

I am not a pacifist. I can think of a whole number of wars in our country's history where I would have enlisted. I would have been lined up the next day.

I would not say that first strikes should always be ruled out, but I sure want to ask some questions and I sure want to know some answers. This idea of trying to impugn the patriotism, in the interest of helping the American people, of anyone who wants to ask questions, I find, well, too low for words.

I ask the junior Senator from California if she has the same feeling. I come from New York. I know what terrorism does. I knew people who were lost. I put this flag on September 12, and I have worn it every day since then in memory of those who were lost. God willing, I am going to wear it every day for the rest of my life.

I know what terrorism is all about. Nobody wants to beat back terrorism more than I do, but I want to make sure we do it and we do it right. I want to make sure if we go to war in Iraq we are not going to ignore or take resources away from, for example, fighting al-Qaida or other terrorist groups. Perhaps we can do both, but I have not had a chance yet to get all the answers about that. I wonder what the Senator thinks.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my friend, he is absolutely right.

I want to say for the benefit of my senior Senator for California, I will be talking another 5 minutes and then I will yield.

I want to underscore that what the Senator says is so right. After that debate that took place on the first gulf war, about 80 percent of the American people said they were so proud. Clearly, they may not have agreed with my position, your position, or any other Senator on the other side of the debate, but they saw debate free and open, respectful debate, among colleagues, asking questions, posing ideas, other solutions, other paths to resolve the issue.

In some cases, there was strong support for the President. They realized then that we are a representative democracy. They were calm.

When I went home this past weekend, I found out the people in my State are not calm. They are very agitated, and it is because they are worried that debate is being stifled. They are worried that a resolution is—

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has used her 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. When Senator REID made the request, he did not apply the 10 minutes to this speaker, but I ask unanimous consent to continue for 5 additional minutes before Senator FEINSTEIN proceeds.

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

Mrs. BOXER. The people at home are agitated, I say to my friend, because they expect to see this respect go both ways between the parties and even, frankly, within the parties. We have Republicans who are asking questions

and others who are not. We have Democrats who are ready to vote today for the Bush resolution and others, such as myself, who frankly could not because I believe it is a blank check.

I thank my friend for his engagement in this colloquy. Let me conclude in this way: I have thought to myself, why is this happening? I believe there is a political decision that has been made to keep this country focused on the foreign policy questions and not focused on the everyday kitchen table issues, the domestic issues that need to be addressed. I am going to go to some charts very quickly.

We have seen long-term unemployment more than doubling since this administration came in. We have seen the worst performance of the stock market since Hoover. That means pensions are going down the tubes, as well as 401(k)s, and people's hopes and dreams for their retirement. We have seen an average rate change in the real gross domestic product, which is the worst in generations. It is the worst of all Presidents from Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, the first George Bush, and President Clinton. It is the worst growth rate. That is what we have seen.

In summing up the economic record, we have seen record job losses, weak economic growth, declining business investment, falling stock market, shrinking retirement accounts, eroding consumer confidence, rising health care costs, escalating foreclosures, vanishing surpluses, higher interest rates on the horizon, raiding Social Security, record executive pay and a stagnating minimum wage.

So I believe that a decision was made to deal with a foreign policy issue at the exclusion of what is happening on the ground with our families. Mr. President, that is distressing. We need to do both.

We need to rise to the foreign policy challenges we face. On the war against terrorism, we have a long way to go. In Afghanistan, in Pakistan, right here, with the cells that exist in our country, we have a long way to go. We need to step to the plate on that fight. We need to step to the plate on the Iraq challenge and handle it correctly with our allies, with a plan that will lead us perhaps to a peaceful end without having to shed blood. Maybe there is a chance. We should at least explore it. We have to step to the plate on the economic issues and we need to do that across party lines. We have to do it with the Republicans, with the Independents, with the Democrats—together.

One course we do not want is for one party to say about the other: They don't care about the security of the American people. If one party does that, as the Republicans did today, as the President did, as reported today, we will lose all these other battles. We will have a divided country. We will not be able to work together in good will.

My leader, TOM DASCHLE, the leader of the Senate, was right to say what he said, was right to express himself in the way he did. I hope the answer will be that in the future we will join hands as Americans and, even where we might disagree on a strategy, on an amendment, on a bill, work together as Americans. That is when the people are most proud of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 20 minutes.

IRAQ

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague, Senator BOXER, for her excellent remarks, and those Senators from New Jersey and New York who joined her. She has made a very impassioned message. It is a correct message. I hope people listen.

I also am deeply saddened by recent comments made by the President and Vice President which imply that Democrats are not protective of our Nation's security. Nothing is further from the truth.

