

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

significantly worse off than he is now in terms of the ability to threaten the world with these weapons or to attack his neighbors. And he will know that the international community continues to have the will to act if and when he threatens again.

Following any strike, we will carefully monitor Iraq's activities with all the means at our disposal. If he seeks to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction, we will be prepared to strike him again. The economic sanctions will remain in place until Saddam complies fully with all U.N. resolutions. . . .

Now, let me say to all of you here, as all of you know, the weightiest decision any President ever has to make is to send our troops into harm's way. And force can never be the first answer. But sometimes it's the only answer.

You are the best prepared, best equipped, best trained fighting force in the world. And should it prove necessary for me to exercise the option of force, your commanders will do everything they can to protect the safety of all the men and women under their command. No military action, however, is risk-free. I know that the people we may call upon in uniform are ready. The American people have to be ready as well.

Dealing with Saddam Hussein requires constant vigilance. We have seen that constant vigilance pays off, but it requires constant vigilance. Since the Gulf war we have pushed back every time Saddam has posed a threat. When Baghdad plotted to assassinate former President Bush, we struck hard at Iraq's intelligence headquarters. When Saddam threatened another invasion by massing his troops in Kuwait, along the Kuwaiti border in 1994, we immediately deployed our troops, our ships, our planes, and Saddam backed down. When Saddam forcefully occupied Irbil in northern Iraq, we broadened our control over Iraq's skies by extending the no-fly zone.

But there is no better example, again I say, than the U.N. weapons inspections system itself. Yes, he has tried to thwart it in every conceivable way. But the discipline, determination, the year-in, year-out effort of these weapons inspectors is doing the job. And we seek to finish the job.

Let there be no doubt, we are prepared to act. But Saddam Hussein could end this crisis tomorrow, simply by letting the weapons inspectors complete their mission. He made a solemn commitment to the international community to do that and to give up his weapons of mass destruction a long time ago, now. One way or the other, we are determined to see that he makes good on his own promise. . . .

That is the future I ask you all to imagine. That is the future I ask our allies to imagine. If we look at the past and imagine that future, we will act as one together. And we still have, God willing, a chance to find a diplomatic resolution to this and, if not, God willing, a chance to do the right thing for our children and grandchildren.

Thank you very much.

That speech was made by President Clinton on February 17, 1998. I find it very strange that my friends on the other side of the aisle—and they are my friends—are attacking President Bush for having made statements weaker than these statements.

If one reads this statement in full, the President of the United States, then speaking to the generals who command all our forces, told them to be ready. He had just had the briefing. He had the briefing that convinced him in 1998 that he might have to act as President to take military action against Saddam Hussein.

Five years later, another President is saying the same thing, and he is attacked. We never attacked President Clinton. We never doubted his sincerity. But now my friends—and they are my friends—are saying that this President does not know what he is doing. I believe the President knows what he is doing, and I think he made a masterful statement last night of the position in which the United States finds itself. It is not different from the position President Clinton was in in 1998. Should he be in this position now? Should we have done something in the interim? The answer is simply yes. We should have done something years ago—gone to the U.N. and said: If you are going to have any meaning in the world at all, you must insist that Saddam Hussein obey the mandates you have issued.

I come from a State that has a great many of our military planes, and I talk to our military pilots wherever I travel in the world. One thing is clear: Our pilots, our Air Force pilots have been enforcing the no-fly zones since 1991. They have been flying every day in harm's way. They have been shot at nearly every week. We retaliated, retaliated, retaliated, but young men and women are up there tonight flying planes over portions of Iraq, at the insistence of the United Nations that we prevent Saddam Hussein from having any aircraft in those zones in the north and south. We are following their request. We are carrying out that operation at our expense and with our pilots, with our planes, and we have been doing it now since 1991.

How long will this continue? How long do we have to fly to prevent Saddam Hussein from having weapons in the air that are really minuscule compared to what is on the ground—weapons of mass destruction, that President Clinton described adequately and succinctly and honorably in 1998.

