Mr. President, I

have listened with a great deal of interest

to this presentation. I think there

are a couple of clear points one can

make in response, and then I will comment.

We have been dealing with Saddam

Hussein with our men and women in

uniform for 12 years. We have been occupying

positions in the Middle East.

We have been flying over the regions

that Saddam has. We are flying the nofly

zones in the north and south of

Iraq. We had weapons inspectors in

there for the 12 years, until they were

kicked out 4 or 5 years ago. After Saddam

was kicked out of Kuwait, after

there was a United Nations agreement,

and after basically he agreed to an armistice,

and after inspectors, he said: I

will take out all weapons of mass destruction,

and I will turn them over to

the international community. And he

has not done that. We know that. He

has failed to do that.

We have had economic sanctions

against Iraq for a period of years now.

They have not worked. There is such a

sieve in the region that he is able to

get oil out and goods in without any

problem.

We have worked with the United Nations.

We had some 16 resolutions that

passed through the United Nations. It

is as if some of the debate on the floor

is that we are just now starting to try

to deal with Saddam Hussein, when I

think you have to look back over the

past 12 years. We have been dealing

with this dictator and this despot for 12

years in every way conceivable.

I think the conclusion most people

have is that 12 years ago we should

have gone into Baghdad and removed

him at that time. That is the real conclusion

people come to. Yet, for reasons

of the Congress or the international

community—whoever you

want to say in that point of time—

there was no agreement to kick him

out.

Since that time, it has not changed.

He is the same guy who has these

weapons of mass destruction. It has

just gotten worse in that period of 12

years.

I would analogize it to having cancer.

If you have cancer, you have a couple

of options: You can deal with it. You

can go in and have surgery to remove

the big areas that are spreading. You

can try to contain it for a period of

time through different therapies. Or

you can ignore it and just say: It does

not affect me today. I am fine today.

Saddam Hussein has chemical weapons.

He has biological weapons. He is

working on nuclear weapons. He has

missile capacity to deliver all of these.

That is the cancer that exists. We

can say we feel fine today; we are fine.

What if he decides to launch any one of

those? What if he does it not at military

targets but at civilian targets, at

one of our allies, or even at us? Are we

fine then? I can just see us having a

commission after that period of time

asking: Why didn’t we catch these terrorists?

We were working on Iraqi soil

before they attacked the United

States. We should have gone in there.

Did we not know enough? Were we not

sufficiently concerned about it in a

similar way that we are having hearings

now about why we didn’t do things

prior to September 11? Did we see the

clues and the situation building up

prior to the Twin Towers and the Pentagon

being hit? Did we not see this

coming?

Let us apply that same standard to

Saddam Hussein and the nexus he provides

between the weapons of mass destruction

and terrorists. They are

clearly there. I just articulated the

weapons of mass destruction that he

has. He is also working on such things

as smallpox. We think he may be trying

to do something with that. He is

working on all sorts of things. Yes.

Weapons of mass destruction.

What about the terrorist connection

that is there? Abu Nidal’s organization

was headquartered there for a period of

time. He just died, or he was killed recently,

for whatever reason. Al-Qaida

leadership is in Iraq. Hussein has

worked closely with a number of terrorist

organizations in and on his soil.

They are there. You have the mix of

these two sitting side by side—a toxic

mix that the United States cannot

countenance.

I respect a number of people who

think this isn’t the way we do things.

Democracies have real difficulty declaring

war. That is a very good thing.

This is just something we don’t like.

We want somebody to come and hit at

us first, before we go on to war. You

can look through the history of the

United States and the acts where we

were hit and then we responded. That

is the way we are most comfortable in

dealing with these tough, difficult

issues about whether you go to war

with a foreign nation. It is good that

we wrestle with that and with this situation.

It is like in the old television show

‘‘Gunsmoke.’’ At the end of the

‘‘Gunsmoke’’ episode every week, it

ended the same way: Matt Dillon walks

out on the main street of Dodge City.

The bad guy walks out on the street on

the other end. They stare at each other

for a little while. The bad guy has a

chance to walk off, if he wants to. He

also gets to draw first. He draws first.

Then Matt Dillon draws. The bad guy

goes down. There is a sense of fair play

and honor about that. There is a set of

rules. The bad guy gets to shoot first,

but you are going down in the process.

If you are going to do that; you have a

chance to walk away. If you decide not

to, that is your choice.

That is the way we like to do things,

because there is a sense of, Do we really

want to bother somebody else to this

degree? Is this the right thing to do?

Saddam Hussein doesn’t operate that

way. The terrorists today don’t operate

with those same sorts of rules of decorum

in operation, and the rules of boxing,

if you will.

These are people who don’t go out on

Main Street with Matt Dillon. They

sneak around behind buildings and try

to get at innocent people and women

and children. They don’t go straight at

our military. They attack people in civilian

positions. Their object is to disrupt.

It is not to protect a nation state.

It is not to confront the military. It is

to kill as many civilians as they can.

Can we afford, in that type of atmosphere

and that new way of operating,

to have terrorists force us to sit back

and say: OK? Are we going to wait

until somehow they attack us, or try

to get botulism in our food supply, or

try to get anthrax into a broad area of

the United States, or one of our allies,

or try to make a weapon with smallpox,

and then we will go at them?

The cost of doing that is to spread a

cancer; the deaths of many people. This

is not something we can countenance.

It is not something—when my primary

duty and the primary duty of the elected

Members of this body is to provide

for the national defense—that we can

countenance. It is not something we

can do.

I want to read from some testimony

Henry Kissinger gave 2 weeks ago before

the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that his entire

testimony be printed in the

RECORD after my comments.

