Mr. President, I

come to the floor today to discuss S.J.

Res. 46, the Lieberman, Warner Bayh-

McCain resolution, and the issue that

everyone of my colleagues agree on—

that Iraq is in serious violation of its

U.S. and U.N. agreements prohibiting

its possession of weapons of mass destruction.

What my colleagues cannot agree on

is how we should go about disarming

Iraq.

Let me add my views.

I believe that the best way to deal

with the threat posed by Saddam Hussein

is to build a multinational coalition

and engage the United Nations.

But we can’t ask the United Nations

to disarm Saddam Hussein if we are

not willing to disarm him ourselves.

Today’s vote for S.J. Res. 46 is a

statement of national resolve to disarm

Saddam Hussein. By showing our

unity as a nation, we help the United

States unite the world against his continued

effort to use weapons of mass

destruction.

History has shown that we have been

very patient with Saddam Hussein.

First, let us remember that the

United States and 34 other nations

were at war with Iraq in 1991.

After 3 months of war in which the

U.S. coalition lost 556 lives and 502

wounded—including seven young men

from my home State—not to mention

the estimated 100,000 Iraqis killed—we

negotiated a cease-fire agreement with

Iraq that ended our military campaign.

This cease-fire was approved in return

for Saddam Hussein’s promise

that he would unconditionally accept

the destruction and removal of all biological,

chemical and nuclear weapons

and to allow U.N. inspectors to verify

the elimination of these programs.

This cease-fire agreement was even

signed by the Iraq government.

We staked lives, resources, and diplomatic

weight on that promise, and yet

here we are today because of the noncompliance

of that issue.

If military action is eventually taken

by a UN-backed effort or multinational

US effort, that military action would

not be a pre-emptive strike, but the enforcement

of the Iraqi government

cease fire agreement.

In fact, I would say we have been in

a constant battle of enforcement for 11

years on this enforcement issue.

Shortly after the cease-fire agreement

in 1991, Saddam Hussein started

to thwart the cease fire agreement.

For 7 years, inspectors were sent to

Iraq to verify his promise to disclose

and destroy his cache of chemical, biological

and nuclear weapons, and for 7

years Hussein obstructed the inspectors

efforts.

Saddam Hussein did hide and inspectors

did find weapons of mass destruction—

literally tons of them—most of

which were unaccounted for in the

final reports’’ and in clear breach of

the cease-fire agreement.

Saddam Hussein even bugged the

UNSCOM offices in Bahrain and New

York, disguised weapons and hid them

in various places. He leaked false intelligence

and blatantly lied over, and as

Sandra Mackey outlines in her book,

‘‘The Reckoning, Iraq and the Legacy

of Saddam Hussein,’’ ‘‘Hussein’s tactical

war of cheat and retreat with UN

arms inspectors gave him power to remain

a world figure and gain a hold

over his own people.’’

What has been our response and the

response of the United Nations?

We have tried economic sanctions to

get Iraq to comply with the disarmament

agreement—and they have

failed miserably.

It is the innocent Iraqi people that

feel the effects of sanctions, including

hunger and a lack of medical care.

Saddam Hussein not only continues

to eat well—hoarding much of the aid

and food imported into Iraq through

the oil-for-food program—but he builds

palaces, and he devotes substantial

riches toward developing weapons of

mass destruction.

We have tried sending a strong signal

to the United Nations.

In 1994, I joined my colleagues in the

House of Representatives in calling for

the United Nations to take action on

Iraq’s noncompliance.

The House resolution went even further

and urged the President and the

United Nations to establish a tribunal

to charge Saddam Hussein as a war

criminal.

That vote showed a clear consensus

eight years ago when members of the

House agreed that Saddam Hussein was

neither a legitimate ruler nor an honest

actor in the ceasefire and UN agreements.

In 1998, we increased military pressure

in the region and even conducted

a military strike under President Clinton

called Operation Desert Fox—hoping

that the threat of force and the destruction

of military installations

would bring Hussein to reason and

allow the inspectors back in.

