United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2003 No. 37

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 10, 2003, at 12 noon.

Senate

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2003

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, omnipresent Lord of all life, we do not presume to invite You into this Chamber or into the deliberations of this day; You are already here. This is Your Nation; this historic Chamber is the sanctuary for the sacred work of government. All the Senators are here by Your choice, and all of us who work to support their leadership are here by Your providence.

The one place You will not enter without our invitation is our souls. You have ordained that we must ask You to take up residence in our inner being and to guide our thinking, desires, vision, and plans. The latch string is on the inside. You stand at the door of each of our souls, persistently knocking. We open the door and receive You as absolute Sovereign of our lives. Just as You reign as Sovereign of this Nation and our ultimate Leader to whom we relinquish our own wills, may Your very best for our beloved Nation be accomplished through what is debated and decided today. You are our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TED STEVENS led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I advise Members that the Senate will be in a period of morning business until the hour of 12:30 p.m. today, with time equally divided between the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Democratic leader or their designees. The Senate leadership—the majority and minority—recognizing that a number of Senators have desired to speak on the international situation, is making this period available for Senators to address the world scene relating to the war on terrorism, with emphasis on Iraq and North Korea.

As announced last night, there will be no rollcall votes during today's session. The next vote will occur at 6 p.m. on Monday. It will be on the nomination of Gregory Frost of Ohio to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Also, a reminder: Under the consent agreement reached last night, the Senate will begin consideration of Calendar No. 19, S. 3, the partial-birth abortion bill, at 5 p.m. on Monday.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with time to be equally divided between the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, and the Democratic leader or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as may be required to our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

WAR ON TERRORISM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Virginia organizing this opportunity to discuss what is obviously one of the most serious issues which we as a nation are facing and which the world is facing; that is, the question of how we address terrorism, and specifically how we address terrorist states such as Iraq.

The leadership of the Senator from Virginia on this point has been long and strong and continuous. I admire the fact that he has given us that leadership, and I appreciate the fact that his service in the Senate and his expertise are brought to bear on this type of a very difficult question.

When we begin to address this issue of terrorism, I think we should start with the source. Let us turn to the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

words of the man who has basically orchestrated the attacks on the United States, Osama bin Laden, and his intentions and the intentions of the people he directs, and unfortunately encourages. Osama bin Laden, on the issue of weapons of mass destruction, in an interview in 1999 from Time magazine, said the following:

> Acquiring weapons for the defense of Muslims is a religious duty. If I have indeed acquired these weapons—

Weapons of mass destruction—

> —then I thank God for enabling me to do so. And if I seek to acquire these weapons, I am carrying out a duty. It would be a sin for Muslims not to try to possess the weapons that would prevent the infidels from inflicting harm on Muslims.

In a religious order he states:

> We, with Allah's help, call on every Muslim who believes in Allah and who wishes to be rewarded to comply with Allah's order to kill Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies, civilians and military, is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it.

These are the words of a fanatic who has a purpose. We have seen the execution of his purpose in the attacks on Americans, with thousands dying in New York and others here in Washington, military men and women in Yemen, and in our Foreign Service personnel in Africa.

The question becomes: From whom would he obtain these weapons of destruction? It is clear that one of the core sources of weapons of mass destruction is terrorist states which are producing those weapons of mass destruction—states which act outside the responsibility of the civilized world.

The state which has most flagrantly pursued that course of action is, of course, Iraq. They have weapons of mass destruction. That has been confirmed beyond question—biological and chemical—and they clearly are trying to develop nuclear. More importantly, Saddam Hussein has used those weapons not only against what he perceives as an enemy—the Iranians—but against his own people. He has killed thousands of his own people and tens of thousands of Iranians using weapons of mass destruction—chemical weapons.

We know there are literally tons of Vx gas and pounds of anthrax which are unaccounted for and which cannot be found—and which are in the possession of Saddam Hussein. Should they fall into the hands of Osama bin Laden, it is very clear from his own words that they would be used against us here in the United States, and the implications are staggering. If they were to be dispersed in any number of ways, tens of thousands of Americans might be harmed and possibly even die.

The United Nations has equally recognized that Saddam Hussein is a threat to the civilized world, and a number of resolutions have been passed by the United Nations calling for action to be taken by Saddam Hussein and his regime to comply with international law.

In April 1991, almost 12 years ago, the U.N. Security Council decided in Security Council Resolution 687 that Iraq shall unconditionally accept, under international supervision, the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of its weapons of mass destruction, and ballistic missiles with a range over 150 kilometers. It further required Iraq to make a declaration within 15 days of the location, amounts, and types of such items.

Twelve years ago that resolution was passed. It is uncomplied with. It has been ignored. It has been intentionally obfuscated by Saddam Hussein.

In August 1991, Security Council Resolution 707 demanded that Iraq provide, without further delay, full, final, and complete disclosure of its proscribed weapons and programs as required by the previous resolution.

That resolution has been ignored, obfuscated, undercut, and actively avoided by Saddam Hussein's regime.

In June 1996, Security Council Resolution 1060 deplored the refusal of the Iraqi authorities to allow access to sites designated by the Special Commission, which constituted a clear violation of three previous resolutions.

That resolution has been ignored, obfuscated, and undercut by Saddam Hussein, and intentionally undermined.

In June 1997, Security Council Resolution 1115 condemned Iraq's actions and demanded Iraq allow UNSCOM's team immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any sites for inspections, and officials for interviews by UNSCOM. Again, the resolution has been ignored, undermined, and actively obfuscated and circumvented by Saddam Hussein.

