I want to talk on a number of issues

that I think are very, very important

to us as we confront the decision we

must make and the vote we must take

tomorrow. I want to talk about the seriousness of this issue. I want to talk

about the question of preemption and

why America might even contemplate

striking under these circumstances. I

want to address the concerns of those

who say they simply do not want to go

to war and talk about why I do not

want to go to war either, but some-

times war is necessary. I want to talk

about the issue of why now, because I

think that is a very pressing issue. And

I want to talk, most importantly,

about how I believe this resolution is

the most certain way, indeed perhaps

the only way, we have to avoid war.

Let me begin with the seriousness of

this issue. Beyond a shadow of a doubt,

this will be the most solemn, most serious vote I believe I will cast in my tenure in the United States Congress. I

have been here for some pretty serious

votes. I have seen us balance a budget,

I have seen us impeach a President, but

nothing comes close to the vote on a

resolution of force such as the one we

will consider tomorrow. I approach

that vote with the grave appreciation

of the fact that lives are in the balance: lives of American soldiers, lives

of innocent Iraqis, lives of people

throughout the world.

I also approach that vote with the

grave knowledge that while my son is

16 years old and would not likely serve

in this war, I have many constituents

and many friends with sons and daughters who are 18 years old or 19 or 20,

and who may be called upon to go to

war. This is, indeed, I believe, the most

serious issue this Congress can con-

template, and it is one that has

weighed on me for weeks.

Some of those amongst my constituents who are deeply worried about this

issue say why should we act and why

should we act under these circumstances? They argue that we

should pursue deterrence. They argue

that we should pursue containment;

and then they argue that if neither deterrence nor containment work, we

should wait until a first strike is

launched and then we should respond.

Well, I would respond by saying history has proven sadly over the history

of the Saddam Hussein regime that deterrence does not work. This is a man

who has proven by his conduct over and

over again that he cannot be deterred.

This is a man who will not respond to

the kind of signals that the rest of the

world sends in hopes that a world leader would respond. Although we have attempted containment, this is a man

who has proven he will not respond to containment.

At the end of the Gulf War, he agreed

to a number of things that we are all

now painfully aware of and that have

been covered in this debate. He agreed

to end his efforts to procure chemical

and biological weapons. He agreed to

end his efforts to obtain nuclear weapons. He agreed to end his efforts to

have and to develop long-term missiles

and other delivery systems. And yet none of those have worked.

At the end of the day, deterrence and

containment simply have proven, over

a pattern of 11 years, not to work. His

deceit, his deception, his continued

pattern of forging ahead show us beyond a question of a doubt that he will

not be deterred and he will not be contained.

We know some things. We know that

because of the nature of the weapons

that he has, and because of his willingness to use those weapons and to use

them perhaps secretly, we cannot wait.

I listened to the debate last night, and

I was very impressed with it. One of my

colleagues in this institution came to

the floor and made an impassioned

speech against this resolution and said,

we absolutely should wait, and he cited

the Revolutionary War and the command to our troops to wait until fired

upon. I would suggest to my colleagues

that when we have an enemy who has

chemical and biological weapons of the

nature of those that this enemy has, we simply cannot wait.

VX nerve gas kills by paralyzing the

central nervous system and can result

in death in 10 minutes. Sarin nerve gas,

cyclosarin nerve gas, mustard gas. I am

afraid the words ‘‘chemical weapons’’

have lost their meaning; but they

should not, because they are abhorrent

weapons, and he has them. There is no doubt.

Biological weapons. He has anthrax.

He has botulism toxin. He has aflatoxin

and he has resin toxin. It would be bad

enough if he simply had those, but we

know more. He has them and he has

tried to develop strains of them that

are resistent to the best drugs we have,

resistent to our antibiotics. That is to

say he has them, he could use them,

and not until they had been used could

we discover that the best our science

has cannot match them.

Now, why can we not wait, given that

type of history and that type of chemical? Because the reality is we do not

know when he will strike. He could indeed strike and we would not know it

for days or weeks, until it began to manifest itself.

But let us talk also about the whole

possibility of him using terrorists. We

talk a lot about him, and we get deceived by this discussion of he does not

have a long-range missile that can

reach the United States, because he

does not have aircraft that can reach

the United States, we ought not to

worry about those. We talk about the

issue that it could be months or a year

before he could develop a nuclear weapon. All of those are false pretexts. All

of those are serious mistakes.

The reality is that if he chooses to

deliver those weapons through any of

the means that we know he possibly

could. By handing them in a backpack

to a terrorist, we might never know

that it was Saddam Hussein that delivered the weapon. And if he chooses to

use chemical or biological weapons for

such an attack, we might not know

until hundreds, indeed until thousands,

perhaps tens of thousands, perhaps mil-

lions of Americans were infected and

fatally wounded and would die, and we

would not know until afterwards.

I would suggest that the old doctrine

of wait until they fire is simply no

longer applicable under these circumstances.

Now, I have conscientious colleagues

and I have constituents who come to

me and say, I am not ready for war; I

do not want war. I want to make it

clear that no one wants war. Not a single Member of this body would choose

war. And this resolution, as the President said the other night, does not

mean that war is either imminent or

unavoidable. The President made it

clear he does not want war. But I would

urge my colleagues that there are some

certainties. One of those is that the

best way to prevent war is to be prepared for war.

The best way to prevent such a war is

to send clear and unmistakable signals.

He has unarmed aerial vehicles. That is

to say, he has model airplanes, and he

has larger airplanes which can be operated by remote control.

