Mr. President, I believe

that Senator DASCHLE will join me on

the floor shortly because he and I

would like to, in effect, have a joint

statement with regard to Iraq because

we want the message to be unambiguous,

very clear to America and to our

allies around the world, and to Iraq

about our attitude and what our intentions

are with regard to this very important

matter.

I just had a call from Senator JOHN

WARNER, who is in Russia today along

with Senator CARL LEVIN. They are escorting

Secretary of Defense Bill

Cohen. They have already been to six

countries since they were in Germany.

I believe perhaps even the Senator

from Arizona, the Presiding Officer,

was there. They have gone throughout

the Arab world, and now they are in

Russia.

He tells me that he believes that

when they return, Secretary Cohen and

the two Senators will bring a great

deal of helpful information to the Senate

and to the American people about

what they have heard in the Arab

world and what they have heard from

our allies in those areas’ meetings.

They believe that they will be able to

answer some of the very important

questions that Senators have been asking.

So we will look forward to their return.

I had hoped that we could get to the

point where we could pass a resolution

this week on Iraq. But we really developed

some physical problems, if nothing

else. Senator WARNER and Senator

LEVIN would like very much to be a

part of the discussion about what the

situation will be and how we should

proceed on Iraq. They would like to be

here. And other Senators are necessarily

not going to be able to be here

beyond this afternoon.

So we have decided that the most important

thing is not to move so quickly

but to make sure that we have had all

the right questions asked and answered

and that we have available to us the

latest information about what is expected

or what is going to be happening

with our allies in the world.

I was noting, I say to Senator

DASCHLE, that I just talked to Senator

WARNER in Russia, and he was telling

me that Secretary Cohen and Senator

WARNER and Senator LEVIN are looking

forward to coming back and giving us a

full report on their trip to the Arab

world. Now they are in Russia today.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that

the entire world is watching the current

crisis between Iraq and the international

community unfold. This is another

showdown caused by Saddam

Hussein.

The Iraqi dictator has decided that

his weapons-of-mass-destruction program

is more important than the welfare

of his own people. At a time when

we have been getting reports—in fact,

we have seen children suffering from

malnutrition—this dictator has been

building $1.5 billion in additional palaces.

He has already endured 7 years of

sanctions so that he can develop biological,

chemical, and nuclear weapons

—and the means to deliver them.

This is a very serious matter. For

some time we—and I mean America

and our allies—have been working to

develop a resolution on Iraq that has

broad bipartisan support and also one

that would bring the situation under

control there by diplomatic efforts

hoping to avoid military action. But

that has not happened yet.

I believe we are moving toward a consensus

in the Senate on a number of

the key issues that must be addressed

as we look to the future. And here they

are.

First of all, Saddam Hussein does

pose a real threat to the region and to

the entire world. I believe the Senate

recognizes that. I hope that the American

people recognize that. This is not

a hypothetical danger that has been

dreamed up by some armchair strategists.

There is a long track record in

this area of actions by Saddam Hussein.

He poses a clear and present danger

without equal in the post-cold-war world.

He is dangerous. He is a threat

to his neighbors. He is a destabilizing

force in the whole region. And, yes, he

is actually a threat all over the world

including the United States. This is a

man who has already invaded two of

his neighbors. Iraq has used chemical

weapons inside and outside its borders.

It has launched missiles against Saudi

Arabia and against Israel. Hussein

tried to murder former President

George Bush in 1993.

Now, we should not make any mistake

and think that a military action,

if it comes to that, is going to rehabilitate

Saddam Hussein or even eliminate

him. He does not have any desire to

join the civilized world, apparently,

and he has shown that he can survive

even when the whole world has concerns

with his conduct and has taken

unified action to stop his aggression.

Second, I think there is a consensus

in the Senate that military force is justified

if diplomatic actions fail in responding

to the threat that Saddam

Hussein poses. The threat is serious

and our response must be serious.

Now, any military force that is used

does entail risks, to our military, to

our allies and even to our country if

there is an attempt at retaliation. The

American people need to understand

that, and we need to think about it

carefully. And we need to talk about

the risks that are involved. That is one

reason why, when we bring up a resolution,

if it is necessary—and I assume it

will be—we must make sure that every

Senator who wants to be heard can be

heard.

I remember when we had a similar

debate back in the early nineties. I

think some 80 Senators spoke. Now,

this time we won’t have 500,000 troops

amassed on the ground ready to go in,

but it is still a very serious matter,

and I want to make sure that we don’t

try to restrict Senators. In fact, we

could not. Senator DASCHLE knows if

we asked unanimous consent to bring

this resolution up today and vote on it

in 4 hours, we would not get it; the

Senate is known for its deliberate actions.

And the longer I stay in the Senate,

the more I have learned to appreciate

it. It does help to give us time to

think about the potential problems and

the risks and the ramifications and to,

frankly, press the administration. I

feel better this week than I did last

week because of the responses we are

getting about how this is being

thought out and what would be the

military action and what will be the

long-term plans to deal with Saddam

Hussein. We are beginning to get some

answers now. I believe the administration

is thinking harder about what

those answers should be because the

Senate, Republicans and Democrats,

has raised these questions, not in a

critical way, not in a threatening way,

but in an honest way of saying, have

you thought about this? What about

this approach? Can we do more? I think

that has served a very positive purpose.

