Mr. President, I would

like to begin by thanking all my colleagues

who have participated in this

very crucial and historic debate. I must

say I was struck last Friday by the

magnificent debate between Senator

BYRD and Senator WARNER. I think

their debate on Friday represented

what the Senate is all about, and I congratulate

both of them. Really, every

Member who has come down here has

had something to contribute.

It is clear that each Member who

came down here has thought long and

hard about this very important vote.

Throughout my Congressional career,

I have believed that the United States

must lead in foreign affairs. In doing

so, our foreign policy must reinforce

and promote our own core values of democracy,

free markets, human rights,

and the rule of law. And, I am not at

all ashamed to say that our most important

export to the international

community is our ideals and our ideas.

The first U.S. President I remember

as a child is Dwight D. Eisenhower. We

know that he ran for President because

of his strong belief that the United

States needed to lead in the world. He

believed that by leading and by being

involved in the world—and not isolated

from it—we would have the best chance

of guaranteeing peace, freedom, and

stability. As President Eisenhower said

in his January 1961 farewell address:

He understood that we have a moral

obligation, as the leader of the Free

World, to use our power to promote

freedom and stability and to help alleviate

suffering around the globe. And

in that process, he understood the importance

and the necessity of working

with our partners through organizations,

such as NATO.

And though it is vital that we be engaged

in world affairs and work with

other nations whenever possible, ultimately

we cannot escape the fact that

when the world looks for leadership, it

can look to only one place—and that

place is, of course, the United States of

America.

History has put us here. And, if the

United States does not lead, there is no

one else who can lead—and frankly, no

one else who will lead.

That is why, in the 1980s, when I was

in the House of Representatives, I supported

efforts to establish stability and

democracy in Central America. The

United States led—and it made a difference.

Significant progress was made

in Central America. Democracies

emerged.

And, significant progress was made

throughout the Western Hemisphere.

In 1981, 16 of the 33 countries in our

hemisphere were ruled by authoritarian

regimes. Today, all but one of

those nations—Cuba—have democratically

elected heads of government.

They are certainly not all perfect and

maybe those nations don’t conform exactly

with how we see democracy, but

they certainly are better off than they

were 25 years ago.

The United States led. It made a difference.

It paid off.

That is why, throughout my career, I

have supported U.S. leadership efforts—

efforts to export our democratic

values to other areas of the world,

using tools, such as foreign trade and

foreign aid.

Speaking of foreign aid, though I

wasn’t in Congress at the time, I supported

U.S. leadership through

NAFTA. I voted in favor of Trade Promotion

Authority to give the President

fast track or enhanced trading abilities

with our global partners. I voted in

favor of the Andean Trade Preferences

Act to expand the economic benefits of

trade with the nations of the Andean

region. I voted in favor of the African

Growth and Opportunity Act and the

expanded Caribbean Basin Initiative.

And, I support efforts to negotiate free

trade agreements within our Western

Hemisphere.

All of these efforts require strong

U.S. leadership. So, too, does an underutilized

tool of our foreign policy—and

that is foreign aid.

First, we don’t utilize it enough. Currently,

our foreign assistance budget

comprises less than one percent of our

overall budget, and is barely 0.1 percent

of our Gross Domestic Product.

Second, we aren’t creative enough

with the limited resources we do have

in our foreign assistance budget. And

so, here, too, the United States needs

to lead.

There are things we can do with this

assistance. We can and we must do

more to help end suffering throughout

the world. We can and we must do more

to help alleviate the worldwide AIDS

pandemic. We can and we must do more

to feed starving children worldwide. We

can and must do more to help implement

the rule of law in developing democracies.

We can and we must do

more to foster agricultural and economic

development in poverty-stricken,

disease-ridden, war-ravaged parts of

our world. And, as the leader of the

Free World, we also have a moral obligation

to bring stability and peace to

volatile, violent regions around the

globe.

Candidly, sometimes the only way to

do that is through the use of our military.

That’s why I supported military

action in Bosnia in 1995 and in Kosovo

in 1999. The simple reality is that the

job could not get done without U.S.

leadership. We had to go in. We had to

lead. It was the right thing to do, and

we did it.

And so, Mr. President, it may seem

paradoxical now that I have found the

decision concerning this Resolution to

be very, very difficult. It is difficult, I

believe, principally for two reasons.

