Senator GRAMM of Texas be recognized to offer an amendment; that there be two hours of debate equally divided between Senators GRAMM and LIEBERMAN or their designees; that at the conclusion of that time the amendment continue to be debatable and Senator DASCHLE or his designee be recognized.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the amendment we have been waiting for for some time will be offered in the morning, or as soon as the vote is completed, as the unanimous consent request indicated.

It appears the two managers have some amendments they can clear on this homeland security bill. That being the case, we will stay on the bill. When the amendments are cleared, we will go to a period for morning business until Senators have said all they wish to say, and then we will recess until tomorrow. We hope this is the beginning of the end of this bill. I think we have made progress to get to this point. As I have indicated, we have been trying to get this amendment now for about the second week, so finally we are there. This is a big amendment. We will determine how it is going to be disposed of sometime tomorrow.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator DORGAN is here and wishes to speak as if in morning business. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized for up to 20 minutes, and that following his statement, we return to the bill.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

TERRORISM AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about several important issues facing the Senate at the moment: namely, the situation with Iraq, and the state of our economy.

First, let me speak about Iraq. And let me begin by saying that I don't think there is any question that Saddam Hussein is not following the terms of surrender at the end of the gulf war. He has failed to live up to any one of those terms or conditions.

I was at the Incirlik Base in Turkey and visited with the pilots who are flying over the northern area of Iraq enforcing the no-fly zone. These pilots fly in harm's way. They are often shot at by the ground forces of the Iraqi Army. The fact is, Saddam Hussein has violated virtually everything to which he previously agreed.

I don't think there is any question that this is a bad person, who poses a real threat. He wants access to nuclear weapons. He has access, apparently, to chemical and biological weapons. And the President says we ought to do something about this threat posed by Saddam Hussein. I agree that we should. The question is, How?

The President went to the United Nations. And I think that was the right thing to do. The Secretary of State is now asking the Security Council to join us and pass another enforcement resolution so we can, with other countries, begin to enforce coercive inspections in Iraq to make sure that, if they have weapons of mass destruction, they are destroyed, and to make sure they are never able to acquire weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons.

But there are other avenues that we should also pursue. I have thought for 10 years, since the end of the gulf war, that this country should press for the formation of an international criminal tribunal at the United Nations to indict and try Saddam Hussein as a war criminal.

I don't know whether at the end of the day there is going to be a regime change in Iraq or not. I hope there is. I believe there ought to be a regime change, but I am not sure whether that is going to happen. If it doesn't happen, I still think we ought to push for the creation of an international war crimes tribunal, so that Saddam Hussein is indicted and convicted.

There is ample evidence—both in this country and also in the United Nations—to indict and convict this man of war crimes.

I spoke on the floor some years ago about a young boy and his family who lay dead on the ground in Iraq—victims of weapons of mass destruction unleashed by Saddam Hussein that killed thousands of those people. He is the only leader I know of in this world who has used weapons of mass destruction against his own citizens. So there is ample evidence for that and other reasons to indict, try, and convict Saddam Hussein for crimes against humanity.

I have never understood the reluctance of this Government to push ahead to do that. I have never understood that. Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania and I offered a resolution—I think it was about 5 years ago in the Senate—calling on the State Department to go to the United Nations and attempt to get a war crimes tribunal so we could indict, try, and convict this man as a convicted war criminal. I think whenever we talk about Saddam Hussein, we should be talking about a convicted war criminal.

Had we done what we should have done 10 years ago and 5 years ago, that is what we would now call him, because the evidence is so substantial about what he has done to his own people, to people in the region, to his neighbors, the weapons he has used—there is just no question that this man, even in absentia, would be tried and found guilty as a war criminal.

I think even today our State Department should press that case, even as we are pressing for coercive inspections and contemplating taking action again against the country of Iraq.

I have asked my staff to talk to the staff of the Senator from Pennsylvania about offering that resolution once again in the Senate. It passed the Senate 4 or 5 years ago without a dissenting vote. Yet nothing has happened with respect to Saddam Hussein and Iraq and the creation of a war crimes tribunal at the United Nations to indict and to try him.

Let me turn to the economy for a moment. Because while the Iraq issue is vitally important, we have other very big challenges that are largely being ignored. The President and some in this Chamber don't want to talk about this, but the fact is our economy is in some significant trouble. We have some people whose responsibility it is to be involved in fiscal policy who say: What trouble? Things are going just fine. This is just a little bit of a correction. Things will be fine. Just wait and do nothing. Things will work their way out.

The fact is, we have come to an intersection in this country unlike any we have ever arrived at before. Just a year and a half ago, President Bush proposed a fiscal policy. He came to office, and said: What I see in this country is 10 years of surpluses, and big ones at that. That money belongs to the taxpayer. Let us give it back. Let us have a $1.7 billion tax cut.

I did not vote for that because I said I thought we ought to be a little more conservative. I don't think we can see 3 months ahead, let alone 10 years ahead. I think the conservative thing to do would be to attempt to be a little more moderate in how we deal with fiscal policy and not lock in a $1.7 billion reduction in revenue.

I lost that argument. The majority in this Chamber and the other Chamber voted for a $1.7 billion tax cut over 10 years. The President celebrated and his supporters celebrated. Everyone talked about how wonderful that was. Mr. Greenspan, down at the Federal Reserve Board, thought that was fine, too.

It wasn't very much past that—some months past that—when we discovered the country was in a recession. If we had been in a recession at the time we were talking about these expected 10 years of surpluses, would we have made a different decision? Maybe.

Not much more than a couple of months beyond that we had the terrorist attacks against our country on September 11. Had we known we were going to face a recession and the terrorist attacks on our country on September 11 that caused such a devastating loss of life, would we have said let us put in place a $1.7 billion tax cut? I think we might have made different decisions.