There is no shortage of courage and bravery and patriotism on this side of the aisle. We, too, have our heroes who prove that: Senator MAX CLELAND, Senator DANIEL INOUE, former Senator Bob Kerrey, and Senator JOHN KERRY, people who fought with bravery and distinction in major conflicts this Nation has had.

Even to imply the Democrats are not interested in the security of the American people is not only wrong, but in the present pre-election period I believe it is also base.

Last night, it was reported the Vice President went so far as to state that American security would be enhanced if a certain GOP candidate was elected to the House of Representatives. This very statement, carried by major newspapers, jaundiced any fair discussion in this pre-election period.

One might ask why? The reason is both the President and the Vice President have an extraordinary bully pulpit with a very long reach. It makes up about 95 percent of everything that reaches the American public; the remaining 5 percent is scattered among whoever is able to receive it.

If this debate is politicized in the heat of an election and the decision is made for the wrong reasons—out of fear; if we do not carry out the public trust that is invested in us and make the decision for the right reasons, then we betray our trust. And no election is worth doing that.

I share the concern of the majority leader, and I hope it is not too late to end this politicization. But there is only one way. Shortly, we in Congress will begin debate on whether to authorize the President the authority to use force against Iraq. It is, in effect, a declaration of war. The President has sent a draft resolution. He made his case before the United Nations. Today he

seeks the support of the international community. Now it is our job, our constitutional duty, to debate this resolution. But we must do so in an atmosphere that is true. The decision to go to war is perhaps the most grave and significant decision any nation makes. It is a decision that must be made on its own merits, with a timetable determined by the cause and the case and not based on political considerations and upcoming elections. I believe that deeply.

A declaration of war against Iraq is the most serious decision many Members will ever make as Senators. It is a life or death decision for the American men and women we put into harm's way, for the innocent Iraqi people who will be killed, for the repercussions it will have throughout the Persian Gulf, the Middle East and the Arab world, and throughout our own country and the rest of the world.

Congress must not rush to judgment before it has had ample opportunity to answer the many questions that still remain regarding why a war, a preemptive war, should be fought at this time against Iraq. For example, what is the immediate threat to American security to justify an attack on another sovereign nation? How would such a war be conducted? How would we respond to Iraq's use of chemical or biological weapons, to an attack on Israel, or to a ricochet of terrorist incidents in our country and around the world? And what are our responsibilities for post-war stability once Saddam Hussein is ousted? How do we prevent civil war between the Sunnis and the Shias?

No one questions that Saddam Hussein is an evil man, or the potential of Iraq acquiring the nuclear capability within the next 5 to 7 years is a possibility. We believe it is. There is reason to believe that Saddam Hussein has squirreled away biological and chemical weapons. But they are most likely close to civilians; in tunnels, under mosques, around schools and hospitals, and inside palaces or in mobile vehicles.

This is not sufficient reason to preemptively attack another sovereign nation—for the first time in this Nation's history—without first being provoked by an attack against our homeland, our people, or our interests. It is not sufficient reason to put our service men and women in harm's way when there are real, viable options short of war left on the table. There is no question this country should take steps to disarm Iraq. Saddam Hussein, with chemical and biological weapons, represents a real threat to his own people, to the Middle East region, and to the international security. The question is, Is use of force the first option or the last option? In my view, it should be the last. In my view, working with the international community, doing all we can to disarm Iraq before jumping to military force, remains an option.

If Saddam Hussein balks at inspectors, if he starts playing games, if he

continues to thwart the will of the international community, then the use of force by the United States has a moral imprimatur and is the only remaining viable answer.

There is no question that Iraq is in direct violation of international law, numerous U.N. Security Council resolutions, and that he poses a threat in the region. Nobody debates that. But there is no persuasive evidence that Iraq is prepared to unleash its biological or chemical weapons today. Although he used them against the Kurds in 1987 and 1988, and against Iran in their decade-long war, he has not used them in over 10 years, and he knows what will happen to him if he does. He may be homicidal but he is not suicidal.

Likewise, there is no persuasive evidence that he possesses nuclear weapons today. He may be trying to gain these weapons, but he remains years away. So instead of rushing to war, I believe we should proceed in a calm, methodical, and nonpolitical manner. The United States should work through the United Nations Security Council—as the President himself suggested in a September 12 speech to the United Nations and as Secretary of State Colin Powell is now trying to do to obtain full and unconditional access for arms inspectors, and hopefully accompanied by a United Nations military force.

We should seek the complete destruction of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. This approach should be our first option, not window dressing or an option to be dismissed out-of-hand. And we should do this not for idealistic reasons but because it is in our national security interests to do so.

Indeed, the benefit of pursuing a multilateral approach was seen clearly when Saudi Arabia suggested that, if the United States were working through the United Nations, it would grant U.S. forces access to its bases. Action against Iraq becomes much more complicated, from a military perspective, if there are no landing or fly-over rights in other Arab countries; and managing the aftermath becomes much more difficult if we find the entire Arab world against us.

