Mr. President, I want to

answer some of these questions about

why we are now considering a resolution

and what proof we have about

Iraq. Senator SARBANES and I are the

two delegates to the United Nations

this year for the House and Senate. I

was on the floor of the United Nations

General Assembly when the President

made his speech and presented his case

to the General Assembly. I have to say

I was so proud of him.

Before he even gave the speech, there

had been a lot of hype in the papers

that was unfavorable to him. When he

was introduced, the tension in the

crowd could be felt, and there was no

applause. I did learn later that there is

seldom applause when a head of state is

introduced.

When he gave his speech the body

language could be seen on the other

delegates. At the end of the speech—

also untypical—they gave him applause.

I also want to tell my colleagues

what happened after that. As we wandered

about and met other delegates,

we heard lots of positive comments

about what the President said. Not

only that, virtually every head of state

who followed him had the same message

for the U.N.: Be useful or be done.

That is the message that the President

delivered.

Why now? Right now because we are

trying to strengthen the resolve of the

United Nations. Discussions are going

on right now in the Senate and

throughout the nation about what

should be done with Iraq. We are the

ones who provide the leadership in this

country. We are the ones who set the

tone. We are the ones who have to approve

what the President is doing.

What proof do we have? I hope everyone

is attending the classified briefings

that are available. The things that are

not classified are enough to scare us.

The reports of Iraq that gave to the

United Nations show many chemical

weapons they had left at the end of the

war—their report, their numbers, their

chemicals, their weapons of bioterrorism.

Subtract out the numbers that

they destroyed, and we wind up with a

huge supply of chemical and biological

weapons. Weapons that could be used

against us now.

One of the things the other countries

of this world appreciate is the patience

our President had after September 11.

Bombs were going off in Afghanistan

that very night, and the press covering

it said: The United States is retaliating.

But it was not us. The President

was busy sending envoys to nations all

over the world, setting up a coalition—

the same kind of coalition we are being

asked about now. Some have asked:

Shouldn’t we see if there is a coalition

first? No. First we should show our resolve,

and then we can build coalitions.

This is the President who built coalitions.

This is the President who went

into Afghanistan with war plans, with

a method, with cooperation, and he did

in 1 month what Russia was not able to

do in 7 years. It is a President who

knows what he is doing. It is a President

with patience. Now he is asking us

to pass a resolution.

How strange and unheard of is this

request to pass a resolution? In 1998, a

Republican-controlled Senate for a

Democrat President recognized that

this was not Democrat versus Republican.

We then said that it was very important

to bring up a resolution that

would show our resolve. That is exactly

what a resolution does—show resolve.

We passed a resolution in 1 day. We

passed a resolution with no amendments.

The President asked us. We did

it. We showed unity. We showed the

country we were behind the President

and we were ready to do whatever was

necessary for the same despot we are

talking about now.

Do we think he has gotten better?

No. He has gotten worse. Do we think

he has gotten less prepared? No. He has

gotten more prepared. It is time we did

something about it, and time we did it

through the right channels—that is exactly

what the President is doing. Part

of that process is to ask us, ask Congress,

to help.

In 1998, we did it with no questions.

We did it with no amendments. We did

it with no filibuster. What do we have

in the Senate today? We have a filibuster.

We have amendments. We have

people giving all kinds of excuses so

they can vote against an amendment

that is necessary to get the resolve of

the Security Council. That way the

United Nations will have the backbone

to say to this despot, this tyrant, this

killer of babies, that it is time he

straightened out, got rid of his chemical

weapons, got rid of his biological

weapons, and let us in to make sure

there were not any nuclear weapons. It

is time he becomes part of the community

of nations or gets out of office. It

is that simple.

If we could do pass a resolution for

Bill Clinton, we ought to be able to do

it for President Bush. Again, I want to

remind my colleagues of the patience

and resolve we had going into Afghanistan.

I think parts of this discussion

came up from the fact that somebody

heard that we had plans for attacking

Iraq. Well, we better have. We have a

Defense Department that we pay a lot

of money to plan for events so that

they never happen. They have a plan

on Iraq, and they have a plan on another

dozen countries.

