

on title affecting Kansas City landowners. Under the legislation, the Secretary of the Interior would take into trust for the benefit of the Wyandotte Nation a parcel of real property located in Edwardsville, Wyandotte County, Kansas. Concurrently, the Wyandotte Nation would relinquish all claims to lands in Kansas and would acquiesce to dismissal with prejudice of their lawsuit.

Currently, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, along with the municipal leadership of Edwardsville, is negotiating a legally binding Memorandum of Understanding with the Wyandotte Nation regarding the operation of any gaming facility that the Wyandotte Nation may establish on its settlement lands under this measure. The Mayor and Commissioners of the Unified Government support my introduction of this legislation at this time. I anticipate that these negotiations will reach a satisfactory conclusion within a few weeks; if that does not come to pass, however, I reserve the right to withdraw my support for this proposal if a Memorandum of Understanding is not endorsed by all parties within a reasonable time.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will provide significant support to ongoing economic development efforts in my congressional district. In 1996, a nonbinding, county-wide referendum registered an endorsement of nearly 80 percent for legalized gaming in Wyandotte County. For this reason, past measures I have introduced to assist the Wyandotte Nation's efforts to bring gaming to Wyandotte County have had broad support among my constituents, including local elected officials, consumers, labor organizations and the business community.

I hope that all members of the Kansas congressional delegation and Governor Bill Graves will join me in supporting this important proposal, so that we can see it signed into law prior to the adjournment of the 107th Congress.

PROVIDING A PRELIMINARY AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF FORCE AGAINST IRAQ

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks since the president's speech to the United Nations, I have taken time to listen to Coloradans and to discuss with military leaders and other experienced voices the threat posed by Iraq. This has been a difficult, even soul-searching time for all Americans, and I have taken my responsibility very seriously because I deeply believe that this vote will be among the most important I cast in Congress.

The U.S. Constitution assigns the power to declare war to the Congress, and if we are on the path to war, I believe this Congress has the grave responsibility to join with the president in determining whether this path will be short or long, who will be on that path with us, and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage.

After deep reflection and after listening to those whose experience and judgment in matters of war and peace I respect most, particu-

larly those in the military, I have come to these conclusions about the path to war:

We should only go to war as a last resort and after all diplomatic efforts have been exhausted, and I take some comfort that President Bush apparently agrees with this view.

Unless there is new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations.

America can go it alone, and should go it alone where we believe an attack is imminent, but that is not the case with Iraq. In this case, I believe we need the United Nations with us—not so much to win the war and topple Saddam Hussein, but to secure the peace and take responsibility for the costly and difficult nation-building that must follow.

Some say that after 9–11 we cannot afford not to attack Iraq on our own. I say that after 9–11 we should only attack in concert with the international community. Why? Because a preemptive, go-it-alone attack could seriously compromise our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world.

Saddam Hussein is a dangerous tyrant and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I have no illusions about the duplicity of this man nor the depth of his cruelty. The world would be safer and breathe easier if he were removed.

Getting the job done and doing it in a way that protects American interests, American values, and American lives is what concerns me most. Moreover, I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat in the context of other security goals, including winning our war against terrorism and Islamic fundamentalist terrorism in particular.

I have indicated that I cannot support the Congressional Resolution on Iraq that has been reported by the International Relations Committee. This resolution would not meet what I believe to be the solemn responsibility of Congress to declare, authorize, and define war, particularly on a full-scale, preemptive basis.

The current resolution concerns me most because it shortens the path to war. Worse, it vests total discretion with the president to determine how fast we run this path. This path to war is far too complicated and the consequences far too dangerous for Congress to delegate this responsibility to one man.

I believe this path to war should be slower-paced and involve more check-points—check points that include the participation by Congress.

These are the check-points I think should mark any path to war with Iraq:

1. We must secure a tough new resolution from the United Nations Security Council that establishes a timetable for the destruction of Saddam Hussein's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. This will strengthen the president's hand.

2. If we secure the full support of the United Nations, I believe the UN must join us in deploying a robust and even coercive inspection and disarmament program against Iraq, backed up by a multinational force that America would lead.

3. If we fail to secure the support of the United Nations and unfettered inspections are

not begun, I believe we must cripple Saddam Hussein's ability to acquire and deploy weapons of mass destruction. At that juncture, military force may indeed be necessary as a last resort. But before America launches a massive operation of the kind we saw in the 1991 Gulf War, however, I believe the president should come to Congress to ask for a separate authorization of war.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terror and the consequences for our security in the region, is simply irresponsible in my view.

More important, Congress needs to share responsibility for the decision to go to war on this scale. We cannot simply wish the president the best and wash our hands of the awesome responsibility to send thousands of American men and women to war.

The last time we did so, in 1964, when Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, my father was serving in Congress. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, like the one we are now debating, was designed to strengthen the president's hand in dealing with an international crisis. It led to the eventual deployment of 500,000 American soldiers in Vietnam, and the deaths of 55,000 American servicemen and women. My father came to regret his support for that resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war.

My father was an early and outspoken critic of that war, and I know he came to believe that Congress made a terrible mistake when it passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Let not this Congress, a generation later make a similar and tragic mistake.

The resolution I am offering specifies key questions that should be answered before we send thousands of American soldiers into harm's way. It would also establish the legitimacy of American military action as a last resort because we would have clearly exhausted all other means to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Finally, it would preserve the Constitutional responsibility of the Congress to declare war.

The resolution I offer today is intended to avoid the mistakes of the past, while still allowing us to accomplish the important task of ridding the world of the dangers posed by Iraq under Saddam Hussein.

RECOGNITION OF JAMEEL HOURANI

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Jameel Hourani of Los Angeles, California. On October 16, St. Nicholas Antiochian Orthodox Christian Cathedral will honor Jameel Hourani as its "Man of the Year." I would like to join the Orthodox Union Club in publicly recognizing this outstanding person.

In 1988, Dr. Jameel Hourani was elected the President of the Parish Council at Saint