

and dinners, homemade gifts, and, if my family is typical, some gentle teasing. It is a day we show our gratitude, and we remember how important our dads are in our lives.

I was very close to my dad, and I cherish my memories of him.

When I lived in Nashville, I used to drive by my parents' house everyday on my way to work. And everyday, no matter where I was, I would call to touch base and say hello.

My father was a man of extraordinary kindness and generosity. He was known throughout the community for his good works.

Before he died, he wrote a letter to his grandchildren, passing on his humble wisdom collected over a lifetime. In it, he told them:

"Be happy in your family life. Your family is the most important thing you can ever have. Love your wife or your husband. Tell your children how great they are. Encourage them in everything they do.

"Be happy in your community. Charity is so important. There's so much good to do in the world and so many different ways to do it."

He also wrote that,

"I believe that life is made up of peaks and valleys. But the thing to remember is that the curve is always going up. The next peak is a little higher than the previous peak, the next valley isn't quite so low.

"The world is always changing, and that's a good thing. It's how you carry yourself in the world that doesn't change—morality, integrity, warmth, and kindness are the same things in 1919 when I was born, or in 2010 or later when you will be reading this. And that's a good thing, too."

I have worked hard to live up to his high ideals and the sterling example he set before us. And I have worked hard to instill these values in my own sons Bryan, Jonathan and Harrison. If I have half succeeded, that is a very good thing.

As we celebrate our fathers this weekend, I also encourage everyone to reflect on the importance of fathers to the social fabric.

The National Fatherhood Initiative, a non-profit devoted to promoting responsible fatherhood, reports that today's fathers are more present in their children's lives than ever. Dads in two-parent families spend more time with their children than the previous generation of dads. Research also indicates that today's fathers are more active and more nurturing.

And it has a big impact.

Children with involved, loving fathers—as compared to children without—are more likely to do well in school, have healthy self-esteem, show empathy, and avoid drug use, truancy, and criminal activity. The bottom line is kids do better when their dads are around. For a while America forgot just how important dads are, but now we know in our heads what we have always known in our hearts.

So, this Father's Day, we salute them. Dads on the front line who risk their lives for our freedom. Dads on the home front who go to work everyday to

support their families. America honors you as everyday you honor us.

STATEMENTS REGARDING GUANTANAMO

Mr. KYL. Madam President, one of the things I remember that my father taught me—and it has stood me in good stead, though I have not always followed the advice—is to have strong convictions but always to deal in moderation and be reasonable in your approach, to listen to other people and try to be responsible in what you say. In all things, moderation would have applied to the advice he gave me frequently. Again, not to say one should not have strong views, but you can be more effective in communicating those views if you treat people decently, if you listen to what they have to say, and if you express your own views with a degree of humility and moderation. That is something that, sad to say, even in my relatively short time in the Congress, I have seen adhered to, sadly, less and less.

Certainly, the Senator from West Virginia sets a standard for all of us in the way that he treats this body, the reverence he has for the institution and, therefore, the care he takes to deal in this body in an appropriate and responsible way, in the great tradition of the body.

I mention that because the coarsening of our language, I suppose, can be expected to be manifested first in the political environment. It certainly has occurred with increasing intensity over the years, though, not just in political campaigns but even on the floor of the Senate and engaged in by colleagues in the Congress as well as pundits and others.

Strong subjects sometimes evoke strong emotions, and perhaps that explains why some of the rhetoric surrounding the discussion of our detention of enemy combatants at Guantanamo Bay has reached such a high-pitched level, to such a high degree of hyperbole and exaggeration—I daresay, in some cases, irresponsible characterizations.

If this were simply a matter of political rhetoric and partisan politics, I suppose that in some senses it could be excused, though it is not helpful. But here the consequences of such language, this over-the-top kind of rhetoric, can actually be detrimental to the effort of the United States that all of us support—certainly to the people we put in harm's way, our men and women in the military, and the other services that are helping us to fight the war on terror.

This is why it distresses me to hear the characterizations of American activities and Americans as being equated with some of the worst actors in the history of mankind—phrases thrown around, apparently, somewhat thoughtlessly, without due regard for the consequences, when enemies of the United States seize on the flimsiest of

things to take to the streets and riot and kill each other.

