I thank the Senator

for those kind words. In terms of the

Powell doctrine, I had a chance to listen

to it up front and close when I encountered

him as Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

We had a long discussion about being

fellow Vietnam veterans, about what

we learned out of that war, and how he

approached the world now as Chairman

of the Joint Chiefs.

I can remember two elements to the

Powell doctrine. The first is sometimes

overlooked. The first should be how to

use the American military to stay out

of war and, if we do get in it, win

quickly. The second part of the Powell

doctrine is the doctrine of superior

force, what Nimitz called in the Second

World War in the Pacific ‘‘superior

upon the point of contact.’’

I am delighted we have a Secretary of

State who understands the power of

the first, which is using the American

military to stay out of war. I think

that is step one for me in the Powell

doctrine. Step two is obviously if diplomacy

fails, use superior force to accomplish

your objective. In many

ways, we have been acting since 1991.

We have had Iraq under Operation

Northern Watch and Southern Watch.

We are covering 40 percent of Iraqi territory

as we speak, we have a naval

blockade, and we have sanctions, so we

have not been inactive since 1991.

What is the status of his weapons of

mass destruction, which is the focus of

this entire debate? We really don’t

know, since the U.N. inspectors were

kicked out about 4 years ago, where we

stand in that regard. That poses a question

and a threat. We know he has biological

and chemical weapons, and he

is working on a nuclear weapon. So

that poses great danger to the Middle

East, our allies, Western Europe, and

potentially to us. Therefore, I think it

is appropriate for the U.S. Senate to

support, and the Congress to support, a

resolution authorizing the President to

take all necessary means, including to

use force, to back up the original 1991

U.N. resolution authorizing disarmament

of Saddam Hussein and his

weapons of mass destruction. For me,

that is the political objective and the

military objective.

That is correct. I

voted for that resolution in 1998. At one

point, the resolution did not authorize

the American forces to involve themselves

in a regime change. In this resolution

we are considering now, we are

considering using American forces to

not only order Saddam Hussein to comply

with the 1991 resolution in terms of

disarmament, there is an ‘‘or else’’

clause that says the President can use

force as well.

Two points. First, the

1998 resolution, which I supported, the

Senator from Virginia supported, and

most of us supported, called for regime

change but did not authorize the use of

American military force. This resolution

is different because I believe the

situation is different, as the Senator

pointed out. The situation is we really

don’t know the exact status of the biological

and chemical capability of Saddam

Hussein to wage warfare on his

neighbors, our allies, our friends in the

Middle East, and on us. Therefore, the

4 years the inspectors have not been

there gives us great pause and great

concern.

Therefore, our first step should be access

to those military sites, those

weapons of mass destruction sites, and

the destruction of those weapons of

mass destruction and complete disarmament

according to the 1991 resolution.

It is worth, in my opinion, authorizing

the use of military force to

accomplish that objective.

Mr. President, I find

it the height of irony in the midst of

our discussion on potential war with

Iraq and potential use of force and

committing young Americans into

harm’s way—and I indicated my support

yesterday for the bipartisan resolution

that would authorize the use of

force to go after weapons of mass destruction

in Iraq—I find it ironic in the

midst of this debate about whether to

commit American forces to a national

objective somewhere in the world, that

in the Washington Post yesterday an

article was entitled ‘‘New Pension Benefits

Imperil Defense Bill. In Cost-Conscious

Move, Bush Vows to Veto Entire

Budget if Item Isn’t Eliminated.’’

The message in the article is disturbing

to me because the item referred

to is something called concurrent

receipt.

I might say currently under law

there is an untenable situation where,

if someone has served 20 years in the

American military and additionally

gets wounded in that service, they cannot

draw their retirement which they

have earned and their disability compensation

which they are entitled to,

concurrently. They cannot do that. So

I find it ironic in the midst of the time

when the President is calling upon us

to authorize the use of force somewhere

in the world, he is opposing the

use of concurrent receipt or the ability

of our troops, our servicemen and

women who have served 20 years or

more and get wounded in that effort, to

draw those entitlements concurrently.

He opposes that and has threatened to

veto the almost $400 billion defense authorization

bill because of that one

item. That is unconscionable.

This article says the President has

threatened to veto the defense authorization

bill for fiscal year 2003 in order

to block the Defense Department from

paying veterans and military retirees

the very compensation they have

earned.

I am puzzled. I am flabbergasted by

the President’s position and the veto

threat. He goes on television one night

and threatens war to accomplish our

national objectives, and the next moment

says he is going to veto the entire

defense authorization bill which

would help pay for that very war because

he doesn’t agree with the Senate’s

position here, where we stand

foursquare behind those who have gone

in the military, served more than 20

years, and gotten wounded.

I can’t understand it. Surely, with all

the benefits and quality-of-life provisions

we have in our laws supporting

our military families, and authorizing

weapons systems, and passing, as we

passed in this body, a defense authorization

bill of $393.4 billion—that the

President has threatened to veto this

package over a question that ought to

be a nonstarter, a no-brainer, is very

alarming. The fact is, if somebody

serves in the American military 20

years or more and gets wounded in that

service, what they are actually entitled

to is not authorized.

I challenge anyone who opposes the

repeal of the concurrent receipt: Just

what are we talking about here? What

is the cost to our military personnel

who put their lives on the line? And

what is the cost to our Nation when nobody

else wants to do that because we

are not giving them their just due? We

have to address this issue and protect

our military retirees and veterans. To

ignore it is actually the height of hypocrisy,

and dishonors the very men

and women who serve in uniform.

How can we as a Nation, in good conscience,

in a matter of hours, ask our

military men and women to put their

lives on the line in the future if they

know this country will not take care of

them?

That is idiotic. The defense authorization

bill is in conference between

the House and the Senate. It is my

hope we can find the right compromise

that will make sure we take care of our

veterans and retirees. I urge that the

House and Senate adopt legislation

that will address this issue, and I ask

the President and the Secretary of Defense

rethink their position and stand

up for our veterans and military retirees

who are unfairly affected by the

current law. We need to change it.

This body stood foursquare behind

them. As a matter of fact, one of my

combat veterans in this great body

here, fellow Vietnam veteran Senator

JOHN KERRY from Massachusetts, he

and I and others are sending a letter to

the President of the United States,

urging him to recant that position on

threatening to veto the very defense

authorization bill we will need to go to

the very war he is trying to crank up.

I see this as the height of irony. At

one moment we are threatening to put

our young Americans into harm’s way.

At the other moment the President

said he is going to veto the entire defense

authorization bill because of one

item. What is that one item we are

paying at the request of this great

body? Those who serve 20 years or more

and get wounded, they get their just

due.

I appreciate my colleague, Senator

REID from Nevada, for pushing this

issue and bringing it to national attention

as the chairman of the Personnel

Subcommittee in the Armed Services

Committee. We feel very strongly in

our committee and in the Armed Services

Committee of this body on this

issue.

I yield the floor.

I would certainly hope the

President of the United States, the

Commander in Chief, would not veto a

defense authorization bill worth $394

billion, that this body passed, on a spurious

issue that it costs money to pay

those who fight our wars. It sure does,

especially those who get wounded in

our wars. It sure does. If we can find

the money for war, certainly we can

find the money to take care of those

who fight our wars. It is just as simple

as that to me.

So I thank the Senator from Delaware

for his question.