

know, I am going to be there to help you. And, working with the Congress, that is exactly what happened. We extended unemployment benefits five times.

Are the people today less deserving? Are the workers who lost their jobs because of corporate illegality, economic slowdown, or terrorist attacks somehow not worthy of our help? I don't think so. I certainly hope not.

As you can see from this chart, which has a lot of writing on it, basically the bottom line is that during the early stage of the recession in the 1990s, 35 States received 26 weeks of benefits, and 16 received 33 weeks. And it is so clear that today during our recession we only have 39 States getting 13 weeks of benefits and 12 receiving 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CLINTON. This is not only a comparison—it should cause us to wonder what our national policy is—it is also a reflection of how we have no economic policy in America right now. We don't have an emphasis on creating jobs, prosperity, and economic opportunity.

Our leader, Senator DASCHLE, came to the floor earlier this week and, in a series of charts, made clear that we are not attending to America's business. We all know we have foreign policy challenges. I, for one, have supported our men and women in uniform and supported our need for homeland security. I will continue to do so because our threats are real, and we have to deal with them. But we are a great nation. We can do more than one thing at a time. We should be paying attention to our economy. We should be taking care of our unemployed workers. It is the right thing to do. I hope we will do it because it takes care of people.

Look at this next chart. Every dollar we spend on unemployment insurance adds \$2.50 to our gross domestic product. It is a good investment. Why? Because when the unemployed get those benefits—when Mr. Batista and others like him finally get some help—what do they do? They go out and spend it. They have no other means. They have to buy food, they have to pay the rent, and they have to make a car payment. The money goes right into the economy, and it provides stimulus.

In contrast, President Bush's solution is to stimulate the economy for the wealthiest—keep giving them big tax cuts and hope that it trickles down to people such as Mr. Batista. That didn't work in the 1980s, it didn't work in the 1990s, and it will not work in the 21st century, either.

I believe the President is using the wrong approach. Our economy needs to help people. It needs to stimulate jobs. And we owe it to the unemployed such as Mr. Batista to act now.

Finally, obviously, I believe our economic policy during the 1990s worked

for all Americans—the rich, middle income, and poor. It provided more than 22 million new jobs. We were on the right track in America when it came to the economy. For reasons that escape me, we threw all of that good work away, and now we are back into the deficits. We are not taking care of the unemployed. We are not creating jobs. And I don't think we have any plan to do so.

I earnestly request that our colleagues here take leadership and support our unemployed people. Do what was done in the 1990s, provide these benefits, stimulate the economy, and let us get back on the right track for America's future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 minutes over and above the order that has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

IRAQ

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call attention to an article in the Washington Post of September 15, Sunday, the final edition. I shall read excerpts therefrom. The headline: "In Iraqi War Scenario, Oil Is Key Issue; U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool." The article is by Dan Morgan and David B. Ottaway, Washington Post staff writers.

I will proceed now with reading the first three paragraphs:

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein would open a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

The importance of Iraq's oil has made it potentially one of the administration's biggest bargaining chips in negotiations to win backing from the U.N. Security Council and Western allies for President Bush's call for tough international action against Hussein. All five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China—have international oil companies with major stakes in a change of leadership in Baghdad.

"It's pretty straightforward," said former CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has been one of the leading advocates of forcing Hussein from power. "France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them." But he added:

"If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States, which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall.

Are you listening? Out there in America, are you listening?

Let me say that again, with reference to former CIA Director R. James Woolsey:

But he added: "If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States—

Hear that—

which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall.

Are we paying attention?

Representatives of many foreign oil concerns have been meeting with leaders of the Iraqi opposition to make their case for a future stake and to sound them out about their intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies from more than a dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

It is a lengthy article, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, let me call attention to an editorial in today's Charleston, WV, Gazette, titled, "Bush, Cheney won't stop."

And I read therefrom:

Although Iraq agreed to readmit U.N. weapons inspectors, President Bush and Vice President Cheney still are clamoring for U.S. military action to topple dictator Saddam Hussein.

The White House continues its mantra—

Now listen. This is the Charleston, WV, Gazette.

The White House continues its mantra that war is necessary because Saddam is "evil" and he's secretly making weapons of mass destruction. But this justification may be a smoke screen.

Are you listening? Are you listening, the people out there throughout this great land? Are you listening?

... this justification may be a smoke screen. Some observers say the administration's hidden motive is to gain control of Iraq's oil.

In a front-page Sunday report subtitled "U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool," The Washington Post said America's oil industry—to which Bush and Cheney are closely tied—eagerly wants a "regime change" in

Iraq so U.S. firms can begin drilling into Iraq's vast, 112-billion-barrel reserve.