While this limited military pressure

produced some initial results, as soon

as the United States turned down the

heat Saddam Hussein went back to his

old ways.

Where are we today.

For 11 years since our cease-fire

agreement with Iraq we have tried to

stop Iraq’s effort to develop weapons of

mass destruction.

In reality, our efforts have failed to

stop his continued build-up of weapons

of mass destruction.

The United Nations should never

have allowed Saddam to negotiate the

terms of inspections.

When he crossed the line in the sand

that separated Iraq from Kuwait, Hussein

demonstrated to the world his absolute

disregard for international law;

and his defiance of the will of the international

community.

He also displayed, on a world platform,

his utter disdain for the principles

of human rights and a free society;

and revealed to the world a frightening

weapons capacity, including

chemical and biological weapons and

substantial progress towards developing

a nuclear weapon—all of which

he intended to use to advance his regional

ambitions and threaten enemies.

Saddam Hussein is a global menace

that we cannot simply wish away.

By doing nothing the world is not

only failing to enforce the terms of a

cease-fire that we fought for; but it is

allowing a dangerous threat to grow

that deserves renewed immediacy.

This immediacy was demonstrated 13

months ago, when we witnessed the

devastating steps that terrorists were

willing to take and we know that this

problem is not going away; and Saddam

only increases the danger.

Some citizens say there are other

countries in the world producing weapons

of mass destruction and could be a

source of aid to terrorists. Why worry

about Iraq?

I know of no other country that has

posed such a unique threat by: Violating

of US/UN cease-fire agreement

to stop development of weapons of

mass destruction; Using weapons of

mass destruction in war or against its

own people; and Refusing to help the

U.S. in the Afghanistan war on terrorism

and actually applauded the efforts

of Al Quida of 9/11.

We are now considering a resolution

that I believe will take a positive step

towards effectively dealing with the

threat of Saddam Hussein, his failure

to comply with the terms of the 1991

ceasefire agreement.

The best way to do that is to bolster

the President’s and the U.S. efforts by

sending a message to the U.N. Security

Council that we must act. This vote

tells the President of the United States

we agree Saddam Hussein and his failure

to comply with the cease-fire

agreement constitutes a serious breach

and a threat to global stability.

The vote tells the President we firmly

support his promise to go to the

United Nations Security Council and

live up to the responsibilities to enforce

a cease-fire agreement that Iraq

has continued to try to subvert. This

vote is a statement of national resolve

that Saddam Hussein must be disarmed

by peaceful means, if necessary, but by

showing our unity as a nation, that we,

the United States, will help eliminate

this threat and will unite the world behind

it.

Some have called this unconditional

authorization. That is not the case.

Senators LIEBERMAN, WARNER, BAYH,

and others have made great progress on

this legislation. There are conditions.

It requires a limited scope of operations

in the Iraq theater, continued

consultation with Congress on military

action, and serious reporting requirements

to inform Congress of the commencement

progress and plans of both

operations and postwar strategies.

I make clear this resolution does not

endorse a unilateral action. If for some

reason the U.N. Security Council does

not act, I expect the President to make

a major and aggressive diplomatic effort

to enlist other partners around the

globe in doing the right thing to stop

Hussein’s efforts. The President has

promised Members of Congress, including

the chairman of the Foreign Affairs

Committee, that he would be committed

to developing a coalition of allies

for military action. We know how

important these coalitions are. We expect

the President to fulfill this promise.

My vote for this resolution does not

mean I am convinced the administration

has answered all the questions. In

fact, I believe the following issues must

be addressed—there are several—before

the U.N. or the United States takes

military action: First, it is clear we

need a continued, multilateral approach.

The President must continue

to make the disarmament of Iraq a

global issue. The rhetoric surrounding

Iraq earlier this summer was

unilateralist. It offended our allies and

others who might have been with us. It

brandished the view around the world

that the United States is an arrogant

power, and did serious damage to our

relationship with many important powers

in the Middle East region.

The President’s September speech to

the United Nations reflected a new

chapter and much needed improvement

in the administration’s efforts to confront

Saddam Hussein. He made clear

that the priority of the administration

was to mobilize an international effort

to enforce the cease-fire.

