

more sophisticated and cynical about the narrow and selfish bureaucratic motives that sometimes shaped our policies. Human nature is what it is, and I was rewarded and promoted for understanding human nature. But until this Administration it had been possible to believe that by upholding the policies of my president I was also upholding the interests of the American people and the world. I believe it no longer.

The policies we are now asked to advance are incompatible not only with American values but also with American interests. Our fervent pursuit of war with Iraq is driving us to squander the international legitimacy that has been America's most potent weapon of both offense and defense since the days of Woodrow Wilson. We have begun to dismantle the largest and most effective web of international relationships the world has ever known. Our current course will bring instability and danger, not security.

The sacrifice of global interests to domestic politics and to bureaucratic self-interest is nothing new, and it is certainly not a uniquely American problem. Still, we have not seen such systematic distortion of intelligence, such systematic manipulation of American opinion, since the war in Vietnam. The September 11 tragedy left us stronger than before, rallying around us a vast international coalition to cooperate for the first time in a systematic way against the threat of terrorism. But rather than take credit for those successes and build on them, this Administration has chosen to make terrorism a domestic political tool, enlisting a scattered and largely defeated Al Qaeda as its bureaucratic ally. We spread disproportionate terror and confusion in the public mind, arbitrarily linking the unrelated problems of terrorism and Iraq. The result, and perhaps the motive, is to justify a vast misallocation of shrinking public wealth to the military and to weaken the safeguards that protect American citizens from the heavy hand of government. September 11 did not do as much damage to the fabric of American society as we seem determined to do to ourselves. Is the Russia of the late Romanovs really our model, a selfish, superstitious empire thrashing toward self-destruction in the name of a doomed status quo?

We should ask ourselves why we have failed to persuade more of the world that a war with Iraq is necessary. We have over the past two years done too much to asset to our world partners that narrow and mercenary U.S. interests override the cherished values of our partners. Even where our aims were not in question, our consistency is at issue. The model of Afghanistan is little comfort to allies wondering on what basis we plan to rebuild the Middle East, and in whose image and interests. Have we indeed become blind, as Russia is blind in Chechnya, as Israel is blind in the Occupied Territories, to our own advice, that overwhelming military power is not the answer to terrorism? After the shambles of post-war Iraq joins the shambles in Grozny and Ramallah, it will be a brave foreigner who forms ranks with Micronesia to follow where we lead.

We have a coalition still, a good one. The loyalty of many of our friends is impressive, a tribute to American moral capital built up over a century. But our closest allies are persuaded less that was justified than that it would be perilous to allow the U.S. to drift into complete solipsism. Loyalty should be reciprocal. Why does our President condone the swaggering and contemptuous approach to our friends and allies this Administration is fostering, including among its most senior officials. Has *oderint dum metuant* [Ed. note: Latin for "Let them hate so long as they fear," thought to be a favorite saying of Caligula] really become our motto?

I urge you to listen to America's friends around the world. Even here in Greece, purported hotbed of European anti-Americanism, we have more and closer friends than the American newspaper reader can possibly imagine. Even when they complain about American arrogance, Greeks know that the world is a difficult and dangerous place, and they want a strong international system, with the U.S. and EU in close partnership. When our friends are afraid of us rather than for us, it is time to worry. And now they are afraid. Who will tell them convincingly that the United States is as it was, a beacon of liberty, security and justice for the planet?

Mr. Secretary, I have enormous respect for your character and ability. You have preserved more international credibility for us than our policy deserves, and salvaged something positive from the excesses of an ideological and self-serving Administration. But your loyalty to the President goes too far. We are straining beyond its limits an international system we built with such toil and treasure, a web of laws, treaties, organizations and shared values that sets limits on our foes far more effectively than it ever constrained America's ability to defend its interests.

I am resigning because I have tried and failed to reconcile my conscience with my ability to represent the current U.S. Administration. I have confidence that our democratic process if ultimately self-correcting, and hope that in a small way I can contribute from outside to shaping policies that better serve the security and prosperity of the American people and the world we share.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN VALUES AND WAR WITH IRAQ

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, the true greatness of America lies in the values we share as a nation.

