

I thank the Senator from West Virginia and yield the floor.

# HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002—Continued

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I have long had as my friends Senators from Alabama. When I came to the Senate, there were Senators Sparkman and Lister Hill. There have been a succession of Senators from Alabama. Especially, I want to mention the late Senator James Allen from Alabama. I have had very good relations with the Senators from Alabama.

I consider myself as being on the same footing, same level of good relations with the distinguished Senator from Alabama who has just addressed the Senate.

I do want to comment briefly on two or three things that he said.

He first indicated, when I yielded to him, that he and I had often agreed on matters and that there were times when we might disagree as to our interpretations of the Constitution. That can be very true.

Today, I have been talking about a phrase which, when joined with the preceding language, amounts to a sentence, a clause: The Congress shall have power to declare war.

There is no reason for anybody to misinterpret that. I hope the Senator from Alabama wouldn't misinterpret what is in plain view, written in plain English, and has been in that Constitution now for over 200 years. I hope there is no matter of misinterpreting that plainly spoken clause in the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have power to declare war.

I hope we don't have to argue about how to interpret those plainly written, well-understood words from the English language that Congress shall have the power to declare war. That is what I have been talking about.

The distinguished Senator went on to say, we need to be with the President of the United States; we need to support the President of the United States.

I like to be with the President of the United States on most matters. And in the final analysis, I may be with the President on this one. But it is not a matter of being with the President or supporting the President. I maintain that we need to be with the Constitution of the United States. We need to support the Constitution of the United States. It is not damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead; it is not damn the Constitution, full speed ahead.

I want to be with the Constitution. Count me on the side of the Constitution. I want to support the Constitution first, last, and all the time, I say to the Senator. And maybe I will be with the President in due time. But I am not one who says this is a matter that has to be hurried before the election. What is this? Is this the October surprise in August or in September? This is a matter of great moment. And hinging on the decisions of this Senate may be the lives of many citizens.

In the second book of Samuel, I remember the story there which is told of a rich man and a poor man who lived in the same city. The rich man had huge herds of sheep, cattle, and lambs. The poor man had one little lamb. The poor man had one little ewe lamb. Everywhere that poor man went, that little lamb went. That little lamb was the sole possession the poor man had. When he ate, he fed that little lamb from his bowl, from his pot, or whatever it might have been. The poor man cared for that little lamb and it loved him. He shared his food and he shared his shelter with that little lamb.

Presently, a traveler visited the rich man, and the rich man wanted to present a feast to the traveler. He wanted to show courtesy and all of the niceties of being a man of hospitable nature. He wanted to spread food before the stranger. Did he take from his lambs, his herds? He had huge herds. He had vast possessions. He had barns in which he stored the product of the fields. He had vast lands. He had servants. He was well off. He had many, many lambs.

Did he take one of the lambs from his own herd? No. He took the one little lamb that the poor man had and served it up, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He served that little lamb, the only lamb that the poor man had. He didn't ask for it. He just took it. He took that little lamb from the poor man and served it up to his guest.

Now, why do I say this? Why do I refer to second Samuel today? There are many mothers in this land who won't get to vote on this matter. There are many mothers in this land who have but one little lamb. I know we have a volunteer military now, and those who volunteer understand what their responsibilities are. They know they may have to sacrifice their lives, and they volunteered to do it. Nevertheless, there are those in the service who are the little lambs of mothers who are at home at night thinking about their little lambs and praying for their little lambs.

Now, here we are about to be faced with a proposition in which these representatives—these mothers of the sons and daughters who are in the services—will not be asked for their vote. There are those who apparently are under the impression that the Congress doesn't need to be asked for its vote—the Congress, the elected Representatives under this Constitution.

Yet some have suggested that the President has the authority. He can go. Some say he is right and he should attack unilaterally. That is what we have been talking about in the last few weeks. People were under the impression that this might be a unilateral attack by the United States against a sovereign state that was not attacking the United States. Of course, we all agree about this imp who is head of that government. But that is a sovereign state. That state is not attacking us.

I am not arguing that Iraq it is not a threat, but is it such a threat, is it so

impending, is it so immediate that the Commander in Chief, who is the civil authority over the military in our system of government, can send men and women in the military to war, send them to give their lives, to shed their blood, without asking the Congress? Is he the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end, of this decision?

