey and I traveled together, I remember so well, on a trip to Bosnia. We were coming into that zone where the war had just passed through not more than a day, if even as much as a day. Homes were burning. The ordnance was clearly visible, and the escort officers we had were somewhat concerned. I remember Kerrey fearlessly walking through areas. I was there by his side. We visited with a number of detainees who had been captured. You learn about an individual when you do a trip such as that. I became very close to him. We bonded together in many respects on that trip to that war zone on that particular day, the several days we were together.

I reposed unquestioned confidence in his judgment, his honesty, and his integrity, being his boss in 1969, as Under Secretary of the Navy, at that time when these incidents happened. Indeed, the Medal Of Honor came up through the Navy Secretariat. I remember it quite well. Senator Chafee and I sat down, and Senator Chafee, then being the Secretary, affixed his name to that citation for his heroic actions.

This has been a personal experience to watch very carefully, to study and read the many pieces that have been written, to watch him in his public appearances and study his face very carefully, his eyes and his mannerism, as he, I think in a very forthright manner, shared with the American public, and, indeed, those in Vietnam who watched, his heartfelt expressions about this incident. It was a tragic incident.

I ask unanimous consent two articles which appeared in today's media be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 1, 2001]

THE CONSEQUENCE OF WAR

(By James Webb)

The Vietnamese government is happy to trot out witnesses from the supposed atrocity conducted by Bob Kerrey's Navy SEALs at Thanh Phong. It is doubtful that they

would be so cooperative if questions were asked about Communist killings in places such as My Loc.

In April 1969, the Marine rifle company to which I was assigned was operating in the An Hoa Basin of Vietnam, west and south of Danang. In addition to our routine of long-range combat patrols and defensive positions along a vital and heavily contested road, it was decided that we would provide security for a "town meeting" hosted by the South Vietnamese government's district chief, who had been criticized for living in the distant and more secure confines of Danang. Over the space of a few days, visits were made to nearby hamlets, where 30 delegates were chosen to attend the meeting. After that, the district chief and his senior aide were brought in on the morning convoy.

A thatch-covered "hooch" at the bottom of our perimeter, about the size of a typical American living room, was chosen as the meeting place. Shortly after the meeting began, a Viet Cong assassination team raced through the thick foliage, hit the hooch, and fled. My rifle platoon was returning from a combat patrol as explosions rang out to our front. In seconds a Viet Cong soldier sprinting down the trail collided with my point man. I can still see his young face, adrenalized and madly grinning, as he was captured. And I remember the sight of the others as we reached the hooch.

The floor inside was covered with an ankle-deep mix of blood, innards, limbs and bodies. I and several others waded into the human mire, emptying bodies from the hooch and finding medical care for those who had survived. Nineteen people were dead, including the district chief and his aide. The aide's right arm was blown off near the elbow, its tendons like slim white feathers, as if he had been reaching to catch a grenade.

Nearby an older woman sat motionless against a wall, her face stunned and her dark eyes piercing, untouched except for a small, square hole in her forehead. I thought she was alive until I grabbed her arm. The wounded squirmed on the floor, reaching past dead bodies as they crawled in the muck, covered thickly with blood and twisting among each other like giant fishing worms.

We cleaned out the hooch, evacuated the wounded, washed at a nearby well, and went back to our war. By the next day this incident was over, a little piece of history in the long and ugly journey of a combat tour. But in the coming months as I reflected on them, the killings at My Loc raised an important distinction, which has become even more relevant with the media firestorm over Bob Kerrey's ill-fated SEAL patrol in the Mekong Delta.

Civilians have a terrible time in any war zone—fully one-third of the population of Okinawa was killed in 12 weeks of fighting on that island in 1945. But in a guerrilla war, the support or control of the local population, rather than the conquest of territory, is the ultimate objective. Civilians become enmeshed in the actual fighting, inseparable from it.

They fight among themselves for political dominance of a local area. They form an infrastructure and quietly support one side or the other when it moves through their village. They suffer greatly when battles are fought on top of them, and when emotions overcome logic and troops snap, as at My Lai. But the villagers of My Loc and others like them, clearly noncombatants, were killed purely as a matter of political control, for having met with a South Vietnamese government official and given some legitimacy to his authority.