Madam President, I think it is high time we came together. I am sincerely disappointed that we do not have a uniform force here, that we do not have a uniform force right here on the floor of the Senate saying: Mr. President, we understand that you—as did President Clinton—have in front of you a horrendous decision to make. When do we have to go in and destroy these weapons?

How many weapons has he created since 1998? How much more difficult will it be to find those weapons than it would have been in 1998? I say in all sincerity, as one who has watched over the Defense Department's appropriations now since 1981, either I or my friend from Hawaii, the two of us jointly have done that job. We have been to this part of the world of the Persian Gulf many times.

This is an awesome problem that faces the President of the United States. We should help him, not challenge his decision and what he is doing. He is asking the world to come together to demand that Saddam Hussein

do what he agreed to do in 1991, as President Clinton repeatedly said in his statement, and as our President, President Bush, has said before the U.N. in a masterful statement he made when he went before the U.N.

The time is now for us to come together and realize we are approaching decision time. I served in combat in World War II, and many of us know the awesome days we went through then. They were nothing compared to what this world will be if Saddam Hussein ever uses those weapons of mass destruction. I think we have changed our way of life. We have changed our lifestyles. We have already been affected by his collusion with the al-Qaida force, and those people who are part of that terrible force.

President Clinton called it the unholy axis. President Bush called it the evil axis and has been criticized for saying so. President Clinton said we have to defend our future from these predators of the 21st century, and I say things are worse today than they were in 1998.

I am one of those who gets these intelligence briefings. I have told my wife when I come home after those briefings I find it hard to think about the work I have to do other than just think about these terrible intelligence reports. This is not a simple world we live in, but it is a world in which I believe the freedom-loving people look to us for leadership. I say, thank God we have a leader who means what he says, and I am willing to follow him when he says it is necessary to use force if that day ever comes.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and your leadership. Thank you, Secretary Cohen, for the superb job you have done here at the Pentagon and on this most recent, very difficult problem. Thank you, General Shelton, for being the right person at the right time. Thank you, General Ralston, and the members of the Joint Chiefs, General Zinni, Secretary Albright, Secretary Slater, DCI Tenet, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Berger, Senator Robb, thank you for being here, and Congressman Skelton, thank you very much, and for your years of service to America and your passionate patriotism, both of you, and to the members of our Armed Forces and others who work here to protect our national security.

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. 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 was thinking, as I sat up here on the platform, of the slogan that the First Lady gave me for her project on the millennium, which was: Remembering the past and imagining the future. Now, for that project, that means preserving the Star-Spangled Banner and the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and it means

making an unprecedented commitment to medical research and to get the best of the new technology. But that's not a bad slogan for us when we deal with more sober, more difficult, more dangerous matters.

Those who have questioned the United States in this moment, I would argue, are living only in the moment. They have neither remembered the past nor imagined the future. So, first, let's just take a step back and consider why meeting the threat posed by Saddam Hussein is important to our security in the new era we are entering.

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 interest 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 demanded—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 had 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. And 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 the 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 reports. For example, Iraq revised its nuclear declarations 4 times with just 14 months, and it has submitted six 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 has 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.

Next, throughout this entire process, Iraqi 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 biological weapons, and a massive biological weapons facility at Al Hakam equipped to produce anthrax and other deadly agents.

Over the past few months, as they have come closer and closer to rooting out Iraq's remaining nuclear capacity, Saddam has undertaken yet another gambit to thwart their ambition by imposing debilitating conditions on the inspectors and declaring key sites which have still not been inspected off limits, including, I might add, one palace in Baghdad more than 2,600 acres large. By comparison—when you hear all this business about “Presidential sites reflect our sovereignty; why do you want to come into a residence?”—the White House complex is 18 acres, so you'll have some feel for this. One of these Presidential sites is about the size of Washington, DC. That's about—how many acres did you tell me it was—40,000 acres. We're not talking about a few rooms here with delicate personal matters involved.

