

year 2006. That is why the President said let's bring that reduction forward 3 years and provide this benefit immediately.

There is another benefit for small business that has not been talked about much. The President's proposal would increase from \$25,000 to \$75,000 the amount that small businesses may expense each year, that is to say that they can write off in their income taxes. There is broad bipartisan agreement that allowing small businesses to expense a larger amount of their investment in equipment will provide a strong incentive for small business to expand. As I said, these are the businesses that provide most of the new jobs in our country.

Let me conclude by talking about this class warfare. The previous speaker said he didn't want to talk about class warfare but immediately got into the same argument about who benefits. He also acknowledged something that is very true. John Kennedy is famous for saying, back in 1963 when he was proposing a capital gains tax reduction and people pointed out that there were not very many people who had capital gains, President Kennedy said:

But a rising tide lifts all boats.

If some taxpayers benefit, in the long run all taxpayers benefit. That is an acknowledged principle of economics.

One ought not be asking why do you get a \$3,000 benefit from President Bush's tax proposal and I only get a \$1,500 benefit? But rather, they should say, I am glad I got the \$1,500 benefit and I am glad you got the \$3,000 benefit, because for all of it is going to make the economy healthier and in the long run it will make us all wealthier. That is the attitude, fortunately, most Americans have.

According to the IRS data from 2000, the top 5 percent of tax filers paid more than 50 percent of all income taxes, and the top half of all tax filers were responsible for nearly all of our taxes, 96 percent.

Who ends up paying a higher percentage or lower percentage after all of the Bush tax plan is put into effect? It turns out that the wealthier people end up paying an even higher percentage of taxes and the people in the lower brackets pay an even smaller percentage of taxes. So it does not help the wealthy at the expense of the poor. In fact, if you want to just measure it by that measure, the wealthy pay even more of the taxes than they do today.

If your income is over \$200,000, you are going to be paying 45.4 percent of all of the Federal income taxes. Currently, they pay 44.8 percent. So that is an increase in the amount of taxes that are going to be paid by people who make \$200,000 or more. If you are making above \$100,000 and less than \$200,000, you are going to be paying 27.9 percent of all Federal income taxes. Currently, you pay 27.6 percent—an increase.

Under the Bush plan, families with incomes of over \$100,000 would end up paying 73 percent of all Federal income taxes.

By the way, it takes 3.8 million low-income taxpayers off the tax rolls completely, the Bush plan does. So it is not even an effective rebuttal to say it benefits the rich at the expense of the poor.

I have gone through all the different arguments. We talked about where is the alternative. We talked about the benefits to the States. We talked about the benefits to families. I haven't even talked here about the child tax credit or the marriage penalty elimination. All of these features of the Bush plan are designed in one way or another to help different parts of our economy, different types of families in America, so at the end of the day everybody benefits.

It is possible to pick out one little segment of the tax cuts proposed by the President and say that does not benefit everybody. Of course. If you don't have any children, the child tax credit isn't going to help you. But for those families with children, it is going to help a lot. Same thing if you are two single people; ending the marriage penalty might not help you. If you are a married couple, you might get the benefit of that. But you put it all together and end up with a mosaic that provides not only help to all Americans but an economic long-term growth package that can sustain the kind of living we want in this country, while providing the kind of revenues to State and local governments as well as the Federal Government.

That is the philosophy of the Bush tax plan. It is a good philosophy, and I look forward to a robust debate with my colleagues who may disagree with portions of that plan. It is a very defensible plan, and I am proud to support what the President has proposed here.

I hope we will have plenty of opportunity to debate this in the near future so we can enact all of the President's proposal as soon as we possibly can for the benefit of the American economy but, more importantly, all American families.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 6 p.m., with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand the leader wants to go out at around 6 o'clock tonight. As far as the Democratic time is concerned, I would like 25 minutes allotted to Senator BYRD, who wishes to speak now, but during the remainder of the time, without any specific designation as to when it starts, I would ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes of our time be given to Senator KENNEDY, 7½ minutes to Senator SCHUMER, and 7½ minutes to Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his request?

Mr. KYL. I revise my unanimous consent request to incorporate what Senator REID has just requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Arizona.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, has the able Senator from Arizona relinquished the floor?

Mr. KYL. I have indeed.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from West Virginia.

IRAQ

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, President Bush last night warned the American people to brace for war with Iraq. In his State of the Union Address, he vowed that if Saddam Hussein does not disarm, the United States will "lead a coalition" to disarm him.

Although the President stopped short of a declaration of war, his message was clear: In his view, Saddam Hussein constitutes an imminent danger to peace and security in the world, and the United States is prepared to wage war, with or without the support of the United Nations, to remove him from power. The chain of events that President Bush set into motion last year when he inducted Iraq into what he called the "axis of evil" appears on the verge of spilling over into battle and bloodshed.

The President's remarks come amid a firestorm of protest from some of our closest allies in Europe and the Middle East over the apparent willingness of the United States to ride roughshod over the United Nations and dictate to the rest of the world the terms of Iraq's disarmament. The President in his State of the Union speech once again made clear that Iraq will be dealt with on his timetable, at his hands, according to his agenda.

Mr. President, I am fully cognizant of the danger presented by the possibility of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons in the hands of a ruthless dictator like Saddam Hussein. I am fully cognizant of, and frustrated by, the fact that Iraq has consistently flouted the United Nations mandates to disarm, and has apparently shown only token cooperation with the current inspection regime. Iraq has much to answer for, and the President is correct in demanding that Iraq respond to the United Nations.

What concerns me greatly, however, is that this President appears to place himself above the international mandates of the United Nations. He has turned a deaf ear to the concerns of other nations and has vowed that the United States will lead an assault on Iraq regardless of the judgment of the United Nations. President Bush has

made the overthrow of Saddam Hussein a personal crusade, and in his zeal to pursue his goal, he has failed to make the case to the American people out there and to our allies abroad that the United Nations is dragging its feet, that war is the only option left, and that war cannot wait.

