Madam President,

there is an interesting turn of events.

Those who were looking for a debate on

the war in Iraq had best turn to CSPAN

and witness the question period

in London before the British House of

Commons. I have been watching it. It

is a fascinating debate.

Tony Blair is defending his position

in support of the United States. His

own party is divided. The conservatives

support him. The questioning is very

tough. In the course of defending his

position, some important questions are

being asked and answered in the British

House of Commons.

If you would expect the same thing

here in the U.S. Congress, you might be

surprised or disappointed to learn it is

not taking place. What is taking place

is speeches on the floor by individual

Senators. Today, I have seen Senator

BYRD of West Virginia, Senator DAYTON

of Minnesota, Senator KENNEDY of

Massachusetts. Others have come to

the floor to speak about the war in

Iraq. But there has literally been no

active debate on this issue on Capitol

Hill, in the United States of America,

since last October.

The reason, of course, is that last October

we enacted a use of force resolution

which virtually gave to the President

of the United States the authority

to declare war and execute it against

Iraq at the time and place of his choosing.

I was one of 23 Senators who voted

against that resolution, believing that

there were better ways to achieve our

goals, and that if Congress did that, we

would be giving to this President the

greatest delegation of authority to

wage war ever given to a President.

The time that has intervened since

the passage of that resolution has proven

me right. Congress has had no voice.

Oh, we have had moments of criticism,

moments of comment, but we are not a

serious part of this national concern

and national conversation over what

will happen in Iraq. That is indeed unfortunate.

There are several facts I think everyone

concedes, virtually everyone, on either

side of the issue. The first and

most obvious is that Saddam Hussein

is a ruthless dictator. His continued

domination over the nation of Iraq will

continue to pose a threat to the region

and a concern for peace-loving nations

around the world. The sooner his regime

changes, the better. The sooner

we control his weapons of mass destruction,

the better for the region and

for the whole world. No one argues that

point, not even the nations in the U.N.

Security Council that are arguing with

the United States about the best approach.

The second thing I think should be

said at the outset is no one questions

the fact that the U.S. military, the

men and women who make it the best

military in the world, deserve our support

and our praise. They deserve our

continued devotion to their success,

whatever our debate about the policy

in the Middle East or even in Iraq. As

far as those 250,000 American servicemen

now stationed around Iraq, and

many others on the way, whatever our

position on the President’s policy, that

is irrelevant. We are totally committed

to their safety and their safe return.

That is exactly the way it should be.

Having said that, though, I think it

is still important for us to step back

and ask how we have possibly reached

this state that we are in today. The

United States finds itself in a period of

anti-Americanism around the world

that is almost unprecedented. I traveled

abroad a few weeks ago. I was

stunned to find in countries that have

traditionally been our friends and allies

that, although they are saying little,

in private they are very critical of

the United States and what we have

done.

What happened between September

11, 2001, and March 13, 2003? Remember

that date, after the September 11 tragedy,

when nations all around the world,

including some of our historic enemies,

came forward and said they would

stand with the United States in fighting

the war on terrorism? It was an

amazing moment in history. It is a moment

we will never forget as Americans.

For the first time since the British

came into this building in the War of

1812, the United States was invaded by

an enemy. Of course, Pearl Harbor was

an attack on the territories as well,

but that attack on the continental

United States on September 11, 2001,

was one that stunned us, saddened us,

shocked us as a nation, and we looked

for friends and we found them in every

corner of the world. They joined us in

a war on terrorism, sharing intelligence

resources, working together,

making real progress. It was a good

feeling, a feeling that many of these

countries now understood how important

a friendship with the United

States would be for their future and for

the world.

Look where we are today. We are at

a point now where we are trying to win

enough friends to show that we have a

multilateral coalition that is going to

wage this war against Iraq.

I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD an article that

was published in Business Week. The

edition was March 10, 2003.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

Let me quote several

lines from this article in Business

Week, not known as a liberal publication:

It goes on to say:

What a dramatic turn of events, and

from the spirit of international cooperation,

fighting the war on terrorism,

for the United States to be in a

bidding war to try to bring the Turks

into the position where they will allow

us to use their country, it is just such

a change from where we were. It reflects

a sad decline in our diplomatic

skills.

