I thank the Senator

from Nevada.

Mr. President, today, I rise in strong

support of S.J. Res. 46, the bipartisan

joint resolution to authorize the use of

the U.S. Armed Forces against Iraq.

First, I want to praise the President

for his leadership and for reaching out

to all Members of this body. I am proud

to be an original cosponsor of S.J. Res.

46 with Senators LIEBERMAN, MCCAIN,

WARNER, BAYH, DOMENICI, HELMS,

HUTCHISON, LANDRIEU, and MILLER.

These Senators are leaders of the Senate,

and I am proud to be associated

with them on this important matter.

Also, I want to commend the leadership

of the other body for their leadership

in brokering this agreement between

the administration, the Senate,

and the House.

I know this debate will be vigorous in

nature and serious in tone, which is exactly

how such a debate should take

place. One of our most solemn duties as

Senators is when we are called upon to

cast a vote on whether to send our men

and women in uniform into harm’s

way. Quite simply, this is one of the

most serious votes any Member will

make.

I remember, as a new Member of Congress

in 1991, one of my first votes was

whether to go to war in the Persian

Gulf. Just like in 1991, voting on this

resolution will be a tough vote. But

that is why we are here—to take a

stand, state what we believe, and make

the tough votes. In the end, I hope this

debate will show that the Senate, despite

any disagreements, is united in

its resolve against Saddam Hussein.

Mr. President, the United States has

basically been at war with Iraq ever

since the Persian Gulf conflict. In April

1991 and August 1992, the northern and

the southern no-fly zones were established

in order to enforce United Nations

Resolution 688. Since then, U.S.,

British, and coalition aircraft patrolling

these no-fly zones have been fired

upon by Iraq more than 2,500 times and

over 400 times this year alone. However,

despite the daily threat in the nofly

zones, our pilots have only fired

back in response 44 times.

Saddam Hussein has repeatedly defied

sixteen United Nations resolutions

which were designed to ensure that

Iraq would no longer be a threat to

international peace and security. Plus,

the United Nations Security Council

has issued 30 statements regarding

Saddam Hussein’s violations of these 16

resolutions. At this time, I ask unanimous

consent that a list provided by

the White House of the 16 United Nations

Security Council Resolutions and

a list of Council statements regarding

the violations be printed in the

RECORD.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

After the Persian Gulf

conflict, the international community

levied economic sanctions and established

the ‘‘Oil for Food’’ program.

However, these sanctions have largely

eroded due to the lack of resolve by the

international community and the reality

of Iraq’s substantial illicit trade.

Turkey and Jordan import Iraqi oil via

truck routes, Iran escorts oil tankers

through territorial waters, an Iraq-

Syrian pipeline is the largest export

method of Iraqi oil, with an Iraq-Jordan

pipeline scheduled to be operational

in 2005.

The United States attempted to garner

support for ‘‘Smart Sanctions’’ in

early 2001, but this attempt met tepid

reception by the international community.

Russia, China, and France have

negotiated substantial contracts with

Iraq which would be executable upon

lifting of U.N. sanctions. Under the Oil

for Food program, food import levels

exceed and oil revenue is comparable

to pre-Gulf war levels. The program experiences

periodic progressive adjustments

in its export ceiling in response

to growing international concern about

the Iraqi humanitarian condition.

However, Saddam Hussein consistently

circumvent’s the economic sanctions

and attempts to thwart the oil

for food program. Saddam’s regime has

exported thousands of barrels of oil

each day in violation of UN resolutions

and he completely disregards the humanitarian

well-being of his own people.

By illegally exporting this oil, he

has deprived the Iraqi people billions of

dollars in food and medicine which

would have been allowed under the program.

The living conditions of the Iraqi

people are intolerable. Saddam Hussein

has expanded his violence against

women and children, withheld food and

medicine from his own citizens, and

violated the basic human rights of the

Iraqi people.

Mr. President, some have blamed the

oil for food program and the economic

sanctions for these conditions. But let

us be very clear, the reason for these

intolerable conditions and why we are

debating this topic today lay at the

feet of Saddam Hussein and his regime.

