I thank the Chair.

Madam President, in a short while,

on behalf of a number of colleagues,

particularly Senators WARNER, BAYH,

MCCAIN, and myself—and I am happy

to note the occupant of the Chair, the

junior Senator from Louisiana is also a

cosponsor with us—we are going to be

offering a substitute to the pending

business to authorize the use of United

States Armed Forces against Iraq.

This is, obviously, a momentous decision.

The debate has begun in this

Chamber over the last few days. I have

watched a lot of it with great interest.

It has been carried on with the tone of

seriousness and purpose the matter requires.

This debate will continue in

earnest over the next few days as we,

each in our own way, facing our own

conscience, considering our values, our

sense of history, our understanding of

the threat posed by Iraq under Saddam

Hussein, will reach a conclusion.

Senators WARNER, BAYH, MCCAIN, and

I have reached a conclusion in submitting

the resolution. I say for the record

this resolution is the result of an open

and spirited process of discussion and

negotiation between the President of

the United States and Members of both

parties in both Houses.

The result is a resolution that, in its

preamble, states the case against Saddam,

the case of the ambitions this

brutal dictator has to gain hegemonic

control over the Arab world and the oil

there; the extraordinary acts of brutality

he has committed himself and

directed others to commit against his

own Iraqi people; his invasions of his

neighbors, Iran and Kuwait, which is

evidence, prior to the gulf war, of the

long-held belief that he has had which

is fundamental to the Baath party,

which he heads, of rising to dominate

the region as a modern-day Saladin and

all that it contains.

The resolution records the allied efforts

in the gulf war which were triumphant,

and the resolutions of the

United Nations that followed thereafter

as part of the promises Saddam

Hussein made to end the gulf war, the

most significant of which was to disarm

and to allow United Nations inspectors

in to guarantee the world that

disarmament would occur.

I talked to someone who was in our

Government at that time, and they

said the presumption was disarmament

would occur rapidly and that inspectors

might be necessary just to make

sure there was not, over time, an attempt

to rearm. Of course, it is 11

years after the gulf war ended, and disarmament

has never occurred. The

United Nations resolutions have been

violated repeatedly, and ultimately the

inspectors were thrown out in 1998. All

of this, and more, is recorded in the

preamble section of the resolution we

will offer.

Also recorded is the effort the Bush

administration is making now to finally

convince the United Nations to

act, to prove its resolutions are worth

more than the paper on which they are

printed; that the United Nations Security

Council will act to enforce its resolutions,

to protect the world from the

unique threat represented by Saddam

Hussein, an ideology which calls on

him to spread out and dominate his region,

weapons of mass destruction he

has used not once but repeatedly

against the Kurdish people who are

Iraqi citizens, and against the Iranians

in war and his support of terrorism.

There are only seven nations in the

world our own State Department lists

as state sponsors of terrorism.

Iraq is one of those, and it has supported

terrorist groups that have killed

Americans. This is a unique circumstance.

At different times I know

our colleagues have asked: What about

the other countries that are on the list

of state sponsors of terrorism? What

about other nations that have weapons

of mass destruction? What about other

nations that have aggressive ambitions?

Well, there are such nations, but

there is no one other nation that brings

as much poison and evil intent together

and, in that sense, so threatens

the United States of America as Iraq.

This resolution, which again is the

process of bipartisan and bicameral negotiation

with the White House, is explicit.

It has taken some clauses out of

the original White House proposal and

has added some others, but in its most

operative sections it says this Congress

of the United States authorizes the

President to use the Armed Forces of

the United States to defend the national

security of the United States

against the continuing threat posed by

Iraq and enforce all relevant United

Nations Security Council resolutions

regarding Iraq.

There are those who ask: Why now?

What is the urgency? My own response,

as the President of the United States

declared most recently, last night, is:

Why not earlier? Why not over the

course of the last decade, when Saddam

Hussein, to our knowledge, continued

to build up his weapons of mass destruction

and the most dangerous and

threatening means to deliver them on

targets near and far, constantly ignoring

and violating resolutions of the

United Nations, growing more ominous

a threat to his neighbors and to the

world?

My answer, again, to, why now? is,

why not earlier?

Others have said: There has been no

provocation. Why are we not waiting

for an attack to occur? Well, why, after

the devastation of September 11, 2001,

would we want to wait until an attack

occurs by someone who is clearly arming

and threatening us?

This is not, in the classic sense, an

act of preemption to authorize the

President to take military action

against Iraq as a last resort if all else

fails. In fact, the United States of

America—and the United Nations, for

that matter—have been in a continuing

military conflict with Iraq since the

gulf war began.

We have 7,500 American military personnel

dispatched to the region, working

alongside their British colleagues

to enforce the no-fly zones, costing

American taxpayers more than $1 billion

a year. This is not safe duty. This

is not casual duty. These American Air

Force personnel are being fired on repeatedly.

More than 400 times this year

alone, American and British aircraft

have been fired on by Iraqi forces. So

this is not an act of preemption. This is

an act of response and prevention.