So I believe that if the United States fails in its efforts to compel Iraqi compliance with a United Nations inspection, verification, and destruction regime—either because other countries threaten a veto in the Security Council or the United Nations is unable to muster the muscle and will to enforce its own resolutions—then the United States, with or without willing partners in the international community, must be prepared to go it alone.

But we must be clear. If we go to war, it should be to force Iraq to disarm.

This time, too, it is critical that the United States stays the course on the war on terror.

In every book you read on Osama bin Laden, you see that he believed that we

would never stay the course in a war against him. We would hit a camp once and then disappear. As happened before, we would go to Somalia, get into trouble in Mogadishu, and we would turn tail and run. Bin Laden bet on that. He cannot be right about that. We have much to do to win this war.

Many of those who perpetrated the September 11 terrorist attacks remain at large, including two-thirds of the al-Qaida leadership; the Taliban and its leader, Mullah Omar; not to mention thousands of terrorists sympathetic to al-Qaida worldwide, including in our own country.

Afghanistan remains a fragile and unstable country. The United States must continue our efforts to rebuild this country. We cannot repeat what was done to it since 1979. We must continue our efforts to rebuild Afghanistan, the Afghan economy, to assure that the Taliban and al-Qaida do not return to power there—because they will if they can. We must protect and stabilize the Government of Hamid Karzai. And any effort in Iraq must not detract from our war on terror.

The President has rightly pointed out that the war on terror will be a long and hard-fought battle, and it is not just against al-Qaida. It is Hezbollah, which equals al-Qaida in its reach, in its viciousness, in its malevolence, and its evil. We must not take our eye off this ball. The President must come forward to explain not only how we fight this two-front war without allowing one front to jeopardize our interests in the other, but also what we would do in the event of a major strike against Israel.

I have come to this floor before and indicated that there is ample evidence that rockets are being shipped out of Iran, through Syria and into southern Lebanon—Katyusha rockets with extended range anywhere from 8,000 to 10,000, to hit Israel's industrial zone north of Haifa, should we attack Iraq.

What do we do then? What is our commitment, and what will the other Arab States do? I think we ought to know this. I think as prudent leaders, as part of a debate in the greatest deliberative body in the world, we ought to know these things before going into it, so there are no surprises.

Finally, it is critical that if and as we consider any use of force against Iraq that we have a clear understanding of the aftermath. Who would do the rebuilding? Who would pay for it? Who would run any new government? And could that government provide security? Could it prevent a bigger and more brutal battle between the Sunni and the Shia.

That is not a question to overlook. Read the history on Iraq. You will see the brutality and the viciousness, the attack of one tribe on the other that has characterized Iraqi history from the time of ancient Mesopotamia. There are a lot of grievances out there to be settled, big grievances between the Shia majority and the ruling Sunni Baath party minority.

As General Shalikashvili made clear in his recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, planning for a post-conflict situation, winning the peace, is every bit as important as planning for the conflict itself.

And until the planning for post-war Iraq is in place—and it is not now—we should not rush to initiate combat. In fact, every general with whom I have talked—and I have talked with several—has urged caution. Every general with whom I have talked, privately, believes this war could end up being much more difficult than some expect it to be.

So to simply rush ahead and authorize the President to use force now, before these questions are answered, and without an imminent threat—save what some hope to gain from this issue in the elections—would be a grave error.

Congress must debate these issues fully, thoroughly, on a schedule, and with a timetable driven only by the merits of the issues. We must then move forward to pass a resolution tailored to the specific circumstances and giving the President the proper authority he needs to safeguard U.S. national interests.

So much is at stake here. American lives are at stake. We do not know how many, but I know one thing: It is not going to be like the gulf war. This war will be in cities. This will be street to street and house to house. We might send in the B-2s, the B-52s and the 117s, and they might drop huge numbers of laser-guided missiles and precision bombs. We will kill a lot of people. And then do we risk what may happen with the chemical and biologicals squirreled away? Do they go up in those attacks? Or are they released over innocent people? I have never heard one person discuss this, and it is time that we do so.

We are not a mercenary nation. This is not our heart. It is not our soul. And we have never engaged in a preemptive attack on another sovereign nation.

It may well be that untold numbers of lives are at stake elsewhere in the Persian Gulf, in the Middle East, and yes, right here in the USA.

Matters of war and peace, of life and death, must not be held in the grip of shortsighted, partisan rancor. I for one refuse to make them so. I respectfully suggest the Administration do the same. The stakes are simply too high.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH IN KANSAS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an issue that has been in the press much today, and I think there is a great deal of misinterpretation taking place about the President's and the Vice President's comments regarding homeland security and the war on terrorism.

