

stock market plunges, we watch billions of dollars evaporate from families' retirement savings. Health care costs continue to spiral out of control. They have risen five times the rate of inflation, and our families are falling farther behind, no matter how hard they struggle to keep up. Education is more important today than ever, but our schools continue to suffer as Congress withholds needed funding.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must act to get the American economy back on track. We must balance the budget and pay down the national debt for long-term economic growth. We must protect Social Security from privatization schemes that would cut back and raise taxes. We must lower health care costs. And we must fund education so that every American willing to work hard can make the best of their God-given ability.

#### HONORING GLORIA PEREZ

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gloria Perez of Santa Ana, California, for 27 years of service as a police resource officer in that city.

Ms. Perez was recently recognized as the Crime Prevention Practitioner of the Year by the California Crime Prevention Officers Association. She was honored for her work in establishing the Junior Children of Pride program, a crime prevention program created to encourage a work ethic and develop trust of law enforcement for local children.

□ 1015

The program targets high-risk neighborhoods and creates a reward system for children that pick up trash and keep their neighborhoods clean. Young people that take part in the neighborhood beautification effort are rewarded with donated prizes distributed by law enforcement officers, allowing these children to bond with local officers in a positive manner. Ms. Perez has continually demonstrated her commitment to serving her community, and I am proud to have her as a neighbor and for all her efforts to make our district a safer place to live.

#### WHY WE MUST DEAL WITH IRAQ

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night President Bush followed through on a promise to the American people when he stood before a crowd gathered in the Cincinnati Museum Center and outlined the reasons Saddam Hussein's regime must be dealt with now.

The President acknowledged the doubts some Americans have about confrontation with Iraq, and he offered

answers to those questions. He outlined why Iraq is unique and why we cannot afford to wait to act. He explained how Saddam's regime has oppressed the Iraqi people and violated United Nations resolutions for the past 11 years by continuing his quest for weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 taught us that we are vulnerable and that there are those who wish to harm us. I commend the President for taking steps to convince the public that Saddam Hussein is a very real threat that must be dealt with before he follows through on his desires to use weapons of mass destruction against the American people.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 114, AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 574 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 574

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment to the preamble and the amendment to the text recommended by the Committee on International Relations and now printed in the joint resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any further amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 17 hours of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, which may be extended pursuant to section 2; (2) the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) after the conclusion of consideration of the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, a final period of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, which shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order for the Majority Leader or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader, to move to extend debate on the joint resolution, as amended. Such motion shall not be subject to debate or amendment.

SEC. 3. During consideration of House Joint Resolution 114 pursuant to the first section of this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair

may postpone further consideration of the joint resolution to a time designated by the Speaker either on the same legislative day or on the next legislative day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule that provides for 20 hours of debate on the resolution as well as providing for two Democratic substitutes. The rule also provides that after consultation with the minority leader, the majority leader may extend debate to ensure that all Members have an opportunity to speak on this important issue. Just as in 1991, every single Member will have a chance to be heard.

The rules makes in order two substitute amendments, two Democratic substitutes to be offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), as well as providing for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment the people's House begins debate on one of the most difficult questions we will ever face. I rise today in strong support of the resolution authorizing the President to take action to address the very troubling issue of Saddam Hussein and Iraq. No Member of this body should ever be too eager to send our military into harm's way. Nor should we ever consider taking such an action without a strong and vigorous debate. At the end of the day, however, I am pleased that we have come up with a bipartisan resolution to prove once again that partisanship ends at the water's edge.

I am a strong supporter of international cooperation, working with our friends and allies and the United Nations. However, in matters of national security, multinational cooperation and coalition-building are tools that help us to achieve our most precious national interests. We cannot be beholden to any institution whose interests may not coincide with our own.

Obviously, we would all be gratified to have the full and unconditional support of the United Nations Security Council. Secretary of State Colin Powell has been working tirelessly for months to garner that support up in New York. But as the Government of the United States, it is our primary responsibility to provide for the safety and security of our citizens, both at home and abroad. That is why I support this resolution which will in fact strengthen our hand at the United Nations and demonstrate that this government is united in its determination

to address the threat that Saddam Hussein poses.

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein oppresses his people, flaunts the will of the international community, has committed genocide, and pursues weapons of mass destruction that will dramatically alter the status of his country in the international system.

For 12 years he has blatantly ignored the Security Council resolutions he previously agreed to. When the inspectors were conducting their inspections with Iraq, they were constantly impeded. The time for ineffective inspections, with conditions set by this Stalinist dictator, has passed. Iraq has received chance after chance, only to continue to obstruct and deny. The time for chances is over. Only unconditional and unfettered inspections with total disarmament of Iraq's cache of weapons of mass destruction are acceptable.

So far, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has proved unwilling to back its words with actions. As Saddam's primary enemy, it falls to the President and this Congress to protect the American people from this mass murderer. Saddam Hussein presents a clear and immediate threat to the safety of American citizens and our interests overseas. We know he has produced such deadly gases as VX and sarin, along with anthrax. We know he has over 30,000 delivery vehicles for such biological and chemical agents, and we know he has scuds capable of reaching our forces stationed in the Gulf and our NATO allies in Turkey.

Perhaps more frightening, we know that Iraq is actively seeking to reestablish its nuclear weapons program and has reportedly been seeking uranium to achieve that goal, and the track record shows that his ability to inflict harm has always been underestimated. Given the level of technical expertise that Iraq developed prior to the Gulf War, it would take them months, not years, to develop a nuclear device once they obtained the proper materials.

There are those who argue that Saddam Hussein, a man who has started two wars in 2 decades, can be contained and managed. Let me remind the Nation of Saddam Hussein's record in power. He sponsors terrorist groups that have killed American citizens. He routinely pays the families of suicide bombers while he lets his own citizens starve. He has executed thousands of Iraqis a year and combats dissent by publicly removing the tongues of his critics. He has engaged in ethnic cleansing utilizing chemical weapons that have killed over 5,000 Kurds, and he has completely destroyed entire towns he felt were disloyal. He has committed genocide and other crimes against humanity and deserves to be held accountable.

The United States held the moral high ground in ending Slobodan Milosevic's reign of terror, and Saddam has reigned too long.

