Mr. President, I call attention

to an article in the Washington

Post of September 15, Sunday, the final

edition. I shall read excerpts therefrom.

The headline:

The article

is by Dan Morgan and David B.

Ottaway, Washington Post staff writers.

I will proceed now with reading the

first three paragraphs:

said former

CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has

been one of the leading advocates of forcing

Hussein from power.

But he added:

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi

government has fanned concerns by non-

American oil companies that they will be excluded

by the United States, which almost

certainly would be the dominant foreign

power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein’s

fall.

Are you listening? Out there in

America, are you listening?

Let me say that again, with reference

to former CIA Director R. James Woolsey:

But he added:

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi

government has fanned concerns by non-

American oil companies that they will be excluded

by the United States—

Hear that—

which almost certainly would be the dominant

foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath

of Hussein’s fall.

Are we paying attention?

Representatives of many foreign oil concerns

have been meeting with leaders of the

Iraqi opposition to make their case for a future

stake and to sound them out about their

intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies

from more than a dozen nations, including

France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam

and Algeria, have either reached or

sought to reach agreements in principle to

develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities

or explore undeveloped tracts. Most

of the deals are on hold until the lifting of

U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in

interviews last week that they will not be

bound by any of the deals.

It is a lengthy article, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that this article

be printed in the RECORD at the

close of my remarks.

Now, Mr. President, let

me call attention to an editorial in today’s

Charleston, WV, Gazette, titled,

And I read therefrom:

The White House continues its mantra

that war is necessary because Saddam is

‘‘evil’’ and he’s secretly making weapons of

mass destruction. But this justification may

be a smoke screen.

Are you listening? Are you listening,

the people out there throughout this

great land? Are you listening?

. . . this justification may be a smoke

screen. Some observers say the administration’s

hidden motive is to gain control of

Iraq’s oil.

In a front-page Sunday report subtitled

The Washington Post said America’s oil industry—

to which Bush and Cheney are closely

tied—eagerly wants a ‘‘regime change’’ in

Iraq so U.S. firms can begin drilling into

Iraq’s vast, 112-billion-barrel reserve.

So the Charleston Gazette of today

calls attention to the Washington Post

article which I have already read and

have included in the RECORD, the Washington

Post article of last Sunday.

Continuing with the Gazette editorial:

Mr. President, how much

time do I have?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous

consent that I may have an additional

10 minutes, if needed.

Mr. President, before the

Nation is committed to war, before we

send our sons and daughters to battle

in faraway lands, there are critical

questions that must be asked, and it is

not unpatriotic to ask questions.

To date, the answers from the administration

have been less than satisfying.

After weeks of criticism from

Congress and, indeed, from the countries

of the world, President Bush went

to the United Nations to press his case

that Iraq posed a serious threat to the

peace and security of the globe. But instead

of offering compelling evidence

that the Iraqi regime had taken steps

to advance its weapons program to the

point that it is necessary for the

United States to deliver an unprovoked

attack on a sovereign state—namely,

Iraq—the President offered the U.N.

more of a warning than an appeal for

support.

Instead of using the forum of the

U.N. General Assembly to offer evidence

and proof of his claims, the

President basically told the nations of

the world that ‘‘you are either with me

or against me.’’

‘‘Do not question this stand,’’ the

President said. If the U.N. is unwilling

to act, then ‘‘by heritage and by

choice, the United States of America

will make that stand.’’

While Mr. Bush tried to play the role

of an international prosecutor, his case

was at best circumstantial. He did a

fine job in laying out the facts with regard

to the failure of the United Nations

to uphold and take more compelling

action in upholding its previous

resolutions. He made a fine statement

in that regard. He made it clear that

the United Nations had not enforced its

resolutions. Sixteen resolutions had

been adopted by that agency.

But in the days that followed that

address, the administration officials

have attempted to provide some answers

to the looming question. However,

this week, when asked by the

House Armed Services Committee

members what was new, what was compelling

to force the hand of this Nation

against Saddam Hussein, Secretary of

Defense Donald Rumsfeld offered nothing

new. He pointed to the terrorist

acts of September 11 as compelling reason,

and he said:

The last thing we want is a smoking gun.