The unfortunate reporting of Newsweek Magazine—which turned out not to be true—regarding desecration of the Holy Koran caused Muslims in the world—thousands and thousands—to riot and cause harm to each other. I believe there were at least three deaths that resulted, if I am not mistaken. Words have consequences, and when Americans speak in irresponsible terms about the actions of Americans who are simply trying to do their best in trying circumstances, in ways that denigrate their motives, denigrate their actions, and that call into question the entire character of America, because of these actions, it is irresponsible. And it should not be engaged in, especially it should not be countenanced by Members of this body or the Congress, certainly not engaged in by leaders in this body. Yet, sad to say, we all have heard in the last few days this kind of language.

I will get back to that in a moment. Let me go back and try to provide some perspective about this entire debate about Guantanamo Bay.

Guantanamo Bay is a place where the United States Government has had a lease from the Cuban Government for a long time and spent about \$150 million to build a prison facility to house many of the people who had been detained in the war on terrorism, primarily people who were on the battlefield in Afghanistan, there being no facilities adequate in Afghanistan.

It is a place that was designed to be able to accommodate people of different cultures. It is significantly managed by Americans who have a significant degree of medical background and training in the culture of Islam in order to ensure that the people there are treated as humanely as possible under the circumstances and with due regard for not only their human rights but their faith as well.

This country need apologize to no one in the way that over the years we have tried to adhere to human rights standards and treat people of faith appropriately. Certainly the stories—and I say "stories" because in most cases, they are mere allegations that are untrue—of treatment of people at Guantanamo Bay have raised the interest of Americans because we are a people who instinctively pull back from such kind of conduct. We do not want to be even against terrorists engaged in inhumane activity. That is why these stories have such resonance.

Yet this facility, which takes care of these people in some respects even better than the troops there—in terms of the sleeping quarters, meals, and so on—this facility is as good, I think, as any prisoner of war facility in recent memory and certainly with the attention of the media, the International Red Cross, visits by American officials—there have been thousands of visits. It is a very wide open facility in that sense.

With all of this attention, I think the very small number of specific complaints that have been investigated and found to have any merit at all—something like five in number—is a testament to the commitment of the United States to adhere to standards of decency and humanity when dealing with people.

Who are these people? These are the worst of the worst. We do not have the time or the ability to round up people and hold them for the sake of it. It is too costly. Over 10,000 people have been captured in this war against the terrorists. Something like 520 are at Guantanamo Bay. These are the people who are the bombmakers, the bodyguards of Osama bin Laden, the financiers, the plotters, the people who have been sent out to be assassins, to be suicide bombers. These are the worst of the worst, the killers who, if let go, will return to their killing.

Since the detentions at Guantanamo Bay, the United States Supreme Court has said there is one right that these detainees have, and that is a right to have their status determined, even through a habeas corpus petition, which in the United States means a right to have questioned the appropriateness of your being detained. The Supreme Court did not hold they have a right to a trial, that they have a right to be charged with anything, that they have a right to a particular kind of legal proceeding. Simply, they have a right to have their status reviewed by an appropriate tribunal.

And since then, their status has been reviewed, every one of them. There is a process by which it is reviewed annually to determine whether they not only are still appropriately held, but whether they need to be held, whether they pose a threat.

In this period of time, a dozen of these detainees—many were released, something like 200, as I recall—a dozen have already been recaptured on the battlefield. They went right back to killing Americans.

This is why prisoners of war are detained when captured, and it has thus been throughout modern history. In World War II, for example, we have all seen the movies and read about the internment camps of Germans and Japanese and, of course, the way Americans were held as POWs as well. With the rare exception of the people at the very top of the Nazi Government and a few of the Nazi generals, the German POWs were not charged with crimes or tried for those crimes. They were simply held in these camps until the end of the war.

A couple of these camps were in Arizona. I know an Arizona physician who went through one of these camps, I believe in Nebraska. When he got out, he decided he liked America a whole lot and became a renowned physician in Phoenix. These were places that people were held until the end of the war so they could not go back to fighting against Americans. That is precisely

the primary purpose of Guantanamo Bay.

For the worst of the worst, the people we do not want to go back fighting against us or committing terror against anyone else, we have to have a place to detain them.