Further, I disagree with those who argue that we should not undertake this action because it is preemptive. Authorizing the President to effectively address this situation is not preemptive. This is a response to those heinous acts I have just outlined. With every U.N. resolution Iraq ignores, it threatens international peace. Unless and until Iraq complies fully with the inspections, a standard it has never met, there remains ample justification for taking action to defend the security of our Nation. Iraq is a nation that publicly states that it has every intention of cooperating with the international community, but continues to try to shoot down our brave pilots enforcing the no-fly zones.

History has not been kind to the governments that have acceded to the wishes of brutal dictators in the hopes of staving off conflicts. The security of the future depends on the resolve we show here today. As we learned on September 11, delaying our response to security threats can have devastating consequences. It is incumbent upon all of us to demonstrate to the world's dictators they cannot hide behind false cooperation and that our Nation will not be cowed from protecting our citizens for fear of political or military difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, our security comes first. I cannot help but think of Abraham Lincoln's words 137 years ago when he said: "The struggle of today is not altogether for today. It is for a vast future also."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, today we begin a historic debate here in the House of Representatives. It will continue for 3 days, and every Member will have the opportunity to be heard. Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, it is not often that Congress must consider matters of war and peace, so we have studied the issue seriously. Within the Democratic Caucus, Members have received numerous briefings from Republicans as well as Democrats and outside experts as well as those inside the administration and asked probing questions over the past few weeks and months.

I expect that this debate will be as robust as it is serious. It should come as no surprise that many sincere people in the administration, in Congress, and among the public have varying views about how best to deal with Saddam Hussein; and it should come as no surprise that there is no party position on an issue of this gravity.

In 1991, I was in the minority of my own party when I voted to authorize the first President Bush to use force against Saddam Hussein. Now, 11 years later, the situation is different; and I expect that more Democrats will au-

thorize the second President Bush to use military force, if necessary, to end the threat that Saddam Hussein poses.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with those who assume that the opposition's part is to automatically oppose the administration. When it comes to national security, the public expects Democrats and Republicans to lay down our partisan swords and try to work out a consensus.

□ 1030

We may differ in some areas, but those differences should be based on principle, not on party labels. The three resolutions on the House floor meet that standard. They have the support of thoughtful Members of both parties who have struggled sincerely to devise what they believe is the best approach to protecting America and our vital interests in the world.

Mr. Speaker, our lively and honest discussion this week, and I expect it will be very lively, should not be mistaken for a lack of resolve. On both sides of the aisle there is general consensus that Saddam Hussein is a threat to the security and stability of the world, and there is an overwhelming bipartisan commitment to ending that threat.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Saddam's outlaw regime poses a serious threat to the United States, our allies, and the rest of the world. Between 1991 and 1998, weapons inspectors found and destroyed significant amounts of chemical and biological weapons, despite Iraq's protestations that none existed. Since then, Saddam Hussein has continued his pursuit of weapons of mass destruction as well as his hostilities to the United States and our interests.

I am pleased that Democratic and Republican leaders, working with the administration, have agreed to the compromise resolution H.J. Res. 114 that is on the House floor this week. The President has accepted many important Democratic changes to his original resolution. As a result, it has been significantly improved and America's position against Saddam Hussein has been strengthened.

The compromise resolution strikes a good balance between using a multilateral approach and preserving America's right to defend our interests. It strongly supports the efforts of Secretary of State Colin Powell to build an international coalition through the United Nations against Saddam Hussein; and if diplomatic efforts fail, it requires the President to report back to Congress before beginning military action.

There are other important changes. While the original White House draft would have authorized military action in the region, this compromise focuses on Iraq specifically. It also requires the President to comply with the War Powers Act and its regular procedures for consulting with, and reporting to, Congress. Moreover, this resolution requires the President to ensure the war

on terrorism will not be hampered by military action against Iraq.

Since September 11, Democrats and Republicans have worked together to wage the war on terror, and it is critical that the administration not forget its commitment to bring Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda to justice.

Finally, this resolution forces the administration to report to Congress on their planning for the reconstruction, peacekeeping, and other activities that will be necessary after a military conflict with Iraq. Winning the peace is as important as winning the war, and we insist that the administration prepare the American people for the long-term commitment needed to restore peace and stability to Iraq and the Middle East.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan compromise is a substantial improvement on the White House's original draft. Just as importantly, it will help build broad support in the international community as well as here at home for ending the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. That is critical because this is not an easy job. I remain hopeful that international diplomatic pressure will allow a strong, unfettered inspections regime to disarm Saddam Hussein, and I believe that the strong signal that Congress sends with this resolution will increase our diplomatic leverage.

But I am also not naive. Given Saddam's history, we must be prepared for the possibility of a military confrontation with Iraq. The United States has the finest fighting force in the world, and I am confident that if we are forced to fight Saddam Hussein our troops will defeat him overwhelmingly. But war is not something to be taken lightly, and it requires the full support of the American people. That is why, Mr. Speaker, Democrats insisted that the President seek congressional authorization before taking action against Saddam Hussein; and it is why Democratic leaders reached out to the White House to craft a bipartisan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a deadly serious matter, and I have tremendous respect for many of those who differ with me on it. After all, men and women who love their country can disagree on the best way to protect our country. Nonetheless, I believe that the best way to end Saddam Hussein's threat is to meet it head on, and I believe that the compromise resolution represents a sensible and responsible approach to protecting America and the world against Saddam Hussein. I expect it will pass with the overwhelmingly bipartisan support it deserves.

In closing, let me make one more point. Before this is over we may be asking families across the Nation to make tremendous sacrifices. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops may have to put their lives on the line.

I have no doubt that the men and women of the military can secure America's interests abroad, but as

these brave Americans do their job, I hope this Congress will finally do its job and address the deepening economic uncertainty that threatens our security here at home. After all, Iraq is not the only issue in America today. As we speak, unemployment and the poverty rate erupt, while the stock market and 401(K) plans are down. Every day Americans across the country have to deal with economic security as well as national security. It is time this Congress followed their example.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the Republican members of the Committee on Rules are going to be standing today in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and the House.

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of both this rule and the underlying legislation which authorizes the use of our Armed Forces by the President of the United States against Iraq.

