

The Failed Republican Record on National Security: *Democrats' New Direction for Real Security*

GOP RECORD ON THE WAR IN IRAQ: Republicans support the Bush promise to “stay the course” in Iraq with an open-ended commitment, even though his “stay the course” strategy has strained our military, cost nearly 2,700 American lives and more than \$300 billion, and diverted attention and resources away from the real war on terror.

- The Bush Administration has proposed to stay the course in Iraq, with the President refusing to offer any plan for Iraq that will bring our men and women home.
 - The President has conceded that under his plan, U.S. troops will remain in Iraq after 2008
 - The top U.S. commander in Iraq has said that “Iraqi forces need up to 18 more months before they can operate on their own.” [New York Daily News, 8/31/06]
- The President’s “stay the course” strategy in Iraq has made America less safe.
 - Iraq has become a terrorist “training ground,” and is breeding a new generation of “professionalized” terrorists, according to the National Intelligence Council. [WPost, 1/14/05]
 - The Iraq War has diverted resources away from the global war on terror and homeland security – for example, shifting the military’s counterterrorism unit from the hunt for bin Laden to the search for al-Zarqawi in Iraq. [NYT, 7/4/06]
 - General Zinni, former CENTCOM Commander, says Iraq is a distraction from the war on terror: “We’re throwing away 10 years worth of planning, in effect, for underestimating the situation we were going to get into, for not adhering to the advice that was being given to us by others, and, I think, getting distracted from Afghanistan and the war on terrorism that we were committed to when we took on this adventure.” [General Zinni, *Meet the Press*, 4/2/06]
- U.S. troops and taxpayers continue to pay a high price for Bush’s war in Iraq. We are approaching 2,700 dead U.S. soldiers, 20,000 wounded. American taxpayers have already contributed over \$300 billion and each week adds another \$2 billion to our record budget deficit.
- The Iraq war has depleted our military, constraining our ability to deal with other challenges, such as al-Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. Readiness levels for the Army are at a 30-year low. There is not a single non-deployed Army Brigade Combat Team in the United States that is ready to deploy. [The National Security Advisory Group, 8/1/06]
- Administration officials acknowledge the growing prospect of a civil war.
 - A new Pentagon report notes, “Conditions that could lead to civil war exist in Iraq...”
 - “General John Abizaid recently stated that “Iraq could move toward civil war,” and described the sectarian violence as “probably as bad as I have seen it.” [AP, 8/3/06]
 - From May 20 through Aug. 11, the average number of attacks per week against Americans and Iraqis was 792, the highest for any counting period since the war began.
- The Bush Administration planned the war poorly, rejecting the advice of military leaders for a larger number of troops, failing to provide adequate safety equipment for our troops, and wasting billions of taxpayers’ dollars on no-bid contracts for Bush cronies such as Halliburton. “The Government Accountability Office report ... asserts that the Bush administration's Iraq strategy is inadequate and was poorly planned...David M. Walker, the U.S. comptroller general, told lawmakers that President Bush did not give proper consideration to conditions on the ground....” [Washington Times, 7/12/06]

- The Republican Congress has failed in its oversight responsibility -- whether it is troop levels, body armor, WMD, Abu Ghraib, or the overall conduct of the war. Republicans in Congress have rubberstamped the Bush Administration's Iraq policy, refusing to conduct oversight on the money going to Iraq, or to safeguard taxpayer funds from abuse.
- Much of the criticism of the President's failed Iraq strategy comes from conservatives themselves.
 - William F. Buckley Jr: "One can't doubt that the American objective in Iraq has failed." [National Review Online, 2/24/06]
 - George Will: "It is not perverse to wonder whether the spectacle of America, currently learning a lesson ...has emboldened many enemies." [Washington Post, 7/18/06]
 - Even Sen. John McCain, a staunch supporter of the war in Iraq, has said: "One of the biggest mistakes we made was underestimating the size of the task and the sacrifices that would be required. ... 'Stuff happens, mission accomplished, last throes, a few dead-enders' ...it grieves me so much that we had not told the American people how tough and difficult this task would be." [NY Sun, 8/23/06]

DEMOCRATS ON THE WAR IN IRAQ: Democrats want a New Direction in Iraq, with the responsible redeployment of U.S. troops beginning this year, in order to strongly position America to confront the global challenge of terrorism. Our Real Security plan is a strategy for taking the fight to the terrorists to better protect Americans.