Every once in awhile, we even have

exercises or war games so our Defense

Department can see how to move people

and have the right equipment in

the right place at the right time. That

way we know that the training is good

for the people we have in the armed

services. Anybody who commits to the

service of this country must be assured

that we are also committed to providing

them with the training and everything

under the Sun we can give

them to keep them safe. Keep them

safe so they can do their job and to

com home alive. That is absolutely essential.

Today we have half a dozen amendments,

we have substitutes amendments

to substitute amendment. We do

have a resolution, a resolution the

President asked us to pass. It is one

that is considerably more detailed and

one that has more hoops to jump

through than the one we approved in

1998. This is the resolution we need to

pass. We must give President Bush the

authority we gave President Clinton in

1998 without limiting authority or

amendments.

In July of 1998, as I mentioned, we

considered a resolution urging the

President to take appropriate action to

bring Iraq in compliance with international

obligations. The Senate debated

that for one day, without amendments.

We approved the resolution by

unanimous consent. That means no one

objected and no one wanted to add an

amendment. We just said yes. The

House debated that one for day, had no

amendments, and approved it by a vote

of 407 to 6.

In October of 1998, we considered legislation

that, in addition to authorizing

the President to provide assistance

to the Iraqi democratic opposition,

declared it should be the policies

of the United States to seek the removal

of Saddam Hussein’s regime and

replace it with a democratic government.

What did we do on that? The

Senate debated that legislation for one

day without amendments and we approved

it by unanimous consent. Once

again, no one wanted to amend it, no

one disagreed. We gave President Clinton

the authority. The House debated

that legislation for one day and approved

it by a vote of 360 to 38. One day

in each Chamber—one day in each Republican-

controlled Chamber giving

authority to a Democratic president.

One day in 1998. How many days will it

take in 2002? We are already days into

debate. How many days are needed by

my colleagues to undermine the ability

of the United States to address a security

threat?

The President has been criticized for

asking for a Congressional resolution

prior to achieving a United Nations Security

Council resolution. I believe the

United Nations does have an important

role in the future of Iraq. If the UN

does its job, and member states do

what is right, we can address the

threat within the realm of the United

Nations, which I am sure would be everyone’s

preference. As an independent

nation, however, the United States

cannot sit idly by while the Security

Council debates the validity of pledges

made by a known liar. If the General

Assembly and Security Council are not

prepared to defend the security of the

world and the legitimacy of this organization,

the United States must be

prepared to act. A strong resolution

with strong support is the best effort to

prevent a war later. Afghanistan made

the U.S. credible. It proved our patience

and capability. Those traits go a

long way to moving Saddam—as long

as Congress shows resolve and then the

UN shows resolve.

It is also important to note that the

passage of a Congressional Resolution

would not prevent the Administration

from continuing its work at the United

Nations. Rather, I believe it will help

the President gain support for an appropriate

Security Council resolution.

As Congress, our actions must show a

united front with the strong resolve of

the American people. We will not wait

to be attacked. We will not wait for inaction

and discord. We will not tolerate

an Iraqi President who flouts the authority

of an organization only to

cower under its umbrella when convenient.

Saddam Hussein is not crazy or an

idiot. He is dangerous because he is

cunning and very calculated. Repeatedly,

he pushes the international community

to the brink point and then

backs down and says—sure, let the

weapons inspectors come back. How

many times are we going to let him

play this game? Do we wait for him to

attack with nuclear, chemical, or biological

weapons? Do we wait for yet another

international inspector team to

be denied access to weapons stockpiles?

Do we wait for another attack on the

United States? Iraq has a despot leader,

chemical and biological weapons,

and a proven willingness to use anything.

Iraq is the only country in the

world with all three components. We

must have changes immediately or regret

it soon.

Many have asked why now, and I

must ask why have we not acted sooner?

We have considered action in Iraq

before. We decided in 1991 that we

should defend Kuwait. We sent in

planes and bombs in 1998 and brought

the inspectors home, but we have been

silent since then. It is worthwhile to

look at a few of the 16 Security Council

resolutions that Saddam has chosen to

ignore:

Resolution 687, adopted April 3, 1991,

called for Iraq to accept the destruction,

removal or rendering harmless of

all chemical and biological weapons

and unconditionally agree not to acquire

or develop nuclear weapons or

nuclear-weapons useable material;

Resolution 707, adopted August 15,

1991, condemned Iraq’s violation of Resolution

687, adopted only four months

before;

Resolution 1051, adopted March 27,

1996, called for Iraq to comply with

weapons inspectors;

Resolution 1115, adopted June 21,

1997, condemned the repeated refusal of

Iraqi authorities to allow access to UN

inspectors; and

Resolution 1194, adopted September

9, 1998, condemned the decision by Iraq

to suspend cooperation with inspectors

and oppose its obligations under Security

Council resolutions.