In addition, this rule will allow for the consideration of two amendments in the nature of substitutes, thus allowing the Members of the House to choose among several measures on this grave and important issue. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for his thoughtful deliberation in bringing this rule to the floor today.

Over the next few days, this body will find itself engaged in a debate of historic proportions; and, once the debate has concluded, we must give an answer to our President who has asked the Congress to unite with him in opposition to the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein. I am proud to stand with President Bush and cast my vote in support of H.J. Res. 114.

Since 1798, the United States has involved itself in approximately 310 separate military actions worldwide. Of that total, Congress has authorized the use of force through legislation 11 times and has declared war on sovereign states five times. Thus, the vote we will cast on this legislation will be among the most profound of our careers. Yet a careful review of the evidence that President Bush has put before the country, the United Nations, and the world makes it clear that this difficult choice is our only reasonable choice.

Of course, a peaceful resolution to the problems that Saddam Hussein poses in the world would be ideal, and continued diplomacy should be our preferred tool. Yet what has been going on

for the last 11 years if not that? The failures of the United Nations' actions are well known. Shall we continue down that same road and expect to arrive at a different destination?

The President has made clear that we will continue to work with the United Nations for a peaceful result, but absent that the United States must be prepared to take strong action. This resolution makes it clear to Saddam that, if he fails to immediately comply with a host of United Nations resolutions, then he must be fully prepared to accept the consequences of those failures.

The fundamental question before us today is: Will the United States of America, in coalition with the peace-loving nations of this world, allow the tyranny of Saddam to continue, or will we take steps to rid the world of this growing menace?

What is clear today, Mr. Speaker, is that a peaceful world is the end we seek, a world in which free nations can pursue their own dreams unthreatened by warring despots whose only pursuit is power. The people of Iraq should and must be free from the oppressive, tyrannical and dangerous regime of Saddam Hussein. The peace-loving people of the Middle East, the European continent, Asia, Africa, and, yes, North America, too, must be freed from the fear that weapons of mass destruction visit upon them.

It is indisputable that the United States has been, for over two centuries, the beacon of freedom and opportunity for the world. Our military ambitions have been forever leavened by our dream of peace and freedom in the world. I see no reason now to answer this call with a message of timidity or caution.

I urge my colleagues to join with me so that Congress can speak with a clear voice and support the President for peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both this rule and the underlying, H.J. Res. 114, which authorizes the use of our Armed Forces by the President of the United States against Iraq.

In addition, this rule will allow for the consideration of two amendments in the nature of substitutes, thus allowing the Members of the House to choose among several measures on this grave and important issue. I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, for his thoughtful deliberation in bringing this rule to the floor today.

Over the next few days, this body will find itself engaged in a debate of historic proportions. And, once the debate has concluded, we must give an answer to our President, who has asked the Congress to untie with him in opposition to the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein. I am proud to stand with President Bush, and cast my vote in support of H.J. Res. 114.

Since 1798, the United States has involved itself in approximately 310 separate military actions worldwide. Of that total, Congress has authorized the use of force, through legislation, 11 times, and has declared war on sovereign states five times. Thus, the vote we will cast on this legislation will be among the most

profound of our careers. Yet, a careful review of the evidence that President Bush has put before our country, the United Nations and the world makes clear that this difficult choice is our only reasonable choice.

Of course, a peaceful resolution to the problems that Saddam Hussein poses to the world would be ideal, and continued diplomacy should be our preferred tool. Yet, what has been going on for the last 11 years if not that? The failures of United Nations actions are well known. Shall we continue down that same road and expect to arrive at a different destination?

The President has made clear that we will continue to work with the United Nations for a peaceful result, but absent that the United States must be prepared to take strong action. This resolution makes clear to Saddam that, if he fails to immediately comply with a host of United Nations resolutions, then he must be fully prepared to accept the consequences of those failures.

The fundamental question before us today is: will the United States of America, in coalition with the peace-loving nations of this world, allow the tyranny of Saddam to continue, or will we take steps to rid the world of this growing menace?

What is clear today, Mr. Speaker, is that a peaceful world is the end we seek. A world in which free nations can pursue their own dreams unthreatened by warring despots whose only pursuit is power.

The people of Iraq should and must be free from the oppressive, tyrannical, and dangerous regime of Saddam Hussein. The peace-loving people of the Middle East, the European continent, Asia, Africa, and North America, too, must be freed from the fear that weapons of mass destruction visit upon them.

It is indisputable that the United States has been, for over two centuries, the beacon of freedom and opportunity for the world. Our military ambitions have been forever leavened by our dream of peace and freedom for the world. I see no reason to now answer this call with a message of timidity or caution.

Passing this resolution with a broad, bipartisan majority gives the U.S. Congress the opportunity to bring a troubled world together under the flag of freedom, a flag that has been unseen in much of the Middle East for too many generations.

I ask my colleagues to join with me, so that the Congress may speak in one clear voice, to answer the President's call for peace throughout the world, to remove those who seek to harm not only their own people, but everyone who believes in liberty and justice, and to bring freedom to the people of Iraq—by any means necessary.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, although I wish more of the substitute amendments had been made in order.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to House Joint Resolution 114, the resolution on Iraq.

I have great respect for the President and for all my colleagues who disagree

with me on this vote of conscience, but I must dissent. Simply put, the resolution on Iraq grants authority for the United States to unilaterally attack Iraq. It grants the President the right to go to war with Iraq tomorrow, without the support of any other nation and absent the support of the UN Security Council.

A little over a year ago, I voted to support the President when he asked for authorization to use force against those who attacked us on September 11. I believe that campaign remains the number one priority for our foreign, military and intelligence policy.

In Afghanistan we are still engaged militarily, hunting down the surviving al Qaeda leadership and its network of supporters. That work is far from over. There is a desperate need for more resources to rebuild Afghanistan and restore democratic government. The U.S. and the international community cannot, must not fail Afghanistan again.

Our work to take down al Qaeda's international organization and financial network is also far from over, and it requires the continuing assistance of the international community.

Some argue that we have the resources to do it all, to wage a war against terrorism, to unilaterally invade, occupy, and rebuild Iraq, and not compromise our troops deployed around the world. But why, when we can and should work with other nations to disarm Iraq, when our allies can share the cost?

