

for their health insurance. Health insurance has become a breaker for businesses large and small.

Those good American companies, patriotic companies, if you will, that provide health insurance for their employees, when they sell the product in competition around the world, have to bring into the cost of that product the cost of health insurance for their employees.

The obvious question is, What are you doing, Senator? What is the Senate or House or Congress or the President doing to deal with these skyrocketing health insurance costs? The answer is: Nothing. For at least 3 years and even longer we have been afraid to even discuss the issue, as this system has fallen apart in front of our eyes.

So if you are talking about businesses being more competitive and jobs being created and making certain that our products have a chance in world commerce, energy cost is important but so is the cost of health insurance. This Congress has done nothing.

I have introduced legislation with Senator BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN of Arkansas and Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware that tries to create a system much like the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program so that small businesses have access to the same private insurance pool as Federal employees across America. It would give them at least an opportunity for enrollment in a competitive atmosphere where prices could come down as a result.

Let me address the bill before us, though, because it relates to this as well. Imagine the situation of the employees still working today—thank goodness many are and have not lost their jobs, or are in low-paying jobs—and they happen to have children. One of the concerns, of course, is what happens to the kids when these employees go to work. This bill before us is welfare reform. I voted for it when it first came out, but a lot of Democrats didn't.

My friend and mentor and one of my best influences in politics was the late Paul Simon of Illinois, and he thought it was a terrible bill. I disagreed with him. I didn't very often, but I did on this bill, and I voted for welfare reform. Thank goodness the Clinton boom occurred right after we voted for welfare reform, and a lot of people came off welfare to find work.

Now we are in the sad state of affairs under the Bush administration where we have lost more than 2.6 million manufacturing jobs since the President took office. We have lost manufacturing jobs for 43 consecutive months. Frankly, as a result of that, the jobs remaining are not paying as well. So now you have a person struggling to get by, they have a low-paying job, and children; they are worried about daycare.

This bill, thank goodness, has a provision that is going to be added by the Senator from Maine in a bipartisan amendment in which Senator SNOWE

has suggested that we add \$6 billion for daycare. It is long overdue. Some 16 million children under the age of 13 live in low-income families, and they need childcare. Only 1 in 7 are eligible to receive current Federal subsidies for childcare.

The funding in the original Senate bill wouldn't even serve the children served today. So the bill that comes before us is not adequate. In 15 States there are waiting lists of families that cannot afford to pay for childcare, and they are hoping to get a subsidy which is not there.

Let me also tell you it is an expensive proposition. Full-day childcare can cost between \$4,000 and \$10,000 a year. It is comparable to the cost of college tuition. These are low-income families struggling to deal with the reality of childcare. Twenty-five percent of America's families with young children earn less than \$25,000 a year.

We have to make certain we not only take care of the childcare but also afterschool care. A lot of kids today get out of school at 2:30 or 3 in the afternoon and have nowhere to go. They are latchkey children who go home. What happens during that period before a responsible adult is on the scene? For some kids they watch television, they sit around and eat junk food; some do homework; some get in serious trouble—involvement with drugs and gangs and guns and pregnancy. Problems occur. Afterschool programs mean kids are in a healthy environment where they can learn instead of being exposed to the streets or left alone in a circumstance where they might not come out of it in a positive fashion.

Childcare works—not only childcare for smaller children but afterschool care as well. We need to make that commitment. If we are saying to a welfare mother we want her to step forward and change her life, let us accept the reality that if she is going to go, in good conscience, forward to get a job and acquire the skills and move forward, her first concern is her kid. Making sure her kids are taken care of in a safe way during the day and afterschool.

Senator SNOWE of Maine, my Republican colleague, has that bipartisan amendment which I hope is going to be adopted very quickly.

How much time do we have remaining under the unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much.

#### THE 9/11 COMMISSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to close on an unrelated topic. I am in the process of reading a book, "Against All Enemies," by Richard Clarke, and as I started reading the book I was struck by the first chapter. You may remember Mr. Clarke served as the terrorism adviser and coordinator under President Clinton and then

again under this President Bush. He has been working for some 30 years as a professional in this field. He has made some statements over the last 10 days which have become a source of headlines across America.

