Mr. President, I thank

the Senator from Colorado. I appreciate

his courtesy, and I appreciate his

leadership on the most important resolution.

His leadership has had an integral

impact on how this resolution was

designed, and he has been a leader on

addressing what is obviously the major

national security issue which we confront

as a Nation today.

I—like many Americans, hopefully—

have followed the debate in this Chamber.

I have been interested in the tenor

and tempo of the debate. I believe it

has obviously been serious and substantive

in its approach to how we address

the question of this resolution,

which will authorize the President to

take such action as is necessary in

order to protect our Nation relative to

Iraq, and to work with the United Nations

in that undertaking.

One of the things, however, I have

also noted is there is almost a sophistry

being presented here. For example,

I heard one presentation, talking

about whether or not we were pursuing

preventive war versus preemptive war,

in which there was almost a rather

nice dissertation of what I would call

political science 101 on the difference

between preemptive war and preventive

war, and whether or not we, as a Nation,

had a right to pursue a preventive

war versus a preemptive war.

I would simply point out we are at

war. We are not initiating war. We are

not in the process of striking an enemy

by whom we have not been struck. Two

Embassies in Africa were attacked.

Hundreds of people died. An American

ship in Yemen was attacked. Many

sailors died. And, of course, on September

11, thousands of Americans died

in America as a result of an attack.

We are at war. We did not ask for it.

We did not initiate it, but we have no

choice but to respond to it. In responding

to it, we must have our eyes open.

We are a Nation which inherently believes

in the better nature of people.

We inevitably give people the benefit of

the doubt. It is our culture, and it is

one of our strengths. Regrettably, in

this war, giving people the benefit of

the doubt—people who have a track

record of either hating us, attacking

us, or confronting us militarily—may

end up costing us even more lives.

I think we need to review the enemy’s

purpose. Let’s begin with al-

Qaida and bin Laden, and use his own

words.

bin Laden, in an interview that was

published in January 1999—it originally

appeared in Time—made the following

statement:

He went on to say, in February 1998:

‘‘Civilians and military.’’

He went on to say:

And most recently, in a tape recently

released just a week ago:

Referring to America——

This is an enemy who has called to

arms the people who believe in him and

follow him for the purposes of killing

Americans as defined by his own language:

‘‘civilian and military.’’ That is

the enemy we confront in al-Qaida.

And what is the relationship to Iraq?

First off, we must look at the history

of our relationship and of Iraq’s relationship

in the area of military activity.

Saddam Hussein has attacked his

neighbors, neighboring nations twice.

He has mercilessly—mercilessly—suppressed

his own people, especially the

Kurdish minority within Iraq. He has

invaded Iran and Kuwait.

He has also developed and used weapons

of mass destruction. ‘‘Weapons of

mass destruction’’ is a terribly antiseptic

term. But what it means is, he is

essentially willing to spread disease

which will kill thousands—tens of

thousands—of people in order to obtain

his purpose. And he has done it. He has

used biological weapons. He has used

chemical weapons against the Iranians

and against the Kurdish people in his

own country, killing literally thousands

of people.

Of course, we went to war with Iraq

in the early 1990s. So our history with

Iraq is significant, as we recognize they

are governed by an outlaw and, as a result,

have been a nation functioning

outside of the civil discourse of organized

nations.

But why is it important we confront

them at this time and in this context?

It is important because of the weapons

of mass destruction which they have. If

this were the world prior to 1980, let us

say, when weapons of mass destruction

were not so readily available, or nations

which had them were governed by

governments which had at least some

modicum of responsibility, then you

might not look at a tyrant such as

Hussein and say you needed to do anything:

Let him, regrettably, do his

harm to his neighbors and his nation.

It is not affecting us.

The problem is, after September 11,

we, as a country, cannot take such an

isolationist view, for we know there is

an enemy out there called al-Qaida

that has stated, unequivocally, their

purpose is to kill Americans and destroy

our society and culture. And we

have seen them take action to do that

on September 11, and in Africa at our

Embassies, and at the USS *Cole*.

We also know there is another nation

out there, run by a tyrant, who is a

murderous individual, who has weapons

which are capable of exacting massive—

massive—amounts of damage and

loss of life, if used.

The threat, obviously, is that the two

should be joined or that the tyrant

should just unilaterally use these

weapons. Why is that threat legitimate?

It is legitimate because there is

significant common sense which tells

us that it may be joined.

There have been reports not by

American news media or by American

intelligence services but by Arab

sources which have made it clear that

there is a cross-fertilization between

the Hussein government and al-Qaida.

