Mr. President, as

Members of this body, there is no issue

we face as grave and important as determining

whether we should authorize

force against Iraq that might place our

men and women in uniform in mortal

danger in order to protect the freedoms

we cherish, and extend these freedoms

to the people of Iraq, through the disarmament

of a tyrant committed to

harming his own people and the rest of

the world. As a member of the Armed

Services Committee, and as a citizen, I

have given great consideration and

thought to this course of action. Can I

in good conscience authorize the use of

force that could place someone’s child,

or my child, or someone’s husband,

wife, mother, or father in harm’s way?

Should the President commit troops to

Iraq, American blood will certainly be

shed. But, the authorization of force is

recourse we must take.

For 11 years, Saddam Hussein has

openly violated 16 U.N. resolutions

calling on him to disarm; cease his production

of weapons of mass destruction;

and stop the ethnic cleansing of

his own people. For 11 years, the people

of Iraq have suffered. Furthermore,

Saddam Hussein has made the world a

much more dangerous place. His relish

to produce chemical, biological, and

nuclear weapons has only increased

since the end of the Gulf War. Now, we

have learned that he is harboring al-

Qaida terrorists; strengthening his ties

to al-Qaida; and financing terrorist organizations

that promote suicide bomb

attacks in Israel.

I am confident that the enactment of

this resolution will give our President

the tools he needs to bring the world

community together to disarm this

brutal tyrant through diplomacy. But,

this resolution also gives the President

authority to follow diplomacy with

force, if necessary, to ensure that the

threats Saddam Hussein brings to the

world are neutralized.

The threat from Saddam Hussein’s

WMD programs is real and growing

every day we fail to take action to disarm

him. He has used WMD against his

own people and his neighbors. We

should not wonder whether he has any

interest in using them against the U.S.

or our allies.

As chair of the Emerging Threats and

Capabilities Subcommittee, along with

Senator ROBERTS, the Subcommittee

held a hearing in February to investigate

the status of his WMD programs

since inspectors left and the threat

those weapons could pose to the U.S.

At that hearing, the Subcommittee

was faced with the blunt findings that

Saddam successfully hid weapons while

U.N. inspectors were in Iraq. Moreover,

there are no mechanisms in place to

prohibit Iraq from ramping up its production

of biological and chemical

weapons, and its quest for nuclear

weapons.

At the hearing, Anthony Cordesman,

from the Center for Strategic and

International Studies, stated Iraq admitted

in 1995, ‘‘that it had produced

30,000 liters of bulk biological agents.

Iraq admitted it produced anthrax, botulinum

toxins, and aflatoxins.’’ We

must remember it took only a few

grams of Anthrax to throw the Senate

and the East Coast of the U.S. into disarray.

Worse yet, Iraq admitted it had

affixed these biological agents to missile

warheads and bombs.

Dr. Cordesman went on to say that

UNSCOM believed Iraq had produced as

much as 120,000 liters of biological

weapons, not the 30,000 it admitted—

enough to kill millions. Furthermore,

UNSCOM has been out of Iraq for 4

years, yet UNSCOM stated that Iraq

could reconstitute its biological weapons

program within a matter of weeks

after UNSCOM’s departure. Imagine

the destruction that could be caused by

Saddam Hussein with his unchecked inventory

of hundreds of thousands of liters

of biological weapons. Again, he

has the capability to injure or kill millions.

The Subcommittee also received testimony

that Iraq has actively rebuilt

its chemical weapons programs since

UNSCOM was thrown out of Iraq.

UNSCOM reported to the Security

Council that Iraq withheld information

related to Iraq’s chemical weapons program.

UNSCOM uncovered only a small

portion of Iraq’s chemical weapons. In

fact, Iraq confiscated information

gathered by UNSCOM regarding Iraq’s

chemical weapons, so the information

could not be transmitted to the Security

Council. Iraq also told UNSCOM

Iraq had not armed missiles with VX

gas—one of the deadliest of nerve

agents. Yet, in 1998, UNSCOM discovered

missiles tipped with VX. Soon

after, UNSCOM was told to leave Iraq

and Iraq has resumed chemical weapons

production. It takes only 10 milligrams

of VX to kill a person. A wine

bottle full of VX could kill at least 75

people. We must find out how much VX

Saddam has, and destroy it.

Moreover, Saddam Hussein is devoting

much of his defense budget to becoming

a nuclear power. After the Gulf

War, we learned from the U.N. weapons

inspectors that Iraq was within 1 year

of developing nuclear weapons. Prior to

the war, we thought Iraq was 5 to 7

years away. Since 1998, we cannot say

with any certainty that we know the

status of Iraq’s nuclear program. Once

again, Saddam could be less than a

year away from a nuclear bomb. The

world must know how close he is, and

he must stop his nuclear development.