From America's beginning, we shared a passionate concern for the rights and the well-being of each individual—a concern stated eloquently in our founding documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

From our immigrant roots, we learned not only to tolerate others whose appearance, religion, and culture are different from our own, but to respect and welcome them, and to recognize our diversity as a source of great strength.

From our religious faith and our sense of community, we gained an understanding of the importance of fairness and compassion for the less fortunate.

In the same way that parents try to build a better life for their children, each generation of Americans has tried to leave a more just society to the next. We all know that our history in-

cludes periods when grave injustices were tolerated. Those dark periods in our national history teach us lessons we must never forget. But we have battled fiercely to overcome injustice, and we are a better nation for our willingness to fight those battles.

Our most deeply held national values are rooted in our pursuit of justice for all. It urges us to ensure fair treatment for each person, to extend help to those in need, and to create opportunity for each individual to advance. Those are among the most important yardsticks by which we measure our success in building "a more perfect union."

Now as we consider the prospect of war with Iraq, many of us have serious questions about whether current national policy reflects America's values.

We owe it to the brave men and women of our armed forces to ensure that we are embarked on a just war—that the sacrifice we ask of them is for a cause that reflects America's basic values.

Our men and women in uniform are working and training hard for the serious challenges before them. They are living in the desert, enduring harsh conditions, and contemplating the horrors of the approaching war.

Their families left behind are sacrificing, too, each and every day here at home, wondering if their loved ones in uniform will return unharmed. Many—especially the families of our reservists—are struggling to make ends meet as their spouses are called up for months of duty abroad. Wives are separated from husbands. Children are separated from fathers and mother. Businesses and communities are struggling to go forward without valued employees now serving in the gulf.

More than 150,000 National Guard and Reserve soldiers have been mobilized. Of these, 13,000 have been on active duty for at least a year. Others return home from deployments, only to turn around and head back overseas for a new tour of duty. For many of these soldiers, "the expected one weekend a month, two weeks a year" is merely a slogan, and does not reflect their new reality. In fact, today's reservists are spending thirteen times longer on active duty than they did a decade ago.

A recall to active duty brings financial hardship as well. Many give up larger civilian salaries when they go on active duty. The law requires employers to take back reservists after their deployments. But for those who work in small firms or are self-employed, there are no such guarantees unless their firms are still in business.

The families of our men and women in uniform pay a price for this deployment. During the Vietnam War, only 20 percent of all Army military personnel were married. Today over 50 percent of the military are married, which means enormous strain on the families who are left behind to worry and cope with the sudden new demands of running a household alone, never knowing how long their loved ones will be away.

Among those on active duty, we are demanding more from our troops for longer periods of time. One of our aircraft carriers, the USS Abraham Lincoln, has been away from home port for 233 days. The crew expected to return for Christmas, and had made it half way home across the Pacific Ocean when they were given orders to turn around and head for the Persian Gulf. These men and women are forced to put their lives on hold, missing births, delaying weddings, and dealing with family crises by phone and e-mail.

These men and women are well-prepared to serve their country. But in calling them up, we also pay the price here at home with increased vulnerability in our police and fire departments. A recent survey of 8,500 fire departments by the International Association of Fire Chiefs showed that nearly three-fourths of them have staff in the Reserves. A similar survey of more than 2,100 law enforcement agencies by the Police Executive Research Forum found that 44 percent have lost personnel to call ups.

These are Americans who love their country. They proudly wave the Stars and Stripes on our national holidays. They honor and pray for past veterans on Memorial Day. Their children are in our schools. They attend our churches, our synagogues, and our mosques. We see them in the grocery store or at PTA meetings. They are a part of our communities—and a part of us. And they are willing to give their lives for their country. So we owe it to these men and women and their families—these brave Americans—to get it right.

I am concerned that as we rush to war with Iraq, we are becoming more divided at home and more isolated in the world community. Instead of persuading the dissenters at home and abroad, the Administration by its harsh rhetoric is driving the wedge deeper. Never before, even in the Vietnam war, has America taken such bold military action with so little international support. It is far from clear that the United Nations Security Council will pass any new resolution that we can use as authorization for military action in Iraq. Even such strategically important allies, such as Turkey, who were expected to be with us, have backed away. The administration continues to turn a deaf ear to all of these voices, and single-mindedly pursues its course to war.

