

to share information with State and local law enforcement and to access their capability. This is not happening.

The third failure is the failure to establish within the intelligence community priorities and then deploy behind them. Rather than set up intelligence systems to validate convenient political notions, we need a system that pursues mutually agreed upon intelligence priorities. To that end, the President must assure that clear, consistent, and current policies are established and enforced through the intelligence agency. The President needs to charge the National Security Council with the preparation of a government-wide strategy for combating terrorism at home and abroad. It is an outrage that we are now more than 3 years from September 11 and we do not have a clear national strategy of how we are going to eradicate international terrorists.

The restructuring of the intelligence community suggested above can significantly contribute to a more coherent set of intelligence initiatives, but without leadership and commitment from the President, little progress will be made.

Fourth, the intelligence community has not implemented the policies necessary to recruit, train, reward or sanction, maintain the talents, or diversify its human intelligence capabilities. The intelligence community's current recruitment and training regime has been inadequate to overcome this handicap.

Of particular concern to me is the difficulty of receiving a security clearance for a first-generation American of Arabic ancestry. These young Americans, who have a heritage in the countries of the Middle East and Central Asia, are most likely to have absorbed colloquial Arabic, Farsi or Pashtun, at home, and could have the personal skills that will increase their value as a case agent. Of course, they are likely to have something else; that is, they are likely to have a family.

An intelligence security background check—an important part of assuring the patriotism of our intelligence community—includes interviews with family members. And if those family members live in Syria, for example, it may be difficult or impossible to get a clearance. If one of the family members, even a distant one, has been in the service of that foreign government, the recruit is likely to be rejected, even though he or she may meet every standard of being a patriotic American. By failing to find ways to overcome this bias, we are denying ourselves the benefit of one of our Nation's greatest assets, our diversity.

Another frequently cited reason for difficulty of recruitment of intelligence officers is the mid-1950s culture of the intelligence community. While most other aspects of our society have become accustomed to frequent turnover in careers—in fact, the average American can anticipate working at

seven or more distinctly different jobs or places of employment throughout his or her worklife—intelligence agencies continue to seek to employ people who are prepared to make a lifetime commitment.

Our Joint Inquiry recommended a series of reforms to bring the human talent in the community, which is in line with the current challenges, to the intelligence community. Those included a focus on bringing midcareer professionals into the intelligence community, allowing for more time-limited service for college graduates, finding ways to bring more native language speakers into the intelligence agencies, and other efforts at diversification.

At this point, I commend the former Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. George Tenet, for the work he has done to initiate these policies. I am pleased that the recently enacted Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005 includes seed money for the development of a reserve officers training corps style program for the intelligence community at several universities, a recruitment and training program which will provide financial aid in exchange for a commitment of service within the intelligence community.

This could be a significant response to the need for proficiency in some of the world's most difficult languages and least known cultures and histories. Having these students under supervision during their college careers would also facilitate the clearance of first-generation Americans of Arab background into the intelligence services. And it would have, as does the military reserve officers training corps, the further attribute of facilitating jointness; that is, the willingness of people to see the mission rather than stop their vision at the particular agency at which they serve. Once these young people enter their respective intelligence agencies, many of them will have known each other during their shared preparatory experience and, therefore, will be more likely to work effectively together.

The fifth failure is the failure to realize that many of the most important decisions made by the intelligence community that were previously described as tactical have now become strategic.

There have been too many instances, most of which we cannot talk about in open session, when mid-level bureaucrats in the intelligence community have made decisions at a tactical level without a more strategic view as to the implications of those decisions. These can be seemingly as simple as the rotation of surveillance aircraft or other means of surveillance which, when discovered, set off a diplomatic firestorm with one of our friends or with one of our enemies.

The leadership of the intelligence community has a special responsibility to determine if there is a full understanding of the implications, rewards, and risks of an action. Review and ulti-

mate judgment on tactical measures must be made by someone with the requisite strategic vision and authority.

For that reason, and because of the significant confusion that the FISA process—the process by which a warrant was obtained to either place a wiretap or review the effects of a foreign person—caused for the FBI in seeking to investigate suspects prior to 9/11, it is important we reform the way the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is now taught and applied.

For example, the officials of our Government who are charged with making the ultimate decision on these warrants, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State or their delegates, must place the individual application of such a warrant into the context of U.S. strategic global interests.

There are areas where the Congress, through oversight, can and must play a significant role. In a subsequent statement, I will review in more detail the role of Congress in the oversight and direction of the intelligence community and some of the reforms that I suggest should be made in order to more effectively carry out that responsibility.

America lost more than 3,000 of our people on September 11. But we lost something else. We lost our innocence. We can never bring back those people we lost, nor will we ever restore America's innocence. What we can do is honor their memories. What we can do is learn from their loss by embarking on the road from innocence to wisdom.