The President is the Commander in Chief. He is not a four-star general. Under our system, it is meant to be that way. He is not a four-star general. This is a republic, a constitutional republic, and we have a legislative branch and a judicial branch. These are separate branches. Are we, the Congress, going to stand by and say I am with my President, right or wrong?

No, I don't subscribe to that. Every Senator in this body knows I have spoken out in opposition to Democratic Presidents—President Clinton being one. I am not speaking from the standpoint of a Democrat. I am speaking from the standpoint of a duly elected Representative of the American people who have sent me here to this body under a constitutional system that observes a separation of power. No, don't tell me you are either with the President or against the President. That is what I have just heard.

I am with the Constitution. Mark me down for the Constitution.

Now, I will have both ears open and hear the arguments that are made. I have already applauded the President for going to the United Nations. I think the U.N. has been derelict in its duty. It has stood by supinely while 16 of its resolutions have been ignored. I don't disagree with that; the President did the right thing in doing that. There should not have been all this talk in the newspaper, on the television, and on the radio, and through the media—the many men and women of the Government taking the attitude, apparently, that the President has the authority to go to war if he wants to; he has the authority. That is not so.

We are not talking about a mere skirmish. We are not talking about a situation in which another country has attacked our country or launched an attack on our military forces. This is not a skirmish that we have looming out here. This is war. The weapons that may be unleashed in this war will not have been unleashed, perhaps, in previous wars. But we still have a Constitution. I don't care how many, or how loud they may talk or speak. I am going to be at least a single voice saying that we live, we work, we act by the Constitution of the United States when it comes to declaring war and making war. You can have a thousand voices, but they will not drown out mine.

I am going to be heard, if God gives me the privilege of standing on this floor and speaking. I don't know how long God may give me that privilege. But as long as I can speak, I will. I am not the greatest defender of the Constitution that ever lived. I know a lot

about American history, and I know a lot about the Daniel Websters who spoke in support of the Union that was created by this Constitution, which I hold in my hand.

This is no Johnny-come-lately to this Senate. I have seen 300 Senators come and go except for one Senator. There have been others in this body who have defended this Constitution as valiantly as any could defend it.

Don't say to me you are either with the President or you are not with the President. That is not the case. I am with the Constitution of the United States, and I am with the Commander in Chief of the United States when Congress declares war.

I know there have only been five declarations of war. I know there have been seven other wars that have been carried on, not by declaration but by congressional statute. Congress authorized them. There have been many smaller wars, conflicts, military skirmishes, and so on. But this is a major question facing this country. It will not be a military skirmish if it happens, and many a mother will cry on her pillow because her lamb, perhaps her only lamb, will have his life taken.

Mr. President, I say let's hear what the ordinary people—I want to use the word “ordinary” because that fits me exactly. I came from the other side of the tracks. I did not grow up in the boardrooms of this country. I was never on any corporate board. The only business I ever had was a small grocery store. My wife did most of the work in that little grocery store. She put me through college. So I am from the other side of the tracks.

I have known times when I did not know what my next job would be. I had a family early. My wife and I have been married 65 years, 3 months and 15 days today. We were poor. When I was married I was making \$70 a month, working 6 days a week, long hours a day, and for a while in that period walking 4 miles to work and 4 miles from work if I could not catch a ride on a milk truck or bread truck.

I am from the other side of the street. I am not a pampered brat who never knew the need for a nickel, never knew the need for anything, had everything given to me. I do not find any fault with people who are born lucky. What I am saying is there are many more people like this man from the other side of the tracks in this country, and there are many more mothers from that side of the tracks than there are those who never knew what it was to have to wipe the sweat from their brow for their daily bread; never had to get their fingernails dirty; never had to wear tennis shoes in the snow. Those are the people who fight in wars. They are the people whose sons and daughters die in wars, but they are not the people who are at the high echelons of Government who do the voting.

In this instance, yes, we are going to have a vote. You can bet on that. We will have one. I said all along we ought

to vote. That is what I am saying today. Congress should vote. But I am not for an “October surprise” in August, and I am not for voting on this matter before the election.