Within the rising chorus of dissent have been the voices of much of the organized religious community in this country—Christian, Jewish and Muslim. Within the Christian community, opposition to war against Iraq includes the Roman Catholic Church, to which I belong, and many mainline Protestant and Orthodox churches. These are not pacifist groups who oppose war under all circumstances. They are religious leaders who say the moral case has not been made for this war at this time.

War is not just another means to achieving our goals. More than any

other option, it is dangerous, it is deadly, it is irreversible. That is why, whenever we resort to force in the world, there is an urgent need to ensure that we remain true to our values as Americans.

Saddam Hussein is one of the most brutal tyrants on the world stage today. He has murdered thousands of his own people—many with chemical and biological weapons. He has attempted to wipe out entire communities. He has attacked neighboring countries. He supports terrorism against innocent civilians throughout the Middle East. Undeniably, the world would be a better place without Saddam Hussein. That fact, however, should not be the end of the inquiry, but only the beginning.

From the perspective of our shared values, the fundamental question is whether this is a “just war.” That is not an easy question to answer, because some elements of a just war are clearly present.

There are six principles that guide the determination of “just war.” They were first developed by St. Augustine in the Fifth Century and expanded upon by St. Thomas Aquinas in the Thirteenth Century. To be just a war must have a just cause, confronting a danger that is beyond question; it must be declared by a legitimate authority acting on behalf of the people; it must be driven by the right intention, not ulterior, self-interested motives; it must be a last resort; it must be proportional, so that the harm inflicted does not outweigh the good achieved; and it must have a reasonable chance of success.

These are sound criteria by which to judge our impending war in Iraq.

First, does Iraq pose a danger to us that is beyond question?

Clearly, Iraq does pose a considerable danger, principally because of Saddam Hussein’s biological and chemical weapons and his history of attempts to develop nuclear weapons. But it is not at all clear that the only way to protect ourselves from that threat is war. In fact, many of us are deeply concerned that initiating a war to remove Saddam Hussein will actually increase the danger to the American people.

The biological and chemical weapons Saddam has are not new. He has possessed them for more than a decade. He did not use them against us in the gulf war and he did not use them against us in the years since then, because he understands that any use of them would lead to his certain destruction. As CIA Director George Tenet stated last year in testimony before Congress, the greatest danger of their use occurs if Saddam knows he is about to be removed from power and therefore perceives he has nothing left to lose.

Iraq, to the best of our knowledge, has no nuclear weapon. If nuclear weapons in the hands of a rogue state are our principal concern, then certainly North Korea poses a much more imminent threat. And Iran—not Iraq—is close behind.

The President must explain why war with Iraq will not distract us from the more immediate and graver danger posed by North Korea. Something is wrong at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue if we rush to war with a country that poses no nuclear threat, but will not even talk to a country that brandishes its nuclear power right now. Any nuclear threat from Iraq, we are told, is probably 5 years into the future. But the threat from North Korea exists today.

Desperate and strapped for cash, North Korea is the greatest current nuclear danger to the United States, and it is clearly taking advantage of the situation in Iraq. It is the country most likely to sell nuclear material to terrorists. It may well have a long-range missile that can strike our soil.

War with Iraq will clearly undermine our ability to deal with this rapidly escalating danger. But our options are not limited to invading Iraq or ignoring Iraq. No responsible person suggests that we ignore the Iraqi threat.

The presence of U.N. inspectors on the ground in Iraq, coupled with our own significant surveillance capacity, make it extremely unlikely that Iraq can pursue any substantial weapons development program without detection. If we can effectively immobilize Saddam’s activity, the danger his regime poses can be minimized without war.

Above all, we cannot allow differences over Iraq to shatter the very coalition we depend upon in order to effectively combat the far greater and more imminent threat posed by the al-Qaida terrorists. Close international cooperation is what led to the recent arrest in Pakistan of the planner of the 9/11 attack.

Second, has the war been declared by a legitimate authority acting on behalf of the people?

