Buchanan and Press'
October 10th, 2002

MSNBC

SEN. TOM DASCHLE (D-SD), MAJORITY LEADER: ... because I believe that Saddam Hussein represents a real threat, and because I believe it is important for American to speak with one voice at this critical moment, I will give-I will vote to give-the president the authority he needs.
(END VIDEO CLIP)
BUCHANAN: That is Majority Leader Tom Daschle trying to lead his Democrats in the Senate into the president's camp and the vote in the House on war with Iraq is upcoming in just a few minutes. We're going to have that. But right now we've got a debate right here on MSNBC-Bill.
PRESS: Yes, indeed and joining us as that-just about-that vote about to take place, joining us to debate the issue, first, New York Republican Peter King who is certainly going to vote for the president's resolution, and Illinois Democrat Jan Schakowsky who is not so happy with the resolution and as we hear may, in fact, vote against it.
Peter King let me start with you, Mr. Congressman, thanks for joining us.
REP. PETER KING ®, NEW YORK: Thank you, Bill.
PRESS: According to the front page of the New York Times this morning the CIA has told members of Congress that they're not convinced, they don't buy the White House's line that Saddam Hussein poses an immediate threat to the United States. If they don't believe it, why should you?
KING: First of all, the CIA does confirm that he does have chemical and biological weapons and he could be very close to attaining nuclear weapons. After that, it's a judgment call. And I have no idea whether Saddam Hussein is thinking of attacking today or tomorrow; my feeling is, though-my strong belief is-that what he has is a level of weapons and he's attaining more weapons, we can't afford to take that chance and we shouldn't wait until he attains nuclear weapons before we take action. Now I'm hoping that the U.N. will support intrusive inspections and that we can do it through the inspections regime but if we can't I think he president has to have the power to move now rather than wait until it's too late.
BUCHANAN: OK, Congresswoman Schakowsky it's-it seems that most of the members of your party believe in their hearts this may not be a wise idea but many of them are voting for war anyhow. Is that a fair assessment?
REP. JAN SCHAKOWSKY (D), ILLINOIS: Well, actually, you saw that the majority of the Democratic Caucus voted to support an alternative that said go first to the United Nations, work closely with the U.N. to get even coercive inspections backed by force and then if that does not work if the United States can't be a leader with the context of the international community, then the president should come back to the Congress and ask for the use of force.
But I'd also like to comment on the CIA-they went further and they said that right now the risk from Saddam Hussein is low but should the United States go in and attack the risk becomes high of terrorist attacks and the unleashing of chemical and biological weapons.
BUCHANAN: OK, let me-Peter King-I want to follow up on what you said. Your hope is that these U.N. inspections, they get in there, that Saddam Hussein opens up his palaces, that we're not jerked around, that we can look everywhere and get these weapons. If that happens, would

you then say to the president, Mr. President, let's not go to war if we can get the job done peacefully?
KING: Yes, if the inspectors are satisfied that they are being given full access, if we feel that we are making progress in the inspections then yes, I don't expect that to happen but if it does happen, yes, then I would tell the president and-to the extent he cares what I have to say-but I think the president would agree that so long as the inspection procedure was going forward, it would not be a need for war.
But, again, I don't expect that to happen, Pat, I really don't. And I would disagree with Jan very respectfully on this I think once we-if we had adopted the amendment by Congressman Sprat and it was well thought out but I disagree with it, but if we did we would have, in effect, been given the U.N. I think too much of a veto power over American policy.
We should set our policy as to what it is and try to get the U.N. to go along but not allow them to put a bump in the road. Like, for instance, when President Clinton went into Kosovo in 1999, the U.N. did not give him the resolution.
PRESS: Quickly, what about that, Congresswoman?
SCHAKOWSKY: Well, it seems to me that what the resolution said is that war is not just another policy option, war is, in fact, the very last option and we should give every opportunity to working toward a more peaceful solution and working with our allies. It seems to me that we are making a mistake by leaping first by going in by saying that we should go in with guns blazing.
PRESS: All right, Members, hold your fire and we'll continue the debate right here. The debate on Iraq between Peter King and Jan Schakowsky on MSNBC, BUCHANAN & PRESS.
(COMMERCIAL BREAK)
PRESS: You're watching BUCHANAN & PRESS, they are debating it right now on the floor of the House just about to vote on this resolution authorizing use of force against Iraq and before they run downstairs to vote, two members join us right here to debate the issue.
Republican Peter King of New York, Democrat Jan Schakowsky of Illinois.
Congresswoman, let me come back to you and ask you a somewhat-perhaps-of a Devil's Advocate question but the-there's no doubt, I think you'd agree with me, Saddam Hussein would never have even agreed to let inspectors back in if George Bush hadn't been out there beating on the war drum.
SCHAKOWSKY: Exactly.
PRESS: So isn't he in better shape, though, to have this resolution authorizing the use of force in his back pocket in the weeks ahead?
SCHAKOWSKY: No, I think that the president should have been able to take yes for an answer. He did a good job of convincing the United Nations that they need to live up to their own resolutions.
We can be a forceful leader in that, we can participate in even coercive inspections in Iraq and to disarm Saddam Hussein but does anyone in the world doubt that if the United States wanted to take out that regime we could?
Of course not, they know that, but we should be leading an international force and I think the story of the day is going to be that a large segment of the House of Representatives agrees with that, more than a third of all of the House members have voted for an alternative.
BUCHANAN: OK, Peter, I want to follow up on that question I just asked you. As I understand it, you want Saddam Hussein disarmed. And if you can get that guarantee you don't think we ought to go to Baghdad and have to overthrow him and democratize Iraq because there is a wing of the Republican party represented by Wall Street Journal editorial page, which said as

much is, let's take this opportunity to seize Iraq and democratize it. What is your bottom line?
KING: I would obviously want Iraq to be democratized but that is not the main purpose of the United States military. I don't think we should be using military force just to bring about democracy in Iraq. I think as a practical matter you cannot have full disarmament of Iraq as long as Saddam Hussein is there.
But if that did happen, if Saddam Hussein was able to convince us that all those weapons of mass destruction have been destroyed or eliminated, then I don't think at that stage we would have any reason to be bringing down Saddam Hussein. But I think it's more of a hypothetical question, Pat, because I don't see the two happening.
BUCHANAN: We're going to have a war, then.
KING: I would say right now the-yes-the odds are that we'll be an invasion of Iraq and I-I'm hoping that we'll have a U.N. Security Council Resolution authorizing it.
PRESS: Very quickly, do you agree with that bottom line, Congresswoman?
SCHAKOWSKY: I would encourage the American people to continue as they have, to write to their members and to write to the president and say no to unilateral war by the United States.
BUCHANAN: OK, thanks very much to both of you, the vote is right around the corner, folks, and the House of Representatives to or for against war?