(A) in a serviceable condition;
(B) is surplus property; and
(C) meets or exceeds the requirements of Nation security. For the current Federal
 year, the Attorney General of the United States
 and the Secretary of State of the United States
 shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a written noti-
 cing identifying the amount of body armor donated and each State or local law enforce-
 ment agency that received the body armor.
(3) NOTIFICATION TO ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of a Federal agency may donate body armor directly to any State or local law enforcement agency, if such body armor:
(i) is in serviceable condition; and
(ii) is surplus property; and
(iii) meets or exceeds the requirements of Nation security.
(B) Donation of body armor.—Notwithstanding section 253 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484), the head of a Federal agency may donate body armor directly to any State or local law enforcement agency, if such body armor:
(A) in a serviceable condition; and
(B) is surplus property; and
(C) meets or exceeds the requirements of Nation security.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 574, I call up the joint resolution (House Joint Resolution 114) to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

The text of House Joint Resolution 114 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 114

Whereas in 1990 in response to Iraq’s war of aggression against and illegal occupation of Kuwait, the United States forced a coalition of nations to liberate Kuwait and its people in order to defend the national security of the United States and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq; and
Whereas after the liberation of Kuwait in 1991, Iraq entered into a United Nations sponsored cease-fire agreement pursuant to which Iraq unequivocally agreed, among other things, to eliminate its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver and develop them, and to end its support for international terrorism;
Whereas the efforts of international weapons inspectors, United States intelligence agencies, and Iraqi defectors led to the discovery that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical weapons and a large scale biological weapons program, and that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program; and that by using its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver and develop them, Iraq posed a developing nuclear weapon than intelligence reporting had previously indicated;
Whereas Iraq, in direct and flagrant violation of the cease-fire, attempted to thwart the efforts of weapons inspectors to identify and destroy Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and development capabilities, which finally resulted in the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq on October 31, 1998;
Whereas in 1998 Congress concluded that Iraq’s continuing weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and development capabilities threatened vital United States interests and international peace and security, declared Iraq to be in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations, and that Iraq had presented a continuing threat to the national security of the United States; and
Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it “supports the use of all necessary means to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent relevant resolutions and to compel Iraq to fulfill its international obligations concerning the proliferation of internationally controlled nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the current Iraqi regime will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists who would do so, and the extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack, combine to jus-
ify action by the United States to defend itself;”
Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes the use of all nec-
ecessary means to enforce United Nations Secu-
ry Council Resolution 660 and subsequent rele-
vant resolutions and to compel Iraq to fulfill its in-
national obligations concerning the proliferation of interna-
tional nuclear and other weapons of mass de-
struction, and its capability and willingness to use such weapons of mass de-
struction;
Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it “supports the use of all necessary means to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent relevant resolutions and to compel Iraq to fulfill its international obligations concerning the proliferation of internationally controlled nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the current Iraqi regime will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists who would do so, and the extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack, combine to jus-
ify action by the United States to defend itself;”
Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes the use of all nec-
ecessary means to enforce United Nations Secu-
rity Council Resolution 660 and subsequent rele-
vant resolutions and to compel Iraq to fulfill its in-
national obligations concerning the proliferation of interna-
tional nuclear and other weapons of mass de-
struction, and its capability and willingness to use such weapons of mass de-
struction;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has dem-
strated its capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;
the peace, security, and stability of the Persian Gulf region, and that Congress, “supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council resolutions.”

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law 105–338) expressed the sense of Congress that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove from power the current Iraqi regime and promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime.

Whereas on September 12, 2002, President Bush committed the United States to “work with the United Nations Security Council to meet our common challenge” posed by Iraq and to “take all necessary measures” while also making clear that “the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, and the just demands of peace and security will be met, or war will be unavoidable.”

Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq’s ongoing support for international terrorist groups and terrorist organizations, including weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of its obligations under the 1991 ceasefire and other United Nations Security Council resolutions, and that it is in the national security interests of the United States and in furtherance of the war on terrorism that all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions be enforced, including through the use of force if necessary;

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations; and

Whereas Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of its civilian population through the use of all available means, and by continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

The Congress of the United States supports the efforts of the President to—

(1) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq and ensure enforcement of those resolutions by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion and noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions.

(2) obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion and noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States in support of United States interests as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to—

(1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq;

(2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force the President shall, prior to such exercise or as soon thereafter as practicable but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that

(1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq; and

(2) acting pursuant to this resolution is consistent with the United States and other members of the Security Council continuing the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(c) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) The President shall, at least once every 60 days, submit to the Congress a report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of any authority provided by the joint resolution and the most recent update of the status of planning for efforts that are expected to be required after such actions are completed, including those actions described in section 7 of Public Law 105–338 (the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998).

(b) To the extent that the submission of any report described in subsection (a) coincides with the submission of any other report on matters relevant to this joint resolution otherwise required to be submitted to Congress pursuant to the reporting requirements of Public Law 102–1 (the War Powers Resolution), all such reports may be submitted as a single consolidated report to the Congress.

(c) To the extent that the information required by section 3 of Public Law 102–1 is included in the report required by this section, such reports shall be considered as being the report required by section 3 of Public Law 102–1.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the amendment to the preamble and the amendment to the text printed in the joint resolution are adopted.

The text of House Joint Resolution 114, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 574, is as follows:

Whereas in 1990 in response to Iraq’s war of aggression against and illegal occupation of Kuwait, the United States forged a coalition of nations to liberate Kuwait and its people in order to protect the national security of the United States and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq;

Whereas after the liberation of Kuwait in 1991, Iraq entered into a sponsored cease-fire agreement pursuant to which Iraq unconditionally agreed, among other things, to eliminate its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and to destroy and develop them, and to end its support for international terrorism;

Whereas members of international weapons inspectors, United States intelligence agencies, and Iraqi defectors led to the discovery that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical weapons and a large scale biological weapons program, and that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program that was much closer to producing a nuclear weapon than intelligence reporting had previously indicated;

Whereas Iraq, in direct and flagrant violation of the cease-fire, attempted to thwart the efforts of weapons inspectors to identify and destroy Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and inspection capability conclusively resulted in the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq on October 31, 1998;

Whereas in Public Law 105–235 (August 14, 1998), Congress concluded that Iraq’s continuing weapons of mass destruction programs threatened vital United States interests and international peace and security, declared Iraq to be in “material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations” and urged the President “to take appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations”;

Whereas Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations.

Whereas Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of its civilian population through the use of all available means, and by continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations.

Whereas the United States has determined its capability to use weapons of mass destruction against other nations and its own people;

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its continuing willingness to attack, the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush and by firing on many thousands of American soldiers in the Persian Gulf War; and

Whereas the United States, in response to Iraq’s attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq;

Whereas Congress, in aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of United States citizens;

Www. in response to the attacks of the United States of September 11, 2001, underscored the gravity of the threat posed by the acquisition of weapons.
of mass destruction by international terrorist organizations;

Whereas Iraq’s demonstrated capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction, the recent events in the Persian Gulf region, and its failure to employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists violate the United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 (1990) and subsequent relevant resolutions and to compel Iraq to cease certain activities that threaten international peace and security, including the development of weapons of mass destruction and refusal or obstruction of United Nations weapons inspections in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (1991), repression of its civilian population in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 (1991), and threatening its neighbors or United Nations operations in the region; and


Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq’s ongoing support for international terrorist groups constitute a continuing threat to the national security and an empire of violent international terrorists to international terrorist organizations, including those that, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such persons or organizations;

Whereas the President and Congress are determined to continue to take all appropriate actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such persons or organizations;

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to meet the needs of the United States to protect itself; and

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to meet the needs of the United States to protect itself; and

Whereas Congress has taken steps to pursue vigorously the war on terrorism through the provision of authorities and funding requested by the President to meet the needs of the United States to protect itself; and

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS. (a) REPORTS.—The President shall, at least once every 60 days, submit to the Congress a report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of authority granted in section 3 and the status of planning for efforts that are expected to be required after such actions are completed, in connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) of section 3.

(b) SINGLE CONSOLIDATED REPORT.—To the extent that the submission of any report described in subsection (a) coincides with the submission of any other report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, the reports described in such subsection shall be submitted to Congress pursuant to the reporting requirements of subsection (a) of section 3.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, after 17 hours of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendments printed in those House Reports 107-726, 107-727, and 107-729. The report may be offered only in the order printed, 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 debatable for 1 hour, and shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent.

After the conclusion of consideration of the amendments printed in the report, there shall be a final period of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, which shall not exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee of International Relations.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 8½ hours of debate on the joint resolution.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the joint resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. Speaker, on September 11 those who hate freedom tried to silence the
voices of the American people as represented by this body. But free men cannot be silenced; and so once again today, as we have almost every day since September 11, we gather in this Chamber to do the people’s business.

The President has granted responsibility for us as Members of this House than the protection of our Nation and the lives of our men and women who serve that Nation in our armed services.

So today and tomorrow and on Thursday, we will as free men should, passionately, but peacefully, debate what is best for America and for our freedom-loving allies around the world. We will do in this place what the “Butcher of Baghdad” and the remnants of the al Qaeda hiding in bombed-out caves in far-flung places around the world hate the most, we will exercise democracy; and we will show the world how free men and women behave.

I rise in support of this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

This resolution authorizes the President to use necessary and appropriate military force against Saddam Hussein’s regime to enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions that Saddam Hussein has routinely ignored over the last decade. We take this step knowing that Saddam Hussein is a threat to the American people, to Iraq’s neighbors, and to the civilized world at large.

On September 11, 2001, this Nation changed utterly. On that fateful morning, Americans woke up with the usual expectations: go to work, provide for the family, feed the children, live the American dream. Firemen, stockbrokers, custodians, police officers, office workers, all started their day, perhaps with a cup of coffee, perhaps hurrying to get to work on time.

But those plans were shattered when planes hit the World Trade Towers, the Pentagon, and while attempting to strike this very building and silence the voices of democracy in this very Chamber were thwarted by brave passengers over the skies of Pennsylvania. All of us lost our innocence that day.

Before September 11, we all believed that the troubles that infected the rest of the world did not impact us as we lived in a splendid isolation, protected by two vast oceans. Before that fateful day, war and disorder were distant memories. On September 11, we awoke to the reality that we must build a consensus with the United Nations, let me say that we are taking an effective action here in this Chamber to perhaps help the U.N. do what is right in their own chamber.

Earlier this century, fascist regimes in Italy and Germany routinely ignored the dictates of the League of Nations. Both Mussolini and Hitler built their empires on the backs of their neighbors and oppressed their citizens, all in the face of an ineffective League of Nations.

If the United Nations is to have relevance in the 21st Century, we must not let it go the way of the League of Nations. We must give the United Nations the backbone it needs to enforce its own resolutions. But if the U.N. refuses to save itself, and more importantly the security of its member states and the cause of peace in this world, we must take all appropriate action to protect ourselves.

Edmund Burke once said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing. We must not let evil triumph. We must do something. We must pass this resolution, support the President of the United States as he works to disarm Saddam Hussein, and win the war against terrorism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one-half of my time be yielded to the gentleman from California (Mr. PAYNE) and that he be allowed to further allocate that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is about to ask that the time allotted to the Democratic side of the aisle be divided equally between those Members who are in favor of the resolution and those Members who are opposed to the resolution.

This is a motion that I fully and enthusiastically support, but I would like to make the observation that while there are Members on the other side of the aisle who are opposed to the resolution, no similar request has been made to divide that time equally. If no request is made to divide that half of the time which is allotted to the debate for this resolution, then it will develop that we will have a debate dominated by those who favor the resolution because three-quarters of the time will be allocated to those Members who favor the resolution, and only one-fourth will be allocated to those who oppose the resolution.

It seems to me that this situation is inherently unfair. Therefore, I would request that the majority party also divide the time allotted to them so that half of that time may be distributed among Members who are opposed to the resolution. In that way we will have a fairer debate.

If we enter this debate with three-quarters of the time distributed to one side and only one-fourth to the other, it is obvious that the weight of the debate will be unfair going in, and that those who oppose the resolution will be facing a stacked deck. That is not appropriate or in keeping with the traditions of this House.

Now, I know a rule was passed earlier in the day, and perhaps it may have been more appropriate to make this statement or something similar to it at that time. Nevertheless, that time has not passed. This is an issue that is available to raise this issue and to make this request, which I make in all earnestness and all seriousness.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a resolution, the result of which is likely to cause the deaths of unknown numbers of unknown people should it prevail. This is the most serious matter that can be addressed by the Members of this free and open body. Therefore, it seems to me that this debate ought to be conducted in a free and open manner.

Allocating the time, and I believe that this is a very short time which has been allocated for this debate, it should be longer. We must pass this resolution, support the President of the United States as he works to disarm Saddam Hussein, and win the war against terrorism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one-half of my time be yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and that he be allowed to further allocate that time.
Mr. HINCHHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman’s statement because it makes a very good point about fairness.

Prior to the writing of the rule, I did make some requests about getting some time because as a Republican, I have strong constitutional reservations about what we are doing, and I think they are worthwhile hearing. That was turned down. It was not written into the rule; and of course the amendment that I offered that may have offered an opportunity for me to make those constitutional points, that also was declined. But I have been informed today that I would be allowed 3 minutes to make the case for the Constitution. I appreciate very much the gentleman bringing this up, and I hope our leadership will reconsider and allow Republicans on this side to have a fair share of the time, as the Democrats are doing.

Mr. HINCHHEY. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I earnestly thank the gentleman for his efforts made today. It seems to me that the rejection of the gentleman’s efforts constitutes a mistake on the part of the people who made that decision. His voice ought to have been heard. He ought to have been listened to when he asked for a proper allocation of time. He ought to have been listened to when he asked for the opportunity of an amendment on this resolution. He was not. We now have an opportunity to rectify those mistakes.

Furthermore, the allocation of 3 minutes to defend the Constitution of the United States seems to me to be wholly inadequate and unworthy of this body. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request that the request of the gentleman who just spoke be recognized by the majority in this House, that fairness be honored by the majority in this House, and that they divide the time that has been given to them so that those people who are opposed to this resolution, earnestly and devoutly opposed to it, will have an equal time to express that devotion and earnestness in opposition to this resolution as those who favor it. I make that request.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my intention to yield time to everyone who asks for it, regardless of what side they are on. I will not discriminate between people who are for it or against it. If they are Republicans and they want time, we will give it to him or her so long as we have time, and we will allocate it as fairly as we possibly can.

Mr. HINCHHEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that. But I would just like to make the observation that, while the gentleman’s offer is made sincerely and I respect him, as I always do, and everything he says on this floor and everything that he does, I think that he is not providing the opportunity that cannot arise in this House earnestly desire and I think the people of this country earnestly desire, and that is a fair and open exchange on the merits of this resolution.

I ask, how can we have a fair and open exchange on the merits of this resolution when those who are opposed to the resolution, regardless of what party they may belong to, are not provided the opportunity to make their case? They are only given a fourth of the opportunity, while those who favor the opposition are given three-fourths. This is inherently an unfair circumstance.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on his reservation?

Mr. HINCHHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California (Mr. HINCHEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHHEY) makes a very valid point. It was my understanding by the resolution the gentleman reported 5 minutes. I am not sure if I heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) correctly, but my understanding is that he reported 3 minutes.

I say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) I think it is extremely important in this debate that even 5 minutes may not be long enough to discuss the issues of life and death. I believe the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHHEY) has made a very valid point about sharing of the time, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for sharing the time.

I add my plea to the request that if we have to stay here into the weekend that this is such a vital discussion that there should be no limit and no limit on the amount of time and certainly we should equate the interests of the people of the United States with the interests of Members of the United States to be able to debate the issues of life and death on this amendment and view it as a long portion of the American people, and it should not be limited, and certainly 3 minutes is not adequate.

I would ask that the gentleman’s request and his reservation be, if the Members will, judged and judged appropriately and approved that we share the time for this enormous decision that we have to make.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me these arguments should have been made when the rule was debated. The rule has been adopted. There was testimony before the Committee on Rules. I do not know that these folks were there making the same arguments, but to make it now comes rather late in the proceedings. We would be as fair as we possibly can, but the rule has been adopted. It does not address itself at all to how much time certain Members will have depending on their attitudes towards this resolution. This concern comes too late to adopt the rule has been adopted by voice vote.

Mr. HINCHHEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I thank the Chair for his forbearance and I ask an opportunity to go on for no more than another 2 minutes.

I appreciate what the gentleman said, and I recognize his sincerity. However, I believe that the House has made a mistake and that we have the opportunity to correct that mistake and that people of goodwill recognizing the mistake will do so. That is, step forward honestly, forthrightly and correct the mistake that has been made in the context of the rule. We may not debate this issue fairly and openly, and it seems to me that I think it would seem to any fair-minded person, not just the Members of this House but any fair-minded American, that it is not possible to have a fair and open debate when the time has been so misallocated, three-quarters of it given to those who favor the resolution and a quarter for those who oppose.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s concern about how we manage our time on this side of the aisle, but I would point out to him as a matter of fairness that the manner proposed and being followed by the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations is the only fair way to apportion time on this side of the aisle.

If, for example, the preponderance of the speakers on this side of the aisle are in favor of the resolution, to give half of the time to those in opposition of the resolution would be grossly unfair to those who favor the resolution and would have only a small portion of time with which they could express their point of view relative to a very large amount of time that perhaps 10 percent of those on this side of the aisle might choose to exercise. So the chair of the committee is absolutely right to reserve the time.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his decision to apportion the time on his side of the aisle because there may be greater division over there. But the gentleman should yield to this side of the aisle to determine how we will apportion our time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HINCHHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I understand what the
Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the House’s attention to section 2 of the rule which says, “It shall be in order for the majority leader or his designee, after consultation with the minority leader and to extend debate on the joint resolution, as amended. Such motion shall not be subject to debate or amendment.” So this extension of time is provided for in the rule, which has already been adopted, and when the occasion arises I will do everything in my power to facilitate extending the time so nobody is muzzled or gagged in this Chamber.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s sentiment, and it is not my belief that it is the intention of the leadership of this House to muzzle any individual Member. My point is that we are debating an issue of such profound seriousness with such vital importance, both for individual human beings, Americans, Iraqis and others, as well as the life of the Constitution of this country that we ought to do this in the most open and fairest way; and it is my contention that the rules governing this debate is neither open nor fair under those circumstances.

It is further my contention that this body possesses the ability to change that rule and to provide the Members of this chamber with the opportunity to engage in free and open and unfettered debate on an issue which is the most critical that one may contemplate as a citizen of this country and as a Member of this House.

Mr. BALLenger. Mr. Speaker, could we ask for regular order on this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Is the gentleman asking for regular order?

Mr. BALLenger. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that 4¾ hours of his time be allocated to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE)?

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a Parliamentary inquiry. I want to ask if it is appropriate to request an extension of the time allotted for this debate in accordance with the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would recognize the managers of the joint resolution as assigned by the special order adopted by the House for that purpose at this time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized on his time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have any problem on our side of the aisle. I have asked unanimous consent to yield half of the time I control to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) who, during the deliberations of the Committee on International Relations, voted no on the resolution; and he is the highest-ranking Member on the Democratic side to vote in such a manner. We are perfectly satisfied with time allocation on this side. I yield to the gentleman from California. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to restate my position for the record. I believe that the House is proceeding improperly. I believe that the allocation of time is wrong, unfortunate and does not provide for an equal opportunity to serve notice that I will request again, it seems to me that if we are going to have a fair and open exchange of views on this issue, it is essential that those people who are in opposition to the resolution have as much time as those who are in favor of it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that, should the allotted time be insufficient to deal with this issue, in the event some Members feel that they have not had an opportunity to express their views, I want to serve notice that I will request under unanimous consent to extend the debate.

I think this is a significant historic debate. No Member of this body should be deprived of the opportunity to express his views. So I want to assure my colleague that, should the initially allotted time to both sides prove insufficient, it is the intention of this gentleman to request additional time so that every Member will have an opportunity to express his or her views.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate that sentiment on the part of the gentleman. I know that he is sincere. However, if that procedure is to be adopted, we ought to have a vote on it now. Now is the time to make that decision, because I do not know that at some point in the future the gentleman may change his mind or at some point in the future he may not be recognized or some other event might intervene between now and then. I think that that decision ought to be made now.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree that a decision should be made now. We do not know whether the allotted time is sufficient or not. If the allotted time is not sufficient, I can assure the gentleman I will not change my mind and I will request an extension of time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
have the luxury of considering this issue in splendid isolation. The whole world is watching, and it will measure the resolve of the United States by the outcome of this debate. Let the People's house seize this opportunity to lead.

Mr. Speaker, in debating this issue, I am haunted by history. As a young man resisting the Nazis in my native Hungary during the Second World War, I experienced firsthand the ravages of both air and ground war. The murderously effective dive bombers, the thunderous rumbling of panzers still reverberate in my memory. I know all too well the painful human costs of war, the lives lost, the families broken, the homes destroyed, the dreams shattered. I abhor war in the way only a survivor and the grandfather of 17 can.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the costs of war are great, the costs of inaction and appeasement are greater still. Had the United States and its allies confronted Hitler earlier, we acted and smothered the Sturmwehr of 1933, we stymied his evil designs, the 51 million lives needlessly lost during that war could have been saved. Just as leaders and diplomats who appeased Hitler at Munich in 1938 stand humiliated before history, so, will we appease Saddam Hussein today.

To grasp the consequences of our choice, I urge my colleagues to consider two futures: first, imagine a future in which Iraq continues to build its arsenal of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Wielding such weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein not only assures his own survival, but rises to preeminence in the Arab world. Within Iraq, Saddam intensifies his brutal repression of the Iraqi people and crushes all internal opposition.

Beyond Iraq, Saddam Hussein seizes new territory, intimidates his neighbors into submission, and blackmails the United States and our allies. At the same time, his threats sharing his anti-American hatred find refuge and resources under his wing.

Now, I ask my colleagues to imagine a different future based on the alternative that Saddam Hussein is disarmed, is discredited, and falls from power. With strong material and moral support from the United States and the entire international community, Iraq could emerge as a beacon of democracy and a beacon of hope in the Arab world. The Iraqi people are freed from his brutal repression of the Iraqi people and crushes all internal opposition.

Today the people of Kosovo live in peace, Serbia holds democratic elections, and in the Hague, Milosevic stands on trial for war crimes.

Mr. Speaker, from many of the same reasons our coalition won in Kosovo, today we must act in Iraq. Saddam Hussein's brutal repression of the Iraqi people is a crime against humanity. His stubborn defiance of the United Nations is an affront to the civilized world, and his diabolical drive to develop weapons of mass destruction is a danger to the United States and to world peace.

Let us be clear. We seek to preserve peace, we seek to avert war, we seek to maintain international order, not to disrupt it. In doing so, we seek the support of our friends and allies.

I support the President's decision to challenge the United Nations to enforce the Security Council resolutions Iraq has flagrantly and repeatedly violated. If the U.N. seizes this opportunity, it could prove to be its finest hour. The joint resolution before us is the best assurance that the international community may indeed rise to this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein represents the antithesis of freedom and is the principal antagonist in a struggle unfolding in the Middle East; and the United States, I believe, is destined to be a principal protagonist in this struggle. The great debate we begin today represents the opening act of a drama that promises to define the 21st century.

Each of us was elected to engage in just such a debate. Only in a democracy are the people, through their chosen representatives, entrusted with their own security. Only in a democracy must the protectors answer to those they protect. Only in a democracy must the Commander in Chief come to Congress in exercising military power. Debating war and peace as we do this day is the essence of democracy.

Many different views will be heard during the course of our debate. Let no one, Saddam Hussein especially, confuse debate with disunity. The ability to debate freely, but unite ultimately, is the hallmark of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in debating this joint resolution, I urge all of my colleagues to consider the consequences of our decision. They will be felt far beyond the confines of this Chamber. Should we act, Saddam Hussein history will reward us. If we fail to do so, history will haunt us. A future of hope, or a future of fear hangs in the balance. I am confident that we shall make the right choice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) who did not give an opening statement but rather contributed to the literature of freedom, a remarkable statement and worth keeping.

Sixty-six years ago, on March 7, 1936, a brutal dictator who had terrorized his own people and instigated religious and ethnic persecutions on a massive scale declared his aggressive intent against his neighbors in a stream of gutter writings dating back a decade and a half and rearmed his country in defiance of solemn treaty obligations. He then flagrantly violated yet another international obligation by militarily reoccupying a portion of his country that had been demilitarized by international agreement.

His democratic neighbors said nothing.

Free men around the world did nothing, except protest weakly. The dictator, who may have been mad but who was certainly no fool, took those empty words of protest as further signs of the free world's weakness and fear.

The League of Nations did nothing.

Nine years and more than 40 million deaths later, the perpetrators and their accomplices, who have been reconstituting a portion of his country that had been demilitarized by international agreement.

His democratic neighbors said nothing.

Free men around the world did nothing, except protest weakly. The dictator, who may have been mad but who was certainly no fool, took those empty words of protest as further signs of the free world's weakness and fear.

The League of Nations did nothing.

The League of Nations did nothing.

The League of Nations did nothing.
beaten to turn Europe into a slaughterhouse because free men had failed to stop him before he set loose the greatest war in human history. That the Holocaust was permitted to occur stands as a permanent reproach to us all. Millions of innocents died because the free world lacked the will and the courage to face a brutal dictator’s manifestly aggressive intentions, his burgeoning weapons capabilities, and his gross violations of international law.

Does this scenario, does this failure to recognize that evil intentions plus destructive capability plus unscrupulous will plus lack of present danger, sound familiar? It should. And not from the history books, but from the morning newspaper.

We are faced today with a situation whose analogies to 1936 seem all too clear. An aggressive dictator has once again willfully and repeatedly defied the basic norms of international law. Having terrorized his own people into submission, Saddam Hussein has re-armed his forces and infeveribly sought weapons of mass destruction. It is sheer nonsense to suggest that he wants those weapons for anything but aggression. Does any sane person looking at this man’s record over the past 2 decades imagine that he will be deterred by reason or by moral suasion?

We have spent more than a decade trying, without any success, to enforce Saddam’s pledges to disarm. We have tried inspections. We have tried sanctions. We have tried no-fly zones. We have run out of options.

In 1980, he attacked Iran and initiated a decade of warfare that killed and wounded over 1 million people, a conflict that included his use of chemical weapons on Iranian troops. In 1990, he invaded Kuwait and imposed a brutal occupation on that country, laying waste to everything within reach when his forces were finally driven off. He has indiscriminately used chemical weapons on unarmed civilians in his own country, and he has slaughtered anyone who dared oppose him.

Given this record, there can be no doubt that, once armed with weapons of even greater destructive power, he will have little reluctance to use them.

In a world of modern technology, the first strike might well be the last strike. We flew hijacked aircraft into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon had nuclear bombs instead of airplanes as weapons, do we doubt they would use them? We would then be mourning 3 million deaths, not 3,000.

Permitted to acquire and deploy even more lethal weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein will use those weapons; and he will use them against us and against our allies. Some of us demand a smoking gun before we will approve the use of force. We may well get a smoking city like Hiroshima in place of a gun.

He must not be allowed to gain those nuclear capabilities. We cannot afford another reoccupation of the Rhineland, another gross failure to enforce the basic norms of international order, this time, in a world of weapons of mass destruction and intercontinental ballistic missiles. He must not be disarmed, because the world simply cannot permit this man to obtain usable weapons of mass destruction.

If the international community is so feeble as not to see that this man’s threat of force, justice, and freedom must be confronted boldly and decisively, then the United States and those allies who will stand with us must do the job for our own safety’s sake and in defense of the minimum conditions that make a civilized world possible.

The menace posed by Saddam is undeniable, but we are confronted with an even greater danger. Despite clear and repeated warnings, it appears much of the world has decided that we have entered a wholly new and increasingly perilous era, one with new and harsher rules. Through repeated usage, the term “weapons of mass destruction” has become somehow inimical. The implausible notion that these represent requires our constant focus and the determination to do what we must to defend ourselves.

The problem is not merely that a murderous tyrant such as Saddam may be in possession of these weapons. In the aftermath of September 11, we must accept that he has been joined by many others of an even more fanatical purpose. Terrorists willing to commit suicide in order to kill large numbers of innocents cannot be stopped by the familiar conventions of deterrence. Their possession of weapons of mass destruction must be equated with a certainty that these will be used against us.

We cannot shield ourselves with hope. We must not guess the world into submission, searching for a concert with others. The voice of indecision, or insignificance, can be no safety if we condition our actions on the approval of others, only if need be risks yet another miscalculation on his part and a false grant of safety to call our bluff.

Vigorous debate in our deliberations is not only desirable, it is essential. The question before us demands it. But the point of that debate cannot be to condition our actions on the approval of others, for we might wait and wait and wait for an approval that may never come.

We must remember our debate here today is not for ourselves alone and that our audience is not confined to this Chamber. The world is watching. It is looking for signs of indecision in our resolve, searching for a fatal sign of weakness that will come from binding ourselves to act only in concert with others. The voice of indecision would cut through any wording in which we might attempt to secrete it, however artfully phrased and cleverly contrived we might render it.

We do not have the luxury of pretending not to see the danger confronting us. All of our choices are difficult, but our only real option is action.

Over a century ago, in another conflict, Abraham Lincoln said, “We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare or spare another; the fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.”

A century ago, Britain stood majestically at the height of her power. With the 40 years, the knife was at her throat, and she survived only because we were there to rescue her. But there is no one to rescue ourselves with our friends and allies, if possible, but alone if necessary. There can be no safety if we condition our decision on the cooperation of others, only a hope that all will be well, a hope that eventually must fail.

For more than half a century, whatever stability and security has existed in this world has been there largely because America has been unafraid to act against threats and to act alone, if necessary. The perception that we are resolved to do so has prevented many acts of aggression and thus strengthens and continues to do so today.

On many occasions we have been joined in our efforts by our friends and allies; and, more rarely, we have enjoyed the world’s approval. But often we have not, and still we acted. If we are to have a chance of averting a conflict in Iraq, a simple resolve on our part will not be sufficient. For the great danger we face with Saddam is ambiguity.

Saddam has often miscalculated in the past. His flawed judgments have resulted in wars that have killed hundreds of thousands of people. For that reason, any ambiguity regarding our course of action and our determination to act alone if need be risks yet another miscalculation on his part and a false grant of safety to call our bluff.
Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President. I do so not simply because he is a good, honest, intelligent man who happens to be the leader of my party. I do so because, as President, he is right, strategically, politically, and morally right. In the autumn years of my long life, I do not intend to see the free world repeat the errors it made when I was a teenager, errors that extracted an unfathomable cost in blood and treasure. I do not believe my country wants to be a party to appeasement.

We cannot defend America, we cannot build a world of peace, order, justice, and freedom by hope alone. The statesmen of the 1930s tried to secure the peace by hopes alone. They failed, and the results are with us still. We cannot repeat their failure. We must not. History will not forgive us another failure of imagination and will. I propose there is a reason why you are here today and I am here today. That is because providence has burdened us with the terrible decision of what is best for America. I propose what is best for America is to support our President.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his powerful and brilliantly reasoned statement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one-half of my time be allocated to my good friend and our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and that he may be permitted to control that time and yield it to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for equally dividing his time.

Mr. Speaker, this signal from the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), although he very strongly supports the President, and we have heard his eloquence as he has, in so many instances done, and his position is clear, and given the respect that we have for the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a survivor of the Holocaust, a person who stands for fairness, that he would yield 50 percent of his time so other voices could be heard is simply another example of the character of the gentleman from California. With that, I yield my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very difficult decision to make here. We will be watched by the world. I think that the strength of America is that people can have different opinions. In my opinion, that is what makes America great. We come out as strong as Americans with our diversity. We are the most diverse Nation in the world, and we are the strongest; so I think that it is important that dissenting voices be heard.