Any American who directed a similar slaughter, or participated in it, would have

been court-martialed. This distinction was basic to our policy in Vietnam, and it seems to have been lost by many over the past week. The body language and word choices of many media commentators indicates clearly that a larger issue—how history will judge our involvement in Vietnam—is still very much in play, and a big part of that issue is to continue to demean the American sacrifices in that war.

Words like "atrocities" and "massacre" are routinely being thrown about, with some even calling for Nuremberg-like trials for Americans' war crimes in Vietnam. Aggressive reporters have played "gotcha" with every Kerrey statement. How could he say it was a moonless night when the charts say it was a half-moon? (Try clouds. Or canopy. Or vegetation.) Did he take one shot or many shots at the first outpost? Did he kneel on a guy when his throat was getting cut?

For many who went through extensive combat in Vietnam, such parsing brings back an anger caused by memories not of the war but of the condescending arrogance directed at them upon their return, principally by people in their own age group who had risked nothing and yet microscopically judged every action of those who had risked everything and often lost a great deal. Combat in a guerrilla war requires constant moral judgments, in an environment with unending pressure, little sheep, and no second chances for yourself or the people you are leading when you guess wrong. Were we perfect? No. Were we worse than Americans in other wars, or our enemy in this one? Hardly.

Which brings us to the recent attention given the Kerrey patrol. There is much in the New York Times magazine story to make one uneasy. They key "witness" from the village where the incident took place is the wife of a former Viet Cong soldier, who now has told Time magazine that she did not actually see the killings. She and the other Vietnamese witness, who was 12 at the time of the incident, live in a communist state where propaganda regarding America's "evil" war efforts is one of the mainsprings of political legitimacy—not the best conditions to produce honesty in cases with international implications.

The one member of Mr. Kerrey's SEAL team to allege extreme conduct did not pass the credibility test with Newsweek magazine when the story was considered there. CBS's "60 Minutes," which co-sponsored the investigation, seems to have an affinity for stories about Americans committing atrocities, having rehashed My Lai as the best way to remember the 30th anniversary of 1968, the year that brought the worst fighting, and highest American casualties, of the war.

Most important, to one practiced in both combat and journalism, a key and possibly determinative piece of information seems vastly underplayed. According to the Times magazine story, archive records of Army radio transmissions indicate that two days after the incident, "an old man from Thanh Phong presented himself to the district chief's headquarters with claims for retribution for alleged atrocities committed the night of 25 and 26 February 69. Thus far it appears 24 people were killed. 13 were women and children and one old man, 11 were unidentified and assumed to be VC."

Given the tone of the story, this radio transmission was probably included because it refers to the Kerrey patrol as having committed an atrocity. But a closer reading would appear to confirm the position of Mr. Kerrey and the five others on the patrol that they took fire and returned it, with the loss of civilian lives an unfortunate consequence.

This piece of evidence is perhaps the most objective account available of the results of the Kerrey patrol, coming as it does from a

time near the incident, from a man who was asking for retribution and thus was hardly trying to cover things up. It also coincides with Mr. Kerry's recollection of 13 or 14 dead civilians in the village before the team left the scene, as any Viet Cong soldiers would most likely have been on the other side of the villagers who were killed, perhaps even using them as a screen while attempting to escape.

As has often been said over the past week, we will never know the exact details of what occurred. But is a seven-man patrol operating independently at night far inside enemy territory killed 11 Viet Cong soldiers after coming under fire, it would seem they hit their assigned target. And the loss of civilian life that accompanied this brief but brutal firefight adds up not to an atrocity or a massacre, but to a tragic consequence of a war fought in the middle of a civilian population.

[From the Washington Times, May 1, 2001]

SCALES OF CULPABILITY

[(Georgie Anne Geyer)]

In days long gone by, when we lived far simpler lives, according to the corny but nevertheless accurate truism, we agreed that to genuinely know another human, you needed to walk awhile in his moccasins.