In October 1997, Security Council Resolution 1134 demanded that Iraq cooperate fully with the Special Commission and demanded also that Iraq, without delay, allow the inspection teams immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records, as well as to persons whom the inspectors wish to interview.

The resolution has been ignored, undermined, and actively obfuscated by Saddam Hussein.

In November 1997, Security Council Resolution 1137 condemned the continued violations by Iraq, its tampering with monitoring cameras of the Special Commission, and demanded that Iraq cooperate fully, and immediately.

That was in 1997. And there has been no immediate cooperation. In fact, there have been active—active—attempts to interfere with and undermine that resolution.

In March 1998, Security Council Resolution 1154 stressed that Iraq must accord immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to the Special Commission, and that any violation would result in the severest consequences for Iraq.

Again, Iraq has ignored the resolution and actively worked to undermine it.

In November 1998, Security Council Resolution 1205 condemned the decision by Iraq to cease cooperation with the Special Commission as a flagrant violation of Resolution 687 and other resolutions.

In November 2002, Security Council Resolution 1441, which was unanimously approved, decided that Iraq has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions and decided to afford Iraq, by this resolution, a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under the relevant resolutions.

Resolution 1441 has been ignored, obfuscated, and actively—actively—undermined by Saddam Hussein and his regime.

There can be no question—absolutely no question—but that Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq continued to possess weapons of mass destruction, continued to hide those weapons from the inspectors, continued to violate resolution after resolution of the world community, as presented by the United Nations, and represents a clear and present and immediate threat not only to its neighbors, but more specifically to us, the United States.

There are some in the world community, obviously—mostly in Europe—some of our allies, who, for whatever their personal reasons or whatever their national interests, have decided Saddam Hussein does not represent the threat we know he is. I might even recall the words of Washington when I think of that. Washington advised us, of course: Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice? There are interests there that are not ours. But in the end our purpose must be our national security and the security of our people.

It was not, of course, Berlin or France or Paris that was attacked. It was New York City that was attacked. As a result, it is America that is at risk.

Former President Clinton made it very clear he understood the threat of Saddam Hussein. He has described Iraq as a ''rogue state with weapons of mass destruction ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed.'' He went on to imagine: What if Saddam fails to comply with the U.N. resolutions and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third course, which gives him yet another opportunity to develop this program of weapons of mass destruction? Mr. Clinton answered his own question by saying:

> Well, [Saddam] will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction. And someday, some way, I guarantee you he'll use the arsenal. And I think every one of you who's worked on this for any length of time believes that, too.

That was President Clinton.

Last night, President Bush made it very clear that he understands his purpose as President, his responsibility as Commander in Chief, but more importantly, his responsibility as a leader of the free world, and the protector of the interests of the American people and the lives of Americans, must involve the disarmament of Iraq.

There can be no question about that. Iraq must be disarmed. We are engaged in a war. Some on the other side have said or implied there is no war and, therefore, we should not go to war. But when our buildings were attacked and our people died in New York, and when our people died in Washington, and when our sailors were killed in Yemen, and our Foreign Service people were killed in Africa, clearly, those were acts of war directed at us and at our people.

Were this the 19th century or well into the 20th century, when despots such as Saddam Hussein also existed—all through time there have been despots—then maybe we could take a more casual or leisurely approach to this, and maybe we could live by the code of some of our European allies: That we simply will do business with them and hope they go away. But those times no longer exist.

Today, when a rogue nation, led by a criminal individual, attains weapons of mass destruction, the death and destruction which they can level on people who they perceive as their enemies is overwhelming. The smoking gun is no longer a single bullet. The smoking gun may be a nuclear bomb or a biological weapon or a chemical attack which kills tens of thousands of Americans.

We cannot wait for the smoking gun. We know the weapons exist. We know the person who controls those weapons is fundamentally evil. And we know the people who want to attain those weapons have already killed thousands of Americans. We must take action.

So I congratulate and support our President as he moves forward to make it unquestionably clear we will not tolerate an Iraq that has weapons of mass destruction, and we will do what is necessary to protect our Nation and our people and the freedom which we enjoy.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Virginia granting me this time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the contribution of our distinguished colleague.

We have two speakers on our side ready to go forward, and we will rotate, as the case may be. But we now have the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense within the larger committee, a man who has dedicated much of his lifetime to defense issues, beginning in World War II with his distinguished service in the Army Air Corps.

I would hope the chairman might make reference to the work that has been done in his committee with reference to the issues relating to international terrorism, Iraq, and North Korea, because there is some challenge to the Senate as an institution as to whether or not we are giving attention to these issues. Within the last day or so, I put into the RECORD a very long recitation of what the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate has been doing. I know the Committee on Appropriations, particularly the subcommittee, has been very active. We also are likely to hear from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. His committee has also been doing a great deal of work.

We all recognize the value of debates in this historic Chamber, but there is much work going on within the committee structure by individual Senators in their town meetings. So, collectively, this institution has a good record of addressing the serious issues of our time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is right. As a veteran of World War II and a child of the Depression, I harken back to the days before World War II when we had so much information coming our way concerning the scourge that was threatening and did threaten and almost destroyed Europe. We have tried to be vigilant in this country. We have had a series of debates not only on this occasion but at the time of the decision of the United States to fulfill the request of the United Nations to eject Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. We had similar divisions on the floor of the Senate then. I was sad to hear comments made before that action was initiated, but I was very proud of the Senate that after the decision was made to go to war against Iraq in order to eject them from Kuwait the Senate came together and supported President Bush in 1991 to achieve that objective.

Now we face a different circumstance. I like to harken back to the words that my good friend, the former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last September. He said then:

> We must consider not only the result of action but the consequences of our inaction.