First of all, let me say from the outset that I oppose a unilateral first-strike attack by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on our soil. The President's resolution does not prove even a hypothetical imminent danger of attack, and we in Congress have received no evidence of such an imminent and immediate threat.

If the United States is in fact in danger of immediate attack, the President already has the authority under the Constitution, the War Powers Act, the United Nations Charter, and international law to defend our Nation.

A unilateral first strike would be codified in this resolution. The fact that it could set an example for potential conflicts between India and Pakistan, between Russia and Georgia, between China and Taiwan, and many other corners of the world is something that we have to be concerned about.

Only Congress has the authority to declare war. House Joint Resolution 114 is not a declaration of war, but it is a blank check to use force without moral or political authority of the declaration of war.

For example, Franklin Delano Roosevelt did on December 8 to begin World War II.

Every diplomatic option must be exhausted. This resolution authorizes the potential use of force immediately, long before diplomatic options can be exhausted or even fully explored.

Other governments, including France and Russia, have proposed a two-step process in which the world community renews vigorous and unfettered inspections, and, for example, the United Nations does its work to seek out and destroy weapons through inspections, it places immediate force on the table.

A unilateral first strike would undermine the moral authority of the United States, result in substantial loss of life, destabilize the Middle East region, and undermine the ability of our Nation to address unmet domestic priorities. The President's resolution authorizes all of these outcomes by authorizing and codifying the doctrine of preemptive war.

This resolution can unleash all these consequences: destabilization of the Middle East; casualties among U.S. troops and Iraqi citizens; a huge cost, estimated at between $100 and $200 billion; and a question about our own domestic priorities, with such a cost looming over our heads.

Further, any unilateral plan for maintaining stability in the region would be costly and would require a long-term commitment. Experts tell us that the United States might have to remain in Iraq for a decade. Such a commitment would drain resources for economic growth and international priorities. Failure to make such a commitment would leave another post-intervention disaster scene.

We still have the commitment that we were making to Afghanistan, where we said we would rebuild schools and we would build water treatment plants to bring water out for the people there. We have been unable to do that in Afghanistan; however, now we are moving to Iraq.

Many people have spoken recently, and we have heard many calls from our constituents. There has been a tremendous amount of discussion. Vice President Al Gore began it several weeks ago when he raised a question on the first resolution that was proposed by the President.

We heard Senator KENNEDY state that al Qaeda offers a threat he believes more imminent than Iraq. The Senator also underscored that our first objectives should be to get U.N. inspectors back to the task without conditions. Only when all responsible alternatives are exhausted should we discuss military action, which poses the risk of spurring a larger conflict in the Middle East. Furthermore, Senator KENNEDY correctly observed one's view on how to handle the situation in Iraq is not a reflection of one's loyalty to the United States.

Senator DODD noted that international cooperation is necessary to counter terrorism. This cooperation should not be diminished by our unwillingness to address Iraq through multinational channels.

Senator FEINSTEIN questioned the immediate threat posed by Iraq and argued that there was time to build support within the international community.

Our own Representatives, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MORGENTHAU), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), went to Iraq to see firsthand. They support unfettered, unrestricted weapons restrictions and said, let us give that an opportunity.

Senator BREAUX observed that "with America so divided on this issue, a process of consultation with the administration to demonstrate the need for military action to address the threat posed by Iraq."

We have for the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a survivor of the Holocaust, a person who stands for fairness, that he would yield 50 percent of his time so other voices could be heard is simply another example of the character of the gentleman from California.
Last night, Senator BYRD had strong observations about this and questioned whether at this time it is a time for us to move into the Iraq situation possibly unilaterally. All of these opinions and observations bring us to the belief that the United States should confront the evidence on Iraq directly and should make decisions based from a broad base. I concur with many others who believe that we must work cooperatively with the United Nations, both to foster action and to reinforce the strength and sanctity of the United Nations Security Council.

I strongly believe that unfettered inspections must resume promptly in Iraq and that Iraq must allow the U.N. weapons inspectors to carry out their responsibilities. This and a full range of diplomatic efforts need to take place before we can conclude that military action is warranted.

Therefore, in conclusion, we must keep as our main objective, that of countering terrorism and working with others to ensure that this world will be a better place tomorrow for our children than it is today. This calls for cooperation, communication, and careful calculation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that, in this debate or any other, it is inappropriate to refer to individual Senators, except as provided in clause 1 of rule XVII.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the threats posed by Saddam Hussein are real. As President Bush forcefully said last night, we refuse to live in fear.

Only a few of us can remember the threat posed by an evil man a few generations back, a man by the name of Adolph Hitler. A lot of us in those days were discussing whether Hitler was a real threat. No, he is not very dangerous, they said. We do not need to worry about him.

All of a sudden, he wanted Alsace-Lorraine, and he took it. The world said, They are mostly Germans, so it is really not a big deal. A little while later he took Austria. Everyone said, you know, They are Germans, too. Then he took Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia. Again, the world said, They are mostly Germans, as well. We should not worry a great deal about that.

Then Hitler took Czechoslovakia. A fellow named Neville Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, joined the world leaders and created a settlement which Chamberlain declared would bring peace in our time. Not long afterwards, Hitler decided that he wanted Poland, so he and Stalin cut up Poland. As a result, 51 million people died throughout the war, and some of them were my classmates. I do not know how many people could have been saved if Britain and France had shown the leadership that it was necessary to stop Hitler at the Alsace-Lorraine, but I am sure it would be a lot less than 51 million.

I do not believe we are in a similar position today, and we need to show the leadership that was lacking in World War II. I hope we are assisted by the United Nations in these actions. I hope that this resolution will give the U.N. a backbone to step up and speak out.

While I will vote for this resolution, I also have a personal problem and a great deal to worry about. I have grandchildren who are young men, bringing into reality that they could become involved in this potential conflict; so I have not arrived at this decision without a great deal of thought.

Many times, because we have been lacking in leadership in this world, millions of people have been killed before someone decides to take preemptive action. We must and we will support President Bush in his request of this Congress to give him the authorization to use military force.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Mr. Speaker, we face a toxic mix in Iraq: dangerous weapons controlled by a dangerous tyrant. From the beginning of this national debate, I have felt strongly that we must act through the United Nations, in concert with our allies, and with multinational support, and focus on the weapons of mass destruction and disarming Hussein.

Clearly, we must rid Iraq of the weapons of mass destruction and the means of producing new weapons of mass destruction. If Saddam resists and regime change thus occurs, we must be prepared for what happens next, the very next day.

According to the initial resolution the President sent to the Congress, it gave credence to the fear that we would, as a first step, act in a preemptive unilateral military strike, which I would not support and do not support in the absence of an imminent threat to the United States. That resolution was too broad, did not require the President to work through the U.N., and did not address our plans for the future of Iraq.

Since then, the White House and the administration, in a bipartisan manner, have negotiated a compromise resolution that addresses many of those issues. I support the resolution now. It strikes a good balance between urging a multilateral approach and preserving America's right to defend our citizens.

The President has promised congressional leaders he will exhaust all options at the U.N. before taking military action. At a White House briefing I attended last week, the National Security Adviser and the CIA Director made the same assurances.

The resolution, even with this balance and moderating language, still represents a grant of broad military authority to the President, broad authority for the President to wage war. The question is. Do we trust the President's judgment to use this authority wisely? This President came to office without much background in foreign policy and without much apparent interest in foreign policy. The President's initial steps in foreign relations were an isolating brand of unilateralism that told the world that America would thrive if we acted alone in our own interests.

Then came 9-11 and the President changed his policies, and I am glad he did. In the war on terror, the President wisely has led a skillfully assembled the international coalition against terror, and has made necessary and appropriate use of America's military power.
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Presidential historians argue and teach that presidents grow fond of foreign and military exercise of power because they can make things happen than in the domestic arena, and I think this President is no different. President Bush has clearly come to relish the exercise of American power on the world stage, and he deserves the strong public and congressional support generated to date by his policies against terror. I hope and pray the President also understands and respects the need for restraint in the use of America's awesome military power. I hope his judgment made the same assurances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President in the strongest terms to adhere to the letter and spirit of this resolution in exhausting all diplomatic options in order to disarm Saddam Hussein. But the use of American military power alone will not meet all of our challenges. We must be prepared for the challenges of nation building, prepared for challenges of peacekeeping. We must be prepared for the redevelopment of Iraq and potential hot spots around the world where people not just have to deal with the grinding poverty and the lack of day-to-day opportunity but they have to deal with day-in, day-out sense of hopelessness.

We must consider the demand for a new, modern-day Marshall Plan to address the development needs, the food and educational needs, the hope that people must have to lead to democracy and self-government.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 114, an important historic
resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. The distinguished chairman of our House Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), we thank him for his leadership in bringing this critical resolution before the House today. I also want to express our appreciation to the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his staunch support of this resolution.

Since expelling U.N. inspectors from Iraq, Saddam Hussein has had 4 years in which to rebuild and rearm his country's weapons stock piles. It is imperative that the United States does not ignore. Yet, in the same fashion that we have responded to Saddam Hussein's threats, we must be fully committed to the reconstruction of Iraq as a unified and a democratic state in the event of a military action against Iraq. The distinguished chairman of our House Committee on International Relations before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to lend their full support to H.J. Res. 114, authorizing the use of U.S. Armed Forces against Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Our Nation faces a monumental decision, one that could dramatically change our lives, harm our national security, and one that could forever shatter the fragile stability of the world. We have carefully rebuilt and realigned our international commitments; of lying about it in this country, I assure you that we have a moral responsibility to deal with, regardless of victory.

I do not share that view. We have to be cognizant of what this war will unleash upon the world. I have never in my 30 years of public life and 26 years of serving here seen the world community so fragile. It is a tinderbox, and a hair trigger waiting to go off.

I am not ready to alter the course that we have taken since our founding to embrace the preemptive strike doctrine. If we strike first, what kind of message does that send to the tenderboxes of Pakistan and India, China and Taiwan, North and South Korea, and the first time we go to war in Iraq, in North Korea? Where does it end? The broader global implications will be grave. Second, I am not ready to act unilaterally and in potential defiance of the United Nations Security Council. Because, by going it alone, what signal do we issue by tossing aside diplomacy? What sirens do we set off by ignoring the rest of the world?

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "War is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong and multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses." Multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses.

We are told this war, this invasion of Iraq, will right the wrongs that Saddam Hussein has created. We are told that this war will help end the evils of terrorism. And we are told that this war will bring peace and regional stability to the Middle East.

No one wants to talk about that. No one wants to put a price tag on it, but it is there. And while we may not know about it in this country, I assure you that the people in the Arab world know about it, the people in Central Asia know about it.

They know about the 500,000 children who have died prematurely since the end of the war because of U.S. sanctions. They know of the 50,000 children who die each year for want of medication. They understand because of depleted uranium attached to the bombs that we dropped on Iraq during the last war the leukemia rate and the cancer rate and the lymphoma rate of 10- and 12- and 13-year-old children have increased 100 to 120 percent.

Second, I am not ready to act unilaterally and in potential defiance of the United Nations Security Council. Because, by going it alone, what signal do we issue by tossing aside diplomacy? What sirens do we set off by ignoring the rest of the world?

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "War is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong and multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses." Multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses.

We are told this war, this invasion of Iraq, will right the wrongs that Saddam Hussein has created. We are told that this war will help end the evils of terrorism. And we are told that this war will bring peace and regional stability to the Middle East.

I do not share that view. We have to be cognizant of what this war will unleash upon the world. I have never in my 30 years of public life and 26 years of serving here seen the world community so fragile. It is a tinderbox, and a hair trigger waiting to go off.

I am not ready to alter the course that we have taken since our founding to embrace the preemptive strike doctrine. If we strike first, what kind of message does that send to the tenderboxes of Pakistan and India, China and Taiwan, North and South Korea, and the first time we go to war in Iraq, in North Korea? Where does it end? The broader global implications will be grave. Second, I am not ready to act unilaterally and in potential defiance of the United Nations Security Council. Because, by going it alone, what signal do we issue by tossing aside diplomacy? What sirens do we set off by ignoring the rest of the world?

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "War is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong and multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses." Multiplying, instead of indemnifying, losses.

We are told this war, this invasion of Iraq, will right the wrongs that Saddam Hussein has created. We are told that this war will help end the evils of terrorism. And we are told that this war will bring peace and regional stability to the Middle East.

I do not share that view. We have to be cognizant of what this war will unleash upon the world. I have never in my 30 years of public life and 26 years of serving here seen the world community so fragile. It is a tinderbox, and a hair trigger waiting to go off.

I am not ready to alter the course that we have taken since our founding to embrace the preemptive strike doctrine. If we strike first, what kind of message does that send to the tenderboxes of Pakistan and India, China and Taiwan, North and South Korea, and the first time we go to war in Iraq, in North Korea? Where does it end? The broader global implications will be grave. Second, I am not ready to act unilaterally and in potential defiance of the United Nations Security Council. Because, by going it alone, what signal do we issue by tossing aside diplomacy? What sirens do we set off by ignoring the rest of the world?
Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a distinguished member of our committee.

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

Appeasement does not work. The chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), spoke just a few minutes ago and he talked about what happened in the 1930s and how 40 to 50 million people died because of appeasement.

Nobody wants war. But what my colleagues failed to mention, the previous speaker, is that we are at war now, right now. Has anyone forgotten that we lost over 3,000 people on September 11 last year? There are al Qaeda cells and terrorist cells in the United States and around the world that want to do us ill.

Saddam Hussein is part of that terrorist network. We all know that. He has used chemical weapons on his own people, chemical weapons on the people next to him, killing tens of thousands of people. He has used Scud missiles. He has violated every U.N. agreement he has signed, and he has been shooting at our airplanes in a no-fly zone. Does anyone doubt his intentions?

Now, what are we to do about that? Are we to wait for another attack on America where maybe 10 or 20,000 or hundreds of thousands of Americans might die? Or do we take pre-emptive action?

I think if everybody thought very seriously about this, they would realize that we have to preempt Saddam Hussein and the terrorist network that he is a part of.

Do we preempt him or do we react? Do we react after the fact, after we lose 10 or 20 or 30 or 50 or 100 or 100,000 people?

Our responsibility in this Chamber and in this government is to protect American citizens, to protect our democracy, our freedoms and our rights; and if we do not take the right actions now, we will suffer the consequences later.

Let me just tell my colleagues, we have a chance now to avoid more carnage in America; and the only way to do it is to send a very strong signal to the terrorist network around the world that we mean business; that we are not going to appease them, and if they mess with us, we are going to take them out; and the first target ought to be, and I believe if President Bush has his way will be, Saddam Hussein.
Let us all do what we can to protect our Nation and the American people. Let us vote “yes” on this resolution today, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member; for his fairness in ensuring that democracy prevails, even during this very critical and important debate.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution authorizing a unilateral first strike against Iraq. Such an action would destabilize the Middle East and set an international precedent that could come back to haunt us all.

President Bush’s doctrine of preemption violates international law. It violates the United Nations charter and our own long-term security interests. It forecloses alternatives to war before we have even tried to pursue them. We do not need to rush to war.

Furthermore, this resolution is not a declaration of war. In fact, we do not need this resolution. If the United States indeed faces an imminent attack from anywhere, the President already has all of the authority in the world for our defense.

President Bush called on the United Nations to enforce its resolutions, but here we are today voting to go to war before the United Nations has even had a chance to implement inspections. What kind of international cooperation is that? What kind of leadership is that? Does not take leadership to go drop bombs and go to war. It takes real leadership to negotiate and to develop peaceful resolutions to our security needs.

The President has called on the United Nations to assume its responsibilities, but here we are today voting to go to war before the United Nations has even had a chance to implement inspections. What kind of international cooperation is that? What kind of leadership is that? Does not take leadership to go drop bombs and go to war. It takes real leadership to negotiate and to develop peaceful resolutions to our security needs.

The President has called on the United Nations to assume its responsibilities. I call on the United States to assume our responsibilities by working with the United Nations to ensure that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction.

Ms. LEE, Madam Speaker, first, let me just thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), for yielding me time and for his leadership on this very important issue of such critical importance to our world community.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member; for his fairness in ensuring that democracy prevails, even during this very critical and important debate.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member; for his fairness in ensuring that democracy prevails, even during this very critical and important debate.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution authorizing a unilateral first strike against Iraq. Such an action would destabilize the Middle East and set an international precedent that could come back to haunt us all.

President Bush’s doctrine of preemption violates international law. It violates the United Nations charter and our own long-term security interests. It forecloses alternatives to war before we have even tried to pursue them. We do not need to rush to war.

Furthermore, this resolution is not a declaration of war. In fact, we do not need this resolution. If the United States indeed faces an imminent attack from anywhere, the President already has all of the authority in the world for our defense.

President Bush called on the United Nations to enforce its resolutions, but here we are today voting to go to war before the United Nations has even had a chance to implement inspections. What kind of international cooperation is that? What kind of leadership is that? Does not take leadership to go drop bombs and go to war. It takes real leadership to negotiate and to develop peaceful resolutions to our security needs.

The President has called on the United Nations to assume its responsibilities. I call on the United States to assume our responsibilities by working with the United Nations to ensure that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction.

I keep asking the question: Is our goal the elimination of weapons of mass destruction because they pose a potential danger, or is it regime change or the elimination of weapons of mass destruction? Where would this doctrine of preemption lead our country? How could we be the first and then claim the moral authority to tell others not to do so? Is this the precedent that we want to set for India, Pakistan, Russia, China, and others?

How does all of this make the American people safer? Are our airports safer today? Are our seaports secure? What happens to the economic security of our country and our economic needs, given the enormous amount of money, upwards of $100 to $200 billion, that this war will cost us? And how many of our brave young men and women will be put in harm’s way?

We have the opportunity to destroy the terrorist network. Let us not waiver in our commitment to destroy the terrorist network. Let us not waiver in our commitment to the safety and welfare of the American people.

A year ago we were surprised. Today, we have the opportunity to destroy the enemy’s capabilities before they can be used against us. As President Bush so carefully articulated last night, Saddam Hussein’s regime trained al Qaeda operatives to carry out these terrorist attacks and provides medical treatment in Baghdad to some of its senior leadership. Saddam Hussein is not far from developing and acquiring the means to strike the United States, our allies, our friends, our children, and our children’s children.

Saddam Hussein’s regime is pursuing unmanned aircraft to deliver chemical and biological weapons. The United Nations weapons inspectors and the U.S. intelligence community concluded a few years ago, based upon intelligence reporting statements by Iraqi defectors and the Iraqi Government’s own admission, of a more extensive prohibited biological weapons program than previously admitted, including the weaponization of these deadly biological agents. The Iraqi regime has dozens of ballistic missiles and is working to extend their range into violation of United Nations restrictions.

The former deputy chairman of the U.N. inspection team for Iraq and the dossier on Iraq’s capabilities prepared by the British Government, both of these sources support the Bush administration’s assertion that Iraq is at the threshold of possessing nuclear weapons. Satellite imagery has revealed that Saddam Hussein’s regime is actively rebuilding its nuclear infrastructure and is working to develop and acquire enriched uranium. Thus, if we do not address the problem now here today, will it be a better time when the Iraqi regime is stronger and its weapons programs are even more advanced?

The Iraqi regime has ordered the use of chemical weapons against its own people. It has committed genocide and ethnic cleansing in northern Iraq, ordering the extermination of between 50,000 and 100,000 people and the destruction of over 4,000 villages.

Former President Ronald Reagan once said: “We have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on Earth. If we fail, at least let our children, and our children’s children, say of us, we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.”

For all of these reasons and more, on Thursday, I will offer the Lee amendment to H.R. 114, incorporating my bill, S. 1400, currently supported by 37 Members of the House.

As former President Ronald Reagan once said: “We have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on Earth. If we fail, at least let our children, and our children’s children, say of us, we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.”
standing up to oppression and in standing up to a tyrant who has weapons of mass instruction.

I also want to give special regard to President Bush for the leadership he has demonstrated in bringing this matter to the fore. As I said today, because without his leadership we would still be caught up in the double-talk and moral hypocrisy which constitutes so much of the diplomacy in the world today.

So many countries choose to look the other way. So many countries just hope that somehow this problem will go away. But President Bush has brought this issue to the forefront; and because of that, we are reawakening... to just take what I believe will be a very strong and manifest decision to destroy oppression, to eliminate a tyrant such as Saddam Hussein if he does not comply with the U.N. resolutions which have been made.

More important than that, Madam Speaker, I believe President Bush deserves credit for asserting the fact that the United States is the world leader. Yes, the United States is going to the United Nations, but at the end of the day we cannot be bound by some morally opaque decisions made by countries who do not share our values.

If the Security Council does stand with us, fine, and that is all to the better. Let us remember, when President Clinton was President, back in 1999, the U.N. Security Council would not give approval to attack Serbia because of what they were doing in Kosovo, but President Clinton went forward and led an attack, which I supported and which President Clinton has demonstrated in bringing this matter to the forefront; and because of that, we are reawakening to just take what I believe will be a very strong and manifest decision to destroy oppression, to eliminate a tyrant such as Saddam Hussein if he does not comply with the U.N. resolutions which have been made.

More important than that, Madam Speaker, I believe President Bush deserves credit for asserting the fact that the United States is the world leader. Yes, the United States is going to the United Nations, but at the end of the day we cannot be bound by some morally opaque decisions made by countries who do not share our values.

If the Security Council does stand with us, fine, and that is all to the better. Let us remember, when President Clinton was President, back in 1999, the U.N. Security Council would not give approval to attack Serbia because of what they were doing in Kosovo, but President Clinton went forward and led an attack, which I supported and which now has brought stability to Kosovo and, as the gentleman from California (Mr. Lantos) pointed out, has brought Milosevic to the international criminal court. So this is the type of action that must be taken.

I have tried to listen carefully to those who are opposed, and I just cannot figure out really what the substance of what they are saying is. They say we should use diplomacy. We have tried diplomacy for 11 years. They say that somehow the policy up to now has worked. Well, it has not worked because Saddam Hussein has more weapons of mass destruction now than he had before. He has constantly flouted and violated resolution after resolution.

The fact is, we saw on September 11 what happens if we are caught unaware. We have no excuses this time. We know the weapons that Saddam Hussein has. We know that Saddam Hussein will use those weapons if given the opportunity.

Another argument that is used is somehow that we should carry out the war on terrorism before we go after Iraq, before we take action against Iraq. To me, the two are intertwined and connected. You cannot have one without the other. These are people who work in collision. They work in the same league. There is no doubt about that.

We are also told that if somehow we go forward we will lose allies in the war against terrorism. I am not aware of one country, whether it be in the Arab world or whether in Europe, which is backing away from supporting us in this war against terrorism because of our policy of Iraq.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, there is no alternative. We must go forward.

Let me just say, in conclusion, that I respect the honest differences, and I acknowledge that, I would just say, though, if this resolution does pass and does pass by a large vote, that once that has been done we should stand together and speak with one voice and send the world a message that the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States stand behind the President of the United States in taking the action that he will take pursuant to this resolution.

I would also ask all those who vote for the resolution to not do so in any way grudgingly but to give it their fullest and total support. There is no such thing as an easy war. If there are tough days ahead, not to use that as an opportunity to somehow back away. If we go ahead, we are in this for the long haul. We are in it until we succeed. We owe that to the men and women of our Armed Forces. We owe that to the people of the world and to the people of our country who look to us for guidance and direction and for leadership.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to send the word to this gentleman from California (Ms. Tauscher), my good friend and colleague, a leader in the field of national security.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of this resolution because it puts our country back on the right track of working with the United Nations to disarm Iraq.

The congressional resolution in support of efforts to disarm Iraq will not provide President Bush with open-ended authority. In fact, Congress and the President's hard work is just beginning. The United States has a responsibility, as the world's only superpower, to set the standard for international behavior. We must consider every peaceful alternative and contemplate every possible outcome before we go forward.

With this resolution, Congress is making clear that our first priority is building an international coalition through the United Nations. If the President decides that diplomatic efforts have failed, he must inform Congress and explain his reasoning. If the United States engages in military action, the President must provide continual updates to Congress regarding the status of the war. The President will also be required to declare that any military action against Iraq will not hamper our ongoing efforts on the war on terrorism.

I also expect the President to provide clear plans for military engagement that explain our military strategy, detail where our troops will be based, report to Congress on his efforts to secure international assistance, protect us against simultaneous threats from any other parts of the world and define plans for Iraq after Saddam.

If the President follows congressional intent and builds a successful international coalition to address the threat of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, he will not only improve our national security and that of others but he will also put meaning into the will of the international community as expressed in the United Nations resolutions.

On a personal note, I would use the use of force if become necessary, I will be sending young men and women from my local Air Force Base, Travis, and across California to fight in this war. So my role as a check to the administration's power and plans is something that I take very seriously. I will use my position on the House Committee on Armed Services to make sure we are protecting our fighting men and women and that the President is doing this every step of the way.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unite this Congress and to work to support the American people in this effort.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Shrritt), the vice chairman of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYNES), the chairman of the full committee for his exemplary leadership, as well as the ranking member (Mr. LANTOS).

I, too, like many of my other colleagues, respect those who disagree with this resolution. I think this debate is enlightening and is being carried out in the highest way befitting this institution, and I want to thank my friends on the other side of the issue as well.

Madam Speaker, President Bush has made, I believe, an extraordinarily convincing case that the Iraqi dictatorship poses a significant, lethal threat to the people of the United States, our allies, and to the tens of millions of people living in the region of the Middle East. Saddam Hussein's dark obsession with acquiring, developing, stockpiling, and using weapons of mass destruction can
no longer be ignored, wished away, or trivialized.

In the past, Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction, killing thousands of people, mostly Kurds, in the late 1980s. If not disarmed, pursuant to the resolutions that followed the Gulf War and all subsequent U.N. resolutions, he will likely use them again at the place and time of his choosing.

Madam Speaker, the loss of human life and the hideous effects of these weapons cannot even be imagined. In like manner, the environmental and economic consequences would be staggering and possibly earth changing. The agony of death by mustard gas, VX, sarin or radiation sickness is absolutely numbing. The massive release of germs and microbes like anthrax, smallpox, and botulimum toxin would result in massive deaths and casualties and a regional or global epidemic that might not be stoppable.

And I am stating that Saddam is on an aggressive quest to develop nuclear warheads and the means of delivering them.

Madam Speaker, according to the U.S. and British intelligence services, Hussein is trying to develop nuclear weapons has been reconstituted, that is, if it ever went out of business in the first place. The British Joint Intelligence Committee assessment noted, and I quote, that Iraq had recalled its nuclear scientists to the program in 1998. Since 1998, Iraq has been trying to procure items that could be use in the construction of centrifuges for the enrichment of uranium. The report notes that intelligence shows that the present Iraqi program is almost certainly seeking an indigenous ability to enrich uranium to the level needed for nuclear weapons.

Madam Speaker, last night, while brilliantly reiterating U.S. resolve to prevent Saddam Hussein from developing and using conventional and chemical disarmament has ended his brutal dictatorship, President Bush made it clear that war was not the only option, that war can be averted, but the burden rests squarely on the shoulders of Saddam Hussein.

The best outcome, of course, would be a successful redeployment of U.N. inspectors to Iraq, backed by the will of the international community, with a clear, nonambiguous mandate to inspect without condition, to have unimpeded access to suspicious locations, and to inspect and disarm Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

Madam Speaker, given Hussein's ugly, pathetic record on human rights abuse, widespread torture, systematic rape and mass murder, the only way to ensure that diplomacy and arms inspections have a chance to succeed is by backing it up with the credible threat of overwhelming force. Standing up to the raving bully, especially when he is armed to the teeth with weapons of mass destruction, is the work of peace-makers.

No one, Madam Speaker, no one wants war. But if we fail to back the diplomacy with the credible threat of force, it seems probable to me that it is only a matter of time before Hussein and his allies in his network of terror use weapons of mass destruction again.

The question will not be a matter of if, the question will be when and where and how. Support the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a leader in environmental affairs and a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time and the leadership for promoting a full and thoughtful debate on this critical issue for our country. It has truly been a very positive experience on our committee, and I am looking forward to bringing it here to the floor of the House.

As I listened to President Bush attempt to make his case for war last night, what I heard him debate was debating with thousands of Americans who have voiced their concern to us in e-mails and letters and conversations. These are citizens, ordinary citizens, raising straightforward, commonsense arguments against unilateral preemptive military action. Those voices were unanswered last night.

Unanswered was the learned warning of a respected Portland rabbi recently returning from another month-long stay in Israel who assures me that Israeli will, in his judgment, undoubtedly respond with nuclear weapons if Saddam Hussein unleashes Scuds armed with chemical or biological agents against it.

Unanswered was the common knowledge that some allies have already used the rhetoric of this administration to pursue policies against their own terrorists, complicating the lives of our officials who must deal with the results.

Unanswered were the countless questions in our meetings at home who asked why some of the same people who are promoting this action against Iraq are the same who aided Saddam Hussein in getting chemical and biological agents in the 1980s and who did not speak out when he used them against his own people then.

As the President confidently predicts our pre-emptive strikes, I hear the voices of the American public. It does not reflect the mood of the many challenges we face or the legitimate concerns and observations of the American public. It does not prepare America for the real struggle ahead. I will vote "no," and I urge Members to do likewise.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. The wisdom of the war is one issue, but the process and the philosophy behind our foreign policy are important issues as well. But I have come to the conclusion that I see no reason to trust our intelligence. There is no convincing evidence that Iraq is capable of threatening the security of this country, and, therefore, very little reason, if any, to pursue a war.

But I am very interested also in the process that we are pursuing. This is not a resolution to declare war. We know that. This is a resolution that does something much different. This resolution transfers the responsibility, the authority, and the power of the Congress to the President so he can declare war when and if he wants to. He has not even indicated that he wants to go to war or has to go to war; but he
will make the full decision, not the Congress, not the people through the Congress of this country in that manner.

It does something else, though. One-half of the resolution delivers this power to the President, but it also instructs him to consult the U.N. before action. I happen to think I would rather listen to the President when he talks about unilateralism and national security interests, than accept this responsibility to follow all of the rules and the instructions and United Nations. That is what this resolution does. It instructs him to follow all of the resolutions.

But an important aspect of the philosophy and the policy we are endorsing here is the preemption doctrine. This should not be passed off lightly. It has been done to some degree in the past, but never been put into law that we will preemptively strike another nation that has not attacked us. No matter what he said during the Iran-Contra hearings, the President is saying today, this policy is new; and it will have ramifications for our future, and it will have ramifications for the world because other countries will adopt this same philosophy.

I also want to mention very briefly something that has essentially never been brought up. For more than a thousand years there has been a doctrine and Christian definition of what a just war is all about. I think this effort and this approach comes short of that doctrine. First, it says that there has to be an act of aggression; and there has not been an act of aggression against the United States. We are 6,000 miles from their shores.

Also, it says that all efforts at negotiations must be exhausted. I do not believe that is the case. It seems to me like the opposition, the enemy, right now is begging for more negotiations.

Also, the Christian doctrine says that the authority must be responsible for initiating the war. I do not believe that proper authority can be transferred to the President nor to the United Nations.

But a very practical reason why I have a great deal of reservations has to do with the issue of no-win wars that we have been involved in for so long. Once we give up our responsibilities from here in the House and the Senate to make these decisions, it seems that we depend on the United Nations for our war. I do not think that is why a Member earlier indicated, essentially we are already at war. That is correct. We are still in the Persian Gulf War. We have been bombing for 12 years, and the reason President Bush, Sr., did not go all the way to war was because the U.N. did not give him permission.

My argument is when we go to war through the back door, we are more likely to have the wars last longer and not have resolution of the wars, such as we had in Korea, and Vietnam. We ought to consider this very seriously.

Also it is said we are wrong about the act of aggression, there has been an act of aggression against us because Saddam Hussein has shot at our airplanes. The fact that he has missed every single airplane for 12 years, and tens of thousands of sorties have been flown, indicates the strength of our enemy, an impoverished, Third World nation that does not have the capability of force, anti-aircraft weapons, or a navy.

