Mr. President, the majority

leader filed a cloture motion on

the motion to proceed to the resolution

dealing with Iraq. I happen to be proud

of the fact the Senate has bipartisan

support for this resolution.

The President has worked hard on it,

as well as Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator

WARNER, Senator MCCAIN, Senator

BAYH, and others. I compliment them

for that. I look forward to the debate.

I think we can have a good debate.

We can pass a positive resolution

that will reaffirm the United States in

saying we believe the resolutions we

supported and passed in the United Nations

should be enforced. This body and

the United Nations have passed several

resolutions telling Iraq they must comply,

and then not enforcing them, and

we have done it year after year.

In 1998, we passed a resolution unanimously

saying we should enforce the

existing resolutions requiring Iraq to

disarm. Unfortunately, that resolution

was good on paper, but it was not enforced.

Now we have an administration that

says they are willing to enforce it. I believe

this Congress will stand behind

President Bush in saying: Yes, we will

give you the authorization to enforce

it.

These resolutions mean something.

We don’t think it is acceptable to have

a person with Saddam Hussein’s known

history of using weapons of mass destruction

against his own people, and

also invading his neighbors, and lobbing

missiles against Israel and Saudi

Arabia—it is not acceptable for him to

be developing further these weapons of

mass destruction. That is against the

United Nations resolutions.

We are saying these resolutions mean

something. Let’s enforce them. We said

that unanimously in 1998. It is going to

be interesting to see if people want to

weaken what we passed in 1998.

I hope our colleagues read President

Clinton’s statement he made in 1998 to

the Pentagon that talked about the

need for strong enforcement. That is

not the same speech President Clinton

made yesterday in London, unfortunately.

And I am very disappointed in

President Clinton’s speech.

Former Presidents usually have a

tradition to not undermine current administrations

in foreign policy, certainly

in foreign lands, and that is not

what President Clinton did. President

Clinton, in London, I think, made a

speech that very much undermines the

current administration, including the

administration in London, in trying to

develop an international coalition to

stand up to Iraq and Saddam Hussein.

I mention that. I don’t really like

being critical of anyone or any administration,

but for the former administration,

which did not enforce the existing

U.N. resolutions during their

tenure, during their 8 years in office,

did not pursue terrorists, including terrorists

that were al-Qaida, who were directly

responsible for blowing up two

U.S. Embassies in Africa in 1998, and

the USS *Cole* in the year 2000—when

they did not go after the terrorists aggressively

after those two terrorist attacks,

did not enforce the U.N. resolutions,

then to have President Clinton

being critical of President Bush in

Great Britain I think is very demeaning

to the office, and I am very regretful

a former President would make

such a statement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and

suggest the absence of a quorum.