I must say, in a debate with the senior Senator from Vermont last night on television—and he and I disagreed generally about this issue—he acknowledged this is not about Guantanamo Bay. As he said, we have to have a place to hold these people, and I agree with that proposition. Some have even suggested we close this brand-new facility. If you close it, where are you going to put them? Would you like to take one of the military bases that is being closed in your State and make it available for these detainees? Maybe that is the place to detain them. I do not think so.

The issue is not closing Guantanamo Bay. I think it is, frankly, criticism of the American Government and leaders of the American Government. Some people do it for partisan political purposes. Others do it, to bring down certain people. Others, frankly, have a disregard for this country and are quick to criticize almost anything we do.

But look at some of the specific charges. One of them is these people are being held in limbo. They are not being held in limbo any more than any other prisoner of war or enemy combatant has been held in the past. They are being held until the conflict is over so they do not go back to fighting us again.

Then they demand to know of the general and admiral who were before the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday when we held a hearing on this: Well, how long are they going to be detained? We demand to know. We do not know how long the war is going to last, Senator. I demand to know. Will it be forever? What if the war lasts for forever, will they be detained forever?

These are pretty silly questions, if you ask me. We do not want to detain these people. We would like not to have to do it. We would like to bring the war to a close, but until it is safe to release them, they are not going to be released, not unless we are going to jeopardize the service people and others who are subject to terrorism. So let's get back to reason and solid logic here.

Another question is, Why are we treating these people possibly a little bit differently than other prisoners of wars have been treated? The answer is they are not prisoners of war. That does not mean we do not treat them humanely and in accordance with the Geneva Conventions.

That is another charge, that we violated the Geneva Conventions. No, we have not. No, we have not. The United States adheres to the Geneva Conventions, and we have not violated them, and we do not intend to. Enemy combatants are not entitled to the protection of the Geneva accords to which prisoners of war are entitled.

The reason for the Geneva accords for the POWs is we want to reward people who adhere to the laws of war. What does that mean? They fight for a country, they wear the uniform of that country, they adhere themselves to the rules of war. In the case of terrorists, that does not apply. They do not fight for a country, they fight for a cause. They do not wear a uniform. They do not fight by the rules of war. They kill innocent people indiscriminately. That is their *modus operandi*. That is their preferred action.

That is why they are enemy combatants, not prisoners of war. So we would not have to accord them any standards of treatment except that we are the United States of America and we say, and the President has said and Secretary Rumsfeld and everyone else in the Government has said, for the United States of America it is inappropriate to do anything less than treat people humanely, and we will not violate the Geneva accords.

So even though they are not entitled to all of the rights of prisoners of war, there are standards of treatment that have been established and have been adhered to. In the few situations in which there is an allegation that maybe those standards might have been violated in some small way, the people have been held responsible who have violated the standards. I think there have been five cases of dealing inappropriately with the Koran at Guantanamo Bay, not having both hands on it at once or not having a white glove when dealing with a prisoner. It is that kind of violation.

This kind of thing has been compared by some to Pol Pot and Nazi Germany and the Soviet gulag and the human rights abuses that the United Nations complains about each year. These comparisons are not apt. They are not responsible. They are not appropriate. They do not even begin to appropriately describe the kind of conduct that our people have engaged in and the crimes against humanity that were referred to. To even think of them in the same sense is unthinkable.

What about the question about charging them? There is a suggestion they should either be charged or released. Well, this is not a fishing contest. This is not catch and release. This is serious. This is war. When somebody is trying to kill you and you can detain them, you do it. The alternative is, obviously, you kill them. But hopefully you do not have to kill them; you can detain them, and you can put them in a place that, until the end of the war, is safe for them and safe for you.

For those who have committed war crimes, we have the option of charging them with such crimes, and there is a special tribunal set up to try them for those crimes, and they can be tried. Now, there are cases in the courts of appeal right now that are helping to define the parameters of those trials and until that is very clear those will not proceed, but that is the way we will deal with those cases.

So for those that can be tried, obviously we will do that, but that is a very small percentage. There is no point in charging prisoners of war or enemy combatants with anything because the whole point of their being held is to prevent them from going back to war against you.

