

We want to move this legislation along. I think that is what we need to do.

The Senator doesn't need to respond to that at all. I just wanted to let him know that we hope to work something out in the next couple of days. I hope we can work something out tomorrow. We want to move this legislation along.

I have to say this: Having been on this bill for the fourth week, I am concerned that maybe people down on Pennsylvania Avenue don't want this bill. We have done everything we can to move this legislation. It doesn't appear that people on the other side of the aisle want it moved.

For example, Senator BYRD's amendment was pending for several days. At any time, Senator BYRD's amendment was subject to a motion to table. Everyone knew there were enough votes to table that amendment. But for days, the minority chose not to do that.

So I hope that I am wrong. I hope that I am wrong. I hope that there are as many on your side of the aisle as on our side of aisle who want this legislation to pass. But I have the feeling now, I say to my friend from Ohio, is that the minority does not want to move the homeland security bill.

We will see in the next—

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, I beg to differ with the Senator from Nevada. We do want to move forward with this homeland security bill. We do want it to pass. We know how necessary it is for the President to have this new Department, with the flexibility he needs to merge more than 20 agencies.

From my perspective, I cannot figure out why the Majority has been filing cloture motions on some of these amendments, when I think they could make a motion to table instead. I am still trying to figure that out. I may need to get the Parliamentarian to explain what this is all about.

But I can assure you, that after the time I have spent on this issue with many of my colleagues, including many on the other side of the aisle, we want this to move forward.

We would like to have a vote up or down on the President's amended proposal, which is contained in the Gramm-Miller amendment. We would like to have a vote on the recommendations from Senators NELSON, BREAUX, and CHAFEE, and see where the Senate stands on that amendment.

We have to move this along. We cannot go home, I think, without getting this done. I know this has gotten to be pretty partisan. But I honestly believe that if we can sit down and start talking about some of this a little bit more, we could work something out and move ahead.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we are not delaying this. We want to move forward. And I will certainly do anything I can to help cooperate in this regard.

But we want a vote on the Gramm-Miller amendment. We also want a

vote on the amendment of Senators NELSON and CHAFEE and BREAUX.

Mr. REID. I would simply say—the majority leader is here, and I don't want to take a lot of time—the majority of the Senators over here want a bill. I am confident a majority of the Senators want a bill. This is the fourth week we have tried to do it.

We are trying very hard. We should be able to do it. It appears to me that some people cannot take yes for an answer. We are willing to give a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, but he says he does not want a vote unless he can have the first vote. It is just a lot of what appears to me, and I am sure to the people in Nevada and the public, to be a lot of silliness.

We want to move forward with this legislation. As the Senator from Ohio has said, you want it passed. We want it passed. Hopefully, we can do something. But it appears we are not getting impetus from the leadership on your side of the aisle and the White House to get this done.

I am sorry to have taken the leader's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Who controls the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nobody controls the floor at this time.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the statement of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I don't see anybody else seeking recognition on my side of the aisle. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I came to the floor for a couple of reasons. One was to reiterate what I think I heard the assistant Democratic leader say with regard to our desire to have a vote. As we have indicated publicly and privately, we are prepared for an up-or-down vote. We want a vote on the Nelson-Breaux amendment. And once that vote is taken, we are more than willing to vote on the Gramm amendment. So there should be no question about that.

I think I heard the Senator from Nevada say that there are some who cannot take yes for an answer. We are prepared to offer that vote any time. I would hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would take our offer in the manner in which it was intended. We hope to have a vote up or down on that particular amendment.

NO "CONTEXT" JUSTIFIES QUESTIONING THE PATRIOTISM OF OTHERS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the other matter I wanted to come to the floor to discuss is the reaction to some of the comments that I made this morning.

A number of our colleagues have come to the floor and, as I understand

it, the administration has stated that if I had understood the context in which the President made those remarks—the remarks that Senate Democrats are not concerned about national security—that I probably would not have been so critical. In fact, they criticized me for having criticized the President.

Mr. President, what context is there that legitimizes an accusation of that kind? I don't care whether you are talking about homeland security, I don't think you can talk about Iraq, you can't talk about war, you can't talk about any context that justifies a political comment like that.

This is politicization, pure and simple. I meant it this morning and I mean it now. I don't know what may have motivated those in the White House to make the decision to politicize this debate, but it has to stop. There is no context within which anybody can make that accusation about people on this side of the aisle on an issue relating to homeland security, or Iraq, or defense, or anything else.