The administration has spent more time since he first appeared on "60 Minutes" 7 or 8 days ago discrediting Richard Clarke than I have ever seen spent on any other individual. It is clear what he has said is painful to them. What he said is he believes this administration—the Bush administration, and the Clinton administration for that matter—could have done a better job in anticipating the threat of al-Qaida.

He says in his book, of course, that he thinks they were too focused on Iraq, even though there was no connection between Iraq, Saddam Hussein, and 9/11 and the al-Qaida terrorists responsible for it.

These statements have enraged the White House. They have sent everyone out—from the President on down—stating publicly that Richard Clarke is out to sell books.

If you read the first chapter of this book, you will get a much different impression of this Richard Clarke, who to many is just another faceless bureaucrat working in the White House. You will learn when you read this book—or others will tell you—that on 9/11 after the World Trade Center was struck in New York, it was Richard Clarke in his capacity as coordinator to deal with terrorism in the White House—who had I guess as much as any single person in the Government—who had a particular personal responsibility to deal with the safety of the President and the Vice President and the Cabinet, the continuity of Government, and the whole question of grounding aircraft around this country. He was the man who was at the controls at that point in time as everyone was trying to deal with what was going on.

I say that in a positive fashion because I do not know that I have ever heard many say what I have just said. But it tells me that a man who spent 30 years dealing with the intelligence and domestic security and terrorism who is now being discredited in a matter of 7 or 8 days as a person who can't be trusted to share his insights on what happened raises some important questions.

I honestly believe Richard Clarke has done us a service. He says in this book the Clinton administration could have done a better job. He says the Bush administration could have done a better job. And, frankly, we all could have done a better job, including Members of Congress, the Senate and the House. That is something we ought to face up to.

Let me also add he appeared last week before the 9/11 Commission. The September 11 Commission is a bipartisan commission cochaired by Governor Kean of New Jersey and former Congressman Lee Hamilton of Indiana—two good men, professionals who

are trying to get at the bottom of why 9/11 occurred and what we could have done to avoid it.

They have had testimony from Mr. Tenet, who is Director of the CIA, from Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld, and his predecessor, Secretary Cohen. They are going to entertain testimony from President Clinton and President Bush. They certainly had Mr. Clarke before them, and I think that is all well and good. I think all of those leaders in Government who were involved in the decisionmaking should sit and meet with this commission to get to the bottom of how America can be safer, which brings us to the story of the day.

I can't understand why Condoleezza Rice, who has served this administration and this country so well, is resisting an invitation to appear before the 9/11 Commission. If the President can find time, if former President Clinton, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, and the head of the CIA can find time, certainly it is not a matter of scheduling.

Second, she has made a number of appearances, as you know, on television on "60 Minutes" last night, and many other shows. So she is prepared to entertain questions from reporters. Why is she resisting this opportunity to testify? To say it has never been done, that it is unprecedented, let me say thank goodness 9/11 had never occurred before and it was unprecedented.

Let us gather together in a bipartisan fashion. Ms. Rice should come before the bipartisan commission and answer as many questions as openly and honestly as she can without ever crossing the line in the area of national security. But as she resists this opportunity to share her feelings about the preparation of the defense of America, she shortchanges the process which is simply trying to make America a safer nation.

Let us keep this bipartisan. Let us entertain not only Mr. Clarke but also Ms. Rice in terms of her views and memories of what happened on that fateful day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate that has been swirling around the country with respect to Iraq. The debate comes up again with respect to the commission which is currently meeting.

I cannot respond to all of the specifics that come along. I am tempted to, but I will not because I want to spend the time that is allotted to me by setting the total record before those who might be listening so we can understand that many of the original statements or original positions with respect to Iraq that are being repeated over and over again are, in fact, false.

I remember our colleague across the aisle, the late Senator Moynihan from

New York, one of my dear friends and one of the Senators for whom I have the highest regard, quoted something. He probably didn't think of it himself, but it was more or less his mantra, as he said to me: "Everyone is entitled to his own opinion but not to his own facts."

