Mr. President, I yield

myself 5 minutes. Mr. President, I wish

to respond to a couple of the statements

made by the junior Senator from

Minnesota. I don’t think they are actually

correct in categorizing what happened

in 1998. I believe I heard him say

then we were very deliberative and the

resolution we passed did not authorize

the use of force. Well, I will show you

what we did in 1998.

In 1998, Saddam Hussein had continued

his defiance of the U.N. He had not

complied with any of the 16 resolutions.

So the U.S. passed a resolution

saying he should comply, Public Law

105–235, on August 14th. But the deliberative

portion was introduced before

the Senate on July 31, 1998—placed on

the calendar July 27, measure laid before

the Senate on July 31—and it

passed the Senate with an amendment

by unanimous consent. So it passed in

one day. I don’t remember the number

of hours spent in debate, but it wasn’t

a lot. To say we spent months deliberating

it is not accurate. The fact is

we passed it in one day. And then to

say it had no authorization for force, I

don’t believe is actually correct either.

If you look at the resolved section—I

put the 1998 resolution in the calendar

because I think it is important. It goes

through several items of noncompliance

by Iraq. Basically, we are saying

we should force or compel Iraq to comply.

The resolved section says:

I believe in the appropriate action

Congress was saying with a united

voice: Take military action, if necessary,

to get Saddam Hussein to comply

with the U.N. resolution. That is

what this resolution stated. We passed

it unanimously. We also passed, in 1998,

the Iraqi Liberation Act. This act did

not authorize any additional military

force. That is correct with this act, but

not with Public Law 105–235.

When someone says we didn’t authorize

force in 1998—yes, we did. The Iraqi

Liberation Act didn’t have an authorization

of force, but it did include a

change of regime. It said Saddam Hussein

should go. Again, we spoke with a

united voice. We passed that by a voice

vote. I might mention this to my colleagues.

In the House, it passed by 360–

38. In the Senate, we received it from

the House on October 6 and passed it in

the Senate on October 7. We passed it

by unanimous consent. We passed it

without objection.

This resolution says it should be the

policy of the U.S. to have a regime

change. That became the law of the

land. It passed unanimously in the Senate

with an overwhelming vote in the

House. Then, the earlier resolution

that passed on August 14 said the

President is urged to take appropriate

action to compel compliance with existing

U.N. resolutions. That was a

strong, united voice. Congress spoke

together, overwhelmingly. It was not

unanimous in the House, but it was

unanimous in the Senate. Both of these

resolutions passed in one day.

So for people who are saying we

haven’t been deliberative enough, and

what is the consequence of this—what

has changed? This Congress, Democrats

and Republicans, this Senate unanimously

told President Clinton to compel

compliance. Also, we stated it was

the public policy of Congress to have a

regime change in Iraq. I want to clarify

the RECORD and make sure we are factually

accurate.

Congress spoke in a united fashion in

1998. It was proud to be part of that

then, and I am proud to be part of the

sponsorship of this resolution, which I

believe will also pass with a very

strong voice—after much more extensive

debate than we had in 1998. I thank

my friend for yielding me the time.