Thank you very

much.

So one could write at length about

the parallels in our country’s history

and how it relates to today. Then follow

every war we have been in, and

then ask, What country is the most

just throughout its history? Would

there be any question? It would be the

United States. Yet, we have people saying

we shouldn’t get involved in this,

as if we are some big bamboozling

country wrought on doing damage. History

will tell us and tell the world that

that is not why America would get involved

in this situation. Isn’t that

right? Historically, the United States

has only used military force when we

can do some good. We stand for some

principle or concept that we really

think is tremendous—in this case, democracy

versus dictatorship, democracy

and freedom versus the kind of

despicable character about whom our

President has been speaking to us for a

long time. The world is seeing a new

kind of war that started with the destruction

of our towers and our Pentagon.

This war has its origins right there in

that Middle East where, if action is not

taken, humankind is going to have

some big problems. And I concluded

that if we want to make sure our military

personnel are safe, we would have

to get them out of the Middle East,

bring them all home. But guess what?

If we did that there would be a war in

the Middle East without question. It

would not take Saddam Hussein very

long before he would attack Israel. And

if he wasn’t successful, who else might

join to help him? Perhaps two or three

other nations who would be willing to

take up arms against Israel. So I believe

there is a real reason for us to

work through the United Nations to

try to bring peace to that area.

So I do not intend to go into all the

details about the threat Iraq poses,

rather, I just want to talk about the

conclusions I tried to draw about dealing

with that threat. One that I just

talked to Senator FRIST about, is that

we are probably as good a nation as

any in the world to decide that action

needs to be taken. I have also concluded

that to be successful, we had

better give our President the authority

he needs to act. In this way can better

negotiate so as to maintain the peace.

I guess I am going to stop for a

minute and ask, is something going on

I should know about? I have 20 minutes

to speak. If people are not waiting, I

am going to speak for 20 minutes.

Mr. President, I say

to the Senator from Tennessee, I am

delighted to have found you on the

floor just before my remarks. As always,

you eloquently in describing

what terrible things this man can

wrought on this world and how we need

to be careful. If we are going to get involved,

we ought to be prepared. And

what I added tonight, is that if we are

going to do anything about it, we have

to give our President the authority he

needs. And he may well need our Army,

our military to do it.

So, Mr. President, I rise today in support

of the Lieberman-Warner-Bayh-

McCain amendment because I am convinced

that without clear authority to

act decisively, it is not possible for the

President of the United States to effectively

confront the growing threat in

Iraq.

As I just said in talking with my

friend from Tennessee, I do not think it

is going to be very effective for us to

say: Mr. President, stay involved, go to

the U.N., talk to everybody about the

despicable character who is now the

head of Iraq.

I don’t think that is going to do anything

if the President is not backed up

with real authority to take military

action. I don’t want our President to

engage in an effort that, from the

onset, will not allow him to achieve

intervention by the U.N. with a resolution

of consequence.

What I want for the American people

is for our President to be able to effectively

work with the U.N. to the maximum

extent, as this resolution allows.

This resolution makes certain that if

the United States is involved, our

President, after trying negotiations—

and the words are voluminous on how

hard he must try to resolve this matter

peacefully and to keep Congress informed,

he must give us reports—that

he has the strength of the U.S. military

if that does not work. And, frankly,

I repeat, I think that is more apt to

preserve peace than if we do not give

the President the power.

I am concerned that the world is already

set up for a major war in the

Middle East. And the only way to prevent

it is to give our President the authority

he needs to negotiate effectively,

to go to the U.N., to go to our

friends, to use diplomacy, but to be

ready to say: The people of the United

States, through our Congress, gave me

authority to do more than that. They

gave me authority to intervene and use

the full power of the United States.

Maybe while they

are gone, and the only one here is Senator

BYRD, I could ask unanimous consent

that I have an additional hour.

I am just joking, so you don’t have to

object.

In any event, it is clear to me that in

the absence of this authority, Saddam

Hussein will continue to assume that

America’s warnings are not serious. He

will continue with all manner of delay

and defiance, and he will continue to

buy time for further development of

weapons of mass destruction. And that

is what we are talking about.

Mr. President, while I will associate

myself with the technical remarks of

my friend, the doctor from Tennessee, I

know a little bit about nuclear weapons.

It is my subcommittee on appropriations

that funds them, and has for

the last 61⁄2 years. So I know a little bit

about that.

