

We also are creating, from the pattern given to us by the 9/11 Commission, a very strong Intelligence Committee. And in the appropriations process, we have a subcommittee there. I spoke last night to Lee Hamilton, one of the cochairs. We have kept them advised as to everything we have done, and they are on board. They think what we are doing is totally in keeping with their recommendations. We haven't followed everything they wanted, but we have kept them advised along the way. We have a very good product.

Again, Senator MCCONNELL and I extend both to the majority leader and Senator DASCHLE our thanks for keeping your eyes on the prize and having us go forward, as difficult as it has been.

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 9:40 a.m., with the first half of the time under the control of the majority leader or his designee, and the second half of the time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

---

#### HELEN DEWAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will speak within morning business.

As we move to adjourn at the end of this week, I fear we will lose sight of an important event which will take place at the end of the 108th Congress. Because at the end of this session, the Senate press corps will lose one of the most distinguished and accomplished members of that body.

After nearly 25 years of hallway stakeouts, quorum calls, late-night votes, pressing deadlines, takeout food, the Washington Post Senate reporter Helen Dewar plans to leave her position when we adjourn sine die. Before that happens, I believe it is appropriate to recognize Helen's outstanding career during which she has faithfully informed Post readers on the oftentimes complex and intricate actions of this body.

Since 1980, Helen Dewar has covered every major Senate debate—from budget battles and judicial nominations to the sweeping intelligence reforms we are making now. But Helen's special talent has been to bring clarity to the day-to-day operations of this body, the Senate. Helen Dewar is known for being tough, persistent, inquisitive, and thorough. Helen's direct style of asking questions gets right to the heart of matter. She never asks an important question just once; she asks

until she is satisfied she has gotten as much as she can.

Born and raised in Stockton, CA, Helen Dewar earned her undergraduate degree in political science from Stanford University. Her first stint at the Post was filling paste pots for the then-Women's page. She left after one week for a reporting job on the Northern Virginia Sun. She returned to the Post in 1961 as a reporter and has worked steadily in that role since.

When Helen was getting started in the newspaper business, women had to struggle to get entry level jobs. It was rare for women to win a job covering politics at the Post back in the 1970s. Helen had to push hard to move from the ranks of the Metro staff to covering Jimmy Carter's 1976 campaign, and then to winning the coveted assignment covering the Senate.

Helen began covering the Senate in late 1979. When Ronald Reagan swept to victory over President Carter in 1980, the Republicans claimed control of the Senate, and Helen was poised to cover a great story. As the Senate reporter who was also responsible for following the budget, Helen wrote extensively about the Reagan revolution. She covered the battle over President Reagan's 1981 tax cut and the Cold War military buildup.

Helen has covered virtually every major story on the Hill during the past 20 years, from Reaganomics to Iran-contra, ethics investigations, the fight over the Gulf War resolution, to the impeachment of President Clinton. During election season, she covered Senate election battles and how they might impact national policy. Helen has reported on the career of seven Senate majority leaders, including ROBERT BYRD, HOWARD BAKER, BOB DOLE, GEORGE MITCHELL, TOM DASCHLE, TRENT LOTT, and myself. The hallmark of Helen's reporting has been fairness, integrity, clarity and scrupulous attention to detail.

Helen is regarded by her colleagues as the dean of the Congressional Press Corps. She intently focuses on detail and comes from the school of journalism where the story is more important than the journalist. The hallways of the Capitol and Tuesday stakeouts will not seem the same without her. I offer my warmest wishes to Helen Dewar in all her future endeavors. Her colleagues here on the Hill and in the Post newsroom will miss her. But those who will feel her departure most acutely will be her thousands of readers who, for more than two decades, have looked to her to provide a succinct, unvarnished account of the activities of their elected officials.

I yield the floor

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in applauding the remarkable career of Helen Dewar, the dean of the Senate press corps.

As Senator FRIST mentioned, Helen will be leaving her beat as the Washington Post's Senate correspondent at the end of this Congress. If I can bor-

row a phrase, not having Helen Dewar to kick us around anymore will be a loss for the Senate and for America.

Helen Dewar is a dogged reporter and graceful writer, and those gifts are rare enough, but she has possessed an even rarer gift. From the day she started the Senate beat, she has always known that you cannot understand the Senate just by walking these marbled Halls and making phone calls from a desk in the Capitol; you have to go out into America and talk to the people.