Reports appearing in a Karachi newspaper,

the Ummat, on November 22 carried

an article saying that Saddam

Hussein has offered asylum to the top

Taliban and al-Qaida leadership, including

Osama bin Laden and Mullah

Omar. In this regard, a delegation led

by a senior official in the Iraqi Government,

Taha Hussein, met with Mavlana

Jalal ud-Din Haqqani—I hope I pronounced

that correctly, but considering

his purposes, I don’t really care—

in Qatar and conveyed Saddam Hussein’s

offer to him.

If the report is true, then it is at

least the second time Saddam Hussein

has offered bin Laden asylum. A report

in the Christian Science Monitor cited

Arab sources which it considered to be

legitimate that, according to Hassan

Mohammed, who claims to have

worked for two decades for Iraq intelligence

services, graduates of an Iraqi

school were intimately involved in

training both Assad al Hassan and al-

Qaida cells, and the quote is:

There are more and more reports like

this. It is also logical, logical because

Osama bin Laden and his people have

made it clear that those who consider

us an enemy are their allies. Therefore,

Iraq is a natural ally to them, and vice

versa.

So the possibility that a weapon of

mass destruction which has been developed—

and we know they have been developed

within Iraq, biological and

chemical weapons—could fall into al-

Qaida hands or people representing the

same concepts of al-Qaida is distinct.

We also know that Iraq is moving

forward with a nuclear program, that

they wish to have a nuclear bomb, and

that they may well have it, if they are

able to get fissile material within a

year; if not, within 3 or 4 years. They

are much further down the road toward

obtaining nuclear weapons than we

even anticipated when we had the war

with them in the early 1990s. That was

terminated then but has been restarted.

So what are we to do about this? The

U.N. has passed 16 resolutions, the

basic purpose of which is to try to disarm

Saddam Hussein and his government,

specifically in the area of weapons

of mass destruction. There is no

civilized nation today that does not understand

the threat that is represented

by having a government headed by a

tyrant such as Saddam Hussein having

weapons of mass destruction.

So the U.N. has made a conscientious

effort to address this with these 16 resolutions.

Of course, Saddam Hussein

has ignored those, lied about what he is

doing, and he ejected the inspectors,

which leads us to the point we are at

today.

This resolution has as its fundamental

purpose the disarmament of

Saddam Hussein, taking away his

weapons of mass destruction. If, as a

corollary to that, a regime change occurred

in Iraq, that would be for the

betterment of the world, I suspect. But

the vital purpose here is to terminate

the capacity to have and to use weapons

of mass destruction, either by Iraq

or by a client of Iraq or by an ally of

Iraq or by al-Qaida specifically.

It is a totally legitimate national security

purpose that we should pursue.

The President has outlined the need to

accomplish this. What he has essentially

said, and appropriately so, is

that we will support the U.N. effort to

accomplish this. But if the U.N. is unable

to accomplish it, then our national

security is so important, so

overriding, that we should take action

with our allies to accomplish this.

That is the only reasonable approach

when you confront a threat of this significance.

There are some in this body who have

essentially said we should pursue what

I call the good intentions approach.

That is an American trait—that we do

give people the benefit of the doubt.

But the good intentions approach in

this area—hoping that things will work

out through a policy of containment—

has not worked.

We know for a fact that Hussein and

his people have ignored the 16 resolutions

and that they are developing

weapons of mass destruction, and they

actually possess them. We know for a

fact that they may well use them. To

wait and rely on good intentions would

be an error of policy which might lead

to the death of many Americans. We

can’t afford that risk. We must insist,

as the President has said, on the disarmament

of the Hussein regime; specifically,

the disarmament of their weapons

of mass destruction, in a manner

which is absolutely confirmable, where

we know without question that it has

occurred and that those weapons have

not been moved into other places of

hiding or into other hands, which may

cause greater harm.

What the resolution before us does is

give the President the authority to accomplish

those goals. To fail to give

the President the authority to accomplish

those goals would be, in my opinion,

an act of gross negligence, a failure

of our responsibility as a government

to defend our people.

We are at war. We have been attacked.

Americans have been killed.

And if Mr. bin Laden and his people

have their way, more will be killed.

If we are to defend ourselves, we

must be assured that the most threatening

weapons they can use will not be

used against Americans. Therefore, we

must take action relative to Iraq. This

resolution empowers the President to

accomplish that. That is why I intend

to vote for it.

I yield the floor.