Mr. Speaker, I found

the previous speakers’ comments interesting.

In part their comments were accurate,

but I should point out that

when we talk about the Kyoto treaty,

what they should bring to the attention

of the body is that when it was

voted on by the United States Senate,

the vote was 99–0. 99–0. That was not all

Republicans, that was Democrats and

Republicans combined in the United

States Senate. Not one vote in favor of

that so-called treaty. Why? Because

that treaty unfairly assaulted the

United States of America.

Obviously we as elected representatives

of this country want to stand in

front of this body and stand in front of

the American public and commit to do

things that are better. We can do a lot

more to conserve, everybody in this

country, in this world, can do more to

conserve and, frankly, conservation

right now is going to get us a lot further

than my colleague’s suggestion

that the President of the United States

convert his ranch in Texas to solar

power. Conservation is the answer

right now. In the long run, solar power,

in the long run energy from waves, in

the long run energy from other sources

is what is going to be the answer, but

in the short time, sitting here and condemning

the United States of America

as some people might do or feeling that

the United States of America should

hang its head low is wrong. The leading

technologies in the world on environmental

control, on assisting us with

stopping pollution, on making coal

cleaner burning and so on, without a

doubt the leading technologies in the

world are developed by the scientists in

the United States of America. There is

no other country in the world that has

helped more other countries with their

environmental problems, assisting

them, sending them financial aid,

doing anything we can to assist, than

the United States of America.

The United States of America has

nothing to apologize about. The United

States of America is committed to do

things better. But I for one am tired of

seeing foreign country after foreign

country after foreign country bash the

United States of America. And we see

it come to this floor. Some of our colleagues,

while well intended, seem to

get up here and become apologists for

the greatest country in the history of

the world. This country, the United

States of America, has fought for other

countries, has gone overseas more than

any other country in the history of the

world to fight not for American land

but to fight for other people in this

world.

Who do you think led the battle in

Bosnia? Who do you think got communism

out of Europe? You can go to

example after example after example.

It is the United States of America. To

see some of my colleagues, or to see

people stand up and continually bash

the United States and put a spin on it

is discouraging.

Take a look at Berkeley University. I

cannot even imagine. There is an actual

debate at Berkeley University on

the commemoration for September 11,

whether they should allow red, white

and blue to be worn. Not a flag, just

the colors red, white and blue, whether

they should be allowed to be worn on

campus because it might offend somebody.

The American flag might offend

somebody, so maybe we ought to take

it down. Come on. Give me a break. Patriotism

in this country today is still

very strong. This country has got a lot

more things going right for it than it

does wrong. This country will stand

head to head with any other nation,

not just existing nations today, but

look in the history of the world, and I

challenge my colleagues, look in the

history of the world to find one nation

that has done as much as this Nation

has done for the poor people in the

world, for hungry people in the world,

gone to the defense of many, many nations

in the history of the world, educated

more people than any other

country in the world, educated them to

a higher level than any other country

in the world.

And what is the biggest export of this

country that no other country can

match? In fact, cumulatively, if you

put all the history of the countries together

in the world, they do not even

come close to exporting what the

United States of America exports as its

biggest item. What is that item? It is

freedom. The United States of America

has broken the ice. It has taken the

lead. It has put the footprints in the

sand for freedom. And we see that some

of our citizens for some reason act

ashamed of being an American. The

beauty of freedom is that they can always

move. If the beauty of this country

is so bad that you do not think it

can be improved or you think that you

have to continually criticize this Nation,

go somewhere else.

I am one of those people that likes to

look at the good things that this Nation

does. Look what this Nation has

done for the world in the development

of medicine, in the development of vaccinations,

in the fight against cancer.

We can go down a list of a thousand

different items. You pick the items.

And amongst the very top of doing

positive things, of doing good things, is

the United States of America.

Many times, many times the United

States of America, when nobody else

would stand up, it is the United States

of America that ends up standing up. It

is the United States of America that is

the first one out of the foxhole, and it

has not come without cost.

Many years ago, remember when the

United States put weapons on European

soil to stop the Russian Communist

machine from moving in? And

not all the students, but a bunch of

student protests were organized, frankly

organized by professionals in Europe;

and the European leaders got

pretty fragile, and I understand it.

They were under a lot of pressure, get

American troops off European soil.

Americans go home. Americans, you

are not welcome. The doctrine of appeasement.

Communism is not going to

take us. Communism, Americans are

trying to over-exaggerate the situation.