Second, we must understand what

our successful military strategy is.

This vote is not an endorsement of the

President’s military strategy, mainly

because we have not been given what it

is. However, there is good reason to believe

that this operation, which may

require force to enter Baghdad, will

prove substantially more complex and

difficult and costly than Operation

Desert Storm—not only in its economic

cost, but most important, in the

lives of soldiers and innocent Iraqi citizens.

This is, indeed, a troubling scenario.

And if the administration ultimately

acts within the scope of this

authorization, it must be up front and

honest with Congress and the American

people in explaining what we are

up against.

Third, we must have a postwar commitment

strategy. This vote is not an

endorsement of the President’s postwar

scenario either, largely because I have

not seen details on that. We have heard

some broad outlines, if, in fact, action

by the U.N. or U.S. troops were taken.

But we need to realize the process of

creating a peaceful and stable post-

Saddam Iraq will be huge and expensive

and politically volatile.

If the President does not commit to

multilateral military action, we must

similarly commit ourself to a serious

long-term strategy to bring about freedom,

representative democracy, and

prosperity to the people of Iraq. This

will require a substantial obligation

and commitment.

Fourth, fighting the broader war on

terrorism cannot be left behind. And

while the President has made the point

that this effort is related, we need to

make sure if we commit troops to the

Persian Gulf, that we will not be diminishing

our other efforts on the war

on terrorism.

Fifth, and probably the challenge

that most of my colleagues have tried

to address, maintaining the Middle

East stability. I do remain very concerned

about the effective military action

and the volatile situation that

may occur in the Middle East. The

Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains in

a disappointing and potentially volatile

state. We must be aware that any

action in Iraq and the possible extension

to Israel poses a serious threat to

the future peace in this region.

If the administration or the U.N. selects

military action against Iraq within

the scope of this resolution, we must

work aggressively through diplomatic

channels to ensure that such action is

kept separate and distinct from the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

And lastly, we must protect Iraqi civilians.

We cannot diminish the serious

concerns regarding the effective potential

military action on that population.

They have been the victims of a brutal,

harsh and inhumane dictator who has

not only stripped away their political

liberty and free expression but also distributed

to Iraqi populations economic

deprivation, malnutrition, lack of medicine,

and diverted billions of dollars

into other programs.

If the President of the United States

or the U.N. determines that we should

move forward within the framework of

this resolution and military action

must be taken, it must be used as a

last resort.

The President needs to take leadership

and work with Congress to incorporate

the issues I have just mentioned

and come back to Congress and consult

with them.

I take this vote very seriously. The

men and women in the Armed Forces

from Washington State may very well

be called into action. Whether it be our

troops at Fort Lewis, our refueling

tankers flying out of Fairchild Air

Force Base in Spokane, our cargo

planes from McChord, our radio

jammers or P–2 aircraft out of Whidbey

Island, or even the men and women of

the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln* who were

recently in the Persian Gulf, or the

thousands of men and women serving

in Washington State—I hope our vote

tonight with the President’s multilateral

effort will lead to a successful result

where we would not need to use

these personnel. But if we do, I know

these men and women will be ready to

meet the task with conviction, resolve,

and professionalism.

I do not now, nor have I ever believed,

that military action is our preferred

method to address international

conflict. But I have seen over the last

11 years, Saddam Hussein has consistently

failed to live up to the 1991 ceasefire

agreement, and his noncompliance

is a dangerous failure that this body

must address. This problem is not

going away. If anything, it will grow

increasingly more dangerous as Saddam

Hussein increases his chemical, biological,

and nuclear weapons stockpile.

There is no question that we are

looking for a strong and effective response

from the United Nations Security

Council, and I believe this vote

sends an important message to the

United Nations Security Council and

gives the President the domestic backing

he needs to get that international

support. By being serious, forceful, and

resolute in expressing our dissatisfaction

with Saddam Hussein for his continued

noncompliance, I think we are

charting the best course for an international

response. We are taking action

in this body tonight, and we want

the international community to take

action with us.

I yield the floor.