The President was right to challenge the U.N. Security Council to carry out its mandate to disarm Iraq and ensure that it can no longer stockpile, develop, produce or use chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. We must now work to ensure that the U.N. Security Council meets its responsibilities. If we get inspectors back into Iraq, then once again we will destroy Saddam's weapons. This time we must ensure that he remains disarmed.

I am not asking that we stand by or stand down. If Iraq continues to obstruct inspections, then the Security Council must approve coercive inspections or a broader military intervention. But we are not yet at that point, and this Congress should not approve immediate and unilateral U.S. action without the sanction of international law or the support of our allies.

I have no doubt that we can defeat Iraq, but I have heard nothing, nothing in the shifting rhetoric and rationale supporting unilateral action against Iraq to make me confident that the consequences of such an invasion have been fully considered. There is no genuine plan of who and what would come after Saddam Hussein, or the requirements of an occupation force to hold and protect Iraq from internal and external enemies, or the resources needed to rebuild Iraq and who would provide them, or the impact of invasion on Iraq's neighbors or on popular feeling throughout the world, let alone the impact of achieving peace in the Middle East.

If we take unilateral action outside the authority of the U.N. and without the direct involvement of our allies, invoking our new policy of preemptive strike, are we not setting a dangerous precedent for other nations? More than any other country, the U.S. has spent the past half century building a body of international law, rules of engagement, and multilateral institutions to guard against this very thing, nations taking matters into their own hands and deciding to fix what is wrong with the world as they see fit.

As the world's greatest military power, it is our first responsibility to build consensus, create coalitions, and move international bodies to protect and provide for our collective security. It should not be "Plan B."

People throughout my district have asked me, why are we going to war in Iraq? Veterans and seniors, students and CEOs have expressed their deep concern. They hate Saddam and recognize, as I do, that he is a brutal dictator, but they do not think we should go it alone.

When I vote whether to send our brave young men and women into harm's way, I must be absolutely sure that I can face their fathers and mothers, their husbands, wives, and children and tell them we have no other choice; war is the only option. And I simply cannot do that yet.

Last September, I voted for force. It was necessary. It was right. It was clearly in defense of our Nation. But today I must dissent.

□ 1045

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, continuing with our colleagues on the Committee on Rules, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a true patriot and my great friend.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we can engage in no more important task than this, debating whether to authorize the use of the Armed Forces of the United States. This task is difficult, but the issue before us is fundamentally clear.

After it was expelled from Kuwait in 1991, Iraq agreed to end its production forever of weapons of mass destruction. Despite that requirement set forth by the international community by means of U.N. Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq has at this time a usable chemical and biological weapons capability, which has included recent production of chemical and biological agents.

As recently declassified intelligence reports have made clear, Iraq can deliver chemical and biological agents using an extensive range of artillery shells, free-fall bombs, sprayers and ballistic missiles. Iraq continues to work on developing nuclear weapons, in breach of its obligations under the nonproliferation treaty and in breach of U.N. Security Council Resolution 687. Uranium has been sought by Iraq

that has no civil nuclear application in that country.

Iraq's military forces are able to use chemical and biological weapons with command, control, and logistical arrangements in place. The Iraqi military is able to deploy these mobile units within 45 minutes of a decision to do so. Iraq has learned lessons from previous U.N. weapons inspections and is already taking steps to conceal and disperse sensitive equipment and documentation in advance of the possible return of inspectors.

Despite having lost the war in 1991 and despite being required by the U.N. to eliminate his weapons of mass destruction and to acquiesce to free and open inspections by the U.N. to verify his compliance with the world community's requirements that he not possess those weapons, Saddam expelled the U.N. weapons inspectors in 1998.

What seems inconceivable to me is that we did not have this debate in this forum 4 years ago. But in reality, only the Commander in Chief can really lead in the field of national security.

Some say we should wait until we find a smoking gun with regard to nuclear weapons. As my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), said last night in the Committee on Rules, that smoking gun would be a smoking city, and having to mourn 3 million innocent civilians instead of 3,000.

Regime change in Iraq is a strategic necessity. It cannot be postponed because time is not on the side of the United States and the international community. The world community should have removed Saddam from power when he expelled the U.N. weapons inspectors 4 years ago. Saddam must be removed before he has a single nuclear bomb and before he has the means to deliver his other weapons of mass destruction on a large scale.

The long-term cost in blood and tears of allowing Saddam to strengthen his position would be much higher than the cost of any action to remove him now.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has begun a historic debate on the most serious topic that we have ever considered by this body, the question of whether to go to war. The Constitution states explicitly that Congress shall have the power to declare war. This great and terrible power is vested not in the individual of the President, but in the collective will of the electorate as embodied by its representatives. Members can cast no more weighty vote than this.

That said, Mr. Speaker, every bone in my body is telling me that the American people do not want this conflict, nor do they believe this resolution is warranted at this present time. The voices are drowned out by the drum-

beat for war emanating from Washington. These voices are not confident that the body has asked the tough questions. They are not confident that the shifting rationales for the invasion are anything but a war in search of a justification.

In the last 2 months alone, more than 1,100 people have called or written my office expressing intense disapproval of any U.S. military action against Iraq. That contrasts with 15 who support it. These voices are not an anomaly. Members from both sides of the aisle are hearing them. I believe more and more that they represent the majority of the Nation.

Like most of my colleagues, I have thought and reflected at length on this vote. It is never an easy decision for a Member of Congress to make lightly. I would like to share with my colleagues and constituents the issues and questions that have led me to oppose this resolution as written and not to send young Americans into harm's way.

First I want to discuss the source of Iraq's bioweapons. Saddam Hussein is not a new threat for the United States. Since he took power in 1979, Hussein has committed a laundry list of human rights abuses, despotic acts and crimes against the global community. In 1990, this Chamber voted to empower the President to wage war against Iraq in order to free Kuwait and in order to preserve stability in the Middle East. Yet the policy by the United States has not always been clear.

Most people do not know that during the early 1980s the Reagan administration, followed by the first Bush administration, backed Iraq in its war against Iran on the theory that the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

At that time, the Commerce Department of the United States approved a series of exports to the Iraqi Government of substances that will now sound familiar to many Americans. The administration allowed Iraq to receive biological samples of anthrax, the bacteria that makes botulinum toxin, the germs that cause gas gangrene, and West Nile virus, among others. Sure, he has biological weapons. We gave them to him.