Government must lead when the people hesitate. And the people must lead when our Government, as it has under our current President, falters. Our safety and our future are too important to be left to change. Luck may spare us. It will never protect us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order I be allowed up to 10 minutes to speak as in morning business.

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

FAILED POLICY IN IRAQ

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, 3 days ago, a picture appeared in the Minneapolis-based Star Tribune newspaper, accompanying a Los Angeles Times article whose headline read: "U.S. Makes Show of Strength in Fallujah."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DAYTON. The picture, for the record, showed about 30 Iraqi civilians standing amidst the rubble of bombed buildings in the Iraqi town of Fallujah. In the forefront of the picture were five Iraqi children, and the caption beneath the picture read:

An Iraqi boy weeps, as people survey the destruction in a neighborhood, following a U.S. airstrike overnight. Twelve Iraqis were killed, including several women and children. . . .

President Bush makes a show of strength, and an Iraqi boy weeps. I say "President Bush" because this is not the U.S. military. They are carrying out the orders of their Commander in Chief. This is not the American people because the American people do not kill innocent women and children in another country. This is the result of and the responsibility of a failed policy in Iraq by the President and his administration.

There were at least two other aerial bombings that day in two other Iraqi cities, according to that one story—more destruction, more civilian casualties, more children weeping; children who lost brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, grandparents, and friends; children who will have the United States of America, for the rest of their lives, seared into their memories; children who will, horribly, possibly cheer if terrorists can cause that kind of terrible destruction to Americans in American cities; children who might even be willing to do something like that themselves in revenge.

President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and other apologists for this continuing war in Iraq claim that they are fighting terrorists there so we won't have to fight them here. By these actions, I maintain they are creating terrorists in Iraq whom we will have to fight here, whom we will have to defend against, fend off, and protect ourselves from for years, even decades to come. How would we feel if our children or our friends or our parents or wives or husbands were buried beneath the rubble that used to be our homes, our stores, and our neighborhoods?

I do not fault the courageous Americans in our Armed Forces who have borne the brunt of this administration's failed policy. To the contrary, I salute them for their heroism and their patriotism. It has been over a year and a half since they won the initial military victory in Iraq. They went from the Iraqi border to Baghdad in 3 weeks. They routed Saddam Hussein's army. They toppled his evil regime. And since then, they have stood guard until someone began to run that country.

They are still standing guard, 138,000 brave Americans. They are fighting, they are bleeding, and they are dying because this administration and their Iraqi allies have not figured out how to run that country.

We need a policy, a plan, and a timetable to get out of Iraq—not to lose Iraq but to leave Iraq, not tomorrow or next week, unfortunately—because the Bush administration has failed. They have failed to prepare for that. But not in 10 or 20 years, as my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, has predicted. He is not recommending that course of action; he is just telling us and the American people

the truth. Thank goodness someone is telling us the truth, the truth about what the Bush administration has gotten us into and where their present policies will leave us.

What he can't tell us, because no one can, is how many more Americans will die in Iraq during those 10 or 20 years; how many more Americans will die elsewhere around the world or, God forbid, right in this very country because of the failures of those policies today.

Today I am asking the esteemed chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee to hold oversight hearings this week on the current policy in Iraq, on the military situation there, on the plans of this administration, on the timetable for our continuing involvement there, and on the costs in dollars and lives and international esteem to the United States of America, because the American people deserve the truth. This Congress deserves the facts. Our soldiers, our 138,000 courageous Americans serving in Iraq today, deserve to come home with their military victory secured.

And I say to those who want to support our troops, if you want to support our troops, bring them home alive, bring them home alive now or as soon as possible hereafter, but not in 4 years or 10 years or 20 years. Make the administration in Iraq and the people of Iraq responsible for their own country. That is what democracy is about. It is about self-determination and self-responsibility. It is time the people of Iraq become responsible for Iraq. It is time the 206,000 militia and military that we claim to have trained in Iraq become responsible for Fallujah and Baghdad and everywhere else in Iraq.

The article I referred to earlier states: U.S. and Iraqi authorities lost control of Fallujah last April after they turned the city over to a U.S.-sanctioned force, the Fallujah brigade, which has now all but disappeared.

Where did they disappear to? I supported that action back then. I thought that was the right course of action, that we make Iraqis responsible for the defense of their own country, for the security of their own cities. Now I learn, not through this administration's disclosures but through an article appearing in an investigative story—thank goodness for the free and vigilant press because we wouldn't learn those things here in Congress if we were waiting to be told—that the Fallujah brigade has "all but disappeared."

That is a fundamental failure of this administration and the Iraqi administration to train, equip, and motivate the Iraqi forces in Iraq to stand up for and defend their own country from whomever it is over there—insurgents, terrorists, and citizens who want an end to the violence, understandably so, in their own homes and neighborhoods.