The final purpose for this detention is intelligence gathering. We have found that human intelligence is the best intelligence and that the highest percentage of human intelligence is the interrogation that has occurred here and elsewhere that has led us to learn a lot about the techniques of the terrorists, their plans, the names of others, and other important information that has helped us save lives. So the point of this detention is to save lives, to keep people from killing us, and to get information that will help us to prevent future killing. That is an appropriate purpose of Guantanamo.

So when people use irresponsible language, when they seem to leap to conclude that the United States must have done wrong simply because a lawyer or some group or a prisoner has alleged abuse—and by the way, remember that the al-Qaida training includes a manual instruction on how to allege that they are being abused as a prisoner, as a detainee. They are supposed to allege abuse, and they do. So let us not jump to the conclusion that any al-Qaida terrorist who alleges abuse at Guantanamo Bay must be right and all of the Americans, from the President on down, must be wrong. I like to put my chances on Americans trying to do the right thing. We will make mistakes, but we will try to correct those mistakes and punish those responsible. In the meantime, I think the benefit of the doubt goes to those people whom we have given a very hard job to do.

To get back to my original point, the use of irresponsible language, irresponsible charges, has consequences. It can hurt those people that we put in harm's way by turning international public opinion against the United States. When responsible American officials make irresponsible charges, all the world listens. When they listen, sometimes they react very badly. It does our cause no good when—as some of my colleagues have said, this is all about winning the hearts and minds of the Muslim world. There is a great deal of truth in that. It does no good in that battle to denigrate our own actions in a way that is calculated to or one must know will inflame the passions of terrorists and others around the world that support the terrorists. It does no good to this ultimate goal of winning hearts and minds to unduly criticize America, Americans and American leaders for actions that are nothing more than what any Nation has the right to do when it captures people who have been engaged in combat or terrorism against it.

I urge my colleagues to keep this issue in perspective, to understand the reason we detain people, to understand

the impact of irresponsible language, to tone down the rhetoric, understand that the President and all acting on his behalf are trying their very best to do what we want them to do, and at the end of the day, this is all about winning the war on terror, saving American lives and moving on to a more peaceful world.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, in the past few weeks a number of allegations have been leveled against the Guantanamo Bay detention center.

There have been some legitimate questions about the treatment of detainees, which is fair and responsible. The United States is governed by the rule of law. And it is proper for the Congress, in its oversight role, to ask the executive branch about such matters and make sure the interests of our constituents and the Nation are being properly addressed.

That being said, in many cases, the allegations that have been made recently have been false, distorted or misrepresented.

Newsweek, as we are all too familiar, erroneously reported that an American guard flushed a Koran down a toilet. That report, which was later withdrawn, resulted in widespread protests and the deaths of several individuals.

When the facts came out, we learned that, in the 3 years that Gitmo has been in operation, there have only been 5 cases of "mishandling" of the Koran by our military staff.

In those few instances where mistakes were made—and people do make mistakes—they were corrected and persons were held accountable.

We also learned that the prisoners themselves had abused the Koran 15 times, in some cases, reportedly, to implicate our soldiers in a religious crime.

Multiple inquiries have found that the detainees at Guantanamo are being treated in accordance with the Geneva Conventions and U.S. law. They are well fed and well housed. They have access to clean showers, Muslim chaplains, and even psychological counseling if they request it.

Some might say they are living in more luxury and safety than our soldiers and marines fighting the terrorists in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Our service men and women in the field usually eat cold, packaged meals; sleep in crude living areas without beds; and often wonder if they will live to see the next day, all in the cause of promoting freedom and democracy and defending our country.

One thing is for sure, the detainees are enemy combatants who were picked up off the battlefields of Afghanistan and elsewhere. They are hardened terrorists and have pledged their lives to jihad, the death of Americans, and the destruction of our country.

They are being held at Guantanamo so they don't kill more Americans, either at home or abroad.

They are being held at Guantanamo so that we can question them, so that

we can prevent their colleagues from committing more terrorist acts.

The intelligence we have learned about the terrorists, their networks, their plans, and so on, has been a treasure trove that has saved lives and is helping us win the war on terror.