Once he develops a nuclear program,

we will never be able to shut it down.

For these reasons, we cannot take

our time in passing this resolution. We

must act now. Saddam Hussein has

shown, on numerous occasions, his

willingness to use WMD to attack his

countrymen and his neighbors. He has

killed 20,000 Iraqis in 40 villages with

WMD. As President Bush said two

nights ago, ‘‘Saddam Hussein is a homicidal

dictator who is addicted to weapons

of mass destruction.’’

I want to read from Charles Duelfer’s

testimony before the Emerging Threats

and Capabilities Subcommittee’s hearing

on Iraq’s WMD programs on February

27, 2002. Mr. Duelfer was the Deputy

Executive Chairman of UNSCOM.

He said that it is inconceivable that

Iraq did not resume its WMD programs

after UNSCOM left. Mr. Duelfer said it

is difficult ‘‘to imagine circumstances

under which this regime would end

these programs’’ of WMD because . . .

‘‘the regime in Baghdad will devote full

resources to its weapons programs . . .

This has not changed even under sanctions

. . . The regime seeks to dominate

the region . . . The use of force

comes naturally’’ to Saddam Hussein.

WMD are his tools to dominate the region.

If we wait to pass this resolution,

Saddam will only continue to enlarge

his WMD program; threaten the Middle

East; and then threaten the U.S. He

will never end his programs unless the

world reins down on him to eliminate

his tremendous capacity for killing.

This resolution is the proper tool to

give the Administration a firm hand in

negotiating with the world to disarm

Saddam Hussein and eliminate his capacity

to kill. We should pass the

Lieberman-McCain Resolution immediately

and overwhelmingly to show

the world we are united. We must not

tie the President’s hands and the hands

of Secretary Powell to negotiate a new

Security Council Resolution that calls

for the disarmament of Iraq—and the

threat of force against Iraq if Saddam

does not abide by the resolution. We

can bring the Security Council on

board if we can show them the United

States stands together to disarm Saddam

Hussein. If this body is divided,

the U.N., and especially Saddam Hussein,

will pay us no mind.

The best outcome is a new Security

Council resolution that calls for unfettered

inspections throughout Iraq, including

Saddam’s presidential palaces;

the disarmament of all WMD; and the

threat of force should Saddam Hussein

not comply. That outcome has a better

chance of becoming a reality if we pass

this resolution.

The new U.N. resolution the President

and Secretary Powell seek is our

best chance to avoid a war. But the

threat of force must be present to enforce

a new resolution because Saddam

only understands force. Again, Charles

Duelfer testified before the Iraqis were

perfectly willing to thumb their nose

at UNSCOM because the U.N. had not

authorized force to make Iraq comply.

Iraq’s Deputy Foreign Minister,

Tariq Aziz, regularly told Mr. Duelfer,

‘‘You are not General MacArthur (referring

to MacArthur’s occupation/disarmament

of the Japanese) . . . Therefore,

there are limits to what you can

do.’’ What Aziz meant was you have no

authorized force; you have no army

with you to make us show you what we

have and where it is. A new resolution

will only work if the threat of force

lurks behind any Iraqi failure to obey.

This resolution is also a narrowly

tailored authorization of force. It seeks

peace before war to enforce past and future

U.N. resolutions against Iraq. This

resolution does not give the President

carte blanche to use force throughout

the Middle East for any reason. Force

is only authorized to bring Iraq into

compliance with U.N. resolutions—so

that Iraq disarms its WMD; ceases production

of WMD; does not threaten its

neighbors, and does not repress and

commit atrocities against its citizens

with WMD.

This resolution correctly authorizes

force for the violation of all 16 U.N.

resolutions, because Saddam’s crimes

against humanity should concern

America as much as his WMD capabilities.

America has been a tremendous defender

of human rights. But, at times,

we have not always defended the victims

of ruthless dictators.

In Rwanda, 800,000 Rwandans were

slaughtered in 12 months, yet America

did nothing to stop the ethnic cleansing.

America’s failure to act in Rwanda

could be the lowest point in American

history. We should not make the same

mistake by turning a blind eye to the

Kurds and Shiites Saddam has tortured

for years. Any resolution to dismantle

his WMD must also call for him to end

ethnic cleansing in Iraq.

In 1944, two Jews who escaped Auschwitz—

and revealed the horrors of concentration

camps to the world—asked

the U.S. War Department and the War

Refugee Board to bomb train tracks

leading to Auschwitz so no more Jews

could be brought there. U.S. bombers

were already bombing fuel dumps near

Auschwitz. Yet the War Refugee Board

refused this simple request. John

McCloy, the head of the Refugee Board,

denied the request. He stated the operation

did ‘‘not warrant the use of our

resources.’’ How could saving lives not

warrant the use of American resources?