But the indication is because he shot at us, therefore, it is an act of aggression. However, what is cited as the reason for us flying over the no-fly zones are not to protect his people, which does not instruct us and all the nations to contribute to humanitarian relief in the Kurdish and the Shiite areas. It says nothing about no-fly zones, and it says nothing about bombing missions over Iraq.

So to declare that we have been attacked, I do not believe for a minute that this fulfills the requirement that we are retaliating against aggression by this country. There is a need for us to assume responsibility for the declaration of war, and also to prepare the American people for the taxes that will be raised and the possibility of a military draft which may well come.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and regardless of what many have tried to claim will lead us into war with Iraq. This resolution is not a declaration of war, however, and that is an important point: this resolution transfers the Constitutionally mandated Congressional authority to declare war to the President's branch. This resolution tells the President that he alone has the authority to determine when, where, why, and how war will be declared. It merely asks the President to pay us a courtesy call a couple of days after the bombing starts to let us know what is going on. This is exactly what our Founding Fathers cautioned against when crafting our form of government: most had just left behind a monarchy where the power to declare war rested in one individual. It is this they most wished to avoid.

As James Madison wrote in 1798, “The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.”

Some—even some in this body—have claimed that this Constitutional requirement is an anachronism, and that those who insist on following the founding legal document of this country are just being frivolous. I could not disagree more.

Madam Speaker, for the more than one dozen years I have spent as a federal legislator I have taken a particular interest in foreign affairs and especially the politics of the Middle East. From my seat on the international relations committee I have had the opportunity to review branches of documents and to sit through numerous hearings and mark-up sessions regarding the issues of both Iraq and international terrorism.

Back in 1997 and 1998 I publicly spoke out against the actions of the Clinton Administration what I believed was moving us once again toward war with Iraq. I believe the genesis of our current policy was unfortunately being set at that time. Indeed, many of the same voices who then demanded that the Clinton Administration attack Iraq are now demanding that the Bush Administration attack Iraq. It is unfortunate that these individuals are using the tragedy of September 11, 2001 as cover to forge their long-standing desire to see an American invasion of Iraq. Despite all of our efforts to illustrate the fact that I remain very skeptical that the nation of Iraq poses a serious and imminent terrorist threat to the United States. If I were convinced of such a threat I would support going to war, as I did when I supported President Bush by voting for the 1998 U.N. resolution. I now believe that we must ask the right questions and clearly determine what is necessary funding to fight the war on terror.

FURTHER BACKGROUND/POINTS ON H.J. RES. 114 AND IRAQ, 8 OCTOBER 2002

Claim: Iraq has consistently demonstrated its willingness to use force against the United States by firing on our planes, patrolling the UN-established “no-fly zones.”

Reality: The “no-fly zones” were never authorized by the United Nations, nor was their 12 year patrol by American and British fighter planes sanctioned by the United Nations. Under UN Security Council Resolution 688 (April, 1991), Iraq’s “right of the moment” and the UN did not authorize for “no-fly zones,” much less airstrike. The resolution only calls for member states to “contribute to humanitarian relief” in “sheltered areas.” Yet the U.S. and British have been bombing Iraq in the “no-fly zones” for 12 years. While one can only condemn any country firing on our planes, the real argument whether we should continue to bomb Iraq relentlessly? Just since 1998, some 40,000 sorties have been flown over Iraq.

Claim: Iraq is an international sponsor of terrorism.

Reality: According to the latest edition of the State Department’s Patterns of Global Terrorism, Iraq sponsors several minor Palestinian groups, the Mujahedin-e-Khalq (MEK), and the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK). None of these carries out attacks against the United States. As a matter of fact, the MEK (an Iranian organization located in Iraq) has enjoyed broad Congressional support over the past years. Patterns of Global Terrorism, Iraq has not been involved in terrorist activity against the West since 1995—the alleged attempt against former President Bush.

Claim: Iraq tried to assassinate President Bush in 1993.

Reality: It is far from certain that Iraq was behind the attack. News reports at the time were skeptical about Kuwaiti assertions that the attack was planned by Iraq against fmr President Bush. Following is an interesting quote from Seymour Hersh’s article from Nov. 1993:

Three years ago, during Iraq’s six-month occupation of Kuwait, there had been an outbreak of a teen-age, terrorist-identified elquently and effectively before Congress about Iraqi atrocities involving newborn infants. The girl turned out to be the daughter of Kuwaiti Ambassador to Washington, Sheikh Saud Nasir al-Sabah, and her account of Iraqi soldiers flinging babies out of incubators was challenged as exaggerated both by the U.S. government and by Kurdish groups. (Sheik Saud was subsequently named Minister of Information in Kuwait, and he was the government official in charge of briefing the international press on the assassination attempt against George Bush.) In a second incident, in August of 1991, Kuwait provoked a special session of the United Nations Security Council charging that twelve Iraqi vessels, including a speedboat, had been involved in an attempt to assault
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Bubiyan Island, long-disputed territory that was then under Kuwaiti control. The Security Council eventually concluded that, while the Iraqis had been provocative, there had been no breach of security. The Kuwait government knew there hadn’t. What did take place was nothing more than a smuggler-versus-smuggler dispute over war booty. The United States had already, at the time, begun to co-opt the Kurds to crush the Kurdish insurrection. It sent representatives to Baghdad, where they were interviewed by staffers of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. 

The incident is far from conclusive. A 1990 study by the classified C.I.A. study that was highly skeptical of the Kuwaiti claims of an Iraqi assassination attempt. The study, prepared by the C.I.A.’s Counter-Terrorism Center, suggested that Kuwait might have cooked the case to cover up the fact that Saddam Hussein was using chemical weapons to induce the Kurds to leave Kuwait. 

Yet this does not, on the other hand, mean we will have to put up with the “continuing Iraqi threat” to Western interests in the Persian Gulf. Neither the Times nor the New York Post, which first publicized the August 25 letter, are noted for their significant contributions to the Persian Gulf. The two major American newspapers had both driven by their source to the other side of the dispute. 

At the very least, the case against Iraq for the alleged bomb threat is not conclusive. Claim: Saddam Hussein will use weapons of mass destruction against us; he has already used them against his own people during the Iran-Iraq War. He is good at it. It may be accepted as conventional wisdom in these times, but back when it was first claimed there was great skepticism. The evidence was suggestive, but not conclusive. That is why the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College cast great doubts on the claim. The use of chemical weapons on the Kurds. Following are the two gassing incidents as described in the report: 

In September 1988, however—a month after the war (between Iran and Iraq) had ended—the United States did not immediately start to back up the use of force. Reality: Iraq is but one of the many countries that have not complied with UN Security Council resolutions. In addition to the dodgy or so resolutions currently being violated by Iraq, a conservative estimate reveals that there are an additional 51 Security Council resolutions that had already been violated by Iraq. Adding in older resolutions that were violated would mean easily more than 200 UN Security Council resolutions have been violated with total impunity. Countries currently in violation include: Israel, Turkey, Morocco, Croatia, Armenia, Russia, Sudan, Turkey-controlled Cyprus, India, Pakistan, Indonesia. None of these countries have been threatened with force over their violations. Claim: Iraq is a radiation, biological, and chemical weapon threat. Reality: That may be true. However, according to UNSCOM’s chief weapons inspector, the use and development of biological weapons and capabilities were destroyed by 1998; those that remained have likely degraded in the intervening four years and are likely useless. A 1994 Senate Banking Committee hearing revealed some 74 shipments of deadly chemical and biological agents from the U.S. to Iraq in the 1980s. 

One 1986 shipment from the Virginia-based American Type Culture Collection included three strains of anthrax, six strains of the plague bacillus, and four strains of bacteria that cause gas gangrene. Iraq later admitted to the United Nations that it had made weapons out of all three. Only the deliberately obtuse can doubt that Saddam Hussein is a murderous, rapacious dictator with an addiction to aggression, and a long record of committing crimes against humanity.

Since seizing power and killing all of his domestic rivals, Saddam spent the entirety of his rule either committing acts of gross unprovoked aggression, preparing for war, conducting war, brutalizing his own countrymen, or committing crimes against humanity.

Mam Speaker, if we believe there is good in the world, surely we must recognize that there is also evil. Saddam Hussein is pure evil. The litany of his bad behavior is very familiar, and there is no real question about Iraq’s appetite for weapons of mass destruction and his thirst for nuclear
weapons. We know beyond a shadow of doubt that even after defeat in the Gulf War, and even while the United Nations inspectors were attempting to verify Iraq’s United Nations mandated disarmament, Saddam Hussein’s regime continued its covert and comprehensive plans to acquire those weapons and the means to deliver them.

All of these facts are established and known, and the President made them all very clear last night. The single question answer, the only decision from which all other decisions will naturally descend is what to do about this threat. It is grave. It is immediate, and it will not satisfactorily resolve itself without action. We cannot simply hope that Saddam Hussein will be deterred. He has shown himself to be an inveterate and dangerous gambler.

We cannot simply hope that Saddam will not share weapons of mass destruction with terrorists. We know al Qaeda elements have already been at work soliciting Iraqi aid in this field. We cannot simply hope that U.N. inspections will rout out Saddam Hussein’s weapons of terror. We know that he has defied inspections for 10 years and is prepared to risk his regime in order to preserve them.

Madam Speaker, hope is not a plan; nor will hope ensure our national security. I believe that we all want a non-violent resolution to this problem.

As the President said last night, “Military action is not imminent or unavoidable.”

Madam Speaker, it is not our first choice, but the only way for us to be clear about Saddam’s obligation is for us to speak with one voice. Madam Speaker, we have fought wars that we have not declared, and we have declared wars that we have not fought. Let us hope that this is one of the latter.

I believe that authorizing the President to use force, if necessary, is the best way to avoid war and is the best way to make clear that preservation of peace depends on Iraq’s compliance with its obligations. But if we must use force, then the central issue to my mind is how to secure the greatest and the broadest international endorsement for our proposed course of action.

Madam Speaker, since World War II, the United States, on the basis of broad bipartisan consensus, has been leading the world through the creation of a system of international security based on shared norms and institutions. The international order our Nation has established and sustained since the presidency of Roosevelt and Truman and Eisenhower, the so-called Pax Americana, has succeeded for decades because it has been perceived internationally as legitimate and is not just self-interested. The peace of the Americans, not just the peace for the Americans.

The goodwill that we have built up for decades is not simply the product of our support for democracy and free markets but rather our enduring and substantial material support for international institutions such as the United Nations and NATO and, through them, our commitment to international cooperation in the pursuit of peace. I believe that the real question is we are all in this together has enabled our country to lead for decades without any significant backlash.

The real questions that we should be asking are not about whether some kind of action is something must be done. Our national security requires it. The key questions that remain are about international order and our relationship with the rest of the world.

The President’s speech to the U.N. seemed to be the first step in our effort to build a coalition. Last night’s speech was another. These were necessary efforts, and we must continue. Because a preventative war devoid of any sort of international consensus is not a precedent that we choose to establish. Our Nation used to refer to that kind of project as aggression. Like it or not, we will need the international community when and if the time comes for the reconstruction of Iraq.

But beyond our efforts in Iraq, we continue to need the international support for the war on terror. We cannot soar international concerns and reservations about the kind of limited means we will give the best chance to stop a gathering storm in the terrorist world.

There are some in this House and some in this Nation who are ready to put their faith solely in diplomacy. They believe that, given more time, there will be more discussion and more parley and somehow that can produce a result that it has not yet produced in the course of more than a decade. Others of us, I think most of us, would dearly like to put our faith in diplomacy alone, but we know that history does not allow us the easy way out, neither the history our dealings with this tyrant nor the even dimmer and longer-term history of containment and appeasement. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) have painted that picture all too well. I am afraid.

I support the resolution before us because I believe it strikes the right balance. It specifically requires the pursuit of diplomacy. In a civilized world like ours, diplomacy should always be the first path chosen, but it also backs that talk up with the threat of serious action. The resolution wisely faces the reality that a tyrant aimed at gamesmanship and amassing power instead of living up to universally accepted obligations is unlikely to take diplomacy very seriously without the potential for strong enforcement.

Under this resolution, the President must first determine that peaceful means cannot accomplish our goals.
If we have learned anything over this decade, it is surely that Saddam Hussein will do everything he can to manipulate the diplomatic process for his own nefarious advantage. This is exemplified by his recent announcement that he will permit ‘unconditional’ weapons inspections to resume, but only if they do not include 12 square miles of his presidential palaces and thousands of buildings.

He has hidden behind diplomacy, while continuing to develop his weapons of mass destruction. He calls for more negotiations, while firing thousands of times at coalition planes in the no-fly zones. He cynically declares to the civilized world he would never support terrorism, and yet we know every day more and more why that is not true.

We cannot ignore this history. We dare not ignore this history. Yet some would put all their faith in diplomacy. Others of us would like to put our faith in diplomacy, but, once I am afraid, we all too aware of its shortcomings. Force or the threat of it seems to be the only language Saddam Hussein understands. It is how he speaks, and it is the only way he listens. Diplomacy without force will not work, so we must be sure once again to get lost in the translation, the translation between the civilized world and the savage mind of Saddam Hussein.

The resolution pushes diplomacy. It requires inspections to resume. But, thankfully, it empowers diplomacy. This is how, God willing, we can secure real and lasting peace for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget.

(Ms. BALDWIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution to authorize the President of the United States to go to war with Iraq in a unilateral first strike.

It is clear that Saddam Hussein has been and continues to be a threat to Iraq’s neighbors and to all peace-loving nations of the world. The United States and the United Nations have recognized the dangers posed by his pursuit of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The very existence of these types of weapons in our world is exceedingly dangerous. They are dangerous in the hands of a dictator like Saddam Hussein, but they are also dangerous in the world community. Control and destruction of weapons of mass destruction are essential to our national security and to world security.

The world has wisely taken action to proactively address this threat, and I am proud that the United States has been a leader in addressing the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Right now, the United States is spending $1 billion per year to prevent the proliferation of these weapons, but we must do more.

The question before the world today and the Congress of the United States is, what is the United States willing to do to ensure that Iraq does not use weapons of mass destruction? The President has indicated a willingness to work together with the United Nations to renew international inspections and disarmament. But let us see if we can do more than this, to ensure that this process begins, and we must do everything we can to ensure that it succeeds.

In the absence of an imminent threat to the United States, in which case the President, as Commander-in-Chief, already has the necessary legal authority to act, and end the threat of weapons of mass destruction? The President has indicated a willingness to work together with the United Nations to renew international inspections and the disarmament process. It already has the legal authority to respond, but in the absence of an imminent threat, working with our allies and other nations to address this threat is the appropriate way to proceed.

The administration’s skepticism about Iraq’s agreement to allow weapons inspectors without conditions is understandable. However, we must not miss a chance to make this process work, to ensure that they have failed. The world community is with us in demanding inspections and disarmament. Establishing an inspection process that is complete, thorough, and comprehensive can be done, but it will require resources and it will require our determination and it will require the active cooperation of our allies and the world community.

War against Iraq should not be our first choice but rather our very, very last resort. The United States has many tools. I mean many tools, to address the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Absent an imminent threat, we must exhaust our other tools before hauling out the machinery of death and destruction, and there are alternatives between doing nothing and declaring war.

It is our responsibility to address the threat to the safety of Americans and our allies from Iraq. Nothing is of greater concern to a Member of Congress than the health and safety of our citizens. A military first strike on Iraq absent the support of the international community, may be more dangerous to our citizens than using means short of war. War against Iraq could further destabilize the Middle East. War against Iraq could make it more likely that weapons of mass destruction are used on our citizens. If Iraq could endanger our allies in the region, War against Iraq could endanger our allies in the region. War against Iraq could reinforce anti-American extremism and terrorism recruitment. It is absolutely essential to weigh these costs.

The President’s case for war emphasizes the potential threat from Iraq, while minimizing the dangers inherent in military action targeted at a regime change. War is far from risk free. In fact, it may be far more dangerous an option to American security.

A rat backed into a corner will fight, not surrender. If Saddam Hussein has no other option, he is more likely to use weapons than under our current containment policy. He could use them against American troops. He could use them against Israel. He could use them against the United States. He could use them against the weapons to anti-American terrorists.

Madam Speaker, we should be very aware that Iraq’s neighbors are not clamoring for us to attack. They understand the danger of war with Iraq. They know that a first strike against Iraq would likely be perceived by some as an attack on Islam, generating more anti-Americanism and encouraging radical fundamentalism. The precedent set by a go-it-alone first strike would shape the future of this century. Is that how we will approach the nearly 30 other countries that possess or are developing the weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them? And how will we speak with any moral authority to sovereign nations to take things into their own hands against other states they see as threats?

Madam Speaker, issues of war and peace are never easy. The decision we must make between war and peace are never easy. The decision we must make is whether we would put all our faith in diplomacy. It is our responsibility to address the threat of weapons of mass destruction to our nation’s security and world security.

The world has wisely taken action to proactively address this threat. I am proud that the United States has been a leader in addressing the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Right now the United States is only spending $1 billion per year to prevent the proliferation of these weapons. We must do more.

The question before the world today and the Congress of the United States is: what steps do we take to ensure that Iraq does not use weapons of mass destruction? The President has indicated a willingness to work together with the United Nations to renew international inspections and the disarmament process. We must let this process begin. And do everything we can to make sure it succeeds.

The President’s case for war emphasizes the potential threat from Iraq, while minimizing the dangers inherent in military action targeted at a regime change. War is far from risk free. In fact, it may be far more dangerous an option to American security.

A rat backed into a corner will fight, not surrender. If Saddam Hussein has no other option, he is more likely to use weapons than under our current containment policy. He could use them against American troops. He could use them against Israel. He could use them against the United States.
our allies and other nations to address this threat is the appropriate way to proceed.

The Administration’s skepticism about Iraq’s agreement to allow weapons inspectors without conditions is understandable. However, we must allow weapons inspection a chance to proceed, as I believe they have failed. The world community is with us in demanding inspections and disarmament—we should do all we can to make them effective. Establishing an inspection process that is complete, thorough and comprehensive can be done. It will require resources. It will require determination. And it will require the active cooperation of our allies and the world community.

War against Iraq should not be our first choice, but rather our last resort. The United States has many tools to address the threats of weapons of mass destruction. Abstain an imminent threat, we must exhaust other tools before hauling out the machinery of death and destruction. And there are alternatives between doing nothing and declaring war.

The President has articulated his case against Iraq by citing the danger posed by its weapons on mass destruction. He has envisioned a Middle East dominated by a nuclear-armed Iraq, bullying its neighbors, blackmailing the region, threatening the United States, and arming terrorists. I believe the United States and the United Nations should take actions to prevent this nightmare scenario from occurring.

It is our responsibility to address the threat to the safety of Americans and our allies from Iraq. Nothing is of greater concern to a Member of Congress than the health and safety of our citizens. A military first strike attack on Iraq, absent the support of the international community, may be more dangerous to our citizens than short of war. War against Iraq could further destabilize the Middle East. War against Iraq could make it more likely that weapons of mass destruction are used on civilians. War against Iraq could endanger our allies in the region, like Israel and Turkey. War against Iraq could reinforce anti-American, extremist and terrorist recruitment. It is absolutely imperative to weigh these costs of war against the threat.

The President’s case for war emphasizes the potential threat from Iraq, while minimizing the dangers inherent in military action targeted at a regime change. War is far from risk free. In fact, it may be a far more dangerous option.

A rat backed into a corner will fight, not surrender. If Saddam Hussein has no other option, he is more likely to use these weapons than under our current containment policy. We did successfully rebuild Europe and Japan after World War II. It has been an unqualified success. Yet more than fifty years later, we still find ourselves defending our soil and in our defense. Are we prepared to keep 100,000 or more troops in Iraq to maintain stability there? If we don’t, will a new regime emerge? If we don’t, will Iraq become the dominant power in the Middle East? If we don’t, will Kurdish separatists declare a new state, destabilizing our NATO ally Turkey? Will Turkey react? If we don’t, will Islamic fundamentalists take over Iraq? We cannot know what will happen in a post-war Iraq, but all of the good outcomes clearly require a substantial U.S. commitment, far more than any in the region, even after the potential threat.

International law is clear in reserving for a sovereign nation the right to self-defense. It is also generally accepted that this right of self-defense extends to a preemptive attack in the case of an imminent threat. Thus, should Iraq possess a nuclear weapon, the United States would be justified in taking preemptive action. The President has not made the case that an imminent threat exists. Instead, he has made a much broader and more troubling argument: that we are unlikely to ever have proof of a terrorist attack of the sort that struck the United States and we would be justified in taking preemptive action. The fundamental problem with this line of reasoning is that it blurs the standard of evidence required to justify a preemptive attack under international law, undermining the ability of the world community to maintain peace and security.

The precedent set by a go-it-alone first strike would shape the future of this century. Is that how we will approach the nearly 30 other countries that possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them? And how will we speak with any moral authority to other sovereign nations who seek to “take things into their own hands” against other states they see as threats? Absent an imminent threat, it is imperative that we build a strong case for taking preemptive action against Iraq. The standard of evidence must be high, not low. The best way to build a convincing case is to work with the world community to build that case. Coercive weapons inspections will help us build that case in two ways. First, if they cooperate, even reluctantly, we will know far more about his weapons capability and the threat. We will also be able to disarm him of all that we find. If Saddam Hussein refuses to cooperate, or undermines the work of the inspectors, the world will be more willing to accept a military solution. A comprehensive inspection effort over the next several months will strengthen our ability to deal with the threat.

The President should be commended for going to the United Nations last month to urge a resumption of the inspections. We should work with our allies and other nations to implement a strong inspections program. The goal of these inspections should be to find all weapons of mass destruction and disarm Iraq.

I believe that the United Nations Security Council would support a strong inspections program that meets the goals articulated by the President.

I believe it is a mistake to demand that the Security Council authorize the use of force now. I believe Congress should not authorize the use of force today. We should move forward as quickly as possible with unconditional inspections. Authorizing the use of force to enforce these inspections and disarm Iraq now would make our diplomatic efforts have been attempted and found to fail. They may fail. But they also may succeed. And they are more likely to if it is a united world against Saddam Hussein instead of the United States and Britain on our own.

Madam Speaker, issues of war and peace are never easy. The decision we make will shape this century. I do not know what the future will bring. However, I firmly believe that we must pursue diplomacy and every other tool first. War with Iraq now is not the answer.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlemen from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), a distinguished member of our Committee on International Relations. Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution on the use of force in Iraq. This resolution may very well determine where America’s future lies. And I do not take this responsibility lightly.

I fully understand what it will mean to watch the carriers leave port in Virginia, or see the men and women leave the many military bases that I represent back home.

This vote may send them in harm’s way, in defense of liberty and freedom; and that is a very heavy weight to carry. However, we cannot forget the aftereffects of that tragic day last year could have been avoided. The answer is simple: we do not avoid these disasters; we prevent them. I support this resolution because I firmly believe that prevention is the only way to preserve our way of life, and fixing the regime change in Iraq is necessary to restore global peace.

I believe that if we do not remove Saddam Hussein and his regime from power and bring liberation to Iraq, the terrorist attacks of last year could have been avoided. The answer is simple: we do not avoid these disasters; we prevent them. I support this resolution because I firmly believe that prevention is the only way to preserve our way of life, and fixing the regime change in Iraq is necessary to restore global peace.

I believe that if we do not remove Saddam Hussein and his regime from power and bring liberation to Iraq, the terrorist attacks of last year could have been avoided. The answer is simple: we do not avoid these disasters; we prevent them. I support this resolution because I firmly believe that prevention is the only way to preserve our way of life, and fixing the regime change in Iraq is necessary to restore global peace.

We are certain that Iraq has continued with development of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons; and we know of their effectiveness. Hussein’s maniacal use of these agents on his own people proves not only his disregard for human lives, but also proves their effectiveness. He has killed thousands in his very own country.

We know that without intervention, Iraq’s weapons programs will only increase and improve; and the longer we
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wait to intervene, the more seriously our troops will be threatened by Iraq’s nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare programs. The possibility of Hussein having long-range nuclear capabilities in the near future is very, very real.

America cannot afford to allow its people to live in a world where Iraq has nuclear weapons. Saddam Hussein is the world’s most dangerous terrorist; and as the attacks of last year have shown, terrorists do not consider the consequences. America must prevent these disasters before they happen and ensure that nuclear war never enters the pages of 21st-century history.

America’s Iraqi policy of containment must be replaced with a policy of prevention. We must prevent future disasters by disarming Saddam Hussein of his nuclear, his chemical, and his biological weapons and overthrowing his regime.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support our President and to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 7 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), one of our leaders in the field of foreign policy and national security.

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Speaker, to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a visionary thinker and planner, and also one that is a Holocaust survivor, our only one in the U.S. House of Representatives, I rise in support of the resolution before us today. As a veteran, I understand the importance of this vote and the enormous impact it may have on the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces and their families, as well as our country and our world.

As debate on this issue has progressed over the last several months, I have repeatedly heard one concern from the citizens of Tennessee: exhaust diplomatic alternatives first; engage the international community before taking any military action.

Let me say for the record that I am pleased that the resolution does not call for the U.S. to act alone. Quite simply, this resolution makes clear the convictions of Congress that the President should pursue all diplomatic options first; but if Iraq resists diplomacy, the President is authorized to use all necessary means to enforce U.N. Security Council resolutions.

I believe the language in this resolution offers a balanced approach that is limited in scope and specific in its goals. This resolution gives the President the flexibility he will need, while ensuring that Congress is consulted and has a meaningful role.

Most importantly, it reflects the importance of putting diplomacy first and working with the international community to address the Iraqi threat. While we must pursue a diplomatic solution, we cannot afford to ignore the threat Saddam Hussein poses to his neighbors and to our national security. According to the terms of the 1991 ceasefire that ended the Persian Gulf War, Iraq was required to destroy its stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and stop its development of nuclear weapons.

Before the Gulf War, the U.S. intelligence community estimated that Iraq was between 5 and 10 years away from building a nuclear weapon. However, when international inspectors went in after the war, they discovered that Iraq was less than a year away from building a crude nuclear device. In fact, the inspectors found that Iraqi scientists had crafted a workable weapon design and were very close to refining enough heavily enriched uranium to produce a nuclear bomb.

Fortunately, over the course of the next 7 years of internationally supervised inspection, Iraq’s nuclear program was largely wiped out. But in 1998 the Iraqis stopped cooperating with U.N. mandates and Saddam threw out the weapons inspectors. Since that time, our intelligence indicates that he has moved quickly to reconstruct his nuclear program. He has hired 200 nuclear Ph.D.s and 7,000 technicians to build a nuclear bomb and has tried to obtain nuclear components from the black market; and he has continued to stockpile huge quantities of chemical and biological weapons, including mustard gas, VX nerve gas, sarin gas, and anthrax.

Saddam Hussein’s pursuit of these weapons of mass destruction presents a clear and present danger to U.S. national security and disarming of his regime must be our top national priority.

Unlike the Gulf War in 1991, we are not dealing with a threat posed by a conventional force. Iraq’s military has largely been contained and isolated and is unprepared to take the kind of aggressive action it did against Kuwait in 1990. The danger we face from Iraq is much more dire, because it is more capable, better armed, and has a stronger interest in mass destruction which could devastate our Nation on a scale we have never seen before. And the longer we wait, the greater the chance is that Saddam Hussein will turn over his weapons of mass destruction to al Qaeda or other terrorists who share his hatred of the United States.

We know that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda seek weapons of mass destruction to kill millions in large numbers and destroy our way of life, and we know Hussein is working around the clock to build his nuclear capacity.

How long will it be until these two forces come together against the United States? If we wait until we are attacked, the loss of life could be devastating. The detonation of only one nuclear device in a highly populated urban area could cause the deaths of tens of thousands of people. This is an unacceptable threat to our national security, and we must do everything we can to disarm his regime immediately.

We have given Saddam Hussein 11 years to comply with United Nations resolutions, and he has chosen not to do so. Saddam Hussein has defied the international community for far too long. Diplomatic efforts have failed. Sanctions have failed. Saddam has thumbed his nose at the international community for more than a decade by ignoring U.N. Security Council resolutions that required him to disclose his weapons stockpiles, to disarm, and to cut ties to terrorist groups.

The time is now for Saddam Hussein to live up to the 16 U.N. resolutions he has defied. This is Iraq’s last chance. Confronting Saddam Hussein now is a necessary step to rid the world of his destructive power and to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction. We cannot afford to allow it.

Madam Speaker, I remain hopeful that we will see a diplomatic solution, but we must be prepared to act if those efforts fail. There is no more difficult decision that we as Members of Congress will face than a decision to authorize the President, the Commander in Chief, to put the men and women of the United States military into battle. Each Member of Congress must make this decision according to his personal conscience and his sense of what is best for the security of the people of the United States of America. For my part, I have made that decision. We must be prepared to use force if diplomacy fails.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others have done outstanding work on this resolution; and I commend them for the efforts they have put into it. But I think the time is now for Saddam Hussein to come to the table, as we all have been calling for and we have been applying pressure on the international community for far too long.

I am pleased, Madam Speaker, that President Bush last evening made it clear that he is not as astute as Hitler. I do not know their respective intelligence quotients; but I do believe that Hitler was a man with a great deal of egotism and a great love of power, and as evil as Adolf Hitler was. The time for us to act is now. As the President told us last evening, Saddam and his thugs are not only willing to do us in, they are eager to do us in; and that determination is shared by sizable numbers around the world.

I am pleased, Madam Speaker, that President Bush last evening made it
clear that we Americans are friends of the Iraqi people. This is not an effort to be adversarial to those people. They are the victims of this schoolyard bully; and Saddam, not unlike the schoolyard bully, has no respect for anyone. They are afraid of him. I think that many of the Arab states would like to see him removed, but they do not want their fingerprints on it. If he is in fact removed, I think they would silently applaud enthusiastically.

It was in the Middle East recently, Madam Speaker, and was confronted by a journalist who accused President Bush of being abusive to Saddam Hussein. I reminded that journalist that it was not President Bush who was being abusive, but that Saddam himself had been ruthlessly abusive, not only to others, but to his own people. The journalist did not respond to me, because he knew I was speaking factually and accurately.

The time to act is now. I am uneasy when I think about nation building, because that could involve disastrous results. But the point is, and we need to drive this home, that nation building can be avoided with mere compliance. All that has to be done is comply with the U.N. resolutions is to permit these inspectors back in, unfettered, no strings attached, in full view; and if this is done in a compliant manner, I see no need for war.

President Bush himself last evening said, this is avoidable. It lies upon his authority of our Constitution, the nation building that will be necessary in order to maintain stability in the Middle East region following an attack on Iraq. This is my pleasure now to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus outlining specific principles we believe must be addressed before military action should occur:

"We oppose a unilateral, first-strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States. "Only Congress has the authority to declare war.

"Every conceivable diplomatic option must be exhausted.

"A unilateral first strike would undermine the security of other nations, destabilize the Middle East region and undermine the ability of our Nation to address unmet domestic priorities.

"Further, any post-strike plan for maintaining stability in the region would require a long-term commitment."

Madam Speaker, I believe that the President has failed to address these principles.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein's regime poses a threat to the Iraqi people, to his neighbors in the Middle East, to the United States, and to the world at large with his biological and chemical weapons and his nuclear program ongoing. For this reason, I cannot unequivocally count future military action out in the face of this legitimate threat.

However, I strongly believe that the most effective way of combating this menace is bysolidifying the support of the international community and acting within the auspices of the United Nations, not by acting unilaterally.

In the 1990s, we made significant progress in conjunction with our international allies through the United Nations weapons inspection program which led to the destruction of 40,000 chemical weapons, 100,000 gallons of chemicals used to manufacture weapons, 48 missiles, 30 warheads, and a massive biological weapons facility equipped to manufacture anthrax.