In fact it went to the state where de

Gaulle calls Johnson, gets Johnson on

the phone. ‘‘Mr. President,’’ he says, ‘‘I

want all American troops off European

soil.’’ And, as the story goes, President

Johnson replies to Mr. de Gaulle, ‘‘Mr.

de Gaulle, does that include all of the

American troops buried beneath your

soil?’’

America is a great country, but, once

again, as we speak today, America will

be called to a great task, a task not

only brought to light by the events of

1 year ago on September 11, but a task

that because of our strength, because

of our capability to lead, the United

States must answer the call; and it is

not a small task, it is a great task, to

which we have been called.

We have got to go out, and we have

got to stop the proliferation amongst

terrorists, amongst mad people, of

these types of weapons that they are

currently right now underneath our

noses and in many cases with the

knowledge of the world developing. So

this evening I really want to focus my

comments on our situation with the al

Qaeda, and our situation with Iraq.

I do not know how many Members

saw the headline today, what the al

Qaeda said in the last few days, or at

least it has now come to our attention.

Pay very careful attention. Please, if

you are doing something out there, colleagues,

put it down. All I want, if you

do not listen to anything else I say this

evening, if you do not listen or do not

remember anything else I say this

evening, give me 15 seconds. That is all

I am asking you for, 15 seconds. If this

does not shake you up, I do not know

what will. Give me 15 seconds.

This is the quote from the al Qaeda.

For those of you colleagues out there,

here is your 15 seconds. Take 15 seconds

to look at this poster.

Let me read it. I was stunned when I

saw this; not surprised, but stunned.

Let us go through it. This is the al

Qaeda, the leadership of the al Qaeda.

This is not directed at the U.K.; it is

not directed at France. It is directed at

the United States of America, and, in

turn, when it is focused on the United

States of America, to our good friends

overseas. And we have many allies

overseas, and we have good allies overseas.

Do not be mistaken. Just because

they are at the door of America’s kindergartens

today does not mean that

they will not be at the door of your

kindergartens tomorrow.

Look at what this says. This is why

I want this 15 seconds: ‘‘We are emerging

stronger, and we will hit America.

We will hit America’s shopping malls,

their stadiums and kindergartens. This

is our promise. Al Qaeda.’’

As I go on with my remarks this

evening, I want to build a case for some

of my constituents and for some of my

colleagues who wonder whether or not

we should not just kind of look the

other way when it comes to the situation

in Iraq.

Keep in mind that Iraq and the al

Qaeda are comrades in arms. These

people have one very strong common

bond: they want to see the destruction

of every man, woman and child, and

keep in mind, child, kindergartners, of

America. And when they are done with

America, they will want to see the destruction

of every man, woman and

child in Canada. And when they are

done with Canada, they will want to

see it in France, and they will want to

see it in the United Kingdom. They will

want to see it wherever they can get it.

These people are mad people, but

they are smart and they are intelligent.

That is obvious by the strike

they carried out against the United

States.

This is a cancer we are dealing with.

The people that speak like this, that

carry out these acts, they are the

equivalent of a horrible, fast-moving

malignant cancer.

I spoke recently back in my district,

and I said it is kind of like you are

walking around and you go to the doctor,

and the doctor says, ‘‘We just did

an x-ray, and inside your foot, you do

not feel it, but inside your foot our xray

tells us that you have a malignant

cancer that is developing and spreading

very quickly.’’

You say to the doctor, ‘‘Doc, my foot

feels fine. I do not feel anything in my

foot. I really do not want to face cancer.’’

The doctor says, ‘‘Look, in trying to

attack this cancer we may very well

have to amputate your foot, which

means you will never run again. It is

going to be a severe interruption in

your life. It is going to interrupt your

financial status. It is going to have an

impact psychologically on you. And

the chemotherapy that may be necessary

may have to be very aggressive,

and it too will interrupt your lifestyle.’’

But you say to the doctor, ‘‘Doctor, I

do not have any pain in my foot. I did

not come in to see you about my foot.

You show me this x-ray, but, I don’t

know, I am not feeling the pain. I am

not feeling the pain. I do not know

whether I want you to do what you say

you have to do with my foot.’’

That is what we are dealing with

here. We have got people in this country

who say out of sight, out of mind.

Do not be mistaken, Iraq is not an idle

threat sitting out there. It is a very realistic

threat that could happen today,

it could happen tomorrow, or it could

happen 5 years from now.

Saddam Hussein, keep in mind, I saw

Bill O’Reilly tonight on TV, and Bill

O’Reilly on TV was talking about a

guy in jail in Texas that had allegedly

killed 80 women, the most horrible

criminal they have ever seen in their

lives. Eighty women. It is a horrible

person. All of us gasp at how horrible a

person must be that commits these

kind of murders. That is a serial killer.