In those days, too, the press in particular held as its central maxim the idea that we journalists were blessed with our wondrous positions in order to tell the relative truths that keep people sane (journalism is news, not "truths") and to relate rather than judge. Walk in anyone else's moccasins today trying to understand another's life? Not really interested.

Instead, in journalism and in politics as well, the response to trials, scandal and tragedy has boiled down to most news-gatherers (1) having no common experience with the prolific targets of their fleeting attention, and (2) not hesitating to publicly reveal every delicious tidbit they can unearth. Thus, they become prosecutor, judge and jury.

As you may perhaps have guessed, I'm being so critical because of the evolving case study of Nebraska's respected senator, Bob Kerrey.

The retired senator, now president of the New School University in New York, has long been one of our most responsible public servants. Thoughtful, intellectual, known for his integrity: Those are only a few of the small accolades he has merited in a capital so often these days filled with incompetence and greed.

Recently, in a series of revelations whose genesis, at least as of this writing remains unclear, a tragic story has been unfolding about him in different venues of the press.

In short, the story is that, in a midnight raid on a supposed Viet Cong village in 1969, Mr. Kerrey led a Navy SEALs raid. He believed his nervous and inexperienced unit had been fired upon by the village, and so they bombarded it. But when they entered, they found only the bodies of 13 Vietnamese women and children or more.

For those of us who were in Vietnam (I was there for a total of 10 months as a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News in 1967, '68, '69 and '70), such accidents of war were so common as to be barely commented upon. In fact, what exactly did Americans at home expect of these young men and women, having sent them into such a hopeless and agonizing morass, barely prepared and on such an imprecise, futile mission?

On any given night there, our soldiers were in dark jungles or mountain ranges. They didn't know where the "enemy" was—or why in God's name they were there at all. They

didn't speak the language, understand the culture, or see the great "geopolitical importance" their leaders safely at home in their air conditioned Washington offices seemed so insistent upon giving to "Vietnam."

There were some sadists and psychopaths in the U.S. military then—and there were plenty of them in the anti-war movement, as well—but Bob Kerrey was certainly not one of them. Indeed, in all of the reporting on his bleak and tormenting memories of that night, Mr. Kerrey has spoken repeatedly of how he has "never made by peace with what happened that night."

Nor should the fact that his own fellow SEALs offer different versions of that night by really surprise anyone. Thirty-two years ago, a moonless night in a strange and unknown country, told the enemy was all around them. . . . Why, most of the families I know would tell different stories about what they had for dinner last night.

Still, even having said this, at least two additional points need to be made: about the men truly responsible for those moonless missions in Vietnam and about the coverage of this Bob Kerrey story.

For there are people who deserve to suffer as Mr. Kerrey has—haunted and profoundly regretful for what he did under his country's orders in the name of his people. They had the real responsibility. Robert McNamara, the supercilious weapons maven, Lyndon Johnson (remember how he just resigned midstream when the war wouldn't go his way?), the fall-in-line joint chiefs of staff, not one of whom resigned over the war, even John F. Kennedy and Harry S. Truman. I haven't heard of much trauma or many sounds of remorse from these men, let alone any seeking of forgiveness. And, remember, too, that the American people voted enthusiastically for many of these "strategists" of war.

There are also people in the media for whom "Vietnam" is less a country or even a war than another way to "get" public officials.

Most of the media do not cover stories overseas these days. (If you watch the news discussion shows, few of the participants go out in the field to actually report anymore.)

That's precisely why they can be so judgmental of the men and women our country sends out to do its dirty work. Judgmentalism is fun. It builds bylines and reputations, and if it hurts a few public lives here and there, well, that's what those guys should have expected when they went into public office. Given all of this, Bob Kerrey continues to look like the hero everyone has thought him.

Mr. WARNER. I was personally impressed by these articles, the first written by former Secretary of the Navy Jim Webb appearing today in the Wall Street Journal, and the second in the Washington Times, written by Georgie Anne Geyer. I have not sat down with Ms. Geyer in some time, but in my course of these 23 years in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to be interviewed by her. She is a very thoughtful and careful journalist. In this article she recounts that she spent some 10 months in country covering that war.

