

burden. But our children will likely bear the burden of a 10-year deficit that is put on their shoulders by a fiscal policy that is irresponsible.

We will have a budget debate next week. I will offer amendments. My colleagues will offer amendments. I don't have any interest in deciding that Republicans have the wrong answer and Democrats have the right answer. There are good answers that come from all parts of the Chamber. But the construct of this fiscal policy is just fundamentally wrong and everybody in this Chamber who knows how to add and subtract ought to know that. It is time for us to start speaking about it.

I am perfectly interested in providing tax cuts to the American people when we have budget surpluses. But the tax cuts should be to working families and should be distributed fairly. But at a time when we have the highest deficits, to say let's ignore them and let's have a political construct that increases spending in the largest areas of spending in the Federal budget and decreases taxes with very large tax cuts and then pulls the rest out of it out of some very important things that invest in people in this country, including veterans and Indian health and education, and a whole series of things, that is wrong.

We need to stand up and talk about it. I will speak about it at greater length next week. I wish I could come to the floor and say this is a wonderful fiscal policy. I just cannot. I feel obligated to say this is wrong; we are headed in the wrong direction. We need to fix it as a country. Our children's future depends on it.

I will make one final point. On September 11, when this country was attacked, we were one country. I was proud of President Bush, and one of the best speeches I ever heard he gave to a joint session of Congress. This country responded as one. But this country does not do a service to its future by believing now—a year and a half following that period of time—that voices still, because they don't want to engage in debate over issues that are important to our future, are somehow disadvantageous to our country. We need a robust debate about the right fiscal policy. We disserve our constituencies if we don't bring this debate to the floor in an aggressive way. What works? What will restore economic health to the country? What do we do to improve economic growth, to provide jobs, to get people back to work, and get the economy moving again? Those are the questions we have to ask as we construct a budget and put this fiscal policy together.

I regret I come to say this fiscal policy makes no sense at all and must be changed. I wish that were not the case, but it is. The result of that is I will be here with amendments, as will others, hoping we can improve this fiscal policy for our country's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

#### THE WORDS OF ALISTAIR COOKE

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I am glad to see an Alaskan in the chair as I make this statement. This morning, as it usually happens, when I turned on my computer, I found a series of e-mails from friends at home. I do not always have time to read them then, but I saw one from a very close friend, who has been a friend now for over 50 years—Frank Reed, a former neighbor, a person who has helped me in many ways in my life. He asked me to read this article he attached to his e-mail. I get a little disturbed when I see that the testament is a little longer than the e-mail. But I found that he had sent me a verbatim transcript of an article by Alistair Cooke entitled "Peace For Our Time," that was on the BBC News on Monday, February 3 of this year. I want to read that tonight because I think it reflects what I have been trying to say on the floor of the Senate these past several weeks.

The following was written and spoken by Alistair Cooke. He said this:

... I promised to lay off topic A—Iraq—until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspectors' report and I shall keep that promise.

But I must tell you that throughout the past fortnight I've listened to everybody involved in or looking on to a monotonous din of words, like a tide crashing and receding on a beach—making a great noise and saying the same thing over and over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare—a day-mare, if you like.

Through the ceaseless tide I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man—Prime Minister Chamberlain saying: "I believe it is peace for our time"—a sentence that prompted a huge cheer, first from a listening street crowd and then from the House of Commons and next day from every newspaper in the land.

There was a move to urge that Mr. Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Peace Prize. In Parliament there was one unfamiliar old grumbler to growl out: "I believe we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat." He was, in view of the general sentiment, very properly booted down.

This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 with the British prime minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered. "Oh dear," said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck. "He has betrayed my trust."

During the last fortnight a simple but startling thought occurred to me—every single official, diplomat, president, prime minister involved in the Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most of them unborn. So the dreadful scene I've just drawn will not have been remembered by most listeners.

Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years but only two years before, when he broke the First World War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland. Only half his troops carried one reload of ammunition because Hitler knew that French morale was too low to confront any war just then and 10 million of 11 million British voters had signed a so-called peace ballot.

It stated no conditions, elaborated no terms, it simply counted the numbers of Britons who were "for peace."