Others have said on this floor that

the authorization we are giving the

President of the United States is an abrogation

of our constitutional responsibilities

and is much too broad. I respectfully

disagree. It seems to me the

Constitution and the Framers have set

up attention, attention that they must

have understood, to give us, the Members

of Congress, the authority to declare

war, to essentially authorize war,

but they gave one person, the President

of the United States, the power to

be Commander in Chief to carry out

war. Five hundred and thirty-five

Members of Congress cannot conduct a

war. It is our responsibility to determine

when and under what circumstances

we will authorize the Commander

in Chief to do that, but only

the President, as Commander in Chief,

can do that.

This resolution we will submit in a

few moments strikes exactly the right

balance. It gives the President a clear

and a strong mandate, but it limits it.

It limits it to a defense of the national

security of the United States against

the continuing threat posed by Iraq,

and it authorizes the President to use

military force, if necessary, to enforce

all relevant United Nations Security

Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

For those of us who are sponsoring

this resolution, it is based on our conclusion

that Iraq is a threat to the security

of the American people, a clear

and present danger that, if we do not

stop Saddam now, we will look back on

some terrible day, with a profound

sense of remorse and guilt, and say

why didn’t we do it?

Based on those conclusions, all the

evidence I have recited, and so much

more that has been recited on this

floor and will again be recited, this resolution

says: Mr. President, we have

decided Iraq is a danger to the United

States, we have decided that United

Nations Security Council resolutions

can no longer be ignored, and we give

you the authority, as Commander in

Chief, to take it from there.

In closing, with that authority we

are giving the President come accountability

and responsibility. There are

some who have said this is a blank

check. Of course if somebody forges a

check, they are held accountable, but

it is not as if this is a blank check,

without accountability, on a bank account

that has no limit.

With this resolution—if and when, as

I hope, it passes overwhelmingly—we

not only give the President the authority

to act within the parameters of the

resolution, we give him a tremendous

and awesome responsibility. It is not a

blank check. It is the most serious responsibility

the Congress can give the

President. As the President himself has

made clear over the last several weeks

on several occasions, he understands

the weight of that responsibility. But

he and we, the sponsors of this resolution,

understand if we do not authorize

him to take this action, the American

people may suffer a far worse fate.

It is our intention to lay this resolution

down soon. I look forward to the

debate. My colleagues and I intend to

be in the Chamber to answer questions

of our colleagues about these issues.

I am happy to

yield for a question.

I did.

I thank the Senator

from Arizona for his question. Of

course, I agree with the Senator that

the President of the United States has

made it quite clear that he is asking us

for this authority to dispatch our responsibility

under the Constitution to

give him the power to make war if necessary,

but he hopes—and clearly, we

hope—that will not be necessary.

I hope this is one of those cases

where, as someone once said, the best

way to achieve peace is to prepare for

war. The best way to achieve compliance

by Saddam Hussein with the

promises he made at the end of the gulf

war is to show that finally we are prepared

to go to war once again to enforce

those promises he made.

This Nation has been remarkably patient.

The fact is, over the last decade

or more we and the United Nations

have tried just about every other conceivable

way, short of war, to get the

Iraqis under Saddam Hussein to keep

the promises they made and to disarm.

We have tried sanctions which have

been so difficult because of the way

Saddam Hussein has carried them out

on the Iraqi people. We have tried inspections.

We have tried the Oil for

Food Program. We have tried limited

military action. None of it has worked

to convince this brutal dictator to observe

the rule of law and to keep the

policies he made.

In one sense, we might say this is the

moment of truth for him, the challenge

the President has given Saddam Hussein,

and that this bipartisan resolution,

which I hope and believe will

achieve an overwhelming vote of bipartisan

support by our colleagues, this

resolution finally says to Saddam Hussein:

Disarm. We do not want to go to

war against you. Disarm or face war.

The danger you represent is so great.

We can only hope and pray that message

will be heard in Baghdad.

I thank the Senator

from Virginia. May I say first how

grateful I am for his kind words towards

this Senator. I return them in

the fullness of sincerity. One of the

great honors and pleasures of the last

14 years has been serving with you, but

also getting to know you and considering

you a friend. There is not a better

person or gentleman or anyone

more committed as a patriot to our

country than the Senator from Virginia.

I am honored once again to be

working with him in this cause.

I appreciate what he has just said

about the programs of weapons of mass

destruction Saddam Hussein has, and

particularly these programs of chemical

and biological weapons.

I know the Senator has spent some

time considering, and I wonder if you

might, to the extent you are able to,

discuss matters in an open session as

to some of the concerns that I know

you and I share about the programs

that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq has now to

develop not just ballistic missiles to

carry biological and chemical weapons

but unmanned aerial vehicles, some of

which are quite small and potentially

could threaten not only Saddam’s

neighbors there in the region but potentially

could threaten us, the American

people, here in the continental

United States.

I thank the Senator.