Jim Webb, of course, was a highly decorated combat Marine officer: Navy Cross, second highest decoration next to the Medal of Honor; Silver Star; Purple Heart; and, coincidentally, he was a naval aide to me and to John Chafee as a young captain and major in the Marine Corps in that period of time. He briefed me prior to trips I

would take to Vietnam. Through the years I have valued his friendship enormously.

I also had another personal experience. I remember one day there was a knock on my Senate door and in walked Jan Scruggs, who asked if I would help his group in their struggles to build the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. I cannot think of a greater honor I have had as a Member of the Senate than working, as I often refer to myself, as a private in the rear ranks of Jan Scruggs' group of individuals, who conceived and put together this magnificent memorial to the men and women who sacrificed so much in that conflict.

I think I worked with him 6 to 7 years. I went to many meetings with many stormy sessions in either my Senate office or across the hall in the Armed Services Committee, and in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I remember we would thrash out, in a highly contentious way, certain aspects of the design and development of that historic memorial. Now it stands as just an extraordinary reminder of that period. Its symbolism is different to every person who comes up to look at it.

But in the course of those years, I relived, with so many of those people, their experiences in that conflict. Therefore I have had, if I may say, some modest association with the men and women who fought in that conflict, and I have shared with them many times their thoughts and concerns and recollections of the stresses and hardships that they have carried with them to this day.

So I find these articles to be very compelling and I urge my colleagues to read them. I think they provide thoughtful, objective thinking to help in the interpretation of that chapter in history which was so difficult to understand, particularly Senator Kerrey's mission on that fateful night in Vietnam.

Americans must understand that war is a terrible thing. Since the beginning of history, wars have imposed the harshest of consequences, not only on the combatants in uniform but so often on the innocent civilians who get entrapped between the lines or in the path of the advance or in the path of the retreat. And they have paid a price. I thought both Jim Webb and Ms. Geyer treated that subject thoughtfully based on their own firsthand observations and experiences in country in Vietnam.

So I attribute a great deal of credibility to these two authors, particularly because of my long personal knowledge of Jim Webb. I say, with great respect to him, his career in the military far exceeded anything I ever did with my two brief periods of active duty, one just in the training command at the close of World War II, and the second for a brief tour of duty in Korea with the 1st Marine Air Corps.

To the extent I was able to observe others in a combat situation in Korea,

as basically a staff officer—I never put myself in the category of those who rightfully claim combat status, but I did stay in the same tents, eat in the mess, slept in the bunkers with them—they are a very special breed, these young men and women who fought wars in harm's way to preserve our freedom.

Today I do my very best as a member of the Armed Services Committee to provide for a means of showing my respect for them and, indeed, my gratefulness to the American military for training me as a young person and for providing me with the GI bill of rights.

I have many emotions as I stand before the Senate tonight to express these views. I got to know Jim Webb well when he was in the office of the Navy Secretary and I tried to counsel him as best I could on his decision to leave active duty—which largely was not of his choosing but was dictated by facts very personal to him. Had he stayed in the Marine Corps I think he was destined to the highest of rank and the greatest of responsibility. He had to make a tough decision to leave the Corps and pursue other challenges. I mentioned, of course, for a brief period he became Secretary of the Navy. I was very proud of his service as Navy Secretary.

Several facts which I note from these articles and which I note from my own observation, again, are unquestioned. So many statements have been made by my distinguished colleagues about the honor and integrity of Bob Kerrey. His bravery and valor have been recognized many times, including being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I know during the Vietnam war we asked many young men—I repeat that, we, the United States of America, we the Congress of the United States and the President, the Presidents of the United States—asked many young men, and some women in a combat support status, to undertake very difficult missions under the most extreme and dangerous of conditions. They put their lives at risk to accomplish sometimes unclear missions while trying to minimize casualties within their own units.

Recently, I discussed this with members of the Armed Services Committee staff, combat veterans from Vietnam. We followed these stories about Senator Kerrey. We sat down and exchanged our own views. I deferred to them because two of them were in the thick of battle and they talked about the number of times throughout that war as veterans of ground combat that they took risks, themselves, personally, and risks to their men who were with them, to provide some measure of protection to the innocent non-combatant persons who had gotten entrapped in those battles in the dark nights and dusty days in that deep canopy.