To quote Secretary of State Powell

from a Foreign Relations Committee

hearing on September 26, ‘‘Iraq stands

guilty. It convicts itself by its actions.’’

The threat of Saddam Hussein is real

and is growing. Iraq enjoys a sizable

military advantage over all Gulf States

except Iran. Iraq’s 424,000 military personnel

outnumber the combined personnel

total of all U.S. Gulf allies. Iraq

continues to pursue weapons of mass

destruction, and is attempting to acquire

a nuclear capability. According

to recent reports, it is estimated that

if Iraq were to obtain fissile material

then Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear

bomb within months. United Nations

Special Commission has identified

gaps in accounting for Iraq’s current

chemical stockpiles and capabilities

and has not accounted for hundreds

of tons of chemical precursors

and 1000’s of delivery warheads.

UNSCOM also reported that Iraq has

understated their declarations regarding

the extent of its biological agents.

Again, I would like to quote Secretary

Powell from the same hearing,

when he stated:

Secretary Powell also made it clear

that we aren’t alone in our concern regarding

the threat of Saddam Hussein.

Referencing Arab leaders and their

thoughts regarding Saddam, Secretary

Powell added, ‘‘There is no question in

their minds that he’s a threat to regional

stability and peace. There is no

question in their minds that he is a

threat to the region and has demonstrated

previously his willingness to

use weapons of mass destruction. And

there is no doubt in their minds that

he continues to have the intent to develop

these weapons of mass destructions.’’

So what now—what do we do? Do we

hope that Saddam Hussein goes gently

into the night or do we finally stand up

to this dictator and let the world know

that Saddam Hussein can no longer

thumb his nose at the international

community.

We only need to go back a few weeks

to see Saddam’s duplicity. On September

16, 4 days after the President’s

speech at the U.N., the Iraqi government

announced it would unconditionally

allow the return of U.N. inspectors.

However on September 20, Iraq

backpeddled on its previous announcement

by stating that the definition of

‘‘unconditional access’’ means no

‘‘presidential sites’’ and 24 hours notice

before any inspection.’’

My reaction to this new definition of

‘‘unconditional’’ by Iraq is best

summed up in an October 3 Denver

Post editorial when it stated, ‘‘Saddam,

there you go again.’’

I ask unanimous consent that the entire

article entitled ‘‘Saddam Must

Open Palaces’’ be printed in the

RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I wish

to quote a few passages from the editorial:

Later in the editorial it states:

I hope the United Nations Security

Council will devise a new tough resolution

which will demand ‘‘unconditional

and unfettered’’ access to all sites. I do

not want to have to use force to disarm

Saddam Hussein. However, I also will

not allow the United Nations or any

permanent member of the Security

Council with veto power, to control our

national security policy. And that is

why I support this resolution.

S.J. Res 46 does not advocate force,

but it does not preclude it. It uses force

as the last resort, the very last. The

resolution basically states that the

President is granted authority to use

force if he determines that:

I believe Secretary Powell clarified

the administration’s position even further

regarding the use of force during

the September 26 hearing by stating,

‘‘Yes, he [the President] wants the authority

to carry out those resolutions

where he believes force is the appropriate

way to get implementation of

those resolutions. I think it unlikely

the President would use force—if he

[Saddam Hussein] complied with the

weapons of mass destruction conditions,

it seems very unlikely that anybody

would be using force to comply

with any of the other resolutions.’’

Much of this debate is about when to

pass this resolution. Should we pass a

resolution before the United Nations

acts or should we wait until after the

United Nations acts? I believe this Senate

should act prior to the United Nations

to show that we speak with one

voice in the importance of disarming

Saddam Hussein. I agree with Secretary

Powell and former Secretary of

State Albright when they both stated

that the United States would be in a

much better position to prevail in the

United Nations if the administration

had a congressionally approved resolution

in their pocket.

