

information on this case has been provided to the press, mainly in statements by unnamed administration officials, but also by Department of Justice (DOJ) spokespersons.

Washington Post articles indicate that the deportation of Mr. Arar was approved on October 7, 2002, by then-Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson, who signed the order in his capacity as Acting Attorney General. "Man Was Deported After Syrian Assurances," Washington Post, November 20, 2003 [hereinafter Washington Post, Nov. 20, 2003]; "Top Justice Aide Approved Sending Suspect to Syria," Washington Post, November 19, 2003. The same story states that U.S. officials "decided to send [Arar] to Syria last year only after the CIA received assurances from Syria that it would not torture the man." Washington Post, Nov. 20, 2003. And yet, "spokesmen at the Department of Justice declined to comment on why they believed the Syrian assurances to be credible." *Id.*

Mr. Arar claims that he was, in fact, tortured while in Syrian custody. The Syrian government has denied that Arar was subjected to torture, but statements from U.S. officials contradict that assertion. In a November 15 New York Times article, "American officials who spoke on condition of anonymity," were quoted as saying that Arar "confessed under torture in Syria that he had gone to Afghanistan for terrorist training, named his instructors and gave other intimate details." "Qaeda Pawn, U.S. Calls Him Victim, He Calls Himself," New York Times, November 15, 2003 (emphasis added). I find this statement to be shocking in light of the administration's assertions that it acted within the scope of its international treaty obligations.

Mr. Arar claims to have stated repeatedly to his U.S. interrogators that he feared torture at the hands of the Syrian government. Whether or not Mr. Arar had ties to terrorist organizations, as is alleged by U.S. officials, or whether his confession was a false one produced by coercion, as he claims, he was subject to the legal protections provided by the Convention Against Torture, which the United States has ratified.

The statements by Mr. Arar and the unnamed sources in the New York Times article cited above beg the question of whether the United States has investigated Syria's alleged non-compliance with any assurances it provided to the U.S. government. This question is especially critical in light of President Bush's statement on November 7, 2003, that Syria has left "a legacy of torture, oppression, misery, and ruin" to its people.

In light of the above facts and assertions, I request that you provide detailed answers to the following questions:

1. Under what specific authority was Mr. Arar detained, first at John F. Kennedy Airport and then at the federal detention center in Brooklyn, New York?

2. Is it true that Mr. Arar was denied access to counsel, as he claims?

3. An intelligence official is quoted in a November 5 Washington Post story as saying, "The Justice Department did not have enough evidence to detain him when he landed in the United States." "Deported Terror Suspect Details Torture in Syria," Washington Post, November 5, 2003. It has also been reported that U.S. officials were in contact with Canadian authorities regarding this case. Given that Mr. Arar, a Canadian citizen, resides in Canada and was traveling home to Canada when he was detained at the airport, why did the officials choose not to turn Arar over to Canadian authorities?

4. Did you become aware of Mr. Arar's case at any point between his detention on September 26, 2002, and October 7, 2002, the date

the deportation order was signed by Mr. Thompson? Did Mr. Thompson, who was serving as Acting Attorney General when he signed the order, consult with you before signing the order? Did you approve this action?

5. In a June 25, 2003, letter to me on the subject of rendition and other matters, the U.S. Defense Department General Counsel, William Haynes, stated that the "United States policy is to obtain specific assurances from the receiving country that it will not torture the individual being transferred to that country." The November 20 Washington Post article cited above confirms that assurances were obtained from Syria. What was the scope of such assurances? Were they provided to the U.S. government in writing? If so, please provide a copy to the Committee. If such a document is classified, please arrange for cleared staff to view it. If the assurances were not provided in writing, please explain why written assurances were not sought or provided.

6. What steps did the United States after Arar's rendition to assess compliance with the assurances provided by Syria in this case?

7. Is the statement of an unnamed official above that Arar "confessed under torture" accurate? If so, then Syria's actions violated the assurances provided to the U.S. before Arar's rendition. What has the U.S. done (a) to investigate such non-compliance and (b) to hold Syria accountable for such violations.

8. Under U.S. law, non-citizens who express concerns about torture if removed are entitled to an evaluation of their claim before being removed. Under the specific regulations that were likely applied to Mr. Arar's removal, there is an explicit prohibition against returning someone to a country where there are substantial grounds for believing he would be subject to torture. What process was used, if any, to evaluate the likelihood that Mr. Arar would be subjected to torture before removing him to Syria?

9. According to the November 5 Washington Post article cited in question 3, numerous unnamed intelligence officials have admitted to the press that renditions have occurred, purportedly under a "secret rendition policy." This policy was described as "a secret presidential 'finding' authorizing the CIA to place suspects in foreign hands without due process." Are you aware of a "secret presidential 'finding' authorizing the CIA to place suspects in foreign hands without due process"? If so, please provide a copy to the Committee. If such a document is classified, please arrange for cleared staff to view it.

10. Has the FBI or DOJ authorized or participated in any other alleged renditions, including interviewing and then handing suspects over to intelligence officers for transfer to another country?

11. In its effort to fight terrorism, the administration has focused on individuals who have connections to Al Qaeda that need to be further explored, and has argued that it has the right to detain and interrogate prisoners in Guantanamo Bay, perhaps as unlawful combatants or enemy combatants, as long "as it is necessary to help win the war against the Al Qaeda network and its allies." Washington Post, "High Court Will Hear Appeals From Guantanamo Prisoners," November 11, 2003. Notwithstanding my concerns about the legal status of those detained at Guantanamo, and the administration's treatment of enemy combatants in general, it would seem that Mr. Arar fit the classic administration profile for someone who should be detained in Guantanamo. Presumably, Mr. Arar would have been safer in detention at Guantanamo Bay than in Syria.

a. Was the option to detain Arar as an enemy combatant in Guantanamo Bay considered and rejected in favor of rendition to Syria? If so, on what basis was the decision made to send him to Syria?

b. Where there is more than one destination country to which detainees may be rendered, do you believe there should be a policy to render detainees to the country where torture is least likely (e.g., a country that does not have a history of documented humanitarian abuses)?

c. What is the standard applied by the administration in determining whether to deport an individual, transfer the individual to custody at Guantanamo Bay, or to charge the individual with a crime?

Thank you for your prompt answers to these questions.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senator.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

One such crime occurred in Passaic, NJ, in August, 1999. Kareem Washington, a gay man who sometimes dressed in women's clothing, was stabbed multiple times and left to die in an industrial area in Passaic. Police were unsure of the motive for the murder, however, the victim's wallet was found on his body. The victim was wearing a skirt, high-heeled shoes and stockings at the time he was killed.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR LOUIE B. NUNN

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to remember Gov. Louie B. Nunn of Versailles, KY, who passed away Thursday, February 5, 2004. Louie was elected Governor of Kentucky in 1967 and was a pillar of strength in the Republican Party for half a century.

Looking back through the history of the Commonwealth, I can say that he was truly the education Governor. Louie was a champion of the education system in Kentucky. He raised the standards of education for all, but focused his efforts on those people who too often fell through the cracks in the system.

He also was an advocate for mental health issues. People used to put anyone with a mental health problem in a shoebox and write them off, but Louie