

As General Shalikhshvili 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 give 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

continue the positive direction President Bush has set for the nation—with solid, pro-growth, pro-job reforms—Americans will enjoy even greater prosperity in the years ahead. But we will not be satisfied until every sector of the economy—from agriculture to high-tech—is vigorous and growing. And we will not rest until every person in America who wants to work can find a job.

We'll see more growth and new jobs when Congress passes the President's energy policy—a policy that encourages efficient technology and conservation, and increases production here at home. Especially in times like these, we must pass a comprehensive energy bill, and reduce America's dependence on foreign oil.

We'll see more growth and new jobs when people around the world have more opportunities to buy things that are made and grown here in America. Under President Bush's leadership, Congress has passed trade promotion authority, signed into law just recently. The President will use that tool to open up new markets to our country's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers.

Congress has also followed the President's lead in passing a new law to protect investors, to bring more accountability to corporations, and to ensure tougher oversight in the accounting profession. Our country has the most productive, creative, and promising economic system the world has ever known. The President's reforms will bring out the best in that system, and make it even stronger and better than ever before.

Americans can also count on President George W. Bush to continue working to reduce the federal tax burden. Last year we passed the biggest taxpayer relief package in a generation. As enacted, however, those reductions stay in place only for a time, and then expire in the year 2011. Even the death tax is scheduled to rise from the dead that year. For the health of the economy—and for the well-being of every taxpayer—we need to make the Bush tax cut permanent, and enforce spending discipline in Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

Some in that city need reminding that every dime the government spends was earned and sent in by someone else. And we have a responsibility to help keep spending under control. In a time of war and recession-induced deficits, we need to show extra care in our spending priorities, and the discipline that fits the times. The President's budget commits most new spending to national security and to homeland defense, and seeks to hold the rest of government to an increase of two percent. Were spending to grow without restraint, billions more would be diverted from families and entrepreneurs, limiting the economy's ability to expand in the future. President Bush is going to insist on spending discipline in Washington—and, if necessary, he'll use the veto power to protect the American taxpayer.

Another responsibility the President takes very seriously is the job of placing qualified, common-sense judges on the federal bench. (Applause.) The Senator has a responsibility of its own—to give every nominee a prompt hearing and a vote. The Democratic leadership has refused to do so. Dozens of judgeships sit empty, while many of the President's judicial nominees have waited for more than a year for the Senate Judiciary Committee to even give them the courtesy of a hearing.

In nominating judges President Bush chooses men and women of experience, judicial temperament, and good judgment—people who respect the Constitution, and understand the limits of judicial power. The Senate should move to confirm the President's nominees for the federal courts, and they

should do so without wasting another day. (Applause.)

As we look to the agenda for the fall, we are keeping first things first. The most important responsibility we have, as Adam mentioned, is to protect the American people against future attack and to win the war that started on September 11, 2001.

This has been a period of testing for the United States. The American people have met that test. We are united. We understand the threats that have formed against us. We are determined to protect our country. And we will prevail.

In the past year, we have captured many terrorists, and frozen the assets of many terror groups and front organizations. Our people in law enforcement and intelligence, working under the most urgent and sometimes dangerous circumstances, have disrupted terrorist plots here and abroad. At home, we are reorganizing the federal government to strengthen our ability to guard against further attacks. And of course in Afghanistan—where so many terrorists were housed, armed, and trained—we have shut down the camps, and liberated an entire nation from the Taliban regime. In the case of Osama bin Laden—as the President said recently—“If he's alive, we'll get him. If he's not alive—we already got him.” (Laughter.) That's a Texas phrase, I guess. (Laughter.)

Every bit of progress we've achieved, all of us appreciate that we are still closer to the beginning of this conflict than to its end. The President and I begin each day with a briefing on the threats facing the country. There is little doubt that our enemies are determined to do further significant harm to the American people. Nine-eleven and its aftermath have given us a clear picture of the true ambitions of the global terror network, as well as the growing danger of weapons of mass destruction.

In that changing environment, as always, we must take the facts as they are, not as we wish they were, and we must think anew about the requirements of national security. In the days of the Cold War, we were able to manage the threat with strategies of deterrence and containment. But it is a lot tougher to deter enemies who have no country to defend. And containment is not possible when dictators obtain weapons of mass destruction and are prepared to share them with terrorists.

We have already found confirmation that the al Qaeda terrorists are seriously interested in nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. At the same time, there is a danger of terror groups joining together with regimes that have or are seeking to building weapons of mass destruction. In the case of Saddam Hussein, we have a dictator who is clearly pursuing these capabilities—and has used them previously, both in his own against Iran and against his own people.

