Mr. President, the second

subject I address is a resolution the

White House has sent Congress for consideration

of Presidential authority to

deal with the problem of Iraq. There

have been questions raised this weekend

about the language of the resolution

and the need, in some people’s

minds, to define it and provide greater

definition.

My own view is the President and his

administration did a very good job at

crafting a resolution which will give

the President the authority he needs to

do the things we understand have to be

done. I am a little worried about trying

to be too cute in drafting language

that will constrain the President in a

variety of ways, not because we do not

want to know what the President has

in mind, but because we do not want to

come back to the Congress every time

the President needs some additional

component of authority in fighting this

war on terror.

The immediate need is to grant the

authority to follow up on the resolutions

that were violated by Saddam

Hussein, and that if the United Nations

is not going to take action, and it is

not, then for the United States to be

able to do that. We will pass that resolution

by a fairly wide margin both in

the House of Representatives and in

the Senate. I am hoping Members of

this body will not view it necessary to

draft the language in such a way that

it puts the interests of the United

States behind the authority of the

United Nations.

The U.S. Government and those who

represent the people of America will

act on behalf of the security interests

of the American people. That ought to

be our first objective, not to try to resurrect

the good reputation of the

United Nations, not to put the U.S. position

in a subservient role to the Security

Council of the United Nations, and

not to subject our decisionmaking or

the President’s authority to act to approval

first of a body in the United Nations.

I therefore urge my colleagues not to

succumb to the temptation of inserting

language which would submit first to

the United Nations and then the U.S.

Congress.

It was my understanding—perhaps I

should have asked unanimous consent

before I began to speak—that I would

be allotted 20 minutes, 10 minutes beyond

the usual time.

Might I then have 30 seconds

to explain that I had been told

that I would have 20 minutes, and I

have calibrated my remarks to reflect

that? I regret I will not be able to finish

these remarks.