Clearly one must address Iraq and its arsenal, but we can go forward without alienating our friends and allies within the region. Indeed, our allies are critical to winning the war on terror, on which we have already embarked, just as they were an important part of the 1991 coalition that led to the expulsion of Iraqi troops from Kuwait. Moreover, our allies financed that conflict.

I am deeply troubled by the administration's unwillingness to address the long-term strategy of Iraq. The President has failed to articulate any plan for dealing with the future of Iraq if and when Saddam Hussein is removed. Is Saddam's removal the final goal? Or will the United States be expected to engage in the reconstruction of Iraq?

Will our country be involved in overhauling their political institutions, the

Iraqi economy, or its infrastructure? What if our invasion sparks more terror and a wider war in the Middle East? Are the American people ready to make these commitments?

Why do we think that rank-and-file Muslims in the Middle East will support America in a war with Iraq, as they did in the early '90s? With millions of Muslims watching death and destruction on television, blaming the United States, is our strategy really one that will stabilize that region?

None of these questions have been addressed publicly by the President, and we should not vote to authorize any President to initiate an open-ended conflict with so many unanswered questions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, why now? What has changed? Saddam Hussein has been a threat in the region since he invaded Kuwait 12 years ago, and yet we left him alone. He has not ever cooperated basically with the United Nations since shortly after the 1991 cease-fire when the Security Council demanded that Iraq cooperate with weapons inspectors. He has not fully cooperated in more than 10 years; and as President Bush has noted, it has been 4 years since a U.N. inspector has been allowed inside Iraq.

So if nothing has changed in the past 4 years, why are we going after Iraq now? If there are new developments and concerns, why does the administration not share them with us?

The emotional and financial costs of any such action can be felt for a generation or more. In a time when our economy is reeling, when our stock market is spiraling, when the safety nets such as Social Security and Medicaid that have sustained our seniors and our most vulnerable citizens are threatened, this body needs to take a hard look at what this Nation's priorities are and why we are undertaking this and ask again, Why now?

Mr. Speaker, I vote against this resolution with a heavy heart, but I am fortunate that there will be a resolution we can support by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) which does all the following things we have talked about, making sure that diplomacy and all other avenues have been explored before we make this extraordinary decision.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to one comment made by my friend from Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, it is very true that during the 1990s the United States did in fact provide biological materials to Iraq, but I should say it was done with the best of intentions, with the goal of trying to help the Iraqi people through fighting malaria and other diseases.

Now, it is very apparent, we have learned, Mr. Speaker, that fertilizer request could be utilized to create a bomb, as we found in Oklahoma City several years ago. The challenge that we have is in dealing with the intentions of Saddam Hussein, and that is the question that we face right here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to a very hard-working, thoughtful member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, each of us comes to Congress for the first time with hopes and dreams of what lies ahead while we serve as Members of this great institution. But surely none of us here today and none who came before us could possibly have wished for the terrible choice facing us at the conclusion of this debate. And make no mistake, it is indeed the most terrible of choices.

For, one way or another, once we vote, lives will be lost. That will be the case whether military action against Saddam Hussein is authorized or not. And it goes without saying that none of us takes such a Hobson's choice lightly.

Whether we like it or not, a choice must be made, and made without delay. The imminent nature of the threat facing America and the world means that not to decide is to decide.

We all know too much about the plans that Saddam Hussein has made for those of us that love freedom and about his ongoing preparations to carry out those deadly plans.

Simply put, this is a man who must be stopped. To those who oppose military action in Iraq, we can only ask if we do not stop Saddam, who will?

Some say the case is yet to be made that military action is warranted. To them I say, the record is clear and unambiguous, as even the brief remarks highlighted to the Nation by President Bush last night made clear. That debate, Mr. Speaker, is over.

Others say we must wait for the United Nations or for the active support of a broad coalition of nations. To them I say, protecting American citizens from the likes of Saddam Hussein is America's responsibility and no one else's. After all, protecting the American people from foreign enemies is the first and most critical function of our Federal Government. It is the very reason the Federal Government was established by our Founding Fathers.

We cannot be the world's police force, but there are times when we must stand forcefully against threats to peace, both here and abroad. But far more important, we must never fail to protect the lives of American citizens, citizens who are at risk today from the attacks by the agents of Saddam Hussein.

So if we must go it alone, let us not shrink from that duty. We know our troops will not shrink from theirs.

But we should not assume, Mr. Speaker, that because some nations have yet to endorse this vital mission that we will be forced to carry this burden alone. Consider for a moment our experience in Kosovo. For the record, I voted against that military action. I did so because I was not convinced that

the crisis in the Balkans threatened our American security, and I opposed military action there because I felt it was Europe's problem; and if the Europeans were not willing to support our efforts, it would be wrong to send young American men and women into harm's way on their behalf. But when my side lost that debate, I supported the President, because that is what we do in this country.

In hindsight, however, I believe it was correct to undertake that mission in the Balkans, which is now rightly considered a success.

I believe experience demonstrates that sometimes what the world wants from America is for America to lead. When the United States did what was right by moving militarily to stop the genocide in Kosovo, the Europeans fell into line and stood up for freedom. They continue to do so today. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the same thing will happen if we act resolutely to remove the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

Once we act, freedom-loving nations everywhere will welcome the chance to rid this world of this deadly menace, but only American leadership will ensure that he is removed once and for all.

Protect American lives, end Saddam's reign of terror and send a message of hope that will echo around the world by supporting this rule and the underlying resolution and giving the President the authority he needs to do what is right.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

□ 1100

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying resolution. The resolution presented to Congress by the administration gives authority to the President to act prior to and even without a U.N. resolution. It authorizes the President to use U.S. troops to enforce U.N. resolutions, even without the United Nations' request for it. In other words, America would be going it alone, and we would be stuck alone.

This is a violation, this resolution, of Chapter VII of the U.N. charter which reserves the ability to authorize force for that purpose to the U.N. Security Council alone.

My esteemed colleague, who is the chairman of the committee, quoted Abraham Lincoln. I, too, would like to quote Abraham Lincoln. "With malice towards none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right." Lincoln spoke of principles of unity, not only unity in this Nation but unity in the world, and Lincoln's prayer was for unity.