Let me outline them for the Senate.

First, the resolution before us is an

authorization of force to be used by the

President—at his discretion—at some

point in the future. It is not a declaration

of war. And, it does not say that

war will take place.

But, it does authorize the President

‘‘to use the Armed Forces of the United

States as he determines to be necessary

and appropriate in order to: Defend

the national security of the

United States against the continuing

threat posed by Iraq; and enforce all

relevant United Nations Security

Council Resolutions regarding Iraq.’’

While unusual, this type of resolution

is not without precedent. Congress

passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in

1964, which said this:

I went back to the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD of 1964 and read some of Senator

Gruening’s and Senator Morse’s

remarks to get a better understanding

of why they dissented—why they voted

against this resolution. I also read

comments from those who voted ‘‘yes.’’

However, it is noteworthy that the

Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was not the

first time Congress had passed a resolution

to give the President the authority

to use force—at his discretion—at

some point in the future. Actually,

Congress passed two such resolutions

during the Eisenhower Administration:

one in 1955 regarding Formosa and one

in 1957 regarding the Middle East.

So while there is precedent, this type

of resolution to grant the President the

authority to use force, at his discretion,

at some point in the future, is

certainly unusual, and so we have an

obligation to treat this matter with

great caution. Granting the President

this kind of power is indeed a very

grave matter.

The second reason this decision, for

me, has been so difficult is that the

consequences of war would be so serious.

A possible war against Iraq would

have very real and very serious consequences,

many of them unforeseen

today.

I believe the American people need to

understand this. My colleague, Senator

BIDEN, who preceded me, made that

point very well. I believe we have an

obligation during this debate to explain

to the American people what war

with Iraq might mean. We have an obligation

to be brutally frank in telling

the American people about these consequences

of war.

What are they? What are the risks of

war with Iraq?

First, Saddam Hussein may very well

use chemical and biological weapons

against our troops. If we went to war,

we would be attempting to remove Saddam

from power. Therefore, unlike the

Persian Gulf war, this time he is likely

to actually use those chemical and biological

weapons against our troops, or

at least attempt to.

Second, we know that war with Iraq

dramatically increases the possibility

of attacks against United States troops

stationed in other places abroad and

United States civilians throughout the

world.

Third, we know that war with Iraq

increases the possibility of attacks

against Americans right here at home,

in our mainland.

This has already been read on the

floor and discussed, but I would like to

read to my colleagues some information

recently declassified by the CIA.

In a letter to Senator GRAHAM dated

October 7—Monday of this week—the

CIA released the following:

This information is certainly

chilling.

We also know that war with Iraq increases

the likelihood that Saddam

will launch Scud missiles against

Israel, this time maybe with biological

or chemical agents attached to the

missiles. In fact, Iraq has admitted to

the weaponization of thousands of liters

of anthrax, botulinim toxin, and

aflatoxin for use with Scud warheads,

aerial bombs, and aircraft.

Furthermore, if attacked, what

would Israel do? Would Israel, this

time, retaliate? In the Persian Gulf

war, Israel held back, but would they

this time? And if they did not, in such

a scenario, what would other countries

do? What would Syria do, for example?

What are the chances of the entire Middle

East literally going up in flames?

At the conclusion of a war with

Iraq—we would win the war; we know

that—but at the conclusion of a war

with Iraq, there very well may be

bloody, fractious battles among the different

ethnic groups residing in Iraq.

Pent up hostilities among Shiites,

Sunnis, and Kurds—just to mention a

few—would be difficult to restrain, easily

resulting in families warring

against families and neighbors against

neighbors, all fighting village to village

and house to house. And there

simply would not be enough United

States troops or allies you could place

into Iraq to stop that from happening.

What are the unintended global consequences

of the United States using

preemptive action? How does this

change the dynamics of the world?

What would it mean for the India-Pakistan

nuclear standoff? What would it

mean for China and Taiwan? Would

these nations be less restrained in

using preemptive strikes? These are

questions to which we do not know the

answers.

Finally, what will Iraq look like

after the war? What kind of humanitarian

assistance will be needed? How

many people will we have to feed?

What is our plan now for reconstruction?

What does it cost? Who will help?

What other countries will we be able to

involve in helping us?