A gun smokes after it has been fired. The

goal must be to stop Saddam Hussein before

he fires a weapon of mass destruction

against our people.

Well, he said the same thing before

the Senate Armed Services Committee

on yesterday. He said: We are being

asked what is new.

He said: What is new? September 11.

Well, September 11 is not all that

new, Mr. President, September 11 was

365 plus 9 days, in other words, 374 days

ago. That is not so new.

With reference to Mr. Rumsfeld’s

statement concerning a smoking gun,

when he said, ‘‘The last thing we want

is a smoking gun. A gun smokes after

it has been fired’’—my concern, Mr.

President, is that the United States, in

forcing war in Iraq, will end up shooting

itself in the foot. Unless proper

care and deliberation precede any action,

we must not be hell-bent on an invasion

until we have exhausted every

other possible option to assess and

eliminate Iraq’s supposed weapons of

destruction program.

The United States must not act

alone. The United States must have

the support of the world.

Yesterday, the administration sent

to Congress a draft resolution to authorize

the use of American military

might against Iraq. In that resolution,

President Bush requests approval to

‘‘use all means’’ he determines to be

appropriate. In other words, the President

is saying: Authorize me, the

President, authorize the President to

‘‘use all means’’ he, the President, determines

to be appropriate.

Congress must not hand this administration

or any other administration a

blank check for military action, period.

What Congress needs is solid evidence.

What we need are answers. Does

Saddam Hussein pose an imminent

threat to the United States? Should

the United States act alone as this administration

has been threatening to

do? Should Congress grant the President

authority to launch a preemptive

attack on Iraq? What would be the repercussions

in the Middle East? What

would be the repercussions around the

globe?

How many civilians would die in

Iraq? How many American men and

women would be involved? Will even

greater numbers of National Guardsmen

and Reserves be called up to prepare

for an invasion? And if they are,

what will happen to the war on terrorism

here at home? Will troops be

shifted from other missions to support

a war against Iraq?

We have 8,500 men and women in Afghanistan.

We have forces in the Philippines,

in Bosnia, in Kosovo and in

many other places throughout the

world. What are we going to do, pull all

of them out of those faraway places

and use them in an unprovoked attack

on the sovereign state of Iraq?

How do we afford this war? The gulf

war cost $61 billion. The gulf war of a

decade ago cost $61 billion. Of that,

other countries coughed up, in cash

and in contributions in kind, $54 billion,

leaving, I believe, roughly $7 billion,

the cost to American taxpayers.

Now, what would it cost this time if

other nations are not helping the

United States to bear the financial burden?

Bruce Lindsey, the President’s

economic adviser, says it might cost

$100 billion or $200 billion. And then he

said: $100 billion why, that is nothing.

He is quoted in the press as saying: $100

billion? That is nothing. Yet, this administration

won’t get its feet out of

the concrete and head out of the sand

when it comes to raising the top line

for Congress to be able to utilize in

passing 13 appropriations bills and

sending them to the President—not

willing to agree to $9 billion more than

the President’s foot-in-concrete figure

of $759 billion.

Congress needs $768 billion. The

House chairman, Mr. YOUNG, and this

chairman in the Senate, and Senator

TED STEVENS, ranking member on the

Senate Appropriations Committee,

have agreed, and others agreed—and

this Senate has agreed—it should be

$768 billion. There is a $9 billion gap between

what the President says and

what the Congress needs to meet the

needs of the people. I am talking about

veterans’ care, education, homeland security,

and so on, these are the needs.

Congress would require—and has already

reported bills out of the Senate

Appropriations Committee which assume

the figure $768 billion. The President

and his OMB Director say, no, $759

billion; that is all. So, here we are—

stuck; 13 appropriations bills are stuck

because of the administration’s immovability

in dealing with the needs of

the American people here at home.

The Administration, says: No, we

won’t accept that. Hence, we have 13

appropriations bills stuck.

Lawrence Lindsey has reportedly

said, with reference to a war against

Iraq: ‘‘Oh, that might cost $100 billion

or $200 billion. $100 billion? Well, that

is nothing.’’ That is the attitude of this

administration. That is the attitude of

this administration.