Secretary Kissinger presents the watchwords for this body to consider and think about, especially since this administration and I personally believe that Saddam Hussein represents a clear and present danger to the United States and to those who believe in freedom throughout the world.

As a consequence of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and the war on terrorism that ensued, Secretary Kissinger pointed out that a new geopolitical reality was born. The world must recognize that the potential connection between terrorists and weapons of mass destruction moved terrorism to a new level of threat. In fact, that nexus should be the overriding security issue of our Nation.

President Bush and his team of national advisers has determined that Saddam Hussein is in possession of weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, and possibly nuclear—which could be used by terrorists to threaten the world. There is a great deal of information collected by the United States in the past year concerning that fact.

In 2001, an Iraqi defector, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri, said he had visited 20 secret facilities for chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. Mr. Saeed, a civil engineer, supported his claims with Iraqi Government contracts complete with technical specifications. Mr. Saeed said Iraq used companies to purchase equipment with the blessing of the United Nations and then secretly used that equipment for their weapons programs.

Iraq admitted to producing biological agents and, after the 1995 defection of a senior Iraqi official, Iraq admitted to weaponization of thousands of liters of anthrax, botulinum toxin, and aflatoxin for use with Scud warheads, aerial bombs, and aircraft. Our Defense Department reported in 2001 that Iraq had continued to work its weapons programs, including converting an L–29 jet trainer aircraft for potential vehicles for delivery of chemical or biological weapons. Just think of that, weaponization of an airplane and using an airplane in a way entirely foreign to its original purpose. It reminds me of September 11.

This jet trainer is capable of delivering both of these systems, chemical and biological weapons. In fact, Iraq has not accounted for hundreds of tons of chemical precursors and tens of thousands of unfilled munitions, including Scud variant missile warheads. It has not accounted for at least 15,000 artillery rockets that in the past were its preferred vehicles for delivering nerve agents, nor has it accounted for almost 550 artillery shells filled with mustard agents.

Iraq is still purchasing chemical weapons agent precursors and applicable production equipment. It is making an effort to hide the activities at the Fallujah plant, which is one of Iraq's chemical weapons production facilities, which was one of those production facilities before the gulf war. At Fallujah and three other plants, Iraq has chlorine production capacity far higher than any civilian need for water treatment. Evidence indicates that some of its chlorine imports are being diverted for military purposes.

A report issued by the International Institute for Strategic Studies concluded that Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain fissile material. In the last 14 months, Iraq has sought to buy thousands of specifically designed aluminum tubes which intelligence officials believe were intended

as components for centrifuges to enrich uranium. Iraq has withheld documentation relative to its past nuclear program, including data about enrichment techniques, foreign procurement, weapons designs, experimental data, and technical documents.

Saddam Hussein has repeatedly met with his nuclear scientists over the past 2 years, signaling his continued interest in developing a nuclear program.

Iraq is believed to be developing ballistic missiles with a greater range than 150 kilometers, as prohibited by U.N. Security Council Resolution 687. Iraq continues to work on the al-Samoud liquid propellant short-range missile which can fly beyond the 150 kilometers barred by the agreements into which it has entered. The al-Samoud and the solid propellant Ababil-100 appeared in a military parade in Baghdad on December 31, 2000, suggesting that both were nearing operational deployment. The al-Rafah-North facility is Iraq's principal site for testing liquid propellant missile engines, and it has been building a new larger test stand there that is clearly intended for testing prohibited long-range missile engines.

Each of these actions point to the creation of an environment that will permit Saddam Hussein to go after his enemies, whether they are in Iraq or any other region in the world. And we have seen time and time again Saddam Hussein has no regard for the ideals of freedom, equality, and justice for others. He lives in an empty echo chamber of evil.

What we must face is that the United Nations resolutions were systematically and brutally ignored and violated for the past 12 years. It was the U.N. inspectors who found it impossible to do their job and had to leave their work unfinished. They returned, and they have been at it again, trying to find the evidence to prove what we all believe is true.

Clearly, the Senator from New Hampshire has just stated Iraq has ignored now 17 resolutions and blatantly violated the agreement it made after defeat in 1991.

What we face is existence of a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction. I wonder if anyone here denies that. They have the willingness to use these weapons and have demonstrated in the past, both against the Kurds and Iran, that they have a hatred for the civilized world. It is a terrorist state now, in my opinion. If we were to go to war with Iraq again, we will not be ignoring our war on terrorism but trying to stamp out the source of it. Americans must face this responsibility and the realization that we are the one country in the world that can both eradicate this man, bring him to justice, and bring the seeds of democracy to a new nation.

I hope we will finally hear soon that all of the nations we believed were our partners in seeking freedom will support the objectives of the U.N. resolutions that have already passed. I think if we would enforce those, we would achieve a safe and lasting peace for Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein from power. In fact, I remind the Senate and the President of section 6 of the Iraqi Liberation Act of 1998, which urged then-President Clinton to call upon the U.N. to establish an international criminal tribunal for the purpose of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials, including his sons Qusay and Uday, who are responsible for crimes against humanity, genocide, and other criminal violations of international law.

Mr. President, I also awakened this morning to find the Washington Times. This story bothers me considerably. It is a story headlined ''Iraq Strengthens Air Force with French Parts.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this disturbs me greatly. For the last 20 years, 21 years, I have been privileged to attend the Paris Air Show, along with a substantial number of Americans and our American companies. I visited those companies in their chalets there. We tried to develop what was called a ''two-way street.'' We would buy some materials from them and they would buy some from us.