- Democrats want a New Direction in Iraq; our Real Security plan calls on the President to:
 - begin the phased redeployment of U.S. forces before the end of the year,
 - transform the U.S. mission to counterterrorism, training and logistical support,
 - work with Iraqi leaders to disarm the militias and to develop a broad-based and sustainable political settlement, and
 - launch a real diplomatic and reconstruction effort to help stabilize Iraq.
- Democrats have demanded that the President develop a plan for Iraq and a strategy for success, including clear benchmarks for measuring progress.
 - In October 2003, Democrats were united in demanding that President Bush submit to Congress a plan for postwar Iraq – a workable strategy to accomplish our mission. Republicans blocked consideration of this Democratic amendment. [Supplemental Funding bill, 2003 Vote #544, blocked by a vote of 221-202, 10/16/03]
 - In July 2005, Democrats were united in voting to set benchmarks for a more successful strategy in Iraq, but Republicans defeated the plan, preferring to "stay the course". [HR 2601, 2005 Vote #398, 7/20/2005]
- Despite GOP charges that Democrats are working to cut off funds for our troops, the majority of Democrats have supported funding for the troops– proposing \$4.6 billion more than Republicans for military equipment and benefits for troops – such as funds for repairing and replacing equipment, better health care and military family support services, and 20,000 additional troops. [2003 Vote #108, 4/3/2003, 2004 Vote #284, 6/22/04, 2005 Vote #77, 3/16/05, 2005 Vote #287, 6/20/05, 2006 Vote #65, 3/16/06, 2006 Vote #305, 6/20/06, Supplemental Funding bill, 2003 Vote #544, 10/16/03]
- To combat the waste, fraud and abuse by Halliburton in Iraq, Democrats have been fighting for enactment of our Honest Leadership-Open Government Act to subject major contract actions to public disclosure and aggressive competition, criminally prosecute contractors who cheat taxpayers, and create tough penalties for improper no-bid contracts. This Democratic legislation has been blocked by Republicans. [H.R. 4682]

GOP RECORD ON WAR ON TERRORISM: Under the failed policies of President Bush and the Bush Republicans, we are not winning the global war on terrorism. The Bush Administration has failed to capture or kill Osama bin Laden or destroy al Qaeda; global terror attacks and terror groups are on the rise; and anti-Americanism is rampant.

Five years after 9/11:

- In a survey of America's top national security experts, 84 percent said America is not winning the war on terror
- We have still failed to capture or kill Osama bin Laden and his deputy Ayman al-Zawahiri
- The situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating – with the Taliban and bin Laden allies regaining strength
- Our military is being stretched thin, undermining our ability to respond to threats
- The number of worldwide terrorist attacks has grown dramatically in the last three years
- The growing nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea make it more likely that terrorists can gain access to nuclear weapons
- U.S. prestige is at an historic low and we are not winning the battle for “hearts and minds” in the Islamic world
- Hundreds of tons of loose nuclear materials remain unsecured and vulnerable to terrorist theft

DEMOCRATS ON WAR ON TERRORISM: Democrats propose a New Direction in Iraq to promote Real Security and re-focus our attention and resources on the global war on terrorism. Democrats have fought for strong intelligence reforms, full funding of counter-terrorism programs, and greater efforts to secure loose nuclear materials around the world.

- Launching a New Direction in Iraq that requires Iraqis to take more responsibility for their own security would enable America to focus its attention and resources on the global war on terror. The Democratic Real Security plan calls for new efforts in the global war on terror, including :
 - Providing new resources to target Al Qaeda and other networks of global terrorists, including finishing the job in Afghanistan
 - Doubling the size of our Special Forces
 - Increasing our human intelligence capabilities
 - Securing by 2010 loose nuclear materials that terrorists could use to build nuclear weapons or “dirty bombs”
 - Redoubling our efforts to stop nuclear weapons development in North Korea and Iran
- Democrats fought for strong intelligence reform, implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that called for a strong, new Director of National Intelligence to oversee all intelligence budgets and personnel and reorganize U.S. intelligence agencies. Twice, House Republicans rejected this effort. [2004 House Vote #510, 10/8/04; 2004 House Vote #522, 10/8/04]
- Democrats proposed toughening efforts to prevent nuclear non-proliferation – by securing loose nuclear materials in order to keep them out of the hands of terrorists -- but Republicans blocked consideration of this Democratic proposal. [2003 House Vote #104, 4/3/03]
- Democrats voted to provide for full funding of counter-terrorism programs in intelligence but Republicans defeated the motion. [2004 House Vote #299, motion to recommit, the FY 2005 Intelligence Authorization bill, 6/23/04]