We can expect to pay for a large part

of this. And we can expect our troops

to be involved for an extended, indefinite

period of time—not days, not

months, but years. And there could be

no doubt about that.

So, yes, Mr. President, there are

grave consequences of going to war

with Iraq. We cannot predict the future.

We do not know exactly how Saddam

would react. But it is vital that

the American people understand the

sobering reality of a war with Iraq;

that all Americans understand the uncertainty

and the risks and the dire

consequences.

Yet we also know that inaction is not

a choice when it comes to the situation

in Iraq. Inaction is just not a choice.

We know the status quo is unacceptable.

We know things have languished

too long. We know Saddam Hussein’s

regime is in possession of chemical and

biological weapons. And we know they

are working, as frantically as they can,

to develop nuclear weapons.

The fear is, also, that Saddam Hussein

would eventually put these weapons

into the hands of other terrorist

groups, terrorist groups such as al-

Qaida, terrorist groups that have no

qualms about targeting U.S. citizens

anywhere in the world, terrorist groups

that have networks already established

around the world. When that handoff

would be made, the consequences would

be unbelievable.

President Bush made very clear in

his speech on Monday night in Cincinnati:

So I commend President Bush for

putting Iraq back on the world stage in

his very forceful speech at the United

Nations. He has taken Saddam Hussein’s

evil regime by the throat and

dragged it back in front of the eyes of

the international community. And he

has forced the United Nations to confront

Saddam’s rampant and flagrant

disregard of 10 years’ worth of U.N. Security

Council resolutions. He has

forced the U.N. to confront its failure

to enforce past resolutions regarding

weapons inspections. And, rightly so,

President Bush has forced both the

U.N. and our own country to confront

this global threat and to deal with it. I

commend the President for his leadership.

None of us in this body disagrees

about what Saddam Hussein is. We

know he is a power-hungry dictator,

the embodiment of pure evil. The litany,

ably recited here day after day,

detailing Hussein’s thirst for power, is

by no means exaggerated, nor is it understated.

And there is simply no logic

to his actions. Just think back to his

attempt to assassinate former President

Bush shortly after President Clinton

took office. Even in his perverse

view of the world, what in the world

could that have accomplished from his

point of view?

Clearly, Saddam is ruthless. He is diabolical.

He is a cold-blooded killer. He

has launched Scud missiles against his

neighbors. He has diverted much of the

$10 billion worth of goods now entering

Iraq every year—money he gets from

oil—he has diverted that money he is

supposed to use for humanitarian purposes,

to help his own people, to develop

weapons of mass destruction.

He has murdered his own people. He

has killed or injured more than 20,000

Kurds with mustard gas and sarin.

In short, Saddam is a 20th century

Adolf Hitler, straddling 21st century

weapons of mass destruction. No one in

this body disagrees Saddam Hussein is

an evil despot, but reasonable people

can still disagree about our policy for

disarming Hussein; reasonable people

can disagree with the wording of the

resolution we are debating; reasonable

people can disagree about the timing;

and reasonable people can disagree

about how we proceed at the United

Nations.

This is a very difficult decision.

There are very legitimate issues of

controversy.

Yes, the costs will be high, very high,

if we go to war. Again, that is why this

decision has for me been so very difficult.

It is the most serious vote I

have cast in the 8 years I have been in

the Senate.

None of us take the gravity of this

vote lightly. Over the last several

weeks I have spent many hours in Intelligence

Committee hearings and

briefings and other briefings gathering

as much intelligence and information

as humanly possible. I have met with

numerous current and former highranking

officials from the military, the

CIA, the State Department. I met personally

with President Bush.

At the end of the day, we still must

weigh all of the costs and all of the

consequences of a potential war with

Iraq against the potential for peace and

stability and lives saved that will come

with the disarmament of Saddam Hussein.

Let’s be honest, though. The fact is,

the ghost of the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin

resolution haunts this Chamber, just as

the tragedy of Vietnam and the over

58,000 U.S. lives that were lost hang

heavy in the heart of America. We

should be haunted by the Gulf of Tonkin

resolution, and we should be haunted

and troubled by the Vietnam war.

However, it is instructive, as I mentioned

earlier, to remember that the

Gulf of Tonkin resolution was not the

first time Congress gave the President

the authority to commit U.S. Armed

Forces at his discretion at some time

in the future.