So the Charleston Gazette of today calls attention to the Washington Post article which I have already read and have included in the RECORD, the Washington Post article of last Sunday.

Continuing with the Gazette editorial:

The White House supports the London-based Iraqi National Congress, an umbrella organization of exiled Iraqi groups seeking to remove Saddam. INC [Iraqi National Congress] leader Ahmed Chalabi told the Post [the Washington Post] that, when a new regime is installed in Baghdad, "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi oil."

The Washington [Post] quoted former CIA Director James Woolsey:—

And I have also referred to his remarks. But let me continue with the Charleston Gazette editorial:

Amazing!

In referring to what Mr. Woolsey was saying, the Gazette said:

Amazing. This implies that Bush's war urge isn't about "evil" or weapons. It's about oil.

"It's about oil."

Atlanta Journal-Constitution columnist Cynthia Tucker said the White House war demands are "tainted with the sickening smell of gasoline."

Now, that was the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. That is a Georgia paper that is known and read nationwide and internationally.

Let me read what that column said again:

Atlanta Journal-Constitution columnist Cynthia Tucker said the White House war demands are "tainted with the sickening smell of gasoline."

Further reading from the Charleston Gazette of today:

"If the Bush administration invades Iraq," she wrote—

Atlanta Journal-Constitution columnist Cynthia Tucker—

"future scholars will look back on this period and name the period for what it was: the Petroleum Wars. . . . What but oil could possibly explain the Bush administration's stubborn insistence on attacking Saddam Hussein, who had no connection to the atrocities of Sept. 11?"

Senator Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., has taken the lead in questioning President Bush's warplans.

We hope that he and colleagues in Congress try to learn whether the White House war cry is designed to serve America's oil industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Gazette editorial in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 10 minutes, if needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before the Nation is committed to war, before we send our sons and daughters to battle in faraway lands, there are critical questions that must be asked, and it is not unpatriotic to ask questions.

To date, the answers from the administration have been less than satisfying. After weeks of criticism from Congress and, indeed, from the countries of the world, President Bush went to the United Nations to press his case that Iraq posed a serious threat to the peace and security of the globe. But instead of offering compelling evidence that the Iraqi regime had taken steps to advance its weapons program to the point that it is necessary for the United States to deliver an unprovoked attack on a sovereign state—namely, Iraq—the President offered the U.N. more of a warning than an appeal for support.

Instead of using the forum of the U.N. General Assembly to offer evidence and proof of his claims, the President basically told the nations of the world that "you are either with me or against me."

"Do not question this stand," the President said. If the U.N. is unwilling to act, then "by heritage and by choice, the United States of America will make that stand."

While Mr. Bush tried to play the role of an international prosecutor, his case was at best circumstantial. He did a fine job in laying out the facts with regard to the failure of the United Nations to uphold and take more compelling action in upholding its previous resolutions. He made it clear that the United Nations had not enforced its resolutions. Sixteen resolutions had been adopted by that agency.

But in the days that followed that address, the administration officials have attempted to provide some answers to the looming question. However, this week, when asked by the House Armed Services Committee members what was new, what was compelling to force the hand of this Nation against Saddam Hussein, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld offered nothing new. He pointed to the terrorist acts of September 11 as compelling reason, and he said:

The last thing we want is a smoking gun. A gun smokes after it has been fired. The goal must be to stop Saddam Hussein before he fires a weapon of mass destruction against our people.

Well, he said the same thing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on yesterday. He said: We are being asked what is new.

He said: What is new? September 11. Well, September 11 is not all that new, Mr. President, September 11 was 365 plus 9 days, in other words, 374 days ago. That is not so new.

With reference to Mr. Rumsfeld's statement concerning a smoking gun, when he said, "The last thing we want is a smoking gun. A gun smokes after it has been fired"—my concern, Mr.

President, is that the United States, in forcing war in Iraq, will end up shooting itself in the foot. Unless proper care and deliberation precede any action, we must not be hell-bent on an invasion until we have exhausted every other possible option to assess and eliminate Iraq's supposed weapons of destruction program.

The United States must not act alone. The United States must have the support of the world.

Yesterday, the administration sent to Congress a draft resolution to authorize the use of American military might against Iraq. In that resolution, President Bush requests approval to "use all means" he determines to be appropriate. In other words, the President is saying: Authorize me, the President, authorize the President to "use all means" he, the President, determines to be appropriate.

Congress must not hand this administration or any other administration a blank check for military action, period. What Congress needs is solid evidence. What we need are answers. Does Saddam Hussein pose an imminent threat to the United States? Should the United States act alone as this administration has been threatening to do? Should Congress grant the President authority to launch a preemptive attack on Iraq? What would be the repercussions in the Middle East? What would be the repercussions around the globe?