GOP RECORD ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Under President Bush and Bush Republicans, we are not as safe as we should be. The bipartisan, independent 9/11 Commission – in its final report card – gave the Administration and Congress 5 F’s, 12 D’s, and 9 C’s on homeland security.

Five years after 9/11:

- Only 6 percent of containers entering U.S. ports are being screened.
- Fewer than half of U.S. ports of entry have radiation portal monitors.
- There are 800 fewer Border Patrol agents, 5,000 fewer detention beds, and nearly 500 fewer immigration enforcement agents being funded than promised by Congress in the Intelligence Reform (or 9/11) Act of 2004.
- There is still not a unified terrorist watch list for screening airline passengers.
- Most air cargo is still not being screened.
- First responders still do not have the equipment they need to be able to communicate with each other in an emergency.
- Republicans have provided only \$600 million of the estimated \$6 billion needed to improve transit security.
- Investments in R&D in cutting-edge explosive detection technology have lagged.

DEMOCRATS ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Democrats have been fighting for key homeland security initiatives, including implementation of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission’s recommendations.

- Democrats are calling for a New Direction in homeland security, including:
 - Immediately implementing all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations
 - Screening 100% of containers and cargo bound for the U.S. in ships or planes
 - Providing our first responders with the training, equipment and technology they need
 - Preventing outsourcing of American security at our ports and airports
- Democrats have led the fight on border security. The 9/11 Act of 2004 called for 2,000 new Border Patrol Agents in 2006; and yet the President’s budget provided funding for only 210 new agents. Throughout 2005, Democrats fought for the funding for the promised 2,000 new agents. On three separate occasions in 2005, House Republicans voted against efforts to provide this essential border security funding. [H.R. 1268, motion to recommit, 2005 Vote #160, 5/5/05, 201-225; H.R. 2360, blocking Obey amendment, 2005 Vote #174, 5/17/05, 223-185; H.R. 1817, motion to recommit, 2005 Vote #188, 5/18/05, 199-228]
- Democrats have been fighting to close the serious gaps in port security. On nine separate occasions over the last five years, Democrats have put forward proposals to strengthen port security – and yet each time Republicans have defeated these efforts. [e.g., 2001 Vote #454, 11/28/01; 2003 Vote #103, 4/3/03; 2003 Vote #305, 6/24/03; 2004 Vote #243, 6/16/04; 2005 Vote 187, 5/18/05]
- Democrats have also been repeatedly fighting to increase aviation security investments. Democrats offered a motion to require that all air cargo be screened within three years – a motion rejected by Republicans. (2005 Vote #188, 5/18/05)
- Democrats have also been repeatedly fighting to increase rail and transit security investments. For example, the Democratic substitute to the FY 2006 Homeland Security Authorization bill included a three-year \$2.8 billion initiative to improve transit security and a \$1 billion initiative to improve rail security. The substitute was defeated. (2005 Vote 187, 5/18/05)

GOP RECORD ON MILITARY READINESS: Republican Iraq policies have dramatically weakened our military, undermining our ability to take on global terrorist threats and keep our country safe.

