Mr. President, I have

time tomorrow to speak, too. I will

make a much longer speech on my

views on this subject.

There used to be a trial lawyer I

practiced law under. I used to sit in the

counsel chair next to him and watch

how he tried cases. He used to say to

the jury, when he started the case, his

opening statement, he would say: I

want you to keep your eye on the ball.

I want you to focus on the issue at

hand.

He would turn to his client, who

sometimes was not the most admirable

of people, who may have been innocent

but not admirable. And he would say: I

want you to take a look at my client.

You wouldn’t invite my client home for

dinner. You wouldn’t want your daughter

going out with my client. As a matter

of fact, I wouldn’t even go have a

cup of coffee with him after this. The

question is not whether or not he is a

homely guy or a bad guy, or whether or

not he is a guy who you would like to

have as a friend.

The question is, did he kill Cock

Robin? Keep your eye on the ball. What

is going to happen here is you are

going to have the State coming in saying

this is a bad guy. He is an ugly guy.

Look at him, he doesn’t dress very

well. Look at him, he is not very amiable.

Keep your eye on the ball.

Just listening to my friend from Kansas

and others today, I think we are

kind of taking our eye off the ball. Tomorrow

I will go into this in great detail.

But let’s remind ourselves why are

we here right now. Why are we here,

notwithstanding the fact Senator

LIEBERMAN and Congressman GEPHARDT

went down and stood with the

President of the United States and said

they adopted a resolution? That is not

why we are here today. We are not here

because of that. We are here because of

what the President told us. Everybody

remember, keep your eye on the ball.

The President said he has not decided

whether or not we are going to go to

war. He said it is his hope that we not

go to war. It is his hope it can be avoided.

Yet, for the first time in the history

of the United States of America,

in my judgment, the President of the

United States is asking for the Congress

to give him the equivalent of a

declaration of war—to go to war—before

the President has made up his

mind. He has not made up his mind.

Keep your eye on the ball. Follow the

bouncing ball like in the old Lawrence

Welk days. A, the President has not decided

whether or not to go to war; B,

the President says give me the authority

to go to war; C, we say on what

basis do you want to go to war, Mr.

President?

The details matter. If, for example,

we leave here, setting a precedent, suggesting

the reason we might go to war

is because of this new doctrine of preemption,

which no one has explained—

no one has explained it. I sat at the

White House, I say to my friend from

Virginia, with Dr. Rice for hours. Dr.

Rice said it is no different than what

has always been the policy of the U.S.

Well, if that is the case, then I don’t

have any problem. The President always

has the right to act preemptively

if we are in imminent danger. If they

are coming up over the hill, he can respond;

if troops are coming out of Tijuana,

heading north, we can respond;

if they are coming down from Toronto,

we can respond; if missiles are on their

way, we can respond. But that is not

the way I hear it being used here. We

are talking about preemption, as if we

are adopting a policy. As Dr. Kissinger

said before our committee, that will

undo an agreement the Western World

made in the early 1640s at the end of

the religious wars in Europe, which

said no country has a right to preemptively

move against another country

because they think they are going to

be bad guys.

So this is a pretty big deal. Words

matter. And so I say to my friends,

let’s go back. Why did the President

ask us for a resolution when he sent up

the draft resolution? Why? He stated

forthrightly why. He said: Because I

need to demonstrate that I have support

in order not to go to war. That is

what he said. He said: You, the Congress,

give me overwhelming support.

Then the U.N. will know I mean it.

Then the Security Council will say if

we don’t, he will, so we better. That is

the reason why we are here. That is the

reason, I remind my colleague from

Connecticut and my friend from Virginia,

why we are here. Otherwise, it is

ridiculous—a President saying I don’t

know whether I want to go to war yet,

but declare it.

So I hope people don’t start confusing

things on this floor. I may not

be around here after November—I hope

I am; I am up for reelection, but I don’t

want to be on this floor 6 years from

now and have someone stand up and inaccurately

say, by the way, back in the

year 2002, in October, we adopted a policy

of preemption. Therefore, even

though we are in no imminent danger,

even though there is no violation of

any international rule, we think the

country of Xanadu are bad guys and we

are invading. That would be a serious

mistake. Let me tell you why—not because

as an American and as President,

if I were President, or as a Senator, or

as a Congressman, I would like to have

that ability. But, guess what, I don’t

want Beijing waking up one morning

and saying, you know, we have a right

to preemptively attack Taiwan. I don’t

want India waking up one morning and

saying, by the way, we have a right

preemptively to attack Pakistan. In

case you are all wondering—and I know

my colleagues are not, because they

know the score and they are thinking

about both of those things—both of

those countries could conceivably

reach that conclusion. It’s not an impossibility,

if the most powerful Nation

in the world establishes an unnecessary

doctrine. So let’s keep our eye on the

ball.

Why are we being asked to do this—

to give the President the kind of momentum

he needs to allow the Secretary

of State to convince the Security

Council to do what they should do

in the first place?

