

military operation in Iraq? Has anyone heard any credible plan for what steps the United States intends to take to ensure that weapons of mass destruction do not remain a problem in Iraq beyond the facile "get rid of Saddam Hussein" rallying cry?

Saddam Hussein is a vile man with a reckless and brutal history, and I have no problem agreeing that the United States should support regime change. I agree with those who assert that Americans, Iraqis, and the people of the Middle East would be much better off if he were no longer in power. But he is not the sole personification of a destabilizing WMD program. Once Hussein's control is absent, we have either a group of independent, self-interested actors with access to WMD or an unknown quantity of a new regime. We may face a period of some chaos, wherein a violent power struggle ensues as actors maneuver to succeed Saddam.

Has anyone heard the administration articulate its plan for the day after? Is the administration talking about a long-term occupation? If we act unilaterally, that could mean a vast number of Americans on the ground in a region where, sadly, we are often regarded as an imperialistic enemy.

Given the disarray in Afghanistan and the less than concerted American response to it, why should anyone believe that we will take Iraq more seriously? Certainly, it is undesirable for the United States to do this alone, to occupy a Middle Eastern country, and make our troops the target of anti-American sentiment.

Of course, Mr. President, I am sure you and I would agree, none of these concerns is a rationale for inaction. Let me repeat that. None of these concerns is a rationale for inaction. This is not about being a hawk or a dove. This is not about believing that Saddam Hussein is somehow misunderstood. He is a monster. Iraq's weapons programs are real, and only a fool would believe that the United States should simply hope for the best and allow recent trends to continue.

Equally, Mr. President, only a person lacking in wisdom would send American troops wading into this mire with a half-baked plan premised on the notion that the Iraqis will welcome us with open arms; that somehow the WMD threat will disappear with Saddam, and that U.S. military action to overthrow the Government of Iraq will somehow bring the winds of democratic change throughout the entire Middle Eastern region.

We do not make decisions crucial to our national security on a leap of faith. Congress is the body constitutionally responsible for authorizing the use of our military forces in such a matter. We cannot duck these tough issues by simply assuring our constituents that somehow the administration will "work it out." That is not good enough. We must not fail to demand a policy that makes sense.

Let me be clear about another important point: Maybe a policy that makes sense involves the United Nations, but maybe it does not. It is less important whether our actions have a formal U.N. seal of approval. What is important is whether or not action has international support. More important still is whether or not action will promote international hostility toward the United States.

In the context of this debate on Iraq, we are being asked to embrace a sweeping new national doctrine. I am troubled by the administration's emphasis on preemption and by its suggestion that, in effect, deterrence and containment are obsolete. What the administration is talking about in Iraq really sounds much more like prevention, and I wonder if they are not using these terms, "preemption" and "prevention" interchangeably. Preemption is knowing that an enemy plans an attack and not waiting to defend oneself.

Prevention is believing that another may possibly someday attack, or may desire to attack, and justifying the immediate use of force on those grounds. It is the difference between having information to suggest that an attack is imminent and believing that a given government is antagonistic toward the United States and continues to build up its military capacity.

It is the difference between having intelligence indicating that a country is in negotiations with an unquestionably hostile and violent enemy like al-Qaida to provide them with weapons of mass destruction and worrying, on the other hand, that someday that country might engage in such negotiations.

Of course, prevention does have an important role in our national security planning. It certainly should. We should use a range of tools in a focused way to tackle prevention—diplomatic, sometimes multilateral, economic. That is one of the core elements of any foreign policy, and I stand ready to work with my President and my colleagues to bolster those preventive measures and to work on the long-term aspects of prevention, including meaningful and sustained engagement in places that have been far too neglected.

Unilaterally using our military might to pursue a policy of prevention around the world is not likely to be seen as self-defense abroad, and I am not at all certain that casting ourselves in this role will make the United States any safer. Would a world in which the most powerful countries use military force in this fashion be a safer world? Would it be the kind of world in which our national values could thrive? Would it be one in which terrorism would wither or would it be one in which terrorist recruits will increase in number every day?