How many civilians would die in Iraq? How many American men and women would be involved? Will even greater numbers of National Guardsmen and Reserves be called up to prepare for an invasion? And if they are, what will happen to the war on terrorism here at home? Will troops be shifted from other missions to support a war against Iraq?

We have 8,500 men and women in Afghanistan. We have forces in the Philippines, in Bosnia, in Kosovo and in many other places throughout the world. What are we going to do, pull all of them out of those faraway places and use them in an unprovoked attack on the sovereign state of Iraq?

How do we afford this war? The gulf war cost \$61 billion. The gulf war of a decade ago cost \$61 billion. Of that, other countries coughed up, in cash and in contributions in kind, \$54 billion, leaving, I believe, roughly \$7 billion, the cost to American taxpayers.

Now, what would it cost this time if other nations are not helping the United States to bear the financial burden? Bruce Lindsey, the President's economic adviser, says it might cost \$100 billion or \$200 billion. And then he said: \$100 billion why, that is nothing. He is quoted in the press as saying: \$100 billion? That is nothing. Yet, this administration won't get its feet out of the concrete and head out of the sand when it comes to raising the top line for Congress to be able to utilize in passing 13 appropriations bills and sending them to the President—not

willing to agree to \$9 billion more than the President's foot-in-concrete figure of \$759 billion.

Congress needs \$768 billion. The House chairman, Mr. YOUNG, and this chairman in the Senate, and Senator TED STEVENS, ranking member on the Senate Appropriations Committee, have agreed, and others agreed—and this Senate has agreed—it should be \$768 billion. There is a \$9 billion gap between what the President says and what the Congress needs to meet the needs of the people. I am talking about veterans' care, education, homeland security, and so on, these are the needs.

Congress would require—and has already reported bills out of the Senate Appropriations Committee which assume the figure \$768 billion. The President and his OMB Director say, no, \$759 billion; that is all. So, here we are—stuck; 13 appropriations bills are stuck because of the administration's immovability in dealing with the needs of the American people here at home.

The Administration, says: No, we won't accept that. Hence, we have 13 appropriations bills stuck.

Lawrence Lindsey has reportedly said, with reference to a war against Iraq: "Oh, that might cost \$100 billion or \$200 billion. \$100 billion? Well, that is nothing." That is the attitude of this administration. That is the attitude of this administration.

Has the United States ruled out responding with nuclear weapons should Saddam Hussein use chemical or biological weapons against our soldiers? Does Saddam Hussein have the capability to unleash weapons of mass destruction within the United States? Does the United States have adequate military and intelligence resources to fight a war in Afghanistan and a war in Iraq while, at the same time, mobilizing resources to prevent or defend against attack within our own shores? What will happen to this war here at home?

What will happen to homeland security if the President unleashes an unprovoked attack on Iraq? Does anyone believe there would not be any repercussions here at home? We have terrorists within our midst in this country. They are all about us. The FBI arrested six in New York just recently. So the FBI is on the job. The FBI is working to defend this country. But what else might happen? Are we focused too greatly on fighting suspected terrorism overseas, while focusing too little on the threat of terrorism here at home? What is going to happen to the needs of this country—the monetary needs and the needs with respect to security of our nuclear plants? What is going to happen at our ports of entry and on our borders? What is going to happen within our midst if the President launches an unprovoked attack on Iraq?

These are questions—and there are many more questions—that will be asked. If it is unpatriotic to ask questions, then I am unpatriotic. Is it unpatriotic

to ask questions, when this President is seeking powers that have never been given to any other President?

On September 19, yesterday, the President sent to Congress his suggested text for a resolution to authorize war with Iraq. The problems with this proposed resolution are numerous. When taken as a whole, this resolution would constitute the broadest possible grant of war powers to any President in the history of our Republic. The President has inherent powers under the Constitution to repel a sudden, unforeseen attack on this Nation—nobody argues with that—but he doesn't have inherent power under that Constitution to launch an unprovoked offensive military attack on another nation or state.

The resolution is an affront to the powers given by the Constitution to Congress on matters of war. The first 2 pages of the draft resolution have 16 "whereas" clauses that would serve to explain the intent of Congress—if the resolution were adopted as it is written—in passing the resolution for the use of force.