The second point I would like to

make is this: We are, right now, talking

about preemption, when there is no

need for any doctrine of preemption to

justify us going against Iraq with others,

or alone, if need be. Let’s get the

facts straight. There is a guy named

Saddam Hussein who, in the early

1990s, broke international law, invaded

another country, violating every rule

of international law. The world, under

the leadership of a President named

Bush, united and expelled him from

that country. Upon expulsion, he said a

condition for your being able to remain

in power, Saddam Hussein, is you sue

for peace and you agree to the following

terms of surrender. Those terms

of surrender, unlike with the Treaty of

Versailles and other treaties where surrender

comes about, were in the form

of concessions to the U.N., to the

world. So he signed onto a number of

resolutions.

If the world decides it must use force

for his failure to abide by the terms of

surrender, then it is not preempting, it

is enforcing. It is enforcing, it is finishing

a war he reignited, because the

only reason the war stopped is he sued

for peace.

So, for Lord’s sake, anybody who decides

to vote for this resolution, please

do not rest it on this cockamamie notion

of preemption. You will rue the

day. If that is the precedent we establish

for our own safety’s sake, you will

rue the day.

The third point I want to make about

keeping your eye on the ball here is—

the fact of the matter is the President

of the United States has not yet, A,

made the decision about going to war

and, B, if he decides to go to war, he

has not made the case to the American

people.

Let me explain what I mean by that

before my colleagues jump all over it.

He made a clear case to the U.N. that

by the standards of the United Nations,

this man, Saddam Hussein, has flouted

the rules of the U.N.—absolutely an

overwhelming case. Then he came

along on Monday and he made a clear

case, in the minds of many, to the

American people that Saddam Hussein

is a danger to the United States.

But there is one more case he has to

make. Those of us out of the generation

of Vietnam, and those who were in

power during the generation of Vietnam,

know that no matter how well articulated,

no matter how well formulated

a foreign policy is, it cannot be

sustained without the informed consent

of the American people. What is

being asked of them? The American

people do not know what is going to be

asked of them yet.

I am fully confident if the President

decides, in concert with others, war is

necessary, he will have to inform them

before he launches it. I say that because

he personally told me that. I

asked him. My friend from Virginia

may have been at the leadership meeting

3 weeks ago in the cabinet room

when the President turned to me after

others had spoken and said, ‘‘Mr.

Chairman, will you be with me?’’ I

said, ‘‘Mr. President, I will be with you

on the condition that you do two

things: One, you make every effort possible

to do this under the auspices of

the U.N. or the coalition, like we did in

Kosovo; and you inform the American

people that it is going to require substantial

American forces and substantial

American money to stay in Iraq

after Saddam Hussein is down.’’ He

looked at me in the presence of everybody

and said, ‘‘I will do that.’’ So I

take him at his word.

I lay you 8 to 5, if you go home and

ask your constituents who say they are

for war—ask them the following question:

How long do you think we are

going to have to keep American forces

in Iraq? I will lay you 8 to 5 that 90 percent

will look at you with a blank

stare and ask: What do you mean, stay

in Iraq? What are you talking about,

stay in Iraq? They have no notion. Senator

DODD, Senator SARBANES, and I,

and the Foreign Relations Committee

held several very good hearings. At one

hearing, we had the fellow who headed

up the office in the Pentagon as to

what we do after we win the war—planning.

We had two other military experts.

Do my colleagues know what they

told us? They probably told you the

same thing in Armed Services Committee.

It is probable we will have to

keep at least 75,000 American forces in

Iraq for at least 1 year at a cost of $19

billion. Maybe it will not be 75,000.

Maybe it will be 25,000; maybe 105,000. I

do not know. But we have an obligation

to tell our constituents.

As I said to my good friend, Mr.

BROWNBACK, who is on our committee,

in one of our hearings: Everything may

go smoothly. And I think there is a

possibility it could happen. If we have

to go to war, everything may go

smoothly, and once he is down and does

not use chemical weapons, the army

surrenders and the Republican Guard

crumbles, and he is assassinated on the

way out of town, and we get our hands

on the weapons of mass destruction

quickly, we identify where they are, we

destroy them, and the rest of the world

comes in to help us with the burden of

keeping Iraq from splitting into at

least three separate pieces—that could

all happen. That is possible.

What happens if it does not? Big nations

cannot bluff. We should tell the

American people straight up, and I am

prepared to do it and support it: If, in

fact, we are forced to go into Iraq with

other nations, for his failure to comply,

say goodbye for a while to the new

permanent tax cut; say goodbye for a

while to significant increases in health

care funding; say goodbye for a while

to a whole lot of issues for those who

vote for this.

This is the time for a little honesty

in advertising. This is the time the

American people are strong, they are

bright, and they are willing to take

this on. The one thing I believe they

will not stand for is being sold a bill of

goods. We are not stopping 400 miles

short of Baghdad this time if we go. We

are not. The Senator from West Virginia

has said repeatedly, this is a considerable

undertaking.