Look behind that drapery. Draw aside that veil. What do you see? It has to be voted on before the election? Forget it. If circumstances develop that truly can convince, can be persuasive beyond a semblance of doubt that Congress ought to act tomorrow or the day after tomorrow or next week, yes, but that convincing case has not been made.

A convincing case was made to the United Nations yesterday with respect to the failures of the United Nations, the fact that that body has been recalcitrant in carrying out their responsibilities, a very convincing case made by the President of the United States. But no convincing case has been made in the press or in this body that we must act to give the President authority to invade a sovereign nation now or before the election. That case has not been made.

Make the case and make it here. And believe me, there will be plenty said on both sides. If our Nation is at war with another country, I will do everything I can to support that war.

I helped to build the liberty ships and the victory ships in the shipyards of Baltimore and the shipyards of Tampa, FL during World War II. I was a first-class welder who helped to build ships to carry the food and commerce for the engine of war in World War II. I helped to build the ships to convey to the military in Europe, in northern Africa, in the Pacific. These ships carried the munitions of war. We helped to keep the food lines and the blood lines open with those ships. So there are many ways to serve. But believe you me, this Senator is not now or ever going to be stampeded into voting for or against this subject just to be with or without the President. I am with the Constitution. If that is the argument we are going to hear, it is not going to be a very persuasive argument. You are either going to be with this President or not with him.

Who made this President? He is a very respectable individual who comes from a fine family. I served here with his father who became President. Who made him? How did he become President? Somebody had to cast votes to elect him President. How long will he be President?

The Constitution made this President. The Constitution was here before this President or any other President. Who made the President? Who is going to be with the President? I will first be with the Constitution. I may be with the President later, but first is the Constitution.

Don't come here saying we are either with or without the President. That is not the question. The question is: Are we with the Constitution? Are the people's representatives going to make a decision? When that time comes, then

there might be some good arguments to go to war with Iraq, even to stand alone and go to war. Maybe arguments can be presented. There may be evidence by then. Who knows? I do not know, but we have to see it. The evidence is not there yet that we have to act so hastily, that we have to act before the election.

What does the election have to do with it? What does the election have within itself to do with it? The election will go forward. What is to keep Congress from voting on this matter after the election? Why does it have to be before the election? Is that the “October surprise” in September or October, before November? Let's not be too hasty. That is what I have been saying about this legislation with reference to homeland security. Let's don't be too hasty. Let's do it right. Remember that mother's lamb.

The distinguished Senator asked: With whom did Hussein talk? With whom did he consult? He may not have consulted anybody; that is too bad. Hussein should have had a free and independent Senate. Hussein should have had a Senate where voices could be heard, voices in opposition to Hussein, voices of caution, openly and freely where all the public could hear. Yes, Hussein should have had that. There was no Senate like this Senate in Hussein's government. I am talking about a free, separate branch, that is independent, where there is free, unlimited speech—except for unanimous consent or cloture—where there is a Senate that controls the purse strings. Yes, I say Hussein should have had that. He should have had a Senate like this Senate. It is not led around by any President's chain. No President chains this Senate.

There are no chains on this Senate. It is a free and independent Senate. Yes, Hussein should have had a Senate such as this one, where debate would have been heard. But he does not have that. With whom did he consult? Certainly not an Iraqi Senate, like this one.

The same could be said of Emperor Justinian who ruled in Constantinople, on the great golden horn. Justinian sent thousands of people to their deaths in the Nika rebellion. Justinian did not have a Senate.

What about Ivan the Terrible, who had tens of thousands massacred? Ivan the Terrible did not have a Senate. There was no Senate in Muscovy.

Peter the Great sent thousands of men to labor and to die in the swamps to build the city of Petrograd, Lenin-grad. But Peter the Great had no Senate to caution him, no Senate that controlled the purse strings.

Yes, with whom did Hussein consult? That is a good question. But we know that Hussein had no Senate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. No, not yet. I will yield maybe later. I will be glad to yield—does the Senator have to leave the

floor? I will yield right now. He is about to leave the floor in a huff, I believe. I hope he is not. Maybe I am misinterpreting him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for a question without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator is so eloquent in defending the prerogatives of this Senate, and I thank him for that.

We do not need to rush into this. I am of the belief—and I ask the Senator if he would consider the possibility that he would be willing to support the commencement of debate and a vote, if we could do so, before we recess because we may be into January before we return, and I think it could complicate matters.