It is time to put Iraq in charge of Iraq, make them stand up and fight for their own country, for their own cities, for their own security, and stop forcing

Americans on the ground or in the air to cause this kind of destruction that that picture capsulizes which is going to wreak future destruction on our own cities and our own people.

This is a failed policy. It is a disastrous policy. It is one for which this administration should take responsibility.

Again, I call upon the Armed Services Committee of the Senate to hold oversight hearings and tell the American people the truth about what is going on there and what the future holds—in the near future, not the future future.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 10, 2004]
U.S. MAKES SHOW OF STRENGTH IN FALLUJAH
(By Patrick J. McDonnell)

BAGHDAD.—U.S. forces rolled into the rebel bastion of Samarra on Thursday and sought to reestablish Iraqi government control as aircraft pounded suspected guerrilla positions in two other insurgent strongholds: the flashpoint city of Fallujah in the west and the trouble spot of Tal Afar in the north.

The show of strength—along with the stated U.S. resolve to crush a Shiite Muslim militia in Baghdad—underscored the military's determination to exert control over the country in the months leading up to elections scheduled for January.

The U.S. move against the three insurgent centers came after a spike in attacks this week that pushed American military fatalities from all causes to more than 1,000. The actions appeared designed to dispel the perception that swaths of Iraq had become a "no-go" zone for U.S. troops.

American warplanes struck Fallujah, the third attack in as many days against suspected insurgent positions in the city 30 miles west of Baghdad. U.S. and Iraqi authorities lost control of Fallujah after U.S. Marines ended a three-week siege last April and turned the city over to a U.S.-sanctioned force, the Fallujah Brigade, which has now all but disappeared.

Nine people, including two children, were reported killed in a Fallujah house that the U.S. command suspected of being used by allies of the Jordanian-born terror mastermind Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

FOREIGN FIGHTERS

On Thursday evening, a U.S. spokesman, Maj. Jay Antonelli, revised the earlier description of events in Fallujah. "In spite of the great care taken to spare the lives of noncombatants, an unknown number of Iraqi civilians were unfortunately among those killed and wounded in the strike," Antonelli said in an e-mail statement.

"The foreign fighters who hide among the people of Fallujah place them at significant risk," Antonelli said.

He added: "Foreign fighters will not enjoy safe haven anywhere in the city."

In a separate statement, the U.S. command said military operations around Tal Afar were designed to rid the city of "a large terrorist element that has displaced local Iraqi security forces throughout the recent weeks."

The U.S. military said 57 insurgents were killed in the attack on Tal Afar, a northern city near the border with Syria that lies on smuggling routes for weapons and foreign fighters. The provincial health director, Dr. Rabie Yassin, said 27 civilians were killed and 70 wounded. It was unclear whether those reported by the Iraqis as civilians were counted as insurgents by the Americans.

Meanwhile, relative calm held in much of the Shiite Muslim heartland after an agreement negotiated last month by Iraq's leading

Shiite cleric, Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Hussein al-Sistani. The agreement brought an end to weeks of fighting between U.S. troops and Shiite militiamen loyal to radical cleric Muqtada al-Sadr.

Scattered clashes continued between Al-Sadr's loyalists and American forces in the radical cleric's Baghdad stronghold, Sadr City.

Iraqi officials want to prevent Al-Sadr from rebuilding his forces in Najaf. Toward that end, dozens of Iraqi soldiers and police raided Al-Sadr's Najaf office to search for weapons. Al-Sadr was not there at the time, and no weapons were found, although Iraqi officials said ammunition and mortars were confiscated from nearby houses.

U.S. and Iraqi government troops are not in full control of several cities and areas in Iraq, including Samarra in the north, Fallujah and Ramadi in the west, and the largely Shiite neighborhood known as Sadr City in eastern Baghdad, where a militia holds sway. Other cities and towns, such as Tal, have become guerrilla bastions where the U.S.-backed Iraqi government exerts only limited control.

In Samarra, U.S. commanders said their forces, accompanied by members of the Iraqi police and by national guard soldiers, drove into the city Thursday morning after gaining assurances from local Iraqi leaders that they would not be fired on. The local leaders said they sensed divisions within the insurgents' ranks between those who favored some accommodation with the Americans and those who rejected it, and felt secure enough to issue the temporary guarantee.

U.S. soldiers and the Iraqi police then convened a meeting of the U.S.-backed council, which chose a new mayor and police chief. After a few uneventful hours, the U.S. soldiers and the Iraqi police left.

However, commanders acknowledge that as many as 500 insurgents remain in Samarra. The guerrillas' preference is to strike at smaller U.S. or Iraqi units. In classic guerrilla style, they tend to hide their arms and blend in among city residents when faced with larger forces.

The U.S. troops pulled out at the end of the day for lack of a secure base to spend the night.