Announcing that we intend to play by our own rules, which look as if we will make up as we go along, may not be conducive to building a strong global coalition against terrorism, and it may not be conducive to combating the

anti-American propaganda that passes for news in so much of the world.

Fundamentally, I think broadly applying this new doctrine is at odds with our historical national character. We will defend ourselves fiercely if attacked, but we are not looking for a fight. To put it plainly: Our country historically has not sought to use force to make over the world as we see fit.

I am also concerned this approach may be seen as a green light for other countries to engage in their own preemptive or preventive campaigns. Is the United States really eager to see a world in which such campaigns are launched in South Asia or by China or are we willing to say this strategy is suitable for us but dangerous in the hands of anybody else?

The United States does have to rethink our approach to security threats in the wake of September 11, but it is highly questionable to suggest that containment is dead, that deterrence is dead, particularly in cases in which the threat in question is associated with a state and not nonstate actors, and it is highly questionable to embark on this sweeping strategy of preventive military operations.

So as we seek to debate Iraq and other issues critical to our national security, I intend to ask questions, to demand answers, and to keep our global campaign against terrorism at the very top of the priority list. This Senate is responsible to all of the citizens of the United States, to the core values of this country, and to future generations of Americans. We will not flinch from defending ourselves and protecting our national security, but we will not take action that subordinates what this country stands for. It is a tall order, but I am confident that America will rise to the occasion.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is the Senate in a period of morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are not.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask, therefore, unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period of 5 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. COAST GUARD PORT SECURITY UNIT 308

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor U.S. Coast Guard Port Security Unit 308 from Gulfport, MS. Port

Security Unit 308 deployed to Southwest Asia for 6 months in support of Operation Southern Watch in March 2002 after the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon. The unit was able to quickly restructure and produce a 53-person detachment for harbor security operations in support of enhanced Force Protection of United States Assets in the Arabian Gulf.

The brave men and women of Port Security Unit 308 Detachment Foxtro provided around the clock anti-terrorism Force Protection for all Fifth Fleet Naval assets located in the Mina Salomon area of responsibility. Water-side patrols logged over 4300 underway hours that included 291 escorts of U.S. Fifth Fleet Naval ships along with performing 1,481 intercepts. In addition to the escorts and intercepts, over 320 inspections were conducted. During the past six months while performing AT/FP, USCG PSU 308 Detachment Foxtro was responsible for the safety of over 25,000 military personnel.

I would also like to recognize MK1 Eddie Spann and BM2 Billy Mcleod who were recognized for their outstanding performance by being selected as Sailors of the Month, June 2002, for Naval Security Forces, Naval Support Activity, Bahrain.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in a round of applause for the fine individuals who are dedicated to winning the war on terrorism.

The following members from Port Security Unit 308 deployed in support of Operation Southern Watch:

LTJG Edward Ahlstrand, PSC James Altieri, PS1 Michael Beshears, BM3 Shannon Brewer, PS2 Ronald Brown, QMC David Conner, BM3 William Courtenay, PS1 Blevin Davis, CAPT Ronald Davis, GM3 Robert Dambrino, BM3 Samuel Edwards, TCC Patricia Geistfeld, LCDR Robert Grassino, MK1 Kenneth Hall, BM3 Charles Hartley, GM3 William Harvey, BM2 Roger Holland, PS2 Darrell Holsenback, BM3 John Hughes, YN1 Brian Hutchinson, HS1 Jason Jordan, BM2 Jim Kinney, MKCM Potenciano Ladut, BM3 Gene Lipps, BM3 Bradford Margherio, PS3 Marcella McDow, BM3 James McKnight, BM2 Billy McLeod, YN2 Tamara Mims, BM3 Paul Muscat, DC3 Jonathan Pajeaud, BM3 Jonathan Phillips, BMC Lisa Pilko, BM1 Darren Rankin, LCDR Michael Rost, SK1 George Scherff, BM3 Terry Sercovich, PS3 David Simonson, PS3 Russell Shultz, PS3 Benjamin Smith, LT Robert Smyth, MK1 Eddie Spann, BM3 Jordan Stafford, ET2 Stephen Strausbaugh, BM3 James Strempel, PS2 Jon Traxler, ENS Ted Trujillo, LT Timothy Weisend, PS2 Danny Welch, GMC Edward West, GM3 Lewis West, PS3 David Wood, GM3 Joshua Yarrowborough.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Mr. INOUE. STROM THURMOND will go down in the history of our Nation as an extraordinary citizen and an extraordinary patriot.