At the beginning of this new century, our prayer should be for a world united by international law, for a world as an interconnected world. That prayer is already being answered. Changes in transportation and communication and trade have brought the world together.

Wherever the world is divided, let the world community work together to heal those divisions. Where global security is threatened, let the global community respond. No nation should be above international law. All nations must confirm international law. All nations should seek to bring back into the international community any nation which sets itself apart.

Inspections should occur in Iraq, through the United Nations, and the inspections should be unfettered and they should eliminate any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq to the extent that they exist. But the argument to destroy weapons of mass destruction in Iraq if they exist should not be a license to destroy the people of Iraq. Let our concerns about weapons of mass destruction cause America to lead the way toward destruction of all weapons of mass destruction anywhere and everywhere in the world.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that of nations that possess, pursue, or are capable of acquiring weapons of mass destruction, there are 17 nations pursuing nuclear; 20 nations that have biological weapons capability or are seeking them; 26 nations that have chemical weapons capability or are seeking those capabilities; 16 nations that have missile capabilities or are seeking them. Are we to suddenly declare war on the world?

Now, we know about Saddam Hussein and that he does not respect the law. There is no question about that. But the question which the resolution that we will be voting on in the next few days poses is whether we, the United States, respect international law and whether we will act preemptively and whether we will uphold the United Nations, the Security Council, and the principles of our own Constitution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Springfield, New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), my very good friend.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on the Iraq issue.

Mr. Speaker, today we begin an important and serious debate. The decision of whether we commit America's military and America's servicemen and women to a confrontation with a sovereign nation is not something to be taken lightly. I applaud our President and this Congress for ensuring that we begin this debate well-informed and well-prepared.

As the President has said in his radio address to the Nation on Saturday, "The United States does not desire military conflict because we know the awful nature of war." But "If the Iraqi regime persists in its defiance, the use of force may become unavoidable."

Mr. Speaker, 16 times the world has come together to stop Saddam Hussein from threatening our peace, stability, and security; and 16 times this madman and murderer has ignored the will

of that world, continuing to develop weapons of mass destruction that have no valid defensive purpose. They have only one purpose: to wreak as much havoc and to murder as many people as possible.

Saddam Hussein has already used such weapons on his own people. Each day he comes closer to developing even deadlier weapons and more effective and longer-range delivery systems. Do we really want to see what these weapons are capable of before we force their destruction?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Saddam Hussein to open his borders for inspection anytime, anywhere. It is time for Iraq and its regime to destroy those weapons of mass destruction. "Delay, indecision, and inaction," as President Bush said, "are not options for America."

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. The rule is a fair rule, and I rise in support of it. I simply want to address a few of the comments of my friends and colleagues who have spoken before me.

The gentleman from Massachusetts and others, the gentleman from Ohio, argue that this is a resolution authorizing the unilateral use of force, and that is why they are against it. Literally, they are correct. A strict reading of the resolution makes that clear. However, it fails to put into context what we are trying to do.

Everyone knows that multilateral is better than unilateral. Everyone knows that approval by the Security Council for the use of force is better than not having approval for the use of force by the Security Council. It is the passage of this resolution, the strong statement by the Congress of the United States that we stand with the administration in the effort to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, that maximizes the diplomatic and political chances of achieving the broadest possible multilateral support for a meaningful disarming resolution out of the United Nations, another resolution and, if necessary, and it may very well be, the right to use force on a multilateral basis.

We will have allies, and we will go to the U.N. Our effectiveness there is directly related to the extent to which we here today speak strongly in favor of this course of action, and that is why I support the resolution.

I do have to take issue with my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules. We did not do what we did in the 1980s up through 1990 because we were trying to help the Iraqi people. We did not take Iraq off the list of countries supporting terrorism even though Abu Nidal was

based there and was involved in terrorist activities using Iraqi passports and diplomatic pouches, bombing and killing civilians all over the Middle East because we wanted to help the Iraqi people. We did not provide dual-use equipment which had military as well as nonmilitary uses, including precursors to biological weapons, because we wanted to help the Iraqi people. We did not encourage our allies to send arms to Iraq during the Iraq-Iran War because we wanted to help the Iraqi people.

We made a strategic and foolish decision that Saddam Hussein was someone we could work with, that we wanted to tilt to Iraq during the Iraq-Iran war, and President Bush the first acknowledged his error and many others have acknowledged the errors of those policies during the 1980s.

So I think, as we come to terms with the past and what we have done wrong, we should acknowledge where our policies were wrong. Now that does not lead us to the conclusion that, because we had the wrong policies at one time, we do not take the decisive action we need to take now, but I think it is very important in the context of what is going to be a long debate that we stick to the historical record.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply respond to my very good friend with whom I have been pleased to work on this issue. That is, it is very clear that we need to focus on the fact that it is the intent of the recipient of this capability, and it would have been wonderful if the biological capability that had been transferred to Iraq would have been used to deal with the problem of malaria and other diseases there. That is my point.

What I am trying to say is that Saddam Hussein is the one who has posed the threat here. His use of this biological and chemical capability is what poses a very serious threat to the United States and to the rest of the civilized world.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), another hard-working member of the Committee on Rules and our very good friend.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for his strong leadership on this resolution. I rise in strong support of the rule which will allow this body and the American people the opportunity to engage in over 20 hours of debate on the resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq.

I would like also to take a moment to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their efforts to put this country ahead of any other consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that we begin this debate on a resolution to authorize the use of force

against another nation to protect freedom, the freedom of all Americans, the freedom of Iraq, the freedom of people all around the world. This is the freedom to be safe from fear, to be safe from oppression, and to be safe from hate. It is a choice that none of us wishes to make, but it is a choice that has been made for us.

The President made his case to the American people last night and to anybody able to hear his speech. Unfortunately, the major networks chose not to carry it, so anyone whose local affiliates carried it or who have cable were able to hear his impassioned plea. But anyone who could hear his speech knows that this President does not want to lead us into war, but little has changed since he identified the threat from Iraq in his January State of the Union address. Iraq continues to pose a serious and imminent threat from its development of weapons of mass destruction and the obvious potential for Iraq to transfer these weapons to terrorist groups, terrorist groups that, like Saddam Hussein, hate the United States of America.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man and, under his leadership, Iraq is a dangerous nation. Our quarrel is not with the Iraqi people. They are among those who have suffered the most under this regime; and, like the Afghanistan people when liberated from al Qaeda, the Iraqi people will rejoice if liberated from Saddam Hussein and his regime of terror.

