Mr. President, I rise

to speak on the two resolutions that

the Senator from Michigan has talked

about in his comments because there

are two resolutions before the Senate,

both of which authorize the President

to use force, if necessary, against Iraq.

Before I discuss those, let me just say

a few words about the war on terrorism

which has engaged the attention of this

entire Nation during the last 13

months.

Before I discuss those, I congratulate

the President on the way he was able

to bring our country together after the

attack of September 11 of last year. In

cooperation with the President, Congress

put aside other matters, put aside

partisan issues, and acted quickly to

appropriate necessary funds and to

enact important legislation to help

safeguard our country and its citizens.

I think all of us in Congress joined in

meeting this challenge, and I am proud

we were able to do so.

The President has come to us again,

and this time he has focused attention

on another threat—that is, the threat

that Saddam Hussein, the leader of

Iraq, will use weapons of mass destruction

against us or our allies or that he

will provide such weapons to terrorists

for them to use.

The President has indicated his belief

that regime change in Iraq is needed to

deal with this threat, but he makes the

point that at this time he has not made

a decision about whether or when to

commence any military action.

The United Nations, for many years,

has agreed with our country’s view

that Saddam Hussein should not be

permitted to possess weapons of mass

destruction. An inspection regime was

established by the United Nations in

April of 1991, and inspections by

UNSCOM continued until August of

1998 to ensure that weapons were not

being developed or maintained.

I11In December of 1998, Iraq expelled

those weapons inspectors, and since

that time it is widely believed the likelihood

of such weapons being developed

in Iraq has increased.

So in response to this threat, the

President has urged Congress to adopt

a broadly worded resolution that authorizes

him at any time in the future:

Senator LEVIN, who is chairman of

the Armed Services Committee, with

whom I have been privileged to serve

for the last 20 years, has urged us to

adopt a different resolution that grants

the President the authority to use

military power, but Senator LEVIN’s

proposed resolution differs from the

broad grant of authority the President

has requested in two very significant

ways.

First, it authorizes the use of force at

this time only pursuant to a resolution

of the U.N. Security Council. In this

way, we would be ensuring our actions

to eliminate Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction

continue to be taken in coordination

with our allies.

Second, the Levin resolution authorizes

the use of:

There is a specific objective we are

saying the President is authorized to

use military force to accomplish.

The Levin resolution does not authorize

unilateral action at this time

to accomplish so-called regime change.

Rather, it would leave open the option

for the President to come back to seek

and obtain that authority from Congress

if and when he determines that

military action against Iraq is required,

even without U.N. sanction.

I strongly support giving the President

authority to work with our allies

in the United Nations, to inspect for,

locate, and destroy weapons of mass

destruction in Iraq. It may well prove

necessary to use military force to accomplish

that objective. In my view,

the Levin resolution grants the President

that authority. Unless that effort,

which is already underway, fails, I believe

it would be wrong for us to grant

authority to the President to use U.S.

Armed Forces in what is essentially a

unilateral action to achieve goals that

are, at best, vague and broad.

The President has made clear that in

his view our goal should be regime

change. The argument is Saddam Hussein

has shown such a proclivity to lie,

cheat, and evade that anything short of

regime change will leave us vulnerable

to a future attack by Iraq.

Depending on the success of our current

efforts to reinstitute an inspection

regime, the American people and our

allies may well conclude the President

is correct. We may have to conclude

that finding and destroying weapons of

mass destruction in Iraq cannot be

achieved as long as Saddam Hussein is

in power, and if that is the necessary

conclusion we reach, then a major

military action will likely be required,

with all the casualties and consequences

such an action entails.

Our allies have not reached that conclusion

yet. They believe a new inspection

regime can be made to work and

that the threat can be dealt with short

of going to war. At least they believe it

is worthwhile for us to make that final

effort.

The President’s proposed resolution

authorizes him:

This is, in my view, a virtually openended

grant of authority. It is not a

proper action for Congress to take at

this time. I do not believe it is wise at

this point to be authorizing war without

the support of the United Nations

and our allies. If war must be waged,

other countries should be there with

us, sharing the costs, both the financial

and human costs, and helping restore

stability in what will almost certainly

be the tumultuous aftermath of

that military action.

I also do not favor an authorization

for war unless and until the President

is prepared to advise Congress that war

is necessary, and he has explicitly said

he is not prepared to advise us of that

at this time.

For all these reasons, I will support

the resolution put forth by Senator

LEVIN and not support the much broader

grant of authority urged by the

President.

I yield the floor.