Yes, they did take personal risks themselves. As near as I can determine, then-Lieutenant Kerrey, Robert Kerrey, took those risks himself.

They did so to protect the civilians in the combat zone. In that period of time, it was very difficult to determine who the enemy was; imagine that—who the enemy was. It was a very complex conflict into which we injected our men and women.

So we will never know exactly what happened that February night in that Thanh Phong, Vietnam, battle. But I respect the word of my former colleague, Robert Kerrey, and I urge other Senators to read these articles and decide for themselves. I believe each of us ought to make our own determination about this situation.

I conclude my remarks with a salute to the men and women who fought in that conflict and share with them my complete understanding, as near as I can base it on my own experiences. I salute them.

RESIGNATION OF DIRECTOR FREEH

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the principal reason for my seeking recognition is to comment briefly on the announced resignation of FBI Director Louis Freeh. He has tendered his resignation effective in June of this year. I believe Director Freeh has done an outstanding job in a very difficult position.

I had considerable opportunity to work with Director Freeh in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary and when I chaired the Senate Intelligence Committee. The Judiciary Subcommittee on Terrorism in 1996 had extensive hearings on Ruby Ridge, with Randy Weaver isolating himself, and action by the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms units and FBI that led to a shootout which regrettably caused the death of a U.S. Marshall, Randy Weaver's wife, and Randy Weaver's young son.

During the course of that investigation, FBI Director Freeh had the courage to stand up and change very deeply ingrained policies in the FBI, changing their rules of engagement and their use of deadly force. I think that took some doing in the face of institutional opposition.

He led an outstanding FBI investigation into the bombing on Khobar Towers, personally making a number of trips overseas. That is a matter which has yet to see a final resolution, but there has been very able and excellent investigative work done by the FBI in that matter in a very difficult circumstance, working with officials from Saudi Arabia.

Director Freeh did a good job in campaign finance reform, taking positions which were sometimes in conflict with the Attorney General, technically his superior, in the Department of Justice, although the FBI Director has unique status, really, in that he has a 10-year appointment. So there were times when Director Freeh found it necessary to take stands in opposition to the Attorney General of the United States

and sometimes even in opposition to the President of the United States. While I didn't always agree with some of the details, it was my view it was a strong performance on the part of FBI Director Louis Freeh.

I think the Director also did an outstanding job in expanding the FBI's role in combating organized crime internationally, and his tenure has seen a vast expansion of FBI offices around the world carrying on very important counterespionage work and counterterrorism work. There has been an excellent level of cooperation established between the FBI and the CIA under the CIA leadership of George Tenet and, before that, John Deutch, with the FBI directorship under Louis Freeh.

There have been difficulties during Director Freeh's tenure with the FBI crime lab and with the investigation of Dr. Wen Ho Lee—on that subject, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts is continuing the inquiry—and also with the allegations as to the Hanssen case, the alleged spy.

But I think, overall, Director Freeh's tenure with the FBI has been outstanding. He brought to the position unique credentials, having been an FBI agent and assistant U.S. attorney, a Federal judge, and he had the capacity to know law enforcement while also understanding civil rights. When the problems arose in Ruby Ridge, he did not hesitate to change the long-standing FBI policies on the use of deadly force in recognition of civil rights, at the same time maintaining very strong law enforcement standards.

I think the President will have a difficult replacement assignment in finding another Director who can measure up to what Director Freeh has done. It is certainly a fact when law enforcement has faced tough issues, they have moved ahead and made many assignments to the FBI. Director Freeh's response on changing the FBI's use of deadly force was in sharp contrast to the refusal of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms units, and even the Secretary of the Treasury, to make changes when there had been clear-cut fault established as to the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms unit.

I salute Director Freeh on the announcement of retirement and note his very excellent work and say we will have a tough time finding someone to fill those big shoes.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a "Commentary" on the mideast peace process.

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