Mr. President,

former Secretary Kissinger is probably

one of the best minds, if not the best

mind, in foreign policy in the world. He

dealt with the cold war. He was directly

involved in that, and he has been

a very astute student. And now he is a

student of what takes place today in

the war on terrorism that we have. Listen

to just a couple paragraphs of what

he says about these weapons of mass

destruction in the hands of a country

that also works with and provides support

and housing for terrorists. He says

this:

There he is speaking of the entire

Middle East.

He points out in this statement that

he thinks going at Iraq will have a very

positive impact on terrorism, and if we

do not go at Iraq, our war against terrorism

will just devolve into an intelligence

operation, and that would be

the likely continued status of it.

He handles another argument. I will

read another quote from Secretary Kissinger:

That is what Secretary Kissinger

goes on to say in this presentation. He

argues that this is an essential part of

the war against terrorism, if we are to

effectively deal with this terrorist

threat and the problem that we have.

And not to overrepeat this, but I do not

think one can overrepeat it. It is a little

bit like a doctor’s prescription dealing

with your health where you are,

and here are the possible problems you

have.

Here is what we know that Saddam

Hussein has.

Gaps identified by UNSCOM in Iraqi

accounting and current production capabilities

strongly suggest that Iraq

maintains stockpiles of chemical

agents, probably VX, sarin, cyclosarin,

and mustard.

UNSCOM reported to the U.N. Security

Council in April 1995 that Iraq had

concealed its biological weapons program

and had failed to account for 3

tons of growth material for biological

agents.

In 2001, an Iraqi defector reported visiting

some 20 secret facilities in Iraq

for chemical, biological, and nuclear

weapons.

Saddam continues to pursue nuclear

weapons, and has used chemical weapons

against his own people, as well as

his neighbors.

I do not think I need to remind people

about what he has done in his region.

He has attacked Iran, invaded

Kuwait, and he has launched missiles

at Saudi Arabia and Israel. That is why

we will have had, and have today,

strong allies in the region opposed to

Saddam Hussein continuing.

I want to look at the positive, the upside

of dealing with Saddam Hussein.

We have a lot of difficulty, a lot of potential

problems to deal with, but what

happens if you get Saddam Hussein out

of power?

I think there are significant, positive

steps moving forward in that region.

It is interesting to note that from

1920 until the late 1950s, Iraq had a constitutional

monarchy, a bihouse parliament

that had authority over budgets

and ministers. They have a history

of some democracy. It was not the level

of democracy we have, but they have

that in their historical background.

Ten percent of the world’s oil supplies

are located in Iraq. They have an

educated urban population. They will

embrace and encourage and move forward

with democracy on a rapid basis.

Now, it is not going to be completely

free of any hitches, but I think the potential

in developing an active, vibrant,

working democracy in Iraq is

significantly greater and higher than

what we are seeing in the situation in

Afghanistan, which is moving forward

but with a lot of difficulty. They do not

have the natural resources to build.

They do not have a historical basis of

democracy with which to work. They

have a number of warlords in the area,

which does not exist in Iraq.

There is reason to believe that the

upside potential with Iraq, and the

spread of democracy and human rights

and religious freedoms and pluralism

will be significant in Iraq. And that

will spread throughout that region.

These are a set of values, of human values,

for which the United States stands

and has stood for years, and we have

been very positive in this. Yet we have

not pushed this set of values generally

in that region of the world, in the Islamic

region of the world.

There is something like 49 countries

and 2 democracies in that region of the

world. And a number of people wonder

why there is the push for human rights,

democracy, and religious freedom everywhere

else and not there. And we

have kind of hemmed and hawed and

‘‘well, I don’t know,’’ and we have allies

there, and we are dependent on the

oil, and we don’t want to upset things

in the region.

The truth is, we need to stand for the

things there that we stand for everywhere

else. And if we do that, and push

that in Iraq, it is going to be a flower

that will bloom there in the desert. It

is going to show the way to a number

of countries. It is going to involve the

people. And the people are going to be

able to grow and possess that beauty of

liberty that they seek and know and

want. We will be able to help put it forward

and move it into action in that

region.

These are very difficult times for us.

There are difficult times in the region.

But I think the question clearly before

us is whether we should move forward.

I think the answer is definitely yes,

that we should move forward.

This is a time for us to be very humble

and wise about what we need to do

and definite about how we move forward.

We do not make this choice

lightly, nor without the understanding

that with this action comes difficult

consequences to some of our finest citizens

in the Armed Forces and potentially

of terrorist attacks to our allies

and to us.

We would do well to remember the

words of Psalm 140:

Once again, we have come to deal

with a very difficult situation where

we are called upon to stand up to the

threats of evil and tyranny—something

we have had to do many times in the

history of this wonderful Nation. As

daunting as this is, it is not a responsibility

we can shirk. Saddam has made

the case against himself. He has buried

himself with his own lips and his own

actions. We cannot ignore this. And we

should not put off for another year, or

a few, a difficult matter that will only

get worse. If we do not take this action

now, we are unlikely to any time in the

near future. Now is the time for us to

act.

I support the bipartisan resolution

authorizing the President to use force

in Iraq. I hope all the American public

is praying for us, and praying about

this for wisdom, for protection, for limited

loss of life, and for the right thing

to be done.

This is a tough moment. It is a different

stage for us. It is a ways and

means of handling something we have

not done in the past where we go in and

try to take care of a situation before it

kills many people. We need those prayers

for wisdom and wise action.

I urge my colleagues to support this

resolution, this bipartisan resolution

authorizing the President to use force

in Iraq.

I yield the floor.