The President in his address alluded to tantalizing evidence that Saddam Hussein is in collusion with al-Qaida and that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction which it is hiding from the United Nations weapons inspectors. But the President has yet to present that evidence to the public or to demonstrate why it constitutes an immediate cause for war. If the evidence is as compelling as the President indicates it will be, surely the member states of the United Nations will close ranks behind the United States and demand the forcible disarmament of Iraq.

The President also set what appears to be a new deadline for the United Nations. On February 5, he said, the United States will ask the U.N. Security Council to convene to hear evidence of Iraq's illegal weapons programs and its links to terrorist groups. I look forward to learning the details of that meeting. I wonder why the President is holding back for another week if he has such information today, and perhaps has had it for some time. I am confident that the U.N. weapons inspectors would welcome such evidence, not next week but today, so that they could do their jobs more effectively. I wonder why the Senate has not been given this evidence. I wonder why the American people, who are being asked to send their sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters into the battle zone, have not been made privy to this important evidence.

Perhaps the answer lies in the followup comment by the President, when he said: "We will consult, but let there be no misunderstanding. If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm for the safety of our people, and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him." Despite all his comments to the contrary, it appears that the President has predetermined that war with Iraq is the only recourse left.

If war is the answer, the support of the international community is essential. I believe that it would be a grave mistake for the United States to preempt the work of the United Nations weapons inspectors and initiate an invasion of Iraq without first seeking the express support of the Security Council. The United States is already seen by many as an aggressor in the Middle East. Speculation is rife in Europe that the United States is pressing to invade Iraq to give the U.S. control of the Iraqi oil fields. America's reputation in the court of world opinion is in tatters.

Unfortunately, the President's State of the Union speech did little to allay the worries of the American people or the international community. The President signaled to the world that

America is ready for war with Iraq, but he did not explain why Iraq suddenly presents such "a serious and mounting threat" to our country, our friends, and our allies that war is the only option. How is it that the threat from Iraq is more serious than the threat from North Korea? How is it that the threat from Iraq appears to have eclipsed the threat from al-Qaida to our own country and the threat from other terrorist organizations?

Nor did the President attempt to prepare the American people for the possible consequences of war with Iraq—the terrible toll on the lives of innocent Iraqis, the potential for hundreds or thousands of battlefield casualties of American service men and women, the sharply increased threat of terrorist attacks on America and its allies. The President promised that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein would liberate the people of Iraq, but he made no mention of what the American people could expect from a postwar Iraq. The President made no mention of the burden the United States would have to bear to ensure that a postwar Iraq did not devolve into chaos.

In his State of the Union Address last year, the President declared a global war on terror, and he called on all nations of the world to come together to combat the curse of terrorism. In his speech last night, the global war on terror got remarkably short shrift. "We are working closely with other nations," the President said. "We have the terrorists on the run."

Unfortunately, having terrorists on the run means that terrorists have escaped our dragnet and, according to intelligence assessments, are actively plotting new attacks on the United States and its allies. We still do not know the fate of Osama bin Laden. We may have him on the run, but we also fear that he continues to pose a real and imminent threat to the United States. And unlike Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Laden has demonstrated his willingness to attack American citizens at home and American interests abroad.

But instead of rallying the international community to the continued need to cooperate in fighting global terrorism, the President's policies and the President's rhetoric are polarizing the world.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate has a duty to speak to the issue of war with Iraq, and I believe that the United States has a duty under international law to work within the structure of the United Nations charter. If we indict Saddam Hussein on the grounds that he has failed to disarm in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, how then can we turn around and act against him without United Nations support? What signal does the United States send to the world regarding respect for international law? The United Nations is acting responsibly. Iraq, if not fully cooperating, is at least straitjacketed. America's allies are

calling on us to give the inspectors time to do their work. This is not the time for precipitous action on the part of the United States.

For these reasons, I am today introducing a resolution urging that the U.N. weapons inspectors be given sufficient time to complete their work and calling for the President to seek a United Nations resolution specifically authorizing the use of force before initiating any offensive military operation against Iraq.

Now, it may come to be that war is the only way to subdue the malevolence of Saddam Hussein. But that is not a decision for the United States to make unilaterally. President Bush, in November, galvanized the United Nations to act on the issue of Iraq. For that, the President is to be commended. Now he must follow through on his pledge to work with the United Nations. The United Nations has demonstrated in the past 2 months that it is willing to act responsibly and vigorously in addressing the issue of Iraq's disarmament. No one could accuse chief weapons inspector Hans Blix of sugar-coating his interim report to the U.N. Security Council on January 27. He made clear that Iraq is not adequately cooperating on matters of substance. He made clear his frustration with Iraq. But he did not slam the door on the possibility of disarming Iraq without resorting to war.

As long as that door remains open even a crack, as long as Iraq is not actively threatening its neighbors or the United States, as long as the United Nations can maintain a stranglehold on Saddam Hussein's ambitions, I believe that we have a duty to the American people to strive to find an alternative to war. If war it must be, then it should be a coordinated undertaking authorized by Congress and sanctioned by the member states of the United Nations—not a preemptive strike initiated by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, the consequences of war are incalculable. Before we take such a momentous step, before we place the lives of American military personnel and innocent civilians in harm's way, we should stop to reflect on the possible consequences, and we should redouble our efforts to find a peaceful solution to the disarmament of Iraq. If war is the only recourse, it must be a war endorsed and fully supported by the United Nations.

Mr. President, if it must be war, we may be lucky. I hope we will be. But we may not be lucky. I think of the words of Croesus, when he said to Cyrus the Great of Persia:

There is a wheel on which the affairs of men revolve and its movement forbids the same man to be always fortunate.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say as the days come and go on this matter that is so vital to the American people and to their futures and to the futures of our children and grandchildren and their children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe I have time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I thank my friend from West Virginia for his eloquence once again this afternoon. When the history of our time is written, there will be many important chapters on the contributions the Senator from West Virginia has made, certainly for his State, but I also think there will be an important chapter that will be written about his contributions to our Constitution as the principal guardian of the Constitution in the Senate. He has done this on so many occasions. I have admired him so much for that effort and the extraordinary insight he has brought to all of us as a student of history.