It is obvious that there is an attempt here, based on the whole history of this operation since 1991, to protect whatever remains of his capacity to produce weapons of mass destruction, the missiles to deliver them, and the feedstocks necessary to produce them. The UNSCOM inspectors believe that Iraq still has stockpiles of chemical and biological munitions, a small force of Scud-type missiles, and the capacity to restart quickly its production program and build many, many more weapons.

Now, against that background, let us remember the past, here. It is against that background that we have repeatedly and unambiguously made clear our preference for a diplomatic solution. The inspection system works. The inspection system has worked in the face of lies, stonewalling, obstacle after obstacle after obstacle. The people who have done that work deserve the thanks of civilized people throughout the world. It has worked.

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 of 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 yet more opportunities to develop this program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to press for the release of the 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 that 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.

Now, we have spent several weeks building up our forces in the Gulf and building a coalition of like-minded nations. Our force posture would not be possible without the support of Saudi Arabia, of Kuwait, Bahrain, the GCC States, and Turkey. Other friends and allies have agreed to provide forces, bases, or logistical support, including the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain and Portugal, Denmark and The Netherlands, Hungary and Poland and the Czech Republic, Argentina, Iceland, Australia, New Zealand, and our friends and neighbors in Canada. That list is growing, not because anyone wants military action but because there are people in this world who believe the United Nations resolution should mean something, because they understand what UNSCOM has achieved, because they remember the past, and because they can imagine what the future will be, depending on what we do now.

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

significantly worse off than he is now in terms of the ability to threaten the world with these weapons or to attack his neighbors. And he will know that the international community continues to have will to act if and when he threatens again.

Following any strike, we will carefully monitor Iraq's activities with all the means at our disposal. If he seeks to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction we will be prepared to strike him again. The economic sanctions will remain in place until Saddam complies fully with all U.N. resolution.

Consider this: Already these sanctions have denied him \$110 billion. Imagine how much stronger his armed forces would be today, how many more weapons of mass destruction operations he would have hidden around the country if he had been able to spend even a small fraction of that amount for a military rebuilding.

We will continue to enforce a no-fly zone from the southern suburbs of Baghdad to the Kuwait border and in northern Iraq, making it more difficult for Iraq to walk over Kuwait again and threaten the Kurds in the north.

Now, let me say to all of you here, as all of you know, the weightiest decision any President ever has to make is to send our troops into harm's way. And force can never be the first answer. But sometimes it's the only answer.

You are the best prepared, best equipped, best trained fighting force in the world. And should it prove necessary for me to exercise the option of force, you commanders will do everything they can to protect the safety of all the men and women under their command. No military action, however, is risk-free. I know that the people we may call upon in uniform are ready. The American people have to be ready as well.

Dealing with Saddam Hussein requires constant vigilance. We have seen that constant vigilance pays off, but it requires constant vigilance. Since the Gulf war we have pushed back every time Saddam has posed a threat. When Baghdad plotted to assassinate former President Bush, we struck hard at Iraq's intelligence headquarters. When Saddam threatened another invasion by massing his troops in Kuwait, along the Kuwaiti border in 1994, we immediately deployed our troops, our ships, our planes, and Saddam backed down. When Saddam forcefully occupied Irbil in northern Iraq, we broadened our control over Iraq's skies by extending the no-fly zone.

But there is no better example, again I say, than the U.N. weapons inspections system itself. Yes, he has tried to thwart it in every conceivable way. But the discipline, determination, the year-in, year-out effort of these weapons inspectors is doing the job. And we seek to finish the job.

Let there be no doubt, we are prepared to act. But Saddam Hussein could end this crisis tomorrow, simply by letting the weapons inspectors complete their mission. He made a solemn commitment to the international community to do that and to give up his weapons of mass destruction a long time ago, now. One way or the other, we are determined to see that he makes good on his own promise.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq reminds us of what we learned in the 20th century and warns us of what we must know about the 21st. In this century we learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination, and, when necessary, action. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now: 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.