We keep hearing things said over and over again with respect to the war in Iraq as if they were fact. It is time to set the overall record straight.

We heard one statement that there was absolutely no connection between 9/11 and Iraq. The other one we hear over and over again is the reason we went into Iraq is because we thought Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. Some make it a little more stark than that.

There was a group that marched on the Utah State Legislature wearing T-shirts that said, "Bush Lied To Us. There Were No WMDs," as if the President of the United States George W. Bush himself alone was the only authority for the notion that there were weapons of mass destruction; and, once again repeating the false position that the only reason we went into Iraq is because we believed they had weapons of mass destruction.

To quote another individual not nearly as well known as Pat Moynihan but my high school history teacher, she would always say to us, "You cannot cut the seamless web of history." I want to take this opportunity to lay out the whole seamless web of the history of terrorism and do our best to understand it so we can realize the first statement that there was no connection between Iraq and 9/11 and the second statement that the only reason we went in is because Bush lied to us about weapons there, are not true. And I hope we can get the dialog back to the facts.

I am distressed at what has happened to the dialog on this issue. I must comment. On television was the former Vice President of the United States with his hand with a clenched fist raised, the blood vessels standing out on his neck, screaming at the top of his voice, speaking of the President, "He has betrayed this country."

To say the President has betrayed his country is to accuse him of treason, which is one of the crimes specifically listed in the Constitution as an impeachable offense. We have not heard that kind of rhetoric from a politician as highly placed as Al Gore since the 1950s. And the politician who used to speak like that was a member of this Chamber. His name was Joe McCarthy, and the President whom he accused of treason was Harry Truman.

Let us step away from that kind of rhetoric in this debate and review the facts.

I had the opportunity of attending the Kissinger Lecture at the Library of Congress which was given by George Shultz, former Secretary of State. It was one of the most cogent and lucid statements of where we are with re-

spect to the war on terror I have ever heard. An update of that appeared in today's Wall Street Journal. I would like to quote from that those points which address the issues I have talked about, and ask unanimous consent that the entire piece be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, former Secretary of State George Shultz begins with this comment:

We have struggled with terrorism for a long time. In the Reagan administration, I was a hawk on the subject. I said terrorism is a big problem, a different problem and we have to take forceful action against it. Fortunately, Ronald Reagan agreed with me but not many others did. [Don Rumsfeld was an outspoken exception.]

Twenty-five years ago, it was on the radar screen of an American administration—in this case one headed by Ronald Reagan—that terrorism was a problem.

Secretary Shultz goes on to discuss this and then makes this comment:

Today, looking back on the past quarter century of terrorism, we can see that it is the method of choice of an extensive, internationally connected ideological movement dedicated to the destruction of our international system of cooperation and progress. We can see that the 1981 assassination of President Anwar Sadat, the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, the 2001 destruction of the Twin Towers, the bombs on the trains in Madrid, and scores of other terrorist attacks in between and in many countries, were carried out by one part or another of this movement. And the movement is connected to states that develop awesome weaponry, with some of it, or with expertise, for sale.

Let me emphasize that last sentence again. Speaking of international terrorism that was involved in all of these things, going back to the assassination of Sadat in 1981, he says:

And the movement is connected to states that develop awesome weaponry, with some of it, or with expertise, for sale.

All right. Do we have an example of such a state that has developed awesome weaponry that may be for sale? Yes.

Quoting again from Secretary Shultz, he speaks directly of Saddam Hussein and Iraq. He adds to this Kim Jong Il of North Korea, and then says:

They seize control of state power and use that power to enhance their wealth, consolidate their rule and develop their weaponry. As they do this, and as they violate the laws and principles of the international system, they at the same time claim its privileges and immunities, such as the principle of non-intervention into the internal affairs of a legitimate sovereign state. For decades these thugs have gotten away with it. And the leading nations of the world have let them get away with it.

Yes, we have heard much on this floor about America must not invade another sovereign state. That is precisely what Secretary Shultz is talking about when he says, these states that develop awesome weaponry and cooperate with terrorism for the purpose of