All of us will remember very clearly the debates which were led by the Senator from West Virginia some 3 months ago on the issues of war and peace, and now once again, as we are coming to the most significant time, and that is the decision-making that will be made at the United Nations about whether we will continue with a course of inspections and whether we will try and galvanize the world community behind a common purpose, or whether we will go it alone. The Senator reminds us of the dangers of going it alone, of the unforeseen challenges we will be facing, and draws attention to the importance that this is a matter that is debated and discussed in the Senate; that the people in West Virginia, like the people in my own State, are eager to have more knowledge, more awareness, more understanding as to exactly where we are going and the circumstances of that commitment.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia so much for the thoughtful resolution which I am proud to cosponsor and for the comment he has made, which is that we will be back here again to talk about this issue of war and peace.

As he has said on many occasions, there is no vote that is more important than a Senator's vote on war and peace. There is no issue more important that we address in the Senate. The Senator reminds us of that very solemn obligation and responsibility we have on that issue and has, in his resolution, found ways of giving expression to the concerns of many of our fellow citizens.

I again thank him for all of the work he has done. I urge him to continue to lead this body to a better understanding of exactly what policy we are undertaking, what the risks are, and the challenges we face with the real prospects of a war which may be initiated by the United States, in which the United States may be effectively going it alone with perhaps one or two of our allies. I thank him so much for his attention and focus on this issue.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very able Senator for his thoughtful and gracious remarks. I thank him also for his cosponsorship of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution which I have just submitted. I thank him for his contributions to that resolution.

It is my understanding he will be submitting a resolution. We have discussed that as well, and I hope he will add my name to his resolution. He can be sure that, the Lord willing, I will be speaking on this matter from time to time, and I know that he will join me, as I hope others in this Senate will join us. I think it is time for the American people to hear more from the Senate. I do not think they have heard enough from the Senate on this matter that is so vital to them, to their loved ones, to their fortunes, and to their futures.

As far as the Lord enables me to do so, I intend to have more to say on this subject. I thank the Senator. I know he will have more to say. Again, I thank him for his remarks and for his cosponsorship of the resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may I be reminded when I have 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so inform the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last October 16, President Bush signed Public Law 107-243 which authorized the President to use military force, if necessary, to defend our country.

I voted against that resolution and war with Iraq because I was not persuaded that Iraq posed an imminent threat to our national security and because of my belief that war with Iraq, especially without broad international support, would undermine our ability to meet the gravest threat to our national security—terrorism against the United States by al-Qaida and other terrorist groups.

Circumstances have changed significantly since Congress approved that resolution last October. In the months that have passed, events have only strengthened my belief that this is the wrong war at the wrong time.

In those 3 months, al-Qaida has escalated its campaign of terror. North Korea has revived its nuclear weapons program. And United Nations inspectors are now on the ground in Iraq.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator. He invaded Kuwait. He oppresses the Iraqi people. He murders his opponents. He has gassed his own people. He has defied the world community.

So I commend President Bush for going to the United Nations and for working with our allies to put inspectors on the ground again in Iraq. The inspectors are making progress. Rather than commit American troops to war with Iraq at this time, we should give the inspectors our full support and assistance, including our best intel-

ligence information, to strengthen their disarmament efforts.

There are many other questions that must be answered before we go to war:

Will war increase the chances of injury and harm to American citizens if Saddam Hussein, with his back pressed against the wall, decides to use chemical or biological weapons? What will a postwar Iraq look like? Who will govern? How long will our troops need to stay? How many will need to stay?

What will be the impact on the war against terrorism? Will we be increasing support for al-Qaida?

What will be the impact of our allies in the region? Will stability be undermined?

How will our Nation be able to manage three foreign policy crises at the same time—the war against terrorism, the crisis with North Korea, and now war with Iraq?

When Congress voted on this issue in October, the President had not yet decided to go to war. The President said war was the last resort. He said we would work with the international community to obtain Iraq's disarmament. Clearly, we have not reached that last resort. Inspectors are on the ground in Iraq, and the international community wants the inspections to continue; yet, the President is poised to pull the trigger of war.

I am delighted to work with Senator BYRD on this issue, and I am a cosponsor of his resolution. We share the goal of ensuring that war will be the last resort; that if we do have to go to war in Iraq, it will be with the support of Congress, the American people, and the international community.

In light of the changed circumstances since the previous votes by Congress, I am submitting another resolution supporting the inspection process and requiring the President to obtain approval from the Congress before committing American troops to war.

This decision may well be one of the most important that any of us will make.

So much has happened since Congress voted to authorize force last October. On November 8, the United Nations Security Council unanimously approved a resolution that demanded unprecedented access to suspected weapons sites in Iraq. The passage of this resolution demonstrated the resolve of the international community to disarm Saddam, and was soon followed by the arrival of several hundred weapons inspectors in Iraq.

On January 27, the inspectors submitted a report to the Security Council about Iraq's cooperation with weapons inspections. Chief weapons inspector Hans Blix stated that Iraq has so far cooperated "rather well" but that additional cooperation is necessary. The director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency said inspectors "have found no evidence that Iraq has revived its nuclear weapons program since the elimination of the program in the 1990s" and that inspectors "should

be able within the next few months to provide credible assurances that Iraq has no nuclear weapons program."

The U.N. report demonstrated that the inspection process is working. The inspectors are building their case, and Saddam Hussein is feeling the pressure of the international community. Nothing in the report suggests that war now is the only option to disarm Saddam. Clearly, the inspections should continue.

It is wrong for the administration to beat the drums of war. There is time for thoughtful deliberation about whether war now is the right priority for our Nation and we in Congress have a responsibility to the Constitution and the American people to act again on this all-important issue of war or peace.