If we fail to respond today, Saddam and all those who would follow in his footsteps will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity, even in the face of a clear message from the United Nations Security Council and clear evidence of a weapons of mass destruction program. But if we act as one, we can safeguard our interests and send a clear message to every would-be tyrant and terrorist that the international community does have the wisdom and the will and the way to protect peace and security in a new era.

That is the future I ask you all to imagine. That is the future I ask our allies to imagine. If we look at the past and imagine that future, we will act as one together. And we still have, God willing, a chance to find a diplomatic resolution to this and, if not, God willing, a chance to do the right thing for our children and grandchildren.

Thank you very much.

Note: The President spoke at 12:37 p.m. in the auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I commend our distinguished senior colleague from Alaska. He speaks with a corporate memory dating back to when at age 17 he went into World War II and, as he said, flew those combat missions.

I am proud of what the President has shown by way of leadership, and I said the other night, yes, I feel I know most of the facts but he may know a few more, and I repose trust in his judgment and his team to make the right decision. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, Senator STEVENS is the senior Republican in terms of time—I am sure many people do not know it, but I am second—and I want to say I am very proud that he has said what he said.

Many people speak all the time. The Senator from Alaska speaks when it is important. He does not come to the Chamber and engage himself in rhetoric. He is too busy doing tough work. He understands this issue.

Truly, many of the Democrats ought to be ashamed of themselves. We try to support Presidents. We would have supported President Bill Clinton if he had done what he was talking about in that statement the Senator read. I do not think there is any doubt about it. We would not have questioned whether he had the right security briefing and whether he knew what he was doing.

Our President has been warning us, he has been going back to the table, letting the inspectors go in again, coming to the American people, going to the U.N., and nothing happens. As a matter of fact, I believe it is correct, when the Senator cites the date that President Clinton gave that speech, I do not believe anything of a positive nature has happened in Iraq at the hands of Saddam Hussein since that time. It has gotten worse, if anything. He has not ameliorated or made any-

thing better, to my knowledge, and look what it was like on the date the Senator read in his statement.

I commend the Senator, and I do believe the resolution introduced today ought not deter anyone from what we are doing. It ought not change minds in this Senate which voted overwhelmingly in support of our President. I thank the Senator for what he has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I am delighted to join my colleagues in talking about the situation in Iraq and what the President has said and what some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying, that we need to wait, and wait longer.

I will make a few simple points. I have served on the Middle East subcommittee since I have been in the Senate. I have chaired it for a good portion of the time. I have worked on the issue of Iraq since 1996. I have worked with the Iraqi opposition. I have held hearings on this topic. We have had meetings with the then UNSCOM inspectors. We have really worked the full gamut of what is taking place in Iraq. My colleagues on the other side want to wait longer. We have waited 12 years. How much longer do we need to wait?

They want to allow the weapons inspectors to work longer. We had them in there for a number of years and then Saddam Hussein threw them out. They have only been back for a short period of time. I remind my colleagues that we were not finding anything when the weapons inspectors were there prior to 1998. We did not find anything until we had some high level defections on the part of the Iraqis. That is when we started finding things.

Iraq is a country the size of California. It has a dedicated leader who is seeking to thwart the will of the international community to disarm. He is trying to hide items that may be the size of a 5-gallon bucket. He is manufacturing biological weapons and moving them on mobile units the size of a van. He is trying to hide them in a place the size of California, and there are only 120 inspectors in Iraq, as the President suggested last night, in some sort of scavenger hunt. The idea was not that we would go into Iraq and have to find these items. It was that Iraq would step forward and disarm and say we agree, we are going to disarm. That was what they were supposed to do, come forward and disarm. Instead, we have this hide-and-seek that Saddam continues. It is what he did when we had weapons inspectors in Iraq previously. It is what he continues to do now.

