

speaking, thousands of U.S. soldiers, sailors, and marines are being deployed around the globe in such remote places as Southeast Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the Horn of Africa. Just last week, 4,000 soldiers from Fort Carson, CO, were given orders to deploy overseas.

The war against global terrorism continues to require substantial resources and considerable foreign cooperation. The administration has made enormous progress in this area, but more remains to be done. Many al-Qaida operatives are at large, and several nations continue to support terror groups. We must remain vigilant and proactive if we are to prevent future terror attacks.

With regard to Iraq, as the President said during his state of the union address, Saddam Hussein continues to hide his weapons programs, despite an aggressive weapons inspection regime. To many, the 12,000 page Iraqi declaration given to the United Nations last December was duplicative of previous declarations and revealed little of value. It only served to highlight Saddam Hussein's determination to retain his weapons of mass destruction.

The reports earlier this week by the U.N.'s chief weapons inspectors, Hans Blix and Mohamed ElBaradei, further demonstrated that Iraq remains unwilling to give up its weapons programs. In his statement to the United Nation's Security Council, Hans Blix emphasized this point. He said,

Unlike South Africa, which decided on its own to eliminate its nuclear weapons and welcomed the inspection as a means of creating confidence in its disarmament, Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament which was demanded of it and which it needs to carry out to win the confidence of the world and to live in peace.

Iraq has hedged, delayed, and avoided complete disarmament for over a decade. There comes a time when diplomacy and sanctions become exercises in futility. There come a time when only military action will succeed where negotiations have repeatedly failed. There comes a time when the President of the United States, as leader of the free world, must say enough is enough.

Several press reports indicate that some U.S. allies, most notably France and Germany, may oppose military action against Iraq at this time. We should certainly take their thoughts into consideration. Our alliances should be both respected and preserved. At the same time, though, the President has an obligation to our country to do what is best for the United States—his primary responsibility is the safety and security of the American people. It is my hope that our friends and allies will recognize our determination to eliminate the threat posed by Iraq's weapons programs and support our efforts in the Persian Gulf.

Just as we prepare to confront Iraq's growing arsenal of destruction, we cannot ignore the threat posed by North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile

programs. The Bush administration has sought to form a global consensus to deal with North Korea's WMD ambitions. Press reports indicate that the President wants the United Nations Security Council to deal with this threat to East Asia. I think this is a good first step.

In many ways, the North Korean issue is different from the situation involving Iraq. There haven't been any U.N. resolutions calling for the disarmament of North Korea, nor have North Korea's allies, China and Russia, shown much interest in resolving this issue. A global consensus is now beginning to form. Our allies in the region, South Korea and Japan, are only starting to realize the danger North Korea's WMD efforts pose to the region.

Five years ago, North Korea test-launched a three-stage ballistic missile over Japan that could have reached parts of the United States.

I think that is worth repeating.

Five years ago, North Korea test-launched a three-stage ballistic missile over Japan that could have reached parts of the United States.

This test ended a debate as to whether our country was vulnerable to ballistic missile attacks from countries of concern. It became a question of what we were going to do about it. Finally, after much debate, the Congress authorized in 1999 the development and deployment of a national missile defense system "as soon as it was technologically feasible."

Since President Bush's election in 2000, the Department of Defense has made considerable progress on a missile defense system. With additional funding and less restrictions, the Missile Defense Agency has launched a broad effort to evaluate all potential options for missile defense, including ground-based, sea-based, and even space-based defenses. The MDA now has a number of high-profile missile defense systems in development and is making progress in developing sophisticated sensors capable of detecting incoming missiles.

As the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Programs and Operations, including missile defense, I have assisted the President in developing these systems. Last year, the Congress provided nearly \$8 billion for missile defense.

I am pleased that a number of projects are now nearing completion. The PAC-3, an enhanced version of the Patriot missile used during the Gulf War capable of intercepting short and medium-range ballistic missiles, has entered into production. The Army's Theater High-Altitude Air Defense—THAAD—a system to counter medium-range ballistic missiles, is nearing production. And, perhaps most significantly, the ground-based mid-course interceptor system, which provides the United States with a limited defense against ICBMs, is scheduled to be deployed in 2004, as announced by President Bush on December 17 of this past year.

Missile defense is not the only program that has received increased attention since President Bush's election. The DOD budget as a whole has grown substantially over the past 2 years. Last year, the Congress authorized over \$390 billion in funding the department, an increase of nearly \$40 billion from the year before. While much of this increase went to support our military operations overseas, some of this money was used to shore up our counter-terrorism efforts, improve our intelligence capabilities, and develop new technologies to counter the growing threats to our Nation. The department is expected to request similar funding for the upcoming fiscal year.

The President and the Congress have worked hard over the past 2 years to reduce the threats to our Nation and prevent future attacks. It has not been easy. Partisan politics, divergent personalities, and conflicting perspectives frequently interrupt the process.

I believe the President deserves much of the credit for this progress. He has stepped up and led our country in a very difficult time. His message has clearly resonated with the American people. Increased vigilance and enhanced security are essential in a time of uncertainty and perceived vulnerability. I share this message and will continue to work in the Senate to see that measures that are enacted actually increase the security of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight and a half minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

IRAQ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I recognize there has been a good deal of discussion in the last day or two with respect to Iraq; much of it, of course, as a result of the President's State of the Union Message the other evening, and, of course, it is a legitimate discussion about where we are with respect to Iraq and terrorism.