Personally, I am convinced that Guantanamo is humanely and fairly serving its much needed purpose. And I am also convinced that if we closed the camp, it wouldn't make one bit of difference to the terrorists who hate us and murdered 3,000 innocent American citizens before Guantanamo or the war on terror was ever conceived of.

And it will make no difference to those who have agitated and protested against American policy from the very start.

We can debate whether Guantanamo helps us save lives and win the war on terror. But what I can't stomach are the comparisons being made between Guantanamo and some of the most egregious symbols in the history of mankind.

I am referring to the remarks of Amnesty International officials that compared the U.S.-run Guantanamo to the Soviet gulag.

I am referring to the International Committee of the Red Cross official who reportedly compared U.S. soldiers to Nazis.

And, regrettably, I am referring to a Senate colleague who, this week, called Guantanamo a "death camp" and drew parallels to Hitler's Germany, Stalin's gulags, and Pol Pot's killing fields.

This was a heinous slander against our country, and against the brave men and women who have taken great care to treat the captured terrorists with more respect than they would ever have received in any point in human history.

It is reported that nearly 9 million people were killed by Adolf Hitler; about 20.7 million were killed in the Soviet gulags from 1929-1953; and over 1.5 million people were killed in Cambodia from 1975 to 1979.

And there is no need to recount the brutal torture and manner in which many of these people died, most of whom, if not all, were innocent people.

Do we know how many people have been killed at Guantanamo? Zero. That's right: zero people.

And yet we have members of this body who have come to the Senate floor to level the most egregious charges, compare our troops to Nazis, and charge the United States with crimes against humanity. To accuse our sons and daughters, who are serving proudly to keep killers from the battlefield, with committing genocide and war crimes is beyond the pale.

It is wrong to make these comparisons; it is wrong to suggest such things. It is unfair to our military; it is unfair to the American people; and it is unfair to this body. This is wrong and it is the worst form of demagoguery.

It is anti-American and only fuels the animus of our enemies who are constantly searching for ways to portray

our great country and our people as anti-Muslim, anti-Arab. It is this type of language that they use to recruit others to be car bombers; suicide attackers; hostage takers, and full-fledged jihadists.

It is darkly ironic that those who want to close Guantanamo for the sake of public diplomacy are themselves wreaking great damage to our public diplomacy by floating outlandish and slanderous allegations.

It has to stop. We can, and should, have serious debates about legitimate policy questions. But comparing our Nation, our Government and our military to the regimes of Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Soviet Russia, and Pol Pot's Cambodia is the height of irresponsibility.

Frankly, I think it demands an apology to our service men and women, and to all others in our Government who are working hard every day to stop the terrorists, prevent attacks on our homeland, and to win the war on terrorism.

We are fighting a war. And young men and women are out in the field, risking their lives. For their sake, the toxic rhetoric must stop.

CMA FESTIVAL

Mr. FRIST. Madam President. Nashville, TN is home to some of the best music in the world. Last weekend, I had the pleasure of being back home during the 2005 Country Music Association Festival—"Country Music's Biggest Party."

More than 130,000 country music lovers from around the world come to hear their favorite stars perform for the 4-day extravaganza. The energy is electric.

From legendary artists like Kenny Rogers and Dolly Parton, to new talents like Sarah Evans, Rascal Flatts, and Gretchen Wilson, more than 400 country music stars perform over 70 hours of music.

Not only are fans treated to the best country music has to offer, they get to meet their favorite stars up close and personal at the Fan Fair Exhibit Hall where performers sign autographs and mingle with the crowd.

This year, fans were treated to the first ever Music Festival Kick-Off parade in downtown, and a spectacular fireworks display, Sunday night, at the Coliseum. In just 4 days, the festival generates more than \$20 million for the local economy.

The CMA Festival has become a Nashville institution, joining the Grand Ole Opry and the Ryman Auditorium as symbols of our rich musical traditions.

Nashville's thriving music scene has also attracted another festival called Bonaroo—a 4-day event that brings more than 75,000 music lovers to Manchester, TN. The event showcases a wide variety of music including rock, jazz and bluegrass.

This year, more than 80 bands participated, including: the Allman Broth-

ers; Dave Matthews; and Alison Krauss. In just 4 years, Bonaroo has become America's premier rock festival.

