House arrived over here with 377 votes. This is a bipartisan bill. It is something we need to do. We need to do it as quickly as possible.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business until 3:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Tennessee.

WISHING SENATOR JIM JEFFORDS HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to join the majority leader in wishing happy birthday to Jim Jeffords. Jim is a friend of all of ours. I see the Senator from Arizona in the Chamber. We all served together. I served with Senator Jeffords when I was Education Secretary and he was ranking member of the Education Committee. We all know his deep concern for education, especially for children with disabilities. We wish him the very best on his 75th birthday.

INVESTIGATING INTERROGATION TACTICS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, even though President Obama has said we should look forward, some in Congress insist on looking backward to a broader investigation of interrogation tactics that were used against 9/11 terrorists to find out whether even more airplanes were on their way to kill even more Americans.

These interrogation tactics are now well known. They had been approved by the National Security Council, approved by the Department of Justice, were known to senior Democratic and Republican Members of Congress who, CIA records now show, were briefed some 40 times. The CIA has not used the tactics in question for several years. They are not being used today. The Congress has since enacted laws that make clear that interrogation tactics used by the military are limited to those contained in the Army Field Manual. The President extended those same limitations to intelligence agencies this year by Executive order.

The President is following his own advice about looking forward by asking the National Security Council to review what tactics would be appropriate when terrorists are captured who might have information about imminent attacks on Americans. The Senate Intelligence Committee is conducting its own review of tactics and is considering expanding the briefing process for interrogation tactics.

Despite these investigations, some still say, let's have ''a full-blown criminal'' investigation.

That raises these questions: Investigation of whom? Where do we draw the line? Where is the logical place to stop?

On Thursday, I asked these questions of the Attorney General, Eric Holder, at a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing. He found it difficult to give me specific answers.

To begin with, the Attorney General did not answer my question about what directions he had received from the White House concerning interrogations.

Then, he would only answer ''hypothetically'' when I asked if we are going to investigate lawyers for giving their opinions, shouldn't we also investigate intelligence agents who created the interrogation techniques and asked for the opinions, or officials who approved the techniques, or Members of Congress who knew about or approved or even encouraged the interrogation tactics?

The Attorney General could not remember whether he knew or approved of renditions that occurred during the Clinton administration when he was Deputy Attorney General—renditions that took captured terrorists to other countries, for example, perhaps to Egypt, for custody, maybe for interrogation. He did not say what precautions he took to make sure these renditions followed the law.

The Attorney General's unresponsive answers and poor memory suggest what a difficult path it will be if the Government continues to publicize and expand its investigation of interrogation tactics.

This is not a pleasant subject. When we debated it in the Senate in 2005, I was among those Senators, including Senator MCCAIN, who disagreed with the administration. We believed it was Congress's constitutional responsibility to set the rules for dealing with detainees and we helped enact a law requiring that techniques used by the military should be limited to those in the Army Field Manual. But showing videotapes of even those techniques will not be a pretty sight.

Public officials, of course, should follow the law. But it is not necessary to have a circus to determine whether the law was followed.

If there is to be a broader investigation than currently is underway, it must be fair and evenhanded and lead wherever it may lead—perhaps to intelligence officers, perhaps to administration officials, perhaps to Members of Congress. The Attorney General himself needs to be willing to say what he knew and when he knew it and what he did about renditions during the Clinton administration when he was Deputy Attorney General.

Obsessively looking in the rear view mirror could consume our Nation's every waking moment. There is plenty about America's history that, in retrospect, we wish had not happened: Supreme Court decisions barring Blacks from public facilities, Congress filibustering anti-lynching laws, excluding Jews from major institutions, denying women the right to vote, incarcerating Japanese Americans during World War II.

We have dealt with those instances best by acknowledging and correcting them, not wallowing in them by recognizing that the United States has always been a work in progress toward great goals, rarely achieving them, often falling back, but always trying. In fact, the late political scientist Samuel Huntington has written that most of our political debates are about dealing with the disappointment of not meeting great goals we have set for ourselves.

Then there is the thoroughly practical question of who will want to serve in public life in Washington, DC, if the first thing a newly elected administration does is to try to discredit, disbar, or indict all those with whom it disagrees in the last administration. Some of that damage already has been done.

For all these reasons, I would hope the President will follow his first instinct and insist that we go forward as a country—focus on the economy, on the banks and the auto companies, on health care and energy, on a Supreme Court Justice, and two wars in which our men and women are serving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the questions I asked Attorney General Holder on Thursday, along with his answers.

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

ALEXANDER-HOLDER EXCHANGE ON INVESTIGATION OF INTERROGATION TACTICS

HEARING OF THE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE TRANSCRIPT, MAY 7, 2009

Senator ALEXANDER: I have a few questions about the interrogation of enemy combatants. I thought President Obama's first instinct was a good one when he said that we should look forward, but apparently not everyone agrees with that. I notice that a member of the House of Representatives yesterday said that she wanted a full, top-to-bottom, criminal investigation. These are my questions: 1) What directions or guidance have you received from the President or his representatives or anyone in the White House concerning the interrogation of enemy combatants?

Attorney General HOLDER: Well, as we have indicated, for those people who were involved in the interrogation and relied upon, in good faith and adhered to the memoranda created by the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, it is our intention not to prosecute and not to investigate those people. I have also indicated that we will follow the law and the facts and let that take us wherever it may. A good prosecutor can only say that. So, I think those are the general ways in which we view this issue.

Senator ALEXANDER: My second question would be: Should you follow these facts