When Congress voted last October, most Members believed that the use of force by America would have United Nations backing. Such backing is now highly unlikely. Last October, no international inspectors had been in Iraq for 5 years. Now, U.N. inspectors are on the ground engaged in disarming Saddam.

No war by America can be successfully waged if it lacks the strong support of our people. And America remains divided on an invasion of Iraq without United Nations approval. The reason for that lack of support today is clear. The administration has not made a convincing case that war is necessary, nor have they credibly answered crucial questions about the cost of the war in lives and dollars, how long American troops will remain in Iraq, and what type of Iraqi government will replace Saddam.

In his address last week on a post-war Iraq, President Bush failed to give adequate answers to the key questions on the minds of the American people about the war and its aftermath. He painted a simplistic picture of the

brightest possible future—with democracy flourishing in Iraq, peace emerging among all nations in the Middle East, and the terrorists with no base of support there. In a dangerous world, the fundamental decision on war or peace cannot be made on rosy and unrealistic scenarios.

Third, any war must be driven by the right intention.

I do not question the President's motive in pursuing this policy, but I seriously question his judgment.

The Bush administration was wrong to allow the anti-Iraq zealots in its ranks to exploit the 9/11 tragedy by using it to make war against Iraq a higher priority than the war against terrorism.

Al-Qaida—not Iraq—is the most imminent threat to our national security. Our citizens are asked to protect themselves from al-Qaida with plastic sheeting and duct tape, while the administration prepares to send our armed forces to war against Iraq. Those priorities are wrong.

In a desperate effort to justify its focus on Iraq, the administration has long asserted that there are ties between Osama and Saddam—a theory with no proof that is widely doubted by intelligence experts. Two weeks after 9/11, Secretary Rumsfeld claimed that we had “bulletproof” evidence of the link. But a year later, CIA Director Tenet conceded in a letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee that the Administration's understanding of the link was still “evolving” and was based on “sources of varying reliability.” In fact, the link is so widely doubted that intelligence experts have expressed their concern that intelligence is being politicized to support the rush to war.

Fourth, war must always be a last resort.

That is why all options must be pursued. Inspections still have a chance to work in Iraq. Progress is difficult. No one said it would be easy. But as long as inspectors are on the ground and making progress, we must give peace a chance.

But before resorting to war, it is extremely important to reach agreement that there is no alternative. Nations that have been among our closest allies oppose us now because they do not believe that the alternatives to war have been exhausted. Many of them believe that an invasion of Iraq could destabilize the entire Middle East.

Many of them believe that instead of subduing terrorism, war with Iraq will increase support and sympathy in the Islamic world for terrorism against the West. We cannot cavalierly dismiss these concerns of our allies.

War with Iraq runs the very serious risk of inflaming the Middle East and provoking a massive new wave of anti-Americanism that may well strengthen the terrorists, especially if we act without the support of the world community.

A year ago, *The Wall Street Journal* quoted a dissident in Saudi Arabia who

has turned his focus from his own government to the U.S. Government. He said: [The main enemy of the Muslims and the Arabs is America—and we don't want it to impose things on us. We would rather tolerate dictatorship in our countries than import reforms from America.]

The war against al-Qaida is far from over, and the war against Iraq may make it worse.

After 9/11 we witnessed an unprecedented rallying of the world community to our side. That international unity was our strongest weapon against terrorism. It denied terrorists sanctuary, it led to a vital sharing of intelligence, and it helped to cut off the flow of financial resources to al-Qaida. We cannot allow that international cooperation to shatter over our differences on Iraq. We cannot be a bully in the world school yard and still expect friendship and support from the rest of the world.

Fifth, any war must be proportional, so that the harm inflicted does not outweigh the good achieved.

If there is a war, we all pray that it will be brief, and that casualties will be few. But there is no assurance of that. Certainly, we have the military power to occupy Iraq. But that may only be the beginning. Our troops may be confronted by urban guerilla warfare from forces still loyal to Saddam or simply anti-Western. The war may be far more brutal than we anticipate.

In such a conflict, innocent civilian casualties could also be high. We cannot let Saddam hide behind innocent human shields if there is a war. But that large risk makes it all the more imperative for war to be only a last resort.