We all feel that way.

But, for some reason, when I talk to

some about Saddam Hussein, when I

listen to some of my colleagues, they

hold that individual with higher esteem

than they do serial killers within

our own borders. And keep in mind

what Saddam Hussein did. He invaded

Kuwait. What did he do in Kuwait?

They killed thousands of men, women

and children in Kuwait in their invasion.

His armies went in without provocation,

and the reason his armies went

in was to grab that oil in Kuwait.

And, once again, the country that I

find more and more people apologizing

for, or bashing, the United States of

America is the one that led to the freedom

and the liberation of Kuwait

against a murderous tyrant, Saddam

Hussein.

Keep in mind that it was Saddam

Hussein for the first time, I think, and

I am not a historian, a professor of history,

but it was the first time I think

that you had a coordinated assassination

effort by the president of a country

against the United States President.

Saddam Hussein, the evidence is absolutely

clear, it was clear to the Clinton

administration and it is clear to

any law enforcement investigative

agency, attempted to assassinate

George Bush, Sr.; and it was only by a

little luck that that assassination did

not come off.

So we know that Saddam Hussein has

killed thousands and thousands of men,

women and children when he invaded

Kuwait without provocation. That,

standing alone, that standing alone

ought to put him at the bottom of your

list as far as respect or any kind of justification

of why Saddam Hussein is

still alive.

This guy is a bad guy. He is a malignant

cancer out there. But Kuwait, if

Kuwait is not enough, then take a look

at what he tried to do to the President,

our own President of this country,

George Bush, Sr. If that is not enough,

keep in mind our young men and

women that are in the military, that

are stationed in Turkey. Every day, almost

every day of the week in the no fly

zones as designated by the United

Nations, as agreed upon by Iraq, every

day Iraq fires missiles at United States

or allied aircraft in an attempt to destroy

them. These aircraft are not flying

out of their territory. They are flying

within the territory designated as a

no-fly zone by Iraq in joint agreement

with United Nations. And yet for some

reason people are reluctant to take out

Saddam Hussein.

Look at the people within his own

country that he gassed. Look at the

Kurds. You can list example after example

after example of how horribly

evil, how malignant Saddam Hussein is

and why we have got to do something.

We do not have any choice here; at

least we do not have any viable choice.

I guess we do have a choice. We can

pretend that these weapons that they

are developing, that they would have

never used them or will never use

them.

Frankly, I do not think Saddam Hussein,

certainly if he had nuclear weapons

today, and we know he has biological

weapons, and I am going to read

you some information about that here

in a few minutes, I really do not think

that Saddam would use them against

the United States of America today. I

think he would use them against

Israel, but I do not think he would use

them against the United States. He is

no fool. He is a smart man. That is

what I said earlier. He is a smart man.

He knows that if he used them against

the United States of America and the

United States was able to track down,

which we could probably do pretty

quickly, as to where those weapons

came from, who used them against us,

that we have the weapon capability to

destroy Iraq within minutes. So he is

no fool. He does not want to see the

United States of America retaliate

with a massive, overwhelming attack

that would destroy his country.

So do not think that Saddam Hussein

will probably use the weapons himself.

What he will do with these weapons is

he will give them out. He will give

them to the people like the al Qaeda,

the people that swear that they are not

done with America, that they are going

after our kindergartens. Notice they do

not say they are going after the military;

notice they do not say they will

engage in open warfare. They are going

to go to the shopping malls, to the stadiums,

and to the kindergartens.

The thing for me in Oklahoma City,

what appalled me, the whole thing was

horrible, a criminal act, but what was

especially embedded in my memory of

Oklahoma City was the fact that they

had that preschool in there and Timothy

McVeigh and his coconspirators,

they did not care that there were small

children in the Federal building in

Oklahoma City. They killed those children

without thought.

But that number was in the tens and

tens. These numbers, if these people

continue to develop the weapons and

are given the weapons by people like

Saddam Hussein, the next time they

tally a hit against the kindergarten

like we see in Oklahoma City, we will

see numbers in the thousands and tens

of thousands. New York City was 3,000;

the Pentagon was a couple of hundred.

Those casualties are stunning casualties,

horrible, tragic; but the next

time, their goal will be to add another

comma to the fatalities, to the ravage

that they wield upon the United States

of America or upon our allies.

Now let me say that this problem of

Saddam Hussein is not something that

just came up under the Bush administration.

