

typically, when they find the suspected person who has committed a crime, when the agents, the police officers raid the house, they often find reams of pornography, reams of material that uses young children in a provocative, nasty, and disturbing way. So there is a cause and effect between the harm caused to these children and their activities or the utilization of this type of material.

Now, not every girl is going to be molested or harmed, and I understand that. But what they have to be aware of is that too much is occurring on the Internet today that should cause parents considerable concern. First and foremost, I urge every parent to make certain that the computer they use is in the family room where they can observe their young children using the computer.

□ 1645

The person that may be chatting with their child may not be the person who purports to be on the other end. They may say they are a fellow student from school. It may turn out to be the neighbor next door who has ill intent on their child. We should warn our children not to be engaged in conversations with adults on the Internet, and certainly warn them never to meet a parent or adult out in a public setting after a chat on the Internet.

I hope my colleagues will look at this legislation very carefully and consider cosponsoring it, because I do think there is an appropriate time now to address some of the growing concerns on this issue. I urge my colleagues to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHOWS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LARSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO LAUNCH ILLEGITIMATE FIRST STRIKE AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in opposition to the President's efforts to launch an illegitimate first strike against Iraq. The President's war fervor threatens the lives of thousands of American soldiers and Iraqi civilians, ignores international law, undermines our fight against terrorism, and may make average Americans less safe. Yet, the President presses for an invasion.

It is true that Saddam Hussein is a dictator. He is a bad man, and the world would be better off without him. But the world will also be better off if the United States works within the scope of international institutions instead of launching an unprovoked first strike against Iraq.

America's greatest asset is our moral authority, not our military power. Attacking a sovereign country unprovoked forfeits that authority completely.

It is true that Saddam has repeatedly violated United Nations resolutions, but it is also true that only the United Nations has the authority to enforce those resolutions. Furthermore, none of those resolutions call for regime change in Iraq, an often-stated goal of the President's.

On top of all of that, a first strike invasion of Iraq could actually undermine America's vital interests in the Mideast and around the world. It is unfortunate but true that Iraq's neighbors mistrust the United States even more than they mistrust Saddam Hussein.

Invading Iraq could have drastic repercussions by energizing extremists looking to overthrow governments across the Mideast. Such an outcome is even more likely if Saddam Hussein responds to an invasion by retaliating against Israel. If he succeeds in killing Israelis and polarizing the Mideast, what then?

The President claims Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are more than can be justified for aggression. In America,

we must hold ourselves to a higher standard. Those weapons programs are frightening, but policy must be based on fact, not fear.

It is believed that Saddam's nuclear weapons program was 95 percent destroyed by 1998, when the U.N. inspection teams pulled out. There is no reason to think that a new round of weapons inspectors will not be just as effective. Meanwhile, President Bush has sent a message of his own by backing out of the ABM treaty, refusing to sign the Kyoto treaty, refusing to be a party to the mine ban treaty, withdrawing the U.S.' signature to the International Criminal Court treaty, and embracing the use of mini nukes.

Is it any wonder that other nations hesitate to support a first strike invasion when we in the United States ignore the same international standards that we accuse Saddam Hussein of disregarding? We must take a long, hard look at our own policies to ensure that we do not violate the same rules we expect others to follow.

As a Nation, it is our responsibility to live up to our own democratic ideals. We owe it to our children to exercise the full range of diplomatic options in Iraq so we can prevent a war that will cost thousands of lives while at the same time giving a boost to our real enemies: The terrorists who planned September 11.

War represents a failure of civilization. It is a last resort. America's strength is our commitment to moral action, and a government based on the rule of law. That law must never be silent, and our sensibilities must never be intimidated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FARR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS addressed the House. (His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. RIVERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BALDWIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS REGARDING ADMINISTRATION PLANS FOR IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, before the Committee on Armed Services, Secretary Rumsfeld, who has made up his mind, said that the President has not yet made up his mind about a preemptive war and an invasion and occupation of Iraq.

Now, when the Secretary was asked how he reconciled that with the rush to adopt a resolution authorizing the use of force here in the House if the President had not yet made up his mind and could not articulate the case, he really did not answer the question. To tell the truth, I was a bit put off by that, but that is a key question which needs to be answered.

On September 5, I sent the President a letter signed by 17 other Members of the United States House of Representatives. We were pleased that the President had recognized the authority of the Congress, the sole authority of the Congress for declarations of war and use and initiation of force, except in the immediate defense of the United States, as per the Constitution and the War Powers Act; but that we felt that the President had a number of very important questions to answer before Congress should even begin the debate on such a resolution.