The administration has totally failed to make the case that Saddam Hussein is an imminent threat to our security. No evidence, no proof, no "smoking gun," no intelligence has ever been released to suggest we must launch a preemptive strike in order to defend America from an unprovoked attack. Instead of making its case, the administration simply says, "Trust us. We know more than you do."

Many experts believe that Iraq—especially without provocation—does not represent an imminent threat to our security. In fact, it may well be just the opposite. On October 7, CIA Director George Tenet released an unclassified assessment in a letter to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that suggested Iraq would only be a threat if the United States attacked it first.

The letter said, "the probability of [Saddam Hussein] initiating an attack [on the United States] would be low." It also said, "should Saddam Hussein conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions. Such terrorism might involve . . . [chemical and biological weapons]."

In spite of U.S. assertions that we have secret evidence of Iraq's WMD program, we have been transferring this information at a painfully slow pace. It is only this month, that we finally began to hand over "significant intelligence." The administration promises the release of new information and all of us hope that it will be more convincing than what has been made available so far.

Secretary Powell will go to the Security Council to share intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program on February 5. But if the United States has significant intelligence, we should share it with the U.N. inspectors today. We should not wait a further week. If our goal is disarmament, we should do everything possible to assist the inspectors.

The disarmament of Saddam Hussein is essential. But the administration has not made a persuasive case that the threat from Iraq is so immediate

that it justifies resort to war now when the inspections process is obviously making progress. Clearly, we have not reached the last resort.

Our Nation faces another threat that is much more immediate: the possibility of new al-Qaida terrorist attacks. A unilateral invasion of Iraq would not advance our war against terrorism—it would undermine it. Our highest national priority is to wage the unfinished war against al-Qaida and wage it effectively.

In the last 4 months there have been deadly new al-Qaida attacks worldwide, which have slaughtered hundreds. A French tanker was attacked in Yemen, a nightclub bombed in Indonesia, a hotel destroyed in Kenya, missionaries murdered in Yemen. The frequency and ferocity of these attacks is increasing. It is only a matter of time before they strike America again.

The administration would like us to believe that Saddam Hussein is public enemy No. 1, ignoring the fact that Osama bin Laden is still at large. Chilling new evidence has arisen suggests that he is planning new attacks.

At home, we still remain vulnerable. Last October, a Council of Foreign Relations task force chaired by former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman warned that "America remains dangerously unprepared to prevent and respond to a catastrophic attack on U.S. soil."

Another Task Force representative told a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee that "a war with Iraq . . . elevates the risk in the near term of an attack on the United States . . . [and] will likely consume virtually all the nation's attention and command the bulk of the available resources, leaving little left over to address our many domestic vulnerabilities."

For some time, the administration engaged in a complicated spin job to convince the American people that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden are co-conspirators. According to this view, waging war on Iraq is part of the war against terrorism. Last September, our Secretary of Defense went so far as to claim publicly that he had "bulletproof confirmation" of links between Iraq and al-Qaida.

But the administration has never presented any of this "bulletproof" evidence. Most regional experts believe it is highly unlikely that fundamentalist al-Qaida leaders would ever find much common cause with the secular dictator Saddam Hussein. Last October, CIA Director George Tenet even conceded that the administration's understanding of the al-Qaida Iraq link was "evolving" and based on "sources of varying reliability." The administration claimed again this week that they have new evidence of those ties, but so far we have only seen a rehash of old allegations and unreliable anecdotes.

As the administration emphasizes the threat from Iraq, it gives less attention to other countries that pose an even more immediate threat to our security.

The greatest proliferation threat comes not from Iraq, but North Korea. North Korea is much more likely and capable to develop, use and sell these weapons. But unlike Iraq, North Korea probably already has nuclear weapons. Unlike Iraq, North Korea has no nuclear inspectors on the ground to verify disarmament.

North Korea has a long and well-documented history of selling its military technology, especially ballistic missiles, to whoever will pay the highest price. Desperate and strapped for cash, it is the country most likely to sell or transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorists or nations that support terrorism.

In its single-minded focus on Iraq, administration officials at first refused to acknowledge that a nuclear crisis even existed. Only very recently has the Administration begun to devote the attention this crisis deserves.

Nevertheless, the administration continues to focus on Iraq. They are now suggesting an easy war, with few casualties. But our military leaders, especially those with significant combat experience are skeptical. On December 18, a press report said that the commandant of the Marine Corps is concerned that civilian leaders in the Pentagon are underestimating the risks of war, and that military chiefs have challenged the optimistic view that Saddam Hussein's government will collapse soon after a military campaign begins.

In December, we heard dire new forecasts about what war with Iraq would actually be like. U.S. intelligence officials warned that Saddam Hussein may pursue a "scorched earth" policy if the war goes badly. They said that Hussein may try to destroy Iraq's oil fields, power plants and food facilities.

In the Armed Services Committee, we heard testimony from General Hoar and others about the dangers to our troops of urban guerilla warfare.

War will be a disaster not just for the soldiers who suffer and die, but for the vast numbers of innocent civilians who will be affected. In December, the media reprinted a confidential U.N. planning document predicting a humanitarian crisis in the wake of war with Iraq. U.N. officials also predicted a halt to Iraqi oil production, serious degradation of Iraqi transportation, sanitation and power facilities, and the "outbreak of diseases in epidemic if not pandemic proportions." The document also predicted a flow of up to 900,000 refugees.

War will not be as easy as the administration would like us to believe. It may well turn into the first great humanitarian catastrophe of the 21st century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. The debate giving the President authority to use force against Iraq occurred over 3 months ago. Since then, circumstances have changed so significantly that Congress

must consider the issue of war and peace again.

The administration is also not adequately considering the massive political commitment that will be required to Iraq's long-term reconstruction. If we wage this war without allies, the United States will assume a massive and lonely responsibility to rebuild Iraq, preserve its territorial integrity and prevent chaos. Going to war alone will impose massive new responsibilities that could extend for years, if not decades.