I am amazed, frankly. And this

is a bipartisan effort that we have to

make. But I am amazed at the position

that the Democratic party has taken. I

am amazed at some of the leading

Democrats in the United States Congress,

the demands that they are making

upon President Bush, the implications

that they are making upon the

President, that somehow he is some

kind of wild Texas cowboy that wants

to start a war.

I am going to go through what President

Bill Clinton, their favorite President,

the President most strongly supported

by the liberal community, I am

going to go through some quotes that

President Clinton said several years

ago about Saddam Hussein.

This is a very serious problem we are

dealing with. I have never been more, I

guess, in deep thought or sober about a

situation than I am about the situation

that we face today on the international

circuit with the al Qaeda and with

Iraq. I am stunned. Obviously, I do not

disagree at all that the United States

Congress, it is our obligation to be engaged

in debate and to be engaged in

the public policy, and to be engaged in

the declaration of any type of war that

this country might engage in.

So the comments that I am making

are not whether or not we should have

public debate in the United States Congress.

I think that is good. What I am

talking about this evening are how all

of a sudden some of the individuals who

stood right behind Bill Clinton and

urged President Clinton, and these are

Democrats, urged President Clinton to

take immediate action to adopt a war

resolution against Iraq, have done a

complete reverse, saying, well, President

Bush is going to have to answer a

whole bunch of questions. We are not

sure. Where is the justification for taking

on Iraq? Where 3 or 4 years ago

they were standing side by side, shoulder

to shoulder, demanding that President

Clinton and supporting him: We

have to go into Iraq. We have to do

something about that.

That is not stuff I am just making

up. I have it right here. Let us go

through it a little. This is probably an

appropriate time. Let us look at President

Clinton here.

President Clinton understood the

threat then. Now, I think there has

been a little spin put on it. I noticed

that the other day the President said,

or reported, and the President did not

say it to me, I did not hear it from his

mouth, but the President said if we

were to take on Iraq, Saddam Hussein,

that he, the President, that he does

possess weapons, and the concern

would be that he would use those weapons.

If we take that out logically, what

we are saying is we should not go

against Saddam because he might use

these weapons. That is exactly the

kind of leverage that Saddam Hussein

wants to have with the rest of the

world, the doctrine of nonproliferation.

And keep in mind, it was the liberals,

and I am not trying to assail a particular

affiliation, but there is a clear

line here as to our ideas and our policies.

It was the liberals that said, look,

nonproliferation; let us hope this cancer

goes away. Let us pray it away. Let

us have peace throughout the world.

There are a lot of these countries out

there that, unfortunately, no matter

how much we pray, and I pray, and

prayer is good, but no matter how

much we pray, no matter how many

hands we offer, no matter what we do,

they are determined to wipe us off the

face of the Earth. And it is not an idle

threat. It was not an idle threat a year

ago on September 11, and it will not be

an idle threat a year from now.

We have to face up to the fact that

there is a malignant cancer, no matter

how much we pray, and it helps, and no

matter how much we hope, no matter

how well our neighbor talks to us and

says, look, things are going to be all

right, and they hold hands and we have

lots of hugs and lots of tears and lots of

love; people come up and say, we are

going to help you, and all of that; that

is all good, but the fact is that evil

devil of malignant cancer is still in us,

and that is the problem we have right

here.

This kind of thing, this kind of thing

right here, ‘‘We are emerging stronger,

and we will hit America’s shopping

malls, stadiums, and kindergartens,’’

that is a malignant cancer. We are not

going to pray or hope that thought

away. The only way we are going to be

able to eliminate this threat is we have

to take the fight to them.

Let us look at Bill Clinton’s comments,

the former President. I will

read them: ‘‘What if Saddam Hussein

fails to comply and we fail to act, or we

take some ambiguous third route

which gives him yet more opportunities

to develop his programs of weapons

of mass destruction, and continue to

press for the release of sanctions, and

continue to ignore the solemn commitments

that he made? Well, he will conclude

that the international community

has lost its will. He will then conclude

that he can go right on and do

more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating

destruction.’’

That was President Bill Clinton, February

18, 1998, 4 years ago; over 4 years

ago; 41⁄2 years ago those were the profound

and well-spoken words, and right

on point, of President Clinton. Does

anybody in these Chambers believe

that the capability, the destructive capability,

of Saddam Hussein has reduced,

has been reduced? Does anybody

in here believe, really, truly in their

hearts, that this madman has abandoned

his weapons of mass destruction,

which include chemical warfare and

the attempt to get nuclear weapons?