Consider at the same time what is

happening in North Korea. Here we

have a country which has decided to

test the United States. Why they have

decided is anyone’s guess. But let me

hazard one. They see what is happening

in Iraq. Iraq is waiting for the United

Nations and others to protect them

from a United States invasion, and

they are not being successful. North

Koreans decided to take a much different

course. They are confronting the

United States in the crudest and most

dangerous way—suggesting that they

are going to build nuclear weapons;

they are going to fire missiles; they are

going to harass our aircraft; and they

are going to defy us. They believe that

is the way to hold the United States

back. The process they are building up

could potentially proliferate nuclear

weapons around the world.

Our response there, unlike with Iraq

where we are full bore with a quarter

million troops and billions of dollars

committed, is to not even speak to the

North Koreans. I don’t understand that

level of diplomacy. I don’t understand

how that will make this a safer world.

Let us reflect for a moment, though,

on what is happening in the United Nations.

I have read the critics from the

right who basically said we should go

right over the United Nations; we no

longer need them; we have the power;

we don’t need to wait around for small

nations with populations that are a

fraction of the United States to decide

whether they will support us. In a way,

in the world of realpolitik, that is true.

But the United States, in informing

the United Nations, had something else

in mind. It is not just a matter of

whether we have the power and a show

of more strength than the United Nations

as a member but whether the

United States is stronger with collective

security engaging other countries

around the world to join us in efforts

such as containing Iraq and its danger.

I happen to believe that collective security

is not old fashioned and outmoded.

It is critically important for us

to consider building alliances to

achieve important goals for the United

States and the world because in building

those alliances through the collective

security of the United Nations, we

bring together common values, a consensus

on strategy, and a world vision

that will serve all of us well.

To walk away from the United Nations

and say, once having engaged

them in a resolution, that we may not

be able to pass a use-of-force resolution

and that we will do it ourselves is to

walk away from an important concept

which has been fostered by the United

States and supported by the United

States and which has been critically

important to us as recently as our effort

in the Persian Gulf and in Afghanistan.

But, by tomorrow, the decision may

be made. If the United Nations Security

Council does not support us, it is

indeed possible that we will have unilateral

action by the United States,

with the possible support of the British.

I asked the Secretary of Defense,

Secretary Rumsfeld, several weeks ago:

Who are our allies in this coalition

against Iraq? He said: Certainly the

United States with about 250,000

troops, and the British with about

26,000 troops, and others. I said: Of the

others, who would rank third? At that

point, he said: The Turks.

We know what is happening. Their

Parliament will not allow us to use

their country as a base of operation.

That may change. But it shows, when

it comes to this effort, that it is by and

large a bilateral effort by the United

States and the British against the

Iraqis. I think that is not the best approach.

I think it is far better for us to

acknowledge what I think is the real

effective approach, and that is to engage

our allies in the United Nations

and in the Security Council to put

meaningful deadlines on Saddam Hussein;

for the inspectors to reach their

goals; to let Saddam Hussein know

that every step of the way, his failure

to cooperate could result in the United

Nations taking action against him.

That does not call for an invasion, but

it puts him on a tight timetable that

he has to live by.

To abandon the inspections, to abandon

the role of the United Nations, and

to launch a unilateral invasion of this

country is going to be something that

I think we may regret. Will we be successful

militarily? I believe we will. I

can’t tell you the cost in terms of

American lives or in terms of Iraqis

killed. But I trust our military to succeed

in this mission.

Having succeeded militarily, though,

what will we then face? We will face, of

course, the devastation in Iraq.

This week, we learned that the

United States was now soliciting bids

from companies in the United States

for the reconstruction of Iraq before

the bombs have even fallen. That could

be momentous in terms of cost. We will

face it.