In January 1955, when Dwight Eisenhower

was President, the Chinese Communists

were threatening to take over

the Chinese nationalists in Formosa. It

was a very serious time in our history.

Believing that the time had come to

draw the line—those are President Eisenhower’s

words—to draw the line and

hold back the Communist aggression,

President Eisenhower asked Congress

to pass a resolution giving him the authority

‘‘to employ the Armed Forces

of the United States as he deems necessary

for the specific purpose of securing

and protecting Formosa against

armed attack.’’

Congress granted President Eisenhower

this authority with an overwhelming

vote, 410 to 3 in the House,

and 85 to 3 in the Senate. Later President

Eisenhower said that while he

went to Congress for several reasons,

his real reason was ‘‘to serve notice on

the Communists that they are not

going to be able to get away with it.’’

Because of that resolution, the Chinese

Communists in 1955 did not act.

War was avoided. There have been

problems. There have been tensions

ever since. But war at that crucial

time was avoided.

By passing the Formosa resolution,

Congress sent a clear, unequivocal signal

to the Chinese Communists that

the United States would defend Formosa,

that Congress would support

President Eisenhower, and that our

country was, in fact, united.

It is instructive that during that debate,

there was an attempt in the Senate,

in the Congress, to change the

wording and to be more specific and to

mention President Eisenhower, in defending

Formosa, had the specific authority

to defend Quemoy and Matsu,

two little islands close to mainland

China, far away from Formosa, but

controlled by Formosa at the time.

President Eisenhower said, no, do not

do that; do not be that specific in the

resolution.

President Eisenhower was looking for

the authorization to protect Formosa,

but he also wanted the discretion to decide

how to do it. And he also did not

want to tell the Communist Chinese

exactly what he would do.

With the flexibility and discretion to

use force as he deemed necessary,

President Eisenhower left the Communists

guessing about the ways in

which the United States would act, but

they had no doubt that we would act.

That is why I believe we must pass

the resolution before us. We need a

tough resolution that gives the President

the authority he needs to disarm

Saddam Hussein. We need a tough resolution

that also gives the President

flexibility and discretion. We have that

before us. We need a tough resolution

that does not tie the President’s hands.

Through the resolution before us,

this Senate and this Congress is saying

to Saddam Hussein that he is on notice.

Saddam Hussein, we are saying,

you are not going to be able to flagrantly

disregard U.N. Security Council

resolutions any more. You are not

going to be able to get away with

building weapons of mass destruction.

You are not going to be able to threaten

our lives and the lives of our children

and the lives of our grandchildren

and the peace and security of the

world.

In the final analysis, we are left with

the sober realization that when it

comes to Saddam Hussein, there really

are no good choices. When it comes to

him, lives are being lost in his own

country now, and many more could be

lost around the world in the future if

we allow him to continue his weapons

of mass destruction obsession. Left unrestrained,

Saddam Hussein will only

become more dangerous, more diabolical,

and certainly more deadly.

So I believe when you weigh the risk

of action versus the risk of inaction,

we, as the leader of the free world, simply

have a moral obligation to act. As

I already said, we simply cannot, as a

nation, escape the fact that when the

world looks for leadership, it can look

to only one place today. That place is

the United States of America.

We have an obligation to lead the efforts

to disarm Saddam Hussein. In the

process, we may tragically end up at

war with Iraq. But my prayer, my

prayer is that by passing this resolution,

we will not have to go to war

against Iraq. My prayer is that congressional

unity will signal to Saddam

Hussein and to the international community

that we do, in fact, mean business.

My hope is we can get a tough new

U.N. Security Council resolution

passed, giving weapons inspectors unfettered

access to every mile, every

square foot, every inch of Iraq. We increase

the chances for peace by telling

Saddam Hussein and his evil regime

that our Nation is united and that we

do, in fact, speak with one voice. We

increase the chances for peace by giving

the President the strongest possible

hand, while at the same time giving

him flexibility.

Finally, I must say I am convinced

President George Bush will do absolutely

everything he can to avoid war.

Mr. President, I do not know if war

can be avoided, but I do know if we are

serious about disarming Saddam Hussein

of his weapons of mass destruction,

our best chance of avoiding war is

through the passage of a tough resolution.

That is why I will vote in favor of

this resolution.

I yield the floor.