As a result, between 500,000 and 800,000

Jews died at Auschwitz in the final

year of WWII. These lives could have

been saved, but we did not make it a

priority.

We shouldn’t now say that human

rights are not worthy of U.S. and international

diplomacy. We should not say

that we are unwilling to disarm a dictator

who brutalizes his people. If we

do, we will have failed the world, again.

Fortunately, I think this body and

the American people do care about

human rights. We stood up for human

rights in Kosovo. We used force against

a sovereign leader, Milosevic, who was

committed to the genocide of ethnic

Albanians. Through American force,

Milosevic was removed from power and

indicted for numerous war crimes. We

did the right thing for an oppressed

people. And, I must remind you President

Clinton did not seek Congressional

authorization to use force in

Kosovo. Today, unlike in Kosovo, the

President does seek Congressional approval

for force in an effort to seek a

unified American front to disarm another

leader threatening his people and

the world.

But, I must say, again, that force is

a last option under this resolution. The

resolution requires the president not to

use force until he presents his determination

to Congress that diplomacy is

no longer an option. This resolution is

not a call to arms. The President will

not roll tanks into Iraq as soon as we

pass the Lieberman-McCain resolution.

As the President said on Monday, ‘‘War

is neither desirable nor inevitable.’’

War can be avoided.

The President will seek Security

Council support and support from other

allies to bring about a diplomatic answer

to disarm Saddam Hussein. I have

no doubt that the President’s first hope

is to neutralize the Iraqi threat without

invading Iraq.

But, if a Security Council resolution

cannot be achieved and Saddam continues

to jeopardize the livelihood of

Americans—or if Saddam violates any

future resolution—the President should

have the authority to use force. Because

his most important job as Commander

in Chief is to keep the American

people safe from a tyrant.

In conclusion, I want to, once again,

reiterate my support for the

Lieberman-McCain resolution. As a cosponsor,

this resolution is America’s

best effort to stand united to show the

world, and especially Saddam Hussein,

that we are committed to disarm Iraq’s

weapons of mass destruction, which are

a clear and present danger to America

and the world. Hopefully, this can be

accomplished diplomatically with the

world-wide support. But, this resolution

also sends a clear signal that we

are willing to use force to change Iraq’s

ways if Iraq continues to threaten the

U.S.; if Iraq disobeys a new Security

Council resolution; or if the President

determines all diplomatic efforts have

been exhausted. At that time, force

may be necessary for America to defend

herself. This resolution is the

proper mix of diplomacy and force. As

President Kennedy said, ‘‘Either alone,

will fail.’’ I hope the Senate will pass

this resolution overwhelmingly to

show solidarity and resolve to our

friends and our enemies.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I

rise tonight to address the important

resolution pending before the Senate

concerning the authority to use military

force against the Republic of Iraq.

I firmly believe that this resolution we

are debating will strengthen the hand

of President Bush and the international

community in forcing Saddam

Hussein to disarm and to ensure his

compliance with all relevant United

Nations Security Council resolutions.

I believe President Bush will do everything

possible before deciding to

commit U.S. military forces against

Saddam Hussein’s regime. The President

has not decided to employ military

force, nor does this resolution demand

that he do so. Rather, the resolution

signals to the President that Congress

stands behind his decision to employ

military force if Saddam Hussein

fails to disarm or abide by all relevant

United Nations Security Council resolutions.

When he addressed the United Nations

on September 12, 2002, President

Bush convincingly and accurately presented

the case against Saddam Hussein

and his flouting of international

norms and agreements. President Bush

rightly called attention to Saddam

Hussein’s abysmal track record on

complying with the terms of disarmament

he accepted at the conclusion

of the Persian Gulf war. In so doing,

President Bush bucked current international

attitudes that would prefer

that we not call attention to his regime’s

activities.

Ever since the conclusion of the Persian

Gulf war, we have seen Saddam behave

with contempt towards those

countries that see value in the United

Nations resolutions and that ultimately

seek a peaceful and stable Middle

East. For more than 10 years, the

world looked the other way and ignored

the problem with the hope that

Saddam Hussein and his regime would

go away. Regretfully, Saddam Hussein

has displayed remarkable staying

power and a powerful appetite for acquiring

weapons of mass destruction.

I commend President Bush for seeking

congressional authorization for

possible military action against Iraq

and for consulting with Congress on

the drafting of a truly bipartisan resolution.

