Mr. President, I commend

the Senator from Florida for his

thoughtful statement about the threat

of terrorist organizations of global

reach posed to American national security.

The Senator from Florida has devoted

much of his time and professional

energies to investigating the

terrorist threat in great detail as

chairman of the Senate Intelligence

Committee.

Again, I thank the Senator for the

superb job he has done as chairman of

the Intelligence Committee in probably

the most trying times this country has

experienced since World War II—from

an intelligence standpoint, perhaps the

most difficult times. And I am grateful

we have a man of his caliber in a leadership

role. He is an eloquent and

thoughtful spokesman on these issues.

I agree that ultimately the war on

terrorism will not be won until we have

ended these groups’ murderous activities

and held them accountable for

killing American citizens.

However, I must oppose the amendment

because it provides our Commander

in Chief with authority he has

not requested. It is highly unusual for

Congress to provide the President the

authority to use military force to defend

American security against a particular

threat when the President himself

has not requested such authority.

For the President to determine that

the terrorist organizations listed in the

Senator’s amendment posed an imminent

danger to the United States, and

if the President requested congressional

authorization to use military

force to deal with that danger, I don’t

doubt Congress would have full consideration

or debate to provide that authority.

It does seem unusual in a time of

war, and in response to the President’s

request for congressional authorization

to confront a threat he has identified

as imminent, for Congress to identify

and grant the President the authority

to use military force to confront a different

enemy.

The Graham amendment would increase

beyond what was requested by

the administration the scope of authority

provided to the President. Including

these groups in the resolution, unfortunately,

muddies the strong message

the United States must send to

the United Nations Security Council

and the world that we are intent on

dealing with the threat posed by Iraq.

The President wants a strong statement

authorizing the use of force

against Iraq. He understands the value

of an overwhelming congressional vote

to American diplomacy and to demonstrating

American seriousness to the

world.

The pending resolution represents a

carefully crafted, bipartisan, bicameral

agreement on providing the President

with the authority to use force against

Iraq. This amendment is the product of

negotiations between the Speaker of

the House, Congressman GEPHARDT, the

Democrat leader, and the White House.

It was carefully crafted. We intentionally

introduced the exact same language

so that when the other body

passes it and we pass it, it will be the

exact same message. Modifying that

agreement could reopen issues that

otherwise have been resolved and

would unnecessarily slow down consideration

of a resolution that the President

has requested and made clear is

an urgent priority for his administration.

Yesterday, when asked about the

amendment, Secretary Powell stated

that Congress should focus in on the

threat posed by Iraq. The Secretary

also made clear the administration’s

desire that both Houses of Congress

pass identical resolutions to send a

message to the world that we are

united in our resolve to confront Saddam

Hussein and to send a message to

Iraq that we are serious about doing so.

The administration opposes the

Graham amendment on procedural

grounds. The President has requested

congressional authorization to use all

means necessary to protect American

national security against the threat

posed by Iraq. For this body to

supercede the President’s request by

identifying other threats to American

national security—I could come up

with a long list of such threats myself—

would send a confused message to

the American people and the world as

we come together to end the threat

posed by Saddam Hussein’s regime.

Some have argued that the President’s

determination to hold Iraq to

account would undermine the global

war against al Qaeda. I believe this is a

false argument, for as the president has

said, Iraq and al Qaeda are two faces of

the same evil. The Graham amendment

would expand our global campaign to

target not just al Qaeda but several of

the most sophisticated terrorist organizations

on earth. I would assume that

anyone who worries about diversions

from the war on terrorism would vote

against expanding that war at this

time.

I want to stress, however, that ultimately

the war on terrorism will not

be won until we have dealt with the

threat posed by terrorist groups with

global reach such as Hezbollah.

Hezbollah and other organizations listed

in the Graham amendment have

killed Americans and deserve no quarter.

They ultimately represent a grave

threat to America—a threat that will

not diminish until we have dismantled

these organizations and held them accountable

for murdering Americans.

The pending resolution is not the

proper vehicle for this debate. I look

forward to working with the Senator

from Florida to address the threat

posed by Hezbollah and the other terrorist

organizations he has listed.

I urge my colleagues to support the

request of our Commander in Chief by

tabling the Graham amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD a letter from the

White House.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

I say to my friend from

Florida that the administration’s message

is very clear that they do not disagree

with his assessment of the

threat. He is held in the highest regard

by all who have observed his distinguished

work as chairman of the Intelligence

Committee.

I thank my friend from Florida for

his contributions. I know that in the

days ahead he and I will be joining together

with other Members of this body

in addressing the serious threats to

American national security which he

has so eloquently described in his

statement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, a lot of

ground was covered in the time between

the last vote and the time that I

have been recognized, not necessarily

in a structured fashion. I want to respond

to some of the questions and

comments that were made.

