Madam President,

the Senate will be in a period for morning

business until 10 a.m., with the

time equally divided between the two

leaders or their designees. Following

morning business, the Senate will return

to the Estrada nomination, with

the time equally divided between the

chairman and ranking member of the

Judiciary Committee or their designees.

At 10:30, the Senate will vote on

the motion to invoke cloture on this

important nomination. If cloture is not

invoked on the nomination, the Senate

will resume consideration of the Moscow

Treaty. Additional amendments

are expected to the resolution of ratification.

Therefore, Senators should anticipate

votes throughout the day. The

Senate will complete action on the

Moscow Treaty this week.

I ask unanimous consent that the

time allocated for morning business be

equally divided between the majority

leader and the minority leader or their

designees.

That is my understanding.

Madam President,

seeing no one else here and being prepared

to yield as soon as someone

comes with a desire to speak, I will

take advantage of this opportunity to

make a few comments with respect to

the pending situation in Iraq.

Since I returned from last weekend

in Utah, I have become increasingly

aware of how anxious people are about

Iraq and the possibility of war in Iraq.

This anxiousness comes from those

who are supporters of the President as

well as those who are detractors of the

President. Some who have faith in the

President’s judgment and in his instincts

say, we will back him but we

are very concerned about the possibility

of going to war. Those who do

not have faith in the President’s political

judgment are almost beside themselves

with anger and anxiety that he

would go ahead in the face of what

they consider to be serious worldwide

opposition to the war.

As I look out at the situation, as best

I can I have tried to explain to them

what I see to help them understand

that which the Washington Post editorial

said last week; that is, the risks

of not going to war in the present circumstances

are probably greater than

the risks of going to war. Those who

are looking to the United States to exercise

leadership in this part of the

world—indeed, to free them from the

tyranny of Saddam Hussein—are just

as desperate that perhaps we might

back down as are those who fear that

war will come.

War is never an easy decision, and I

assure all of my constituents that this

President is not given to war simply as

something to do. That which we hear

in the press about this possibility is

clearly wrong; that is, the suggestion

that perhaps the President is going to

war in order to secure more oil for

America. I point out that if oil were

our motivation, war would be our last

option. We could simply turn to Saddam

Hussein, remove the sanctions,

make accommodations with him, and

say, go ahead and produce all the oil

you want and we will take advantage

of that and the impact of that on the

world oil market.

Nor does it have anything to do, as

some have suggested in the press, with

the desire on the part of this President

to somehow redeem the pledge that

was made by his father. All of this rewrites

history. George W. Bush—or

George Bush, the first, if I might use

that term—was operating under a series

of resolutions from the United Nations

that did not authorize him to invade

Iraq or go into Baghdad to remove

Saddam Hussein. The decision was

made, after examining the circumstances

on the battlefield, that the

mandate laid down by both the Congress

and the U.N. had been fulfilled

when the first George W. Bush had succeeded

in liberating Kuwait.

We can look back through the lens of

history and say that was a mistake in

terms of what happened in the area,

but by no means was it a circumstance

where we could say that the present

President Bush feels a need to somehow

revenge his father or atone for his

father. At the time, the decision was

made on the basis of the legal situation

and the best information available

from the battlefield. In hindsight, we

might say it was the wrong decision,

but under no circumstances can we say

that the first President Bush should be

criticized for having made it.

No, the reason we are going forward

in Iraq has to do with much more of

the American spirit and the American

tradition. America is not an imperial

power, in spite of the statements by

some of the people in the European

press. America does not seek Romantype

domination over other nations.

When America moves forward in war, it

is for one purpose only, and that is to

advance the cause of freedom. Usually,

it is to advance the cause of freedom in

America; that is, to preserve our citizens

from attack. That is an aspect of

the current situation.

Those who say, no, Iraq has never attacked

us are being blind to the interconnections

throughout the world of

the Middle East with respect to terror.

They say, we do not have a smoking

gun to prove absolutely that al-Qaida,

when they attacked the World Trade

Center and the Pentagon, was receiving

aid from Iraq. Those who are waiting

for that kind of absolute certainty before

they move ahead are not cognizant

of the intelligence information that is

available not only to those who have

attended classified briefings but, frankly,

to the whole world based on the

presentations made by Secretary Powell

at the U.N. and in other circumstances.

There can be no doubt that America

has been attacked, has been attacked

by those who have received sanctuary

in Iraq, and has been attacked by those

who will, if not stopped, come back at

us again and again and again. It is

their clear desire to drive the Americans

out of the Middle East through

military—if necessary, terrorist—tactics,

to see to it that we leave. When

we leave, what will be the legacy of

that decision? If we back out of our

military threat against Iraq, what will

we leave behind? Will we leave stability?

Will we leave freedom? Will we

leave prosperity? No. If we back out of

the region now, we will leave behind us

continued warfare, continued death,

continued poverty, and continued torture.

That is not the American tradition,

to turn our back on those circumstances

and walk away when there

is an opportunity to advance freedom,

liberty, prosperity, and peace.

I do not envy the President the challenge

of the decision he must make,

but I recognize America has traditionally,

when aroused, stood on the side of

moving ahead to protect liberty wherever

we can. If we do go ahead with

military action in Iraq in the face of

Saddam Hussein’s continuing refusal to

disarm, what, then, will be the legacy

we will leave behind when the entire

operation is finished? We can only look

at other American circumstances to

try to find the parallel. When we

moved into imperial Japan at the end

of the second world war, defeated the

Japanese military, what did we find? A

feudal system where women were not

only not allowed to vote but in many

cases were treated like property and

chattel, where slavery existed throughout

the empire, where property rights

were not available to any except those

who had been born to them—a feudal

society firmly mired in circumstances

of centuries before.

What did we leave behind when we

departed? A free nation that had women’s

suffrage, where slavery was abolished,

where property rights were

available to all, where the rule of law

existed in a democratic society. We

saw the Japanese rise to a level of prosperity

thereafter that made them the

second strongest economy in the world.

That was the legacy we left behind

when we achieved military victory.

When we won the Second World War,

we not only liberated those people who

considered themselves under the yoke

of foreign domination—the Dutch, the

French, the Belgians, et cetera—we

also liberated the Germans, who were

our enemies, and the Japanese, who

were our enemies. After the Second

World War, those who had been our adversaries

had a greater degree of freedom,

a greater degree of prosperity,

and a peace and calm in their circumstances

they did not have under

their previous regimes. They did not

live under American domination or

American legions left there as the Romans

would do. They lived there in

freedom and peace and were protected

by American military might from

those who would have attacked that

peace.

It is that history in America that

gives me confidence that President

Bush will do the right thing in Iraq. If

war becomes necessary because of Saddam

Hussein’s continued refusal to disarm

and his continued refusal to step

down and turn his country to freedom,

if war becomes necessary, the American

tradition says the legacy we will

leave behind will be one that our children

can be proud of and in which Iraqi

children can rejoice.

Let us not shrink from our responsibility

to be the protectors of freedom

and liberty throughout the world. And

let us not shrink from our responsibility

to protect America from those

who would attack us if we do not move

ahead.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence

of a quorum.