As Tom Friedman of the New York

Times has written, when we go into a

gift shop and see the sign, ‘‘If you

break it, you own it,’’ the fact is when

we invade Iraq and remove its leadership

and occupy that country, it is

then our responsibility. Others may

help us, but it is primarily our responsibility.

The same thing is true in terms of

the long-term vision of Iraq. This is a

country with no history of self-government,

this is a country with no history

of democracy, and we want to bring

certain values there. We have to concede

the fact that it will take some

time before they arrive at that point.

We will be there in an occupational

way with others perhaps, but we will

have the responsibility of making that

transformation a permanent or

semipermanent presence of American

troops in the Middle East and all that

that entails.

At the same time, it is bound to enrage

our enemies around the world—

those who think the United States is

acting unilaterally and not acting in

concert with other nations, peace-loving

nations that would share our ultimate

goals. That, too, may complicate

the war on terrorism. That has been

conceded by intelligence agencies and

others. Our efforts in Iraq may spread

the seeds of terrorism on new ground,

and maybe even here in the United

States. We will have to work that

much harder to protect ourselves.

I want to enter into the RECORD a letter

sent to Secretary of State Colin

Powell from John Brady Kiesling, who

is with the United States Embassy in

Athens, Greece.

I ask unanimous consent that this

letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, this letter

is a letter of resignation. Mr.

Kiesling, a career diplomat who has

served in United States embassies

around the world, resigned over our

foreign policy in Iraq. I will not read

the entire letter. But this I will read. It

is the letter from Mr. Kiesling to Secretary

Powell: Those are the words of a man who

was a career diplomat serving the

United States with principle and convictions

and who resigned from the diplomatic

corps over our policy in Iraq.

That is a sad commentary, but it is a

reality.

The reality is that we are following a

course of foreign policy that is a dramatic

departure from what we have followed

for almost 50 years. We are making

decisions relative to this war in

Iraq which are changing the rules the

United States has not only lived by but

preached for decades. We are confronting

the world that has most recently

been our allies in the war on

terrorism and telling them that, with

or without their cooperation and approval,

we are going forward with an

invasion of Iraq. We are saying to the

rest of the world that the United

States has the power and will to use it.

It is certain that we have the power

and the strength. The question is

whether or not we have the wisdom—

the wisdom to understand that simply

having the strength is not enough.

I would like to quote a few words

from a statement made on this floor on

October 3 last year by a man who used

to sit directly behind me here, Paul

Wellstone of Minnesota. I miss him

every single day. I pulled out the statement

he made relative to this use of

force resolution. I can recall now when

he said some of these words.

I quote from Senator Wellstone:

It is still true today. It is true so

many months later.

I think the President and this administration

still have a chance to take

what could be a course of action that

departs from a tradition in values

which we have stood by and preached

for so many decades, and return to

those values in our efforts in Iraq.

And I hope we do it. I hope we do not

discard the United Nations and all of

our allies who are part of it. I hope we

understand that when some of our best

friends around the world question

whether we are approaching this sensibly,

it does not demonstrate their

weakness but really calls into question

whether we have the humility to step

back and say: Can we do this more effectively

for a more peaceful world for

generations to come?

Madam President, I close by saying, I

return now, in just a few moments, to

my home State of Illinois. As I walk

the streets of Springfield, of Chicago,

and of other cities, people come up to

me and say: Why don’t I hear a debate

in the U.S. Congress about Iraq?

Well, the fact is, that debate was

waged and decided last October. I was

one of 23 Members who voted against

the use of force resolution because I believe

there is a better way: a collective

approach with the United Nations, that

makes certain that the United States

has a coalition of nations behind it in

suppressing the evil of Saddam Hussein

and his dangers to the region, rather

than a coalition of nations united

against us. That, sadly, is what we face

today.

The vote in the United Nations tomorrow

is historic. I hope we have the

support of that institution. I hope, if

we do not, this administration will

pause before unleashing the furies of

war and consider whether there is a

better, more measured and sensible approach

to show not only our might but

our strength and clarity of purpose.

I yield the floor.