The government of the United States must not look the other way as threats gather against the American people. We are consulting with Congress and with our friends and allies around the world about the course of action. In his speech to the United Nations General Assembly, President Bush made clear to the international community the kind of challenges we must face together.

The President reminded the U.N. that Saddam Hussein made a series of commitments after his defeat in Desert Storm—and that he has broken every one of them. Saddam agreed to cease at once his repression of his people—yet the systematic violation of human rights continues in Iraq to this day. He agreed to return all prisoners from Kuwait and other lands—yet more than 600 are still unaccounted for, and one American pilot—a Kansan named Scott Speicher—is among them.

Saddam Hussein agreed to renounce all involvement with terrorism, and to permit no terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. Yet Iraq continues to shelter and support terrorist organizations. Dissidents abroad are targeted for murder. The Iraqi regime has attempted to assassinate the Emir of Kuwait and a former President of the United States.

Saddam Hussein promised the United Nations that he would destroy and cease further development of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles—and that he would submit to unrestricted inspections. He has flatly broken these pledges, producing chemical and biological weapons—aggressively pursuing a nuclear weapons program—and working to develop long-range missiles. And for four years now, he has refused to admit U.N. inspectors—four years during which he has been able to plan, to build and to test in secrecy.

Last week's letter from the Iraqi government to the United Nations, now pledging to allow inspectors back into the country, is another attempt to avoid strong action by the Security Council. We have seen this kind of tactic before. In the letter, the regime says it has no weapons of mass destruction. We know this is a lie. The entire world knows, beyond dispute, that Saddam Hussein holds weapons of mass destruction in large quantities, and is seeking to acquire more. This is not a matter of inspections. The only issue is the disarmament of Iraq, the elimination of the weapons of mass destruction, as required by Security Council resolutions. False statements from the Iraqi regime will not cause us to ignore history or reality. Saddam Hussein has spent more than a decade in complete defiance of all the demands of the United Nations.

The question for the international community is whether the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, or disregarded without consequence—whether the United Nations will be effective, or irrelevant. As for the United States, the President has made our position abundantly clear: we want to work with the United Nations to meet the common challenge. The Security Council resolutions are to be enforced, or action will be unavoidable. We must, and we will, take whatever steps are necessary to defend our freedom and our security. (Applause.)

In the challenges to America we will be expecting a lot from our military—and those who serve have a right to expect a lot from us. If we're going to ask young men and women to defend our country, our allies, and our freedom, if we're going to send them into harms' way, on dangerous missions to fight determined enemies—they deserve the best tools, the best training, and the best support we can possibly give them.

We are investing in our military so that we can deploy swift and agile forces—any place, any time they're needed. We are building precision weapons that can spare the lives of American soldiers, and innocent civilians in foreign lands. We will multiply every advantage in order to prevail over any enemy. And to have this capability, President Bush has asked for the most significant increase in defense spending since Ronald Reagan lived in the White House.

The conduct of our military does more than bring credit to the country; it reflects the basic character of the American people. This is a good, and decent, and generous land. We fight not for revenge against our enemies, but for the freedom and security of our own people—and for the peace of the world. At times in our history the price of freedom has been very high, but Americans have always been willing to pay that price—even when the odds weighed heavily against us.

I was reminded of this the other day as I read David McCullough's biography of our first Vice President, John Adams. When Adams and his fellow delegates voted to approve the Declaration of Independence, they knew precisely what kind of trouble they were bringing on themselves. To sign the Declaration, one of the founders said, was like signing your own death warrant. As of July 4, 1776, they would be considered traitors to the king, at war with the army of an empire.

Large numbers of enemy soldiers were already positioned on American soil, intent on crushing the rebellion in short order. In mid-August, 32,000 British troops landed at Staten Island—an army greater in size than the entire population of our then-largest city, Philadelphia. The American force was far smaller, had very little in the way of equipment and supplies, and was comprised almost entirely of poorly-trained volunteers. All they had was the courage of human beings determined to live in freedom.

Before they prevailed the Americans endured not weeks, not months, but years of hardship and struggle. The American victory at Yorktown didn't come until the fall of 1781. The Treaty of Paris, which John Adams helped negotiate and which ended the Revolution, was finally concluded in September of 1783—more than seven long, difficult years after the Declaration was signed.

From that day to this, the people of the United States have understood that the freedom that we enjoy did not come easily—and we have no intention of letting it slip away. History has called generations of Americans to defend our country and to defeat some of the gravest threats known to mankind. We have accepted that duty once again, because we know the cause is just—we understand that the hopes of the civilized world depend on us—and we are certain of the victory to come.

In this critical time I have the honor to stand beside a President who has united our nation behind great goals. For all the challenges we face, the United States of America has never been stronger than we are today—and even better days are ahead of us. President Bush and I are very grateful for the opportunity to serve our country. We thank you for your support—not just for our efforts, but for good candidates like Adam Taff, who will make a fine partner for us in the important work ahead.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I think it is important that we work off actual words and not headlines, off actual words and not interpretations, and off actual words and not feelings towards words.

