Mr. President, I have

sought recognition, and as the final

speaker before we adjourn for a recess,

I am going to comment about the situation

in Iraq.

It had been my hope that the Congress

might have addressed this issue.

But it is obvious now that we will not.

I think that the Congress—at least the

Senate—is not addressing the issue because

there is not clear-cut agreement

in this body as to how to proceed.

My own view is that an air attack

and a missile attack, if one is to be carried

out, constitutes an act of war. And

under the Constitution that requires

Congressional authorization. The

President is authorized as the Commander

in Chief—and there is only one

Commander in Chief, and it is obvious

that where the 535 Members of the Congress

cannot agree upon a program

that we are not committed to be the

executive. That is why we have an executive.

But still the Constitution requires

that war would be declared only

by an act of Congress. And I think the

international law interpretations make

it plain that military action, like air

attack or missile attack, does constitute

an act of war.

I believe that we have not yet seen a

clear definition of U.S. objectives as to

what we are seeking to accomplish. My

sense is that the American people are

not prepared for what may occur.

I make it a practice, as I know the

Chair does, of having open house town

meetings. And I had three this week—

on Monday in Cumberland County,

Lebanon County, and Lancaster County,

PA. There is great concern among

my constituents—those whom I have

talked to there and other places—of

not having an idea as to precisely what

we are going to accomplish.

It is my hope, if action is to be

taken, that before any action is taken

the President of the United States will

address the American people and will

identify the goals as he sees them and

evaluate our likelihood of attaining

those goals so that the people of the

United States will be prepared and understand

what is going to happen. But

I do not see at this date how there can

be public support for an attack in the

absence of informing the American

people, preparing them and having a

public dialog on the subject. The Congress

is speaking loudly by not speaking

at all on a resolution to authorize

the use of force against Iraq.

In 1991, on January 10, this body authorized

the use of force. I was at the

forefront arguing that force should be

used at that time. We had an extended

debate. The Congress—the Senate specifically—

was complimented for having

a classic debate on what our vital national

interests were and how we

should respond. I do believe that we

have a vital national interest in what

is going on in Iraq at the present time.

I do believe that there are great dangers

posed by Saddam Hussein and by

his weapons of mass destruction.

I had an opportunity back in January

of 1990—just 8 years ago on a trip with

Senator RICHARD SHELBY—to talk to

Saddam Hussein. It is not an easy matter

to deal with Saddam Hussein, as we

have seen. There is some talk that Saddam

Hussein ought to be toppled. But

the air attacks, the missiles, and the

planes will not accomplish that. It is

plain at this juncture that there is no

positioning of the kind of ground forces

necessary to topple Saddam Hussein.

Even as to the air attacks, it is plain

that we will not destroy all of Saddam

Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction.

The question is: How will Saddam

Hussein come out of whatever military

force we use? I am very much concerned

that he may come out a martyr.

Certainly the lack of support for the

United States raises major questions as

to how the rest of the world views this

issue.

On my travels—and I have traveled

extensively, Mr. President, in my capacity

as Chairman of the Senate Intelligence

Committee in the 104th Congress,

and my work on the Foreign Operations

Subcommittee—I have found

that there is great admiration for the

United States around the world. People

all over the globe admire our economic

achievements. They admire our values.

They admire our freedom, and the success

of our free enterprise system. But

there is also a touch of concern about

abuse of power or excessive use of

power, perhaps arrogance. And, we

have to evaluate that very carefully in

what we do as to Iraq.

I made a trip to the Mideast from

late December to mid-January, and

wherever I went I heard concerns about

the projection of American power and

concerns about the Iraqi civilian population,

not Saddam Hussein, but concern

about the Iraqi civilian population.

It is an odd quirk of history

that after the great success of the

United States, the coalition put together

by President Bush, which was a

masterful job, President Bush is in

Houston and Saddam is still in Baghdad

running Iraq.

I have spoken with some frequency

on the question of greater personal

Presidential involvement in international

dispute resolution, a subject

that I have discussed personally with

the President. It is my view that President

Clinton can leave the Department

of Agriculture to Secretary Glickman

and the Department of the Interior to

Secretary Babbitt, and so forth, but

only the President of the United States

can wield the enormous power that

comes from the Presidency.

In 1995, Senator Brown and I spoke to

Prime Minister Gowda of India, who

said to us that he hoped the subcontinent

could become nuclear free. The

next day we passed that information on

to Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of

Pakistan, who asked us if we had it in

writing. We told her, of course, we did

not. But we asked her when she had

last talked to the Prime Minister of

India. She said,

That night Senator Brown and I cabled

President Clinton with those

views fresh in our mind, urging the

President to call those Prime Ministers

to the Oval Office; nobody turns down

an invitation to the Oval Office. And

later talking to the President, he said,

well, I intend to do that after I am reelected.

I have talked to him since, and

it has not yet happened.

I think the President did an outstanding

job, and I compliment him on

the negotiations in the Mideast in the

1995 timeframe where the President

and the Secretary of State, Warren

Christopher, almost brokered an agreement

between Syria and Israel. When I

met with the President in mid-December

before my trip to the Mideast, I

urged him to become active again on

that track of the peace process because

I think the parties are very close.

I had a chance to talk to Prime Minister

Netanyahu and President Assad

in August-November of 1996, and they

were pretty far apart. Prime Minister

Netanyahu said that he wanted to resume

peace negotiations but he had a

new mandate, he wanted to start fresh.

President Assad of Syria said that he

would want to start negotiations but

would want to pick up where he, or

Syria, and Prime Minister Rabin left

off before Prime Minister Rabin’s assassination

in November of 1995. In

talking to them last month the words

were about the same but the music was

different.

I think that Presidential involvement

there might find success, especially

with the explicit condition that

any agreement would be subject to

ratification by the Israeli electorate on

the Golan Heights, something about

which only Israel could make a decision

for themselves considering all the

security factors, and the issue with the

Palestinians much more difficult, the

Israel-Palestine crack. But here I think

personal Presidential involvement

might be very successful. I think there

has been the absence of that, where we

find ourselves with only Great Britain

at our side now as we look to action

against Iraq. I have heard what the

Secretary of Defense has had to say,

and I have total respect and confidence

in Secretary Cohen based on the 16

years that I worked with him in the

Senate. But he alone cannot carry the

Executive burden in this matter.

On the information at hand, we do

not have the cooperation of others in a

military attack. I think that has to be

weighed very carefully. I do think that

there are alternatives. I do think that

the issue of a blockade is something

that might bring Saddam Hussein, if

not to his knees, to a greater economic

impasse. It would be my hope that before

action is taken which constitutes

an act of war, the issue would be debated

by the Senate and by the House

of Representatives and an appropriate

resolution would be put before us to

have the appropriate constitutional authorization.

I know that many of our colleagues

have spoken on this matter in the

course of the last several days, and as

the last speaker in the Senate before

we go to adjournment, I did want to

make these comments for whatever

consideration the President and the

Executive may choose to make of

them.