

agents stuck their necks out to explain what is wrong with the FBI to Congress and the public. So far the Senate has ignored them, and their careers continue to be at risk.

I know all this might be embarrassing for the FBI, but stealing is wrong, especially from Ground Zero, and there has to be consequences. Heads have to roll. I think the FBI agents in the field around the country do a great job. I have found that the big FBI mistakes over the years usually come from headquarters, not from the grassroots.

In this case, it looks as if there are a few bad apples who did something wrong. And no one wanted to deal with it, so Agent Turner was obligated to blow the whistle. It was her sworn duty as a Federal law enforcement officer.

If we do not have the FBI reform bill, we will not have whistleblowers like Jane Turner and Coleen Rowley who expose these hidden problems that need to be fixed.

Without the bill, agents in the field will still think senior bureaucrats are held to a different standard, so morale suffers.

Without the bill, FBI internal security will not be the best it can be. That means the FBI will be more vulnerable and less effective, and that hurts national security.

This is not about politics. It is about improving the FBI and national security, and about making sure truth, fairness and justice prevail.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this morning I will make a few comments with regard to the issue that is generally before us and before the country, and that is, of course, where we go with regard to Iraq and Saddam Hussein.

The President did a great job last night. He made very appropriate comments at a very appropriate time. He has discussed in detail the threats we see in Iraq, the threats we see in terrorism, and he has talked about his solution.

There have been questions raised, and properly so, and the President last evening sought to answer those questions, as indeed I think he should.

Why do we need to contain this dictator? I think surely most people understand that. Why do we need to do it now? I suppose that may be one of the most difficult questions for some. Why

are we waiting to have allies in the U.N.? Certainly most agree that is something we want. The President covered that very thoroughly, and indicated that is his goal.

Our loss of 3,000 innocent Americans on September 11 makes us aware of why we need to make some changes; that activity in the world has changed. A number of years ago the threats were of landing on barges, flying huge formations of airplanes, with divisions of armed men and women. Now it is not entirely safe, as we found out September 11. We suffer huge damages from one incident. That is difficult to control. Clearly we have a problem.

We must complete our discussion, move forward and make decisions. It is an issue important to everyone, as a Nation, and important to the world. We will be voting on a resolution soon. I suppose there will be amendments to the resolution. The House may or may not come up with the same resolution. Nevertheless, that is the role of the Senate. I hope we deal with it as quickly as we can.

It grants the authority of the President to do what he feels has to be done to deal with this issue. Today we understand the clear and present threat of terrorism being different than in the past. September 11 changed that. We see evidence of these threats around the world.

Our personal safety has changed, as well as our national security. We recognize that. I understand there is reason to debate this issue. People have different views. We need to discuss the commitment of the military in this world. The question of acting unilaterally is a difficult question. That is one alternative.

We need to offer leadership in the world to reduce the risk that exists. The administration has done an excellent job of getting the support of our allies. Not all have signed up. Not all have stood up and raised their hands. Many support what we do now, as in Afghanistan.

Obviously, people have different views. Some are politicized. Some are different, legitimate views. We have to identify what our role should be as a leader in the world. More importantly, we need to protect this country's freedom and protect the freedom of all citizens.

In England, Prime Minister Blair has stepped up. I am sure others will, as well. We need to continue to discuss it. Much of the discussion has already taken place and the decision is ready to be made. Is this a sufficient threat to cause us to commit ourselves? I think so. Should we work through the U.N. with our allies? Of course. That is what the President suggested last night. I heard a fellow Senator this morning saying we should not do anything until the U.N. authorizes it. I hope the U.N. does, and I hope the U.N. is there. They should be. On the other hand, I don't think we ought to be controlled by the U.N. If we find this has

to be something we do, we must go ahead.

Our role is to disarm Saddam. Inspectors are an excellent way to do that. But we have to review policy to see they are unrestricted. However, getting inspectors in is not the goal. Disarmament is the goal. Inspectors may be a way to do that. We hope they are. There will be movement in the U.N. The President's talk last night will do a great deal to assist in that regard.

The resolution before the Senate provides for the necessary authority. It pertains to support of diplomatic efforts of the President to strictly enforce the United Nations Security Council resolutions that have been in place for 10 years. That is all we are asking.

We support, in this resolution, action by the Security Council to ensure Iraq abandons its strategy for delay and invasion. The authorization is included. The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq, and, number 2, enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq. The President makes those determinations and reports to the Congress. He makes available to the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore his determination that, number one, reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or peaceful means alone either will not adequately protect the national security or will not likely lead to the enforcement of those Security Council resolutions. It makes that determination, and, number 2, determines that acting pursuant to this resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take necessary actions against international terrorists, terrorist organizations, including the nations, organizations, and persons planning and authorized to commit or aiding terrorists in the attacks that occurred on September 11.

It is pretty clear what needs to be done. It is appropriate to discuss this. We have discussed it sufficiently. I hope in the next day or two we can complete action. We need a little less talk and more action. The time has come to do that. It is our challenge. It is our responsibility. I hope we can do it in the next several days.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

---

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 724

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today, once again, I will rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to take up and pass S. 724. I will withhold doing that until Senator NICKLES is able to come to the floor. I understand he wishes to address the issue.