If I was inarticulate, I apologize, but my request would be that we consider the policies, not the President. It is not a personal thing; the Senator from West Virginia is correct. Let us consider those policies so the world would know whether we are going to support that or not. I know the former Vice Presidential nominee for the Democratic Party, Senator LIEBERMAN, is supporting these policies, and I think there is a majority here. I think the Senator from West Virginia may well agree at some point, after he has had full time to digest and consider it, but I do believe and hope that the Senator would consider allowing us to have a vigorous debate and a vote as soon as we possibly could.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will respond to the question that has been addressed to me, and it is a good question, a thoughtful question. May I just say I hope the Senator will join me in insisting that this Senate debate the homeland security legislation and not rush that legislation. That is a part of national defense as much as anything. It is the defense of our homeland. So I hope the Senator will be one of those who will join me in taking our time to thoughtfully debate a very serious matter, namely, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, more to the question as it was addressed to me, the answer is I support debate on the question as to whether or not the Congress should authorize the Commander in Chief to make war. I have asked my staff to consider language for such a question to be presented to the Senate. My staff has been working on such a matter. I hear that Mr. LEVIN is going to hold hearings in the Armed Services Committee, on which the distinguished Senator from Alabama serves so well.

It is good that Senator LEVIN is going to do that. It is good that the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, will hold hearings. The chairman of the Intelligence Com-

mittee, Senator GRAHAM, may hold hearings. So all these things are well and good. They are all necessary under the circumstances. We should understand what the witnesses say in those hearings.

Our three chairmen should not just invite administration witnesses. Apparently they already have their minds made up. Invite them, but don't just not stop at that. Apparently they have their minds made up. I heard three or four of them on Sunday talk shows last Sunday. I already mentioned that. They are all from the same viewpoint, and not one mentioned the Constitution of the United States. Yes, I favor that the Congress vote, up or down. I have said that before today. I have said that many days. I think the Congress should vote up or down on the question.

This is the question as to whether or not Congress will authorize and declare war, if it comes to that. This will be no minor skirmish. This will not be a little group out on a party and they happened to run into some other people, they got mixed up and got to fighting, and two or three were killed. This is not a minor skirmish. I said, yes, this is a solemn question because it does involve a dictator such as Saddam Hussein, one who has killed his own people, gassed his own people, one who has shown no compunction about using biological or chemical weapons. We know he has done that. We know he can do that.

But the question is, what is it that makes it so urgent that all of a sudden here comes something like a cloud over the western hills and blows into the Capital City, here is a looming storm that just came up. Lord, this may be a torrent. It may flood ourselves. It may kill people. We have to do something about it right now. What can we do as mere mortals? It is not quite like that.

I have already said the President has inherent power without asking anybody. If Congress is out of town, he does not have to ask Congress. If this country is attacked, he has the inherent power to repel the attacker. I don't argue about that. But that is not the situation. What is so new? We have known these things now for months or years.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, would the Senator show me the courtesy of just finishing? I know there may be some who think I am long winded.

Mr. SESSIONS. I had something I had to take care of, and I thank the Senator, but I will be glad to stay a few more minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Cicero was asked what speech by Demosthenes he liked best; and he said, the longest.

So it is all right. One can be long winded if he has something to say. And he may have to say it over and over and over in this situation.

I say, yes, yes, in answer to the Senator, I am for a vote. But I have to see evidence that requires us to vote now

or tomorrow. We have had this evidence all this while, at least a long while, 3 months or 4 months or 3 years. So why the sudden rush that we have to vote before the election? I think we should vote after the election so Senators will not be persuaded or moved one way or the other, because of an election, as to how they vote. They are voting to send that little lamb to the slaughter. Should we do that in a hurry? No. I say let's delay.

I have said all I will say in answer to the distinguished Senator, unless he has another question.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy and his thoughtfulness. I just ask that he consider, in evaluating his decision, the difficulties it provides for the United States if we cannot get a vote of support. If we are not for it, let's say so. If we do not believe and we are not going to fund—which is our ultimate power, to cut off funds—let's say so, and we get on with something else.