There is no need for France to sell equipment to Saddam Hussein. It is international treason, Mr. President. It is in violation of a U.N. resolution, and there should be no question about French officials—they should come forward quickly to deal with this story. As a pilot and former war pilot, it disturbs me greatly that the French would allow, in any way, parts for the Mirage to be exported so the Iraqis could continue to use those planes. They are good planes, Mr. President. The French make very good aircraft parts. But they should not be finding their way to Saddam Hussein at this time.

I share the concern of the writer of that article about the position of the French government, in view of this information now disclosed by our intelligence officials. As Senator WARNER stated, as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I intend to get to the bottom of that. We intend to make inquiries today and find out what more we know about what is disclosed in the article regarding the shipment of military parts from either France or Germany into Iraq. I believe the American people need to know more about this. We need to know why these two countries, among the best of our allies, are standing on the sidelines as we prepare to try to destroy this regime that threatens the world. In my judgment, it is something the Senate must take very seriously if either of those governments has allowed the export of war materials to go to Iraq at this time.

I thank my friend for allowing me this time.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 7, 2003]

IRAQ STRENGTHENS AIR FORCE WITH FRENCH PARTS

(By Bill Gertz)

A French company has been selling spare parts to Iraq for its fighter jets and military helicopters during the past several months, according to U.S. intelligence officials.

The unidentified company sold the parts to a trading company in the United Arab Emirates, which then shipped the parts through a third country into Iraq by truck.

The spare parts included goods for Iraq's French-made Mirage F–1 jets and Gazelle attack helicopters.

An intelligence official said the illegal spare-parts pipeline was discovered in the past two weeks and that sensitive intelligence about the transfers indicates that the parts were smuggled to Iraq as recently as January.

Other intelligence reports indicate that Iraq had succeeded in acquiring French weaponry illegally for years, the official said.

The parts appear to be included in an effort by the Iraqi military to build up materiel for its air forces before any U.S. military action, which could occur before the end of the month.

The officials identified the purchaser of the parts as the Al Tamoor Trading Co., based in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. A spokesman for the company could not be reached for comment.

The French military parts were then sent by truck into Iraq from a neighboring country the officials declined to identify.

Iraq has more than 50 Mirage F–1 jets and an unknown number of Gazelle attack helicopters, according to the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies.

An administration official said the French parts transfers to Iraq may be one reason France has so vehemently opposed U.S. plans for military action against Iraq. ''No wonder the French are opposing us,'' this official said.

The official, however, said intelligence reports of the parts sale did not indicate that the activity was sanctioned by the French government or that Paris knows about the transfers.

The intelligence reports did not identify the French company involved in selling the aircraft parts or whether the parts were new or used.

The Mirage F–1 was made by France's Dassault Aviation. Gazelle helicopters were made by Aerospatiale, which later became a part of a consortium of European defense companies.

The importation of military goods by Iraq is banned under U.N. Security Council resolutions passed since the 1991 Persian Gulf war.

Nathalie Loiseau, press counselor at the French Embassy, said her government has no information about the spare-parts smuggling and has not been approached by the U.S. government about the matter.

''We fully comply with the U.N. sanctions, and there is no sale of any kind of military material or weapons to Iraq,'' she said.

A CIA spokesman had no comment.

A senior administration official declined to discuss Iraq's purchase of French warplane and helicopter parts. ''It is well known that the Iraqis use front companies to try to obtain a number of prohibited items,'' the official said.

The disclosure comes amid heightened anti-French sentiment in the United States over Paris' opposition to U.S. plans for using force to disarm Iraq.

A senior defense official said France undermined U.S. efforts to disarm Iraq last year by watering down language of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441 that last fall required Iraq to disarm all its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons programs.

France, along with Russia, Germany and China, said yesterday that they would block a joint U.S.-British U.N. resolution on the use of force against Iraq.

French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin told reporters in Paris on Wednesday that France ''will not allow a resolution to pass that authorizes resorting to force.''

''Russia and France, as permanent members of the Security Council, will assume their full responsibilities on this point,'' he stated.

France has been Iraq's best friend in the West. French arms sales to Baghdad were boosted in the 1970s under Premier Jacques Chirac, the current president. Mr. Chirac once called Saddam Hussein a ''personal friend.''

During the 1980s, when Paris backed Iraq in its war against Iran, France sold Mirage fighter bombers and Super Entendard aircraft to Baghdad, along with Exocet antiship missiles.

French-Iraqi ties soured after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait that led to the 1991 Persian Gulf war.

France now has an estimated $4 billion in debts owed to it by Iraq as a result of arms sales and infrastructure construction projects. The debt is another reason U.S. officials believe France is opposing military force to oust Saddam.

Henry Sokolski, director of the private Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, said French transfers of military equipment to Iraq would have ''an immediate and relevant military consequence, if this was done.''

''The United States with its allies are going to suppress the Iraqi air force and air defense very early on in any conflict, and it's regrettable that the French have let a company complicate that mission,'' Mr. Sokolski said.

Secretary of State Collin L. Powell last month released intelligence information showing videotape of an Iraqi F–1 Mirage that had been modified to spray anthrax spores.

A CIA report to Congress made public in January stated that Iraq has aggressively sought advanced conventional arms. ''A thriving gray-arms market and porous borders have allowed Baghdad to acquire smaller arms and components for larger arms, such as spare parts for aircraft, air defense systems, and armored vehicles,'' the CIA stated.

Iraq also has obtained some military goods through the U.N.-sponsored oil-for-food program.

A second CIA report in October on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction stated: ''Iraq imports goods using planes, trains, trucks, and ships without any type of international inspections—in violation of UN Security Council resolutions.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is always a great pleasure to listen to my distinguished colleague.