In response to those who condemn

the United States for displaying

‘‘unilateralism,’’ President Bush took

his case to the United Nations and

forced the world to acknowledge the realities

of the Iraqi transgressions. The

President is also right to seek a United

Nations Security Council resolution

authorizing a return of weapons inspectors

to Iraq. These inspectors must

have unfettered access to suspected

weapons sites in Iraq. There can be no

conditions or dickering over Iraq’s national

sovereignty. Saddam Hussein

lost a war he initiated, he sued for

peace, and he needs to accept the terms

and conditions he pledged to honor. To

expect anything less would be to condone

his transgressions.

The President is being practical by

raising the ‘‘what if’’ element to the

debate. History has shown Saddam will

go to elaborate measures to conceal

and elude efforts to uncover his weapons

of mass destruction capabilities

and development efforts. It is only prudent

that the U.S. Congress and all

members of the U.N. Security Council

consider authorizing measures to force

Iraq’s compliance with efforts to ensure

disarmament. Earlier today, the

House of Representatives passed this

same resolution on a vote of 296 to 133,

and I firmly believe that overwhelming

bicameral approval of this resolution

will strengthen the hand of the President

in securing the strongest possible

United Nations Security Council resolution.

In plain terms, the threat posed by

Saddam Hussein is analogous to the

threat posed by a drunk driver. The

drunk driver is a threat to all on and in

close proximity to the road. Behind the

wheel of a rolling weapon, it is only a

matter of time before the drunk driver

crashes into another car, kills an innocent

bystander or causes immense

damage to someone’s personal property.

Saddam is this drunk driver careening

along the road, a threat to all

those innocents who have the misfortune

to cross his path. It is time to get

Saddam off the road before he can kill

or injure innocents who cross his path.

For those who are critical of discussion

or references to ‘‘regime change,’’

I call to your attention section 3 of the

Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, P.L. 105–

338. Section 3 of the act states: ‘‘It

should be the policy of the United

States to support efforts to remove the

regime headed by Saddam Hussein

from power in Iraq and to promote the

emergence of a democratic government

to replace that regime.’’ Through this

provision, Congress has already expressed

its views on this subject. I applaud

the efforts of the Bush administration

to engage Iraqi opponents of

Saddam Hussein and to work with

these groups to provide a democratic

alternative to this tyrant.

The United States has a strong

record of restoring order and cultivating

democracy in post-conflict regions

of the globe. Examples such as

post-World War II Germany and Japan

are stellar illustrations of how the U.S.

has worked to better defeated nations

that strayed from the norms and rules

of acceptable international behavior.

In addition, unlike Afghanistan, Iraq is

a wealthy nation with natural resources,

an educated populace and a

middle class—all elements that will

bolster the chances of democracy thriving

in this country. There is no reason

to expect that with a concerted effort

by the U.S. and other democratic nations

that Iraq cannot join Israel as

the only other Middle Eastern democracy.

But perhaps most important, benign

neglect is not morally acceptable.

Looking the other way will not and

cannot improve the situation in Iraq

and the threat Saddam Hussein poses

to the world. There is a parallel between

today’s situation and the situation

that confronted the civilized Western

World of the 1930s. In that era,

democratic leaders sought to appease

the ambitions of Adolph Hitler and the

Third Reich. World War II, the Holocaust

and millions of military and civilian

casualties are the outcome of

that deferral of action.

President Bush’s effort to compel

compliance with applicable U.N. Security

Council resolutions is our best

chance for peaceful disarmament. Not

one speaker here in the Senate has indicated

that the status quo is acceptable

or reasonable. It is painfully clear

that one way or another we—preferably

the U.S. in concert with our allies and

the support of the United Nations—

must deal with Saddam and his threat

to our interests, our allies’ interests,

the stability of the Middle East and the

interests of the civilized world.

In conclusion, given the events of

September 11th, given the past transgressions

of Saddam Hussein, and given

the threat posed to the world by his

weapons of mass destruction programs,

it is imperative that we provide President

Bush with the strongest hand possible

to seek compliance with all applicable

U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The attacks of September 11th

and the fateful decisions not taken in

the 1930s illustrate that there is a cost

to not taking corrective action in a

prompt and decisive fashion.

It is my sincere hope that this resolution

will rally the United Nations Security

Council to draft a strong resolution

forcing the disarmament of Saddam

Hussein and his regime of terror.

If the U.N. fails to act, the U.S. must

do what is in the best interest of our

national security interests and disarm

Saddam Hussein. Today represents our

best opportunity for peaceful disarmament

disarmament on our terms

and according to standards established

by the U.N. and other civilized nations.

To do or expect anything less is to

shirk our moral obligation to meet the

national security obligations of our

country.

It is for this reason that I will vote in

favor of the bipartisan resolution

which is before us now.