Mr. President, I have listened to the debate that has

been swirling around the country with respect to Iraq. The debate comes

up again with respect to the commission which is currently meeting.

I cannot respond to all of the specifics that come along. I am

tempted to, but I will not because I want to spend the time that is

allotted to me by setting the total record before those who might be

listening so we can understand that many of the original statements or

original positions with respect to Iraq that are being repeated over

and over again are, in fact, false.

I remember our colleague across the aisle, the late Senator Moynihan

from New York, one of my dear friends and one of the Senators for whom

I have the highest regard, quoted something. He probably didn't think

of it himself, but it was more or less his mantra, as he said to me:

``Everyone is entitled to his own opinion but not to his own facts.''

We keep hearing things said over and over again with respect to the

war in Iraq as if they were fact. It is time to set the overall record

straight.

We heard one statement that there was absolutely no connection

between 9/11 and Iraq. The other one we hear over and over again is the

reason we went into Iraq is because we thought Saddam Hussein had

weapons of mass destruction. Some make it a little more stark than

that.

There was a group that marched on the Utah State Legislature wearing

T-shirts that said, ``Bush Lied To Us. There Were No WMDs,'' as if the

President of the United States George W. Bush himself alone was the

only authority for the notion that there were weapons of mass

destruction; and, once again repeating the false position that the only

reason we went into Iraq is because we believed they had weapons of

mass destruction.

To quote another individual not nearly as well known as Pat Moynihan

but my high school history teacher, she would always say to us, ``You

cannot cut the seamless web of history.'' I want to take this

opportunity to lay out the whole seamless web of the history of

terrorism and do our best to understand it so we can realize the first

statement that there was no connection between Iraq and 9/11 and the

second statement that the only reason we went in is because Bush lied

to us about weapons there, are not true. And I hope we can get the

dialog back to the facts.

I am distressed at what has happened to the dialog on this issue. I

must comment. On television was the former Vice President of the United

States with his hand with a clenched fist raised, the blood vessels

standing out on his neck, screaming at the top of his voice, speaking

of the President, ``He has betrayed this country.''

To say the President has betrayed his country is to accuse him of

treason, which is one of the crimes specifically listed in the

Constitution as an impeachable offense. We have not heard that kind of

rhetoric from a politician as highly placed as Al Gore since the 1950s.

And the politician who used to speak like that was a member of this

Chamber. His name was Joe McCarthy, and the President whom he accused

of treason was Harry Truman.

Let us step away from that kind of rhetoric in this debate and review

the facts.

I had the opportunity of attending the Kissinger Lecture at the

Library of Congress which was given by George Shultz, former Secretary

of State. It was one of the most cogent and lucid statements of where

we are with respect to the war on terror I have ever heard. An update

of that appeared in today's Wall Street Journal. I would like to quote

from that those points which address the issues I have talked about,

and ask unanimous consent that the entire piece be printed in the

Record following my remarks.

Mr. President, former Secretary of State George Shultz

begins with this comment:

Twenty-five years ago, it was on the radar screen of an American

administration--in this case one headed by Ronald Reagan--that

terrorism was a problem.

Secretary Shultz goes on to discuss this and then makes this comment:

Let me emphasize that last sentence again. Speaking of international

terrorism that was involved in all of these things, going back to the

assassination of Sadat in 1981, he says:

All right. Do we have an example of such a state that has developed

awesome weaponry that may be for sale? Yes.

Quoting again from Secretary Shultz, he speaks directly of Saddam

Hussein and Iraq. He adds to this Kim Jong Il of North Korea, and then

says:

Yes, we have heard much on this floor about America must not invade

another sovereign state. That is precisely what Secretary Shultz is

talking about when he says, these states that develop awesome weaponry

and cooperate with terrorism for the purpose of

upsetting the international order, then claim the immunities of the

international order for themselves--as he says: ``such as the principle

of non-intervention into the internal affairs of a legitimate sovereign

state.''

He goes on to summarize all that happened in Iraq. And again, those

who will read the entire piece as it appears following my statement can

get all of those details. But after he recites the details of what

Saddam Hussein has done, he turns to David Kay, the man who is quoted

again and again as the authority for the statement on the T-shirt that

says: ``Bush Lied To Us.''

Well, let's see what David Kay really said. I said in my previous

statement David Kay told this Congress, testifying before the Armed

Services Committee, that Saddam Hussein was, in fact, more dangerous

than we thought when we started the war. But these are the portions of

David Kay's position Secretary Shultz chooses to highlight, and I think

they are the right ones to bring out.