The Senate debated giving the President authority to use force against Iraq over three months ago. Since then, circumstances have changed so significantly that Congress must consider the issue of war and peace again.

Since our debate last fall, we have finally implemented, with our allies, an active process to verify Iraq's disarmament. That process is working and should be allowed to continue. We must help this process along and give persuasive intelligence information to U.N. weapons inspectors.

It is possible that the inspections process will fail or that new evidence will be uncovered about the threat from Saddam Hussein. But under the current conditions, I continue to believe that this is the wrong war at the wrong time.

If we rush to pull the trigger against Iraq, we will invite catastrophe and condemnation. America, which has long been a beacon of freedom for people around the world, will turn into a symbol of brute force and aggression. The world may come to see us as a dangerous rogue state, needing to be contained and deterred. This is not the America that Abraham Lincoln called "the last, best hope of mankind." War now would be alien to our values, contrary to our interests, and must not be waged.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask that I be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask for a point of clarification. I was waiting in the queue. I have no objection to the Senator from Arizona going first. I ask unanimous consent that directly following Senator McCAIN, I be granted a privilege of the floor for 20 minutes.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

MR. McCAIN. Mr. President, over 3 months ago, I worked with Senators LIEBERMAN, WARNER, and BAYH to manage the resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq on the floor of the Senate. Over the course of 8 days, we held a thorough, comprehensive, and honorable debate that allowed all sides to express their views quite thoroughly. Seventy-seven Senators then voted to authorize the President to use our Armed Forces to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and "enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

The resolution, which now has the force of law, was entitled the "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002." One provision stated, "Consistent with . . . the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution." Congress has spoken, and its message could not be clearer.

The Senator from Massachusetts spoke repeatedly and at length over the course of the Congressional debate on Iraq. He spoke eloquently and passionately, in the great tradition of the Senate. At the end of the day, his views did not prevail, but he made an important contribution to the debate.

That debate is over. After a months-long period in which the Bush administration went to the Security Council—as the Senator called for last fall, secured a new Council resolution demanding Iraqi compliance with its disarmament obligations—as the Senator called for last fall, and pursued patient diplomacy while educating the American public about the threat Iraq poses to our interests—as the Senator called for last fall, I agree with him that "much has changed in the many months since Congress last debated war with Iraq."

What has changed is that the Administration has pursued the careful diplomacy the Senator had urged on it and has refrained from using force unilaterally against Iraq. The President has worked to make the case for Iraqi disarmament to America and the world. The administration was able to unite the Security Council behind our demand that Iraq disarm or be disarmed. And the administration has worked diligently to assemble a coalition that will stand with us in the event military action is necessary.

Iraq has provided more evidence of its intentions, and its defiance, by its failure to provide anything resembling an honest declaration of its arsenal of banned weaponry, and its failure to cooperate substantively with the U.N. inspectors, as Hans Blix has stated. By its own actions, Iraq has placed itself before the world in material breach of the Security Council resolution the Senator from Massachusetts demanded the administration seek, and honor, in the congressional debate last fall. I agree with the Senator, much has changed.

As the President said last night, "The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary, he is deceiving." The price of his deception, if allowed to continue unchecked, could have catastrophic consequences for the United States which none of us, no matter how we voted on the Iraq resolution, could ever countenance.

The Senator from Massachusetts apparently believes we should revoke the President's authority as Commander in Chief to order our Armed Forces to defend American national security

against the threat posed by Iraq, as enshrined in the Constitution and authorized in law by Congress, unless and until there is clear evidence of an imminent Iraqi threat of attack on the United States. But in the world we live in, there is no such thing as knowledge of imminence of attack. Had we known what was to happen to our country you September 11, 2001, there is no American leader who would not have acted to prevent it.

Every one of us in this body had contemplated what could have happened had the September 11 terrorists employed weapons of mass destruction. We cannot abide a world in which outlaw regimes deeply hostile to American are free to develop weapons which, in the hands of dictators and terrorists, would be used against us. As long as those dictators reign, and as long as terrorists plot to strike us, the threat can be understood to be imminent, because we don't know when the next attack will happen—and as long as we don't act we can say with certainty that there will be another attack.

Speaking of the nexus between rogue states with deadly arsenals and the terrorists with whom they conspire, the President said, "If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option."

While I respect my colleague's differences with the administration and with a substantial majority of the Congress on the matter of Iraq, I believe the case for action to disarm Saddam Hussein has only become more compelling since Congress debated the authorization to use force against Iraq last fall.

When I heard earlier today—as the word gets out around here—that the Senator from Massachusetts might come to the floor and propose another resolution to be debated, I must say I was of two minds. I thought this would be another marvelous opportunity to debate this amendment, this entire situation, because in the intervening months, as I have stated, Saddam Hussein has proven he is not in compliance not only with the Security Council resolutions but going all the way back to 1991 when he was required, according to Security Council Resolution 687, to comply within 15 days and has not. He has violated some 12 or 13 Security Council resolutions. I thought this would be a great opportunity because there is no doubt in my mind we would prevail again if a vote were held.

I also, on the other side of the coin, believe if we start a debate all over again that lasts for another week or 2 weeks, or whatever it is, surely we would be plowing the same ground. But also, would we be sending a signal that the American people are not united? Would the outcome of the vote be basically the same? Would Senator LIEBERMAN or Senator BAYH decide to

vote against the resolution that they so fervently and eloquently supported on the floor of the Senate? I don't think so.

Another thing about this terrible and difficult decision the President may have to make—which is the most difficult that any President of the United States is faced with, the dispatch of young Americans into harm's way—the President knows full well that even though we will win an overwhelming victory, young Americans will lose their lives.

I believe that conflict will be short. I believe that in 1991 when I debated this same situation where we contemplated previously the subject of military action against Iraq, colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including Senators who will speak and have spoken in opposition, said: It will be another Vietnam; the body bags will be coming back; we should not do this; this is terrible; let's delay; let's give peace a chance.