These clauses, as conceived by the White House, include numerous distortions of fact. For example, in the ninth "whereas" clause, it is asserted that the United States has the inherent right, as acknowledged in the U.N. Charter, to use force in order to defend itself, as if that is a justification for preemptive war. Let me read the relevant section of the U.N. Charter:

Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

That does not seem to justify a preemptive attack. In the 16th clause, it is asserted that:

The President has the authority under the Constitution to use force in order to defend the national security interests of the United States.

At last, the administration has awakened to the fact that there is still a Constitution. That is the first time that I have ever read anything or heard anything from the administration that would invoke the Constitution in this matter. Let's see what they are saying.

In the 16th "whereas" clause it is asserted that:

The President has the authority under the Constitution to use force in order to defend the national security interests of the United States.

Well, that is the broadest reading of the Commander in Chief clause I think I have ever seen. What about the power of the Congress under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to declare war? That is not mentioned at all in the resolution proposed by the White House.

Mr. President, the White House resolution would authorize the President to use all means that he determines—that he determines. What a colossus this

President is going to become if the Senate gives him this kind of authority. The White House resolution would authorize the President to use all means that he determines appropriate.

What does that mean? What does "appropriate" mean here? It would authorize the President to use all means that he—I repeat, that he—determines appropriate, including forces, to restore international peace and security in the region.

Mr. President, that is not an authorization for war with Iraq only. That language would allow the President to march our troops into Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, the West Bank, and anywhere else that is part of the Middle East or where the United States has any security interest in the Middle East. I cannot believe the gall and the arrogance of the White House in requesting such a broad grant of war powers.

Mr. President, this is the worst kind of election year politics!

EXHIBIT 1

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 15, 2002]

IN IRAQI WAR SCENARIO, OIL IS KEY ISSUE;
U.S. DRILLERS EYE HUGE PETROLEUM POOL

(By Dan Morgan and Davis B. Ottaway)

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein could open a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

The importance of Iraq's oil had made it potentially one of the administration's biggest bargaining chips in negotiations to win backing from the U.N. Security Council and Western allies for President Bush's call for tough international action against Hussein. All five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China—have international oil companies with major stakes in a change of leadership in Baghdad.

"It's pretty straightforward," said former CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has been one of the leading advocates of forcing Hussein from power. "France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them." But he added: "If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States, which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall. Representatives of many foreign oil concerns have been meeting with leaders of the Iraqi opposition to make their case for a future stake and to sound them out about their intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies from more than a dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

"We will review all these agreements, definitely," said Faisal Qaragholi, a petroleum engineer who directs the London office of the Iraqi National Congress (INC), an umbrella organization of opposition groups that is backed by the United States. "Our oil policies should be decided by a government in Iraq elected by the people."

Ahmed Chalabi, the INC leader, went even further, saying he favored the creation of a U.S.-led consortium to develop Iraq's oil fields, which have deteriorated under more than a decade of sanctions. "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi oil," Chalabi said.

The INC, however, said it has not taken a formal position on the structure of Iraq's oil industry in event of a change of leadership.

While the Bush administration's campaign against Hussein is presenting vast possibilities for multinational oil giants, it poses major risks and uncertainties for the global oil market, according to industry analysts.

Access to Iraqi oil and profits will depend on the nature and intentions of a new government. Whether Iraq remains a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, for example, or seeks an independent role, free of the OPEC cartel's quotas, will have an impact on oil prices and the flow of investments to competitors such as Russia, Venezuela and Angola.

While Russian oil companies such as Lukoil have a major financial interest in developing Iraqi fields, the low prices that could result from a flood of Iraqi oil into world markets could set back Russian government efforts to attract foreign investment in its untapped domestic fields. That is because low world oil prices could make costly ventures to unlock Siberia's oil treasures far less appealing.

Bush and Vice President Cheney have worked in the oil business and have longstanding ties to the industry. But despite the buzz about the future of Iraqi oil among oil companies, the administration, preoccupied with military planning and making the case about Hussein's potential threat, has yet to take up the issue in a substantive way, according to U.S. officials.

The Future of Iraq Group, a task force set up at the State Department, does not have oil on its list of issues, a department spokesman said last week. An official with the National Security Council declined to say whether oil had been discussed during consultations on Iraq that Bush has had over the past several weeks with Russian President Vladimir Putin and Western leaders.

On Friday, a State Department delegation concluded a three-day visit to Moscow in connection with Iraq. In early October, U.S. and Russian officials are to hold an energy summit in Houston, at which more than 100 Russian and American energy companies are expected.

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) said Bush is keenly aware of Russia's economic interests in Iraq, stemming from a \$7 billion to \$8 billion debt that Iraq ran up with Moscow before the Gulf War. Weldon, who has cultivated close ties to Putin and Russian parliamentarians, said he believed the Russian leader will support U.S. action in Iraq if he can get private assurances from Bush that Russia "will be made whole" financially.