Tennessee is truly a musical mecca. And it has launched some of the biggest careers in music history, including: Elvis Presley; Hank Williams; Johnny Cash; Loretta Lynn; B.B. King; and Garth Brooks, one of the biggest selling popular music artists of all time.

I'm proud and blessed to be from this extraordinary place. And I am proud to be from Nashville, "Music City USA."

OBSTRUCTIONISTS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, on Tuesday—for the record, today is Thursday—President Bush gave a speech in which he complained that Democrats are obstructionists because we are not accepting his entire agenda.

The President also said that we say no to everything. I listened to him and I watched him on TV. But look at all the things he says no to. President Bush said no to Tony Blair when the Prime Minister was here to ask for more help for Africa, to help with AIDS, hunger, and loan reduction. He said no.

President Bush says no to kids with juvenile diabetes, autism, or other childhood diseases, when they ask to be permitted to do stem cell research to see if we can prevent those diseases from plaguing these youngsters for life.

President Bush said no to parents and teachers who want education fully funded.

President Bush said no to a real Patients' Bill of Rights.

President Bush said no to making polluters pay for Superfund environmental cleanups, a program that has been very successful. I was author of the second iteration of Superfund in 1986. It was a program that needed some time to get going. But now we can look at lots of sites that have been cleaned up and are put to useful purposes that don't threaten children or families who live in the area. President Bush said no to making the polluters pay. He said yes to making the taxpayers pay for the cleanup problems the polluters created.

President Bush said no to getting tough with the Saudi Arabians, so we can really bring down oil prices. The Saudis said no to us when we asked for help in keeping oil prices down. Look what has happened to oil prices. I remember so vividly in the last Presidential campaign, when Senator KERRY challenged President Bush. The thing that came out of the White House—the statement most clearly was: If Senator KERRY becomes President, you are going to see taxes on oil prices. If you want to see taxes on oil prices, just look at what happened. The only difference is these taxes are being paid to Saudi Arabia and other places that are not friendly to the United States. But the public is paying for it. Gasoline has gone from \$1.20 to, in some places,

\$2.50, which I paid recently. I don't hear the President saying no to them when they call and say they want help from us.

And the President calls us the obstructionists? I find that label very interesting. What it means is, if you oppose any of President Bush's policies, you are an obstructionist. Frankly, in a democratic Nation, that is unacceptable. It is a disastrous line of thinking. In my view, if you don't like challenge, then you don't understand democracy. This is not a nation where we have a dictator. There should not be a time when simply because the President of the United States thinks it is a good idea that we avoid debate or challenge that we should. No, not on your life. That is how we get ideas and how we challenge the public in this country to say something about the programs in which we are engaged.

The President says: If you don't like my programs, then you are an obstructionist.

Tell that to the people whose pensions are fading in front of their eyes. Tell that to the people who work 25, 30 years for a company and see their jobs ended, without the prospect of coming anywhere near the salary they were earning. No, he doesn't say no to the people he ought to say no to. The President proposed the other day—yesterday—that the tax rate that has done us so much good is something he wants to make permanent—I wish he would say no to that—so that the wealthiest among us don't go ahead and wait for their airplanes to be delivered after 3 years. If you order a private airplane—a \$25 million or \$30 million airplane—if you want to buy one, sorry, there is a line. If you want large yachts, 100 to 200 feet, you have to wait 2 years. What a pity it is for those rich guys to have to pay their share of taxes. I am one of those who have been so fortunate in America. I created a business that got to be very big, along with two other friends who grew up in the poor neighborhood in which I lived. I am more than willing to pay more taxes because, if I do that, I have more money left.

I wish the President of the United States would say no to those people and yes to the people struggling to make a living; yes to the kids who cannot afford to pay for college tuition; yes to those people and don't accuse the Democrats of being obstructionists. Saddam Hussein didn't have to worry about obstructionists in his country. He killed them or jailed them. Mr. President, leaders who are free of obstructionists are also known as dictators.

Our constituents elected us to represent them and their viewpoints in the Senate. One thing I knew when I came to this Senate—now over 20 years ago—I wasn't elected by all the Republicans, by a long shot. I am not even sure I was elected by all of the Democrats. But I won. When I stood and took my oath, I never thought once