I believe the President's message was very complete. I thought he spelled out exactly what his plans are and the reasons for them. I think he has pursued the proper course over a period of time.

Certainly, there is no one here who wants to have to go to war. No one here wants active military intervention if that can be avoided. On the other hand, this is a progressive situation that has to be resolved, which started back in 1991, and has not yet been resolved. So

I think the only legitimate, reasonable course for us is to go through all we can to avoid military action, but if we do not get the results that need to be had, then that is our alternative.

I think we have been on the right course. And we are not finished. Certainly we are not finished. There is all kinds of evidence that things that were promised or ordered to be done have not been done.

I think one of the things we need to consider is times have changed. Times have changed since September 11. Years ago, when there were threats of war, what it involved, of course, was tanks and divisions landing and all kinds of very obvious military activities. Now the real threat is not that, it is terrorism; it is for things that could happen in this country similar to what happened on September 11—without all that preparation, without all that warning. It just happened in very terrible kinds of incidents. So I think in protecting our country, we need to understand the situation is quite different than it was.

There has been a great deal of talk about smoking guns. Frankly, I do not believe you need to see a smoking gun if you go back to the beginning of this whole enterprise. Go back to 1991, when there was a cease-fire arrangement after the gulf war, after Saddam had been driven out of the country he had invaded. And there was a legal basis for it. There was a cease-fire, an agreement, and a succeeding U.N. resolution which was the sound basis for our action in Iraq.

The Council Resolution 687 was adopted in 1991. At the heart of it was a disarmament obligation from Iraq. Then you remember we had inspectors there up until 1998. There was very little cooperation during all that time, and the evidence they had accumulated then is still available. This was all done under international supervision. But nothing was completed. There was not success in forcing Saddam to disarm. So that is where we are at this time.

I think the policy we have to take takes into account what should have been done, what has not been done—this irresponsible activity on the part of Iraq's leadership—and, therefore, we are in the position to have to be prepared to do whatever is necessary to make that happen.

I certainly hope that can happen. And I presume there is going to be some more time for inspectors. Hopefully, based now on another U.N. resolution, which, of course, was done in November of last year, we can put on more pressure to have him comply with that resolution.

The key to this situation, I hope everyone remembers, is to disarm—not necessarily to attack, not to go into Iraq if we can get disarmament. That, obviously, is the thing we are set up to do.

I believe we ought to continue to follow the vote we took in the Senate. I

think it was 77 votes supporting the President to do what he has to do.

Now there are suggestions of having to go back and do that again. I do not understand that, frankly. The basis for that vote is still the basis for where we are today. The authority there is the authority to finish the job that is very threatening to everyone and, indeed, must be completed.

I certainly support the President and his team in terms of trying to come to a resolution on this situation, being prepared to do what we have to do—hopefully, not having to do it—but to be sure we do everything we can to protect Americans, to protect the world, to establish the responsibility that countries have with respect to the U.N. If we are going to have a U.N., if we are going to have U.N. resolutions, then they should be enforced, and they should be expected to comply.

I believe that is where we are. All of us hope for the best and continue, I hope, to support the President to do what is necessary to protect us from another September 11.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF GORDON ENGLAND TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and the Committee on Governmental Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon England, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 20 minutes evenly divided on the nomination.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer had the misfortune last night to be presiding when I presented the qualifications of Secretary Gordon England to be the Deputy Secretary of the new Department of Homeland Security. Unfortunately for the Presiding Officer, the vote did not

occur last night, so he is going to once again hear a little bit more about Secretary England. But since Gordon England is such an unusually well qualified candidate for this position, I will beg the indulgence of the Presiding Officer as I outline for my colleagues who were not here last evening his qualifications for this important post.

Last Wednesday, the Senate voted unanimously to confirm Tom Ridge to be the first Secretary of Homeland Security. Today, I am confident that the Senate will unanimously confirm Gordon England to be Secretary Ridge's Deputy at his side at the helm of this critical new Department.

The Department of Homeland Security opened its doors last Friday. Together, Secretary Ridge and Deputy Secretary England make a formidable team to chart the new Department on a course to protecting our Nation from the threat of terrorist attacks.

As President Bush has said:

Our enemy is smart and resolute, [but] we are smarter and more resolute.

Part of our resolve must be to place the best possible leaders in charge of the new Department of Homeland Security. Gordon England is such a leader. The Committee on Governmental Affairs, which I have the honor of chairing, thoroughly considered his nomination. We held a hearing last Friday. The nominee also responded to extensive prehearing questions. And yesterday the committee unanimously agreed to discharge the nomination to expedite floor consideration.

Gordon England is extraordinarily well qualified for this important post. He currently serves as Secretary of the Navy, a position he has held since May 2001. Moreover, he came to the Navy with an impressive portfolio of management experience. He served as executive vice president of General Dynamics and he was responsible for two major sectors of the corporation: information systems, and international affairs.

Earlier in his career, he served in various executive capacities at a number of divisions of General Dynamics. But as preparation for becoming the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, it would be difficult to beat a tour as the Secretary of the Department of the Navy. As Secretary, Gordon England headed a department with a budget of over \$100 billion and consisting of 462,000 sailors and 212,000 marines.

The Department of Homeland Security, which we often describe as a massive new Department, will bring together a civilian workforce of about 170,000 individuals. The Secretary of the Navy not only had many more military employees to supervise, but he had a civilian workforce of 190,000 employees.

Secretary England's extensive experience in managing large complex operations in both the private and public sectors will serve him well as the Deputy Secretary of the new Department.