What happens if we wait? Let's say we agree we are going to wait. Maybe we will find something, maybe not. What if we do find something else? Is that going to be enough for us to move forward and say we need to completely disarm Saddam Hussein? I think we are

left with a similar set of circumstances-plus, if we do not do anything.

Let's say we do not do anything, we let this go on for another couple of years because there is not an impetus now to really move. Saddam has biological and chemical weapons. He has terrorists on his soil. At any time, he can easily start distributing the chemical and biological weapons to terrorists, who know no bounds. I could easily see us in 2 years with a special committee of the Senate, holding hearings as to how did these biological weapons come in from Iraq, that were distributed to terrorists, to be used against U.S. citizens. I think it is a clear possibility that it would occur.

Nobody wants to go to war. None of us want to do that. That is an absolute last option. We have been working for 12 years with economic sanctions. We have been working for 12 years with no-fly zones. We have been working with the Iraqi opposition. We have been doing everything we can, and yet now we are at this point in time where he has terrorists and weapons of mass destruction together on his soil, and more people are saying, wait.

Wait for what? So they can distribute them further? So that he can attack us?

I realize we all have difficulty with moving forward to a war situation. We do not want to do that. We want to respond if somebody comes at us. The problem with this new war on terrorism is that the terrorists, when they attack, attack civilian targets. They want to try and kill as many people as possible. By our waiting, we actually invite them to come forward.

Some might suggest if we act, we are going to further foment difficulty in the region of the United States. I point out that even prior to September 11, we had 10 years where there were attacks on the United States, on our people, in foreign places by these terrorist groups. We had two embassies in Africa that were attacked by terrorist groups. We had the USS *Cole* attacked by terrorist groups. We had Khobar Towers. They have attacked us for a period of 10 years.

People are saying, show restraint or else they will act more. We have seen it for 10 years, showing restraint. Then we had September 11, and we responded aggressively in Afghanistan. That was a fully appropriate way to respond. If we wait for the terrorists, they will continue to come at us. If we sit and wait, it does not mean they will stop. They will not stop. They have not stopped in the past. They are going to continue to come at the United States because they do not believe in what we believe. They are attacking our sets of values by attacking our civilians, our civilian population.

No one wants to go to war. That is the last thing anyone wants. In this situation, not to move forward is to invite more catastrophic events to happen to our citizenry and to citizens around the world.

Remember, terrorists go at soft targets. They go at the twin towers. They

do not go at military targets. They did go at the Pentagon, but they went at Bali most recently. They will continue to go at civilian targets. They will go at the soft targets. If they have biological and chemical weapons, they will kill that many more people if we fail to act.

I was raised in Kansas. On Saturday night, we would watch "Gunsmoke." That was a great show and a favorite of mine. At the end of every "Gunsmoke" episode, Matt Dillon walks out on Main Street and the bad guy walks out on Main Street. They face off. The bad guy pulls the gun, Matt shoots, and the other guy goes down. That is the way every show ended: Nice, clean, good versus evil. Evil at the last minute is allowed to walk away. He could walk away or he is going down. He never does. He pulls his gun, and Matt Dillon always shoots him down.

There is a sense of honor that we always let the other side, the bad side, go first. You get to pull the trigger because you always have a chance to walk away. What if we do that with terrorists? We have a sense of honor that we should let the other side go first. If you let terrorists go first, they do not walk out on Main Street of Dodge City and face Matt Dillon. They go around the back alleys. They are looking for people who are sleeping. They are looking for families. They are not looking for someone who is armed. They are looking for soft targets to hit, kill, and destroy. That is what they will continue to do.

Now, taking the other side of the argument, what if we do move? What if Saddam Hussein is moved out of power, as has been the stated policy of the United States since 1998 with the Iraq Liberation Act which President Bill Clinton signed into law? What if Saddam Hussein is removed from power by a coalition of the willing—it will be an international coalition—what takes place then?