But I also remember when we went

and talked to groups about weapons of

mass destruction, and we described gas

and biological weapons of mass destruction

by holding up a jar. It was

not like this glass I hold in my hand,

but what we actually used was a mayonnaise

jar, the size jar that most people

associate with a jar of mayonnaise

that you would have in a refrigerator.

And we held that up and said: If you

know how to make real poisonous gas,

and real biological killers, you can put

them in a bottle this small. The chemistry

needed to produce these poisons

could be accomplished in a little room

about the size of a kitchen. And the destruction

that could be caused is beyond

perception.

So we will find that it is not as easy

as to deter these weapons as were nuclear

weapons for all the years we were

standing head to head and toe to toe

with the Soviet Union. We knew everything

about their nuclear weapons;

they knew everything about ours. But

this batch of terrorists, who are bent

on mass destruction, have us much

more over a barrel than the Soviet

Union did with nuclear weapons when

we faced mutual assured destruction,

sometimes called MAD, as the premise

that would prevent war.

So it is clear that weapons of mass

destruction are going to continue,

under the auspices and direction of the

scientists who have been brought into

Iraq, and be shipped around the world

by Iraqi leaders, to put these terrible

kinds of things in the hands of others,

who are the ‘‘minutemen’’ of Saddam

around the world.

So I say again, by enacting the resolution

that is before us, we emphasize

our resolve to act in the event that

Saddam impedes the work of U.N.

weapons inspections. We will emphasize

by this our resolve to act. So let’s

be clear. Saddam Hussein only understands

the language of force. This resolution

provides unambiguous authority

for the President to use force. It is this

authority, and Congress’s support, that

gives us the best hope of avoiding confrontation

in pursuit of Iraq’s disarmament.

So it is the expectation of New Mexicans

and all Americans that wherever

their President considers sending U.S.

troops to battle, that he does so in full

consultation with the Congress and our

allies in the war on terrorism. The

American people also expect that the

President will commit U.S. forces only

after diplomatic avenues have been exhausted.

And this resolution says that.

This resolution underscores those

concerns by imposing unambiguous responsibilities

on our President.

I am sure that resolution has been

read to the American people and those

watching us more than once.

But let me just state a couple of

them. Prior to using force or within 48

hours after exercising the authority,

the President is required to certify to

Congress that diplomatic and other

peaceful means cannot protect our national

security against the threat

posed by Iraq. Also, he must certify

that such means are not likely to bring

Iraq into compliance with all relevant

U.N. resolutions.

Second, only in the event that diplomatic

efforts fail and Iraq continues to

breach its international obligations

and the inspectors are given every opportunity

for unimpeded access, then

our President can use the military. He

doesn’t have to come back to us under

those circumstances.

Believe me, Saddam Hussein and his

military and his scientists will immediately

understand what it means if we

give our President the authority to use

force. There is no longer the delay in

communications. Iraq will know we are

serious, and we can be more effective in

our diplomacy. If it doesn’t work, we

leave it in the hands of our President.

Some observers think this resolution

gives the President too much authority.

In fact, the resolution gives the

President no more authority than he

already has as Commander in Chief to

provide for the national security for

the United States. What the resolution

does is to recognize the clear and

present danger of Saddam Hussein with

weapons of mass destruction. It says he

is a weapon of mass destruction. It

calls the President to exercise this authority

as a last resort, and only in the

event that all negotiations are fruitless,

and with the added condition that

he explain his actions to the Congress.

I believe the best way to prevent the

Middle East, in this moment of history,

from exploding into a war is for us to

recognize how important we are to

achieving peace, how important it is

that we ask our President to be our instrument

of peace in this very troubled

part of the world.

Even a person as culpable and as

lacking in human decency as Saddam

Hussein will understand that our President,

once given the proper authority,

will take all necessary action to ensure

the security of America and humankind

against the destruction of weapons

of mass destruction. I believe he is

far less likely to unleash weapons of

mass destruction when he knows that

the American military, with the full

support of Congress, is poised to stand

in his way.

We have just today approved the biggest

Defense bill ever in the history of

America. We have given the President

most of what he asked for in that bill.

I believe it could not be worse news for

Saddam Hussein than to learn that the

U.S. Congress has approved the money

needed to bolster our military and

then, to learn shortly thereafter, that

it has approved a resolution giving our

President the real authority he needs

to use military force to disarm Iraq. I

believe this is the best way to secure

peace.

I yield the floor.