I make specific reference to a speech that Vice President CHENEY gave in Kansas on Monday. I was at that event. I heard the speech. I was there supporting the candidate for whom the speech was given. Adam Taff, a fine candidate, is running for Congress in the Third Congressional District in Kansas. I want to make it very clear—and I want to enter into the RECORD a copy of the Vice President's words verbatim.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Vice President's speech which he gave on Monday in Kansas be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT LUNCH FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE ADAM TAFF, SEPTEMBER 23, 2002, KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, thank you very much, Adam. And thanks for the kind words, and for the opportunity to be here with all of you today. It's good to be back in Kansas, and standing next to the next Congressman from the Third District. (Applause.)

I'm also delighted today to get the opportunity to spend a little bit of time with Sam Brownback and Pat Roberts, two great United States senators. (Applause.) I know—of course; Pat was up here talking before we came on, and somebody came in and said, you know, you've got to get right down there, Senator Roberts is running out of things to say. (Laughter.) I knew better. (Laughter.)

It's always fun to get a chance to travel with my bride, and spend a little bit of time out on the campaign trail, doing important work. I often explain to people that we have a Republican marriage, that if it hadn't been for that great Republican victory in 1952, when Dwight Eisenhower was elected President, that our lives would have come out very differently. In 1952, when Eisenhower got elected, I was living in Lincoln, Nebraska, with my parents, just a youngster of some, I guess 11 years old at the time. But he came in and reorganized the Agriculture Department—my dad worked for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. Dad got transferred to Casper, Wyoming. We moved to Wyoming. I met Lynn—we went to high school together, grew up together, got married, celebrated our 38th wedding anniversary last August. (Applause.)

But I explained to a group of people the other night that if it hadn't been for that Republican election victory, that Lynn would have married somebody else. She said, right, and now he'd be Vice President of the United States. (Laughter.) There's no doubt in my mind that what that's true. (Laughter.)

Of course, my job now as Vice President—my only job, actually, as Vice President—is

to preside over the Senate. And when they wrote the Constitution they decided they needed a Vice President, somebody to back up the President in case something happened to him. But at the end of the constitutional convention they realized they hadn't really given the Vice President anything to do. So, finally, they settled on making him the President of the Senate, so that he could preside over the Senate and gave him floor privileges, as well.

And John Adams, of course, was our first Vice President, the first President of the Senate. And he presided and he also used those floor privileges—got up and could actually participate in the debate and speak to the issues of the moment and argue for and against the majors on the floor. And then he did that a couple of times and they withdrew his floor privileges. (Laughter.) And they've never been restored. (Laughter.)

But one of the things I do get to do is to swear in the new Senate every January. And I'm enthusiastically looking forward to next January, when I can swear-in Pat Roberts and the new members of a Republican-led Senate in January. (Applause.)

We've got a lot of races here in Kansas this year. Of course, a new Secretary of State, Ron Thornburgh, I think will do very well. Congressman Jerry Moran, who has proved to be a great member of the House of Representatives. And, of course, the next Governor of Kansas, Tim Shallenburger. (Applause.)

And I bring greetings to the people of Kansas from President George W. Bush.

We're all here today because there's an important race for Congress in the third district—and we've got a tremendous candidate. This seat belonged for many years to a great lady and a close friend of Lynne's and mine. We all admire Jan Meyers for her integrity and devotion to duty. (Applause.)

I served for ten years in the House, most of that time with Jan and explained to people, of course—it was a special kind of arrangement to be the congressman from Wyoming, since there was only one congressman from Wyoming. It was a small delegation. (Laughter.) But it was quality. (Laughter.)

But our nominee that we have for the third district today follows very much in the tradition that January established for this district. Adam is a first-class candidate; a distinguished Naval aviator who has carried out missions in many parts of the globe; a citizen actively involved in the life of his community; and a person who understands the need for limited and effective government.

He'll be an effective voice for Kansas, and a fine addition to your Republican delegation—already one of the most talented we have in Washington. The election is just six weeks away, and there's a lot of work ahead. And I am here today to make absolutely certain that Adam Taff is the next congressman from the third district in Kansas. (Applause.)

The President and I look forward to welcoming Adam to the nation's capital come January. He'll be vital in helping us meet the key priorities for the nation—in terms of winning the war on terror, strengthening the economy, and defending our homeland.

For the economy, this administration's goal is for faster growth and for more jobs for American workers. Even in the face of the major challenges—from the terrorist attacks to recession—the economic picture is nonetheless promising. Worker productivity has grown. Interest rates remain low. Inflation is under control. Personal income has continued to rise. And the economy continues to expand.

All of these factors set us on a path for long-term growth and prosperity. And if we