We know in our hearts that he has

not. We wish it were not true. Again,

going to the example, we wish in our

heart we did not have the cancer, we

wish it was not true, we wish we were

having a bad dream, and tomorrow

morning we could wake up and it would

be a bad dream, but it is reality. We

have a commitment. We have a solemn

commitment to the American people

that we are willing and able to stand

up to the great task which sits in front

of us, and that great task, of course, is

to secure the safety of not only this

Nation but our allies, as well.

I know we are getting a lot of bashing

by our allies, and we have a lot of

allies that say, look, do it on your own.

This is a dirty job. This is going to require

some dirty work. We have some

fair-weathered friends out there, but

nonetheless, they are friends. They do

not want to get their hands dirty. They

do not want to get out there in the battlefield.

They want the United States

to do it.

If the United States does it alone and

succeeds, we will be criticized for having

done it on our own. But the reality

of it is, somebody has got to do it. We

cannot continue to let this cancer fester,

because if we do, they are going to

be successful. Knock on wood, and with

the blessing of God, they have not hit

our kindergarten yet. But Members

know that is one of their targets. That

is what they have told us. The statement

is clear.

Let us go through some history here:

‘‘Administration rhetoric could hardly

be stronger.’’ This is an article, by the

way, taken out of the Weekly Standard,

the newsletter. ‘‘The President

asked the Nation to consider this question.’’

This is President Bill Clinton:

‘‘What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply,

and we fail to act,’’ as I said on the

chart that I showed you, and this guy

is allowed to continue.

This article goes on: ‘‘The President,’’

again, referring to President

Clinton, ‘‘His warnings are firm. If we

fail to respond today, Saddam and all

those who would follow in his footsteps

will be emboldened tomorrow. The

stakes,’’ again, Bill Clinton, 41⁄2 years

ago on Iraq, ‘‘The stakes could not be

higher.’’

This is a quote from Bill Clinton:

‘‘Someday, some way, I guarantee you

he will use the arsenal.’’ That is 41⁄2

years ago, and our President ably and

quite accurately recognized the threat.

I can tell the Members that several of

the leading Democrats, the Democrat

leadership, got right behind the President

in regard to the statement.

Yet those very leaders today are

questioning President Bush: He is overreacting,

he is overstating, he had better

have the evidence to prove all of

this. What a 360-degree or a 180-degree

turn in the last 41⁄2 years.

Let me continue on. Those are not

the words of President George W. Bush

in September of 2002, but of President

Bill Clinton on February 18, 1998. Clinton

was speaking at the Pentagon after

the Joint Chiefs and other top national

security advisors had briefed him on

U.S. military readiness. The televised

speech followed a month-long buildup

of United States troops and equipment

in the Persian Gulf, and it won applause

from leading Democrats on Capitol

Hill.

But just 5 days later, Kofi Annan,

with the United Nations, struck yet another

deal with the Iraqi dictator

which once more gave the United Nations

inspectors permission to inspect,

and Saddam won again. Of course,

much has changed since President Clinton

gave that speech. The situation has

gotten worse.

‘‘Ten months after Saddam accepted

Annan’s offer, he kicked U.N. inspectors

out of Iraq for good. We complained

and the United States bombed

a little. Then we stopped bombing.

Later we stepped up our enforcement of

the no-fly zones. A year after the inspectors

were banished, the United Nations

created a new toothless inspection

regime. The new inspectors inspected

nothing.’’

If Saddam Hussein was a major

threat in February of 1998 when President

Bill Clinton prepared this country

for war, and United Nations inspectors

were still inside Iraq, it stands to reason

that in the absence of those inspectors

monitoring this weapons buildup,

that Saddam is even a greater threat

today.

Now, keep in mind the history that

we have seen with the Germans, for example,

in World War I. The complaints

that we see coming out of Iraq, oh, this

is the proprietary area of our borders,

for protection of our country; we

should not be forced to have inspectors

in the country; they are picking on

poor old me; well, look at the arguments

against inspections, although

Germany agreed to it after World War

I, as compared to what Saddam Hussein.

And by the way, he has agreed to

all of this. He signed a compact never

to have these weapons in the history of

his country.

But compare that back in history

with after World War I, what the Germans

did, and what the European response

was to the Germans. It was a

doctrine of, well, we are picking on

him. We really should not be inspecting

this country. We really ought to respect

their borders. We ought to take

them on their word, or make them

promise. But U.S., you are exaggerating.

What was happening? The Germans

were building up their gas munitions.

We all know what happened a few years

later when the Germans utilized these

things. That is what is happening here,

and that is what this article says.