I recently came across what may be the first story Helen ever wrote from South Dakota. The date was July 2, 1980. It was a story about the centennial celebration of Arlington, SD, population 953. The headline read: "Celebrating 100 Years Against the Odds."

Helen described the town's parade as 2 miles long, "considerably longer than the town itself." She recounted people's complaints—farm prices were too low and gas prices were too high.

Mostly, she captured the incredible pride people in Arlington felt for their community. "The pride was so intense," she wrote, "that a visitor from Washington, offering Arlingtonians a chance to sound off about government and politics, was told to forget all about that unpleasantness, grab a plate of barbeque and simply enjoy Arlington."

Helen Dewar is a Washington institution, but she has never worn beltway blinders. For nearly 25 years, she has worked long, hard hours in the Senate, and when the Senate recesses, she has crisscrossed America to get the story—to explain to reporters what their Government is doing and why.

She is a reporter's reporter—tough, persistent, perceptive, and always fair. She has earned the respect of her colleagues, her sources, and her readers.

She has served American democracy well by helping to hold our Government accountable and to give the people the information and knowledge they need to make informed decisions about their Government.

After nearly 25 years covering this body, Helen is part of the institutional memory of the Senate. More than that, she is part of the heart of this place. It is a privilege and a pleasure to work with Helen, and I know we all wish her well in all her future endeavors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks time?

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, for the past several days, I have followed the remarks of the senior Senator from Massachusetts relative to Iraq and the war on terrorism. He likes to talk more about yesterday and not as much about tomorrow. He finds fault in everything that the President and his team have done to protect our lives, our liberties, and our way of life. He interprets facts to fit his dismal view of Iraq.

What bothers me the most about his many public statements condemning the war in Iraq is that he does so while we still have troops engaged in securing that country. These troops know it is vital—absolutely vital—for the long-term security of the United States and our allies that they succeed in helping Iraq become a free and democratic country.

The most recent edition of the Army Times newspaper contains a very telling survey of Active Duty, Reserve and National Guard troops on their views of Iraq and the Presidential race which bears out this point. This is the October 11th edition of the Army Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appears beginning on page 14, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army Times]

THE MILITARY

(By Gordon Trowbridge)

President Bush retains overwhelming support among the military's professional core despite a troubled mission in Iraq and an opponent who is a decorated combat veteran, a Military Times survey of more than 4,000 readers indicates.

Bush leads Democratic Sen. John Kerry 73 percent to 18 percent in the voluntary survey of 4,165 active-duty, National Guard and reserve subscribers to Army Times, Navy Times, Marine Corps Times and Air Force Times.

Though the results of the Military Times 2004 Election Survey are not representative of the opinions of the military as a whole, they are a disappointment to Democrats who hoped Kerry's record and doubts about Bush would give their candidate an opening in a traditionally Republican group with tremendous symbolic value in a closely contested election.

"For a long time, Kerry thought he had a chance to win the mantle and beat Bush on the issue of who could be the better commander in chief," said Peter Feaver, a political science professor at Duke University who has written extensively on civil-military relations and the political opinions of those in uniform.

Feaver said journalists and political analyst focus heavily on the opinions of military members because of a situation the nation hasn't faced in more than 30 years: a heated presidential race amid a difficult and controversial war.

While the survey found some readers with doubts about Bush's handling of the war in Iraq, there was remarkable consistency in their views of the two candidates.

Officers and enlisted troops, active-duty members and reservists, those who have served in combat zones and those who haven't, all supported Bush by large margins. And the survey hints that Kerry's emphasis of his decorated service in Vietnam may have done more harm than good with those in uniform.

"FROM THE HEART"

"It's about honesty and integrity," said Marine Sgt. Jason Jester, who was interviewed separately from the survey.

Jester, a recruiter from Winston-Salem, N.C., voted for Bush in 2000 and plans to do so again.

"He might not always make the right decisions, but I think the decisions he makes come from the heart."

To conduct the survey, Military Times e-mailed more than 31,000 subscribers Sept. 15. They were invited to access an Internet site seeking their opinions on the presidential race and related issues. From Sept. 21 to 28, and before the first presidential debate on Sept. 30, a total of 2,754 active-duty and 1,411 reserve and Guard members took part.

The nature of the survey led experts to caution against reading the results as representative of the military as a whole.

Unlike most public opinion polls, the Military Times survey did not randomly select those to question. Instead, subscribers with e-mail addresses on file were sent an invitation. That means there is no statistical margin of error for the survey—so it's impossible to calculate how accurately the results reflect the views of Military Times readers.