Some people have said to me, even

back in my own State, ‘‘This is not a

threat to us. Let them deal with that

over there.’’ Who? Who is going to deal

with it? If America does not lead, who

is going to lead? Nobody else.

Now, our allies can, should, and, I believe,

will join us if action is necessary.

But we are going to have to lead the

way. We are going to have to make the

tough decisions. And people need to understand

that this threat could even

apply to us. While it may be a direct

threat of a Scud missile in the region

with a chemical warhead even, it could

very easily be a threat to Paris or some

city in the U.S. involving anthrax

that’s been produced by Saddam Hussein.

These are terrible things to even

think about, but you are dealing with a

person who has already used terrible

actions against his own people. And so

he is not so far removed. We are the

ones who have to provide the direction.

And we have to make sure people understand

it is a threat to the whole

world.

In my view, the decisive use of force

against Iraq coupled with the longterm

strategy to eliminate the threat

entails less risks in the long run than

allowing Saddam Hussein’s actions and

ambitions to go unchecked. You cannot

do it when you are dealing with a situation

like this. In the words of former

Secretary of State Jim Baker, ‘‘The

only thing we shouldn’t do is do nothing.’’

We cannot allow that to be the

result or what we do is nothing.

The administration has agreed with

us that funding for the operations in

and around Iraq require supplemental

appropriations. We had very grave concerns

by the Senator from Alaska, Mr.

STEVENS, and Senator DOMENICI about

how much will this cost? How is it

going to be paid for? We cannot continue

to say ‘‘just take it out of your

hide’’ to the Pentagon; it is having an

effect on morale, quality of life, on

readiness and modernization. We already

have a very high tempo for our

military men and women in the Navy

and Air Force. We are satisfied that

they now have made a commitment

that they are going to come up and ask

for funding for both these purposes, in

Bosnia and, if necessary, in Iraq. And

these will be emergency requests so it

will not come out of necessary improvements

in barracks or spare parts

for aircraft, which are very important.

There is a consensus on seriously examining

now I believe long-term policy

options to increase the pressure on

Saddam Hussein. The administration

and Congress and our allies all look

forward to dealing with a post-Saddam

regime. But the question is how to get

there.

That is intended not to be a threat or

say we should violate the law; it is intended

to start the discussion, start

the thinking about how can we increase

these pressures. And we have to

have a strategy to deal with whatever

comes after the military option. Many

things have been suggested. Toughen

sanctions—not loosen sanctions, toughen

sanctions. What about an embargo,

what about expanding no-fly, no-drive

zones? What about the support of opposition

forces?

There is a long list of suggestions,

some that I will not even put in the

record here, but they are worth thinking

about. Our model should be the

Reagan doctrine of rollback, not the

Truman doctrine of containment in

this instance. And I don’t mean that as

critically as it sounds. It is just that

there are two different doctrines, and

the doctrine here should be rollback,

not containment.

Despite our areas of agreement that

we have clearly reached—Senator

DASCHLE and I have been working together

making sure every word is sanitized

in the potential resolution—it is

obvious we cannot get it done this

week for physical reasons as much as

anything else. And I remind my colleagues

and the American people it was

5 months after Saddam Hussein invaded

Kuwait, 5 months before Congress

passed a resolution authorizing

the use of force to expel him. In this

case, we have a bipartisan effort, trying

to make sure that the right thing

is going to be done and that the right

language is developed. Unlike what we

had in the early 1990’s when the Speaker

and majority leader were working to

defeat the administration’s policy, you

now have a Speaker and a majority

leader and the Democratic leader and

the minority leader in the House all

working together with the administration

to make sure that the language is

right and that the actions are right.

Yes, more time may be needed for diplomacy

and more time to think about

the long-term plans, but a point will

come when time will run out and action

must go forward. When that

comes, when U.S. Armed Forces are

sent into harm’s way, by the President

of the United States, they will have the

backing of the Senate and the American

people. If the President makes the

decision to deploy military force

against the threat posed by Iraq, America

will be united, united and praying

for the safety of our men and women in

uniform, united in hoping casualties

are kept to a minimum, and united in

hoping for and supporting a successful

effort.

I just want to make that point clear

today. Nobody should interpret the

fact that we don’t vote on a resolution

today as meaning that we are not

united in the fundamental principles.

We are. But we want to make sure that

when we do take military action, we

have thought about all the ramifications

and the resolution that we come

up with will have the involvement of

100 Senators, with 100 Senators being

present and voting, and that every

word is the appropriate word that reflects

the best interests of the American

people.

So I am pleased to stand here this

afternoon and make this statement and

to assure my colleagues that I will continue

to work with every Senator on

both sides of the aisle to make sure we

take the appropriate action, if it is

necessary, when we return week after

next.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I

am looking forward to hearing Senator

DASCHLE’s comments on this subject.

Mr. President, I observe the absence

of a quorum momentarily.