First of all, very importantly, the

Senator from West Virginia made an

impassioned plea that we not vote for

cloture, not move forward with the disposition

of this resolution supporting

the President of the United States of

America to take action, if necessary,

to bring about an elimination of the

threat to the U.S. national security.

I think it is worthy of a couple of observations,

Mr. President. One is, in

the recent past the Foreign Relations

Committee has held numerous hearings

and the Armed Services Committee has

held numerous hearings. In reality,

though, this issue has been with us for

11 years, and it is not possible to turn

on your television set without seeing a

discussion and debate over this issue.

The night before last, the President of

the United States spoke to the people

of this country on this issue. Debate is

taking place in the U.N. There are discussions

in the U.N. Security Council

as we speak. This issue, more than any

other today, is known to the American

people. As we, their representatives,

debate and discuss it, it is to further

inform them; but they are clearly

aware of the major aspects of this

issue.

Since the year 1992, we have begun to

be aware that Saddam Hussein would

not be overthrown.

We became even more aware over

time that he was not going to comply

with the cease-fire agreements he entered

into and the Security Council

resolutions requiring him to allow intrusive

and comprehensive weapons inspections

throughout his country.

His obfuscation, his delay, his outright

refusal to allow these inspections

culminated in 1998 in ejecting those inspectors,

and that resulted in the passage

of legislation on August 14, 1998,

which President Clinton signed into

law, S.J. Res. 54, which declared that

the Government of Iraq was in material

and unacceptable breach of its

international obligations, and urged

the President:

On October 31, 1998, then-President

Clinton signed into law the Iraq Liberation

Act, which stated:

That was October 31, 1998, the Iraq

Liberation Act, signed into law by the

President of the United States.

I have to say allegations or assertions

that somehow the American people

are not aware of this issue just do

not ring true. Anyone who believes this

issue is not being debated around

kitchen tables and in restaurants and

other social gathering places throughout

America is simply not aware of

what is going on in America.

Yes, they pay attention to this debate,

but the issue is well known, and

there is no reason why we should not

invoke cloture.

It was interesting to me that my colleague

from Virginia mentioned we

really only spent 2 days of formal debate

on the floor of the Senate in 1991.

The Senator from Connecticut and I

were heavily involved in that debate.

But the fact is, that issue was debated

far and wide. By the time that vote was

taken, the American people and the

Members of this body were very well

aware—very well aware—as to what

was at stake and what, at that time,

was a far more controversial issue than

this one is, if you accept our predictions

of an overwhelming vote.

The Senator from Massachusetts

asked the Senator from West Virginia

if he knew about the stories carried in

this morning’s papers about Saddam

Hussein being likely to use weapons of

mass destruction if he is attacked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent

that a statement by George Tenet

be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I do not

want to go through the whole debate

again, but here is the point. Saddam

Hussein continues to acquire, amass,

and improve on his arsenal of weapons

of mass destruction. He continues to

attempt to acquire a nuclear weapon.

These are all well-known facts. So if

you believe that Saddam Hussein, after

we go through this expression of approval,

national debate, Security Council

resolutions, is not going to abandon

his request for his weapons, then the

longer we wait, the more dangerous he

becomes. In other words, if we attack

Iraq tomorrow—and that is not clear

yet; we have Security Council resolutions

to go through—perhaps Saddam

Hussein in his desperation may want to

use a weapon of mass destruction, but

if Saddam Hussein does not comply and

continues the clear record of violations

he has amassed over the last 11 years,

then if we have to remove these weapons

of mass destruction, each day that

goes by he becomes more dangerous,

his capabilities become better, and, in

the case of nuclear weapons, it is not a

question of whether, it is a question of

when.

Experts will debate whether it is 2

years when he acquires these weapons,

whether it is 5 years, 7 years, 10 years,

but there is no doubt over time he will

acquire a nuclear weapon.

Why do I mention a nuclear weapon?

We have equipment that can protect

our men and women in the military

against biological and chemical attack.

It is tough to fight, it is bulky equipment,

but we do have that equipment.

We have not invented any equipment

yet that can protect our troops from a

nuclear weapon.

I say to my friend, it is

very clear he is not developing these

weapons for defensive purposes. He has

used them twice—once against his own

people, once against troops of a neighboring

country in a conflict.

The fundamental point that seems to

be lost in this debate sometimes is at

any time in the last 11 years, Saddam

Hussein could have avoided any threat

to Saddam Hussein’s illegitimate, terrible

regime. It is a terrible and odious

regime, but there are lots of bad guys

around the world. He could have eliminated

any threat if he had just come

clean, taken out these weapons of mass

destruction, taken out the laboratories,

stopped, allowed the inspectors

in, so he must have some other agenda.