The quotes that we have been giving,

with the exception of this, this is not

from 1998, this is very recent, but the

quotes were from President Bill Clinton.

He recognized the threat in 1998,

and so did the Democratic leadership.

Why is it that in 2002, the Democratic

leadership is pretending as if none of

this has occurred? They are making demands

upon President Bush that they

never made upon President Clinton.

I think every President has an obligation

to their Nation, and I think

they are constitutionally required to

justify taking this country into a military

action. After all, we are asking

our sons and daughters to go in in defense

of this country and to take an affirmative

action against another country

where the probability of loss of life

is very high. We ought to meet the

highest of standards.

But it is my position today, and I

think it ought to be Members’ positions,

that those standards have been

met for some time; that right underneath

our nose we have a man who has

cooperated with people like al Qaeda; a

man who invaded another country and

killed thousands and thousands of people;

a leader, a man who poisoned and

gassed his own people; a man who, almost

on a daily basis, fires missiles

against American and allied aircraft.

We know what he is doing. We are

meeting the standards that demand

that America do something about this.

I would hope that our allies come on

board. I would hope we get assistance

from our allies. We cannot turn a blind

eye to a malignant cancer, and we cannot

turn a blind eye to Saddam Hussein.

You cannot do it. It will always come

back to get you, and it will be your

kindergartens that will suffer in the future

if we do not respond affirmatively

today.

Now does that mean we send in more

inspectors? The only way you should

send in more inspectors is on a time

basis and those inspectors have unconditional

entry into that country and

they can go wherever they want in Iraq

and do whatever kind of tests are necessary

to run to ascertain that these

weapons are, in fact, not in existence. I

doubt seriously that that will occur.

Now, Iraq, by the way, may say, just

to stall, they may say, okay, we will

agree to it. But a week later you will

find that there is a flat tire on the bus,

that they are not going to let them go

where they need to go. We cannot continue

to fool around with this malignant

cancer. We have got to sit up to

reality. We have got to face reality. We

have got to aggressively attack this

cancer.

Now, I am not a military expert. I do

not know what the military strategy

should be. But I do know this, diplomatically

we have not achieved the

goal of concurring the cancer. It is like

saying to a patient, I know you have

prayed very hard about this. I know

you have got a lot of family support in

fighting this cancer. I know you have

got a lot of hugs. I know that you have

changed your diet. But the fact is the

malignant cancer is still in your foot

and it is aggressively moving up into

the rest of your body. You face a very

tough decision. It will inconvenience

your life. But in the long run, it is the

only decision for the preservation of

your life that you can make, and that

is that you have got to accept the reality

that it is there, it is moving and

it will kill you.

It is the same thing with Iraq. It is

there. They are developing and have in

their possession weapons of mass destruction

and they will kill us. And if

they do not attempt to kill us, they

will give it to people like the al Qaeda

that will carry this out. They do not

care about our morality, values and

our respect for our children and the

preservation of life. That is obvious by

their acts of September 11.

Let me continue with a few comments.

Summing up the Clinton administration

argument, Senator DASCHLE

said, ‘‘Look, we have exhausted virtually

all our diplomatic efforts to get

the Iraqis to comply with their own

agreements and with international law.

Given that, what other option is there

but to force them to do so? That is

what they are saying. This is the key

question. And the answer is we do not

have another option. We have to force

them to comply and we are doing so

militarily.’’

That is from the majority leader, the

Democratic majority leader, the president

of Senate. All of the sudden that

is not what we are hearing today.

Let me continue. ‘‘JOHN KERRY was

equally hawkish. ’If there is not unfettered,

unrestricted, unlimited access

per the United Nations’ resolution for

inspections and UNSCOM cannot in our

judgment appropriately perform its

functions, then we obviously reserve

the rights to press the case internationally

and do what we need to do

in order to enforce those rights. Saddam

Hussein has already used these

weapons and has made it clear that he

has the intent to continue to try by

virtue of his duplicity and secrecy to

continue to do so. That is a threat to

the stability of the Middle East. It is a

threat with respect to the potential of

terrorist activities on a global basis. It

is a threat even to regions near but not

exactly in the Middle East.’″

These are comments made by leadership

of the Democratic Party in 1998;

and yet today when you read the paper,

well, we should defer this decision until

after the elections, as if Saddam Hussein

schedules his development of

weapons of mass destruction, he sets

them so that they are convenient with

our election dates in this country.