The surveyed group is older, higher in rank and more career-oriented than the military as a whole. Junior enlisted troops in particular are underrepresented in the group that responded.

But as a snapshot of the careerist core of the armed services, the survey holds little good news for Kerry, revealing a group with strong Republican leanings that the Democratic challenger has not shaken. Among the findings:

Echoing previous Military Times polls and other research, the survey found a group with a close affinity for the Republican Party. About 60 percent of those surveyed identified themselves as Republicans, while 13 percent consider themselves Democrats and 20 percent independents. Among the general population, pollsters usually find voters evenly divided among Republicans, Democrats and independents.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, the caption is: "Troops sound off. Who do you choose for President and why?"

Among Active-Duty forces, 66 percent in this poll said the most important issue for them in deciding for whom to vote is the war in Iraq. In the same poll, 60 percent said they approve of the way President Bush is handling the situation in Iraq, and 72 percent said if the Presidential election were held today, they would vote for President Bush. That is quite a statement of support for the Commander in Chief and his policies in Iraq from those who are actually doing the fighting and the dirty work to bring security and prosperity to that country.

Even more significant are the results from the Reserve and National Guard troops who have been called to active duty and deployed to Iraq. Among this group, 72 percent said the most important issue for them is the war in Iraq; 63 percent approve of the President's policies in Iraq; and a full 76 percent of the Reserve and National Guard soldiers who have actually been deployed to a combat zone said they are planning on voting for President Bush. These are amazing figures from both our Active Duty and Reserve Forces that tell us much more about what is going on in Iraq than just the reports of the bombings and kidnaping.

Listening to the assessments from my colleague from Massachusetts begs the question: Why do the vast majority of our soldiers and marines engaged in ground operations in Iraq appreciate the importance of our mission there and believe they are engaged in a his-

torical struggle that will lead to a better world and a safer America when a senior Senator cannot see the same thing? Are they right or is he right?

As I reflect on the words of the Senator from Massachusetts, I am reminded of that famous quotation made by McLandburgh Wilson:

Twixt the optimist and pessimist,

The difference is droll:

The optimist sees the doughnut,

But the pessimist sees the hole.

When it comes to Iraq and the war on terrorism, my colleague from Massachusetts sees the hole, when he should be seeing the doughnut.

I suspect that nothing we say in this Chamber will change his views on the issue. Nevertheless, I feel obligated to make some remarks about why our troops are fighting in Iraq, and why some are giving the ultimate sacrifice for our country. It is important for our troops and their families to know that not all Senators only see the "hole."

Our policy in Iraq should not be viewed in isolation. The issue is far more complex than that. It is important to understand the linkage between the Islamic terrorists who want to destroy us and the totalitarian regimes under which so many of them were raised. People who have such a deranged view of a Supreme Being that they believe their religion sanctions their own suicide, while killing innocent people, and do not come from free, open, and democratic countries and societies.

Let me explain how I look at Iraq and the war on terrorism. If we look at each incident individually, each bombing, each hostage taking, each killing, et cetera, we get one impression of these events. What we should do instead is put ourselves in the place of an eagle soaring high and looking down on everything that is going on inside of Iraq.

When we take the eagle's view, this is what we see: Iraq is no longer a sanctuary for terrorists, it is no longer a country that threatens its neighbors, and it is no longer a threat to world peace and order.

The insurgency in Iraq is confined to 3 of the 18 provinces, and the country is preparing for its first democratic election only 4 months from now.

Iraqi leaders, Iraqi soldiers, and Iraqi policemen are stepping forward in the thousands to take back their country from the terrorists.

All we have to do to see what progress is being made in this area is to look at the success we have had just over this weekend. It was not just American troops who had success in Samarra, one of the most violent places inside of Iraq; it was the now-trained Iraqi security police who fought side by side with the American troops, who received the praise of the American troops for the training, preparation, and the great job they did in not just helping secure the peace but driving the insurgents out of that town and providing a safer and more secure

community in which the people could live.

America, along with many other countries, remains firm and will not be deterred from achieving the goal of seeing a democracy in Iraq.

There is a realistic understanding of the difficulties and dangers in Iraq, but there are also visionary, optimistic leaders in Iraq and in the many countries that make up the multinational force who are determined to see the insurgency fail.

