

## THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the failure of the United Nations. The U.N. is failing to promote liberty, democracy, and human rights for all citizens.

The world has changed a great deal since the United Nations was formed some 59 years ago. The dangers of Nazism and communism have been replaced by an ever-evolving, ever-increasing threat of terrorism.

The United Nations is not up to the challenges of this new century. The U.N. now has sponsors of terrorism and repression overseeing the protection of human rights around the world. The countries of Sudan, China, and Cuba currently serve as members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

Yesterday, the United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, lectured the world body that the rule of law in Iraq is being disrupted as much by the United States as by the terrorists who ravage the country through bombings and beheadings.

Any person or group who cannot decipher the moral difference in this struggle against terror and repression cannot and should not be trusted to lead. In a BBC interview last week, the Secretary General stated that the liberation of Iraq by the United States and its coalition partners was illegal and a violation of the U.N. Charter. This declaration comes on the heels of his earlier statement that "there should have been a second resolution" authorizing the invasion.

Today, Mr. Annan seems to be saying that the only way force can be used legitimately in the modern world is to first obtain the unanimous permission of the U.N. Security Council.

I am pleased President Bush does not adhere to this line of thinking. And I am proud every time I hear him say that he will never wait for permission to defend the United States.

The Secretary General's latest posturing is far from harmless. The U.N. has been given the lead role in organizing the elections in Iraq in January. But Mr. Annan's comments that we have acted illegally in Iraq, comments which have been replayed across the Arab world, have given an added feeling of legitimacy to every jihadist hoping to disrupt the vote.

I believe the U.N. has lost its way. It has ceased to be able to judge the difference between right and wrong. The Secretary General's speech to the General Assembly yesterday illustrated his belief that there is a moral equivalence between the terrorists and those who are fighting them. That is disturbing, and that is wrong.

However, the Secretary General is not alone in expressing it. It is extremely disturbing that a former United Nations official, Anna Di Lellio, has been named as the Director of Communications for the Volcker panel, a supposedly independent panel investigating the Oil For Food scandal. Why

is this so disturbing? Because Ms. Di Lellio has compared President Bush and key U.S. ally, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, to Osama bin Laden. This shows, again, how the United Nations is failing in the essential tasks for which it is responsible.

There is a difference between right and wrong. And words do have consequences.

I also want to read a quote the Democratic nominee made yesterday. It is in the Washington Post today. It says:

Kerry did not directly answer a question about whether he agrees with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, who called the Iraq war illegal. "I don't know what the law or legalities are," Kerry said.

The U.N. Secretary General says the Iraq war is illegal because the United States didn't have United Nations' Security Council approval.

And JOHN KERRY can't give a clear answer that the United Nations Secretary General is wrong? This is a person running for the President of the United States.

Increasingly, the United Nations does not advocate the interests of those pursuing peace, freedom, and democracy in the world. If the United Nations spent more time working for liberty and less time coddling dictators, the world would be a better place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

## IRAQ

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to help frame the issue in Iraq. The American people deserve straight forward answers on issues of war and national security; especially when their lives are directly threatened and our military forces are engaged around the world in the war on terrorism. And it is not just our military forces that are at risk; our diplomats, intelligence professionals, and ordinary civilians working in war zones all face enormous danger from a very treacherous and barbaric enemy.

The recent, brutally grotesque beheadings of innocent Americans Eugene Armstrong on Monday and Jack Hensley yesterday are just two of many examples of the kind of evil that we face and why it must be eradicated.

Ambiguity is something we probably should expect in a heated political campaign, but anything less than total candor on national security issues is not acceptable.

The junior senator from Massachusetts has accused President Bush of "colossal failures of judgment" on his plan for Iraq. He then went on to lay out his own four-point plan for handling the conflict in Iraq. His four points were, No. 1, to get more help from other nations; No. 2, provide better training for Iraqi security forces; No. 3, provide benefits to the Iraqi people; and No. 4, ensure democratic elections can be held next year as promised.

I have no problem with this plan, because it is the short term and long term plan now in place by the Bush administration. Our President has consistently and assiduously worked with our allies to get more help in Iraq.

Sure, we would like to get more countries on board with us, but this is tough business and it takes bold, visionary leadership—like we see in Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, and dozens of our closest allies. To imply, as some of my colleagues have, that the United States is not getting help from our international friends is simply untrue. As terrorism spreads to other countries, as it did recently in Russia, we should expect—and provide—even more help.

And let me point out the obvious about some allies, like France, who have not been supportive of our policies in Iraq. Their foreign policy decisions are based on internal political considerations and not on the personality of the President of the United States. For some of my colleagues to imply that some countries will change their policies toward Iraq if we change our President is ludicrous and misleading. The French will change their foreign policy when they change their President, not when we change ours. I have a great deal of trust and confidence in the common sense of the American people and I am sure they will understand exactly what I am saying.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts has also called for better training for Iraqi security forces. I am glad that he also agrees with President Bush on this point. Training Iraqi security forces is a high priority of this administration.

Let us look at the facts. The Iraqi Army has more than 62,000 members. Of these, almost 46,000 have been trained and another 16,000 are currently in training. All 27 battalions of the Iraqi Army will be operational by January 2005.

Speaking at New York University recently, the Democratic Presidential candidate said, "Of the 35,000 police now in uniform, not one, not one, has completed a 24-week field training program." Just yesterday, however, The Washington Post reported that the head of strategic plans and policy for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lt. Gen. Walter Sharp, said that Kerry's accusation was just not accurate. According to Gen. Sharp, who is in a position to know, basic training for new Iraqi police officers is eight weeks, followed by 26 weeks of "on-the-job" field training. The Post article went on to say that Gen. Casey, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, estimates that Iraqi security forces will be in 'local control' of the majority of Iraq by the end of December, which is just 3 months away. Gen. Casey defined 'local control' as a combination of having Iraqi security forces in place, plus an assessment of the ability of local political leaders to govern