So let's get that straight. I would hope that we can finally bring this debate to a level that it deserves.

I can recall in 1991 and 1992—especially in 1992—when President Bush made the decision he did. I can recall several of my staff coming to me, suggesting that we say this or that. But never once did I have someone on my staff, someone here in the Senate, refer to the politics of the war with Iraq.

I remember sitting at my desk, handwriting my speech, explaining to my people in South Dakota, and to whom ever else might be listening, why I made the decision I did. I did not make that decision for political reasons. And I don't think there is a person in this Chamber who did.

We need that same level of debate this time if we are going to have a debate, if we are going to do it this close to an election.

So I want all the apologies at the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue, all of these explanations about "context" to be taken for what they are worth. They are not worth the paper they are printed on.

The time has come for us to quit the explanations, to quit the rationalizations, to quit the politicization, and do what we should do as Americans: Make our statement, make our judgment, have a debate, and send a clear message to Saddam Hussein as we can. We are not going to tolerate his actions. And we, as a country, will build on a coalition to do the right thing.

I hope this will be the last word. I look forward to talking directly with those in the White House, those on this side of the aisle, as we fashion our response, as we take this matter as seriously as we should, as we do it in a way that lives up to the expectations of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in many ways, this has been a very hard day. I thank the majority leader of the Senate, TOM DASCHLE, for the remarks he just made and for the remarks he made earlier today. He actually spoke in defense of the Senate.

Anyone who knows TOM DASCHLE—and I think most people around here do—knows that TOM DASCHLE is a very soft spoken man. They know that TOM DASCHLE does not rise to anger or fights, if ever, very often. Therefore, one has to really look at why this occurred.

In my mind, this is not an isolated example of what has been happening. It is a continuum of what has been happening, starting with Andrew Card, the President's chief of staff, who, when asked, why didn't you start discussing this this summer, if you were ready to move such a resolution in October or September, answered, in essence: You don't roll out a new product in the summer.

This kind of thing just seems to continue. We have the Vice President campaigning and essentially saying to the campaigns of the Republican candidates: Gee, we really need you because the Democrats won't help our war effort.

I don't know where this President has been, but I have heard many Democrats, including, for example, the individual presiding in the chair, indicating their support. We are an umbrella party. We do represent different views. Frankly, it makes our party stronger. Everyone wants to go after Saddam Hussein. Everyone wants to get rid of those weapons of mass destruction. We may have a different path to get there. Some of us may want to go it alone and give the President the authority he asks for. Some may want to go with our allies. Some may want to see more U.N. resolutions, as the British have said they want.

The bottom line is, this makes us a strong party. Frankly, it makes us a strong Nation. I have heard members of the President's party express some concerns.

What TOM DASCHLE did was essentially come to the floor and defend the honor of the Senate and this democracy. Why did he have to do it? In today's paper, and also on television, we have seen this quote reiterated over and over. We have the President of the United States saying that the Senate is "not interested in the security of the American people."

I know of no one in the Senate, Republican or Democrat, who has slept well after 9/11. I know of no colleague on either side who doesn't think about it every day: How do we protect our people; how do we make the airlines safer; how do we protect this country from chemical warfare; how do we protect ourselves from a possible smallpox epidemic; how do we protect our nuclear powerplants; how do we protect our people night, day, in the air, on the ground? I don't know many Members in

this Chamber on either side who have ever slept as well as they did before 9/11, who don't wake up in the middle of the night thinking about it or turn on the radio at 6 or 7 a.m. and pray that there isn't something there.

This kind of statement, that the Senate "is not interested in the security of the American people," is very hurtful. It is hurtful to this institution. It is hurtful to our democracy. It is, in particular, very hurtful because I have talked to my colleagues who served in Vietnam or who served in World War II or even some in Korea. Nobody asks in the military, Are you registered Democrat or Republican?

This is a horrible turn of events. If we don't express ourselves, it is dangerous for our country to put partisanship ahead of being unified as a nation, standing for the rule of law, for free debate, for discussion, for tough debate. That is good for this country. We have a lot of points of view out there. Everyone in this country needs to know that somehow, some way, somewhere their voice is being heard, not being stifled. Because if you dare to say something that questions anything, whether it is this homeland bill, which is a major reshuffling, the biggest reshuffling of the Federal Government in many years, since the creation of the Department of Defense, if you dare say, are we doing the right thing, are we taking our time, if you dare say that, you will find yourself being criticized in the middle of a campaign.