Inspections are a proven, nonviolent, and internationally supported method of thwarting Iraq's acquisition of weapons material and technology. What is more, a clear majority of the American people want us to give the inspectors the opportunity to work before we take military action.

To this end, I am not convinced that giving the President the authority to launch a unilateral, first-strike attack on Iraq is the appropriate course of action at this time. While I believe that under international law and under the authority of our Constitution, the United States must maintain the option to act in its own self-defense, I strongly believe that the administration has not provided evidence of an imminent threat of attack on the United States that would justify a unilateral strike.

I believe that actions alone, without exhausting peaceful options, could seriously harm global support for our war on terrorism and distract our own resources from this cause.

I am disappointed that those who favor this resolution make no mention of the long-term commitment for nation-building that will be necessary in order to maintain stability in the Middle East region following an attack on Iraq. Thus far, this administration has not made public any plans for our role in Iraq in the years to come, if not decades, after the attack.

I cannot imagine that any of us believe this administration and our Nation is prepared to orchestrate and assume the entire financial burden of economic reconstruction, democratization, and nation-building that would be necessary to stabilize post-conflict Iraq. Let us not forget that this Congress would have to authorize aid for this long-term task at a time when we are still engaged in the Balkans and have only recently started to help in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, our Nation's economic recovery demands our immediate attention; and I am disturbed by reports that our Nation's poverty rate, joblessness, and health care costs continue to rise at the same rate that personal wealth and retirement savings are being de- creased. I fear the prospect of military action in Iraq will further distract our attention from an ominous economic outlook.

So, before we undertake military operations in Iraq, we must ask ourselves some very basic questions:

Does a war with Iraq improve our national security?

Does it allow the United States to make peace through the power of our example?

Does it allow us to focus on the economic suffering of our own people?

Madam Speaker, I believe the answer is a resounding "no." Therefore, I regret that I cannot vote with the President for this resolution.

Mr. BERREUTER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), a valued member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nebraska for yielding me this time.

The American people are now going to experience a wonderful and lengthy debate, something that is just absolutely essential for this country, and they will have their fill of it.

I want to stand here, though, and say that in 1941 I enlisted in the Marine Corps. I voted for Desert Storm. I have always felt that the first dollar of Federal money should go into defense, to protect our country. But I am prepared to vote against this resolution. This is a sad day for me, because I want to support my President.
I admire him greatly. But I guess, with thousands of votes which we make over the years, I have found that conscience is probably the best thing to follow and is most honest if one is going to be true to one’s self, if not always politically popular.

Following September 11 of last year, we were told that terrorism is the enemy. We have to get rid of al Qaeda. We have to take out Osama bin Laden. We have to eliminate the pockets who hate Americans. We have to rebuild Afghanistan. So we were told that to win the war against terrorism, our main objective, it required the cooperation of our allies around the world. And I bought that, and the President spelled it out very clearly and very eloquently.

But now we hear that the priorities have changed and that Iraq is the prime target. Saddam Hussein is a bad man, he has horrible weapons, and I believe all of that. But as a single-minded believer in what does this have to do with September 11? There is very little evidence that Iraq had anything to do with the attack on September 11 or on terrorism itself. As a matter of fact, probably Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden are mortal enemies. One is from a secular country and the other is a religious fundamentalist. Now, I happen to be a hawk on Iraq. Saddam Hussein is bad, and some day we are going to deal with him. But, right now, the security of the American people is at stake, and I believe we must fight terrorism in its emerging and subtle forms.

So, I see that, without finishing what we started to do and with no intimate knowledge that there is nuclear weapons at hand or that there is a relationship to terrorism, why is it that we refocus our objectives? It is hugely costly. We are not backed by some of our key allies and we potentially can unilateralize the very thing which we are fighting: terrorism.

I met with some Arabs the other day, with a group of Israelis and Arabs who were talking about the Middle East, and they said, the Iraqis in general hate Saddam Hussein, but they hate the United States even more.

So Iraq is now one of the only secular countries in that region. And the Sunnis and the Shites could create such a mess following a war that we could find ourselves against a religious fundamentalist state that does this have to develop, where that is not the case now.

The bill here today says that the President, “is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate.”

Now, I have great respect for this President. He is an unusual man. And he may be right. We do not know. This is all the future that we are dealing with.

But I am given the opportunity as a Congressman to express my feelings and to cast my vote; and I, frankly, feel uncomfortable. Unilateralism scares me. We have not shown a lot of patience. Our goal as a Nation is to bring people together, not divide them. This is not going to be a cakewalk. People fighting for their own country first, just differently. And what about the dire Arab-Israeli or Palestinian-Israeli situation?

I think we have the cart before the horse. I think the U.N. ought to do its will first. Frankly, I feel that a right decision at the wrong time is a wrong decision; and somehow we must finish our war on terrorism before we take on another fight.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), a valued member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this resolution. I intend to support the resolution for three reasons.

First, I believe the President needs, as has been said by a number of speakers, the credible threat of force to maximize the chances of negotiating a peaceful settlement to disarm Saddam Hussein to the best of our National interest.

Secondly, I believe that we should at least attempt, if necessary, to use military force to back up an attempt to inspect and disarm. Obviously, Saddam Hussein has been very difficult to deal with in the past, and a more muscular form of inspection may be a further way to avoid a more broad military attack.

Finally, if Iraq fails to disarm and then, in fact, if it is clear that Iraq poses a likely risk of serious harm to this country, I believe we should be prepared to defend ourselves by the use of force as a last resort.

I think it is important to point out that this very difficult decision before we change the course of history, by the mismanagement of this issue by the Bush administration in the days leading up to this. Originally, the presentation by the White House was very much of a unilateralist tone and, as the previous speaker mentioned, many Americans, many Members of Congress have had difficulty recovering from that initial misstep. I am pleased that the resolution reflects a change in heart by the President to work with our allies in the United Nations.

Secondly, it was originally suggested to the Congress and the country that there was some additional information that made the risk of Iraq to the United States imminen. This also proved ultimately to be incorrect. There was no additional information of a heavily significant nature in terms of the level of risk that Saddam Hussein posed to this country, and I personally do not believe the case has been made that the threat is imminent.

I do believe that the case has been made that the threat is significant and, if we do nothing, it will grow; and that is one of the reasons why I support acting. But the case of regime change, based on any additional information and the allegation of the NSC, has not been made.

Finally, all of the tone coming out of the administration in the early days was force as a first resort, not as a last resort. That is not what has made this country great. It is our strength and our wisdom that has allowed us to succeed and enjoy the moral authority that we enjoy today. I am pleased that, as recently as last night, the President has changed his tone and is saying correctly that force should be used as a last resort, and the resolution reflects that as well.

But let me add, I think we can do better. It would be my intention to continue to pursue an amendment to the directive itself, or to what I offered in the Committee on International Relations. That amendment borrowed from the proposal of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, supported then by Senator HAGEL.

What that amendment provided for was that before the President would use force, in the event the United Nations was not successful in negotiating disarmament, that the President must make a determination and a declaration to Congress and the American people that the risk that Iraq posed to our country was so great as to justify the use of military force.

I believe that higher standard, that moderation, is what will help bring this Congress together to give the President the tools he needs to do his job and to demonstrate that what we are acting with is a combination of strength and wisdom.

Secondly, and most troubling of all, we should adopt an amendment that clarifies that the mission of the United States of America and our allies is to disarm Saddam Hussein, not to engage in the same change of history; and so the new resolution is currently written, it is far from clear, it is far from precise, that the Security Council resolutions that we are authorizing the President to enforce through force deal strictly with disarmament.

These two changes should be adopted to make the resolution stronger, more precise, and more clear. For that reason, I hope the House will take that amendment up later in the action.

Mr. BERGUTER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS), a valued member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. KERNS. Madam Speaker, we are faced today with an important decision regarding Iraq, a decision that we wish was not before us. But as a single-minded country, we cannot simply wish our responsibilities away. We are faced with a frightening proposition. However, I have concluded after
much prayer that the failure to act or the failure to support our President is even more frightening.

Saddam is a cancer to society. I think most of us have lost someone dear to cancer. I have loved ones that are battling cancer today, a father in Indiana and a mother-in-law in Baltimore. Would we tell them or advise them to ignore their spread of cancer because it is too costly to fight, because the treatment is too unpleasant, because the treatment will upset our day-to-day lives, or because the treatment might not work, or perhaps they could lose their life in the fight? I think not.

As is true with cancer, it is true with Saddam Hussein and the regime in Iraq: it is a cancer that is spreading, and is spreading at an alarming rate. While it is true that we may be able to survive the day, we know ultimately what he will do: Saddam will kill. He will kill anyone in his way; and make no mistake, he will kill Americans, he will kill anyone in his way; and make no mistake, he will kill Americans, he will kill our children, and he will kill our grandchildren.

Today, Madam Speaker, my fellow Members have quoted great Americans. I would like to share the words of an American, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYNDE), who said shortly after the attacks of September 11, "I hope someone is thinking about the enemy we face today, that they do not think that they are dying when they fly airplanes into buildings, they think they are going to meet their God."

Well, someone has been thinking about the type of enemy we face today, and that someone is President Bush. He has courageously led the world in its fight against terrorism. He has brought the world community together. Perhaps never in history has the world community been so united in its determination to combat terrorism and the attacks that the world has seen. I ask my colleagues to support the President. Let the rest of the world know that the Congress stands with this President and the American people will not tolerate the slaughter of innocent people anyw

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), a great addition to the Committee on International Relations with his extensive background in national security.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

In the landmark case of Schenck versus The United States, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes ruled that freedom of speech should not be abridged, even in wartime, unless the circumstances are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger to the United States.

That doctrine, I suggest, offers an appropriate standard for any preemptive unilateral action. It creates a burden of proof that was best articulated by a patriot from New England who served as Secretary of State in 1837, Daniel Webster. He stated that the need for self-defense must be "instant, overwhelming, and leaving no chance of means and no moment for deliberation."

I would add that the quantum of evidence necessary must be compelling and convincing; not the higher criminal standard of beyond a reasonable doubt, but at least compelling and convincing, because of the obvious magnitude of the consequences that are implicated here.

The resolution before us permits the President to take us into war without satisfying either of these requirements. In terms of the clear and present danger test, only last Friday the CIA stated publicly that without material from abroad, Iraq probably would not be able to make a weapon until the last half of the decade; and further, the evidence needed to support the proposition that Iraq was a present danger is not compelling and convincing, but rather, murky and speculative.

I was particularly disturbed to learn that a national defense intelligence estimate had not even been done before the resolution, that the only preemptive military action had become administration policy. It is as if a policy had been crafted and there was no need for a factual basis based on our own historical precedents, the evidence, and the rule of law; a conclusion in search of facts, if you will.

Now, the factual basis for congressional authorization is incorporated in the preamble of the resolution before us, but the allegations that are recited therein could be made about a number of countries, such as Iran and North Korea, the other original members of the "axis of evil" club, both of whom are further along in the development and capacity to deliver a nuclear device, and possess biological and chemical weapons. Our own intelligence for years has claimed that North Korea has enough plutonium for several nuclear bombs. So why the focus on Iraq?

It is asserted that Saddam has used chemical weapons and thereby demonstrated the necessary intention. Well, in fact, we do know of at least 10 occasions in the 1980s that he used chemical weapons during the war with Iran because we supported him; yet we took him off the terrorist list, opened an embassy in Baghdad, shared intelligence with the Iraqi military, and provided billions of dollars in agricultural credits.

But since the last incident occurred in 1988, I would submit that that evidence is stale and fails the clear and present danger test. What is not mentioned is that he did not subsequently use weapons of mass destruction during the Gulf War because he was told that our response would be devastating.

Yes, he is despicable and truly evil, but he is not stupid. He can be deterred. He is not an al Qaeda fanatic seeking martyrdom. That is not Saddam Hussein. Rather, he is a survivor; and his only concern is maintaining power.

Now, the President in his remarks last night mentioned links between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, but that conflicts with reports that both the FBI and the CIA have failed to corroborate any relationship between Saddam and al Qaeda with credible evidence.

The President further noted that some al Qaeda leaders fled Afghanistan when the United States went to Iraq; and that is true, but they are in northern Iraq. They are in northern Iraq, protected by Iraqi Kurds who are opposed to Saddam. It is difficult to imagine such an alliance because they are natural enemies.

One of the goals of al Qaeda is the destruction of secular Muslim regimes such as Iraq because they believe they have corrupted Islam. Remember, Iraq did not recognize the Taliban, unlike our allies, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

Like all Members, I fervently hope that if this resolution passes, and I am sure it will, a preemptive military offensive will not be necessary; but sadly, this is not just about Iraq, because if we do this, we will have done goes far beyond the instant moment. It will have established, I fear, a precedent that will be used by other nations who have aggressive intentions against their neighbors and others that all they will need is stale evidence, historical sins, and ill-defined allegations that can serve as the basis for unilateral preemptive military action.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I urge defeat of the resolution.
As President Bush stated in his speech last night, the attacks of September 11 showed our country that vast oceans no longer protect us from danger. We see a threat whose outlines are far more clearly defined and whose consequences could be far more deadly. Saddam Hussein’s actions have put us on notice, and there is no refuge from our responsibilities. We cannot sit idle, Madam Speaker, while Saddam Hussein empowers people with fanatic ideas, with weapons of mass destruction, with dictators and terrorists and against our American values of freedom and democracy.

Through the course of my briefings with the National Security Adviser, the Director of the CIA, the President, others, I have become convinced that Iraq poses an immediate threat to the United States. We must not lose time. The safety and the security and prosperity of our Nation, as well as that of the world, hinge on confronting the immediate threat Iraq poses to its neighbors, as well as to the international community.

The President will not send America’s sons and daughters to war with- out serious study and deliberation; and I agree with him that war should always be the final option. But I will not shirk from my responsibility to protect the American people against this tyrant if all other means have failed.

I support this resolution that grants the President the authority to continue the war on terrorism in eradicating future acts of terrorism.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, after much study, reflection and prayer, I rise in support of the resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. While I am certain that little of what we say here will be long remembered, I am also confident that this is a time of consequence and judgment for this Congress.

We will be subject to the judgment of the American people and of the world. Time will judge us. History will judge us. And each of us will also answer to the world that we created and sustains this very Earth we inhabit.

And when that judgment is rendered what of the verdict, Madam Speaker? I grieve at the very thought of the United States in armed conflict, and I cannot escape the thought of the American families that may be called upon to send their loved ones into harm’s way on our behalf.

It is a terrible burden, yet one from which we dare not shrink or retreat. For it is not just peace or liberty that we say here will be long remembered, I agree with him that war should always be the final option. But I will not shirk from my responsibility to protect the American people against this tyrant if all other means have failed.
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the last decade, for that matter. I am pleased that the administration and Congress has come together in a bipartisan fashion to draft a balanced resolution. I think this bipartisan approach is evident in several changes contained within the resolution, issues like compliance with the War Powers Resolution. We have worked to make the language more clearly define the length and scope of any conflict with Iraq, affirmation to Congress that all diplomatic avenues have been exhausted prior to using military force.

I also believe that these changes strengthen the lines of communication between the President and Congress on this most important issue. Unity is critical if our Nation is going to move against any enemy. The United States is prepared to fight for the safety of our Nation, regardless of whether our allies choose to stand with us. It is our job to protect our people, not the U.N.'s. The time for diplomacy is short, and the only acceptable solution we should seek from Baghdad is that U.N. inspectors will have complete and unannounced access to anything they want to see. That includes the presidential palaces that constitute hundreds of buildings that are guarded like Fort Knox.

America will not tolerate a weapons shell game played by the Iraqi military designed to foil international weapons inspectors. Saddam needs to play by the rules or suffer the consequences. And to those who say that this is not a solemn occasion to speak in support of the joint resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. The choice before us is clear, and Saddam Hussein is prepared to fight for the safety of his people. Americans should feel the pain they have inflicted on other peoples of the world.

The decision before this Congress could not be any more serious, but it also could not be much clearer. We are not seeking war. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm. We are not seeking a war of attrition. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm. We are not seeking a war of conquest. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm.

The danger from Saddam Hussein's arsenal is far clearer than anything we could have seen prior to September 11. History will judge harshly any of us who fail to take action to deal with this problem right here, right now. Let our country boldly move forward, not to devastate and to concur, but to reestablish the reign of peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes to authorize the military force against Iraq.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today on this solemn occasion to speak in support of the joint resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq. The choice before us is clear, and Saddam Hussein is prepared to fight for the safety of his people. Americans should feel the pain they have inflicted on other peoples of the world.

The decision before this Congress could not be any more serious, but it also could not be much clearer. We are not seeking war. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm. We are not seeking a war of attrition. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm. We are not seeking a war of conquest. We are seeking Saddam Hussein to disarm.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this issue at length. It is the only course for us to follow. Why should we wait any longer? We owe it to our children and to future generations to act now to deal with this problem right here, right now. Let our country boldly move forward, not to devastate and to concur, but to reestablish the reign of peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes to authorize the military force against Iraq.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a leader in the Democratic Caucus and a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

I commend the President for his vigilance efforts to protect the security of the United States. We should be united in our commitment to this cause. But there are legitimate differences about the best way to protect our Nation.

The President has failed to present clear and convincing evidence to Congress that unilateral military action against Iraq at this time is justified. We have seen over the last 10 years that Iraq is trying to amass chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. But we have seen no evidence of their success, and we have seen no evidence of a delivery system.

I would ask, given the evidence we have today, is this reason why we should vote for this resolution which essentially gives the President unfettered ability to go into Iraq with a first strike military attack in a unilateral fashion, potentially destabilizing the entire world order at this time? I say it does not.

Why are we discussing a war with Iraq right now? What has changed in the last 10 years to make the threat from Iraq imminent? So imminent, in fact, that Congress has got to rush to pass this resolution before we can let the weapons inspectors back in, before we can find any evidence of an imminent threat? What information have we recently obtained that has led the President to believe the war is absolutely necessary now?

Many of us in Congress felt that it was essential that the President come to Congress for action before he attacked another country unilaterally, and we were pleased when he did come to Congress; but if he is going to come to Congress and ask us to pass this type of resolution, he has to give us the information on which we can base our vote, and to date, I have not, and many Members of Congress, no one I know, has been given information by the administration that Iraq indeed poses an imminent threat to the United States. We must have that information before we can pass a resolution like this, especially since the U.N. Security Council is working hard to send weapons inspectors back in and to have international cooperation in dealing with Iraq and in dealing with Saddam Hussein.

International cooperation and the support of the United States people are what will make any action against Iraq successful, just as we had success in our initial action in Afghanistan. I might add, I have had myself now over 3,000 phone calls and letters from my constituents and congressional office, and we have supported this type of uninforming unilateral action. This is not the support of the United States people.

Some of my colleagues have made the comparison to what we face the same challenge with Saddam Hussein that our predecessors did with Adolph Hitler in 1936; but Iraq is not Nazi Germany, as evil as they are. We have been given no evidence that the Iraqi military has grown stronger in the 10 years since the Gulf War. The only evidence that Iraq intends to cross its borders into Turkey, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia or Iran, as it did in 1991 when the
U.S. did intervene; and we have been
given no evidence that Iraq is close to
possessing nuclear weapons, merely
that it would like to.

If the President has acquired intel-
ligence that answers these questions,
he must present it to Congress today, let
us know because today he is asking
Congress to authorize unilateral action
against Iraq. This is a not a debate
about appeasement versus action. We
must not and cannot to appease someone
like Saddam Hussein; but
what it is a question of acting alone
or at most with one ally versus build-
ing a global coalition as we did 11
years ago to oppose Iraq’s aggression against
a peaceful neighbor. To triumph in this
effort we must do that again.

The United States is at a crossroads
in the war against terrorism. To this
point, we have shown the world the
threat posed by terrorists to our na-
tional security. Today, by passing this
resolution, Congress will built an
international coalition to
fight this threat, and together we
have led the coalition to rout terrorism
from its role in Afghanistan. This is
the path we must take, and that is why we
must pass this resolution.

Mr. BERÉUTER. Madam Speaker, it is
my distinct pleasure to yield 4 min-
utes to the distinguished gentleman
from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER),
who chairs the House Committee on the
Judiciary.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from
Nebraska for yielding me the time, and
I rise today in support of the resolution
calling for removal by Iraq and
authorizing the President to use force
to protect America from the threats
posed by Saddam Hussein.

It has often been said that those who
do not remember history are con-
demned to repeat it. Today, by passing
this resolution, we are showing that we
have learned the lessons of World War
II and September 11 and that we are
committed ourselves to ensuring that
those horrors are not repeated.

After the international community
came together to form the
League of Nations in order to resolve
international conflicts without war.
Stiff requirements were placed on Ger-
many to ensure that it could no longer
pose a threat to its neighbors; but
when Adolph Hitler came to power and
began testing the world’s resolve, he
was only met with appeasement, allow-
ing Hitler to build his military and his
terrorism.

The appeasers of the 1930s were con-
tent to receive paper agreements for
peace and stability from the German
dictator, and when those agreements
were shredded by Hitler’s words and his
actions, the international community
refused to enforce its own agreements.
Only when Hitler brutally invaded Po-
land and launched World War II, did
the world finally realize his true inten-
tions and take stock of the enormity of
the failure of appeasement; and to de-
feat him, 30 million people died.

After the failures that led to World
War II, the United Nations was formed
in an attempt to fulfill the worthy am-

defining the League of Nations.

Today, the U.N. is facing a stern test of
its resolve by another dictator.

The U.N. has placed stiff mandates
on an Iraqi dictator who has shown a
thirst for more territory, more power, and
more deadly weaponry, no matter how
horrible. Just as in the past, today’s
dictator has violated agreement after
agreement, 16 U.N. resolutions by my
count.

Now, by passing this resolution, Con-
gress is showing that we have learned
the lessons of history. We will enforce
our international agreements, and we
will not allow rogue dictators to bring
about the deaths of thousands or mil-

ions of Americans and others by our
inaction.

I commend the President for recog-
nizing the need for this resolution. By
passing this resolution, Congress will
voice to counter the threat posed by
Iraq. Further, we will send a message
to the United Nations that failure to
enforce its international agreements
will only lead it down a path of irrele-

vanence. The League of Nations went
down over 60 years ago.

This is not a resolution that must
lead to war. It rightly calls first for
dismantling through diplomacy and
inspections. These efforts alone
could bring more security to the world
and could prevent conflict if Saddam Hus-
sein cooperates fully with the demands
laid out before him by the Congress,
the President, and the United Nations;
but if disarmaments through diplo-
macy and inspections fails, and it can
only fail at Saddam Hussein’s own
choosing, this resolution shows that
Congress and America have the resolve
to protect the U.S. and its friends in freedom
from the dangers of tyrants.

I urge my colleagues to support the
resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the dis-
tinguished gentleman from New York
(Mr. ENGEL), a valued member of the
Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank
my friend from California, whose wis-
dom gets greater with each passing
day, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, there is no jumping
for joy in this debate. This is a very
solemn moment. Each Member of Con-
gress has to do a lot of personal soul
searching. He has no finger pointing, no questioning of patriotism.
This is the American way of life, the
American Congress at our best, democ-
racy where everyone can speak. This
makes me so proud to be an American
and so proud to be a Member of the
United States Congress.

Madam Speaker, for me, I will sup-
port this resolution, even though I
must say there are some unanswered
legitimate questions. I think it is best
to speak about some of those questions
up front.

There are serious questions about the
timing of this. Why is this the absolute
right time to do it? Why not 3 months
ago? Why not 3 months from now? Why
not 6 months from now? I think that is
a very legitimate question, and I am
not totally satisfied with the answers.

Secondly, I do not think there has
been enough thought on what hap-
pens after we get into Iraq. We have to
stay the course. We cannot pick up
and run. We have to make sure that democ-
racy sets root in that country.

Thirdly, there is a question about our
work against terrorism; and to de-

feat terrorism, we must work with
nations that support terrorism. For me,
Iran and Syria have supported ter-
rorism and terrorists like Hezbollah
and Hamas far greater than Iraq. They
support terrorism against us. They
support terrorism against our ally
Israel; and very little has been done to
confront Syria and Iran, and I hope the
looking at Iraq does not turn us away
from other nations that support the
evil of terrorism.

I think for me, Madam Speaker, what
is most important and the bottom line
for me is that as a New Yorker and as
an American, after September 11, the
equation changed.

I was in New York when the World
Trade Center went down. Three thou-
sand lives were lost by any of
my own constituents. The Cold War
arguments of deterrence and contain-
ment I do not think apply anymore.

In this era of terrorism, the U.S. has
to be proactive. What threat is evil
around the world, and the evil threatens
our country, and the evil threatens
innocent people, we have to act. We did
so in Kosovo. We did so in Kuwait back in
1991. We did so in Bosnia. We should have
done so in Rwanda where a mil-
lion innocent lives were lost. I am not
willing to let that happen again.

I have no apologies when the U.S.
does what is in our national interests
to save our people and to save innocent
lives, but we have to try to work with
many nations. We have to work with
U.N. resolutions. We have to work with others.

Madam Speaker, back in 1991 with
the invasion of Kuwait, we knew then
that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant, a
menace to his people, a menace to our
people, and a menace to the world.
I said in 1991 that we should have re-
moved him then, and I am consistent.
He has weapons of mass destruction.
He flaunts U.N. resolutions. He sup-
ports destruction of oil. He has
played a shell game for years with
weapons inspectors. We cannot allow
this to continue.

In the Committee on International
Relations, I voted yes on this resolu-
tion because it is an improvement from
the original resolution that was sent
down by the White House. This resolu-
tion does not give a blank check. This
resolution limits the scope. This reso-

lution is no Gulf of Tonkin resolution.
This resolution strikes the right bal-

ance.

I am willing to look at some of the
amendments. I am willing to listen to
what our colleagues have to say; but in
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terms of this Congress, in terms of final passage, we need to stand together as a Nation. I believe it would be a monumental mistake not to support the President on this.

The arguments against this resolution are similar arguments that were made during Operation Desert Storm in 1991. Time has shown that those arguments were wrong, and backing down now would allow Saddam Hussein and others who wish us ill to conclude that they can simply violate U.N. Security Council resolutions, kill their own people, threaten their neighbors and the world, become a danger to the United States and our way of life while we simply stand idly by. This cannot stand.

Years later, when my children ask me what did I do when confronted with evil, I want to be able to say to them that we rose to the task and did not let tyrants and terrorists threaten our way of life, I urge my colleagues to vote to keep our people out in the desert without the ability to go on the offensive and, thus, it would have destroyed our ability to win that conflict. What would it have been like if they had been stuck out there and able to just absorb attacks? That is what the majority of people on the other side of the aisle voted for, and their entire leadership voted for that. It was wrong. It was wrong and almost did a major disservice to our country.

Let me note what also did a major disservice to our country. We moved forward, a Republican president decided not to finish the job. A Republican president, once we had achieved victory, stepped back from that victory; and now we are stuck with fin- 
ishing the job today. Now we are stuck with an enemy that could get his hands on nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons, and murder millions of our own people because that dictator now has a blood grudge against the United States of America.

It is long past the time that we should have finished the job. But it was not until 9/11 that the American public would support the military commitment necessary to rid the people of Iraq and to rid the United States of this monstrous threat to both our peoples.

This is not just a dictator. There are many dictators in the world. This is a dictator who holds a blood grudge against us, who has now the ability, or he is trying to achieve the ability, to obtain those weapons that would permit him to murder millions of Americans. This is not just any dictator. This is a dictator with billions of dollars of oil wealth that he is using to obtain these weapons of mass destruction.

Over the last few weeks, we have witnessed what I consider to be unconstructive nitpicking on our behalf. I believe it was the Bush administration that was told to go to the U.N.; and that is where he went. Then he was told he should go to Congress. So here we are. Now what we are hearing from the other side is, we cannot support this resolution because it will permit us to finish the job. The same sort of strike. What that means is we have to wait until we are attacked before we can act. That is what that means.

Do we really want to wait in this world to be attacked by the likes of Saddam Hussein once he gets his hands on weapons of mass destruction? In- stead of having 3,000 people, as on 9/11, we would have millions, or at least hundreds of thousands, of Americans slaughtered.

It makes no sense whatsoever. We must step forward today. If we back down today, we are sending a message of cowardice to the despots, to the tyrants and the terrorists around the world.

We must back up our President, who has gone the extra mile to reach the compromises with us, to make the democratic system work, and to make sure that the American people have the protection that they deserve.

We want to join with the people of Iraq, helping them liberate themselves from this problem. We should be supporting the President of the United States in this effort to protect us and to expand democracy.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Woolsey), a leader in the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a leader in progressive ideas.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, we are at a very important place in the history of our Nation and I believe a turning point for the future of our world.

The United States, as the world’s wealthiest economy, the superpower and leader, is faced with a decision that will truly mark who we are as Americans, as participants in the world community, and as human beings. Our choice is whether we use our power to make the future better or whether we repeat the mistakes of the past, like World War I or Vietnam, mistakes that do not work, do not solve the problem, do not make the world safer for our children.

I will vote against the President’s resolution because I do not believe we are making anyone safer if we alienate our allies or set a precedent that it is acceptable to preemptively attack other countries because we do not like their leader or because we think that country could be dangerous someday.

I will vote against the President’s resolution because we must not risk the lives of our sons and daughters or
the lives of Iraqi civilians when we have no evidence that our country is in imminent danger.

I will vote against the President's resolution because we should not spend our scarce tax dollars on war when money is so desperately needed here for education, prescription drugs, health care, Social Security, and Medicare.

Americans demand that we fix the economy. Workers want to know what has happened to their pensions. Families worry about their health care. Senators question whether they will ever be able to afford prescription drugs. Yet we stand here listening to those who are threatening war. We have no business voting on a resolution while there are so many unresolved issues on the table.

What happened to finding Osama bin Laden? What happened to rebuilding Afghanistan? What happened to helping create an Israeli-Palestinian peace?

My constituents want us to concentrate on Social Security and Medicare. They want us to pass an energy policy that will make us safer, more secure Nation; and they want us to prosecute corporate criminals and prevent corporate crime.

I believe, as my constituents do, that we need to work through the United Nations to remove weapons of mass destruction, working multilaterally to address the lack of cooperation or aggression that would put the United States or our allies in imminent danger. I would make certain that the energy policy of the United States will become independent from fossil fuels, especially foreign oil.

Finally, Madam Speaker, realizing how small our world has become, with communications and transportation bringing us together as one big neighborhood, I would invest what this war will cost, $100 to $200 billion, in the human infrastructure needs in our country and in other nations around the globe. Because in a neighborhood we are only as well off as the least of us, it is time in our history to invest in humanity, not destruction. It is time to protect the earth's environment, the resources we have been given. And it is time to make a safe and peaceful world for our children, all children around the world, now and forever.

To that end, I will vote against this resolution and any resolution that I believe will not make the world a safer and better place.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of his position because there is nothing more frightening and the prospect of Saddam Hussein or any terrorist using poison gas, germs, or radiation bombs against innocent people in freedom-loving nations.

The stark reality is that Saddam Hussein has committed these horrific acts before, and he may do so again without warning.

Such a catastrophe or the threat of such terror against humanity is what the President referred to his own words is "a permanent condition with no nation being immune." We may need to act against Iraq now to prevent such a nightmare and lessen the potential for another attack on our fellow Americans here at home.

Madam Speaker, there is no more important task before this Congress and our President than the responsibility to help defend America and protect our citizens. This is our charge to keep.

Nothing else we do here matters unless our children and future generations are assured of a safe, secure Nation where there is freedom and justice and where we can be free of fear. As our President has said, "We refuse to live in fear."

The time for the passage of this historic resolution, we are a Nation at war, engaged in a global battle to rid the world of terrorism. This is a critical fight and one we are resolved to win. But as your young men and women go off to make us proud, serving in the war against terrorism, our President has asked our Nation and this House to consider very seriously the prospect of war with Iraq, part of the terrorist network.