- Under the leadership of President Bush and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, the U.S. military's readiness has dropped to historic lows. The Army's readiness in particular has dropped to levels not seen since the 1970s and will continue to be stressed by the combat in Iraq which falls most heavily on the Army and Marine Corps.
- Two-thirds of the Army's operating force, active and reserve, is now reporting in as unready, and there is not a single non-deployed Army Brigade Combat Team in the United States that is ready to deploy. [The National Security Advisory Group, 8/1/06]
- Stocks of military equipment have been depleted, with shortfalls reaching critical levels. [*Military Readiness*, Government Accountability Office, 10/05]
 - Army Chief of Staff General Peter Schoomaker has testified that he needs \$17.5 billion to restore Army equipment to its former fighting condition, plus \$12 billion annually until at least 2 years after the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have ended.
 - Marine Corps officials have said they need \$11.7 billion to restore their equipment as of today.
- "More than two-thirds of the Army National Guard's 34 brigades are not combat ready, mostly because of equipment shortages that will cost up to \$21 billion to correct, the top National Guard general said Tuesday." [AP, 8/1/06] Until these funds are provided, we will be vulnerable in the event of a hurricane, fire, another natural disaster, or – in the worst case – an attack here at home.
- The Bush Administration's poor planning for the Iraq War has strained our troops, with many units on their second or even third tour in Iraq or Afghanistan, with a report for the Defense Department concluding that the Army risks "breaking the force" in a "catastrophic" decline in recruitment and re-enlistment. [Report by Andrew Krepenevich for the Defense Department, Thin Green Line, 1/06]
- Our continuous troop deployments are sapping our military's strength. In 2005, the Army missed its recruiting goal by almost 6,700 soldiers. We have what some have called a "backdoor draft" (not letting service members leave when their tours are complete and extending combat deployment of units in Iraq) just to retain our current force. Currently, 12,000 Army personnel are under stop-loss orders. The Army and Air National Guard continue to miss their recruiting goals.
- This year's President's budget failed to include \$21 billion in requested military needs – the largest amount denied since 9/11. [Release by Rep. Skelton, 3/3/06]
- The President's Office of Management and Budget cut \$4.9 billion from the Army's request for the 2006 Iraqi war supplemental.
- President's FY 2007 budget would fund 17,100 fewer Army National Guard and 5,000 fewer Army Reserves than are authorized by law.
- Republicans voted to cut \$4 billion in defense spending last December. [H.R. 2683, FY 2006 Defense Appropriations, 2005 Vote #668, Motion to recommit, 12/18/06]

GOP RECORD ON U.S. TROOPS IN IRAQ AND THEIR FAMILIES: At a time of war, Republicans have failed to adequately equip our troops, voted against a bonus for our troops even as they voted to raise their own salaries, voted to raise health care fees for military families, and opposed efforts to improve health care for reservists and military families.

- The Bush Administration's poor planning for the Iraq war failed to provide essential equipment to protect our troops, with these shortages resulting in many unnecessary deaths and injuries.
 - It took more than 18 months after the Iraqi invasion for the Pentagon to provide body armor to all American soldiers.
 - Soldiers and their families were forced to purchase their own body armor – to ensure they had necessary protection when in Iraq.
 - About half of the Army's 20,000 Humvees lack adequate shielding to protect soldiers from roadside bombs, relying instead on improvised shielding.
 - A Pentagon study suggested that 80 percent of Marine fatalities caused by bullet wounds to the torso were likely preventable. [*New York Times*, 1/6/06]
- Republicans voted against a \$1,500 bonus for troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan while voting for a pay raise for themselves. [H.R. 3289, Vote #554, 10/17/03. Rejected 213-213]
- Bush Republicans have opposed Democratic proposals extending TRICARE health care to National Guard and Reserve, even though 40 percent of those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan are from the Guard or Reserve. [H.R. 1815, 2005 Vote #221, motion to recommit, 5/25/05]
- Republicans voted to support the President's request for an increase in pharmacy co-pays for military families, which would nearly double the co-pays of military families who purchase their drugs through a retail pharmacy.. [Defense Authorization, 5/11/06]

DEMOCRATS ON U.S. TROOPS IN IRAQ AND THEIR FAMILIES: Since the Iraq war began, Democrats have put forward initiatives for better pay and benefits for our troops, better health care and military family support services, and better equipment and protective gear – many of which have been opposed and blocked by congressional Republicans.

- Early in the Iraq war, Democrats proposed \$4.6 billion more than Republicans for military equipment and benefits for troops – such as funds for repairing and replacing equipment, better health care, military family support services, and 20,000 additional troops. [Supplemental Funding bill, 2003 Vote #544, blocked by a vote of 221-202, 10/16/03]
- Democrats have consistently supported better pay and benefits for our men and women in uniform – pushing to make permanent increases in imminent danger pay and family separation pay for troops in harm's way; provide a \$1,500 bonus for our troops on the frontline; raise the pay of senior enlisted personnel; provide Army recruitment and retention bonuses and life insurance; and expand TRICARE health care for Reservists – most of which Republicans opposed. [H.R. 1588, 2003 Vote #500, 9/10/03; 2003 Vote #554, 10/17/03; H.Con.Res. 393, 2004 Vote #91, 3/25/04; HR 1815, 2005 Vote #221, 5/25/2005]
- Democrats offered a resolution calling on President Bush to provide our troops in Iraq with body armor and armored vehicles and guaranteeing health care and related benefits for the returning wounded. Republicans refused to let the House vote on the proposal. [H.Res. 564; 2004 Vote #62, 3/17/04]