I wonder if I might just make reference to a point of history. Give or take a year or so, both of us lived through the World War II period. You were a distinguished aviator with the Air Corps. I was a mere sailor in the closing months. You got overseas and, fortunately, my generation didn't have to go because of the courage of Harry Truman.

Mr. STEVENS. I am always pleased to be with young men, Mr. President.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator very much.

We have to use history as a rearview mirror to explain the complexity of the times. You will recall that period in 1937 when the war clouds were gathering in Europe, and Neville Chamberlain went over to see whether or not he could reconcile the situation involving Hitler and the extraordinary buildup of his forces. The world was apprehensive. Chamberlain emerged from the meeting and flew back to London with a piece of paper that said ''peace in our times.'' And then we know the tragic events that unfolded after that, with the invasion of Poland in 1939, and then down through and into France in 1940, and the entrapment of the British forces at Dunkerque. The whole world came in on top of us because we failed to heed what was absolutely manifest—that Hitler was a despotic dictator, with the then-current generation of weapons of destruction, and he unleashed them on the whole world as we stood by.

Mr. President, I fear the same consequences now. That is why I commend our President for his steadfastness, tenaciousness, courage, and wisdom in addressing these issues and not flinching or blinking, but staying the course and trying, as he said last night, to make diplomacy work, but recognizing that if diplomacy fails, we have to step into the breach and lead.

The Senator mentioned the only nation is the United States, but I know he wishes to include Great Britain.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, that is why I amended my comment. I certainly do admire greatly the position of Great Britain and its leaders right now.

Regarding the comment of the Senator about my memories of 1937, I was 14 then. I recall listening to people who tried to explain to me what was going on in Europe. It wasn't until much later, really, that I learned, as I entered college and started studying about world policies, just really the sadness of that trip Chamberlain made.

I join the Senator from Virginia, Mr. President, because I have just total admiration for our President and his fortitude.

Would there had been leaders in Europe at the time we are discussing who had the courage to stand up to Hitler and try to put together coalitions to stop him from expanding. Once on the floor I compared Saddam Hussein to Hitler, and I was criticized for that. In my mind, a tyrant is a tyrant and evil is evil. From the days of my youth, Hitler was the epitome of evil. In the time we are now living, I believe Saddam Hussein is the epitome of evil, and the President is correct to talk about evil in relationship to this man and his intentions.

Above all, I admire the President for his courage to stand up despite all the criticism, all the apparent division that is developing in this country, and saying: We, as a nation, have declared ourselves to be the agents for freedom in the world, and we are going to pursue our goal of changing that regime so it cannot threaten the world.

I am involved, as the Senator knows, with the problems of the development of oil in my State. I shudder every day to think that as the delivery of oil from Alaska to what we call the south 48 States has declined, our purchase of Iraqi oil has increased. I wonder how many Americans realize we are sending daily to Iraq moneys that Saddam Hussein uses to buy this equipment, uses to buy these Mirage parts.

The problem of today is we compartmentalize information to the extent of saying: Yes, we know that, but on the other hand, some people say, we should not be disturbed by those facts.

I am disturbed, and I wonder, as we do go to war with Iraq, about the future of this country and what happens to that oil and what happens to our Nation as we now import about 55 percent of the oil we consume daily. We used to be self-sufficient in oil and gas. We are not today. It is because we have been lured into thinking perhaps if we traded with tyrants such as Iraq, they would recognize the bond of business rather than the bond of commitment to principle.

I hope we will find the day when the Nation as a whole will join President Bush and his advisers—what a wonderful array of advisers he has with Secretary Powell, Condoleezza Rice, and Secretary Rumsfeld. I cannot think of a generation of individuals who are better trained to guide this country through a period of crisis than the ones with whom the President has surrounded himself, with the approval of the Senate.

I have every confidence in what the President is trying to do. I think it will be a swift and decisive war. It will involve casualties—casualties that could be avoided if other nations of the world would join with us and the people of Iraq understood the world was joined together to condemn this man and his cohorts.

Right know, I believe it is time for us to realize, those who support the President, that we may have to do what he says: We may have to go it alone almost. We will have a coalition. The coalition will actually be bigger than 1991 but not the same partners.

I agree with the President, we do not need partners on this one. We do not need them. I believe we have right on our side and we have might on our side and we should use that might for the best interest of the world and the future.

I thank the Senator for the privilege of being with him this morning.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I wish to associate myself with his comment about the great team of advisers the President has. They have time and again gone into the forums of the world to indicate the necessity for strong action and strong leadership at this time. We certainly have it in this President and his administration. I thank my colleague.

I see, Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee still in the Chamber and likewise my colleague, Senator WARNER, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I wish to say what a privilege it is to work with these two great Senators.

Senator WARNER, mentioned, as did Senator STEVENS, the great team the President has assembled with Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell, and Condoleezza Rice. We are very pleased in the Senate with the leadership of BILL FRIST as our majority leader, and committee chairmen are working together vigorously.

I congratulate the Senator from Virginia for his construction this morning of a very important opportunity for us to think together about the events of the present and likewise our possibilities for the future.

My hope is that the United States of America will continue to lead in forming a global coalition that will combat terrorism in a very effective way.

Terrorists, when armed with weapons of mass destruction, are in a position to create what philosophers would call existential events for countries. By that I mean that weapons of mass destruction in the hands of relatively few people—a rogue state, a sub-national group, or maybe even a small terrorist cell—are capable of obliterating large cities, killing hundreds of thousands of people, and creating panic in entire countries. One terrorist attack with a weapon of mass destruction has the potential to create such dislocations in the economy of a country that recovery could take decades. This existential threat from terrorism is a new condition for the world that requires changes in our policy priorities. All nations do not understand this with the same precision that the United States and our leadership does. All nations have not been attacked in the same manner we have been.