The slogan of this movement was "Against war and fascism"—chanted at the time by every Labour man and Liberal and many

moderate Conservatives—a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic as "against hospitals and disease." In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him.

At that time the word pre-emptive had not been invented, though today it's a catchword. After all the Rhineland was what it said it was—part of Germany. So to march in and throw Hitler out would have been pre-emptive—wouldn't it?

Nobody did anything and Hitler looked forward with confidence to gobbling up the rest of Western Europe country by country—"course by course", as growler Churchill put it.

I bring up Munich and the mid-30s because I was fully grown, on the verge of 30, and knew we were indeed living in the age of anxiety. And so many of the arguments mounted against each other today, in the last fortnight, are exactly what we heard in the House of Commons debates and read in the French press.

The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, "negotiation, negotiation". They negotiated so successfully as to have their whole country defeated and occupied. But as one famous French leftist said:

"We did anyway manage to make them declare Paris an open city—no bombs on us!"

In Britain the general response to every Hitler advance was disarmament and collective security. Collective security meant to leave every crisis to the League of Nations. It would put down aggressors, even though, like the United Nations, it had no army, navy or air force.

The League of Nations had its chance to prove itself when Mussolini invaded and conquered Ethiopia (Abyssinia). The League didn't have any shot to fire. But still the cry was chanted in the House of Commons—the League and collective security is the only true guarantee of peace.

But after the Rhineland the maverick Churchill decided there was no collectivity in collective security and started a highly unpopular campaign for rearmament by Britain, warning against the general belief that Hitler had already built an enormous mechanized army and superior air force.

But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested.

Still for two years before the outbreak of the Second War you could read the debates in the House of Commons and now shiver at the famous Labour men—Major Attlee was one of them—who voted against rearmament and still went on pointing to the League of Nations as the savior.

Now, this memory of mine may be totally irrelevant to the present crisis. It haunts me. I have to say I have written elsewhere with much conviction that most historical analogies are false because, however strikingly similar a new situation may be to an old one, there's usually one element that is different and it turns out to be the crucial one. It may well be so here.

All I know is that all the voices of the 30s are echoing through 2003 . . .

Madam President, I was but 14, not 30. I remember the tension we all felt at that time, as country after country became destroyed by Hitler. Previously on the floor of the Senate, I mentioned Hitler and compared Saddam Hussein to Hitler. I was criticized even by the papers at home in Alaska.

I was delighted to read Alistair Cooke's article that Frank Reed sent to me this morning, and I commend it to the rest of the Senate.

This haunts me. It haunts those of us who lived through the thirties to know

we might go through the thirties again because too many people refuse to listen to the truth, refuse to listen to what some of us see in Saddam Hussein, as being another Hitler.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 628 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HONORING GENERAL AL LENHARDT

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, a little over 18 months ago, I came to this floor to welcome MG Alfonso Lenhardt to the Senate on his first day as this body's Sergeant at Arms.

Tomorrow will be GEN Lenhardt's last day in the Senate.

It is with profound admiration, and more than a little sadness, that I rise today to thank him for his extraordinary service, and to wish him much success and happiness in the years ahead.

Nominating Al Lenhardt to serve as the Senate's Sergeant at Arms was one of the great honors of my time as majority leader. It was also, I think, one of the best decisions I made in more than 30 years of public service.

I did not know Al before we began the search for a Sergeant at Arms in the summer of 2001. He was recommended to me by our former Secretary of the Senate, Jeri Thomson.

Jeri had met Al more than a decade ago when they were both at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. She was impressed by his intelligence, knowledge, steady demeanor and commitment to public service, characteristics she correctly noted are highly desirable in a Senate Sergeant at Arms.

Twenty minutes after meeting Al, I knew Jeri had identified the right person for this job.

I also knew, when I nominated Al, that he would make history in this Senate. What I did not realize is what a crucial role he would play, and what a difference he would make, in the history of this Senate.

Al Lenhardt is the first African American ever to serve as the Senate's top law enforcement and administrative officer. In fact, he is the first African American to serve as an elected officer of the Senate or House—ever.

That seems hard to believe, but it is true. And after 212 years, I must say, it was long overdue.

And he was the individual serving as the top law enforcement officer of the

Senate when the unimaginable happened—terrorists struck a devastating blow on American soil.