We have been told that an attack on Iraq will begin with an enormous cruise missile assault to destroy their infrastructure, strike fear and awe in the hearts of the enemy, and undermine their will to resist. We know that thousands of cruise missiles will be fired in the first 48 hours of the war, more than were launched in the entire 40 days of the Gulf War. Such a massive assault will unavoidably produce a very substantial number of civilian casualties. That harsh reality adds greatly to the burden that must be overcome by those who argue that war is the proper response now. It is a burden they have not met.

One of the highest and worst costs of war may be the humanitarian costs. Sixty percent of Iraq's people rely on the United Nations' Oil-for-Food Program for their daily survival. Food is distributed through 46,000 government distributors supplied by a network of food storage barns. A war with Iraq will disrupt this network. Many Iraqis, especially poor families, have no other source of food. Women and children will be the most vulnerable victims. According to recent reports, 500,000 Iraqi children already suffer from malnutrition.

And what are the costs to America? We all know there is an increased risk

of another domestic terrorist attack. The war will make it a more dangerous time on the American homefront.

There will also be a very substantial financial cost to the war. The short-term cost is likely to exceed \$100 billion. The long-term cost, depending on how long our troops must remain in Iraq, will be far more. If our national security were at stake, we would spare no expense to protect American lives. But the administration owes the nation a more honest discussion about the war costs we are about to face, especially if America has to remain in Iraq for many years, with little support from other nations.

The sixth element of a just war is that it must have a reasonable chance of success.

I have no doubt that we will prevail on the battlefield but what of the consequences for our own national security and the peace and security of the Middle East?

We know that a stable government will be essential in a post-war Iraq. But the administration refuses to discuss in any real detail how it will be achieved and how long our troops will need to stay. President Bush assumes everything will go perfectly. But war and its consequences hold enormous risks and uncertainties.

As retired General Anthony Zinni has asked, will we do what we did in Afghanistan in the 1970s—drive the old Soviet Union out and let something arguably worse emerge in its place?

The vast majority of the Iraqi people may well want the end of Saddam's rule, but they may not welcome the United States to create a government in our own image. Regardless of their own internal disagreements, the Iraqi people still feel a strong sense of national identity, and could quickly reject an American occupation force that tramples on local cultures.

We must recognize that from the day we occupy Iraq, we shoulder the responsibility to protect and care for its citizens. We are accountable under the Geneva Conventions for public safety in neighborhoods, for schools, and for meeting the basic necessities of life for 23 million Iraqi civilians.

This daunting challenge has received very little attention from the administration. As the dust settles, the repressed tribal and religious differences of the past may come to the fore—as they did in the brutal civil wars in the former Yugoslavia, in Rwanda, and other countries. As our troops bypass Basra and other Iraqi cities on their way to Baghdad, how will we prevent the revenge bloodletting that occurred after the last Gulf War, in which thousands of civilians lost their lives?

What do we do if Kurds in northern Iraq proclaim an independent Kurdistan? Or the Shia in southern Iraq move toward an alliance with Iran, from which they have long drawn their inspiration?

We have told the government of Turkey that we will not support an independent Kurdistan, despite the fact that the Kurdish people in Iraq already have a high degree of US-supported autonomy and have even completed work on their own constitution. Do we send in our troops again to keep Iraq united?

Post-War Afghanistan is not exactly the best precedent for building democracy in Iraq. Sixteen months after the fall of the Taliban government in Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai is still referred to as “the Mayor of Kabul”—because of the weak and fragile hold of his government on the rest of the nation. Warlords are in control of much of the countryside. The Afghan-Pakistani border is an area of anarchy—and ominous al-Qaida cells.

The U.S. military is far from equipped to handle the challenge of meeting the needs of a post-Saddam Iraq. Our government must have a plan in place to care for the population. Yet we have heard little from the administration on how they intend to meet this obligation. To succeed in winning the peace, we will need the help and support of the international community. That is a far less likely to happen if we do not have the international community with us the start.

Before the President makes the final fateful decision to go to war in Iraq, his administration must answer each of these just war questions much more convincingly than they have so far. The American people are waiting for the answers. The entire world is waiting for the answers.