In 1991, we knew Saddam Hussein was

producing weapons of mass destruction.

We knew it in 1995. We knew it in

1998. We know now—he has these weapons

today. There is no reason he would

stop producing them—no one has been

there to stop him. The United States

and Great Britain have been enforcing

the no-fly zones, but no one has been

enforcing Saddam’s commitments to

disarm. No one can believe he would

simply stop producing these evil weapons

out of the goodness of his heart.

When and if we do use our armed

forces, we must show one of the vast

differences between the US and Saddam:

a value for human life. To him,

soldiers are expendable. To us, each

and every life has value and worth.

Any military action inherently puts

the lives of our brave soldiers at risk,

and the American people know this far

too well, but we must explore all possibilities

and attempt to act with as little

American and even Iraqi lives lost

as possible.

When Congress approved authorization

for forays into Iraq in 1998, in one

days debate, no amendments, former

President Clinton, said, ‘‘Let there be

no doubt, we are prepared to act.’’ This

is the same message we are again debating

today. We must allow this

President—President George Bush—to

stand up and say ‘‘We are prepared to

act.’’ He must be able to state that to

our allies with the authority and Congressional

support, without limitation,

that we gave in 1998.

When we act with our allies or

through the United Nations, we should

go into Iraq with a plan—actually, several

plans: a plan for how to disarm

Saddam and his guard; a plan for how

to remove Saddam from power; a plan

for when and how American troops

should leave Iraq. The United States,

however, should not have a plan for installation

of a hand-picked successor.

The Iraqi people must ultimately

choose their leader. The United States

and the international community must

work with the people of Iraq just as we

worked with the people of Afghanistan.

If we choose a leader for Iraq, we will

not be allowing the Iraqis to form an

independent and democratic nation.

The United States should have a plan

for encouraging the various factions to

work together, but we cannot choose a

future leader before the battle begins.

The President and Congress have

both been accused of trying to politicize

the issue of Iraq. This is not a political

issue. It wasn’t in 1998 and

should not be now. It is an issue of national

security and international stability.

The truth is respected individuals

from both parties have expressed

support for taking action and, more

importantly, support having a plan for

action. On September 12 this year,

former Senator Bob Kerry, a Democrat

from Nebraska, wrote in the Wall

Street Journal, ‘‘The real choice is between

sustaining a military effort designed

to contain Saddam Hussein and

a military effort designed to replace

him.’’ He also pointed out that the

United States has spent more than a

billion dollars in the last 11 years on

simply containing Saddam. What return

have the American people received

from that investment? Saddam

is still in power, the Iraqi people are

still oppressed, and the security and

stability of the region are still threatened.

This is the choice we have today. Do

we keep the status quo and continue to

spend money without any change in

Iraq or do we authorize the President

to take action and make some

changes? I support change. Without

any serious action by either the United

States or the international community,

we are telling Saddam that his

game can go on. He stays where he is

and continues his shell game. We lose

again. Saddam is more than willing to

keep the game going as long as the

United States and the world are willing

to lose.

The people of Iraq, the people of the

United States, and the people of the

world have not need for the leadership

of Saddam Hussein—we can all agree

on that. If he cannot abide by his international

obligations and if he will not

disarm then, simply put, he needs to

go. We need to be rid of him and the

President needs the authority to use

armed forces to remove Saddam if necessary.

I firmly believe that firm resolve

under this resolution—this resolution

that does give some pretty broad powers—

will keep us from having to go to

war.

Without it, I think we may have to

go to war.

I hope my colleagues will join me in

supporting the language included in

the Lieberman-Warner substitute without

any amendments—just as we did

for President Clinton in 1998—with the

same resolve, with the same unity, and

with the same straightforwardness we

had then.

We can’t quite do that, though, can

we? We have already debated a couple

of days. We have already had amendments

put in. But we can still have the

kind of unity we need to show our resolve

so we can get the U.N. to do

something which will keep us from

going to war.

I yield the floor.