The conflict was short. We freed the nation of Kuwait, and for a period of time we had peace in the Middle East without significant threats to the United States national security. Now we have to finish the job, perhaps.

I say two things. One, I regret and grieve the loss of any American lives that might occur as a result of this military action. But our interests are threatened, as the President said last night.

I also want to say a word about post-Saddam Iraq, since that has been referred to continuously by those who oppose any military action under any circumstances.

The people of Iraq are subjected to one of the most brutal, repressive, God-awful regimes in the world today. Last week's New York Times told stories of warehouses where people were hung from hooks, of rape, of torture, of murder. Claire Shipman did an interview with one of Saddam Hussein's previous mistresses. He derived some kind of pleasure watching films of people being tortured.

These are bad people, a bad regime that has killed and oppressed its own people; a complete and total police state. Where are the advocates for human rights?

I promise you there are many of us, at the time of the fall of Saddam Hussein, who will devote American effort and treasure to the construction of a democratic, freely elected, free society in Iraq, and give those people a chance to enjoy the human rights that it is our fundamental belief is the endowment of all men and women.

As far as the expense is concerned, I am sure any new Iraqi Government could cover those expenses. But shouldn't we give those people an opportunity to enjoy their God-given rights rather than continue under the dictatorship of this brutal, mad dictator? He is the only one I know of who has used weapons of mass destruction on his own citizens.

Yes, I will admit, if he wasn't constructing these weapons of mass destruction, and his relentless pursuit of them, we probably wouldn't do anything about it. But this is an interesting nexus of our national interests and our national values. Our values are that all men and women are created with certain inalienable rights. Our interests are threatened by the certain knowledge that, sooner or later, Saddam Hussein would acquire these weapons and use them. There has been no evidence that would indicate the contrary.

I sort of regret we are coming to the floor to begin a debate that may last for some days, whether the Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his resolution or not. I hope not. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will recognize that time was over 3 months ago, and the process moved on, a process of constant consultation with the American people, and with the United Nations Security Council, and a speech that I think was remarkably eloquent last night to the American people by the President of the United States.

But I want to say I believe some time from now we will be pleased as Americans that we placed this responsibility in the hands of the President of the United States; that he acted with maturity; that he acted with great and sound judgment, and the world some time from now will be a far better place—not only for Americans but also for Iraqi citizens.

I yield the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS) The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his comments. He certainly is one who does know about war, and I believe he also believes that war should be a last resort.

I also thank the distinguished Senators from West Virginia and from Massachusetts for introducing this legislation which I have decided to be a cosponsor. Because of my support for the resolution which gave the President authorization for use of force, I felt I probably should come to the floor and explain my rationale for supporting the resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Essentially, Hans Blix's report Monday to the Security Council made it clear that, although there has been progress, Iraq is not fully living up to its obligations, nor is it fully cooperating. Then the President, in last night's State of the Union Message, made clear, I think, some outstanding questions.

The first question is: What has Iraq done with 500 tons of Sarin, mustard gas precursor chemicals, and VX nerve agents? That tonnage is missing. It has not been declared. It has not been revealed or has not been found.

The second question is: What has really happened to the 8,500 liters of anthrax which Iraq has stated it uni-

laterally destroyed in the summer of 1991? But it cannot document that.

And third, what of the 650 kilograms of bacterial growth media? Those are critical items.

These are key and serious issues the answers to which clearly provide the evidence as to whether Iraq possesses chemical and biological weapons.

The fourth item is the U-2 plane. The United Nations, as we all know, has access to a U-2 plane to gather intelligence. However, Iraq has refused to provide it safe overflight. This remains another issue of major non-cooperation.

So the administration is correct in saying that Iraq needs to be immediately forthcoming and immediately cooperative with the inspectors. These issues need to be resolved. These are mega issues from anyone's point of view.

As long as the inspectors believe there is sufficient access and as long as Iraq has said, specifically Tariq Aziz, that Iraq will even offer greater cooperation, I would say there ought to be a period of time where Iraq provides to the world and to the inspectors, the answers to these questions. I think it is vital.

If Iraq is found to pose an imminent threat to the United States, then clearly we have to take action—with others I hope, if we can. But right now that is not the case. If, indeed, after consultations with the Security Council, the administration has clear evidence that Iraq is continuing an illegal program to produce chemical and biological weapons, or nuclear weapons, or possesses these weapons, the time has really come to make it public.

What the President did, in my view, was present very clearly, not only to the Congress of the United States but to the entire world, significant questions that need to be immediately addressed. Iraq must, in fact, step up to the plate.

The reason I believe this resolution—which essentially asks for time for inspections to continue, essentially urges a second vote at the Security Council—is right is because I believe this situation must stand on its own. The degree of threat and the degree of violation must be separately evaluated. But it is also part of a much bigger scenario and I want to spend time discussing that scenario here today.

I believe America's national security policy stands at a crossroads. I believe in the wake of 9/11, last year was fundamental in terms of the administration's articulation of what constitutes, to my mind, a brand new approach to foreign policy by the United States. Within about 8 months last year, the administration put out three separate documents. One of them was the National Security Strategy. The second was the Nuclear Posture Review. The third was the Doctrine of Preemption as represented in the President's speech at West Point.

Although individually each may appear innocuous, taken together these

documents are revolutionary. They posit a world in which the exercise of U.S. military power is the central organizing principle for international affairs in this new century. These documents, in fact, put forward a litany of ways in which the United States will make military activism and adventurism the basic tool for pursuing national security.

First, the National Security Strategy quite pointedly moves the United States away from the concept of deterrence and, to a great extent, substitutes preemption in its place.

Secondly, the administration's Nuclear Posture Review is extraordinarily provocative and dangerous. It blurs the line between the use of conventional and nuclear weapons. It suggests that certain events might compel the United States to use nuclear weapons first, even against non-nuclear states. And it calls for the development of a new generation of United States nuclear warheads, including "mini-nukes."