For some members of our body politic, the September 11 attacks were a wake-up call, but it was a call that has been heard. When President Bush and his strategists put forward a response, it was supported by the vast majority of the American people. We knew that the hijackers were from the al-Qaida group. We knew there were al-Qaida terrorists in Afghanistan who had been in training camps. We knew that the Afghanistan Government, under the Taliban regime, had been hospitable to terrorists.

We asked the Taliban regime in Afghanistan to turn over the terrorists. They were unwilling to do so. As a result, our country led an international effort in Afghanistan to root out the terrorists. As President Bush has pointed out, we pursued this mission in the most careful and humane way with regard to innocent civilians in that country. We sought to find one by one the individuals who were perpetrating not only deeds in the United States of America, but a long string of terrorist atrocities over the previous decade.

The military action that occurred there had the support of our NATO allies.

It had the support of many countries that understood immediately the problems terrorism in the world presents. For example, President Putin of Russia and President Bush were on the phone both voicing mutual support. I mention that particular call because in the past 2 days the Senate has had extensive debate on the Moscow Treaty. This debate had significance for our global position and for an important relationship that has been changing for the better, and which must continue to improve.

One reason for discussing the Moscow Treaty at this particular point in the life of the Senate was because the Senate is deeply engaged in world affairs, in foreign policy, in defense policy, and deeply concerned about our relationship with Russia. The participation of Russia in the war against terrorism is vital. Even at this moment, President Bush and Secretary of State Powell are working with the Russians to come to a somber understanding of what our mutual obligations are with regard to weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and in North Korea and, for that matter, everywhere.

These are important conversations. The President of the United States in his news conference last night, talked about this vigorous diplomacy. Our President has been reaching out to world leaders on the phone. He has been active in attempting to make certain that all nations understand the gravity of danger to each one of us and how much the community of nations depend upon the actions of the Security Council and those who take leadership in the United Nations. These are extremely important days for diplomacy. They are critical days for the success of the Security Council and the United Nations.

In the Senate, we have understood this in our committees. Chairman WARNER pointed out already the extraordinary number of hearings in the Armed Services Committee and the specific ways in which the problems of Iraq have been addressed by his committee. I congratulate the chairman and his committee.

Likewise, Senator STEVENS has mentioned this morning the extraordinary amount of work that occurs in all of the subcommittees on appropriations, but especially those that are dealing with our national security. In the Foreign Relations Committee we have had hearings almost daily on Iraq, on North Korea, on Afghanistan.

Last week, the President of Afghanistan, President Karzai, was before our committee making a personal appeal for the kind of support that he hopes will be forthcoming from not only the United States, but also from the European countries and from nations in his neighborhood. Democracy must succeed in Afghanistan, as we hope that it will in Iraq, and as we hope that it will in all countries of the Middle East. Aspirations for freedom can be fulfilled if democratic institutions are built.

This is what the coalition against terrorism is about. Clearly, we are concerned with the threats from Iraq, but we also want the coalition to understand the role of expanding freedom. The future is a great one for people who have freedom, but at this particular moment terrorists would deny all of us the opportunity to have freedom.

Last evening President Bush indicated that Saddam Hussein has the ability and opportunity to surrender the weapons of mass destruction that were cataloged by the United Nations in 1998 and 1999 and are still in Iraq. Resolution 1441, adopted unanimously by the Security Council of the United Nations, said to Saddam Hussein: This is your last chance. Disarm or show evidence you have disarmed.

Each of the succeeding reports from the inspectors have indicated that Iraq has minimally cooperated in allowing inspectors to go to various sites, but the Iraqi regime obviously has been very reluctant to show evidence of disarmament or, in fact, to disarm. Even the Iraqi missiles possessing an illegal range, which are an undisputed and tangible violation, are being surrendered only gradually in the most resistant manner possible.

There are reports in the American press of destruction of a few of these, but in the Iraqi press, or at least among people in that country, there is no word of this. In part, it is supposed that Saddam would be embarrassed by the disclosure that he has been found out and is disarming at all.

I mention all of this because these are fateful days in bringing together a coalition, hopefully of the Security Council—absent that, a coalition of the willing—that knows the war against terrorism can only be won if weapons of mass destruction in the hands of aggressive dictators are destroyed. Our President has said as the bottom line, Saddam will be disarmed. In the aftermath of that event, we will have a great deal of work to do in this body.

There are expenses involved in disarming Saddam. I think every one of us, as committee chairmen, as Senators, have been up front with our people. We know this is costly and we

know our Armed Forces are at risk. We know a lot of things are at risk. One thing that must not be at risk, however, is the movement to build a greater coalition in the war against terrorism.

I will now speak specifically about the fact that in the Foreign Relations Committee, starting March 25, we will be having hearings on ratification of the NATO treaty of enlargement. The occupant of the chair will recall that a fairly short time ago, seven nations were invited into NATO membership. They have been busy fulfilling the requirements that came with that invitation. They include the Baltic States, as well as Romania, Bulgaria, Slovenia and Slovakia. I will suggest that the hearings on NATO enlargement will, in fact, fulfill an even a greater purpose. We will have an opportunity to discuss the importance of each of the countries in NATO and the historical importance of America and Canada reaching across the Atlantic for over 50 years and working with European friends to guarantee peace on a continent which has known no peace in any 50-year period in the last millennium.