That is the reason I wanted to enter into the RECORD the specific wording the Vice President used in the speech that is being commented upon a great deal by a number of Members. The headline that was out was not something that was said by the Vice President. I think it is important we get the actual words he used on Monday.

I want to also make something very clear. The Vice President did not at all challenge the patriotism of any Member of Congress—House or Senate, Republican, Democrat, or Independent. He did not challenge any of that. He didn't mention any member by name other than the one he is supporting, and who is running for the House of Representatives.

He spoke at length about Saddam Hussein, about the need for homeland

security, and about the need to move these bills forward.

There was no accusation whatsoever about any lack of patriotism on anybody's part. He is supporting, in this case in Kansas, the Third District candidate, Adam Taff, a man who is a former military man, an F-18 pilot, who fought in the gulf war the first time around, and who is running for Congress. This particular individual actually served as an F-18 pilot in the military when Vice President CHENEY was then Secretary of Defense.

Here is a person, a candidate, Adam Taff, who actually worked for the Vice President when he was Secretary of Defense, in a military capacity, and he does push forward his military credentials, as any candidate for office would push forward his credentials for office. And Adam Taff claims his military credentials. I think that is fully laudable and appropriate.

I think it is important to make clear that the Vice President didn't challenge any patriotism whatsoever and did not reference the Senate in any of his comments. Again, as I stated, I have here his actual comments that have been submitted for the RECORD.

I think there has been far too much protesting about this when what we really need to do is get homeland security passed and get an Iraqi resolution dealt with and I hope passed. I hope we can get a resolution, work together in a bipartisan fashion, and get an overwhelming majority for the Iraqi resolution. If we need to adjust words on it, I think that is fully appropriate because we need to show to the world a united front and that this distraction today is just that—a distraction.

Homeland security we should have passed some time ago. We have been on it now for 3 weeks. We have been on it primarily because of special interest issues and not because of interests for the country. I think we need to get that bill posted and cleared in this Congress. It would be an important thing for us to do. It is the time for us to get that done. We have dawdled too long on it.

But these allegations coming forward today that somehow there has been a challenge to the patriotism of other Members of this body are simply not supported by the facts. They are not supported by the facts anywhere. They are not supported by what the Vice President said in Kansas.

We clearly need to deal with the facts instead of trying to divert attention by saying there is an accusation going on which is not built upon the facts—allegations that are coming forward challenging the patriotism of people who have served in the military and in this body. Nobody is challenging that.

There is a clear challenge that we are not getting homeland security passed. We have been 3 weeks at it. There is a clear challenge that we have to get an Iraqi resolution passed before this body goes out for the election period—possibly an extended recess, or coming

back in a lame duck session, whichever actually takes place.

We really should get this bill moved forward. I think if people want to do away with these accusations, the best thing we can do is pass the homeland security bill and pass an Iraqi resolution that we work and mold together here as a body, and get that passed by an overwhelming majority in this body.

I urge my colleagues; I think it would be wise for us to lower our decibel level on this, look at the factual material, and not go after misleading headlines but actually examine the record and move forward with these two very serious pieces of business. It is important that we do that.

The Vice President has not—and I don't think in the future will—challenged anyone's patriotism. People disagree on political issues. They disagree on issues of policy. That is clear. That is why we have a body that debates these issues.

Some people view homeland security one way, and some people think we ought to support giving the President the authority to take whatever means necessary to remove Saddam Hussein. The former Vice President articulated a couple of days ago, saying no, that this is something we don't need to do and shouldn't do at this time. That is the former Vice President's opinion. Others have a different opinion on that.

But we would be wise to debate what those issues are, and the specifics, and not allege issues of character which are not being challenged by the President or by the Vice President.

I yield the floor.

COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate agreed last night, by unanimous consent, to adopt an amendment that Senator GRASSLEY and I offered to the homeland security bill. Our amendment will reinforce the commercial operations of the Customs Service within the new Department of Homeland Security.

A key objective of the homeland security bill is to create coherence in law enforcement at our nation's borders. The Customs Service is vital to that endeavor. For the vast majority of people entering the United States, their first encounter with the U.S. Government is when they are cleared by a Customs officer.

The Customs Service is the principal U.S. Government agency at most ports of entry. It enforces a multitude of commercial and other laws on behalf of itself and some 40 other Federal agencies. In addition to collecting duties, fees, and taxes on imports, Customs assists the Census Bureau in collecting trade data; enforces our environmental laws by ensuring that products of endangered species are not brought into this country; protects U.S. intellectual