There have been many references to the July 2004 National Intelligence Estimate, or the NIE. In fact, Senator KENNEDY said in this Chamber on 29 September 2004 that the best case scenario in that NIE was that violence in Iraq would continue at current levels, with tenuous political and economic stability. Regardless of what this classified NIE actually said, I do know it was based on information that is but a snapshot in time and that time continues to move on.

There are many things visible today that were not clear when that NIE was written. The character of the Iraqi leadership was unknown last June, but no one who heard Prime Minister Allawi speak to the Joint Session of Congress recently could be anything but impressed with his enthusiasm, his intellect, and, most importantly, his determination to see a free and safe and democratic Iraq.

Lieutenant General Petraeus has been working assiduously to build up the Iraqi security forces. Last June, when the NIE was written, very few of those forces had completed their training. Now trained and competent Iraqi Army and police units are on duty and are assuming the major role in restoring security in their own country, and the training continues, so we can expect even more Iraqi security forces to assume their duties every month, just as they did in Samarra this past weekend.

We are engaged in an enormous struggle of historic proportions to see freedom and democracy spread throughout the Islamic world, and this will set the foundation for a final peaceful solution between Israel and Palestine. It will also, in the long term, eliminate the politically oppressive environment and poor economic conditions that have been the breeding grounds for terrorists to find new recruits.

I want to say to our military personnel and their families that your role in this historic and important struggle is the key to its success. You will look back with pride on your contributions and your sacrifices to make our country and the world safer. When you see what you have accomplished from an eagle's view, you will not see the hole that a pessimist sees.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing morning business, it now be in order to consider amendments to the pending intelligence reform bill, and for the information of all Senators, these are amendments that have been cleared on both sides. This will only take a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, I intended to speak for 1 minute before the time had expired for morning business. Will the Senator yield for just one brief comment?

Ms. COLLINS. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### INTELLIGENCE REFORM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this bill came to the floor on September 27. It was debated a few hours, the 28th and 29th similarly. On the 30th, it was debated about half a day. Yesterday, we started business on the bill sometime around noon. Today, we are voting cloture on the seventh calendar day, but probably less than 3 days of debate. I think this rush is unbecoming of the Senate.

I shall oppose cloture, and I want the record to show I do not think this subject, reform of the intelligence community, has ever taken such a short period of time. We are acting under pressure primarily from two men whose business was through when they filed their report. I am appalled that we are moving at this pace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I note that the debate on this bill has been extensive. The Senator from Connecticut and I were here until 9 p.m. last night. We were here until after 6 o'clock on Friday. We have been here, although others have not been here, debating all day every day.

#### NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE REFORM ACT OF 2004

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3933, AS MODIFIED

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the first amendment I call up is amendment No. 3933, as modified, with the changes that are at the desk. This is an amendment from Senators CANTWELL, SESSIONS, SCHUMER, and KYL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for Ms. CANTWELL, herself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 3933, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

##### SEC. \_\_\_\_ BIOMETRIC STANDARD FOR VISA APPLICATIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Biometric Visa Standard Distant Borders Act".

(b) TECHNOLOGY STANDARD FOR VISA WAIVER PARTICIPANTS.—Section 303(c) of the En-

hanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1732(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) TECHNOLOGY STANDARD FOR VISA WAIVER PARTICIPANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 26, 2006, the Secretary of State shall certify to Congress which of the countries designated to participate in the visa waiver program established under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) are developing a program to issue to individuals seeking to enter that country pursuant to a visa issued by that country, a machine readable visa document that is tamper-resistant and incorporates biometric identification information that is verifiable at its port of entry.

“(2) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—This subsection shall not be construed to rescind the requirement of section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)).”

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is pending. Is there further debate? If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3933), as modified, was agreed to.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3957

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I now call up a managers' amendment that is at the desk and, again, has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself, and Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 3957.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further debate on this amendment? If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3957) was agreed to.

##### AMENDMENTS NOS. 3712, AS MODIFIED, AND 3768, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding morning business, that I send two amendments to the desk and ask the pending amendment also be set aside, to S. 2845.

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

Ms. COLLINS. On behalf of Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator BAUCUS, these amendments have been cleared on both sides and I urge their adoption en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

##### AMENDMENT NO. 3172, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide improved aviation security)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

##### TITLE —AVIATION SECURITY

##### SEC. —01. IMPROVED PILOT LICENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Aviation Administrator may develop a system for the issuance of any pilot's license issued more than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that—