Maj. Neal O'Brien of the 1st Infantry Division, which patrols four provinces north of Baghdad that includes Samarra, said, "We will never give up our right to maneuver in any of our areas."

The U.S. approach in Samarra since spring had been to allow local leaders to work out a way to disarm or otherwise neutralize a stubborn insurgent force that had disrupted government and police activities in the ancient city of 200,000.

The largely Sunni Muslim population has long posed a major challenge for U.S. forces. The city was the site of a large-scale U.S. offensive last winter designed to flush out a guerrilla force thought to be composed of religious militants, anti-American nationalists and loyalists of Saddam Hussein's former Baath Party. During that offensive, a U.S. force of more than 3,000 soldiers also met little resistance as the guerrillas apparently melted into the populace.

But in recent months, residents say, Samarra had fallen back under insurgent control.

Mr. DAYTON. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time having ar-

rived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4567, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4567) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nelson (FL) Amendment No. 3607, to provide funds for the American Red Cross.

Schumer Amendment No. 3615, to appropriate \$100,000,000 to establish an identification and tracking system for HAZMAT trucks and a background check system for commercial driver licenses.

Reid (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 3617, to ensure that the Coast guard has sufficient resources for its traditional core missions.

Corzine Amendment No. 3619, to appropriate an additional \$100,000,000 to enhance the security of chemical plants.

AMENDMENT NO. 3624

(Purpose: To increase the amount appropriated for firefighter assistance grants.)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 3624.

On page 39, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 515. The amount appropriated by title III for the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness under the heading "FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS" is hereby increased to \$900,000,000.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am going to speak about the compelling needs that our local fire departments have.

All of us, over the weekend, went to events commemorating September 11, 2001. We all spoke about how much we admired those men and women who stood up to defend the Nation, including those very brave first responders at the World Trade Center who dashed up over 75 floors in burning buildings to try to rescue people. They put themselves on the line, and many of them, as we know, perished on that horrible day.

Here in the Washington, DC area, as we know, the Pentagon was hit. We in Maryland had 60 Marylanders die that day. We had some die at the World Trade Center, but the majority were at the Pentagon. Some died on the airplanes. We had people die on those airlines, including a flight attendant who gave her life and was one of the people who tried to deal with the situation. We had others who died on those planes, such as a family who was leaving on a sabbatical—a husband and wife who were academics, with their two children. Again, we had people die at the Pentagon, such as one young man from Baltimore who was a financial analyst over at the Pentagon. Of those from Maryland who died at the Pentagon, 24 came from one county, Prince George's County. They were pri-

marily African-Americans who worked in this financial services area of the Pentagon. Imagine, 24 people, such as Odessa Morris who had just celebrated her 25th anniversary; or Max Bielke, who had been in the military and when he retired, he went back to work as a civilian employee because he loved it. He was the last man to leave Vietnam. He stamped all the papers at our embassy there. He was the last soldier out of Vietnam. So we mourn that day.

At the same time, we were proud of the Maryland response. I was particularly proud of the Chevy Chase rescue team. This is a volunteer fire department in Montgomery County that dashed across the Potomac under the doctrine of mutual aid to provide firefighting assistance on that horrible day, joining with our local fire departments from Northern Virginia and Rescue One from Chevy Chase, and stayed on the scene in order to be able to quell the fires that continued to burn. They were part of a FEMA search and rescue unit and they provided help. They were the ones who brought in the dogs to look for survivors. They were there night and day for several days and weeks.

I was very proud of the Chevy Chase fire fighters and of all our fire departments in Maryland who went up to the World Trade Center to dig in the wreckage to see if they could find any survivors. We know the story about what happened at the World Trade Center. Again, the Chevy Chase Fire Department is a volunteer fire department. They serve their community and country on their own time and their own dime. It cost the Chevy Chase Fire Department over \$300,000 to be able to be on the job. They did it willingly, unstintingly. Yet at the same time, we know those local fire departments cannot continue to function when we go on Orange Alert, and they continue on their own time and on their own dime.

One of the great things we created was the Fire Grant Program. The Fire Grant Program was an invention before 9/11 of Senator KIT BOND and me as part of a FEMA reform package, along with Congressmen HOYER and WELDON in the House. We did it in a bipartisan effort to make sure our fire departments—particularly our volunteer fire departments—had the right equipment they needed to protect the protector, and also the updated technology to be able to protect us.

When we created that program as part of FEMA, well before September 11, 2001, it was authorized at \$300 million. At the same time, what we know is that when we did that—after 9/11, the need was so compelling, working, again, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, we authorized a fire grant program at \$900 million. What else do we know? We know there is compelling need. We know the fire administration, just in 2003, received almost 20,000 applications totaling \$2.5 billion in funding requests for local fire departments.

Imagine that. The fire administration received requests for \$2.5 billion.