Our President's request is not taken lightly. It is serious. There is no more solemn duty given to a Member of Congress than considering the President's request for authority to send our troops to war, if he eventually decides to do so.

As a veteran, I am keenly aware that wars are fought by the young. Indeed, we have called upon our young men and women in uniform to wage and win the war against terrorism. And if we go to war with Iraq, we may not, in the future, and freedom will rest again on their shoulders.

After September 11, we were a changed Nation. We have grieved together. We have also risen together to meet the many challenges our Nation has faced and will continue to face. As a country that loves freedom, we have been reminded that liberty, our way of life, and those we love must be protected, because they can be so easily taken away.

As Americans, we have renewed our historical obligation to fight to protect our citizens and our American values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These values are endangered by Saddam Hussein. In Saddam Hussein, our Nation faces another grave challenge. He is armed and very dangerous; and, like other terrorists, his regime is a threat to our everyday existence. We cannot trust him, and it is this distrust that may compel us to act. We must do everything we can to do this, and our children do not grow up in a Nation and in a world that fears his weapons of mass destruction.

Iraq persists in violating United Nations resolutions on almost a daily basis. Saddam Hussein, as the world knows well, is a barbarian who has used nerve gas against tens of thousands of his own people, innocent men, women, and children; and we have seen the pictures, as horrible as they are. He has waged war against his neighbors, launched missiles at countries in the region, and has given safe harbor to terrorists.

Madam Speaker, to my colleagues and to those I represent, there are some cold, hard facts about Iraq, its capabilities, and its deception:

In recent years, Baghdad has diverted some of the $100 billion worth of humanitarian goods contracted under the Oil for Food program for military use and has actively sought materials and ingredients that are going towards the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, two summers ago before deciding whether to run for Congress, I sat down with my two daughters. They were, at the time, 13 and 10. They asked how much time I would spend in Washington and how frequently I would be away from Long Island.

I said Congress usually meets on Tuesdays through Thursdays, Members spend plenty of time back home, and we adjourn in October. And then in that tranquil summer I said, unless there is a war, and that is not going to happen.

That summer we made the decision I should run for Congress. The people of New York's Second District sent me here; and in the 22 months I have served those people, we have been required as a Congress to vote on two resolutions to send young Americans into battle. Today on the verge of our second vote authorizing the war, I think of my two daughters and all of the children of my congressional district; and it is for them and for their future that I will support the resolution in the fervent hope that the diplomatic efforts required by the resolution will be effective and that war is not inevitable.

I have relied on the diverse views of those I represent, as well as exhaustive information I received in classified briefings and public hearings, published reports, in-depth discussions. I have spoken with analysts as diverse as President Bush's National Security Adviser and President Clinton's National Security Adviser. I have talked with colleagues who support the use of force now and with colleagues who oppose any force ever.

I have read several books and journals on the subject, including a book...
by the former head of Saddam Hussein's crusade to build nuclear weapons. Last week I joined with just 10 of my colleagues in the Cabinet Room of the White House with the President and Vice President. This week I am meeting again with Secretary Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense, and hundreds of my constituents at supermarkets, in churches and synagogues; and, in fact, just before flying to Washington yesterday, I met with a group of clergy representing religious institutions throughout the nation.

We have all weighed the risks and the benefits and the provocations. The United States since the 1970s has pursued a policy of containment and deterrence towards Saddam Hussein. This policy failed to prevent him from attacking the Kurds in 1974, Iran in 1980, and Kuwait in 1990. He has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people and his neighbors viciously, brutally, and repeatedly.

In 1990 Saddam Hussein threw U.N. weapons inspectors out of Iraq. Since then he has accelerated the development of weapons of mass destruction in unchecked secrecy. He has developed short-range ballistic missiles; he is working on long-range and more efficient delivery systems. In 1990, he constructed a nuclear device, but did not have the fissile material to arm it.

Saddam Hussein has demonstrated a deluded determination. He has the fissile material to arm it; he has developed weapons; tomorrow he will have more. Saddam Hussein's forces are weak; tomorrow they will be stronger. Saddam Hussein has no nuclear capability; tomorrow he will. Today the risk to our troops is serious; tomorrow it will grow worse. Why wait until tomorrow?

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I understand the concerns that have been raised about the United States taking action against the Iraqi regime; but I believe that the President, as Commander in Chief, should have the flexibility he seeks in responding to the very real threat that Saddam Hussein poses to freedom and security today.

We witnessed the vulnerability of America on September 11, 2001, when hijacked jetliners were used as weapons of destruction in New York City, and even close to this Capitol just across the Potomac River at the Pentagon. The families of several dozen people who live in my congressional district gave their lives that day knowing all too well the evil of terrorism.

The devestation of 9-11 must never again be allowed to come to our shore. We must take all appropriate action to stop terrorism and tyrants who would do harm to America and allies. That action includes enforcing the more than a dozen resolutions of the United Nations which calls for the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction.

America also saw the face of terrorism in 1998 when two American embassies in east Africa were bombed by terrorists linked to Osama bin Laden, killing 12 Americans among the 230 who died. Because of my concern at that time about the emerging threat to our country, I authored the legislation to create the National Commission on Terrorism. Quite frankly, it was hard to get the Congress interested at that time, but we were successful in establishing a bipartisan commission to assess the terrorist threat and recommended a response in June 2000.

The Bremer Commission said: "U.S. policies must firmly target all states that support terrorists." The State Department clearly lists Iraq as a state sponsor of terrorism. Evidence shows, articulated, we will be debates today, that Saddam Hussein's dictatorship has provided headquarters, operating bases, training camps, and other support to terrorist groups.

The President has made the case to the American people, to the Congress, to the United Nations, and to our allies that Saddam Hussein poses a clear, lethal threat to our Nation and the world. He has failed to live up time after time to U.N. resolutions. Saddam Hussein has used chemical and biological weapons in his own country, on his own people. Evidence shows he has tried for years to develop nuclear weapons; and if he gets a nuclear bomb, I believe he may use it on America or our Armed Forces somewhere around the globe.

It is critical that Congress come together united now behind the President to approve this resolution before us today to give the President authority to enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq and obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion, noncompliance, and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions.

America is a peace-loving Nation, and we have never sought war. We never seek the use of force; but when we are attacked or our security is threatened, we will take action in the Nation's best interests. Our Nation was attacked on September 11, 2001; 3,000 people were killed. We acted swiftly to declare war on terrorism. We are in a long and difficult battle.

As the President has declared, the war on terrorism includes not only the terrorists who attack us, but also the nations that harbor or give aid. We must work to exhaust all peaceful options to enforce the will of the United States in democracies, but if those peaceful means fail to accomplish that goal, America must stand up for freedom and security, as history has witnessed our great Nation doing in past causes to fight evil, and forcefully remove Saddam Hussein and the threat he brings.

This is a difficult challenge before us. The fight for peace and freedom is never easy, but we must respond to this call for action. The challenge before our President, the Commander in Chief, and before this Congress and the representatives of the United States is sobering. To cast a vote to send America's troops into harm's way to face
Madam Speaker, today our Nation stands at a crossroads. I noticed that it is quieter today, it is a solemn day, it is a serious day as Members of Congress individually try to make the right decision and hope and pray that we do.

Are we to move ahead protecting America and free people by authorizing that use of military force in Iraq, accepting the very grave danger that we know will come with that decision, knowing that there are many, many questions that we have in Congress that go unanswered and, frankly, cannot be answered in many cases except in the future? Or are we to wait on the U.N. Security Council to decide for us? Are we to allow the Security Council to determine what is the appropriate course of action for Americans and when that action should be taken? All the while waiting for these answers, many of which cannot be answered, while Saddam Hussein plots and plans or even strikes us with a terrorist armed with chemical or biological or nuclear weapons.

The question is not whether he has nuclear weapons. He has weapons now of mass destruction that can be put into this country at any time. It seems to me the greater of the two dangers is for us to wait and wait until Saddam Hussein strikes. And make no mistake about it, if given the opportunity, and it will be there, he will strike.

When this madman has carried out his mission in New York City is gone, not just the towers but the city, or Atlanta, Georgia, is gone or Washington, D.C., is gone, what then, Madam Speaker, will we debate? What will the sleeping tiger do then? The possible answers to that are extremely frightening.

For the past 11 years, the U.N. has basically been a paper tiger. The Security Council resolutions that we put in place to protect the world from Saddam Hussein and his regime have gone from being resolutions to suggestions to really a very bad joke. Today we see where the U.N.'s policy of turning a blind eye has gotten us. None of us know if France or China will give us permission to protect ourselves or if the U.N. will ultimately join us.

I do not know for sure. It is the Congress and the President's responsibility to protect our country. It is not the responsibility of the U.N. or any other nation. It is our job. I do believe the President is to be commended for working with the U.N. Security Council and certainly should continue to do so, and we should welcome their help if it is offered. Should the U.N. disagree with the President on the correct course of action or if they stall to the point that our national security is put in even greater peril, our President needs the authority to make the best decision for our Nation and ensure our safety.

With all due respect, the President is the leader of the Nation, Commander-in-Chief. I, for one, trust his judgment and his decisions on my behalf and everyone else in my district, but not necessarily so for the U.N.

Madam Speaker, I believe time is of the essence. Every Member of Congress should support this authorization for the President to protect our borders and provide our national security in dealing with Saddam Hussein.

In the wake of last year's dastardly terrorist attack on September 11, many have asked this body and in this town, could it have been prevented? Today, Madam Speaker, this Congress has an opportunity, I believe, to do the right thing, to ensure that another equally criminal and reprehensible attack against humanity is not carried out and to rid the world of this madman.

Our President, this Congress, must now be prepared to say in a loud and a united voice we will protect our country with whatever military force is necessary. Without this united voice, there will be no diplomatic solutions. There will be only, for sure, war.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WEXLER), my good friend and distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, now is the moment which Congress must defend freedom from this brutal dictator and rid the world of his increasingly devastating threat.

Our decision will not be easy or without consequence. It will pose severe implications for the stability of the world, the security of the Middle East and, ultimately, the future of the United States. It will alter the course of history, change the lives of millions, and resonate in the collective memory of America for generations to come.

This is why this country must not contempate this issue with great deliberation, taking into account the concerns of my constituents in South Florida, many of whom fought in World War II and Korea, who have, time and again, expressed their profound reservation concerning the President's rush to engage in military action in Iraq.

I will vote for this resolution because it has become painstakingly clear that Saddam Hussein represents the epicenter of hostility and conflict throughout the entire Middle East. His very presence threatens to undermine America's war against terror and compromise all prospects for regional security, stability, and peace. There is no doubt in my mind that it is long past time for Saddam to go.

I will vote for this resolution, not because I support the irresponsible manner and timing in which President Bush has proceeded with his plans for war, not because I support the President's attempt to handcuff Congress into granting a blank check for unilateral military action, and not because I
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accept the President’s shameful neglect of our spiraling economic crisis and other domestic issues of imminent concern. Homeland security and foreign policy threats must be addressed in conjunction with, not instead of, America’s economic and social needs.

I will vote for the resolution because I believe, without a doubt, that the threats posed by the current Iraqi regime supersede politics and that America and our allies would be undeniably safer without Saddam Hussein.

Similarly, the threats posed by Saddam Hussein have not dissipated. They have only increased, making it all the more clear that former President Bush should have ousted him when we had the chance in 1991. Since then, Saddam has cultivated his contempt for the international community, his hostility towards the United States, his intent to develop weapons of mass destruction, and his unbridled willingness to use them.

While I agree that we must disarm Iraq and oust Saddam Hussein, I share the deep misgivings of the American people that President Bush appears all too ready to accept the military, financial, and strategic burden of going it alone. Unilateralism is a grave mistake, and President Bush must make every attempt to build support in the international community for regime change in Iraq.

We must ensure that the U.N. and the international community a credible chance to fulfill the demands laid out by President Bush. This would place America and the world in the strongest possible position to disarm Iraq, oust Saddam Hussein, and liberate the Iraqi people from tyranny and oppression.

Ultimately, we will best achieve our goals in Iraq not through alienation and unilateral aggression but, rather, through determined diplomacy and partnerships that shall ensure our vision of stability and peace. This has been America’s legacy, and we owe it to future generations to proceed along this path.

Mr. President, you will get your resolution and with my support, but I implore you to exhaust all options and reserve war as the very last resort.

Mr. President, my constituents are terrified that you are leading America into war with unnecessary impulse and haste. I trust you will prove them wrong.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair and not to the President of the United States.

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

I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114, which would authorize the use of military force against Iraq.

Since August, the intense national debate that has developed in Congress, in the American public, and internationally about whether the United States should use military force if necessary against the regime of Saddam Hussein, and to use such force preemptively, has served a very salutary, even necessary, purpose. Both as a former Army counterintelligence officer and a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, this Member hates security leaks. The massive leaking about sharp internal disagreements within the executive branch, especially the Pentagon, unfortunately preceded the necessary international consultation with at least key committees in Congress, and any concerted effort to inform the American public as to why military action may be required now and why an Iraqi regime change may be necessary.

It also seems clear that the discussions of U.S. military action to eliminate Saddam’s weapons of mass destruction, WMD, stocks and efforts for a regime change in Iraq had gotten ahead of the planning and decision-making for such possible action.

Many of this Member’s colleagues, in both Houses of Congress on a bipartisan basis, and this Member, along with a sufficient number of voices from the American public, helped make it clear to the Bush administration that a congressional resolution authorizing the use of force was an essential step before any preemptive military action against Iraq could be launched. Despite the President’s advisory opinion that a congressional resolution was not required, in a September 4 meeting with elected congressional leaders, President Bush advisedly agreed that his administration would first seek such a resolution. Thus, the House is here today embarked on this gravely important duty.

Another very positive result of the leaking and the resultant intense controversy over the issue of military action on Iraq was what likely will be the outcome of the international community’s furor about a potential unilateral and preemptive American strike against Iraq. That strenuous opposition is especially the case among our traditional European allies and the Arab states.

As was the case in the Gulf War, the administration sought international support for actions on Iraq through the United Nations as a result of President Bush’s speech to the U.N. General Assembly. Finally the international community has become serious about demanding the reintroduction of U.N. weapons inspectors in Iraq with the unfeathered access demanded to search out and destroy production in storage sites of chemical, biological, and possible nuclear weapons.

The U.S. is right to insist upon an unconditional time-certain demand for any new inspection regime to begin and to insist upon full compliance with unfettered access by U.N. inspectors. The American public and the international community now has this forceful proposition before it: Either an effective U.N. weapons inspection program resumes and continues in Iraq now or the U.S. has established more forcefully the legitimacy of military action for regime change with the reasonable expectation of a supportive international coalition for military action against Iraq and for the perhaps more difficult task of Iraq reformation in its aftermath.

Because of an intense public debate about the necessity of military action against Iraq and especially the involvement of Congress, the resolution the House has before it has evolved into a far more acceptable one and the legislative process has not yet been completed. The broad language extending the authorization for the military force to “secure peace and stability in the Middle East” has been narrowed to Iraq. The War Powers Act’s requirements with reporting requirements to Congress are now included in the resolution. A limited notification to Congress by the President about the intent to use the use of military force is now included in the measure. And importantly now included in the resolution is the requirement to report to Congress under Section 7 of Public Law No. 105-338 about the U.S. planning and actions to be conducted or undertaken by America in Iraq after the Saddam Hussein regime is removed from power.

In other words, according to that Act and that report, humanitarian assistance, democracy transition assistance, and methodology for Iraq to repay its debts are all elements explicitly required.

Before using military force, the President now under the procedures specified in H.J. Res. 114 must make available to Congress his determination about two things: that “reliance on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq and is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq,” and (B) that military action is consistent with the U.S. and international war against terrorism. These are among the important changes to a proposed congressional resolution that evolved to the one before us today.

Now, what is the case against Saddam Hussein? Especially important, what is it that justifies the preemptive use of military force?

This Member’s colleagues will recall, of course, that without provocation, Saddam attacked and occupied Kuwait with an attempt to annex it. Crucially, however, as the House considers preemptive force, it must be recognized that Saddam has used weapons of mass destruction, specifically chemical weapons, against the Kurdish population of his own country. Is there any legitimate doubt that he would be willing to use them again?
Unfortunately, I have no such doubts that he would indeed use weapons of mass destruction again.

There also is no legitimate reason to doubt that he has a significant stock of both chemical and biological weapons. The threat is a real and urgent one. We must be prepared. The evidence is clear, today, that Saddam Hussein's SCUD-warheads with traces of both such types of chemical and biological agents in 1991, and in this forum this Member can only say that Saddam Hussein has now developed further ways to deploy such chemical and biological agents against his enemies and our forces.

The evidence is clear today, obtained from numerous verifiable sources, that Saddam Hussein attempts to develop nuclear weapons, that he did so in the past and today again. Ongoing efforts by Saddam Hussein to acquire dual-use technology for use in a nuclear development program continue, and that is notwithstanding the controversy about the intended use of one such attempted acquisition.

Should anyone have any doubts that Saddam Hussein is attempting to procure plutonium to substantially shorten the time of developing nuclear weapons, I have no such doubts. Thus, WMD remains a great threat to a widening circling of Saddam's neighbors and our own forces and facilities in the area.

However, again, what is also crucial and urgent is whether after the terror strikes of 9-11, we have any doubt that he would provide such WMD chemical, biological, and perhaps nuclear, in the future to terrorist groups who would use them against our citizens and those of our allies. This Member does not doubt in the slightest, and it is a risk that the U.S. cannot accept.

In saying this, this Member does understand that the administration cannot yet present incontrovertible evidence of a link between al Qaeda and Saddam. There are, of course, reasons for strong suspicions about such links. "That's a given," says the Gentleman from New York (Mr. WEXLER) made reference to this question.

These questions are: number one, has the U.S. taken adequate steps to broaden the international coalition for not only the military operations, but especially for the more important and long-term vision of developing a democratic regime in Iraq that will not threaten the security and stability of the region? The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) made reference to this question.

Number two, has the administration prepared contingency plans to take into account that Saddam may use chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, directly or through anonymous terrorists, against other nations in the region before or during the conflict which may ensue, for example, to be used against Israel? Has the U.S. prepared for what could be a rather extraordinary Israeli response?

Number three, has the administration taken steps to understand and prepare for the international consequences of such military action against Iraq in the region and elsewhere in the world? Will U.S. action strengthen the influence of Iran in the region, even in Iraq? Will U.S. action weaken demands for an independent Kurdish state in Iraq, including areas in neighboring countries? Will a victory in Iraq unleash a Shi’a Muslim bloodbath against the Sunni Muslim population or a large part of the Iraqi population that was developing a democracy to have supported Saddam Hussein? Is the U.S. ready to control it? Certainly the Shi’a have suffered tremendous provocation for such retribution.

Number four, has the administration adequately considered the resources the U.S. will need in this Iraq war-peacekeeping scenario in order to successfully pursue the ongoing American war effort against al Qaeda and terrorism, including the far-from-finished military, peacekeeping and broad reconstruction requirements in Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, this list of questions is only the beginning. It could be much longer. The passage of H.J.Res. 114 today, momentous as it is, as necessary an action as it is, constitutes but the first step in many important duties the Congress must pursue in this arena. Congress must be ready and fully committed to a constructive, bipartisan effort with the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly encourages his colleagues to vote "aye" on H.J.Res. 114 and then to join in a constructive bipartisan effort to insist and assure that the executive branch has considered and proposed contingency plans and resources to meet the unexpected challenges and the unattended consequences of military action against Iraq, if necessary, if it is necessary, I emphasize, to use military force to eliminate the danger that Saddam Hussein poses to the countries in the region, to our allies, and to our citizens here at home and abroad.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the leader in our party and the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in over 32 years I have never seen an issue that has been more important to me and probably to many of you who have served here than to decide the question of putting our men and women in the Armed Forces in harm's way. It just would seem to me that there is no question that if anyone in the House or the other body thought that our Nation was in eminent danger, that we would have no doubts about taking a preemptive strike and destroying that force before they attempted to harm us.

The President of the United States has said to us that time is not on our side. Well, it may not be, but there are a lot of questions I would like to believe that our constituents will be asking us and that we should be getting answers on these questions before we give up our authority to declare war and turn it to the President of the United States to subjectively make a decision as to whether or not we are in danger.

We are not talking about a danger like 9-11. We are talking about a potential danger that is somewhere in the future. Whether it is 1 month or 1 year, something is clear, nobody has said that we are in danger before November 5. That date just comes up, not as frequently as 9-11 does.

But it seems to me as I have traveled around the world, one of the things that I have been so proud of in saying...
is that with all the problems we have in the United States of America, one thing is that we never start a fight with anybody; that we were always there talking about democracy and believing that when people and communities and nations have disputes, that we would try to talk about the bonds of law, of due process, of diplomacy. We felt so proud to set up the United Nations in such a way as to say that before we destroy each other, let us attempt to talk this out.

The President has reluctantly, but beautifully, gone to the United Nations and laid our case before the leaders of the nations of the world, and I have never felt more proud of being an American than to hear him prod them to do the right thing and to complain about the negligence in which they have not enforced the United Nations resolutions as relates to Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

But, strangely, it ends up with him saying, don’t do the right thing; if you don’t abide by international law, if you don’t respect the resolutions that you have enacted, then I will unilaterally go into these countries and justice will be done.

I don’t want to talk about the defense of the United States to be left to other countries. But if there is no imminent danger, but danger that is perceived, especially as the President has said, danger to the surrounding nations and the peace, then those that are within the direct threat of bio-chemical weapons, those that can be hit by the missiles, then I wonder why, when the President talks about coalitions, that he does not mention any of these countries?

Israel is in direct danger of a strike by Iraq if we invade, as well as Turkey, Iran and Saudi Arabia. Why at least, if not the European countries, why are these countries not saying let us go to the UN and we will tell you that this man is a demon and not just a threat to the United States of America, but a threat to everything that free countries believe in?

It just seems to me that we will never, never, never be in a position to chastise the governments of Pakistan and India, of North and South Korea, of Georgia and the Soviet Union, that we will never be able to tell them that they cannot take their subjective fears and strike against the other nation without our complaint to the United Nations, because we are the ones that have said that, yes, we will go to the United Nations, but we are not bound by the United Nations.

I think we should say that, but I think we should come back to the United States Congress and ask for permission, if that is necessary.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution on Iraq. I want to congratulate the leadership and Members of both sides of the aisle who worked hard to craft this bipartisan resolution.

I am certain that if left to our own devices, each of us would write this resolution differently than the one before us today. But while it may be that each of us would want perfectly, it goes a long way towards addressing the concerns raised by many in this body, and, more importantly, by many of our constituents.

It calls on the President to work with the international community in ending the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. But should diplomatic efforts fail, it authorizes the President to take military action to protect Americans from the threat posed by Iraq.

The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GERPARDT), put it best when he said this resolution means we should act diplomatically if we can, and militarily if we must. All of us hope military action will not be needed that we will abandon its strategy of delay and evasion and instead act responsibly.

But should diplomacy fail, we are making it clear that America will act decisively to remove the threat that Saddam Hussein and his regime poses not only to our citizens but to all freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), my good friend and our distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I speak the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last night in his address to the United States on the administration’s position, the President laid out his indictment of the Iraqi regime and particularly its leader, Saddam Hussein. In doing so, he answered a number of questions that Members of this body, as well as the American public, have raised regarding the administration’s policies.

While I will argue that I have few differences with the President on those issues with respect to the Iraqi regime’s efforts to produce weapons of mass destruction and its efforts against its own people, even the tenous, but troubling, allegations regarding its connections with al Qaeda, the President still did not answer a lot of questions and a lot of questions that have been raised on this floor. That is why I later on, Mr. Speaker, I accept the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

As poignantly as the President’s speech was with respect to his indictment of Iraq, it lacked crucial substance with respect to the means by which the United States can achieve the containment and dismantling of the regime and its threat to the region and, ultimately, our Nation. The President made limited reference to the need for a strong international coalition to rid the world of this menace.

Unlike the last war with Iraq, the present administration has given insufficient attention to building the broad coalition to achieve its all desire. I do not believe, nor do I believe most Members believe, that the United States must obtain permission from other nations of the world to ensure our own safety. Clearly, we possess the means of might. But, at the same time, our strength to defend ourselves and interests is bolstered by our ability to build coalitions with our friends, and undermining that ability will no doubt have costs.

We do not know whether or not acting unilaterally will undermine our efforts with Iraq, with the Middle East, with our interests throughout the world, and our own long-term security. But I am concerned about whether or not the ground that was so helpful in our last war with Iraq and has become the cornerstone of American policy. We run the risk of alienating our friends and foes alike, and I think that is a risk that this body should consider.

Unfortunately, this administration has built a record on eschewing alliances in favor of unilateral approaches to foreign policy, contrary to the scope of American foreign policy by Republican and Democratic administrations for the last 60 years; and it is one that I think is of grave consequence as we go further.

No question that we can address Iraq militarily, but what will be the cost in the long run? How long will we have to leave ground troops if we do not have a coalition going in with us?

I think the administration is on the right track with respect to the regime, but I am concerned about whether or not the United States will have to shoulder the full burden and what will be the security risk of leaving tens of thousands of American troops on the ground in Iraq? No one in the administration, no one in the other body knows how long it will take. And our recent experience in Afghanistan and in the Balkans tells us that it can take a long time before we can rebuild a nation.
but we can also do it to ensure that the United States has a long-term foreign policy that is in our best interests, that ensures that we have our allies throughout the world working to ensure that we protect our interests throughout the world as well as defending the honor of the United States.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that this administration too often seeks to ignore the attempts that all of these prior administrations have attempted to do in ensuring U.S. national security.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see where the resolution, which I agree that the bipartisan leadership crafted in bringing it closer to where we ought to be and having consultation with the Congress and trying to build a coalition, but I am afraid it still gives a blank check. I think the resolution by the gentleman from South Carolina still puts the U.S. firmly on record with respect to the regime but also does not protect those palatial riches that protected the historical precedents of American foreign policy and the defense of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. MOORE). (Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, Aflatoxin, a biological weapon that has mass battlefield use, is one of those things we should all be prepared for. I only recently read about, as it has become apparent that this weapon has been designed and put on missiles able to be delivered by Saddam Hussein, no battlefield use, no military advantage. Somebody has written it could keep a lieutenant from becoming a general, but otherwise has no effect on the battlefield that day. It is designed to end life in a slow and painful way.

The greatest target of aflatoxin are children, children who, many of whom, would eventually die from liver cancer if this particular weapon is used.

In so many ways it sums up Saddam Hussein. Other countries have developed weapons of mass destruction, but only one person in charge of a government today has ever used these weapons. He has used them against his own people. He has used them against a neighboring country. Saddam has stepped beyond the bounds of civilized nations, and, Mr. Speaker, I only recently read in the paper that the President will use the authority of this resolution after exhausting all reasonable alternatives.

For too long, Saddam Hussein has terrorized his own people. For too long, Saddam Hussein has encouraged international terrorism. For too long, Saddam Hussein has defied the international community. For too long, Saddam Hussein has ignored his agreements with other nations and with the United Nations.

The United States did not seek the decision we have before us today. It was forced on us by a discredited dictator and the cowardly forces of terrorism he encourages. Our leadership today will encourage the international community.

The United Nations was created specifically to deal with this type of situation, this kind of aberration among civilized nations. Hopefully, the United Nations will act. In any case, we must show our willingness to enforce the standards of civilized nations on this dictator. We will be joined by many immediately and others as we demonstrate our commitment to the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, a decision we all come to reluctantly but necessarily as we maintain and understand our position of leadership in the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote to authorize the President to use military force against Iraq, provided that we are part of an allied coalition under the authority of a new U.N. resolution. But if the President cannot obtain the support of our allies or pass the test of the Senate, then the congressional resolution must provide an opportunity for Congress to evaluate the situation at the time before deciding on unilateral action.

I would not vote for a nonbinding resolution that is an immediate blank check. Gulf of Tonkin, take-it-or-leave-it abdication of congressional responsibility that would not provide for that opportunity.

Saddam Hussein is a bad actor who must be dealt with. The issue is not whether Saddam will be dealt with, but how. The United States’ interests are best preserved over the long haul if we act in concert with our allies and with the approval of the United Nations. The United States Congress should know where it and our allies stand and how much of the effort and cost they will bear before we decide to proceed unilaterally.

The best way to unite this country and the world in this effort is to follow a careful, two-step process; and I am convinced that this is the wisest course to follow if we want to minimize regional instability and maintain the broadest possible international support for our struggle against terrorism.

It is more important that we do things right that than we do things fast, because the fight against terrorism is a long-term, not a one-week struggle, and we must think long term. With the long haul, we will not be able to conduct a successful war against terrorism without the sustained support of our allies.

Senator Vandenberg, the wise Republican foreign policy leader, once told Harry Truman that if presidents want the Congress to want what could be crash landings, they needed to be with him on the takeoffs. That is just as true for our allies as it is for the Congress. It takes a little longer, but it makes us stronger.

Despite the dangers involved in an initial attack on Iraq, the most serious consequences could well be those we face after Iraq is occupied, unless this Congress and the Secretary of State and the administration work in close consultation with the administration and the intelligence community, I believe much more work needs to be done to put together a plan that will avoid an anti-U.S. backlash in the Arab world, a backlash that could generate thousands of new recruits for Osama bin Laden, Hamas and other terrorist organizations.

We need an after-the-attack plan that demonstrates we are not just going after another Arab country and not just doing it for oil. Part of that plan should be an effort with our European and Middle Eastern allies to attack the poverty, anger, and ignorance that plague so many in a region in which a small elite displays almost obscene palatial riches.

If we are to deny bin Laden and other terrorists thousands of recruits because of our actions, we must show what we are for as well as what we are against in that part of the world.

One of the things we must be for is a resolution of the Palestinian problem. We must be ready to immediately demonstrate our determination to resolve that problem in order to make clear that our target is Saddam’s reckless terrorism and not the Arab world in general, and we need allies to make that believable. That is why I will vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would also hope that once this debate is over we will also give equal attention to the problems that we have in this country, problems of unemployment, problems of retirement insecurity, problems of deteriorating economy. We must have a strong economic base if we are to have the moral and political cohesion necessary to fight any war against terrorists or anyone else. I urge that this Congress give at least as much attention to those problems as it has given to the Iraq issue over the last month. That will truly produce the kind of balance that will be best for our country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). (Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, after about 20 meetings and briefings over the last couple of months, last Thursday the Committee on International Relations reported out this resolution, H.J. Res. 114, which would authorize the President to use force in Iraq, if necessary.

Before this came up in the Committee on International Relations, I had the opportunity to meet with CIA Director George Tenet and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice at the White House last Wednesday to get answers to some...
of my remaining questions. They related classified information about Saddam Hussein's buildup of chemical and biological and radiological and nuclear weapons, as well as the buildup of technology and equipment to deliver those weapons.

This information is very alarming. I suggested to the White House that they try to work at declassifying more of this information and make it available to the American people so that there would be a better understanding of the real threat that Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq is posing against the United States.

Mr. CROWLEY. As an old Air Force intelligence officer, let me suggest that it is my conclusion that Saddam Hussein represents the same terror that we experienced on September 11, a year ago.

We know that he has a buildup of these weapons of mass destruction. We know that he has shown a willingness to use these weapons against his own people up north in the Kurdish area. We know that he is a bully that, with the power, we know he is bloodthirsty, we know that he tried to take Kuwait to expand his power and influence as far as expanding his ability to export his products.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on International Relations to emphasize one important point, that was, that our quarrel was not with the Iraqi people. The Iraqi people had little to do with any of the decisions leading us into this conflict. The aggression and buildup of weapons has happened because the Iraqi Government was seized by Saddam Hussein, who has used Iraq's resources and the Iraqi people for his own delusional purposes. In fact, I believe the people of Iraq will be our allies against Saddam Hussein's regime, as the Afghan people were our allies against the Taliban.

