Mr. President, as

we contemplate military action

against Iraq, I wish to bring to the attention

of my colleagues the rationalization,

in the opinion of the junior

Senator from Alaska, of the circumstances

surrounding the risk to

allow Saddam Hussein to continue to

develop weapons of mass destruction.

It is no secret that over an extended

period of time, Saddam Hussein and

Iraq have been developing this capability.

It not only includes chemical

weapons and biological weapons, but a

delivery system. Clearly, we have seen

as a consequence of the Persian Gulf

war the capability of a delivery system

reaching Israel. In addition to that, we

have every reason to believe he is developing

his nuclear capability.

The question to which we have to relate

is, of course, the obligation as to

how to thwart this exposure from the

standpoint of the United States’ role as

not only the peacekeeper of the world

but the recognition that if the United

States does not do it, it probably will

not be done.

I bring that reference up to simply

highlight a comparison. Had we known

in advance of 9/11 the contemplated exposure—

not only to the United States,

but the peace of the world, as we knew

the world prior to that time and the

recognition that a number of aircraft

was going to be used as weapons and

the consequences associated with the

aircraft that went into the World

Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon,

and, of course, the exposure in

Washington and other areas of the

United States associated with the activities

at that time—we would have

taken some action, Mr. President.

There is no question about it because

we knew the ramifications of not taking

such action.

What I am saying is we have a dilemma

in the sense of a recognized concentration

of weapons of mass destruction

being controlled by an individual

who is not only uncontrollable but one

who has, over an extended period of

time, initiated actions such as we have

seen during the Persian Gulf war where

he saw fit to invade Kuwait with the

intention of going into Saudi Arabia

with the objective of controlling the

wealth of the oil provinces of that part

of the world. That was his objective,

make no mistake about it.

If he could have prevailed in Kuwait

and gone into Saudi Arabia, he would

have controlled a good portion of Mideast

oil and, hence, the wealth and

cashflows of the area.

The consequences of that, as we see

Saddam Hussein again amassing this

threat as a consequence of his development

of weapons of mass destruction,

brings us to the evaluation of what action

we should take. Is it inevitable

that sooner or later Saddam Hussein

will use these weapons of mass destruction,

and against whom?

We have had an opportunity to observe

a pattern of Saddam Hussein in

the time since the Persian Gulf war. If

one can perhaps simplify it, we have

initiated a no-fly zone over Iraq since

about 1992. In initiating that no-fly

zone, we have taken out some of his

targets. He has attempted to shoot

some of our aircraft down that are patrolling

the area.

There is another inconsistency that

stands out even more openly, and that

is the realization that during this time

we have been buying oil from Saddam

Hussein, hundreds of thousands of barrels

a day. In September of 2001, we set

a record by importing nearly 1.2 million

barrels of oil per day from Saddam.

It is almost as if we would take his

oil, put it in our airplanes, and go take

out his targets. That is rather ironic. I

think it is rather inconsistent, and it

shows certainly an inconsistency in

our foreign policy.

What does he do with the money he

receives from the United States? Why,

he takes care of his Republican Guard,

the group that keeps him alive, and develops

more weapons of mass destruction

and perhaps aims them at our ally

Israel. Maybe that is an oversimplification

of foreign policy. Nevertheless,

that is what has been going on over a

period of time. So we have become, to

some extent, perhaps a partner because

we are providing Saddam Hussein indirectly,

through the purchase of his oil,

with a cashflow that allows him to develop

his weapons of mass destruction.

Others might say that is inconsistent

logic because someone else would buy

his oil if the United States did not. I

am not going to pursue that, other

than to state a fact: We are buying

hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil

from Saddam Hussein. He is developing

weapons of mass destruction. Where

does he get the money? A portion of it

comes from oil sales to the United

States.

So as we contemplate our decision on

initiating an action against Saddam

Hussein, we have to look back to the

circumstances surrounding 9/11 where,

had we known that the threat was

what it turned out to be, we would

have initiated an action. We did not

know. We did not initiate an action.

We can criticize our security. We can

criticize the CIA and the other intelligence

agencies for inadequate information.

Nevertheless, the fact remains,

we did not know. Had we known, we

would have taken action.

In the case of Saddam Hussein, clearly

we know he is developing weapons of

mass destruction. So the point is,

should we take action? If we do not,

who will? What is the actual threat?

We do not know, but it is clearly a

choice. We are giving Saddam Hussein

a choice of either surrender—in other

words, open up your country to the

U.N. inspectors—or be prepared for the

ultimate alternative, and that is basically

to be subjected to a conflict that

could go on for some time.

I see my good friend, the senior Senator

from West Virginia, is seeking

recognition. I will conclude with one

reference: That we need to consider

again the obligation that the energy

conferees have. The conference is in

order. The issues are being discussed.

There is an issue, and it is the issue of

opening up ANWR that is within the

authority of the conference to bring

back to the Senate for action. As the

President well knows, the House has

included ANWR in its bill and the issue

is before the conference.

At a time when we are contemplating

an action against Saddam Hussein,

which certainly would result in an upheaval

in the Mideast, it is imperative

each Member recognize his or her obligation

to address this with some finality.

It simply makes sense to authorize

the opening of this area so we can reduce

our dependence on Mideast oil,

particularly the sources we currently

get our oil from, including Iraq and

Saddam Hussein.

There is going to be an invitation by

the conference to invite Members to

ANWR, to Kaktovik, on September 13.

Members should avail themselves of

the opportunity to see for themselves

that it could be opened up safely.

I yield the floor.