Has the United States ruled out responding

with nuclear weapons should

Saddam Hussein use chemical or biological

weapons against our soldiers?

Does Saddam Hussein have the capability

to unleash weapons of mass destruction

within the United States?

Does the United States have adequate

military and intelligence resources to

fight a war in Afghanistan and a war in

Iraq while, at the same time, mobilizing

resources to prevent or defend

against attack within our own shores?

What will happen to this war here at

home?

What will happen to homeland security

if the President unleashes an

unprovoked attack on Iraq? Does anyone

believe there would not be any repercussions

here at home? We have terrorists

within our midst in this country.

They are all about us. The FBI arrested

six in New York just recently.

So the FBI is on the job. The FBI is

working to defend this country. But

what else might happen? Are we focused

too greatly on fighting suspected

terrorism overseas, while focusing too

little on the threat of terrorism here at

home? What is going to happen to the

needs of this country—the monetary

needs and the needs with respect to security

of our nuclear plants? What is

going to happen at our ports of entry

and on our borders? What is going to

happen within our midst if the President

launches an unprovoked attack on

Iraq?

These are questions—and there are

many more questions—that will be

asked. If it is unpatriotic to ask questions,

then I am unpatriotic. Is it unpatriotic

to ask questions, when this

President is seeking powers that have

never been given to any other President?

On September 19, yesterday, the

President sent to Congress his suggested

text for a resolution to authorize

war with Iraq. The problems with

this proposed resolution are numerous.

When taken as a whole, this resolution

would constitute the broadest possible

grant of war powers to any President in

the history of our Republic. The President

has inherent powers under the

Constitution to repel a sudden, unforeseen

attack on this Nation—nobody argues

with that—but he doesn’t have inherent

power under that Constitution

to launch an unprovoked offensive

military attack on another nation or

state.

The resolution is an affront to the

powers given by the Constitution to

Congress on matters of war. The first 2

pages of the draft resolution have 16

‘‘whereas’’ clauses that would serve to

explain the intent of Congress—if the

resolution were adopted as it is written—

in passing the resolution for the

use of force.

These clauses, as conceived by the

White House, include numerous distortions

of fact. For example, in the ninth

‘‘whereas’’ clause, it is asserted that

the United States has the inherent

right, as acknowledged in the U.N.

Charter, to use force in order to defend

itself, as if that is a justification for

preemptive war. Let me read the relevant

section of the U.N. Charter:

Nothing in the present charter shall impair

the inherent right of individual or collective

self defense if an armed attack occurs

against a member of the United Nations

until the Security Council has taken measures

necessary to maintain international

peace and security.

That does not seem to justify a preemptive

attack. In the 16th clause, it is

asserted that:

The President has the authority under the

Constitution to use force in order to defend

the national security interests of the United

States.

At last, the administration has

awakened to the fact that there is still

a Constitution. That is the first time

that I have ever read anything or heard

anything from the administration that

would invoke the Constitution in this

matter. Let’s see what they are saying.

In the 16th ‘‘whereas’’ clause it is asserted

that:

The President has the authority under the

Constitution to use force in order to defend

the national security interests of the United

States.

Well, that is the broadest reading of

the Commander in Chief clause I think

I have ever seen. What about the power

of the Congress under article I, section

8 of the Constitution to declare war?

That is not mentioned at all in the resolution

proposed by the White House.

Mr. President, the White House resolution

would authorize the President to

use all means that he determines—that

he determines. What a colossus this

President is going to become if the

Senate gives him this kind of authority.

The White House resolution would

authorize the President to use all

means that he determines appropriate.

What does that mean? What does

‘‘appropriate’’ mean here? It would authorize

the President to use all means

that he—I repeat, that he—determines

appropriate, including forces, to restore

international peace and security

in the region.

Mr. President, that is not an authorization

for war with Iraq only. That

language would allow the President to

march our troops into Iran, Syria, Lebanon,

Yemen, the West Bank, and anywhere

else that is part of the Middle

East or where the United States has

any security interest in the Middle

East. I cannot believe the gall and the

arrogance of the White House in requesting

such a broad grant of war

powers.

Mr. President, this is the worst kind

of election year politics!

Mr. President, I yield the

floor and suggest the absence of a

quorum.