I strongly believe we should proceed. Senator WARNER, who was chairman of the Armed Services Committee or ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, said there were nine hearings last time before the gulf war, with a period of intense debate. The Senator is correct, we ought to have hearings and we ought to have debate. It is just a question of, as soon as we get that and people feel ready, the sooner we get started and the sooner we complete it, I think the Nation will be better off.

I respect the views of the Senator and the concerns. As the Senator knows, under our Constitution we have elections all the time, one following the other. There is never a time that someone does not have an election in mind, unfortunately.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator avoids the question he put to me. He is talking about an election that will come upon us in November—this coming November. I understand what he is saying. He is saying we ought to take action before the election. Then he says we ought to hear what the U.N. says. And I say, let's not be in all the hurry. We ought to hear what the U.N. says. Let's see what world opinion is. We ought not go into this alone.

If this man is a threat to world peace, the United States should not have to go it alone. Perhaps he will have to be removed. But we have a little bit of time, surely.

I say to the Senator, let's take the time. Let's debate the question. Let's debate it and reach a decision on the basis of what the Constitution tells us.

Let me just continue. I didn't want the Senator to leave. I thought he was about to leave.

Let me continue. He said, with whom does he consult? That is a good question. I have already responded. I also talked about Justinian. I talked about Ivan the Terrible. I talked about Peter the Great. Now, let's go to Stalin. With

whom did he consult? With whom did Adolph Hitler talk? With whom did he consult?

It was not a free and independent Senate. If they had a free and independent Senate that had control of the power and control of the purse strings, history might have been different. Hundreds of thousands of lives might have been saved.

Mr. President, let us not act in haste. Let us forget about our politics. Let us not be for or against a resolution on the question of war or peace on the basis of what party we belong to. Let us put that question in a way that we will be with and in support of the Constitution.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into a period for the transaction of routine morning business and that Senators may speak therein for not to exceed 3 minutes each.

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

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal dated September 11, 2002.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 11, 2002]

#### WE WILL PREVAIL

(By Theodore Olson)

From a speech by Solicitor General Theodore Olson to the Federalist Society on Nov. 16, 2001, Mr. Olson's wife, Barbara, was one of the airplane passengers murdered on Sept. 11, 2001.

September 11, 2001 was unprecedented in our nation's history. Our country has been attacked before. Our soldiers and innocent citizens have been the victims of terrorism before. But never before in our history have so many civilian citizens, engaged in the routines of their daily lives, who neither individually nor collectively had done anything to provoke the savage attack that they were to experience that day, been brutally murdered for the simple reason that they were Americans, and because they stood, in their countless individual lives, for all the things that America symbolizes.

As President Bush immediately recognized, Sept. 11 was an act of war. But it was much more than that. It was also a crime, an act of pure hatred and unmitigated evil.

The victims were of all races, backgrounds, religions, ages and qualities. They had one thing in common. They were nearly all Americans. Their lives were extinguished because they were the embodiment of the aspirations of most of the world's peoples. The people who killed them hate the beacon that America holds out to people who are impoverished, enslaved, persecuted and subjugated everywhere in the world.

The men who planned the savage acts of Sept. 11 cannot prevail as long as American ideals continue to inspire the people they hope to tyrannize and enslave.

It is a cynical lie that the animals that killed our loved ones were motivated by Islam, or because this nation of ours is anti-Islamic. Enshrined in the First Amendment to our Constitution is freedom of expression and the free exercise of religion. This continent was populated by people who crossed a terrifying ocean to reach a rugged and inhospitable frontier to escape religious persecution.

From its birth, this nation and the American people have offered sanctuary and shelter to all faiths. Our Constitution—always with the support of our people—has extended its embrace to the unpopular, the unusual, the unconventional and the unorthodox. We protect not only those who will not salute our flag, but those who would spit upon it or burn it. We pledge our allegiance to a Constitution that shelters those who refuse to pledge their allegiance to it.

It is true, I suppose, that there are many in the Middle East who hate this country for its support of Israel. But how tragic and misguided to despise us for extending comfort and defense to a people who have so long, and so recently, been the victims of indescribable ethnic persecution. Nor has America's support for Israel ever been rooted in or manifested by hostility to the Muslim faith or those who practice it. The terrorists and their apologists have lied about these things, but what is another lie when their goals and tactics are so vastly more evil?