Passing this resolution in no way

precludes the United Nations from acting,

nor should it lessen the resolve of

this administration to gain such support,

but I believe a vote on this resolution

will show our resolve to the

world that we want the United Nations

to act. However, if the United Nations

is determined to follow the same

course it has over the last 10 years,

then Saddam Hussein must understand

that the United States will act alone.

On August 20, 1998, President Clinton

addressed the Nation and said, ‘‘The

risks of inaction to America and the

world would be far greater than action,

for that would embolden our enemies,

leaving their ability and their willingness

to strike us intact.’’ I do not want

us to use force, but I also cannot and

will not sit idly by and hope that Saddam

Hussein does nothing while the

U.N. talks, and talks, and talks.

I believe President Bush summed up

our task at hand during his speech last

night in Cincinnati when he stated:

Mr. President, I end on a personal

note about this Senate. As I look

across the aisle and see the ‘‘Conscience

and Historian of the Senate’’,

the wonderful senior Senator from

West Virginia—with whom I find it a

honor to serve—and as I see Members

of this Senate debate and disagree on

this resolution, it is during these debates

I am in awe of this great country

and this great institution. Unlike so

many other nations, we can debate war

and peace and at the end of the day

there is no fracture in the fiber of democracy

that makes America great. It

is this which we all wish for Iraq and

for the Iraqi people. I look forward to

the day when real democratic elections

occur and when the voices of the Iraqi

people, which have been silenced for

too long, will be heard.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator

from Vermont who is speaking next.

Mr. President, I will

make a few brief comments. I associate

myself completely with the statement

made by the Senator from Connecticut.

I thought they were thoughtful comments.

I also think Senator NICKLES

from Oklahoma, who spoke prior to

him, did a nice job of laying out for the

Senate this issue, whether we should

move forward with the resolution the

President has requested.

I believe the President seeks to avoid

conflict. I don’t think there is anyone

in this Chamber who wants to see us go

into a conflict as a first option. We are

very much concerned about the lives of

our men and women who serve in the

military. We certainly do not want to

put them at risk unnecessarily.

The question occurs, if Saddam Hussein

fails to comply, are we prepared to

use force? I look at it this way. Historically,

if we look at Iraq and what has

been happening, I don’t think anyone

can deny there is a buildup. We either

address it now or we address it later. I

am of the view the sooner we address

this problem, the less the risk will be.

If we continue to let the problem grow,

it increases the risks to our men and

women in the military who may be

called into battle as a result of noncompliance

with Iraq. Hopefully we do

not reach that point.

I compliment the President on his

leadership. It is the kind of leadership

we need at this time. It is a judgment

call. It is what every Senator has to

make a decision about in his own mind,

whether this is the right thing to do.

The longer we hold this up, the risk is

magnified. That puts the neighbors of

Iraq at risk, it puts countries all

around the world at risk.

There is no doubt in my mind Saddam

Hussein has the capability of

using weapons of mass destruction. He

is capable mentally of doing that. He

has done it before. He has used it on his

own. If he can use it on his own, he

would certainly be willing to use it any

place else. If we look at biological

weapons, there is not much doubt he

has the capability to use biological

weapons. Their threat is extremely serious.

That is another threat that will

continue to grow. We know he is out

there trying to develop nuclear capability.

That expands even more my

concerns about an expanding risk as we

continue to delay action.

We need to move forward. We need to

move forward quickly. The sooner we

get this resolved, the sooner we get the

support from the United Nations, we

can move forward, give the President

that option, a final option, that, if necessary,

he will go in, even unilaterally,

to protect the interests of the United

States, to protect the Americans, and,

if necessary, protect our friends and allies

in the Middle East.

There is a quote in the President’s

speech last night I will restate. He says

approving this resolution does not

mean military action is imminent or

unavoidable. The resolution will tell

the United Nations and all nations that

America speaks with one voice and is

determined to make the demands of

the civilized world mean something.

Congress will also be sending a message

to the dictator in Iraq that his only

choice is full compliance. That is key.

The time remaining for that choice is

limited. We need to act quickly. I am

glad we have this before the Senate. We

should have had it earlier than this

week, but hopefully we will get it out

this week and move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.