We have a group of people, Iraqi opposition and others, who have been working on a democratic Iraq with opportunities for all people, for human rights, for people to be able to vote and to express their desires for that country. We have a country that sits on 10 percent of the world oil supplies and an ability to rebuild itself, an educated population that is willing to change. They want to change now. Iraqi opposition is united. We are hearing from people inside of Iraq who want to see a change. People inside the Iraq Government, inside the Iraq military, want to get out and into a different situation.

Look at the seeds of change sown within Iraq and that region, if you have coming forward a democracy, with human rights, with religious freedom, with freedom for women, with people able to vote and participate and a marketplace that allows people to participate. Look at the future for the people there in that region, in that country, if that is what takes place. There is a substantial positive benefit.

It all is with risk. It all has risk. Whether you choose to act or whether

you choose not to act, they both have risk. After looking at this matter for some period of time, the option of not acting has far more risk—little, if any, upside potential—than the choice of acting. And the choice of acting has a downside potential. But it has substantial upside potential, and it does not have the downside that not acting has.

Clearly, the President and his Cabinet and the people have thought this through. It is an extraordinarily difficult choice. Saddam Hussein still has the choice. He can still choose today to disarm and to engage in the international communities and comply with the 12 U.N. resolutions that have followed in the 12 years since he invaded Kuwait.

I point out, we need to remember: Saddam Hussein has attacked two adjacent countries. He has used chemical weapons against his own people and against the Iranians. He has used these weapons in the past. He has threatened to attack, and has attacked, his neighbors in the past. This is not a good man. He is not good for the world. He is certainly not good for the region. He does not get better with time, nor does the situation get better with time. The obligations only get worse.

For all these reasons, I applaud what the President has done. I applaud that he came to the Congress in the first place asking for a resolution. He got it. He got broad bipartisan support. I applaud that he went to the United Nations and got a resolution with broad international support. He has done the things we have asked. And now he is coming forward and saying: Look, Saddam Hussein, the time is running out. Either act now or actions will be taken.

The President has done most of the things we have asked him to do. He has tried to engage the world and get an international coalition. A number of other countries will join. We should back the administration at this point and not try to do more second-guessing or buying of time for Saddam Hussein to develop more weaponry, to develop more terrorist networks to supply and provide the things the terrorist networks want to be able to threaten and to kill our people.

For all these reasons, I hope we will not back a resolution calling for allowing of more time and, instead, support the administration's efforts as they move forward, trying to find a peaceful solution but, if not, forcing Saddam Hussein to choose whether he is going to hold on to his weapons of mass destruction or whether he is going to hold on to power. It is a difficult choice the President has to make and we have to make. We have looked at this pretty thoroughly.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NOMINATION OF SECRETARY GORDON ENGLAND

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise tonight in strong support for the nomination of Secretary Gordon England to be the first Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. I thank the majority leader, in cooperation with the Democratic leader, for promptly scheduling the Senate's consideration of this very important nomination.

President Bush nominated Secretary England on January 7. The Governmental Affairs Committee, which I am privileged to chair, held a hearing on his nomination last Friday, and today, I am pleased to report, the committee unanimously voted to discharge the nominee from consideration. The committee thoroughly considered the nomination at a hearing on Friday. In addition, Secretary England responded to extensive prehearing questions about a wide variety of issues.

I have no doubt, based on my review of the record, and my conducting of the hearing, that Secretary England is extraordinarily well qualified for this position. In fact, it is difficult for me to think of two more qualified Americans than Tom Ridge and Gordon England to head up this vital new Department.

Secretary England currently serves as Secretary of the Navy. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have gotten to know him well in that capacity. I have enormous regard for his ability. He has held that position since May of 2001.

Prior to becoming our Secretary of the Navy, Gordon England had an impressive portfolio of management experience. He served as executive vice president of General Dynamics Corporation, and he previously served in various executive positions at a number of General Dynamics divisions. His experience in both the public and the private sectors will provide him with exactly the experience and expertise needed to oversee the merger of some 22 agencies and 170,000 Federal employees that will be transferred into this new Department.