We are no at a major cross-road in our history. The 9/11 atrocities has forced us all to think profoundly about what is great in America. All through our shock and grief, the people’s courage never failed. 9/11 was one of the Nation’s saddest hours, but the response was one of our finest hours.

That hour must not be lost. It can mark the beginning of a new era of common purpose—a return to policies which truly reflect America’s values, a return to the genuine pursuit of justice. The unselfishness we saw in 2001 must not give way to selfishness in 2003. The noble caring for one another that we celebrated then must not be succeeded now by a retreat from our ideals.

Yes, our country is strong but it can be stronger—not just in the power we hold, but in the promise we fulfill of a nation that truly does make better the life of the world. If we rededicate ourselves to that great goal, our achievements will reverberate around the globe, and America will be admired anew for what it must be now, in this new time, more than ever—“the last, best hope of earth.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

Mrs. DOLE. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to the excellent work of our intelligence services in capturing Khalid Shaikh Mohammed. This is a major triumph in the war on terror. Our officers from the Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Security Agency, and their counterparts in the Pakistani and intelligence services are to be highly commended.

Let there be no doubt, capturing Mohammed is a big deal. He has a long and bloody history. He has been implicated in the 1993 bombing of the Twin Towers. He played a major role in plans to hijack airliners in Asia and crash them into the sea. He may well have been a leader in the attack on the USS *Cole*, an attack that killed 17 United States sailors and wounded 39 others. He has been implicated in the attacks on the United States embassies in Kenya and Tanzania which killed hundreds and wounded thousands. And he planned the attacks of September 11.

It is not just attacks against Americans. He is now wanted by our friends, the Australians, for questioning in connection with the recent bombings in Bali which killed hundreds of those citizens. There has even been a warrant issued by our reluctant allies in France for his role in the bombing of a synagogue that killed a French citizen.

Those are the horrible acts of his past that we know about. By capturing Mohammed, what devastating plots have our intelligence services prevented? Hopefully, as they start to learn more from Mohammed, they will also be able to thwart future attacks.

Another possibility is that those who would engage in such acts will realize their secrets may now be compromised and, hopefully, they will abandon their plans.

Not only did we get Mohammed, their operations planner, we also got Hawsawi, their chief financier. The 9/11 terrorists sent their left-over money to Hawsawi. By taking him out of the al-Qaida operations, we have damaged their ability to move money into terrorists’ hands. This should hamper their ability to launch any currently planned operations.

I want to thank our intelligence services for the work they do. Yes, there have been mistakes in the past, and there will be human failures in the future. But when we learn of their victories, they should be thanked. That thanks comes with the knowledge that there must be many more instances where we have been protected and there was no public acclaim for these servants of the public. Frankly, without the publicity surrounding this

case, we might never have known all the agencies that contributed to the captures.

The Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation do not watch after us alone. We should be thankful for the hard work of the men and women of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office. They and others are working around the clock to defend us in the war on terror.

It is not just our intelligence agencies that should be thanked. It was our friends in Pakistan who discovered Mohammed, who arrested him, who turned him over. President Musharraf has continued his strong support for the war on terror, and we must continue to work with allies such as Pakistan to eradicate terrorism.

Yes, this is a great win in the war on terror, but it was not a victory. We may never actually realize when we have achieved victory; for the men and women who make our intelligence system work will have to continue their vigilance, that quiet and all too often unheralded vigilance.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold her suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mrs. DOLE. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there is an interesting turn of events. Those who were looking for a debate on the war in Iraq had best turn to C-SPAN and witness the question period in London before the British House of Commons. I have been watching it. It is a fascinating debate.

Tony Blair is defending his position in support of the United States. His own party is divided. The conservatives support him. The questioning is very tough. In the course of defending his position, some important questions are being asked and answered in the British House of Commons.

If you would expect the same thing here in the U.S. Congress, you might be surprised or disappointed to learn it is not taking place. What is taking place is speeches on the floor by individual Senators. Today, I have seen Senator BYRD of West Virginia, Senator DAYTON of Minnesota, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Others have come to the floor to speak about the war in Iraq. But there has literally been no active debate on this issue on Capitol Hill, in the United States of America, since last October.

The reason, of course, is that last October we enacted a use of force resolution which virtually gave to the President of the United States the authority