The terrorists can succeed only through corruption and brutality. Thus they must tear down America and its system of laws which shields its people from those malevolent acts. They can enslave the people they wish to subjugate only by keeping them poor and destitute, so they must undermine and discredit the one place in all the world that stands the most for the rule of law and allows its people the opportunity to rise above all those conditions.

Abraham Lincoln was paraphrasing our Declaration of Independence when he characterized our nation as having been "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." That revolutionary document set down our collective belief in inalienable human rights, the proposition that governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, the principle that tyrants who would oppress their people are unfit to be rulers of a free people, and the right to the pursuit of happiness.

The terrorists of Sept. 11 cannot prevail in a world occupied by the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, the Statue of Liberty, the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, the Capitol, the Supreme Court and the White House. They cannot co-exist with these ideals, these principles, these institutions and these symbols. So they cannot survive, much less prevail, in the same world as America.

America is not today, or ever, without imperfections and shortcomings. Implementation of our lofty ideals has never been without error, and some of our mistakes have been shameful. But the course of our history has been constant, if occasionally erratic, progress from the articulation of those lofty ideals to the extension of their reality to all our people—those who were born here and those, from hundreds of diverse cultures, who flock here.

There is no segment or class of the world's peoples who have exclusive claim on the term "American," and no segment of the world's population to whom that claim has been denied. We welcome 100,000 refugees per year into this country. Over 650,000 people immigrated legally to America in the most recent year for which we have reliable statis-

tics. Over five million people are in this country today who were so desperate to come here that they did so illegally.

There are more Jews in New York City than in Israel. More Poles in Chicago than any city in the world except Warsaw. America is home to 39 million Irish-Americans, 58 million German-Americans, 39 million Hispanic-Americans and nearly a million Japanese-Americans. And there are seven million Muslims in America, nearly the population of New York City.

How tragic it is that the agents of the Sept. 11 terrorist acts were people whom we welcome to this country, and to whom we extended all of our freedoms, the protections of all of our laws, and the opportunities this country affords to everyone to travel, work and live. But we welcome immigrants because nearly all of us are immigrants or descendants of immigrants who came here to enjoy freedoms, rights, liberties, and the opportunity, denied elsewhere, to pursue happiness and prosperity.

Ronald Reagan often said that "every once in a while, each of us native-born Americans should make it a point to have a conversation with someone who is an American by choice." Mr. Reagan was fond of quoting from a letter he received from a man who wrote, "you can go to live in Turkey, but you can't become a Turk. You can't go to live in Japan and become Japanese, [and so on for Germany, France, etc.]. But . . . anyone from any corner of the world can come to America and be an American."

So it is particularly sad and a bitter irony that the 19 savages who took the lives of thousands of Americans were able to come here because we welcomed them, and trusted them, and allowed them to learn to fly our airplanes and gave them the freedom to travel. They took these precious gifts and turned them into instruments of hatred and death.

It has, I suppose, always caused some resentment that we believe so passionately and unquestioningly that the freedoms we value should belong to all people. But we know that these are enduring values. We can debate nearly everything else, but we don't need to debate that. We know that these principles lift everyone up.

We have now been reminded, in the most horrible way, that there are those who not only hate our principles, but who would dedicate their lives—and surrender their lives—to banish those ideals and the incentives they provide for tyrannized and impoverished people everywhere to do what Americans did in 1776. We have tragically learned again, in the most unthinkable fashion, that our values and our principles are neither self-executing nor self-sustaining, and that we must sacrifice and fight to maintain what our forebears sacrificed and fought to bequeath to us.

And now the rest of the world is learning again that Americans will not flinch from that fight or tire of it. Americans will fight, they will sacrifice, and they will not give up or leave the job unfinished. This war is for all living Americans. It is for the parents, grandparents and great-grandparents that fought and sacrificed to come here. And it is for our children and generations to come. And it is for those who choose to become Americans in the future.

America will not lose this war because we cannot even consider that we will lose what centuries of Americans fought to create, improve and maintain. We cannot, and we will not, betray the people who gave us this glorious heritage. We cannot and will not, dishonor or wash away the memories of those who somehow clawed their way out of poverty, tyranny and persecution to come to this country because it was America, and because they were willing to risk death to become Americans, and to give their children