It has been pointed out that, given

his lack of trust, an unmanned aerial

vehicle, an unmanned airplane, is the

perfect weapon for this leader, this in-

sane leader, to use, because he does not

have to trust a pilot who might not follow orders. He has the operator of a re-

mote-controlled vehicle standing next

to him. If, in fact, the pilot were to

choose to not drop his load, there

would be little he could do in a manned

aircraft to that pilot. But in an un-

manned aerial vehicle, equipped with a

chemical or biological weapon, he remains in control; and it could easily be done.

He could bring that kind of weapon

to our shores in a commercial ship like

the hundreds lined up right now off the

coast of California and launch them

from there, and we would not know

about the attack until after it was done.

It seems to me that we cannot wait

under these circumstances; and it

seems to me that he has proven beyond

a doubt that deterrence and containment, although we have tried them,

simply will not work.

One colleague pointed out he has

chemical and biological weapons; and

in time, because he is seeking them, he

will have nuclear weapons. It was also

pointed out that if we want to rely

upon a scheme of inspections, and my

constituents back home would hope

that we could rely on inspections. I

would hope that also. But make no

mistake about it, there are two serious flaws.

An inspection regime that relies on

inspecting a country where hundreds of

acres are off limits, cannot be gone

into, the presidential palaces that are

there, an inspection regime that relies

on that is not an inspection regime at

all. But an inspection regime where we

know to a moral certainty that he has

mobile production facilities is an inspection regime that will give us false hope.

I was in the Middle East when the

first weapons inspectors were kicked

out of Iraq. I was on a CODEL with the

gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT)

and four or five other Members of Congress. They left Baghdad and went by

ground to Jordan and flew to Bahrain.

We had an opportunity to meet with

them in Bahrain the first night they

reached there. One of my colleagues

who was there is here tonight on the other side of the aisle. We spent 2 to 21⁄2 hours talking with weapons inspectors

who had just been kicked out of Baghdad.

They made some serious impressions

upon me which I will never forget. One

was echoed in the President’s speech

last night, and that is the Iraq people

are not our enemy. In fact, weapons in-

spectors explained to us that when in-

dividual Iraqis would learn that a given

weapons inspector was an American,

they would say, America, great place. I

have a sister in San Francisco. I have

a brother in Philadelphia.

The President said it right the other

night. The Iraqi people are not our enemies, but they delivered another message to us and

made another impression. That is, they explained to us carefully, six congressmen in a hotel room

in Bahrain, now 7 years ago, they said,

make no mistake about it, every time

they got close to making a real discovery, every time they were at the

door of a facility that they were convinced was producing chemical and biological weapons, there would be a stall,

there would be a delay. They would be

forced to stand outside the gates of

that building for hours and hours while

the inside was obviously being cleaned up.

Indeed, they would sometimes, when

they got savvy to this, the inspectors

would send somebody around to the

back gate and watch the equipment,

watch the trucks roll out the back door.

There is no question but that an inspection regime where they are determined to deceive you, where they are

determined to deny you access to some

locations, and where they have mobile

facilities is no inspection regime at all.

I do not want war. No one wants war.

But I am convinced that the risk of waiting is indeed too high.

I do not believe, and I agree with one

of my colleagues on the other side of

the aisle who said, I do not believe that

Saddam Hussein will ever submit to a

legitimate inspection regime. But I

know this much, he will never submit

to such an inspection regime until and

unless it is backed by credible threat of

force. That is what we are talking about here tonight.

We also on that trip went and visited

our American troops enforcing the no-fly zone, both the southern and the

northern no-fly zone. The American

people deserve to know that we have

been at a state of war with this regime

for 11 years. He has fired on our pilots

over and over and over again. He probably fired on them today. He has certainly fired on them within the last

month. He has fired hundreds of times,

and he has declared war against us. He

has declared a holy war against us.

We know some other facts. We know

over time Saddam Hussein’s weapons

regime will grow, and the threat will

become worse. We do not want war, but

it would appear doing nothing is the

one way to ensure war.

I believe to the depth of my soul that

this resolution is a measured and

thoughtful proposal to achieve one

thing, and that is the disarmament of

Iraq and the Saddam Hussein regime,

hopefully by peace, but if necessary by force.

I think we know that it has the potential of creating the coalition we all

want. If America sends a weak signal

and says we are not sure of our course,

we are not sure of our path, how can we

even hope to bring into our ranks and

to our side allies in a battle against an

insane leader such as Saddam Hussein?

I think we also know, those of us who

intend to vote for this resolution, it

holds a second potential and that is it

could lead the United Nations, indeed,

I am prayerful, as is the President,

that it will lead the United Nations to

rise to its obligations, to make its resolutions meaningful, to remove itself

from the irrelevancy that it currently

has by not enforcing its resolutions,

and to stand with strength and to say

once and for all to this vicious dictator, we will not let you flaunt the

rule of law and the requirements imposed by the U.N.

It could indeed cause Saddam Hussein to come to his senses. I hope it will.

I know failing to act involves too

great a risk. Failing to act exposes not

just the people of his nation, whom he

has terrorized and butchered and tortured, to suffer longer.

We know the dimensions to which he

will go. We know the threat. We know

he will in fact and has used violence of

every dimension against his own people, and we know for a moral certainty

he will bring that aggression against

the rest of the world if not stopped.

No one is happy about this moment,

but I believe it is the right course and,

for those who truly want peace, the only course.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a column from the New Yorker

written by Jeffrey Goldberg. It is

called ‘‘The Great Terror.’’ It is an

interview of the people who were the

victims of Saddam Hussein’s attack on

his own people. It documents his murder of some 50,000 to 200,000 Kurds.