As was well documented in the press last year, the Review also discusses contingencies in which nuclear weapons might be used, including—and I quote—"a North Korean attack on South Korea or a military confrontation over the status of Taiwan" in which our adversaries do not necessarily use nuclear weapons first.

The Review also addresses contingencies in which the United States might use nuclear weapons not in retaliation to a nuclear strike on the United States but to destroy enemy stocks of chemical or biological arms.

Karl Rove was specifically asked that question on television on Sunday, and he did not answer the question.

This Review also states that in setting requirements for nuclear strike capabilities, distinctions can be made among immediate, potential or unexpected contingencies, and that North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya are among the countries that could be involved in these immediate, potential or unexpected contingencies.

That is what makes what is being suggested here in Iraq—if you look at it, in its total expression—so troubling.

The fact of the matter is that several of the nations cited in the Nuclear Posture Review's contingencies lack nuclear weapons. Using nuclear weapons against them would be constitute first use. Under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the United States has agreed not to use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state unless that country attacks the United States "in alliance with a nuclear weapons state."

And finally, the doctrine of Preemption—which we may be seeing for the time with Iraq—asserts a unilateral right for the United States to preempt a threat against our Nation's security.

The doctrine says:

[T]he United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. . . . We cannot let our enemies strike first.

Further on:

The greater the threat, the greater the risk of inaction—and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves.

Taken at face value, this means the United States holds for itself the right to strike against another sovereign nation—wage war, if you will—even in the absence of a clear and present danger, an immediate threat or provocative action, but based solely on the perception of a sufficient threat.

I deeply believe the administration's course in these areas stands in contrast to the successful bipartisan tradition of supporting a world ordered by law, with capable international institutions and reciprocal restraints on action.

But the administration's emphasis on unilateral action, its dismissal of international law, treaties, and institutions, and its apparent focus on the military, especially as documented in the National Security Strategy, the doctrine of Preemption and the Nuclear Posture Review, have created widespread resentment in the international community.

I believe that these documents are the clearest statements in writing of the administration's long-term intentions, and I find them questionable and seriously disturbing.

I must also tell you that Secretary Powell essentially said to me: Well, the Nuclear Posture Review really isn't operative. But, nonetheless, that is a doctrine that was released. It is serious in its ramifications. And the way this relates to Iraq is Iraq may be the first test case. If there are chemical and biological weapons—and there very well might be—does this then justify the use of a nuclear weapon to destroy them? The Nuclear Posture Review puts this on the table as an option. I think we need to know.

So I ask these questions because I think they must be asked. And this is as good a time as any.

If we are going to depend on the might of the sword to right wrongs, and in so doing risk committing our own wrongs, how are we better off?

Coalitions, alliances, treaties, peacekeepers, inspection regimes—all can and have been successful instruments in deterring adversaries, safeguarding American lives and U.S. security interests, and in resolving disputes, conflicts, and crises.

So, Madam President, I remind this body that since World War II, there has been strong bipartisan support of a United States which has embraced international cooperation, not out of vulnerability or weakness but from a position of strength.

House Joint Resolution 114, which I supported, and which authorizes the use of force against Iraq, specifically calls for a Presidential determination, that—and I quote—"reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the

continuing threat posed by Iraq or is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

That finding, that determination, required by our resolution—for which 77 of us voted—has not yet been made. The evidence has not yet been laid out. The conclusions have not yet been drawn.

What happened to the missing anthrax, the missing botulinum toxin, the missing VX nerve agent, the missing precursor chemicals, has not yet been determined. So that is why I come to the floor to say that it is critical that Iraq fully cooperate. It is critical that the inspectors be allowed to continue.

If Iraq does not come clean, if Iraq does not submit the documentation as to the disposition of these chemicals and biological agents, then a legitimate conclusion can be drawn. But the reason I believe arms inspections must be given a chance to succeed and must continue is that I believe Iraq is just one small part of a larger sea-change in U.S. national security policy. It is a small part of the doctrine of Preemption, in which we move against a perceived or real threat. It is a small part of the Nuclear Posture Review, which says the United States would countenance the use of nuclear weapons against hard and deeply buried targets or biological or chemical weapons.

So I believe that restraint is the proper course. It means that diplomacy is a prudent course, and it means that if international law—if international bodies are to have any relevance in this new millennium—then the Security Council itself must respond.

It is my deep belief that in the long run a foreign policy oriented toward cooperation and consultation will prove to be a more effective guarantor of U.S. national security than one of unilateral impulse and confrontation.

Let us remember that we are currently engaged in a war on terror. It is a war that, if we are to win it, will require the cooperation of our friends and allies.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the United States acts precipitously against Iraq, Taliban and al-Qaida fighters in the hinterland of Afghanistan are gathering today and are prepared to strike against our forces there and against the government of Hamid Karzai.

And let us recall that beyond Iraq, there are a host of other challenges—the situation in the Middle East, the nuclear crisis on the Korean peninsula—that require international cooperation and action. So I am deeply concerned that if we are not careful in our approach to Iraq, if we do not present a just case, if we do not build an international coalition, we may well precipitate the very events we are trying to prevent. For example, a preemptive unilateral attack against a Muslim nation may well create a divide between the United States and the Muslim world so deep and so wide that it

will bring with it negative consequences for decades, and unforeseen ones.

I deeply believe that if Iraq is in possession of weapons of mass destruction, it poses a real threat to the entire international community; and there is no doubt, as the President pointed out, that Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator.

But at this point I believe it would be a tremendous mistake for the United States to unilaterally attack Iraq, and I urge the administration to go slow, let the inspectors do their work, and build that international coalition. War should be a last resort, not a foregone conclusion.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

A FORMER PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON IRAQ

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I wish to read from a speech of a President of the United States. In order that there be no question about its source, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks the speech in full be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I intend to read excerpts of the speech. It is too long to read completely in the time allotted to me. I hope my friends on both sides of the aisle will listen to it because when I heard of this speech in the first instance, I was very impressed by it. I think the Senate should be reminded of it. I will start off with this paragraph, and it is not the first, but I will call attention to it. The President said:

I have just received a very fine briefing from our military leadership on the status of our forces in the Persian Gulf. Before I left the Pentagon, I wanted to talk to you and all those whom you represent, the men and women of our military.