GOP RECORD ON VETERANS: Even at a time of war, congressional Republicans have shortchanged veterans' health care for hundreds of thousands of returning combat veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan, and have opposed benefits for those who have served our nation, instead voting for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

- In the lead up to the Iraq War, the Bush Administration cut off veterans' health care for veterans who make as little as \$26,000 a year – which has denied veterans' health care to more than 250,000 veterans and prevented 1 million veterans from getting health care over the past three years.
- As the Iraq War began, House Republicans voted to cut \$14 billion from veterans' health care and \$14 billion from veterans' benefits, including veterans' pensions, compensation, and education. [H Con. Res 95, 2003 Vote #82, 3/21/03]
- The Bush Republicans have shortchanged veterans' health care, and were forced to concede last summer that VA health care was \$3 billion short as the Bush Administration failed to budget for the 77,000 returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan.
- For the fourth year in a row, the President's budget proposes to raise health care costs for 1 million veterans by imposing new fees costing them more than \$2.6 billion over five years, and driving at least 200,000 veterans out of the system.
- Republicans voted for the FY 2007 budget that hurts America's veterans, including cuts in health care totaling \$6 billion and as much as tripling TRICARE health care costs for military retirees under 65. [HCR376, 5/18/2006, Vote# 158]

DEMOCRATS ON VETERANS: Democrats are committed to leaving no veteran behind through our GI Bill of Rights for the 21st Century. We have fought for better veterans' health care and completely ending the Disabled Veterans' Tax and Military Families Tax.

- Democrats have proposed a new GI Bill of Rights for the 21st Century to: improve benefits for our men and women in uniform today; provide long overdue benefits for veterans and military retirees; bolster our support for our troops in harm's way, including special provisions for the National Guard and Reserve; and provide better education, health care and job training benefits for veterans.
- Democrats have fought to increase veterans' health care -- preventing huge cuts approved by House Republicans in 2003, winning a \$1 billion increase in 2004, and securing an additional \$3 billion in 2005 – to ensure care for the hundreds of thousands of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who are being treated by the VA. [e.g., 2005 Vote #82, 3/17/2005]
- Democrats continue to fight to completely end the Disabled Veterans' Tax, which forces 400,000 disabled military retirees to give up one dollar of their military pension for every dollar of VA disability pay they receive. The Bush Administration threatened to veto provisions ending the Disabled Veterans' Tax, and, Republicans have rejected Democratic efforts to completely end the tax. [H.R. 1588, 2003 Vote # 616, 11/7/03]
- Democrats are fighting to end the Military Families Tax, which reduces the benefits of some 60,000 survivors, many of them widows. Republicans have blocked consideration of the issue. [HR 1815, 2005 Vote #212, 5/25/2005; Blocked 225-200]

Responses to GOP Charges on Some National Security Issues

NSA DOMESTIC SURVEILLANCE: Democrats believe that the government must have the intelligence it needs to protect the American people, and that this intelligence can be obtained while upholding the Constitution and the rule of law. Democrats believe that the NSA domestic surveillance program can be brought under the rule of law – by bringing it under the current FISA statute.

Despite Republican charges that Democrats are refusing to give the government the tools it needs to track down terrorists, the facts are as follows:

- Democrats believe that it is vital that U.S. intelligence agencies have the tools necessary to stop terrorist plots before they happen – but that intelligence must be obtained legally. We can uphold the rule of law while also taking all necessary steps to fully protect the American people.
- Democrats are NOT calling for ending the NSA domestic surveillance program – but simply ensuring it complies with the law.
- Democrats have introduced various bills to accomplish this. One of the key Democratic bills -- H.R. 5371-- would require that the NSA domestic surveillance program be brought under the provisions of FISA (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act). The legislation is based on the principle that FISA is the appropriate way to conduct electronic surveillance of U.S. persons on U.S. soil for intelligence purposes.
- Democrats point out that, under the FISA process, the government can already begin surveillance, on an emergency basis, for 72 hours – before obtaining a warrant from FISA; thus ensuring that the government can act quickly. The Democrats’ bill also includes tools to expedite emergency warrant applications, and authorizes additional funds to incorporate standardization, electronic filing and streamlined review procedures at the NSA and the Department of Justice. The bill also requires the President to ensure that resources are adequate to process warrants in a timely fashion.