In conclusion, let me recall what we were told by the Secretary of Defense that it was a last try; but years of U.N. weapons inspections leading us to believe that it is clear that his regime poses a severe threat to the Middle East, our allies in Israel, the United States of America, and to the entire world.

Many of my colleagues have called for weapons inspections to be given one last try; but years of U.N. weapons inspections and international monitoring have demonstrated that such efforts cannot work as long as the Iraqi regime remains determined to thwart them.

It is also clear that Saddam has no plans to end his support for terrorism. While the administration has not, in my mind, proven that Iraq has provided support to al Qaeda, Saddam has funded Palestinian terrorist attacks against innocent civilian Israelis, paying a sliding scale of benefits to the families of Palestinians who are killed or injured in such attacks.

The families of Israelis who blow themselves up in homicide bombings receive $25,000 in cash; the families of those killed in other attacks against the Israelis receive $10,000. Palestinians who are killed in attacks on Israelis receive $1,000, and Palestinians slightly injured in such attacks receive $500.

Saddam Hussein has volunteered to be the workers' compensation plan for Palestinian terrorists whose homicidal intentions are no different from those of the 19 murderers who flew airplanes filled with innocent people into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania, killing nearly 3,000 people. Only when Iraq ceases to be a threat and takes its place as a responsible member of the international community will our future be secure.

As a parent, there is no responsibility that weighs on my mind more heavily than the decision to send our sons and daughters off to war. Yet as a New Yorker, I want to ensure that our country never again faces anything as horrific as the September 11 attack of last year.

I have sought out as much information as possible on the threats and risks posed by launching a military confrontation by Iraq, as well as the risks of not acting. I have heard intelligence briefings on Saddam Hussein's military capabilities. I have heard administration officials and experts make both sides of the argument in testimony to Congress. I have thought about the thousands of young men and women who may be put in harm's way, and I have thought of their families.

During the Vietnam War, my neighborhood of Woodside, Queens, the 1177 ZIP code, lost the highest number of people per capita in our Nation during that conflict. Countless constituents have called me and written to me to express their concerns about the impact that a conflict against Iraq will have on our Nation, our economy, our communities, and our daily lives.

After carefully considering the evidence regarding Saddam's continuing efforts to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and nuclear capabilities, I believe that it is clear that his regime poses a severe threat to the Middle East, our allies in Israel, the United States of America, and to the entire world.

Many of my colleagues have called for weapons inspections to be given one last try; but years of U.N. weapons inspections and international monitoring have demonstrated that such efforts cannot work as long as the Iraqi regime remains determined to thwart them.

It is also clear that Saddam has no plans to end his support for terrorism. While the administration has not, in my mind, proven that Iraq has provided support to al Qaeda, Saddam has funded Palestinian terrorist attacks against innocent civilian Israelis, paying a sliding scale of benefits to the families of Palestinians who are killed or injured in such attacks.

The families of Israelis who blow themselves up in homicide bombings receive $25,000 in cash; the families of those killed in other attacks against the Israelis receive $10,000. Palestinians who are killed in attacks on Israelis receive $1,000, and Palestinians slightly injured in such attacks receive $500.

Saddam Hussein has volunteered to be the workers' compensation plan for Palestinian terrorists whose homicidal intentions are no different from those of the 19 murderers who flew airplanes filled with innocent people into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania, killing nearly 3,000 people. Only when Iraq ceases to be a threat and takes its place as a responsible member of the international community will our future be secure.

Because of Saddam's continued support for terrorism and the serious threat posed by his efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction, I want to express my support for this resolution. It now includes several provisions that I and other Democrats have fought for to ensure the authority of the U.N. Security Council on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

First, I am pleased that the resolution calls on the President to work through the U.N. Security Council to ensure Iraq's compliance with existing U.N. resolutions. Democrats, like the United States and Great Britain, have indicated support for military action unless it is authorized by the U.N. Security Council. If we want to bring an end to religious extremism and terrorism in the Middle East, we must work with and not against leaders in the region and in the international community. It is imperative that the United States act in concert with allies and partners, with the authorization of the U.N. Security Council.

Second, it is important that the resolution prevents the President from using force against Iraq unless and until he declares that he has exhausted all possible diplomatic efforts and attempts that further diplomatic initiatives will have no effect. This means that the use of force will truly be a last resort.

Third, the resolution also requires the President to submit to Congress a determination prior to any action that taking military action against Iraq is consistent with actions needed to eliminate international terrorism. This ensures that the war against terrorism, which must remain our top national priority, will not be pushed aside by efforts in Iraq.

Finally, the resolution requires the President to report every 60 days on military operations and on the planning for post-conflict activities such as reconstruction and peacekeeping. This process is important. I urge our allies that the administration has yet to develop a strategy for rebuilding Iraq. We will need to lead a reconstruction effort, not just because the Iraqi people need such assistance after decades of living under a despotic regime, but rather because ensuring that Iraq is a democratic, prosperous and stable country furthers all of our national interests.

Mr. Speaker, despite my misgivings, and though I wish the administration had decided to wait to pursue this campaign until we and our allies made more substantial inroads in the war against terrorism and groups that support terrorism around the world, I will nonetheless support this resolution. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I urge Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same. I urge Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Winston Churchill is
of mass destruction, that he has not done this, that he has not been an outlaw from the international community. Saddam Hussein has wreaked havoc on our world. He has established a pattern of deception and untold cruelty against humanity. The Iraqi dictator has made a mockery of the international community by defying 16 United Nations resolutions. He has deceived and defied the will and the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. He has gassed, tortured, starved, and executed the people of Iraq, including tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children. He has provided a support network for, and has housed, terrorists. He has refused to account for missing Gulf War prisoners. He has refused access multiple times to U.N. weapons inspectors, in spite of his promises to allow complete inspections of weapons of mass destruction. He has refused to return to the table to negotiate with the international community. He has fired upon American military forces patrolling the no-fly zone. He has sought to circumvent economic sanctions.

Most alarming to me, Mr. Speaker, as a physician, he has developed weapons of mass destruction, including biological and chemical weapons, with long-range ballistic missiles capable to create untold devastation and human misery. Worse, he is close to possessing a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I can tell the Members that we can remediate and protect to a certain degree against chemical and biological attacks, but there is no way to deal with a nuclear explosion. All of these findings are well documented and are a matter of public record.

While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Saddam Hussein stands alone because, as President Bush has made clear, this is the most serious danger of our age in one place under the leadership of a merciless dictator.

Some critics argue that the U.S. should only take military action against Saddam Hussein if the U.N. Security Council endorses military action. While I believe it is important to seek international support, including support of the U.N. Security Council, I do not believe it wise to give other nations like Russia, China, and France veto authority over the national security interest of the American people.

Military conflict is not something to be undertaken lightly, nor is it something we should undertake without exhausting efforts to resolve the issues at hand in other ways. Unfortunately, over the past 10 years, since the end of the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein has chosen to be an outlaw from the international community. He has chosen to disregard the will of the international community.

Some would like to pretend that he has not done this, that he has not been continuing the development of weapons of mass destruction, that he has not been harboring terrorists, that he is not aiding those who seek to harm America. The record of his dictatorship demonstrates otherwise.

We have been students of history. While conflict is not something that we desire, it is something a peace-loving people sometimes have to engage in in order to protect the peace. This often is the only way to stop greater evil from being brought to bear on millions of innocent men, women, and children. What would have been the course of history had a policy of appeasement toward Adolph Hitler not been adopted in 1938? The world was promised peace then, and 6 months later the world was engulfed in World War II. We have been engaged in an appeasement of Saddam Hussein over the past decade. He has been unwilling to respond to the pressure of the international community. How much longer should we continue this policy of appeasement?

What if we refused to take the necessary action to stop the Iraqi dictator from building these weapons? I feel the results could be catastrophic. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the most important questions before the House today and tomorrow and the next day are posed by the resolution introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and many others of us.

The question is not whether action must be taken to disarm Saddam Hussein; that action must be taken. The question is not whether the U.S., as the sole superpower, should exert leadership to bring this action about; it must. The basic question is where the emphasis should be in the use of our superpower standing.

What messages do we want to send the rest of the world? In meeting the challenge posed by Saddam Hussein, is the emphasis on using our leadership to form a broad partnership with other nations or to go it alone? And should we act before the need to use, or is it more likely that unilateral force be essentially in the hands of the executive alone or should the elected representatives of the public in this U.S. Congress be an active participant? Should we be authorizing the President to use the U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq now, before the U.N. Security Council has acted further, or not? Before Iraq has responded completely to all of the U.N. Security Council's references to the strength of collective action in the aftermath of any war on Iraq.

The Spratt resolution, as does Senator LEVIN's resolution in the Senate, makes clear the U.S. will make final decisions about our policies. But the Spratt resolution needs to have collective action through the U.N., with a strong resolution requiring unflinching inspections as to all weapons of mass destruction and their elimination.

The outcome of this international effort remains today uncertain. The odds of effective collective action will be more uncertain to the extent the U.S. position is not total disarmament but a change in regimes. And the President's speech last night veered toward regime change as a prerequisite.

Further, the chances of collective action are dim to the extent the President's approach to Iraq is framed against the broad doctrine enunciated by the administration several weeks ago. As written, it is a doctrine of pre-emptive action in cases short of imminent danger with only cursory references to the strength of collective action and our responsibilities under international law.

The President says that the U.N. action will be enhanced if the U.S. speaks with one voice. True. The approach adopted in the Spratt resolution would have provided a much clearer opportunity for one voice to be spoken and to remain so. The focus of the Spratt resolution is on Iraq. It is total disarmament, not a variety of goals stated in the administration's resolution. Its emphasis is the effort to achieve collective action. Collective international civilian participation, which most U.S. leaders in uniform now favor but which the President and Vice President have argued against, would very likely maximize the chances of success in disarming Saddam Hussein and will minimize the potential adverse consequences for the U.S., adverse in terms of reactions throughout the world, to our alliances, our cooperation in the war against terror, and in broad participation in the aftermath of any war on Iraq.

The Spratt resolution gives the President authority to proceed militarily, to enforce a strong U.N. resolution that provides for enforcement by member states; and it makes clear that the U.S. stands ready to consider unilateral action through this Congress if...
the U.N. fails to act effectively. That surely sends a clear message to the U.N. and Saddam Hussein. The approach in the Spratt alternative lays out a more effective course than the majority resolution. It keeps international action, allowing for the use of military force in that context and, importantly, in preserving an adequate role for the elected representatives of this U.S. government in reaching a decision to go to war against Iraq.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1991, the United States left Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein in power after his unprovoked invasion of Kuwait. The U.S. and coalition powers failed to understand the depths of evil that Saddam would sink to as the leader of Iraq or the willingness of the international community to look the other way as he continued to develop and stockpile weapons of mass destruction.

Over the last decade, Saddam has systematically negotiated and then violated multiple international agreements with the United Nations, allowing him to develop and stockpile weapons of destruction, while at the same time terrorizing his own people. President Bush has called for an end to the international appeasement of Saddam. The President has challenged every nation of the world to face up to its responsibility and stop this evil man with his evil designs. The President said that if the international community is not willing to meet this challenge, that the United States is.

Mr. Speaker, I support the President and his policy of containment. I support Mr. Spratt’s alternative; and I call on my colleagues to do the same by supporting this resolution. Let me explain why.

In 1991, the world came together to defeat a common enemy and then demanded through the United Nations that Iraq stop the repression of its people, return prisoners of the Gulf War, renounce terrorism and end its program to develop and stockpile weapons of mass instruction. Iraq agreed to each of these demands. Instead, in the last decade Iraq has systematically and uniformly defied each and every one of these agreements. These actions alone warrant international action. But, of course, there is more.

We know that the Iraqi government maintains successful biological weapons laboratories. We know that Iraq maintains a chemical weapons stockpile which has shown a willingness to use. And we know that Iraq continues to attempt to develop nuclear weapons. These are not guesses. These are facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the development, manufacture and stockpile of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles is the overriding goal of the Iraqi regime. It is also clear that Saddam Hussein would use every weapon in his arsenal to damage the United States and its citizens, whether within our borders or overseas. Mr. Speaker, deadly weapons are in the hands of a dictator who has invaded both Iran and Kuwait. These deadly weapons are in the hands of a dictator who has fired ballistic missiles at Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel and Bah- rain that have killed and injured U.S. military and civilians, and whose deadly weapons are in the hands of a dictator who has gassed Iranian troops and villages in his own country.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, diplomacy is the preferred course of action to solve this problem. In fact, the United Nations and the United States have been patient over the last decade. Yet Iraq continues to defy U.N. resolutions demanding international inspections for weapons of mass destruction. Yet Saddam has had his opportunity. Unless inspectors are immediately allowed unfettered access to the entire nation, the United States must act.

Others here in the United States believe that we must wait for the U.N. to act before the United States can protect its national security. Again, I disagree. The United States must determine for itself how we should protect our nation and our citizens. It is we, Members of Congress, the President, and the American people, who should determine this.

Now we, as Members of Congress, have the terrible task of determining whether or not our Nation should go to war. As a Member of Congress, I cannot avoid my responsibility to protect our Nation and ensure that Americans both at home and abroad are safe.

I have concluded that to protect the lives and safety of our country and our people we must act. Mr. Speaker, it is time to give the President the authority he has requested to deal with the imminent threat Saddam Hussein poses to the United States and to the world. I hope the diplomacy will work and that Saddam will finally yield unconditionally to international inspections for weapons of mass destruction. I also hope that the U.N. will join the U.S. in this effort. However, we cannot as a Nation make our national security dependent upon this body.

In this end, the growing coalition of countries supporting our efforts will see the overwhelming bipartisan vote this week as a symbol of our unity and commitment to disarming Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the resolution and of the President of the United States in this action.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the resolution to authorize the use of force and deal with Saddam Hussein once and for all. No one can dispute that Saddam Hussein is a tyrant and a thug. His brutal dictatorship has enslaved the Iraqi people in a state of terror for many, many years. His outlaw regime has long been characterized by vicious political repression and a denial of basic human rights. He has unleashed the horrors of chemical and biological weapons against innocent men, women and children in his own country.

Saddam Hussein’s international crimes are well known. On two separate occasions he has invaded neighboring countries to launch wars of conquest against nations that presented him no threat. He has attacked civilian population centers in two Middle Eastern countries—Israel and Saudi Arabia. He has threatened the security of the Middle East region and peace in the world. And his military routinely fires upon American and allied aircraft patrolling the skies to enforce the United Nations Security Council’s resolutions which he agreed to abide by at the conclusion of the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

Make no mistake, Saddam Hussein is an international outlaw who must be confronted once and for all. He must be thoroughly disarmed so that he no longer poses a threat to world peace. Frankly, we should have taken care of this fester ing problem when we had the chance but the first Bush administration walked away and let this murdering thug ravage his country and consolidate his iron grip on power.

The Clinton administration contained Saddam Hussein for 8 years, but it’s progress in obtaining weapons of mass destruction renders “containment” a policy no longer sufficient to the task.

I support President Bush’s policy of confronting Saddam Hussein, but we should assemble an international coalition among the family of nations of the world and present a united front in the struggle against this evil dictator.

International cooperation must not be considered a luxury to be obtained if convenient. Rather, we must recognize a great lesson of the 20th century, that international cooperation is essential to American security and prosperity.

We must also not lose sight of our ongoing worldwide military campaign...
to eradicate the threat of al-Qaeda terror-
ror network. The wounds of 9/11 still
ache. America has unfinished business
with Osama bin Laden and his fanat-
cal followers. Bin Laden may be dead or
he may be alive, but let there be no
doubt that his loyalists still lurk in the
shadows ready to strike America in our
unguarded moments. We must have
no relent in our pursuit of our terror-
ists, and we must not mishandle the
present Iraqi situation in a manner
that breeds suicidal maniacs begging
for the chance to kill Americans. Rather,
we must engage moderate Arab re-
publics and leaders of the Islamic faith
to demonstrate that our cause is just,
our intentions are noble, and our
friendship is genuine and enduring.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend
my Democratic colleagues who have stood
on principle to address the important
shortcomings of the White House’s
original resolution. Now is not the
time for partisan politics, and I am
pleased we have arrived at lan-
guage that a broader cross-section of
this House can support, while leaving
individuals Members free to vote their
conscience.

Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of the
United States Army, my thoughts and
prayers are with our brave men and
women in uniform and the families who
love them. Our military is the finest
fighting force ever assembled in world
history.

They are well trained, highly moti-
vated and superbly trained. Should
force be necessary, their mission may well
be a very difficult one, but I have
no doubt our warriors will rise to the
occasion and win the day.

Finally, Congress must get back to
addressing the critical issues facing
our families every day. Congress must
act to improve education, reduce health
care costs, protect Social Secu-
rity, and get our economy back on
track. We must balance the budget and
pay down the national debt for long-
term economic growth. We must lower
health care costs. We must fund edu-
cation so that every American willing
to work hard can have the most of his
God-given abilities.

In conclusion, I will vote for this
use of force resolution; and at the end of
the day, the leadership of this country
must speak with one voice. As Presi-
dent Kennedy said in his inaugural ad-
dress: “Let every Nation know, wheth-
er it wishes us well or ill, that we will
pay any price, bear any burden, meet
any hardship, support any friend, op-
pose any foe to assure the survival and
success of liberty.

Saddam Hussein is the world’s lead-
ing threat to human liberty. I support
this resolution as a last resort to elimi-
nate this threat.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr.
Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the
distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr.
SAM JOHNSON), a courageous war hero
from Vietnam and former POW.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked
and was given permission to revise and
extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr.
Speaker, I stand here today in full sup-
port of giving the President the tools
he needs to protect the lives of Ameri-
cans at home and around the world. The
United States and United Nations have
tried sanctions. We have tried inspec-
tions, we have tried no-fly zones, we
have tried treaties, peace talks and
16 different Security Council resolu-
tions. Saddam has violated every
agreement.

Anyone who holds hope after 11 years
of Saddam Hussein’s outright rebellion
against the world must be the eternal
optimist. Saddam Hussein has no in-
tention of allowing inspections inside
his palaces or weapons facilities. Sad-
dam Hussein has no intention of allow-
ing his scientists and families to be
questioned outside of Iraq as President
Bush has asked for; and Saddam Hus-
sein has no intention of allowing our
government or the family of Scott
Speicher, the downed American pilot,
any information on their son’s where-
abouts.

Saddam is a blood-thirsty madman
who cannot be left to his own devices.
If left alone, Saddam Hussein will con-
tinue to build biological and chemical
weapons and obtain a nuclear capa-
bility.

Last night, the President told us that
Saddam is now building unmanned ve-
hicles and airplanes to disperse those
weapons almost anywhere. As a rep-
resentative of the people of the State
of Texas, I cannot sit back and allow
Saddam Hussein more time to plot the
demise of the United States and our
allies.

As one of the few Members of Con-
gress to fight in combat and the only
Member held captive as a POW in Viet-
nam, I know we cannot fight a war
alone. We need the United Nations to
win. Our President, with the pas-
sage of this authority, can and will de-
liver.

Let us learn from our Vietnam expe-
rience and ensure that President Bush
has all the tools he needs to protect
freedom in America and in the world. A
resolution without restriction must be
passed. Our future is at stake.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5
minutes to the gentleman from Oregon
(Mr. DEFAZIO), a member of the Com-
mittee on Resources and the Com-
mittee on Transportation and Infra-
structure, and a real leader in our dele-
gation.

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

One of the most solemn duties given
by us to the Constitution is before the
House because the resolution before us
is most certainly a declaration of war.
It lacks the specificity of the last de-
declared war, World War II, but it closely
mirrors the open-ended authority
granted President Johnson in the Gulf
of Tonkin resolution in 1964.

The President is authorized to use
the Armed Forces of the United States
as he determines to be necessary and
appropriate in order to defend the na-
tional security of the U.S. against the
continuing threat posed by Iraq. That
is it. That is the key part of this, de-
spite all the whereases and everything
else.

So, with this resolution, Congress
will preauthorize the first-ever preempt-
tive war in the history of the United
States. A war that may be fought uni-
laterally, without a single ally, con-
ducted without restraint or clear objec-
tive, potentially in violation of the U.N.
charter and widely accepted inter-
national law. I do not believe our Na-
tion’s founders would think that this
was the proper use of our authority
under article I, section 8 of the Con-
stitution.

What is so extraordinary about Sad-
dam Hussein and the threat he poses
that would justify this broad grant of
power? What happened in the 2
years since then-candidate Bush said
The United States will not be the
world’s 911, the world’s police force,
and that we will not engage in nation
building? There were the horrendous
attacks of September 11, attacks
against the United States; but neither
the United States nor British intel-
ligence services can find the slightest
link between al-Qaeda and Iraq. So
that cannot be the reason.

The President won the United States
3 weeks ago, and he repeated in Cin-
cinnati a long litany of charges against
Iraq, most of them true. Saddam Hus-
sein is a brutal psychopathic dictator.
He has committed crimes against hu-
manity. He used chemical weapons
against Iranian troops, against rebel-
lious Kurds in his own country. He
killed tens of thousands, but that was
during the Presidency of Ronald
Reagan and Bush 41; and the United
States turned a blind eye because Sad-
dam was allied with the U.S. against
Iran.

He has violated a number of U.N. res-
olutions, but all along before the last
Presidential election. So something
else must be behind this.

Is this an attempt to obtain nuclear
weapons? Two other members of the
axis of evil are much further along.
Iran has a very well-developed nuclear
weapons programs and much stronger
policies toward terrorist groups, includ-
ing harboring al-Qaeda; and of course,
North Korea has probably nuclear
weapons and two-thirds of an almost
functional intercontinental missile
which is having us rush to build Star
Wars. So, is that the reason? I do not
know.

It really seems to me there is some-
things else going on here. Perhaps it is
because the President brought a num-
ber of people from his father’s adminis-
tration who felt that they were frus-
trated because they did not get to go to
Baghdad the first time when Colin
Powell and George Bush 41 stopped
them short of that goal; but these men,
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these old men, these oil men, most of whom have never fought in a war or have never served in the military, are very deaf to the substantial concerns of Colin Powell, General Clark, and others in the war all too well.

The concerns of Middle East experts and Arabists at the State Department and our intelligence services. They are deaf to the very vocal concern of our allies around the world. They are deaf to the concerns of millions of Americans who have doubts about this war and say that they are blind to the potential repercussions of the Pandora’s box they will open with this war, the first war fought under the new Bush doctrine of preemptive war.

Never has the United States of America launched a preemptive war. The prospect of the United States pursuing a unilateral preemptive war with Iraq with little or no support from allies in the international community is gravely disturbing; but the international application of the doctrine could launch a war against a threat, that is, U.S. or any nation, could launch a war against a threat or perceived threat by another nation. Just think, India and Pakistan, China and Taiwan, Russia and Georgia. The frightening possibilities.

The administration proponents of this resolution would have us believe we have no option, but we do. Continued containment, deterrence and intrusive, unferreted inspections. There is a long process of the success of these inspections rendered by Tony Blair to the Parliament, not by the Bush administration to the Congress: destruction of 40,000 munitions for chemical weapons; 2,610 tons of chemical precursors; 411 tons of chemical warfare agent; dismantling of Iraq’s prime chemical weapons development and production complex at LAI-Muthanna; the destruction of 48 SCUD-type missiles; the destruction of the Al-Hakam biological weapons facility. The discovery of 8 samples of anthrax unerringly produced highly enriched uranium made them disclose their program so that led to the removal and destruction of the infrastructure for the nuclear weapons program, including the Al-Athir weaponization testing facility.

Intrusive inspections, despite the harassment, did work. We do have an alternative. We should return to that alternative. We should return to that alternative. We should return to that alternative. We should return to that alternative. We should root out and destroy his weapons of mass destruction. We have an opportunity and a proven alternative before us, unferreted inspections, destruction of the arsenals; but it is not clear that that is the last objective of this administration.

War should be a first resort? No. War should be a last resort.

Do not vote a blank check to this administration. They are all too determined to have this war no matter what occurs.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished
gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, as we engage in this most patriotic debate, I am struck by how much we all seem to agree upon. We all seek to avoid using force unless absolutely necessary. We might all agree that we are being forced to the greatness of our Nation is not measured in our muscle, but in our restraint. We are a Nation of awesome power; but we do not use it to conquer others, to expand our borders. We are a Nation of majority. We are taking the first blow before we move to respond. On this we all agree.

We all seem to understand and support the imperative of operating in cooperation with international institutions and multilateral coalitions when tackling truly global challenges. It is moral leadership to act in concert with others, and it is smart politics. We preface this path with respect for others, and we follow this path with respect for others and it makes the road to our national goals that much smoother. On this we all agree.

We all agree that the regime in Iraq is a menace to the region and anathema to international law, not to mention it makes the road to our common humanity. Even the most fervent opponent of use of force does not contend that Saddam Hussein is not a tyrant. On this we agree.

Finally, we all agree that in some degree another preemption has to be part of our national defense. Perhaps this is more clear to those of us once lived in the shadow of the World Trade Center or those of the us who attended a funeral for one of the fallen of September 11 or those of us who looked into the eyes of a child whose parent was taken from them in the attacks.

We all agree if we could strike first to prevent the terror of 9-11 we all would have. We all would have. Preemption is moral. Permitting an attack that we can deter is immoral. On this we agree.

So how is it that we agree on so much yet differ on this resolution so starkly? Let me address three points I have heard today and, commonly, over the last weeks.

First, I have heard those that oppose the resolution argue that there is no imminent threat, nothing dire enough for us to act immediately. First, let me concede that this debate should have taken place after the election. It could have taken place after the election, and it would have been most appropriate for it to take place after the election; but I find it astounding that some suggest that because there is no smoking gun we ought not act.

To employ the same metaphor, we have a madman who hates us, gun and bullets in the same room. After hundreds of hours of hearings and thousands of pages of revelations about our failure to connect the dots on so many occasions, why is it now we hear this insistence on metaphysical certainty of the madman’s intent before we act?

News flash. What we do not know about his intent could fill a book. The same critics of our intelligence capability are now expecting perfect intelligence.

Secondly, some have argued that Saddam has not been belligerent. In fact, he has. The U.N. resolutions that we were as a group in 1991 were agreed to by the parties to ensure that Saddam would not be belligerent. He has violated every one. Is not the violation of anti-belligerence agreements itself a sign of belligerence?

Finally, I have heard the argument that Saddam’s capabilities are so degraded that he posed no threat to us or to his neighbors. I remind my colleagues that the cost of the entire September 11 attacks on our Nation were less than that of a single tank. How much does it cost, how hard is it to strap nerve carisistes to a terrorist posing as a tourist and have them walk into Times Square or into the National Archives? He does not need an ICBM to reach New York or Washington. Saddam Hussein just needs a chance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I come to the floor, as we all have today, to address one of the most serious, probably the most serious matters that Congress can consider, and that is the use of America’s military to preserve peace and defend our citizens. I rise in support of this resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq.

The Iraqi regime, controlled by Saddam Hussein, remains a threat to the Iraqi people, Iraq’s neighbors, the U.S., our allies and American citizens. Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction at his disposal, biological and chemical; and he has used them, as we
all know, on his own people and against other countries. He has continuously expressed hostility toward and a willingness to attack the United States. In fact, he was the only world leader to publicly applaud the horrific September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on America. Of all the al-Qaeda affiliated terrorist organizations known to be in Iraq.

These facts simply cannot be ignored, and we cannot afford to wait while further terrorist attacks against the United States are being planned.

Today, Iraq continues to withhold important information about its nuclear program, weapons design, procurement logs, and documents of foreign assistance. Iraq employs capable nuclear scientists and technicians and retains physical infrastructure necessary to build a nuclear weapon. Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes, uranium ore, and other materials for a nuclear weapon, and the country's state-controlled media has reported numerous meetings between Saddam Hussein and his nuclear scientists, leaving little doubt about his continued appetite for these weapons.

Mr. Speaker, in order to preserve the security of the United States and our allies, we must move forward to address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's regime. However, congressional approval of this resolution does not mean military action against Iraq is imminent or unavoidable. The military option is only one option. We are continuing, as we should, to work with our allies to address this threat together.

What Congress is doing by passing this resolution is showing the United Nations and all nations that America speaks with one voice. By passing this resolution, we are showing the world we are determined to support the President's efforts to obtain Security Council resolutions that will ensure Saddam Hussein that full compliance with the demands of the civilized world is his only option.

I am pleased the President has moved forward to press for a new resolution on Iraq within the United Nations. This is appropriate, and I hope our efforts will be successful. However, in order to be successful, any new inspections, sanctions, or enforcement mechanisms will have to be different than the ones that the Security Council has already passed.

I remain concerned about the United Nations' inability to address Saddam Hussein. The Iraqi regime remains in an unacceptable breach of numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions, including those requiring full and unfettered weapons inspections.

Since the end of the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Iraq has fired many hundreds of times at American and British pilots as they enforce the no-fly zones in northern and southern Iraq. The Pentagon confirmed last week that, since April of 1991, Iraq has fired on our coalition aircraft some 2,500 times, 406 times this year alone and 67 times this month.

As long as Saddam Hussein remains in power in Iraq, the Middle East remains a potential powder keg, and countless innocent people throughout the world face imminent danger. By all accounts, the immediate threat posed by Iraq's possession, creation, and/or acquisition of weapons of mass destruction is a substantial one. The President's request for congressional authorization to eliminate that threat is entirely appropriate.

Last night, in my hometown of Cincinnati, Ohio, President Bush made the case for adoption of the resolution before us here today. The President eloquently stated, and I quote, "Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof, the smoking gun, that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud..."

Mr. Speaker, many of the critics of this resolution have wondered what terrible things will happen if we take action against Iraq. The real question, I would submit, is what terrible things will happen to our Nation and the rest of the civilized world if we do not take action.

Throughout the history of Saddam Hussein's long and brutal reign, he has shown no interest in being part of the community. He plundered his countrymen and his neighbors, he has supported and provided safe haven for terrorists, and he continues his long-standing efforts to develop and deploy weapons of mass murder and destruction. All the while, he has shown no signs of remorse and he has given no reason to believe that he will change.

My colleagues who remember their history will recall a tyrant who terrorized Europe a few decades ago. The British Government at the time chose a policy of appeasement. Soon, Adolph Hitler's forces marched across Europe, raining death and destruction. Fifty-one million people went to their graves. We cannot let that happen again. As Americans, we will not let that happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Chief Deputy Democratic Whip. The gentleman from Georgia has personally been terrorized and has been a man of peace for so many years.
Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this resolution. I rise to speak for peace. As a great Nation, we have peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Be they Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist, Sikh; be they white, black, yellow, red, or brown, blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

For we must ask ourselves, are we peacemakers? Will we cast aside our fears, our prejudices, our hate and embrace peace? Will we sow the seeds of peace, or are we just another nation sewing the seeds of war?

War with Iraq will sow seeds in the desert sands of the Middle East and throughout the world. What fruit will our actions bear, not just for us but for our children? And not just for the children of our land, but for the children of the world? Will war in the Middle East and the world? For it is the children, our little boys and girls, who must live with the consequences of our war.

What do we gain? What do our children gain when we have destroyed another nation? What do we gain when we have killed hundreds and thousands of their men, women, and children; when hundreds of our sons and daughters have died?

War with Iraq will not bring peace to the Middle East. It will not make the world a safer, a better, a more loving place. It will not end the strife and hatred that breed terror. War does not end strife; it sows it. War does not end hatred; it feeds it.

So we have war in Israel, and no peace. We have war in Kashmir, but no peace. We have war in Afghanistan, in Colombia, in Sudan and the Philippines, and no peace. It may be hard, it may be difficult, but the quest for peace is as old as the dawn of history and as fresh as the morning newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9:07, each Member of this body received an e-mail message; an alert; and it asked all of us to take precautions. It told us all to restrict our activities at home and in our office. We were asked to share it with each member of our staff. I have that e-mail here. That e-mail dealt with a threat. It said:

‘To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace.’