Officials of the Iraqi National Congress said last week that the INC's Washington director, Entifadh K. Qanbar, met with Russian Embassy officials here last month and urged Moscow to begin a dialogue with opponents of Hussein's government.

But even with such groundwork, the chances of a tidy transition in the oil sector appear highly problematic. Rival ethnic groups in Iraq's north are already squabbling over the giant Kirkuk oil field, which Arabs, Kurds and minority Turkmen tribesmen are eyeing in the event of Hussein's fall.

Although the volumes have dwindled in recent months, the United States was importing nearly 1 million barrels of Iraqi oil a day at the start of the year. Even so, American oil companies have been banished from direct involvement in Iraq since the late 1980s, when relations soured between Washington and Baghdad.

Hussein in the 1990s turned to non-American companies to repair fields damaged in the Gulf War and Iraq's earlier war against Iran, and to tap undeveloped reserves, but U.S. government studies say the results have been disappointing.

While Russia's Lukoil negotiated a \$4 billion deal in 1997 to develop the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq, Lukoil had not commenced work because of U.N. sanctions. Iraq has threatened to void the agreement unless work began immediately.

Last October, the Russian oil services company Slavneft reportedly signed a \$52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field, also in southern Iraq. A proposed \$40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement also reportedly includes opportunities for Russian companies to explore for oil in Iraq's western desert.

The French company Total Fina Elf has negotiated for rights to develop the huge Majnoon field, near the Iranian border, which may contain up to 30 billion barrels of oil. But in July 2001, Iraq announced it would no longer give French firms priority in the award of such contracts because of its decision to abide by the sanctions.

Officials of several major firms said they were taking care to avoid playing any role in the debate in Washington over how to proceed on Iraq. "There's no real upside for American oil companies to take a very aggressive stance at this stage. There'll be plenty of time in the future," said James Lucier, an oil analyst with Prudential Securities.

But with the end of sanctions that likely would come with Hussein's ouster, companies such as ExxonMobil and ChevronTexaco would almost assuredly play a role, industry officials said. "There's not an oil company out there that wouldn't be interested in Iraq," one analyst said.

Staff writer Ken Bredemeier contributed to this report.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Charleston Gazette Online, Sept. 20, 2002]

WAR FEVER: BUSH, CHENEY WON'T STOP

Although Iraq agreed to readmit U.N. weapons inspectors, President Bush and Vice President Cheney still are clamoring for U.S. military action to topple dictator Saddam Hussein.

The White House continues its mantra that war is necessary because Saddam is "evil" and he's secretly making weapons of mass destruction. But this justification may be a smoke screen. Some observers say the administration's hidden motive is to gain control of Iraq's oil.

In a front-page Sunday report subtitled "U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool," The Washington Post said America's oil in-

dustry—to which Bush and Cheney are closely tied—eagerly wants a "regime change" in Iraq so U.S. firms can begin drilling into Iraq's vast, 112-billion-barrel reserve.

The White House supports the London-based Iraqi National Congress, an umbrella organization of exiled Iraqi groups seeking to remove Saddam. INC leader Ahmed Chalabi told the Post that, when a new regime is installed in Baghdad, "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi oil."

The Washington paper quoted former CIA Director James Woolsey:

"It's pretty straightforward. France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them."

Amazing. This implies that Bush's war urge isn't about "evil" or weapons. It's about oil.

Atlanta Journal-Constitution columnist Cynthia Tucker said the White House war demands are "tainted with the sickening smell of gasoline."

"If the Bush administration invades Iraq," she wrote, "future scholars will look back on this period and name the period for what it was: the Petroleum Wars. . . . What but oil could possibly explain the Bush administration's stubborn insistence on attacking Saddam Hussein, who had no connection to the atrocities of Sept. 11?"

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., has taken the lead in questioning President Bush's war plans.

We hope that he and colleagues in Congress try to learn whether the White House war cry is designed to serve America's oil industry.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hearing no objection, the quorum call will be terminated.

The Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON.

IRAQ AND HOMELAND DEFENSE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the President pro tempore for the recognition, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia, who just delivered a very insightful statement of why the Constitution must be protected and not shredded, why the Constitution must be adhered to in a protection of the carefully constructed separation of powers which gives us the checks and balances that have allowed this Government to endure for well over two centuries, to be the strong Government it is because, as a great British statesman once said: Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

In the 1780s, when those political geniuses gathered to construct a document upon which this new Nation could be based and the delicate checks and balances were entered, as well as the spirit of compromise in that Constitutional Convention, they set off one branch of Government from the other.