MILITARY TRIBUNALS FOR GUANTANAMO DETAINEES: Democrats want Congress to respond to the Supreme Court's *Hamdan* decision (which overturned the Administration's tribunals) and enact legislation to create new military tribunals so that Guantanamo detainees are tried expeditiously and their convictions stick.

Despite Republican charges that Democrats are refusing to give the government the tools it needs to deal with terrorist suspects, the facts are as follows:

- Five years after 9/11, not a single al Qaeda terrorist or Guantanamo detainee has been brought to justice because of the Bush Administration's failure to listen to our senior military lawyers and conduct trials of terrorist suspects in a constitutionally permissible way.
- On June 29, 2006, the Supreme Court ruled 5-3 in *Hamdan v Rumsfeld* that the military tribunals established by the Bush Administration to try Guantanamo detainees were unconstitutional.
- Democrats agree with Republican Senators John Warner, John McCain and Lindsey Graham who have been calling for using the Uniform Code of Military Justice as the starting point for designing the new military tribunals. These Senators have been working with Democrats in writing a bipartisan bill that has the support of our senior uniformed military lawyers.
- On September 6, President Bush suddenly announced the transfer of 14 high-value terrorist suspects from CIA secret prisons to Guantanamo and said they would be tried by these military tribunals.
- Democrats welcome the Bush Administration's long-overdue decision to establish a lawful system to try these 14 high-value suspects.
- Also, on September 6, President Bush belatedly sent to Congress his version of legislation on creating military tribunals to respond to the Supreme Court's *Hamdan* decision.
- Republican Senators Warner, McCain and Graham, as well as senior military lawyers, have all raised concerns about the Administration's proposal, which are shared by Democrats. As Sen. Graham said on September 6, "I do not think we can afford to cut legal corners that will result in federal court rejection of our work product." These Republican Senators vowed to work with the Administration and with Democrats to quickly find common ground and a suitable compromise.
- Democrats believe that our country can successfully prosecute the war on terror and uphold our Constitution at the same time.

THE PATRIOT ACT: Most Democrats voted for the PATRIOT Act in 2001. In 2005, when certain provisions were up for renewal, many Republicans and Democrats worked together to achieve improvements in the protection of constitutional rights in the PATRIOT Act.

Despite Republican charges that, even though the PATRIOT Act has made America safer, Democrats voted to kill it, the facts are as follows:

- Democrats believe that the most important duty of government is to protect the American people. We support powerful, flexible and modern tools to detect the plans and intentions of terrorists. Most Democrats voted for the PATRIOT Act in 2001, a few weeks after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.
- Since the PATRIOT Act was enacted in October 2001, both Republicans and Democrats have expressed concerns about the implementation of certain provisions – including provisions allowing the government to conduct broad searches of Americans’ library, medical and business records without any probable cause of a connection to terrorism.
- In 2005 and early 2006, when 16 provisions of the PATRIOT Act were up for reauthorization, many Republicans and Democrats worked together to make modifications in order to strike a better balance in ensuring that both Americans’ security and constitutional rights were protected.
- Democrats who voted against a version of the PATRIOT Act Reauthorization conference report in December 2005 were joined in their opposition by key Republican Senators, including Sens. Larry Craig of Idaho, John Sununu of New Hampshire, Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, and Chuck Hagel of Nebraska. As Sen. Craig pointed out, “While the bill does preserve important tools for law enforcement, it doesn’t do enough to protect the civil liberties of innocent Americans.” House Democrats voted overwhelmingly in favor of a motion to recommit the conference report that would have substituted the bipartisan Senate bill that had unanimous support in that chamber.
- Through the efforts of House and Senate Democrats and some Republicans, a bill improving the protection of constitutional rights (S. 2271) in the PATRIOT Act Reauthorization was approved by the House and Senate and was signed by President Bush on the same day he signed the PATRIOT Act Reauthorization conference report.