Quoting again:

Sellers of what? Buyers of what? Who would the sellers be? Who would

the buyers be? The sellers, obviously, would be the Iraqis. The buyers

would be the terrorists. And what are we talking about?

Back to Secretary Shultz:

Just think about that for a second: the knowledge to make them.

If I could give a very homely example, last week my wife and I were

celebrity chefs at the March of Dimes gala, and we won a prize, and

people all said: Is this an old family recipe? We had to admit, no, we

called a chef in Salt Lake City at one of the finest restaurants there,

who happens to work as a judge at these kinds of celebrity cook-ins,

and he gave us a recipe he thought would win. We have been celebrity

chefs four times. We have called him all four times. We have won three

out of four.

The capacity to tell somebody how to make something will produce that

something just as much as having that something yourself. This chef did

not participate, but his recipes participated, and his recipes won. All

we had to do was be the willing buyers in the case; and he was the

willing seller. I will add, just for the record, no money changed hands

with respect to the recipe. But the example is there, and that is what

David Kay is talking about.

Going back to Secretary Shultz, he says:

Secretary Shultz concludes his piece with this comment:

Put it in context, put it in the historic pattern, and we realize

this is all connected and that the action with respect to Iraq was a

very proper, significant, indeed, essential part of the overall war on

terrorism. If we had not moved ahead, we would have been irresponsible.

The summary is in the callout that is put in the paper that says:

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

If I might use that 4 1/2 minutes, then, to address the

fundamental question of the future nobody talks about. We are spending

all of this time rehashing the past. Here is the fundamental question

of the future: What happened to Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass

destruction? The assumption raised by the statement that ``Bush lied to

us about the weapons'' is that the weapons never existed.

Well, the first person to convince me the weapons existed was

Madeleine Albright. The first President to tell me the weapons existed

was William Jefferson Clinton.

The first group that insisted weapons were there was working for the

United Nations. This was not a partisan thing put together by George W.

Bush. The weapons were clearly in Iraq, and the question is not why

didn't Bush tell us the truth about them; the question is, what

happened to them? That is the question we need to address. That is the

question of the future we are ignoring in all of this debate about who

said what at what point in the past.

As I see it, there are four possibilities of what happened to the

weapons Saddam Hussein had. No. 1, we got them all in the bombing in

1998. We must remember, as we try to truncate the history, the war in

Iraq began in 1991. The U.N. resolution that called for the war was

never suspended. It was renewed with acts of war in 1998. A heavy 4-day

period of solid bombing is an act of war. President Clinton carried

that out with the approval of this Congress. So the first possibility

is that bombing destroyed all of the weapons of mass destruction.

The second possibility, Saddam Hussein himself dismantled his

stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction in an effort to convince the

U.N. inspectors they were not there so the inspectors would leave him

alone and he could go back to building them after the inspectors were

gone. There is some suggestion that was in fact what happened, that he

did not intend to disarm, as U.N. Resolution 1441 required he do. All

he intended to do was deceive, and that is where the weapons went.

Possibility No. 3, they were trucked over the border. Some of them

got into Syria or other places and into the hands of others who still

have them.

And possibility No. 4, they are still in Iraq and we simply have not

found them. When people ask me, which of these four possibilities do

you think is the most likely, I say: All of the above. I believe we

destroyed a good portion of his weapons in the 1998 bombing. I believe

he himself dismantled others in a deliberate attempt to deceive the

U.N. inspectors. I believe some of them did get out of the country and

are in the hands of other bad actors somewhere. And I believe there are

probably still some hidden away somewhere in the desert in Iraq.

Unless the first answer is the only one that is correct and they were

all destroyed in the bombing, they are still around somewhere. The

capacity to build them was still around, as David Kay pointed out,

before we went in and removed that.

If there are some of them still around, why aren't we looking for

them? Why aren't we paying attention to where they might be? I believe

the American military is still on the alert for them. I believe the

American intelligence community is still looking to where they might

be. But in the debate we have here on the Senate floor, this question

is never raised. It is never given any attention. Instead we spend all

of our time looking backward and trying to assign blame instead of

looking forward and trying to solve problems.

I commend Secretary Shultz's presentation to all. It is a clear

historic perspective over a quarter century from one of our senior

statesmen that makes it clear the rhetoric surrounding this issue has

been inappropriate and focused on the wrong thing.

I yield the floor.