By acting today, we move to protect the American people. We do not abandon diplomacy, and we seek international support. However, we do serve notice to the Iraqi regime and, indeed, the world that the United States will defend itself against all threats.

As we move forward, we keep in mind that the goal of any decision with regard to Iraq must be disarmament. Saddam's arsenal of terror must be dismantled, and time may not be on our side. Each day we wait, each day we put off acting, each day we are led astray by idle delays puts us closer to real risk.

Iraq's claim that they are now suddenly willing to allow inspectors back in is extremely dubious. We have been down this road before. To achieve real assurance that Iraq is disarmed and cannot threaten our national security, more serious action may need to be taken.

For the last year, we have waged a war against extremism, against hate, and against terror. Today's resolution will give our President the tools he needs to continue and to win this fight. I urge my colleagues to support this rule to allow us to enter into this full and open debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) that one does not have to be a microbiologist, as I am, to know that we do

not send a country Anthrax, botulism, and deadly viruses to cure malaria unless we expect that cure to be death; and I believe that was precisely what the intent was. It was supposed to be used against Iran.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to offer my deepest sympathy to the young Marine that lost his life in Kuwait this morning; and to the brave men and women who serve our United States military and protect our freedom around the world, I offer my deepest appreciation.

The debate we begin this week is really a question of life or death. It is the most serious debate we have had in this Congress since the Vietnam War which saw 56,000 body bags come home to loved ones in America, and the Gulf War. That is why I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) that this is not a partisan issue, it is not Democrats or Republicans, it is simply Americans. I hope that those of us who come to the floor to express a differing opinion will be respected for being patriots, the same as any of our colleagues.

□ 1115

The bill of particulars against Mr. Saddam Hussein is not new. It has been going on for a long period of time. That is why it seems that this resolution is premature; and in particular, it seems that we should have allowed 15 of the resolutions offered by thoughtful Members of Congress who wanted to be able to deliberate so the American people could know all of the facts. I believe they should have been made in order, all of our thoughts.

Nothing in the present resolution on the floor prevents a unilateral preemptive strike, which is in violation of international law.

Finally, as we begin this debate, as I hope to engage in the debate on a factual basis, nothing in the resolution prevents or allows or encourages the President of the United States to follow the Constitution and to come to this Congress for a separate, free-standing vote to declare war against Iraq.

That should be the question that the American people ask, whether or not, under the three branches of government and the Constitution, we are following the law: an actual declaration of war against Iraq.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to our friend, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), another hard-working member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today the House begins debate on House Joint Resolution 114 to authorize use of the force of the

United States Armed Forces against Iraq. This is a serious debate that needs to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know that I support this resolution, and I support the President of the United States in what he is doing. But today we are here to debate the rule and to talk about what we are going to do as we debate the topic. I support this rule, I support what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, if we dig deep within this resolution, we will see two important things.

Number one, August 14, 1998, Public Law 105-235, Congress concluded that Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction program threatened the United States and its allies; and, point number two, inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq on October 31, 1998, almost 4 years ago. The Iraqis have indicated through their administration, through the constant threat against the United States, that they intend to harm the United States and its interests around the globe. This is the same regime that attempted to assassinate former President Bush in 1993.

Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in now is the support of the United States against enemies around the globe. Our foreign policy had to change on September 11 when we were attacked. I believe that what President Bush is doing now is to make sure that America will no longer be held hostage, will no longer allow a nation state, any nation state, to threaten the United States and get away with it.

It is time that we support our President. The process that has been laid out before the American people and to the United Nations is one that we can understand, that we can support.

I believe this President is well balanced, is articulate, and last night spoke with great favor towards the Nation of the United States that wants peace, not war, but that we will not allow ourselves to be pushed around.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 114 and this rule, which is for peace, but making sure that peace through strength will be achieved through supporting our President. I intend to vote "aye" on the rule and "aye" on the resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I particularly want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for approving and bringing to the floor the separate substitute, which is supported by the following Members as it went to the Committee on Rules: the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. MATSUI), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. Speaker, the separate substitute reflects four fundamental principles:

First, our mission should be clear: disarming Iraq of all weapons of mass destruction;

Second, it includes a sense of Congress supporting tough new, rigorous U.N. inspections;

Third, it authorizes the use of force if sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council; and

Fourth, it establishes a separate fast track congressional authorization of force if U.N. action is insufficient.

In other words, the separate substitute authorizes the use of force today through the United Nations, but it provides no blank check now for unilateral military action. Why does it do that? Because if the U.S. acts unilaterally or with just a few other nations, there is a far higher risk of fueling resentment in Arab and Muslim nations and swelling the ranks of the anti-U.S. terrorists. Our fundamental concern has to be to deal with the terrorist threat represented by al Qaeda and other international organizations.

Regardless of how Members vote on final passage, voting for the separate substitute is an important way to voice concern that the U.S. should work through the U.N. Security Council first and unilaterally only as a last resort. If unilateral action is necessary, Congress should have a vote on that issue.

We cannot fulfill our historic role if we end our consideration of this matter this week. We need to be more than the President's megaphone. We need additional consideration when the President has decided to use unilateral force and when he can tell us what it is he has in mind.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the President somewhat vaguely announced the right policy for this country: to invade Iraq only if unrestricted inspections are not available. This gives us a chance to disarm Iraq without war; but if war becomes necessary, at least the fact that we struggled to avoid it will minimize foreign opposition.

Unfortunately, the Resolution before us is far more vague than the President's speech. It allows for an invasion even if Saddam completely capitulates on the issue of inspections. Unfortunately, the Rule does not make in order a resolution limited to the President's rhetoric. So if we want to authorize force if inspections are not allowed, the Rule requires us to give the President a blank check.