I close by saying that what this Congress needs to do is give our President what he needs to fight terrorism for war, and in doing so we will preserve the peace and ensure the peace for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that we pause briefly in this debate as we debate our fundamental responsibility about how we best protect our country and what instruments will play in protecting our country to appreciate the fact that at 4:15 this morning Eastern Standard Time two Marines with the 11th Marine Expeditionary Unit from Camp Pendleton, California, were outside of Kuwait City participating in a training exercise. One of those young Marines was shot and killed, and the other was seriously injured. We are waiting an update as to how we best protect our country and as to what to do. We will know what to do with him; and it will not be home restrictions, and it will not be inspections with notifications and limitations.

Mr. Speaker, I close with the words of George Washington, our greatest President when he responded at a moment like this as to how do you preserve peace, how do you make the community safe once again, how do you assure the safety of the people. He said:

‘To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace.’
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Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Members to join me in a minute of silence to give thanks for the two brave Marines and appreciate the sacrifice they have made.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members for joining me in that minute of silence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution authorizing the President to use force against Iraq if necessary and under certain circumstances. He has laid the proper predicate. He seeks the support of Congress; and if successful here, he will pressure the United Nations to do their job.

If the U.N. succeeds in a full and acceptable inspection and finds no major violations, they file their report. If they find major violations, they should be forced to take the proper action. If they do not act, the President has a decision to make; and I trust his decisions, just as I trusted Harry Truman's decisions 57 years ago.

Thus, he has, and as much as the Nation has requested him to do, has taken the steps they have asked him to take for this resolution.

The fight against terrorism is a long and difficult mission. I along with most Americans have stood behind President Bush in his campaign against terrorism and the invasion of Afghanistan, and I continue to stand behind him. The President has consulted the American people and the Congress throughout this war. He is consulting us now before any decisions are made concerning Iraq. He will continue to put pressure on the United Nations and give them the opportunity to do their work. He will continue to call for Saddam Hussein to comply with the U.N. resolutions and for weapons inspectors to have unfettered access to do their job. He will continue to insist that any resistance, evasion, or delay must be dealt with clearly and decisively.

I believe that if force becomes necessary, the President's timing will be the right timing. The President has the benefit of information from international fact-finding sources, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the United States intelligence, information that Congress and the average American citizen might not have available to them. I am convinced of the United States' need to act until our actions are justified.

Saddam Hussein's past refusal to allow weapons inspections is a strong indication that his regime poses a very real threat to the civilized world. As cited in the resolutions we are debating today, Iraq has ignored 16 United Nations Security Council resolutions to date, and we expect that there will be more contempt for the United Nations. Saddam Hussein's continued pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, the appalling of his own people and the neighboring countries around him, and his outward defiance of the United Nations mark him as a man who is not only dangerous in his only country, but also dangerous to many others, including the United States.

I think we are all in agreement that no one wants to go to war; but during these turbulent times, in order to preserve freedom, we are given sometimes very little choice.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance." Men like Saddam Hussein will not stop until they have accomplished their objective, or until they are forced to stop. We must be prepared to do what is necessary to remove the threat to our country and to all peace-loving people.

The Congress and the United States stand with the President in his strong resolve to defeat terrorism. The United States stands ready to carry out this mission in Iraq if necessary, and we ask that our allies and all free-loving countries join us in this just cause.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this resolution and give President Bush the authority needed in order to protect the United States of America and the world from Saddam Hussein's oppressive rule.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.J. Res. 114. My support comes after many hours of personal consideration of the facts that are clear, as well as what may be the consequences of military action against Saddam Hussein. I have concluded that clear and present threat of military force is the only way to forge both a meaningful and enforceable resolution in the United Nations Security Council and hopefully a peaceful disarmament and destruction of weapons of mass destruction by Iraq. If the U.N. falters or Hussein continues his deception, then the United States must act.

President Bush has made a clear case against Iraq, and last night he answered the questions that all of us have heard from our citizens in our districts. I respect and understand the concerns that some of those in this Chamber have regarding preemption and a military strike. I understand those who speculate on the consequences of military action against Iraq. In my mind I fear the consequences of failure to preempt the use of weapons of mass destruction far more than the consequences of military action.

On September 11, 2001, terrorists made an unprovoked attack using airplanes as weapons of mass destruction and killed over 3,000 innocent men, women, and children in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. Saddam Hussein praised them. In the Middle East, the families of suicide bombers are rewarded with cash by Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein considers mass murder an acceptable practice. If there were ever a case for preemption to be made, Saddam Hussein has made it himself.

Twice before in my lifetime two great American Presidents, John Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, used the American military and the fear of its use to peacefully resolve two of the world's greatest threats: the Cuban missile crisis and the Cold War. They were right then, and President Bush is right now. Our country and the world demand a united Congress and a united President of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this is a serious debate about the future of our country and about the future that our country will play in the world in which we live. The decision to be made here after this debate is whether or not the United States would declare war on Iraq because, that is what in fact is being debated before the Congress of the United States.

The President came to the White House with the knowledge that he has, that he wants this resolution for a number of different reasons. He has said that he wants it to have a regime change. Later, he said he wanted it to disarm Saddam Hussein. He now says that he wants it simply to get leverage against the United Nations so that they will do what he has asked them to do, what he has quite properly asked them to do.

But, at the end of the day, we will be saddled with a vote to declare war on Iraq. I say this because this is the same administration that was arguing that they did not have to come to the Congress because, from the resolution that we passed in 1991, that they had inherent authority to do this. So I suspect we will be living with the results of the vote here for a long time to come.

There is no debate, I believe, in the Congress of the United States or most places in the world that Saddam Hussein is an evil man, that Saddam Hussein is engaged in some of the most atrocious acts against his own citizens and others around the world. But there is also no debate that he is in violation of the agreements that he signed at the end of the war, he is in violation of the United Nations' resolution that have been passed, and a case can be made and clearly was made by the President of the United States that the United Nations should take action because of his contempt of those resolutions and his failure to comply.

Those were the agreements that he signed; and, if necessary, the United Nations should back that up with force.

This is not a matter of trusting Saddam Hussein or allowing Saddam Hussein to determine where the United Nations will inspect or not inspect, and we have all been through that. This is not about him. This is about us, and
these are the terms and conditions, and they should be enforced. I if that fails, then it is not to suggest that the United States should go to war against Saddam Hussein. It is to suggest that the President then must come to Congress and meet the burden of proof that he, in fact, poses an imminent threat to the national security of the United States. So far, from the best information I have been able to receive from my colleagues on the various committees of jurisdiction dealing with intelligence and defense and in the briefings that I have attended, that case has not been made. That does not mean that it cannot be made. It does not mean that maybe there is information that they are not sharing with the Congress. But understand this: They are supposed to share it with the Congress. But that is a different burden of proof. That is a burden of proof of whether we will unilaterally make a decision to put American men and women in harm’s way and whether or not we will invade another country for those reasons. That is a far different burden of proof. That is a far different decision than whether or not we will invade another country. However, it is not 1991. Saddam Hussein is the aggressor who has chosen to live by the sword. Let us never forget that 9/11 was not the first terrorist attack on America or American interests. We have a right but we have a responsibility to defend our nation and its citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. Speaker, often when we Members come to the House floor to make our arguments about public policy, our rhetoric differs significantly because we have sharply different visions. Our policies are aimed to protect our families, our communities, and those various goals dictate various approaches.

Today, I do not believe we have different goals or hopes. I am convinced that every Member of Congress and, in fact, every American citizen shares a common goal: protecting the safety and security of our Nation. Everyone I know would prefer to avoid war. Everyone I know hopes that diplomatic measures will cause Saddam Hussein to disarm. Everyone I know agrees that multi-lateral action which brings international allies to the side of the United States is far more desirable and effective than unilateral action. These goals and preferences are shared by every Member of Congress who speaks on the floor this week.

I spent a great deal of time over the past few weeks listening to the concerns and anxieties of my constituents, the arguments of this administration, and the whispers of my own heart. Following that time of listening, these are the things I now conclude:

First, the message of September 11, 2001, was undeniable. The United States has enemies who will stop at nothing to harm us and most insidious and destructive ways possible. Their disregard for their own lives means that they can and will take the lives of thousands of innocent Americans on our own land.

Secondly, despite this horrible truth, we must refuse to live in fear. If we allow ourselves to be intimidated, our enemies have conquered not only our bodies but our spirits as well.

Thirdly, Saddam Hussein has left no room for doubt about his willingness to amass and use weapons of mass destruction. Knowing of his character and capacity, we simply give time for Hussein to become stronger and more
dangerous if he believes there will be no consequences for his actions.

Fourth, I do not believe the United Nations will take the action it must take to defend its own credibility and, most importantly, the safety of the world. I have prepared a vote for the amended bipartisan resolution authorizing force against Iraq.

Like every one of my colleagues who votes the same way, I reach this point with a great sense of somberness. The President made it clear that military action is not inevitable, but it is possible, and this means that some of our finest young men and women will once again risk their lives to protect our Nation. As the father of three and the grandfather of two, I have great empathy for every family whose young people will be at risk. I also have an enormous sense of gratitude for the men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line day after day.

The vote we take this week is difficult because it acknowledges the hard and potentially painful work we have ahead of us. This is just one step of a very long journey towards national security. I am convinced, however, that we risk only greater pain if we do not take this step. Ignoring the threat Saddam Hussein poses will not eliminate that threat. It will not remove the potential pain. We must face Hussein head on so that he has no more time or opportunity to become stronger and more dangerous. I sincerely hope and pray that freedom-loving nations around the world will join us in that cause.

President Bush, his administration, this Congress and the American people will stand ready to do so again. We stand ready to defend the United States with a great sense of somberness. The President made it clear that military action is not inevitable, but it is possible, and this means that some of our finest young men and women will once again risk their lives to protect our Nation. As the father of three and the grandfather of two, I have great empathy for every family whose young people will be at risk. I also have an enormous sense of gratitude for the men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line day after day.
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The war on terrorism is working because we are working as an international team. Let us not tear that apart.

The doctrine of preemption, if carried out precipitously on Iraq, without the threat present, the viable alternative without the full support of a coalition we have built to fight terrorism, and without a serious consideration of the attendant risks, may cost America in lives, money and international cooperation far more than the presumed benefits may justify.

Like the Statue of Liberty, America's foreign policy has been a symbol, a powerful beacon that guides the world towards peace and cooperation. This is not to say that America can never act preemptively in self-defense. But it most certainly is to say that we must consider how unilateral action might affect the international system we have worked so hard to build for the last half century. It most certainly is to say that attacking Iraq without the support of the world community will create more enemies and expose the United States to more dangers.

Mr. Speaker, the drum of war has left no room for the answer to these questions: If we do not have an international alliance to disarm Iraq, what will be the damage to our alliance on the war on terrorism? If we invaded Iraq alone, are we ready to lose thousands of American lives in a ground attack in urban warfare?

Since you have said regime change is our goal, is it not more likely that Saddam will invoke weapons of mass destruction against our troops and our allies, which he withheld during the Gulf War?

If he strikes our ally, Israel, what will be the consequences of the stated intention of Israel to strike back, in the rest of the Middle East? Will we fan the flames of a wider regional war and create a new crop of al Qaeda recruits? In such a regional conflict, will President Musharaf in Pakistan hold on to power, lose it, and the nuclear weapons Pakistan has, to dangerous fundamentalists?

What is our post-Saddam strategy? In a country that has separatist desires by Kurds and Shiites, how long will we stay, how many lives will be lost and how much will it cost? Are the estimates of $200 billion to prosecute this war the floor, or the ceiling?

If we seek to disarm Iraq, we need an international coalition to do so. Not only should the international community be enlisted in this cause, they must be part of shedding the blood and spending the money for global security. Such a coalition ensures that America is not fighting alone in our fight against global terrorism.

You have said that Iraq is a continuing threat. America faces many continuing threats which we have not sought or actively strike. The standard must be higher.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair would remind Members that their comments should be directed to the Chair and no other person.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is another grave and gathering threat to the United States. It is the threat of economic insecurity. It is the threat of a fragile economy at home that leaves us ill-pooled to have the resources to prosecute the multiple wars the President has asked us to pursue.

A war against Iraq could be a dangerous alternative for the United States at this time. It is a grave and gathering economic threat to the self-confidence and stability of American families who have already seen their retirement security squandered by corporate crimes and their children's educational savings squandered by the blows to the market at 4-year lows.

But to these threats, we have heard no drumbeat, only silence.

Mr. President, we stand with you in defense of the United States, but we cannot sign on to a plan that has no clear exit strategy, that will leave us all but alone in the world community, and that will strain our ability to deal with other security challenges that we may simultaneously face. And that will set a precedent that will be paid with the lives of thousands of young Americans.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. OSBORNE.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, in 1941 President Roosevelt asked Winston Churchill what the new war should be called. Churchill replied that it should be called the "Unnecessary War," because throughout the 1930s Hitler had done this: he had declared his intent; he had written a book about it; he had built his arsenal and military; started the Holocaust; invaded Poland and Denmark; and refused diplomatic settlement.

Most of Europe, and the United States in addition, hoped that Hitler would be satisfied with his latest conquest. So we sat and we watched, and we sat and we watched.

Churchill's point was this: Hitler could have been stopped in 1935 or 1936 or maybe 1937 with few or no casualties at all. By 1941 he was poised to conquer the world; and as a result, 50 million people died.

There are some parallels I think with our present situation, because Saddam Hussein has, number one, declared his intent to move against his neighbors. No one doubts his motives or intentions. He has killed thousands of his own people, which is very similar to the Holocaust. He has invaded Kuwait, similar to what Hitler did in Poland. He developed weapons of mass destruction, and he has used them. And he has defied all diplomatic resolution of the problem.

One thing is different in 2002 from that which was present in 1941, and that is that today's weapons can kill hundreds of thousands of people, where in 1941 a bomb or a shell could maybe kill 100 or tens or whatever.

We would be foolish not to heed the lessons of history. The President is correct, we cannot afford to do nothing. It will only cost more human lives if we wait. The best chance for a peaceful resolution with Iraq is to convince Saddam Hussein that we will not settle for less than complete disarmament, even if this involves military action. I urge support of the resolution.
Saddam Hussein has murdered thousands of his own citizens with chemical weapons, and we know that Saddam Hussein has already given aid and support to terrorist organizations and indeed has engaged in terrorist actions himself as he attempted to assassinate or give directions for the assassination of our former President George Bush in 1993.

Saddam Hussein has committed environmental terrorism by setting fire to Kuwaiti oil fields and dumping raw crude oil into the ocean during the Gulf War. And he most recently has authorized payments to the families of suicide bombers who would take the lives of innocent civilians, and he has given shelter to terrorists within his own country.

As one who shares with my colleagues the responsibility to protect Americans at home and abroad, I cannot and will not stake tens of thousands of American lives or our long-term national security on a hope that Saddam Hussein will reverse 25 years of deceit and aggression.

The consequences of a failure to act in this instance will be visited upon our cities and towns. That is the nature of the threat that we face. Unless this man is disarmed, until we know that he no longer has and will not ever develop these devastating weapons, we will not be safe; and international peace will continue to be threatened.

Mr. Speaker, we are working with the international community through the United Nations to build a consensus on a course of action that will force Saddam Hussein to comply with U.N. mandates. This process is important; and I believe we must continue to try to work with the United Nations, as Saddam Hussein is not just a threat to America, he is a threat to world peace. As well, the consequences of the use of weapons of mass destruction are global and the effort to prevent their use should be global as well.

I respect the right and the position of my colleagues, especially from my own delegation in Massachusetts who have come back to this chamber to argue that I feel in my heart that in the best interests of our country we should support the President’s resolution, and I ask the Members to support that resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago, the first President of the United States addressed the Nation’s first Congress with these prophetic words: “The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the Republican model of government are, finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.”

Today, we find ourselves in a new century confronted by new trials. We have withstood attempts at invasion, survived a bloody Civil War, endured two world wars, and prevailed in the long twilight struggle President Kennedy spoke of more than 40 years ago.

Ten years after the despoilation of the Iraqi facilities by the specter of Kuwaiti brutality overrun by Iraqi forces, the United Nations and the United States led a coalition of more than 28 nations in a war of liberation. Then President Bush plainly outlined our aims. “Our objectives are clear. Saddam Hussein’s forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate government of Kuwait will be restored, and Kuwait will once again be free.” All of this was achieved.

He then went on to say that, once peace was restored, it was our Nation’s hope that Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations. This hope has been fulfilled.

So in Franklin Roosevelt’s words, “There has come a time in the midst of swift happenings to pause for a moment and take stock, to recall what our place in history has been, and to rediscover what we are and what we may be.”

There is no greater example of what we are than how we responded to the terrible events of September 11. Confronted with the massacre of innocent lives, the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the horror of the instruments of modern technology being used as a means of our destruction, we did not falter. In the weeks and months since, we have banded together to say our wounds, aided the widows and orphans, improved our defenses, and taken the war to our enemy. Now, we are asked to do more.

Over the past few months, I have agonized, along with my neighbors and constituents, on the degree of threat the renegade regime in Iraq represents to our safety and security. It is for these and other reasons that I set the bar so high on what I would require before I would embrace any presidential action that included the use of force to remove Hussein and his henchmen from power.

The most compelling reason, as I have written to my constituents, was the realization that any decision to finally remove Hussein and his regime, once begun, could not be permitted to fail. For those reasons, I urged the administration to work to promote a regional solution and to take further steps to prepare for military action.

I went on to argue that, should these efforts fail, then it was incumbent upon the administration to make its case to the United Nations, to the American people, and to Congress before inaugurating any major military undertaking against Iraq.

This our President has done. Now it is time for us to decide.

I will vote “yes” on this resolution. While I still hold out hope that by its passage the United Nations will be empowered to force Iraq to comply with the will of the international community, that it will eliminate all its weapons of mass destruction, I bear too great a responsibility to allow my actions to be governed by that hope alone. As a Member of Congress, I must act upon information I possess in a way that most clearly protects our people and our way of life, and what I know is that the Administration has determined the renegade regime in Iraq represents a continuing threat to the American people, and to Congress because to the United Nations, to the American people, and to Congress.

I am now persuaded that, left to his own devices, Saddam Hussein will not be content until he has the means to murder his own people and the people of many nations with the most horrible weapons of war. This we cannot permit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the voice of the boisterous and a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(MR. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote “no” on this resolution which seeks to stampede the Congress into granting the powers for unilateral declaration of war on Iraq. Aggressive action against terrorists is needed, but we should not damage our own capability to wage the broader war against terrorism by succumbing to an all-consuming tunnel vision action on Iraq.

Certainly, all Members of Congress recognize that we are living in a time of new dangers and new kinds of unique risk. The Cold War era, with its possibilities of nuclear annihilation restrained only by threats of mutual destruction, was also a time of great danger. We did not succumb to panic and hysteria during the Cold War; we should not succumb now. Our present recognition, our new awakening to the possible lethal potency of terrorist tactics, and our disheartening experience with wide terrorist organizations is the new national defense reality. The massacre at the World Trade Center on September 11
11 has seared the reality of this new danger into our minds. This is a debate about how our great democracy will coexist with this new set of challenging dangers. It is about how we will cope with a new set of unprecedented challenges.

I contend that this administration has made the wrong analysis and has set the wrong priorities. President Bush mistakenly proposes that the obliteration of the capacity of Iraq to deliver weapons of mass destruction, or any weapons must be at the center of our strategy for national security and safety. In particular, the President proposes that we go to war to prevent Iraq from acquiring nuclear weapons. The assumption, which is certainly correct, is that, through Iraq, terrorists would have access to nuclear weapons. It is absolutely necessary that we do all that we can to prevent nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of terrorists.

In connection with this overwhelming need to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists, Mr. Speaker, to the President and to all advocates of the invasion of Iraq, I would ask one simple question: Do you all realize that the best route for revolutionaries and terrorists to gain access to nuclear weapons is through the takeover of our embattled and endangered Islamic ally, the Nation of Pakistan, which already at this moment has nuclear weapons? All nuclear states and other extremists are already on the borders and inside Pakistan. This Muslim Nation is our most vital ally in our fight against terrorism, but Pakistan is an endangered ally. Each $1 spent to strengthen the friendly government of Pakistan, whether it is for economic development or education or whatever, each dollar would produce more safety and more security for America than $1 million spent invading Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, my contention is that our present all-consuming focus on Iraq is a major blunder. I repeat my common-sense observation: Iraq may acquire nuclear weapons within a year, but a successful terrorist coup in Pakistan would place nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists immediately.

Saddam Hussein, the monster who pays bonuses to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers, is truly one of the most dangerous tyrants in the world. All that has been said and written about Saddam Hussein on this floor are true charges, and he must be contained. But blind obsession with Iraq represents dangerous American policy and strategy tunnel vision.

Wake up, FBI, CIA, colleagues here in the Congress; understand that the war on terrorism must remain a comprehensive war. If we are sucked into the bottomless pit of a war with Iraq, we will be unprepared and shocked by calamities that rain down on us from other theaters of conflict. Our cocksure experts have already blundered and allowed the leadership of al Qaeda to escape in Afghanistan. I challenge these same experts in their assignment of maximum priority to an invasion of Iraq. Protecting nuclear capabilities of friendly Pakistan from terrorists should be a greater priority.

We must not remain silent and complacent. We need to understand that it is important that we fight terrorism, the wider war against terrorism, and it must be fought more effectively and not jeopardized by a focus on Iraq. We have learned important lessons from that conflict. First, we reaffirmed that the men and women of America’s Armed Forces are strong and that they are courageous; second, we saw the benefits of acting with regional partners and friends united behind us; third, we continued to see every day the long-term commitment required to help a society transition from a ruthless dictatorship to a more representative government.

The way we fought in Afghanistan offers important lessons as we now confront the threat posed by Saddam and his weapons of mass destruction. He is a menace to his people and to the entire region; but his weapons of mass destruction pose the most significant risk, and it is because of these weapons that we must today authorize the President to act, including with military force.

In saying that, I am not accepting the administration’s line uncritically. The first resolution submitted to Congress by the President was patently unacceptable. It would have allowed the use of force not just against Iraq, but throughout the region and unauthorized use of United Nations Security Council strength.

In critical, in my mind, the resolution did not address the broader implications of action. The administration has said that the risk posed by Saddam is too great to do nothing, but this risk must be balanced against the long-term risk of reckless or ill-considered action.

On September 4, Mr. Speaker, before the original resolution was submitted to Congress, I drafted a letter to the White House. I wrote: First, how would we manage Iraq’s transition to a stable post-Saddam regime? Second, how can we ensure that action in Iraq does not undermine international support for the broader war on terrorism? Third, how can we ensure that the United States military can still execute its other missions?

The resolution originally sent to Congress offered no means to ensure that these questions were answered. This meeting of the Committee on Armed Services and in private conversations, I have discussed these issues with the White House, the Defense Department, the State Department, the Central Command, and numerous retired senior officers and foreign policy experts. What chilled me were the implications of getting the long-term implications wrong.
If we act without international support, we risk losing support for the broader war on terrorism, as well as our credibility as a global leader. If we do not immediately plan for the post-Saddam transition, we risk fueling resentment and anger that could destabilize the Middle East and create legions of new terrorists.

In the history books, Mr. Speaker, we meet today to debate and cast one of the most important votes of our time. I wanted to deliver a message to the Iraqi leadership that President George W. Bush has found its strength. They are absolute, unprovoked, and unrepentant. Only the United States had strong international support which even helped us pay the costs of that war. The world has had, for thousands of years, three main enemies that have wrought despair and destruction. Those enemies are ignorance, arrogance, and dogma. When we put them together in the form of a man like Stalin or Pol Pot or Hitler or Milosevic or Saddam Hussein, we wreak despair and destruction.

The solution to those things in a democratic process is knowledge, humility, and tolerance. And the tenets upon which a democratic process finds its strength. They are absolute, in an absent war, in a dictatorship like Saddam Hussein’s. Absent democracy, we have an Auschwitz, we have Pearl Harbor, we have September 11.

It is difficult for us, yes, as we debate this to understand naked brutality, a psychological nemesis like Saddam Hussein; it is not difficult to understand what must be done. What must be done now is to remove Saddam Hussein from his power and restore peace, life, and dignity. Blessed are the peacemakers.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker; and I urge my colleagues at the end of the debate to vote for the resolution that is now before us for the following reasons:

Blessed are the peacemakers, who freed the prisoners at Auschwitz; blessed are the peacemakers who freed Europe from the yoke of Nazism; blessed are the peacemakers who saved the people of Kuwait from Saddam Hussein; blessed are the firemen, the policemen, the medical personnel, and others who sought and brought comfort to those wounded and to the families of those who were killed on September 11; blessed are the women over the generations who sought peace.

We are not in a panic tonight about Iraq; we are moving deliberately and methodically in a way to understand and to base our decisions on the following. Saddam Hussein has waged aggressive war, brutal war, against his neighbors over the last 20, 25 years; he is pursuing weapons of mass destruction to do it again; he is pursuing weapons of mass destruction against his own people on a tragically experimental basis; he has launched ballistic missiles against his neighbors; he is brutalizing and tormenting his own citizens; he is harboring a network of terrorists. The list goes on, and it is endless.

It is not a matter for us as peacemakers of if we go into Iraq. It is a matter of when we do it, how we do it, and who we do it with.

The world has had, for thousands of years, three main enemies that have wrought despair and destruction. Those enemies are ignorance, arrogance, and dogma. When we put them together in the form of a man like Stalin or Pol Pot or Hitler or Milosevic or Saddam Hussein, we wreak despair and destruction.

The solution to those things in a democratic process is knowledge, humility, and tolerance. And the tenets upon which a democratic process finds its strength. They are absolute, in an absent war, in a dictatorship like Saddam Hussein’s. Absent democracy, we have an Auschwitz, we have Pearl Harbor, we have September 11.

It is difficult for us, yes, as we debate this to understand naked brutality, a psychological nemesis like Saddam Hussein; it is not difficult to understand what must be done. What must be done now is to remove Saddam Hussein from the world that can do it, to take a leadership role in this time now, with the international community, to remove Saddam Hussein from his power and restore peace, life, and dignity.

Blessed are the peacemakers.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we meet today to debate and cast one of the most important votes of our time. None of us can look lightly nor politically upon the decision to send American men and women to war. This is a resolution to grant one man unprecedented, unconstitutional, unprompted, and unsupported power to start a war.

As was the case 11 years ago, this vote has weighed heavily on my mind; but unlike 11 years ago, today we debate the issue within 30 days of political elections, versus 11 years ago, when we were in a rare January session after the elections and in a much calmer atmosphere.

President Herbert Walker Bush. The evidence back then was clear and convincing: Iraq had invaded a neighbor. The United States had strong international support which even helped us pay the costs of that war. Today, the situation is starkly different. Not only is the evidence circumstantial, at best; but we will have to pay our allies or cut them in on oil deals to buy either their silence or reluctant support for this war. These costs are on top of what President Bush’s top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimates to be a 100 to $200 billion cost of an invasion of Iraq, figures that are mind-boggling.

I have had many questions about the prospect of U.S. military engagement, and I am not the only one. This vote is so important to me that I did travel to that country to seek answers to some unanswered questions. I thought it was important to open a dialogue with the Iraqi people for several reasons. I did not get all the answers I sought, either in Iraq or here in this country.

I will not be bullied by this or any President of the United States. I do not work for the President of the United States. I think it is time to cool the rhetoric, the cowboy rhetoric, if you will. I think it is important for Iraqi civilians to see that Americans, among them West Virginians that I represent, are not a warmongering people. I work for the people of West Virginia.

The President has, and rightly so, asked Congress to debate and vote on this issue. We do not wage war simply for war’s sake. The State of West Virginia proportionately sends more of its children to service in this war than most other States. West Virginians could die. We consider the life and death of people on both sides of this war, and even beyond. That is what we are considering today.

As an Arab-American Member of Congress, having extensively traveled in the Middle East and having questioned U.S. policy in this region under both Democrat and Republican Presidents, I felt myself to be a credible messenger. I would go again, even if I removed this vote is so important to me that I did travel to that country to seek answers to some unanswered questions. I thought it was important to open a dialogue with the Iraqi people for several reasons. I did not get all the answers I sought, either in Iraq or here in this country.

I wanted to deliver a message to the Iraqi leadership that President George W. Bush is serious; that the only hope whatsoever of any possible peaceful resolution and in order to prevent further devastation and suffering of the Iraqi people, would be to accept unconditional and unfettered access to U.N. weapons inspectors into the country, period. No gimmicks. No games. No kidding.
U.N. inspectors. I told them the moment was right. If the fruits of peace are to be harvested.

But Iraq had to take a dramatic new approach. I was pleased when, upon my return to the United States, the Iraqi government announced it would allow U.N. inspectors back into the country unconditionally. Was this all that I asked for? No. I suppose it was not, but it was a step in the right direction, but it should not be so out rightly rejected by slamming shut airtight the door to peace.

There is no question, and I recognize as well as the next person that Saddam has played games in the past, there is no question that past weapons inspectors have also been spies, seeking pernicious embarrassing minutia on the Iraqis.

Today's inspectors must be objective, professional and no doubt will have more advanced technologies than 4 years ago. They must have the time to do their job, and they no doubt will have the support. Weapons inspectors must have access to presidential palaces, mosques, schools, hospitals, places where Saddam will, if he has anything to hide, no doubt use so as to be able to claim collateral damages when we do these.

So I do not trust the man. No, I do not. I recognize the deceit and the lies of the past and the fact that he has used chemical weapons against his own people. I am not surprised by what the U.S. said little because we cared little for victims and Saddam knew that at the time. We cared little for those victims whom Saddam was gassing and using chemical weapons against.

I want America to give peace a chance. I want Iraq to give peace a chance. As hard as it is for them to say anything, Iraqis may be the first to say that Saddam Hussein must go. But I guarantee you, Americans are the last from whom they want to hear the message. Iraqis feel that U.S. policy in the region robs us of any credibility and morality whatsoever.

I ask the administration to abandon its cowboy war rhetoric. Remember your campaign words, Mr. President, for a more humble approach to international affairs. We have and will be able to continue to contain Saddam. He loves himself more than he hates us. I recognize the depth of Saddam Hussein's darkness and cruelty, but never be underestimated. To underestimate Saddam Hussein would amount to tolerance of provocations already displayed towards the United States and the freedom-loving world.

We cannot, with the utmost clarity and conviction that we must anticipate our Nation's self-defense against a tyrant like Saddam Hussein. The argument that anticipatory self-defense is a preemptive strike in my mind has no merit. Is it preemptive since Iraq has ignored dozens of U.N. resolutions? Is it preemptive since Iraq has repeatedly ignored those who warned against this war? Is it preemptive since the Iraqi government has a belligerent regime as it continues to threaten the United States and the freedom-loving world.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has been very gracious. The time for the Committee on International Relations was supposed to end a half hour ago. We have had so many speakers, some of whom have waited. In the case of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), he has been waiting for 2 hours, and he has been very kind. We thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a man who lost friends in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time, and I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his graciousness.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor understanding the great gravity with which we debate this resolution. In particular as one who has two out of my three children in their late teens, I understand very well those concerns. But I believe that the arguments for voting in support of it have never been stronger.

With each day that passes, Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq take another step towards building a weapon of mass murder, reach out with another hand to embrace and support terrorism, and turn another back on the peaceful diplomacy of the international community.

It would be unwise not to confront this grave danger here before us, but it would be irresponsible. If the United States were to sit on its hands and wait for the meritless theory of nonintervention to somehow negotiate a compromise with Saddam Hussein, then we will have abdicated the greatest chance the world has ever bestowed upon America, that of the steward of freedom and democracy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has proceeded forward with the utmost dignity and courage of the aftermath of our darkest hour, September 11, 2001. We have forged ahead, determined to defend our precious creed of freedom and democracy. We have done so by turning to international diplomacy as a first option and military action as our last. But Saddam Hussein has chosen instead to resist, deceive and defy the international community by continuing, after more than a dozen U.N. resolutions.