Our colleague from Indiana is

waiting to speak, but I want to just

very briefly say to you again what you

know—and I hope to put some testimony

into the RECORD—about the devastating

biological weapons that Saddam

possesses, some for which we do

not have an effective cure or have an

effective response.

I hesitate to even say this, but I

think to show the seriousness of what

we are about, I know there has been a

lot of discussion: Does Saddam have

nuclear weapons? How soon will he

have them? Will it be 10 years or 1 year

or 5 years?

But does the Senator agree with me

that the biological weapons capacity

Saddam has now, if delivered by an unmanned

aerial vehicle, could do far

more damage—I am talking about

death to people—than the kind of

primitive nuclear weapon he might

have in a year at best, 5 years, 10

years?

In other words, the danger is here. It

is clear and present, and it is now.

Madam President,

as the debate continues, I want to address

myself to some of the history and

also to some of the threat today. This

is a most interesting book that somebody

gave me, that is most timely. It

came out very recently. I don’t know

the exact date. It is called ‘‘The

Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading

Iraq.’’ It is written by Kenneth

Pollack, who worked for the Central

Intelligence Agency. In the period of

1990, he was one of only three who earlier

in 1990 were advising their superiors,

and then ultimately the President

of the United States, that an Iraqi attack

against Kuwait was imminent, it

was going to happen. Over time, he

worked for the National Security

Council under President Clinton. He is

now at the Saban Center, a think tank

here in Washington associated with the

Brookings Institution.

This is a most compelling piece of

work. It speaks history here. It talks

about the great history—the Senator

from West Virginia is in the Chamber—

the great classic history of Iraq. This,

after all, is the place where the Biblical

Garden of Eden grew, along beside

the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is the

place where Abraham, the father of the

three great monotheistic faiths was

when God called out to him and found

his heart steadfast. Of course, in succeeding

times it has had great periods

of progress and leadership—unfortunately,

not in recent times.

But as we deal with Saddam today—

those of us, including myself, who

favor the resolution we have offered as

an amendment, a substitute today—we

tend to recite phrases about what a

brutal dictator Saddam is, and his ambitions.

He has used weapons of mass

destruction. I think in this debate from

time to time we have to go back to the

details.

There is a brief biography, in this

book, of Saddam, of the radical upbringing

he had, of the extent to which

he fell under the so-called pan-Arabist

influences, to create a power that

would gain control over the entire

Arab world. I want to read one quote

from this book—again, ‘‘The Threatening

Storm’’ by Kenneth Pollack:

This is based on a thorough research

of Saddam’s history, of his statements,

of his actions. Why did he invade Iran

in the 1980s? Why did he invade Kuwait

in the early 1990s? It is all part of realizing

this ambition. Why has he developed

weapons of mass destruction and

used them, as this book points out—not

once. There was a terrible genocide at

Halabja. But he used chemical weapons

repeatedly, and indeed experimentally,

against the Kurds. Hundreds of thousands

of people were killed. Against the

Iranians—hundreds of thousands of

people killed.

I read somewhere today—elsewhere; I

forget where it was—that Saddam is

the first person since Hitler who has

used chemicals for the purposes of

mass death.

So this history is chilling. I do not

manufacture it. It is there. It is why it

is so critically important to bring this

madman back within the constraints of

the United Nations resolutions and the

peace that he agreed to at the end of

the gulf war.

Should Saddam be allowed to continue

to develop these weapons of mass

destruction and become the controlling

hegemonic power he has long dreamed

of becoming in the Arab world, Lord

protect us. Lord protect the Arab

world, when you think of the brutal

dictatorship he has represented—no

freedom, no opportunity for his people.

And what about the rest of us, with

Saddam in control of so much of the

world’s oil supply?

So this history is very current as we

consider all the options we have tried

over the decade since the gulf war to

disarm this dangerous dictator, and

why those of us who have sponsored

this resolution believe that the moment

has come, as the President has

said, effectively to say to Saddam: Either

disarm or we are going to be

forced to go to war to disarm you. We

don’t want to do this. But you represent

such a danger to your neighbors,

among whom we have such strong allies

whose support is so critical to us,

whose energy supply is so critical to

our economy and that of the rest of the

world, that if you don’t disarm, we are

going to have to take military action

to do that.

That is the history, the chilling history

that affects the present and is why

the four of us, and others now who have

cosponsored this resolution, have done

so—to prevent this man from achieving

his evil ends.

There have been many thoughtful

statements on the floor. Mr. STEVENS,

the senior Senator from Alaska, spoke

yesterday. Here is a proud, patriotic

American, a veteran of World War II.

He analogized this dictator we are facing

to Hitler. Remember the lessons he

was hearing in high school of the dangers

represented by Hitler and the extent

to which, if we didn’t stop him

then, we would have to stop him at a

much higher price later on. I think the

balance we have to strike here in deciding

how to act is a similar balance.

Do we act now, or do we act later, at

much greater cost in blood, in treasure?