This is the reason that European countries have sought NATO membership. They have wanted to be in a Europe whole and free. They have talked freely about obligations out of area. They are eager to participate in the war against terrorism. They want to be strong friends of the United States of America and manifest that every day. That is something to celebrate. We will do so as we discuss NATO.

But as we discuss NATO, we will also discuss its future, which must be a very strong future. My prayer is that all of our NATO allies will be with us in the event Saddam Hussein does not disarm. I hope that in the event NATO allies are not with us on that particular day, they will get their soon. All of our friends are going to be needed as we think about the future of Iraq and work with the people of that country for the building of democratic institutions.

I hope we are all prepared for vigorous activity in Afghanistan to ensure the success of that state. I hope that we will sustain a partnership with Afghanistan that will inspire confidence throughout the world in our commitment to freedom.

I conclude simply by saying that the President is offering strong leadership and I support him. I am prepared to work with the President in pursuit of all the objectives he has in the days and months ahead. I know from the words of the President that he foresees a future that is filled with complexity, but one that also is filled with promise for our country and for others that share our vision.

Therefore, we should face this day with optimism because we have a plan for a future that looks brighter than the future did on September 11, 2001. On that date we discovered that the oceans did not guarantee our safety, that we were vulnerable, that Americans were dying, that our most cherished landmarks—including this Capitol—were at risk. And I suspect each of us prudently understands that this is still the case. But rather than going into a situation of panic, as resolute Americans, we found leadership with President Bush and new reservoirs of strength within ourselves. This is a place of resolute activity in each of our committees and on the floor of the Senate in discussing the most basic foreign policy and defense issues of our time, doing so with intelligence, with optimism, and likewise, with an ability to listen to each other.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the services of our distinguished colleague from Indiana and his long experience in the Senate and now having risen to new heights in his distinguished career as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have also enjoyed a very warm and strong relationship with my colleague through the years. He is too modest to talk about it, but he served in the U.S. Navy in a position as adviser on foreign policy to the then-Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke. He watched many of the key issues on the world scene unfold.

I made reference to the Chamberlain speech that we will have peace in our time. I addressed this colloquy to Senator STEVENS who, like me, lived through that era. I wonder if the Senator might have some comments on it. It is so appropriate that the world be reminded that there have been parallels in history where we have been faced with the rise of a dictator, and the dictator possessed vast arsenals of weapons and had a proven track record of having used the weapons against other people and other nations, and how this is the time for the strongest leadership, which I believe is being offered by our friend. It is being offered by the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

How severely we regret the leadership of France and Germany, certainly nations venerable in history, having lived through so many periods of turbulence on that continent, cannot recognize today the parallels of years past. I wonder if the Senator might have a viewpoint on that, particularly with reference to France.

Mr. LUGAR. I respond to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who, likewise, distinguished himself as Secretary of the Navy at another time in his career. The Senator clearly has seen parallels at various times.

Historically the path for the United States, France, and Germany was not always easy during the Cold War period. The potential for hostilities with the old Soviet Union tested us many times. I can recall, as can the Senator, when Helmut Schmidt went to London in 1979, and came forward with a very bold statement. He said that if the Soviet Union did not withdraw medium-range missiles that were aimed at Europe, then NATO must put missiles on European soil to counteract them. The Russians perhaps predictably, moved their missiles forward and indicated in an intimidating way that they might be prepared to take action sooner, rather than later, against Europe.

There were rallies throughout Europe, with people saying, ''better red than dead.'' All the major capitals had frequent marches with people claiming peace is what they wanted, but also with some admitting that they would be prepared to live under communism as opposed to having the proper military preparation to combat and deter communism.

In those days the stepping forward of Prime Minister Kohl was critical. Germany came forward and said you can put Pershing missiles on our soil, and so did the Italians.

I cite that event because it was an important and courageous step in a time of great uncertainty and fear. It led, ultimately, to President Bush, the father of our current President, committing America to German unification well before Great Britain, well before France. And Germans understand that. That was the basis upon which the unification of the country came.

Now, from time to time, the French have been extraordinarily helpful, and I think we need to remember that they have participated in many critical NATO policies and operations. They have asked us to step forward specifically in Bosnia where they believed they had a history, as did Germany, that they simply could not overcome.

I mention all these things off the top of the head because they are important, as ways in which we have worked together when there were urgent mutual problems. NATO has not been a hollow alliance. It has been central to the security of Europe and our nation.

On this floor we debated the INF Treaty which provided that all intermediate-range missiles come down, every one of them, on both sides. This happened only because of the strength of the alliance and our mutual action. That is what we ask of our friends now, that they remember that fairly recent history of our solidarity against tyranny. And they understand that terrorism could hit them. The war against terrorism is not just the United States versus al-Qaida. Terrorists could just as well level the Brandenburg Gate or the Eiffel Tower or symbols that are important quite apart from the human losses of those who got in harm's way.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. If I might bring another issue to the forefront on which he has a great deal of experience? As this debate is taking place in the Senate Chamber this morning, Hans Blix presumably is addressing the Security Council. I, frankly, think that the inspection process under his leadership—they have tried and tried hard. What the world fails to realize is that Saddam Hussein, having observed the first

inspection process, has carefully made his infrastructure, which has gone on creating the weapons of mass destruction, be they biological, chemical, or indeed his vigorous efforts to acquire a nuclear capability. They have gone right on throughout this entire period of time. And they have been constructed in such a way that they are moveable. He did that recognizing that at some point in time another inspection regime could be imposed upon him by the United Nations, as was done with Resolution 1441.

