I want to begin by quoting General

William Sherman in the Civil War who

simply stated, ‘‘War is hell.’’ And I can

also say, having visited the Pentagon

the night of the attacks on September

11 and visiting New York City at

Ground Zero just a few days after the

attacks, that terrorism is hell; and the

pain and agony that that has inflicted

on our country, on men and women and

children and families, has been excruciating.

And this resolution that we debate

in this Chamber today and will

vote on tomorrow is one of the most

difficult, heart-stabbing, gut-wrenching

votes that one can cast.

My first vote as a freshman was on

the Persian Gulf War, which had something

to do with Saddam Hussein invading

Kuwait, and now one of my last

votes will be on war. And in between,

we have had votes on Somalia and

Kosovo and Bosnia, and we have had a

vote to declare war on terrorism. These

are difficult, excruciating votes that I

think every Member in this body takes

extremely seriously.

I will vote in favor of the President’s

resolution for three reasons. One is because

of the chemical and biological

and nuclear threat that Saddam Hussein

poses with these weapons. I have

to say that I do not think the administration

has made the case with connections

to al Qaeda, nor have they made

the case with connections to 9–11. But

I think in a compelling and convincing

fashion, we must, in post-9–11 concern,

be very aware of how these weapons

can be used against the United States,

even in America, against our allies in

the region, and all over the world.

When airplanes filled with people and

gasoline can be commandeered and

flown into our buildings in America, we

can only imagine what can be done, not

just with a vial of smallpox that Saddam

Hussein or some other terrorist

group may have, but we are talking

about a few hundred metric tons of

chemical weapons that Iraq possesses.

We are talking about, and I quote from

a declassified CIA report: ‘‘Baghdad has

begun renewed production of chemical

warfare agents, probably including

mustard, sarin, cyclosarin, and VX.’’ It

goes on to say, ‘‘Saddam probably has

stocked a few hundred metric tons of

CW agents.’’ Finally, ‘‘All key aspects:

research and development, production,

and weaponization, of Iraq’s offensive

BW program are active and most elements

are larger and more advanced

than they were before the Gulf War.’’

Mr. Speaker, this is a compelling

concern, this is a present danger, this

is grave and growing.

Now, I think that is the evidence

that we are voting on today. I think

that is the reason for our resolution

going forward.

Secondly, I am voting for this because

this resolution has gone in a

more positive direction from when the

Bush administration first introduced

it. It is narrowed in scope to Iraq instead

of broadly applying to the region.

It applies to try to put together diplomatic

and multilateral efforts. These,

Mr. President, should be exhaustive before

we engage in war in Baghdad or in

Iraq. I think this resolution has moved

in a positive direction in terms of engagement

and consultation with Congress

and the War Powers Act. So that

is the second reason I intend to vote

for this.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly, 15 days after

Desert Storm ended in 1991, the U.N.

started passing one of its 16 resolutions

to say we must look into Iraq and inspect

the sites where they are developing

these weapons. That has been ignored

for the past 10 years. Not only

has it been ignored, but Saddam Hussein

said, you will not look, you will

not investigate, you will not inspect

these compounds, presidential palaces,

so-called compounds, some of which

are 12.5 square miles. The city of D.C.

is 67 square miles. That is a fifth of the

size of our Nation’s Capital of one compound

that Saddam Hussein does not

want our inspectors or the world community

anywhere near.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats said in

their policy platform of the year 2000,

we did not talk about preemptive

strikes; we talked about forward engagement

as part of our foreign policy

to try to stop, whether it be in the environment

or in war, bad things from

happening. Let us exhaust our diplomatic

means, but let us use the force of

war and the threat of war with Saddam

Hussein to open up these compounds

and these presidential palaces and have

the world look at these sites and rid

Iraq of the weapons of mass destruction.