It amazes me that with these kinds

of threats in existence, with the knowledge

that we had in 1998 that we know

has not changed in 41⁄2 years, in fact,

has only increased, that we have hesitancy,

that we have hesitancy by some

of these very leaders that advocated

action in 1998, not to do action in 2002

or to delay it and wait and wait and

wait. Maybe the doctrine of appeasement

does not work. The fact is we

have to deal with it.

Let me finish off this

article with this quote from President

Clinton in 1998: ‘‘We have to defend our

future from these predators of the 21st

century.’’

This is President Clinton I am referring

to.

Let me repeat my comment. From

President Clinton: ‘‘We have to defend

our future from these predators of the

21st century.’’ To leave the quote for a

minute, I absolutely agree 100 percent

with what President Clinton was saying

here. He was right then and George

W. Bush is right today.

Continuing: ‘‘We have to defend our

future from these predators of the 21st

century,’’ he argued. ‘‘They will be all

the more lethal if we allow them to

build arsenals of nuclear, chemical,

and biological weapons and the missiles

to deliver them. We simply cannot

allow that to happen. There is no more

clear example of this threat than Saddam

Hussein.’’ And as the article says:

‘‘What more do you need to say?″

Now, we have taken some steps and

we have taken some bipartisan steps,

our missile defense system. The President

has made commitment and we, as

a Congress, have increased significantly

the budgets, our military budgets,

our defense mechanisms, but here

is our biggest weakness. We have a

very large Nation geographically. It is

very tough to defend these borders. For

example, shipping containers that

come in. We cannot inspect even close

to the number of shipping containers

that come into this Nation every day.

It is kind of like having a village in the

mountains and from somewhere on the

mountain every day you got a sniper,

somebody shooting into your village.

You cannot possibly put up a wall to

stop these bullets from coming in.

Every day that goes by the sniper fires

another shot into the village.

At some point the village has to decide

we cannot defend our perimeter.

We will have to take the fight to them.

We will have to go up on that mountain

and find where that sniper is.

That is the situation we face here

today. We cannot just retract on our

borders within the United States, as

some of our allies may suggest, that

the United States is poking their nose

into somebody else’s business. Well, it

became everybody’s business after September

11. And what President Clinton

accurately forecasted in 1998 came into

place on September 11, 1 year ago.

The time of being able to just sit

comfortably here and hope that it was

not happening out there or enjoying

the privilege of the fact that it had not

happened within the borders of the

United States for a long time, assuming

that Pearl Harbor could go into

that classification, and it does, those

days are gone. We now have to engage

in this fight, and we have to engage in

this in every way possible.

I am not condemning diplomatic pursuit

of some peaceful resolution. I am

not condemning using prayers if you

are trying to fight cancer. I think it is

very, very helpful. And I think diplomatic

efforts are very, very necessary.

And I am not saying that we should not

have congressional debate. I think it is

constitutionally required. I think it is

healthy for this Congress, for the people

who have elected us to represent

their views to have that type of debate.

But what I am saying is we cannot

dilly dally around. We cannot any

longer afford to ignore the fact that

the malignant cancer is out there. We

cannot afford to debate the accuracy of

the x-ray very long. The x-ray tells us

there is cancer. It told us we had cancer

4 years ago when President Clinton

very accurately said what he has, what

Saddam Hussein had, and what Saddam

Hussein, by the way, supplies to the al

Qaeda. We know it is there. And it does

not do us any good in my opinion to

continue to try to pretend it is not

happening, to try to pretend that there

is some clean way to handle this, that

we can call Saddam up on the phone

and say, Knock it off. What are you

doing? Put those weapons in the closet

and quit doing this and live peacefully

with the rest of the world.

They have no intention of doing anything

but destroying as much of the

rest of the world as they can. And at

the top of their list are our kindergartens.

Every mother and father in

America should be in a state of absolute

dismay and anger today after this

quote was released yesterday about

targeting kindergartens. These are kindergartens

in America, kindergartens

in the United States. Some of us knew

that, obviously, we think they will target

some of these other areas; but for

them to come out and say, your kindergartens,

that is what we will target

in America, that ought to wake everybody

up.

The time for a debate is rapidly approaching.

We should have a resolution

on this floor as quickly as we can get

a resolution on this floor. Our allies

that belong to the United Nations

ought to wake up, a lot of them are;

but they need to come to the table too.

America does not want to do it alone.