That isn't right. Of course, we will disagree on certain issues. That is the strength of this Nation. People died for that right. When Senator DASCHLE came down here and said he thought it was important to get an apology, I believed that apology should have been given. Not saying, well, we didn't mean this had to do with Iraq. It had to do with something else.

The statement stands on its own—it could be applied to anything—"the Senate is not interested in the security of the American people." That is why Senator DASCHLE came to the floor. That is why Senator DASCHLE for a moment even lost his voice, because he was so filled with emotion.

He looked behind him at Senator INOUE who lost a limb in World War II. He thought of other colleagues who lost their limbs fighting for this country, who faced the posttraumatic stress of Vietnam, who came home and had to deal with that. Are the Vietnam vets Democrats? Are they Republicans? Are they Independents? I can't tell you that. But some of them are homeless. We need to stand united because they faced a war at a time that our country was divided. We need to make sure we give full debate, not some open-ended resolution.

I sat through a hearing today at the Foreign Relations Committee. It was a very important hearing. We had Ambassador Holbrooke there and Robert McFarlane. We had a Democrat and a Republican. We had a very important debate.

Many different viewpoints were reflected on both sides of the aisle. Some were saying: We are ready. They were ready to give the President whatever he needed, whatever he wanted, now, ready, today, go. Others on both sides of the aisle said, as I said: Where are our allies? Would we be in better shape to go in after another U.N. resolution? I asked: Is there a path to peace? Is there some way we can avoid the bloody war that may ensue? Is there a path to that peace? Let's talk about it. If we must have a war, what is this President's intention following that war? These are important questions.

One question that never was raised by anyone in that committee was: Is anyone on this committee motivated by anything other than patriotism and wanting to do what is right for this country, whether they support the resolution or they do not; whether they support the resolution of the White House or a resolution that may be written by some other Republican or Democrat? No one ever suggested that anyone of either party sitting in that hearing did not have the best motivation at heart for our country.

It is extremely disheartening when we hear the statement of Andrew Card that basically says: We did not want to roll out our new product—meaning resolution—in the summer, talking about it as if it was toothpaste or a new car. It is about life and death.

If anyone says: Excuse me, what is it going to cost us in lives, in blood, in treasure, that person ought to be respected, not told they do not believe in the security of the people, whether it is questioning the homeland security bill or maybe a better way to do that or questioning an open-ended, blank-check resolution which I think has come over and I personally cannot support. The people in my State are telling me they do not want me to support it. They do not want me or Senator DASCHLE to come here and not speak what is in our hearts, in our souls, in our minds.

Senator DASCHLE did a very brave thing today. He did something I believe we do not see often enough in politics today. He spoke from his heart. He spoke the truth, unvarnished. He did not go through a committee. He did not bring it to a political adviser.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the junior Senator from California for her remarks which I think are right on point.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a couple questions. First, she was there, as I recall, as I was, when Senator DASCHLE came into our meeting this morning—there were maybe seven or eight Senators—and read the remarks. All of us were stunned and furious. We were just so upset that not a policy debate but, rather, a sort of below-the-belt hit was being made not only by political operatives but by the President himself when he said people are not for national security.

I have been asked by reporters: Was this a calculated move?

I said: No; you should have been there and just seen the reaction.

I remember the junior Senator from California, the senior Senator from New York, and some others of us urged him to go to the floor and to just speak his mind. He was saying to others: Maybe I ought to reflect on it. No, you should speak what you think.

I think it is clear, and I have been talking with people in my State, that the President has stepped over the line with these remarks. This weekend, I was asked by many people way to the left of me: Isn't the President, when he wants to go into Iraq, using politics?

I said: No, I don't think so. I think he has been wanting to go into Iraq from the very beginning.

Then for him to accuse Democrats of using politics, in my judgment—and I wonder what the Senator from California thinks because she has spoken in a heartfelt, compassionate way—I think the American people are fundamentally fair, and ugly tactics like that will backfire on their own, but I also believe it has to be pointed out because war is serious stuff and we need unity. We do not need political games.

Senator INOUE said it best. I just ask the Senator if she is finding the same thing in her State as mine; that people are not sure, they want some questions asked before we go into war, and people do not like one party accusing the other of not being patriotic or being less concerned about national security simply because they ask questions. I wonder what the Senator's opinion is.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from California yield for a parliamentary request?