I fear they are really putting the cart before the horse here. They want a resolution without making the case. The President gave an eloquent speech at the U.N. last week, but many of the things he talked about, the offenses of Saddam Hussein were in fact things that had happened during the Reagan administration, during the administration of Bush I, in fact, such as the horrible gassing of people within his own country and the U.S. aiding him in his war against Iran before we dropped our friendship and support of his horrible regime. Many of these things took place then.

Then he went on to make the case for the U.N. resolutions which have been violated. We agree there, that this is an odious individual. He is not worthy of leading any nation. He has gassed

and killed his own people, promoted religious and ethnic strife, murdered all his potential political opponents. I wish he could be deported to another planet, but right now, he is in power in his country. Hopefully, some people in his country will find a way to overthrow him and get rid of him.

But the question for us in the United States Congress is, should we authorize the first ever preemptive war in the history of the United States, and what is the immediate and serious nature of the threat that would have us break from all precedents in our history and all the precedents of international law? Those are the questions that are embodied in this letter.

Quite truthfully, thus far in both unclassified and classified briefings, and I cannot talk about what they did talk about in classified briefings, but I can tell Members what they do not talk about in classified briefings. They have not talked about anything in the classified briefings that we have not read in USA Today or heard on CNN, so they have yet to make an effective case that somehow he has been transmogrified from this reprehensible dictator in a mostly impoverished developing or Third World country to this incredible and immediate threat to the integrity of the United States of America.

They can find no links to al Qaeda, who is an immediate threat to the United States of America. In fact, I would say that we are being distracted, as are many of our allies and friends, and not-so-good allies and friends around the world, from the pursuit of al Qaeda and wiping out that threat by propping up suddenly this new threat.

I think a lot of this, unfortunately, is probably left over from his father's administration. Many of the foremost advocates of this preemptive war served in Bush's father's administration, and are aggrieved that they did not then so-called "finish the job."

But the same problems that confronted Colin Powell then confront us now. Probably his military is not that significant; maybe, maybe not. Maybe there will not be a lot of casualties. Maybe this can be done without a lot of civilian casualties. Sure, we can work through all of that. But then what? Then what?

I heard one Senator say that we are going to rule Iraq. We are going to rule Iraq, a country of more than 60 million people with an unbelievably fractious history, in the middle of the most volatile region on Earth, with the problems with the Shi'as and the Sunnis and the Kurds and the Turks and all those other things, and we are going to rule Iraq?

They have to have not only an entrance strategy and a rationale for this war, they need an exit strategy that they have to explain to the American people and this Congress before they should receive any sort of authorization to do anything in that area.

WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no issue that this House will deal with of the gravity of the one we are facing. Sending this country to war, putting our young people, men and women, in harm's way is a heavy responsibility. It cannot be done on the basis of misinformation.

Some of us who serve here served in the Vietnam era. I dealt with casualties for 2 years coming back from Vietnam. The young men and young women of the Seventh Fleet came to Long Beach Naval Station, where I was the chief psychiatrist. I saw what happens to people in war, so I do not come out here with an easy heart to say, well, let us go off and do this and do that. I think it has to be thought through very carefully what this country is doing, because if we put our people on the line, they have to know what they are doing.

If we say to the world that we can make a preemptive strike, we do not like what that person is doing, and we are not sure exactly what he is doing, but we are pretty sure we do not like what he is doing so we are going to take him out, when this country moves to that point, we are moving into a very dangerous period.

I want to read a quote. It was not said in this body, it was said on the other side: "I believe that history will record that we have made a great mistake in subverting and circumventing the Constitution of the United States. I believe this resolution to be a historic mistake. I believe that within the next century, future generations will look with dismay and great disappointment upon a Congress which is now about to make such a historic mistake."

Now, we went to war in Vietnam with a voice vote in the House of Representatives.

□ 1700

No recorded votes. In the Senate they had a vote. Two Members spoke against it and voted against it. One of them was this speech I just read by Wayne Morse of Oregon. Another Senator voted for it but asked a question. He said, "I do not want to do this because I think we are going to wind up with 500,000 troops on the ground." They went down and asked President Johnson and President Johnson called Gaylord Nelson and said, "Gaylord, for heaven's sake you know I am not going to do anything like that." He lied to him. He lied to him.

And when people tell me they have facts, that they know that there are weapons out there, there are nuclear weapons, that, oh, the United States is in grave danger, we knew what Saddam Hussein was doing with those weapons