America can do it alone, but America

wants to be a partner. And I will tell

you, our partnership, whether it is

France, whether it is Hamburg, Germany,

whether it is in Poland, all free loving

countries in the world are under

the threat of this cancer of Iraq and

the al Qaeda. And we, frankly, despite

my criticism today or my expression of

dismay by some of the remarks we see

coming from our European allies, I do

want to take a moment to tell you that

as most of you know our European allies

have assisted us in many ways

with this fight against terrorism. But

for some reason, I am a little baffled by

the fact that we cannot get them to

come over to this side of the line to

face the reality of the threat that Iraq

has against the world.

It is the United States today. Sure,

that is their number one target, the

United States and Israel. But I can assure

our allies it is like the big bad

wolf. It is at our door today, but it will

be at your door tomorrow. And we have

to team up. This partnership has to

stay together. This partner, the United

States of America, does not want to

take Iraq on by itself or take on the

war against terrorism. And our partners

have come to the table in large

part against the war on terrorism. But

they are not coming to the table like

they ought to be on Iraq. And it is time

for this partnership meeting, for us to

cut to the chase, to get down to the

work that has to be done, and it is

dirty work and it is a large task in

front of us; but if we do not do it today,

we will have let down, in my opinion I

do not think it is too strong a word to

use the word betrayed, we will have betrayed

future generations by knowingly

allowing a threat to be built of

nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological

weapons, to knowingly let

that threat and those weapons be built

by a mad man with the kind of commitments

they have made to target our

kindergartens and we do not take the

fight to them.

It is inherently a responsibility of

those of us in Congress to debate this.

I do not argue that, I said that earlier.

But as inherently, as strong as the debate

is to get that debate completed

and to move in a unified fashion as this

Congress and as the United States Senate

signaled it would with President

Clinton in 1998, and the threat has only

grown greater.

I think it is time for both of these

Houses to come together in 2002 and

move against the cancer that exists

out there as a threat against the borders

of this country, and as I have said,

against the borders of our allies wherever

they might be located throughout

the worlds.

So I would hope that in the next, I

hope in the very immediate future, I

know that the President is going to the

United Nations this week, I hope our

allies in the United Nations and the

people of the United Nations understand

what a threat this malignancy is

out there, understand how unsuccessful

we have been to convince through diplomatic

efforts, through inspections,

through economic sanctions, through

no-fly zones, how unsuccessful these efforts

have been to get Saddam Hussein

to stop proceeding with these weapons,

what the ramifications are of these

weapons.

Do my colleagues think that the al

Qaeda, if they would have had nuclear

weapons within their hands, do my colleagues

think they would have used

aircraft on September 11? They would

have used nuclear weapons.

Do not forget, this country suffered

an attack, a chemical attack, anthrax

within days of September 11. We got

hit with a chemical, with a biological

attack against this country. Do my

colleagues not think if the al Qaeda did

not have that in their hands in sufficient

quantities that they would not

have used that? They were probably

surprised that the World Trade towers

collapsed. We know from the video that

we have seen, they were elated by the

success of their attack, but this only

set the base for the al Qaeda. This only

sets a base for countries like Iraq.

The next attack, they want to make

sure those casualties, children, women

and men, they want to make sure those

casualties are many, many multiples of

what September 11, the horror that

September 11 brought to this Nation.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks,

I am trying to think of my history.

I have been in Congress 10 years.

The horrible fires we suffered in Colorado

this year, all of the different

things, big issues that I think over

these last few years we have dealt

with, I cannot think of anything that

is of a more of a threat, that has more

serious future consequences than the

international situation that we face

today. Not the economy, not the impeachment

several years ago, not the

fires. We have got to go after that cancer

that has centered itself in Iraq and

has spread to al Qaeda and throughout

rest of the world.

Again, at the conclusion of my remarks

this evening, let me repeat what

President Bill Clinton said 41⁄2 years

ago. President Clinton, ‘‘We have to defend

our future from these predators of

the 21st century,’’ he argued. ‘‘They

will be all the more lethal if we allow

them to build arsenals of nuclear,

chemical and biological weapons and

the missiles to deliver them. We simply

cannot allow that to happen. There is

no more clear example of this threat

than Saddam Hussein.’’

I will wrap up my comments with 15

more seconds. I would ask my colleagues

to take 15 seconds and read the

poster, and once again, what more of a

threat, what more of a warning do we

need, do we need as a Nation than exists

out there today? If in 1998 what

Saddam Hussein did in 1998 was not

enough, then was September 11

enough? Then was the acts of aggression

against Kuwait enough? Was the

assassination against Bush, Senior

enough? If that was not enough, if all

of that was not enough, this statement

standing alone, this statement standing

alone ought to be enough to bring

all of us to bear arms to assure the security

of this Nation and our friends

throughout the world.