On a completely different issue, I would like to point out that during the

1980s we did provide dual-use material to Iraq that could have been used to wage conventional war, but there is no evidence that we knowingly provided material to Iraq that could be used to conduct biological or chemical warfare.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and obviously the resolution, as well. It is very clear we were talking about the issue of biological weapons. The United States of America does not traffic in biological weapons, and the attack that has been launched by many on the other side against President Bush No. 41 is an unfair one.

We see much dual-use technology which, unfortunately, has been used in a wrong way. But the question that we need to address is the intent of Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein poses a threat to our stability, to the entire world. None of us is enthused about the prospect of going to war; but we face one of the most difficult issues we possibly can as Members of the people's House, that is, are we going to provide this President of the United States the support that he wants and deserves to proceed in defending the United States of America and our interests?

Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult time, and I think back to a debate that took place in the middle of the Civil War. John Stuart Mill wrote: "War is an ugly thing, but it is not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which 'thinks nothing worth a war' is worse."

Mr. Speaker, it is very important for us to realize how tough this is; but the United States of America is a very unique Nation, and we stand for freedom throughout the world. It is important for us to stand up now. Vote "yes" for this rule, and vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, October 7, 2002.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 2690, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5422, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 549, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

**REAFFIRMING REFERENCE TO ONE NATION UNDER GOD IN PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2690, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2690, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 15-minute vote followed by two 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 5, answered "present" 4, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]  
YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Combest	Goode
Aderholt	Condit	Goodlatte
Akin	Conyers	Gordon
Allen	Costello	Goss
Andrews	Cox	Graham
Armey	Coyne	Granger
Baca	Cramer	Graves
Bachus	Crane	Green (TX)
Baird	Crenshaw	Green (WI)
Baker	Crowley	Greenwood
Baldacci	Cubin	Grucci
Baldwin	Culberson	Gutierrez
Ballenger	Cummings	Gutknecht
Barcia	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Barr	Davis (CA)	Hansen
Barrett	Davis (FL)	Harman
Bartlett	Davis (IL)	Hart
Barton	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Becerra	Deal	Hayworth
Bentsen	DeFazio	Hefley
Bereuter	DeGette	Herger
Berkley	Delahunt	Hill
Berman	DeLauro	Hilliard
Berry	DeLay	Hinches
Biggart	DeMint	Hinojosa
Bishop	Deutsch	Hobson
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hoefel
Blunt	Dicks	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Dingell	Holden
Boehner	Doggett	Holt
Bonilla	Dooley	Hooley
Bonior	Doolittle	Horn
Bono	Doyle	Hostettler
Boozman	Dreier	Houghton
Borski	Duncan	Hoyer
Boswell	Dunn	Hulshof
Boucher	Edwards	Hunter
Boyd	Ehlers	Hyde
Brady (PA)	Ehrlich	Inslee
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Isakson
Brown (FL)	Engel	Israel
Brown (OH)	English	Issa
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Bryant	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Burr	Evans	(TX)
Burton	Everett	Jefferson
Buyer	Farr	Jenkins
Callahan	Fattah	John
Calvert	Fiener	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Fletcher	Johnson, E. B.
Cantor	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Forbes	Jones (NC)
Capps	Ford	Kaptur
Capuano	Fossella	Keller
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Carson (IN)	Gallely	Kennedy (MN)
Carson (OK)	Ganske	Kennedy (RI)
Castle	Gekas	Kerns
Chabot	Gephardt	Kildee
Chambless	Gibbons	Kilpatrick
Clayton	Gilchrist	Kind (WI)
Clement	Gillmor	King (NY)
Clyburn	Gilman	Kingston
Coble	Gonzalez	Kirk
Collins		Kleczka

Knollenberg	Ortiz	Shimkus
Kolbe	Osborne	Shows
Kucinich	Ose	Shuster
LaFalce	Otter	Simmons
LaHood	Owens	Simpson
Lampson	Oxley	Skeen
Langevin	Pallone	Skelton
Lantos	Pascrell	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Pastor	Smith (MI)
Larson (CT)	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Payne	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Leach	Pence	Snyder
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Levin	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Stearns
Linder	Phelps	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pickering	Strickland
LoBiondo	Pitts	Stupak
Lofgren	Platts	Sullivan
Lowey	Pombo	Sweeney
Lucas (KY)	Pomeroy	Tancredo
Lucas (OK)	Portman	Tanner
Luther	Price (NC)	Tauscher
Lynch	Pryce (OH)	Tauzin
Maloney (CT)	Putnam	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (NY)	Quinn	Taylor (NC)
Manzullo	Radanovich	Terry
Markey	Rahall	Thomas
Matheson	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (MO)	Regula	Thornberry
McCarthy (NY)	Rehberg	Thune
McCollum	Reyes	Thurman
McCrery	Reynolds	Tiahrt
McGovern	Riley	Tiberi
McHugh	Rivers	Tierney
McInnis	Rodriguez	Toomey
McIntyre	Roemer	Turner
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Udall (CO)
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Udall (NM)
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Upton
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Menendez	Ross	Vitter
Mica	Rothman	Walden
Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Walsh
McDonald	Royce	Wamp
Miller, Dan	Rush	Waters
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Watkins (OK)
Miller, George	Ryun (KS)	Watson (CA)
Miller, Jeff	Sabo	Watts (OK)
Mollohan	Sanchez	Waxman
Moore	Sanders	Weiner
Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Weldon (FL)
Moran (VA)	Sawyer	Weller
Morella	Saxton	Wexler
Murtha	Schaffer	Whitfield
Myrick	Schakowsky	Wicker
Nadler	Schiff	Wilson (NM)
Napolitano	Schrock	Wilson (SC)
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Ney	Serrano	Woolsey
Northup	Sessions	Wu
Norwood	Shadegg	Wynn
Nussle	Shaw	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Shays	Young (FL)
Obey	Sherman	
Olver	Sherwood	

NAYS—5

Frank	McDermott	Stark
Honda	Scott	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Ackerman	Velazquez	
Blumenauer	Watt (NC)	

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis	Jones (OH)	Neal
Clay	Kanjorski	Roukema
Cooksey	Lewis (CA)	Solis
Ferguson	Lewis (GA)	Stump
Hastings (FL)	Mascara	Sununu
Hilleary	McKinney	Towns
Istook	Meek (FL)	Weldon (PA)

□ 1149

Mr. TANNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.