The President was speaking to the force of generals of the United States.

You, your friends, and your colleagues are on the frontlines of this crisis in Iraq. I want you and I want the American people to hear directly from me what is at stake for America in the Persian Gulf; what we are doing to protect the peace, the security, the freedom we cherish; why we have taken the position we have taken.

I will now move down in the speech.

This is a time of tremendous promise for America. The superpower confrontation has ended on every continent; democracy is securing for more and more people the basic freedoms we Americans have come to take for granted. Bit by bit, the information age is chipping away at the barriers, economic, political, and social, that once kept people locked in and freedom and prosperity locked out.

But for all our promise, all our opportunity, people in this room know very well that this is not a time free from peril, especially as a result of reckless acts of outlaw nations and an unholy axis of terrorists, drug traffickers, and organized international

criminals. We have to defend our future from these predators of the 21st century. They feed on the free flow of information and technology. They actually take advantage of the freer movement of people, information, and ideas. And they will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region, and the security of all the rest of us.

I want the American people to understand, first, the past: How did this crisis come about? And I want them to understand what we must do to protect the national interests and, indeed, the interest of all freedom-loving people in the world.

Remember, as a condition of the cease-fire after the Gulf war, the United Nations demanded—not the United States, the United Nations—and Saddam Hussein agreed to declare within 15 days—this is way back in 1991—within 15 days his nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them, to make a total declaration. That's what he promised to do.

The United Nations set up a special commission of highly trained international experts, called UNSCOM, to make sure that Iraq made good on that commitment. We had every good reason to insist that Iraq disarm. Saddam had built up a terrible arsenal, and he used it, not once but many times. In a decade-long war with Iran, he used chemical weapons against combatants, against civilians, against a foreign adversary, and even against his own people. During the Gulf war, Saddam launched Scuds against Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Bahrain.

Now, instead of playing by the very rules he agreed to at the end of the Gulf war, Saddam has spent the better part of the past decade trying to cheat on this solemn commitment. Consider just some of the facts. Iraq repeatedly made false declarations about weapons that it had left in its possession after the Gulf war. When UNSCOM would then uncover evidence that gave lie to those declarations, Iraq would simply amend the records. For example, Iraq revised its nuclear declarations 4 times within just 14 months, and it has submitted 6 different biological warfare declarations, each of which has been rejected by UNSCOM.

In 1995, Hussein Kamel, Saddam's son-in-law and the chief organizer of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program, defected to Jordan. He revealed that Iraq was continuing to conceal weapons and missiles and the capacity to build many more. Then and only then did Iraq admit to developing numbers of weapons in significant quantities and weapons stocks. Previously, it had vehemently denied the very thing it just simply admitted once Saddam Hussein's son-in-law defected to Jordan and told the truth.

Now, listen to this. What did it admit? It admitted, among other things, an offensive biological warfare capability, notably 5,000 gallons of botulinum, which causes botulism; 2,000 gallons of anthrax; 25 biological-filled Scud warheads; and 157 aerial bombs. And I might say, UNSCOM inspectors believe that Iraq had actually greatly understated its production. As if we needed further confirmation, you all know what happened to his son-in-law when he made the untimely decision to go back to Iraq.

He was killed, Madam President.

Next, throughout this entire process, Iraq agents have undermined and undercut UNSCOM. They've harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras,

literally spirited evidence out of the back doors of suspect facilities as inspectors walked through the front door, and our people were there observing it and have the pictures to prove it.

Despite Iraq's deceptions, UNSCOM has, nevertheless, done a remarkable job. Its inspectors, the eyes and ears of the civilized world, have uncovered and destroyed more weapons of mass destruction capacity than was destroyed during the Gulf war. This includes nearly 40,000 chemical weapons, more than 100,000 gallons of chemical weapons agents, 48 operational missiles, 30 warheads specifically fitted for chemical and biological weapons, and a massive biological weapons facility at Al Hakam equipped to produce anthrax and other deadly agents. . . .

That is all we want. And if we can find a diplomatic way to do what has to be done, to do what he promised to do at the end of the Gulf war, to do what should have been done within 15 days—within 15 days of the agreement at the end of the Gulf war—if we can find a diplomatic way to do that, that is by far our preference. But to be a genuine solution and not simply one that glosses over the remaining problem, a diplomatic solution must include or meet a clear, immutable, reasonable, simple standard: Iraq must agree, and soon, to free, full, unfettered access to these sites, anywhere in the country. There can be no dilution or diminishment of the integrity of the inspection system that UNSCOM has put in place.

Now, those terms are nothing more or less than the essence of what he agreed to at the end of the Gulf war. The Security Council many times since has reiterated this standard. If he accepts them, force will not be necessary. If he refuses or continues to evade his obligation through more tactics of delay and deception, he, and he alone, will be to blame for the consequences.

I ask all of you to remember the record here: what he promised to do within 15 days at the end of the Gulf war, what he repeatedly refused to do, what we found out in '95, what the inspectors have done against all odds.

We have no business agreeing to any resolution of this that does not include free, unfettered access to the remaining sites by people who have integrity and proven competence in the inspection business. That should be our standard. That's what UNSCOM has done, and that's why I have been fighting for it so hard. That's why the United States should insist upon it.

Now, let's imagine the future. What if he fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him more opportunities to develop this program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to press for the release of sanctions and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made? Well, he will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal. And I think every one of you who has really worked on this for any length of time believes that, too. . . .

If Saddam rejects peace and we have to use force, our purpose is clear: We want to seriously diminish the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program. We want to seriously reduce his capacity to threaten his neighbors. I am quite confident from the briefing I have just received from our military leaders that we can achieve the objectives and secure our vital strategic interests.

Let me be clear: A military operation cannot destroy all the weapons of mass destruction capacity. But it can and will leave him