Mrs. BOXER. I certainly will.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are on H.R. 5005; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go off the homeland security bill and proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. My understanding is the Senator from California wishes to speak for how long?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Twenty minutes.

Mr. REID. The Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, for 20 minutes following the statement of the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

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

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, let me respond to my friend from New York. The phone calls, letters, and e-mails we

have been getting have been one-sided against an open, blank-check resolution, as they are phrasing it, as was sent over. They are very much against what the President sent over.

More importantly are my conversations with my constituents. They clearly are very pleased that Senator FEINSTEIN has made remarks regarding Iraq, and I have spoken out. I have received calls now because I raised a number of questions in the Foreign Relations Committee regarding working with our allies, working through the U.N., asking: Is there a path to peace here?

What I pointed out is in recent years, I have voted for two resolutions to go to war: One was to stop the genocide by Milosevic, that was with a Democratic President, and one with current President Bush to respond to the brutal, inhumane terrorist attack on 9/11 for which every single Democrat in this particular body voted.

To me, it is not a question of will I ever vote for such action. It is a question of what is the best way to proceed. My constituents want to hear what I am thinking. I have been in Congress for 20 years. They do not want to see debates where one party is saying to another: You do not care about the American people. My friend is so correct. They look to us to engage in a rational debate, not to have one-line zingers as the President put out. This is not what they want.

Then Ari Fleischer, who is the press secretary for the President, said this today:

It's time for everyone to work well together to protect our national security.

That was his remark after he was questioned about the President's statement.

That is the point that Senator DASCHLE was making, but not as rhetoric, as fact. There is an expression, I believe it was John Adams said: Facts are stubborn things. The facts are this President said very clearly: The Democrat-controlled Senate "is not interested in the security of the American people." My people at home are appalled at that.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will continue to yield to both my colleagues.

Mr. CORZINE. I want to reinforce what the Senator from New York said. By the way, this statement about not being interested in the security of the American people was made in Trenton, NJ, on Monday at a political rally. It is hard for me to understand what special interests are being reflected in the President's comments and its repeated nature.

I wonder if the junior Senator from California actually knew this was made in Trenton, NJ, at a political rally for the competitor to our side of the aisle? Is that not political in and of itself?

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my friend, I learned of this quote reading the front page today of the Washington Post,

and I am going to read what it says. It says four times in the past 2 days Bush has suggested that Democrats do not care about national security, saying on Monday that the Democratic-controlled Senate is "not interested in the security of the American people."

His remarks, intensifying the theme he introduced last month, were quickly seconded and disseminated by Republican House majority whip TOM DELAY of Texas.

I was unaware of this, although it is interesting to me, because that particular race, of course, in New Jersey, which is pivotal to the future of this Senate, and adds to the political nature of this comment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the junior Senator from California continue to yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe my friend was here when I was back in 1991. There was a long debate. I think it was a debate on the merits.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Both sides debated strongly in a heartfelt way. The Nation voted to go to war. Whatever side you were on, it seemed to me by having the debate, by keeping the invective aside—I do not remember the previous President George Bush ever using lines like that. After the debate, the vote was close, I believe, in both bodies. It certainly was in the House. The American people were more unified. There was a feeling that everyone had their point of view, that everything was explored.

I would say to my friend from California, at every townhall meeting about Iraq, and I have had a bunch of them around the State, they say you must know something we do not know. There must be some secret.

I have attended a few of the classified briefings and obviously would not want to disclose what is in there, but I say to them, no, as to the basic broad facts, not any kind of detail that would involve security, but the basic broad facts are known to every American because they are in the newspapers. There are no hidden, deep, dark secrets, at least that I am aware of. Maybe there are that we do not know about. But in a democracy, you cannot go to war this way. You cannot say if you are a leader of the country, I know something you do not know, when you are sending the sons and daughters of America to be put in harm's way.

I do not know how I would come out if we had to vote today, but whether I would end up voting yes or no—and I do not know what the resolution would look like—I sure would feel bad if we did not have a debate, if we did not have a discussion, if a whole variety of questions were not asked.

I would like to hear my friend's opinions on this. This is the most awesome, humbling decision that a Member of the Senate or the other body can make, because you are putting the beautiful young people of America in harm's way. You have to be careful.