I think the inspectors have tried. They have unearthed very little. They have not received the cooperation from Saddam Hussein that was the predicate on which Resolution 1441 was adopted. It simply said you are to cooperate, the inspectors to verify and destroy. But in reality the inspectors have been converted to a group trying to search out, given the failure of cooperation, where these weapons might be located.

I will discuss later this morning a letter I received yesterday from the Central Intelligence Agency, under the signature of George Tenet, responding to the cooperation that our country has given the inspection efforts of Hans Blix, by virtue of sharing the intelligence information we had with regard to the location of probable caches of these weapons.

In fact, it has not borne out to be very fruitful because of Saddam Hussein's skill of moving these caches, of moving the infrastructure of manufacturing in such a manner that they cannot be detected and discovered without his cooperation, which he has steadfastly refused to give. Our President addressed that issue last night.

I wonder if my colleague would comment a little bit on the inspection process. As we are speaking, Blix is giving his most recent report. As you know, there are statements to the effect, from other nations, that perhaps the period of time should be extended. The President last night, when confronted with those questions, simply said, as I think he should and very properly said: Time will tell.

I invite the Senator's observations.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. The Senator is correct, times have changed with regard to inspection. Let me offer as an anecdote the Russian facility at Pokrov. This situation is not well known, but it is an agricultural chemical station. Pokrov is an example of the problems which confront Hans Blix and the inspectors.

As I and others went there at the invitation of Russians, we looked around at a rather desolate-looking place with run-down buildings. We were led to a room in which people were making shampoo. They were using stainless steel equipment. I would say, without two Russians at my side, I would have had no idea about the history of that room, quite apart from the facility. But they pointed out that just months before, anthrax was produced in the same machinery. This is dual use in a dramatic way. Equipment used for biological weapons had been easily converted to producing a commercial product. Likewise on this premise, but clearly not within view, were stores of anthrax. In fact, on the third floor of another building they had been making anthrax. In another building, they had been making dual-use materials for agricultural livestock. One was to produce antidotes so they could protect, they thought, the Russian livestock. The other use was to produce toxins, deadly toxins, out of 14 serums that were in vials in a room, in an icebox, that could kill all the livestock in the United States.

My point is that we would have been clueless without those who could give us a 25-year history of the activities at Pokrov. All of it could have been completely hidden. There was not a ghost of a chance an inspector would find anything there in years, quite apart from months.

These are old facilities. Saddam Hussein, and others, have gone to school on dual use. Therefore I simply say, as the chairman already knows, the production of chemical weapons is clearly enveloped in dual use. There is not a ghost of a chance you will find a scintilla of it unless Iraq wants you to find it.

Regarding the biological situation, as Secretary Powell already pointed out in his public address at the U.N., the Iraqis are able to break down all the equipment, put it in vans and cart it down the road 200 miles. Unless the inspector is clued in that this particular van out of all the vans in Iraq has a biological laboratory in it, there is not a chance, zero, of finding anything there.

This is the reason why the inspection business is at best a holding action. Those who argue in favor say: After all, with all those inspectors there, with all of the press following them out every day, surely Saddam Hussein cannot now be producing a whole lot.

But that doesn't solve the problem of what is there, detailed by the U.N., after all these years. Nor does it solve the problem of the intellectual inquiry of scientists who even as we speak are working on new formulations. They don't need huge factories and installations visible from the air. They need only the necessary scientific knowledge and, ultimately, fissile material from somewhere else to get the bomb. And each intelligence report that we have all seen—those now made public—say Iraq may be a year, 2 years, 3 years from making a nuclear weapon. But there is always the footnote: If they get the fissile material from somewhere else—it will take far less time.

That is the basis on which our President has to say the security of the American people is at stake. This is not a speculative business for we all know fissile material exists in the world, a lot of it in Russia. A lot of it is still not pinned down by the cooperative threat reduction program or anything else. That is a tremendous danger, and we all ought to recognize that. It is not going to go away with inspectors.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I guess what both you and I find so perplexing is how responsible world leadership, most particularly France and Germany, which have seen the same facts, have access to basically the same intelligence, and cannot reach those logical conclusions which our President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have reached.

Mr. LUGAR. We must continue to assist them in reaching those conclusions.

Mr. WARNER. I must say, if I could just ask the indulgence of my colleague, my father served in World War I as a doctor in the U.S. Army in the trenches in France. My most prized possession, I say to my good friend, is on the wall in my Senate office. For these 25 years that I have been here, on that wall hangs this Croix de Guerre awarded him by the French Government for his heroism in the trenches for administering healing to Americans, British, Frenchmen, and Germans. I sometimes thought myself, and when the French ambassador visited my office a few days ago, in a courteous way I pointed it out and I said, you know, I am thinking of taking it down, but perhaps better judgment will prevail in your leadership. And therefore for a while I am going to leave it up, in the hopes that reality can be brought to bear.

I thank my colleague for his time.

I recognize the order entered into at the direction of both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate was that the Senate would proceed this morning on the debate with regard to the worldwide situation on terrorism with an emphasis on Iraq, North Korea, and other areas, and the time under the control of the Senator from Virginia, the time having been equally divided, is rapidly approaching the 2-hour mark which is the halfway.

I see a colleague desiring recognition, but I remind that colleague, who courteously advised me that perhaps the subject matter was not that in the order, but I would have to say the time that he uses would have to be charged to the other side.

I have some maybe 15 minutes remaining under the control of the Senator from Virginia, which I will hold in reserve for such rebuttal as may be required on the issues specifically recited in the order before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The order before the Senate is for morning business. Those in control of time may choose to speak on any matter they so choose.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

AIR POLLUTION AND GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, my subject is different but it is similar in