The September 11 attacks occurred less than a week after Al Lenhardt was sworn in as Sergeant at Arms. I do not think he took a day off for over 5 months.

Five weeks after September 11, a letter containing a lethal dose of anthrax was opened in my office.

That incident remains the largest bioterrorism attack ever on U.S. soil, and one of the most dangerous events in Congress' history.

Al Lenhardt's leadership ability, experience and demeanor were instrumental in the Senate's entry into the post-September 11 world. I am not sure that before that terrible day any of us fully appreciated the threat that America's enemies posed to our U.S. Capitol, a majestic and enduring symbol of our democracy.

Al Lenhardt rose to the challenge of protecting against further terrorist attacks on the Capitol complex and protecting the people who work in and visit these buildings—without closing "The People's House" to the people themselves.

Al provided calm and steady leadership in the face of danger that reassured us all in an extraordinarily stressful and emotional time.

When deadly anthrax was released in the Hart Building, 50 Senators and their staffs, and 15 committees and their staffs, were displaced for 96 days while the building was remediated.

Never before—not even when the British burned the Capitol in 1814, had so many Senators been uprooted.

Relocating them and their staffs presented an unprecedented logistical challenge. But Al Lenhardt and his staff, and the staffs of the Rules Committee and the Secretary of the Senate, responded quickly and well. The business of democracy never stopped.

Al Lenhardt stood tall in the face of danger. And his steady hand assured that the Senate kept functioning.

Over the past 18 months, Al Lenhardt rose to the occasion, demonstrating to me that he was indeed the right man, with the right skills and experience, in the right place, at the right time.

Al Lenhardt has had a remarkable public career.

He served in the United States Army for 32 years and as a combat veteran wears the Purple Heart earned in Vietnam.

He retired from the Army in 1997.

His last Army position was commanding general of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command at Ft. Knox, KY. From that post, he managed more than 13,000 people in 1,800 separate locations.

Before that, he served as the senior military police officer for all police operations and security matters throughout the Army's worldwide sphere of influence.

In the 1980s, he did counter-terrorism work in Germany against the Baader-Meinhof Gang and other terrorist groups.

He also was the former commander of the Army's Chemical and Military Police Centers at Fort McClellan, AL, which trains the military police who are guarding our bases overseas.

Al Lenhardt was born in Harlem 59 years ago.

He earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from the University of Nebraska, a master of arts degree in public administration from Central Michigan University, and a masters of science degree in the administration of justice from Wichita State University. He has also completed post-graduate studies at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and the University of Michigan Executive Business School.

Between the Army and the Senate, he served for 4 years as executive vice president and chief operating officer of the Council on Foundations, where he worked to harness the power of philanthropy to meet some of America's most urgent unmet needs.

He has been active in an array of organizations, from the Boy Scouts of America, to the Boys and Girls Clubs of Washington, DC, the National Office of Philanthropy, and the Black Church Project.

He has been married for 38 years to Jackie Lenhardt, one of the few people I have ever met who has a more commanding presence than Al. Jackie and Al have three daughters—two lawyers and a doctor—and two grandchildren, Olly, who is 4, and Maya, who was born 2 months ago.

The closest thing to a complaint I've ever heard from anyone who knew Al Lenhardt in the Army was from an officer who took a battalion six years after Al had left it.

He said: "It's tough to go into a unit after Al Lenhardt because he leaves such strong footprints. Six years later, his policies and procedures still stood. He made a lasting impact on soldiers."

The one consolation in saying goodbye to Al Lenhardt is knowing that the policies and procedures he instituted here in the Senate will continue protecting us in the future.

Al's predecessor, Jim Ziglar, began the effort to modernize security and protect the Capitol in an age of terrorism. And he made a good start.

But I think even Jim would acknowledge that it is Al Lenhardt who deserves the lion's share of the credit for leading the Senate into the modern age of security and law enforcement.

If Congress is ever forced to vacate this building, or even this city, for any length of time, the Senate will be able to move and resume the work of democracy immediately in a new location under a "continuity of operations" plan that Jim Ziglar started and Jeri Thomson and Al Lenhardt completed.

While Al would be the first to state that more needs to be done, he has ensured that the Senate will continue operations in the event of any emergency.