The longer we delay when he is in noncompliance,

the more dangerous that

threat becomes.

There was no contradiction, in my

view, of the comments of the Director

of the CIA that were widely quoted in

the media this morning. I can understand,

by the way, without knowledge

of Saddam Hussein, without the background

we have of his record, without

the knowledge of what he has tried to

do over the last 11 years, why those

comments might be misconstrued. But

taken in the context of the history of

this despot, I think it is very clear that

if he fails to comply—and we are going

to the United Nations and there will be

a Security Council resolution or resolutions—

then obviously the longer we

delay, if he continues on this reckless

path, the more dangerous it becomes

and, frankly, the more casualties accrue,

in response to the Senator from

West Virginia.

I wish to make another comment

about this debate. There is no Member

of this body who has any priority or

any franchise on the lives of American

young men and women. All of us place

that as our highest priority. All of us

recognize the sacred obligation we have

when we vote to send young men and

women into harm’s way, and no one’s

motives should be or will be impugned

in this debate.

I think it is important for the Senator

from West Virginia to appreciate

that I and others will object to any

unanimous consent agreement that

would delay a cloture vote tomorrow

morning. We believe the American people

have been informed, and the Members

of this body have been informed.

As the Senator from Virginia said,

Friday we had debate, and we will, according

to the majority leader, stay as

late or as long as anybody in this body

wants to talk or debate or discuss.

With all due respect to the Senator

from West Virginia, we will object.

Mr. President, we are trying to dispose

of 13 amendments. Obviously, people

want to speak. I respect that, but I

do feel compelled to comment on the

amendment of the Senator from West

Virginia briefly.

I thank my friend from

Virginia.

Mr. President, now I will make a few

brief comments about the amendment

of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment is to provide constitutional

authorities to the President

of the United States. In the heart of

the amendment, it says the President

of the United States cannot use the

Armed Forces for any purposes not directly

related to a clear threat of imminent,

sudden, and direct attack upon

the United States, its possessions or

territories.

If this were 100 years ago, at the time

of my hero, Theodore Roosevelt, who

was ready to send the Great White

Fleet around the world, I would vote

for this amendment in a New York

minute because 100 years ago we had

two oceans to protect us. One hundred

years ago, we did not have in this

world weapons of mass destruction

that could strike continents away,

travel thousands of miles and strike

with incredible accuracy. We did not

have a threat from a group of people

who are yet somewhat unknown to us,

who want to destroy our culture, who

want to destroy our values, and indeed

everything about Western civilization.

They travel sometimes in secret without

us being able to detect them, in the

case of September 11, until too late.

One hundred years ago, we had two

oceans to protect us. We knew who our

enemies might be, either real or potential,

and we could afford to wait until

there was an imminent, sudden, or direct

attack upon the United States, its

possessions or territories. Then I would

have supported this amendment.

The fact is, we all know if we wait

until there is a direct attack on the

United States of America, we pay a

very heavy price. I hope the Senator

from West Virginia, who I am sorry is

not in the Chamber, would have appreciated

that lesson from September 11;

that we cannot wait until there is a direct,

imminent, or sudden attack upon

the United States of America. That is

why if this amendment were to pass, it

would completely prevent the President

of the United States of America

from addressing a clear and present

danger to the United States of America

in the form of Saddam Hussein’s inventory

of weapons of mass destruction.

I respond to my friend

and say that, yes, if this amendment

said a clear threat of imminent, sudden,

or direct attack upon the Armed

Forces of the United States, clearly

that is the case. We saw it in the USS

*Cole*. We saw it in the attacks on our

embassies. We have seen it in many

places.

If there has to be a clear threat of

imminent, sudden, and direct attack

upon the United States, its possessions,

or territories, in all due respect, I

think Saddam Hussein would be very

pleased if we passed this kind of resolution

because that would allow him to

continue to build up his inventory, to

build his weapons of mass destruction,

perhaps acquire a missile with sufficient

range to reach the United States,

and only then could we respond. That

is not what I think our responsibilities

and duties are to the American people.

I am enjoying this debate. I think it

is a good one. I look forward to hearing

the next two speakers because both of

them have played a very important and

informative role, not only on the floor

of the Senate but on talk shows and

great programs throughout America,

both written and in public.

In fact, some of them have been accused

of what I have been accused of

from time to time, and that is seeking

a camera, which is, of course, never

true of me or my two colleagues.

I certainly look forward to listening

to their arguments. I think these next

two speakers will contribute enormously

to the debate. I think the

American people, as well as our colleagues,

will be better informed at the

completion of their remarks.

I yield back the remainder of my

time.