As preparation for being Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, it would be difficult to beat a tour as Secretary of the Navy. The Department of the

Navy has a budget of over \$100 billion. It consists of 372,000 active duty and 90,000 Reserve sailors, 172,000 active duty and 40,000 Reserve marines.

In addition, as Secretary of the Navy, Gordon England has overseen a civilian workforce of nearly 190,000 employees. That number, I note, exceeds the number in the workforce of the new Department. We often talk about what a management challenge it is going to be to the leaders of this new Department to oversee 170,000 civilian employees. As Secretary of the Navy, Gordon England has overseen a civilian workforce that exceeds that number, not to mention the sailors and marines under his jurisdiction.

Secretary England's extensive experience in managing large, complex operations in both the public and private sectors will serve him well in his new position. I have been very fortunate to have had the pleasure of working with him when he was Secretary of the Navy, and I look forward to continuing our partnership in his new capacity.

I urge my colleagues to support confirmation of this important nomination. The new Department of Homeland Security opened its doors officially last Friday, and it is critical that we get the top management positions filled as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I do hope this nominee will be approved unanimously.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to draw attention to an alarming issue—the growing number of premature births. According to data released by the National Center for Health Statistics, the percentage of babies born prematurely—birth at less than 37 completed weeks of gestation—has risen to nearly 12 percent, the highest level ever reported in the United States. In 2001 alone, more than 476,000 babies were born prematurely in the U.S. Unfortunately, in my own State of Tennessee, 14 percent of births are preterm. There cannot be a clearer wake-up call for us.

Today, the March of Dimes is launching a national, five-year prematurity awareness, education, and research effort aimed at preventing prematurity, the leading cause of infant death in the first month of life. I cannot imagine a better organization to take on this serious problem. Over its 63-year history, the March of Dimes has conducted two highly successful national campaigns—the first focused on preventing polio and the second involved educating the public and health providers on the role of folic acid in preventing neural tube defects. My friend, former Health and Human Services Secretary, Dr. Louis Sullivan, is the honorary chair of this campaign, and I salute him for his continued commitment to the public's health.

I'm pleased to be able to salute and encourage this new campaign which holds the promise of significantly reducing the incidence of premature birth throughout the country. Babies

born prematurely are more likely to face serious multiple health problems following delivery: a tragedy for families but one which may be preventable.

Since coming to the Senate, I have focused on disparities in healthcare quality and access. Prematurity is one of the clearest indices of this problem. Rates of preterm birth vary significantly by race and ethnicity. In 2001, rates for black women were highest among all racial and ethnic subgroups—17.5 percent for black as compared to 11 percent for white Americans. We simply do not know why these numbers vary so dramatically. But without further research, our public policy options are limited.

Our great health research institutions also have an important role. I have fought for the five-year doubling of NIH's budget. With this significant increase in funding, the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development and the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities can expand research in this area.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the March of Dimes on its launch of this new national campaign to target the rising rate of premature births.

ERRONEOUS TIME MAGAZINE REPORT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last week in recognition of Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, I spoke about the importance of continuing his legacy and working to ensure that the civil rights of all Americans are protected. I discussed my concerns that some of the current administration's policies jeopardize the gains our Nation has made.

In prefacing my remarks last week, I criticized President Bush, based on a disturbing report that recently appeared in Time magazine declaring that this administration had reinstated the tradition of delivering a floral wreath to the Confederate Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery.

The information I referenced in my speech was inaccurate, as Time magazine has subsequently issued a correction clarifying that the wreath practice was not initiated by President Bush, but in fact had been done by previous administrations. I, therefore, apologize to President Bush, as my remarks regarding the floral arrangement were inaccurate.

I do think this exercise should be discontinued by President Bush, regardless of the past history of the practice.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.