Few people can match his record of achievements:

He was commissioned as an officer in the United States Army Reserve nearly 80 years

ago. In 1959, he retired as a major general after serving 36 years in reserve and active duty.

On D-day, June 6, 1944, Lieutenant Colonel Thurmond boarded an Army CG4A glider and flew behind enemy lines into Normandy.

He served as Governor of South Carolina. Later, he was a candidate for President of the United States, receiving the third-largest independent electoral vote in U.S. History.

In 1954, he was elected to the U.S. Senate as a write-in candidate. Today, he is the oldest and longest serving Member of the Senate.

I have been privileged to know and work with Senator THURMOND for nearly 40 years. I wish to thank him for his wealth of wisdom. I will always cherish his friendship.

But Senator THURMOND is not only my colleague and friend, he is also my brother-in-arms. During World War II, anti-tank gunners from my regiment, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, assaulted southern France in 1944. Like Senator THURMOND, they went into battle aboard gliders without armor. Glider-borne assaults were extremely dangerous and risky; some would even say they were suicidal missions. However, they were a necessary component of the United States' invasion and liberation of Nazi-occupied France.

Senator THURMOND demonstrated rare courage, patriotism, and leadership as gliderman of the 82nd Airborne Division. Most glider descents were "controlled crashes," and that was the case when Senator THURMOND's glider landed in Normandy. Although he was injured, he managed to safely lead his men to the 82nd Airborne Division headquarters at daybreak. The 82nd went on to accomplish its difficult objective of seizing and securing key positions in enemy territory.

I am pleased to report that Senator THURMOND's distinguished military service will be honored with the naming of a new section of the Airborne and Special Operations Museum in Fayetteville, NC. The Thurmond Wing will house an exhibit dedicated to the courageous combat gliderman of World War II.

As a Senator, STROM THURMOND has often taken positions that were not universally supported. Yet one could always be certain that his decisions were honest. He is passionate in his beliefs, and his commitment to serving his constituents has been exemplary. At the end of our service in the Congress, we, his fellow Senate Members, can only hope that we will be able to say we have served our people with the diligence and devotion that Senator THURMOND has served his people. Indeed, Senator THURMOND can leave this Chamber and say, with confidence and without hesitation, that he has faithfully served the people of South Carolina.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred April 20, 2001 in Brighton, MI. Two white men assaulted a black state trooper who was dancing with a white woman. The assailants, who did not believe that the state trooper should be dancing with a white woman, attacked the trooper and yelled racial slurs. The attackers were charged with assault with a dangerous weapon and ethnic intimidation in connection with the incident.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE DROP IN FEDERALLY LICENSED FIREARMS DEALERS IN AMERICA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, earlier this week the Violence Policy Center, VPC, released a new study entitled "The Drop in Federally Licensed Firearms Dealers in America." It found that the number of gun dealers holding Type 1 Federal Firearms Licenses, FFLs, a basic license to sell guns, dropped 74 percent from 245,628 in January 1994 to 63,881 in April 2002 or more than 181,000. The State of Michigan experienced the third largest reduction in the U.S., a drop of 75 percent from 12,076 dealers in 1994 to 3,016 in 2002.

According to the study, the decrease is the result of licensing and renewal criteria contained in the Brady Law and 1994 Federal crime bill. These changes were designed to reduce the number of private, unlicensed gun dealers who operate out of their homes and garages. I voted for the Brady Bill and Federal crime bill, and I am pleased that they appear to be working the way Congress intended. The study also suggests that enhanced enforcement and prosecution of gun laws at the federal, state, and local level have had a significant impact.

The drop in gun dealers is an important step in the effort to reduce firearms violence in the U.S. But despite this decline, private, unlicensed dealers are still supplying guns to gangs, drug dealers, and street criminals. In light of their findings, the Violence Policy Center proposed several recommendations to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. One of the VPC recommendations is to close the loophole