The United States through its actions will rise to the occasion and help channel the greatest interests of the United Nations. By the way, as Americans, let us help the U.N. make its case for relevance in this world and propel it forward. It is wholly appropriate. My friend, for citizens, both American and throughout the world, to insist that this debate transcends international borders since Saddam Hussein's propensity to target his weapons of mass destruction does not stop with the United States but extends to every nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has been very gracious. The time for the Committee on International Relations was supposed to end a half hour ago. We have had so many speakers, some of whom have waited. In the case of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), he has been waiting for 2 hours, and he has been very kind. We thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his graciousness.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor understanding the great gravity with which we debate this resolution. In particular as one who has two out of my three children in their late teens, I understand very well those concerns. But I believe that the arguments for voting in support of it have never been stronger.

With each day that passes, Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq take another step towards building a weapon of mass murder, reach out with another hand to embrace and support terrorism, and turn another back on the peaceful diplomacy of the international community.

It would be unwise not to confront this grave danger here before us, but it would be irresponsible. If the United States were to sit on its hands and wait for the meritless theory of nonintervention to somehow negotiate a compromise with Saddam Hussein, then we will have abdicated the greatest chance the world has ever bestowed upon America, that of the steward of freedom and democracy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has proceeded forward with the utmost dignity and courage of the aftermath of our darkest hour, September 11, 2001. We have forged ahead, determined to defend our precious creed of freedom and democracy. We have done so by turning to international diplomacy as a first option and military action as our last. But Saddam Hussein has chosen instead to resist, deceive and defy the international community by continuing, after more than a dozen U.N. resolutions.

The United States through its actions will rise to the occasion and help channel the greatest interests of the United Nations. By the way, as Americans, let us help the U.N. make its case for relevance in this world and propel it forward. It is wholly appropriate. My friend, for citizens, both American and throughout the world, to insist that this debate transcends international borders since Saddam Hussein's propensity to target his weapons of mass destruction does not stop with the United States but extends to every nation in the world.

It is impossible to refute the fact that Saddam Hussein is intent on developing a delivery system for nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction that will reach well beyond the Middle East. Saddam Hussein has one eye on the United States. He most certainly has the other eye on our allies throughout the world.

The depth of Saddam Hussein's dark heart and cruelty should never be underestimated. To underestimate Saddam Hussein would amount to tolerance of provocations already displayed towards the United States and the freedom-loving world.

It is with the utmost clarity and conviction that we must anticipate our Nation's self-defense against a tyrant like Saddam Hussein. The argument that anticipatory self-defense is a preemptive strike in my mind has no merit. Is it preemptive since Iraq has ignored dozens of U.N. resolutions? Is it preemptive since Iraq has repeatedly ignored those who warned against this war? Is it preemptive since the Iraqi government has a belligerent regime as it continues to threaten the United States and the freedom-loving world.

Mr. Speaker, for citizens, both American and throughout the world, to insist that this debate transcends international borders since Saddam Hussein is complicit in his role of harboring and supporting those responsible for the attacks of September 11 or those who could presumably do the same or worse?

President John F. Kennedy faced down one of the most perilous threats this Nation has ever faced 40 years ago and successfully embraced the line of national defense that reserved the right of this Nation to act with a singular, individual, national interest in protecting the lives of its people. In this world, Mr. Speaker, in this new world community which has brought nations together in the most peaceful times and most desperate of times, the neighborhood has gotten much smaller. But in facing down the most dangerous threats, the challenge of protecting it has become that much greater.

But Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq take another hand to embrace and support terrorism, and turn another back on the peaceful diplomacy of the international community.

It would be unwise not to confront this grave danger here before us, but it would be irresponsible. If the United States were to sit on its hands and wait for the meritless theory of nonintervention to somehow negotiate a compromise with Saddam Hussein, then we will have abdicated the greatest chance the world has ever bestowed upon America, that of the steward of freedom and democracy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has proceeded forward with the utmost dignity and courage of the aftermath of our darkest hour, September 11, 2001. We have forged ahead, determined to def
waiver. We cannot wait. Our Nation must persevere in the face of doubt. We must stay united despite regional dissent, and we must remain resolute when others acquiesce. This is our charge as a people. This is our charge as a Nation, and it is our duty as leaders of the free world.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), 6 minutes of the time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and 90 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that the White House has sent us is a decided improvement over the original draft, but it could be better. If the amendment that I am offering is adopted, I believe that the amendment could draw even more votes and pass this House by a huge bipartisan majority. And in passing a war powers resolution, surely, surely, that should be one of our objectives.

Our resolution supports the President’s campaign in the Security Council for coercive inspections backed up by force. If the Iraqis defy the inspectors this time and the Security Council replies with military action, my amendment gives President Bush the power to use our Armed Forces just as his father did in the Persian Gulf War in 1991 in a military action sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council.

If, on the other hand, the Iraqis defy the inspectors and the Security Council fails to respond with force, then we will be faced with going it alone. In these dramatically different circumstances, my amendment called for a substitute amendment that provided for a military attack, but it ensures that the President will have a fast track for its consideration.

Those of us supporting this amendment, and we have a broad cross-section of our caucus behind it, see Saddam Hussein as a menace. We agree with the President in demanding that the Security Council enforce its resolution and allow no quarter. But for several reasons we do not want to see the United States act alone unless there is no other viable choice.

If we act alone, instead of being the United Nations versus Iraq, a war legitimated by the U.N. charter, this will be the United States versus Iraq, and it is evident that the United States versus the Muslim or Arab world. This is why one general officer, a former Commander of Central Command which has jurisdiction over the Middle East, told us, I fear that if we go it alone, we may pay a terrible price.

If we act alone, it will be harder to build a broad-based coalition, particularly an alliance of contiguous countries like Saudi Arabia and Turkey. If we can count on these countries as allies, their airspace and ports and airfields will be open to us; and the fight will be far easier. If we act alone, we will not have allies this time to help us share the cost. They did in 1991 when they picked up $62 billion out of an overall cost of $66 billion.

Right now, the administration is seeking new and tougher resolutions of the Security Council to disarm Iraq through inspections, but will the Security Council pass a throughput armed force if it is necessary. Our resolution fully supports that objective. But if these arms inspections do not work and the Security Council does not pass a resolution calling for Armed Forces against Iraq, we believe there should be a separate vote on military action.

I know that some will say that a second vote on the resolution is an imposition on the President’s powers, but in truth it is the age-old system of checks and balances at work. It is one way Congress can emphatically say what we prefer, that any action against Iraq should have the sanction of the Security Council and the support of a broad-based coalition.

As a practical matter, I doubt that further action of Congress will be needed. The British seem to be bent on securing approval of the Security Council before war. And if Saddam stiffs the arms inspectors, the French have insisted on a second vote of the Security Council before any military action is taken.

One way or another, I think a Security Council resolution is likely; and, once it passes, our resolution authorizes the President to use our Armed Forces to enforce it without further action of the Congress.

But over the last 6 weeks we have heard from a host of general officers, and retired officers, our former commanders in Europe: Generals Hoar and Zinni, the former commanders of Central Command. They virtually agreed on two things: First of all, in any conceivable confrontation with Iraq, with or without allies, the United States will prevail. But having allies, especially in the region, will make victory more certain and less costly in money and, more importantly, in human lives.

Secondly, we recognize that the post-war period will be the hardest part and far less certain. We do not want to win this war only to lose the peace and swell the ranks of terrorists who hate us. A broad-based coalition will help enhance our chances of success in that post-war period.

Some will say, I know, that this resolution depends too heavily on the Security Council. But the precedent it follows is the one that was set by the first President Bush in 1990-1991, an action that I have voted for and supported. Within days after Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, President Bush defined his goal as nothing less than a new world order. He turned to the United Nations first and sought a series of Security Council resolutions culminating in Resolution 678, which authorized the use of force. He obtained all of these Security Council resolutions with the apparent and evident support of Congress but with nothing more than the actual and expressed war powers resolution until just days before the war.

Rather than asserting that he could go it alone, he sought the Security Council’s approval and allies to stand with us and bear the cost and the burden of war and all but a fraction of the cost. The result was a successful military action and I believe a model that is still worth emulating.

My substitute does just that. I urge my colleagues to consider it carefully, and I hope that you will all support it. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Armed Services has spent a great deal of time working on this issue.

We have had 5 major open hearings. We have had three classified briefings, in which we invited every Member of the House to come in and listen to our intelligence agencies with respect to Iraq’s capability and weapons of mass destruction. Most Members came. We did have over almost 200 Members participate in those particular briefings, and our Members put in a great deal of time on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of America’s freedom, our Nation’s security, and the resolution before us.

We have the responsibility to deal with Saddam Hussein, not only because we have the most to lose, but because it is American leadership that the world looks to in times of crisis. While it is always preferable to lead a large coalition, America must be willing to go with a few like-minded friends or even alone if the situation demands it.

Indeed, the United Nations is at a crossroads. Either it proves itself to be relevant to the 21st century or, in the words of Winston Churchill, it will be known that “they decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, ambivalent for drift, a fraud for fluidity, all powerful for impotence.”

Our actions here in Congress speak to the world, and our resolve can only
heinous attacks of September 11, are the most likely to be destabilized.

Such an attack by the United States against Iraq is a made-to-order event that al Qaeda and other terrorist groups will use to recruit poverty stricken, disaffected young men and women in some of the most destitute areas of the world. Our Iraqi allies, as the most likely to be destabilized.

Waiting for a smoking gun is a risk that America cannot afford to take. If preemptive weapons inspections are not allowed in Iraq, a preemptive strike against Iraq is the only way to build a lasting peace in the Middle East and around the world. The brave men and women of the Armed Forces they represent are prepared to protect America against this threat.

I hope military action will not be necessary in Iraq, but I do not foresee Saddam Hussein conceding to unfettered weapons inspections throughout Iraq. If military action is necessary, the President and our troops should have the support of this Congress.

Let us send a message to the United Nations and indeed the world that the
United States is united behind our President in his efforts to remove weapons of mass destruction from Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, and I urge continued support for our President and Congress in the effort to bring Saddam Hussein to account.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have a grave decision to make on the resolution before us to authorize our Commander in Chief to use force supporting the United Nations resolution calling for Saddam Hussein to rid its nation of weapons of mass destruction.

My constituents and I share the same concerns about this resolution. As in any war, battlefield casualties in Iraq if we go to war with them. We must be prepared for a vicious war. Will our build-up be sufficient for the force we need to strike and overwhelm? Will our forces be properly prepared for the special battlefield needs of Iraq with its extremely harsh environment?

The consequences of this action will be large, at home and abroad. I do commend the President for seeing the wisdom of coalition building, and we strongly and very strongly recommend the United States proceed with a united coalition.

This debate in Congress must be a message to Saddam Hussein and his army that we are not playing games. There is a narrow opportunity for Saddam Hussein to prevent a military attack on his hiding places and on the protectors around him.

Saddam Hussein has ignored 15 United Nations Security Council resolutions. The United Nations was created to provide a forum in which nations can confront offensive nations for their behavior, and the entire world can stand together to oppose offending Nations. This is why we must proceed. We must not go to war alone. We must have a coalition.

Many things are pointing to the fact that time is our enemy in this moment. Whether or not Saddam now has usable nuclear weapons, he is fast approaching the moment he will possess them. The time for a tortured decision for all of us to make, it is time.

Saddam can offer unlimited inspections under the resolution being debated at the United Nations, and the United Nations can remove the threat of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Failing that, the military force of the United States and our allies would remove the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

This is a hard decision, and I was in Saudi Arabia 11 years ago when I met young Marine, 22 years of age, and he says, “Congressman, we need to go in there and do our job against Saddam Hussein, and let me tell you why.” He said, “My wife gave birth to a little boy. He is 2 months old now, and I do not want him to come and do the job that we did not do here.”

We are facing that threat again. I do not want to second-guess our Commander in Chief, nor do I want those who advise him on a daily basis. Therefore, I reluctantly support the resolution and ask for the prayers of the American patriots for the soldiers we would likely send to Iraq.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), one of the most senior, one of the most distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult decision. I do not think anyone here takes this decision lightly. And so I ask myself some questions as I approach this. The first one is, Can we do what needs to be done without going to war? And the answer I come to is, maybe. I hope so. But not if I know that I lack of support of this resolution. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Saddam Hussein has said he will give inspectors unfettered access; however, his regime has in place an elaborate or-ganization to prevent and deceive inspectors. This is the answer to that question is, yes, indeed, Saddam Hussein has the means to be a threat. And the answer is, yes. And I believe we have a coalition. Whether or not Saddam now has with these kinds of weapons, including anthrax, botulinum toxin, and possibly smallpox. His regime has in place an elaborate organization to prevent and deceive inspectors.

One of these palaces is about the size of a presidential palace. And when I say palaces, my colleagues may think of some nice building with some scenic grounds and gardens around it. That is not what a presidential palace is in Iraq. Many of these palaces are acres. One of these palaces is about the size of Washington, D.C., 40,000 acres, with thousands of buildings, including warehouses. This is what he calls presidential palaces.

Some ask, now that Iraq has agreed to unconditional inspections, why does Congress need to act? Well, my colleagues, the issue is not inspections; the issue is disarmament. The issue is compliance. Four years of satellite surveillance has shown these complexes he calls palaces are expanding. What is inside or underneath them we do not know, and we must know. The next question is, Does he have the means to be a threat? And the answer is, and we have heard it over and over today, of course he does. Iraq has a 30-year history of weapons of mass destruction programs. His regime is actively pursuing weapons of mass destruction. His regime has amassed large clandestine stockpiles of biological weapons, including anthrax, botulinum toxin, and possibly smallpox. His regime has an active program to acquire and develop nuclear weapons. The answer to that question is, yes, indeed, he does have the means.

The next question I ask myself is: Does he have the intent? Saddam Hussein's history of using weapons of mass destruction demonstrates the likelihood that he will use them in the future. In 1982, Iraq used riot-control agents against Iranian attacks. Iraq has used more deadly agents, including mustard gas in 1983, and tabun in 1984, becoming a nation in the world today who has used nerve agents in a time of war.

The State Department lists 10 incidents of Iraqi chemical weapons attacks between August 1983 and March 1988. All were launched against the Iranian and Kurdish populations, resulting in casualty tolls in the tens of thousands. Saddam Hussein has ordered the use of chemical weapons, sarin, tabun, VX, against Iraqis. And even to come here. The answer is, yes, he has the will, the intent, the history to use these things and to thumb his nose at the world's society by violating United Nations' resolutions.

A decision to use military force is never an easy decision, and no one with any sense considers war a first choice. It is the last thing that any rational person wants to do. We do not want to go to war. But there are times when we have to be prepared to go to war to stand up to such despotic psychopathic killers as Saddam Hussein. I encourage the support of this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a member of the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and a long-time voice for preemptive war to credit.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time and for his great leadership on matters of international affairs.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the majority resolution. I still get dizzy trying to figure out which of President Bush’s multiple and often contradictory rationales for preemptive war to credit. First, he believes Members of Congress wanted him to go to the U.N. to assure an international coalition; then he goes there, but only after American and world opinion compelled him to go there, and even to come here.

We must go further. We must repudiate the imprudent and dangerous doctrine of preemption. Others will speak on the floor of Iraq. Iraq is the least of it. It is no accident that the President chose this same period to announce a brand-new American doctrine of preemption. Iraq is only the first case in point. Bush has already announced Iraq will not be the last.
It is bad enough that if we vote for the majority resolution we are for the first time in 226 years of American history voting to allow an American President to go to war, and I am quoting, “as he determines to be necessary and appropriate,” not as Congress determines, to be necessary and appropriate. As clear as it gets, this vote would be an unconstitutional delegation of the exclusive power of Congress to declare war. It is simply shocking to give away the unique life and liberty we all have, and there is no law at all if not determined by precedent. Thus, a vote for the majority resolution is a vote not only for a preemptive war on Iraq, but for the new Bush doctrine of preemption that would then be available to the national government. There is no way to get away from what precedent means in our law and in the law of nations. There is no rule of law unless it applies equally to all. And there is no law at all if not determined by precedent. Thus, a vote for the majority resolution is a vote not only for a preemptive war on Iraq, but for the new Bush doctrine of preemption that would then be available to the national government. There is no way to get away from what precedent means in our law and in the law of nations. Because preemption is unlawful under international law, passage of this resolution would make our country an instant international outlaw. Worse, the Iraq precedent means that all bets are off for all nations to do the same.

This resolution gives over the power the people have given to us to the sole discretion of one man, the President of the United States. And who will that be? It will be Mr. Bush’s preemptive wars? Today, we have a volunteer army whose race and class composition speaks to the absence of equal opportunity in civilian society. The middle— and upper-middle class, for the most part, no longer serve and will not be on the front lines. African Americans are 25 percent of the U.S. Army today, Hispanics are 9 percent, an Army more than one-third made of people of color. Already the American people have pulled Bush back before, and surely pull harder if the average son or the average daughter were subject to service today.

Preemptive war is a doctrine that could only survive, if it does, when those who would be the ground troops have had other opportunities preempted. Let the Congress do its own preemption. Let us preempt this President by reclaining our constitutional right to declare war and reclaining two centuries of American principles. Let us agree to speak up so that we may be sent to war without Congress sending them there, whether those who fight look like you or look like me.

Let Congress take hold of this manmade crisis that has already introduced instability into a world that can least afford it now. Let Congress guide our Nation back to its own most precious principles.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who chairs our Subcommittee on Military Construction and has spent many hours on this issue as the chairman of the Panel on Terrorism on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the resolution, while I certainly hope that it will pass. Madam Speaker, in 1991, when the coalition broke off the fight with Saddam’s army northeast of Kuwait City, I was curious as to why that happened. And in garnering an understanding of it, I understood it was because the United States and the coalition partners played by the rules. The United Nations had authorized certain activities, we carried out those activities, and we understood that the U.N. set the rules for that conflict and we abided by them.

But I also had the opportunity a week or so later to be a part of the first civilian delegation to go to Kuwait City after the war, and I saw something different. I saw how Saddam Hussein, 1991, ignored the rules of warfare, ignored the rules of humanity, ignored the rules of being a human being. I saw how he burned the city, how he destroyed the homes, how he executed innocent civilians. And it was a videotape of the Iraqi military marching a young man out, tying his hands behind him on a post, and without a blindfolding shooting him, firing-squad style. And has he lay there dripping on the pole, the leader of the firing squad walked over to him with a handgun and shot him one more time in the head. It was enough to make our group cry and to realize what a success it had been expelling such a despot from Kuwait.

And of course during the war with Kuwait, the war with Iraq at that time, Saddam decided to attack two other countries. He attacked the Saudis with SCUDs and he attacked the Israelis with SCUDs, both Tel Aviv and Haifa. Innocent people were subject to SCUDs and he attacked the Israelis with SCUDs. He did not do it. September 9, 1998, Iraq had to have a northern no-fly zone to protect his own people, the Kurds, and he attacked the Kurds with SCUDs and he attacked the Israelis with SCUDs. He did not do it. On March 27, 1996, Iraq must report to the U.N. on the development of all weapons of mass destruction, and he did not do it. On October 11, 1991, Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA inspectors. He did not do it.

Iraq, in 1994, Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors. He did not do it.

On March 27, 1996, Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to the development of mass destruction to the U.N. and IAEA. He did not do it.

In 1999, Iraq must immediately end repressive actions against its own civilians. He did not do it.

On August 15, 1991, Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq to be in full compliance. He did not do it.

On October 11, 1991, Iraq must cooperate fully with the U.N. and IAEA inspectors. He did not do it.

In 1994, Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors. He did not do it.

In June 1997, Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to U.N. officials. He did not do it.


On two more occasions, once in 1999 and once later that year in 1999, Iraq must fulfill its commitment to run Gulf War prisoners and cooperate with U.N. inspectors, and he did not do it.

For those who say give Saddam Hussein one more chance, I have to disagree. I think he has had plenty of chances. I hope that a big vote will occur on Thursday and show Saddam Hussein that this body stands together against tyranny.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).
(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

After much thought and with deep conviction, I rise in strong support of this resolution. There is no task more grave or serious than the task of putting at risk the lives of people. The decision we are about to make will in fact put at risk the lives of the young patriots who wear the uniform of this country so well and so proudly. And it will put at risk innocent lives of people in Iraq who deserve better.

I support this resolution because it will save lives. It will manifest the principled purpose of this country to use our great might and power as a force for saving life. Tonight Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi Government maintain an arsenal of weapons of mass death. Iraq tonight possesses biological weapons and chemical weapons. The best estimate of the most optimistic observers, in 5 to 7 years Iraq will possess nuclear weapons. Others are more pessimistic. They believe it will be a matter of months.

I believe the truth is that the greatest risk to innocent life in this country, in Iraq, and around the world. There are principled and patriotic people in this debate, many of my friends who take a different position than I do. I respect their patriotism. I listen carefully to their views, but I must say I disagree with what they have to say. Some say Iraq will not use these weapons of mass death because the leader of Iraq, although evil, is not suicidal.

I share with the President the conviction that I am not willing to risk the lives of any Americans or any people anywhere on a prediction on the behavior of Saddam Hussein. There are others who argue that although Saddam possesses these weapons of mass death, he cannot use them against us because he cannot deliver them against us. This is not the case.

Tonight American troops are within the range of his missiles, and perhaps even more importantly, we are all within reach of the use of these weapons through unconventional means: anthrax sprayed by crop dusters, sarin gas pumped through our subway system, smallpox virus dumped into the heating or air conditioning system of a shopping mall or an office building.

Anyone who believes that we are beyond the reach of terrorist weapons has missed the lessons in the last 13 months in America. There are those that argue that we should wait for the United Nations Security Council to agree with our assessment of the compelling need to remove this risk. I support and encourage the President and his administration to seek that support from the United Nations.

But no one can make no mistake about it, these weapons of mass death are not pointed at the Germans who doubt the scope of this risk. They are not pointed at Saddam’s Arab neighbors who scoff at the necessity of this mission. These weapons of mass death are meant to kill Americans, and we will not and should not ask anyone’s permission to defend the people of this country.

There are those who say that we should give weapons inspections another chance. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) laid out chapter and verse just how many chances we have already given. On 13 occasions during the Gulf War in 1991, Iraq has violated the weapons inspection agreements. After each such occasion, they promised the next time to comply. The next time never comes.

We hear others say that we should not proceed because what follows Saddam Hussein in Iraq might be worse, that it will cause disruption around that area of the world. This is not a matter of making a military judgment. However, there is nothing worse than a despot with weapons of mass death that can be used against the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, throughout history Members of this body have faced moments when they have to change history. Our predecessors during the American Revolution had their moment, and they chose to rebel and create independence for this country.

Our predecessors at the time of the Civil War had the painful choice of waging war to keep the Union whole. They had their moment, and they rose to the occasion. Our predecessors in the 1940s had their moment when they stood up and they talked about the evil of Nazi Germany and its allies around the world, and they rose to the occasion.

Madam Speaker, this is our moment. This is the moment when we will begin to change history toward a path where there is liberation, liberation of the people of Iraq from tyranny and liberation of the people of America and the rest of the world from the fear of terror. Let us seize our moment, Republicans and Democrats together, and vote for this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), who has been a 22-year member on the Committee on Armed Services and is leaving this year. The gentleman has been a very wise contributor to this debate in the committee.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, there have been very few times in history when there has been a nation that has had the will and the military might to stop a murderer, a despot, a dictator. I have often wondered about the time in the thirties, as I read history, when Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of England, talked to Hitler about the idea of him not going into Czecholeslovakia. He retired, and he explained to Parliament that Hitler was not going to do it. There was another man in Parliament who stood up and said, No, we cannot trust Hitler. That will not happen. His name was Churchill, and he was born off the floor for doing that, but Churchill had the courage and the vision to see what Hitler was actually going to do.

Madam Speaker, what if there had been a nation with the determination, the will, and the courage to try might to stop Hitler at that time, a nation which said we better stop him before he gets stronger than he is? What would have happened at that time? Literally millions of people would have been saved. But no, no one seemed to have it.

In the early 1980s, many Members who were here remember our Israeli friends when they saw the build up of Iraq’s heavy water capacity and what would they do? The Israelis did not wait very long. They sent in F-16s with 500-pound bombs on their wings, and they bombed it to smithereens to stop it from being used.

I think we have some short memories around here. I have been listening to this debate today. Some Members say we cannot do a preemptive strike or go ahead with this on our own. How about Grenada? We walked in there because we could see a big problem starting out at that time. What about Panama? What about Muammar Qadhafi when he stood up and he talked about the line of death, and Ronald Reagan sent three F-16s, and that kind of calmed him down at that time. But he was getting pretty big for his britches at that point.

I have heard Members talk about inspections. I am given to understand Iraq is about the same size as Big Sky Country that the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) represents. How many Members have been to Montana? It is pretty good-sized. I think we could put 10,000 inspectors over there, and if Saddam Hussein did not want us to find anything, we would not have a prayer of finding it. It is a big country. Keep in mind, he is much better at hiding than we are at finding, and that seems to be the question that we have with him at this time:

I do not think that Americans want inspection; we want disarmament. We want him to give up the weapons of war that he has.

It reminds me of the old saw that Al Capone said to Elliot Ness. Sure you can come in and inspect the place, but you cannot look in the back room where the girls and the booze and the drugs are. I think basically that is what we have had during this time that we have had our inspectors over there. Madam Speaker, let me point out that our first President made a very
wise statement and one we have to live by. He said, "The best way to keep the peace is to be prepared for war." It always bothers me when I hear our past Secretary of Defense, and now Vice President, when he gives that great talk about the particular problem we are facing, get ready, and then we disarm; and we do it time and time again.

Madam Speaker, this time if we want to save ourselves some great problems, we should support this resolution and support the President of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COYNE), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COYNE. Madam Speaker, I believe that the United States has legitimate concerns about weapons of mass destruction in Saddam Hussein's hands and that our government should be working to eliminate the threat presented by these weapons. Consequently, I believe that Saddam Hussein must comply with the U.N. mandate and guarantee U.N. inspectors unfettered access to any sites in Iraq that might be harboring weapons of mass destruction. 

I object, however, to the approach that the Bush Administration is taking to deal with this particular problem. The administration has pursued a headlong, almost unilateral rush to war with the implicit goal of regime change in Iraq. The administration has yet to make a convincing case to Congress that military action against Iraq at this time is necessary or even desirable. I am gravely concerned that the policy of preemptive attack and U.S.-imposed regime change may produce a situation in the Middle East that is even more dangerous for the United States than it is today.

Military action might eventually be necessary but only with clearer proof of that necessity and only after all other options have been exhausted with regard to Iraq. I oppose this resolution because it permits the administration to invade Iraq without first exhausting its diplomatic options. The administration should first pursue action through the United Nations to deal with the potential threat posed by the Iraqi government and then only then should we consider a unilateral action against Iraq.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHale), who is the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Madam Speaker, truly one of the most profound points bestowed upon this Congress is the authority to send our American men and women into armed conflict. The loss of human life that invariably attends every war, no matter how swift or certain its course, demands that such action be executed carefully, with a full understanding of the consequences likely to arise both from the conflict itself as well as from its aftermath. This debate will, as it should, reveal many such questions, many doubts that we have heard here already this evening, many pleas to adopt a different course.

I want to say to those who raise those concerns I extend my gratitude. In my mind, their pleas are not a product of weakness, as some have suggested, but, rather, to the contrary, a necessary challenge for all of us to carefully weigh every possibility, every path.

The question, Madam Speaker, now for those of us entrusted with this awesome authority is to ensure that we have met those challenges, to ensure that Saddam Hussein, for 11 years, has contemplied on this floor for the next 20 hours is our one true choice, the one necessary step to protect the lives and the well-being of more than 280 million Americans who have bestowed upon us this trust in making such weighty decisions.

For me, Madam Speaker, the answer is sadly a resounding yes.

The most vital question before us at this moment is, should we fail to act, what does tomorrow bring? The answer is clear. More debate, more doubts. As President Bush said so clearly in his address to the American people last night, a future of fear. For the past 11 years we have placed our hopes as a good and decent people against the reality of the unabashed deceptions, deceits, and deeds of one of the most despicable tyrants the civilized world has ever known, Saddam Hussein. For 11 years, Madam Speaker, we have hoped Saddam would abandon his murderous ways and at long last obey the dictates of the world community and the rule of international law. We have hoped, hoped he would dismantle and destroy his stockpile of biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction and forensic his feverish pursuit of nuclear weapons. We have hoped Saddam would respect the clear resolutions, 16 in number, of the United Nations and follow the terms that he himself committed to at the end of the 1991 Gulf War.

While we have hoped, Saddam Hussein has plotted and marched forward. During the past 11 years, from September 11 tell the American people through this vote that all we can now offer is hope? How can we merely hope the next cloud we see rising from an attack on our shores will not be from the starting blocks and biological weapons? How will hope dull his affection for, and known support of, numerous terror organizations? And how can hope alone prevent the transfer of his horrible agents of death into the hands of those who have already declared war on our country?

I ask my colleagues, can our message to the American people possibly be at this critical hour we hope the judgment, common sense, and humanity of Saddam Hussein will spare us one more day, just one more day so we can what? Begin to hope again.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to hope that our country leaders to further pursue their ongoing efforts with the United Nations Security Council to produce a workable and just resolution of a dangerous situation too long ignored. I yearn for a way that a timely, understood, unconditional, and effective weapons inspection system can be put into place that Iraq will accept and cooperate with to the benefit of not just America but peace-loving nations throughout the world. And, most of all, I pray we may yet avoid the conflict that this resolution considers, avoiding the need to yet again call our service and women into harm's way.

But in the end, Madam Speaker, should it all fail, we cannot entrust the future of the world great democracy and the very lives of its people to a man who trades not in hope but in destruction, to a man who rules by fear.

This country has seen many great yesterdays. It is our solemn duty this day, Madam Speaker, to ensure that we realize many equally bright tomorrows. It is at long last time for Saddam Hussein to hope and for this Congress to act.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McIntyre), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. McIntyre. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution but in even stronger support of our brave men and women who have dedicated their lives to the common defense of the United States and who stand firm with America, as we well should, in this critical hour of our history.

If Saddam Hussein continues to threaten the security of our Nation by harboring terrorists, producing chemical and biological weapons, and developing nuclear weapons, then the use of military force becomes not a question of if but when.

In adopting this resolution, we must do everything in our power to ensure that our forces have the means, the necessary tools, and the moral and political support of every American to accomplish the daunting task before us. With U.S. forces stationed both here at home and abroad, from America to Afghanistan, from Kosovo to Korea and regions between, our military must be provided with the necessary support to achieve its objective. This means financial support, the best equipment possible, a clear objective, and continued diplomatic efforts, always hoping and praying that peace can be achieved.

We must put American troops in the best possible position to do the job
they are called to do. We must commit ourselves to ensuring that the United States will continue to remain the backbone of freedom and the beacon of democracy throughout the world.

Putting our brave men and women in harm's way is a difficult decision but one we must make. Saddam is determined, and we should be prepared. We owe them our unwavering commitment to provide all the means necessary to carry out the mission before them.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution today because it contains three important components:

First, it ensures that we have first exhausted all diplomatic efforts.

Second, it authorizes the use of force once those efforts have been exhausted.

And, third, it requires the administration to work with the Congress so that we can make sure that our troops are in the best position possible to do the job they are called to do.

One of my constituents, the most highly trained and well-equipped fighting force in the world, and one who-each and every American serviceman and woman the thanks and prayers of a grateful Nation. May God bless our Armed Forces and all those who seek to protect the precious freedoms that so many have fought for throughout the history of this Nation, and may God grant us the wisdom and the will to stand firm for the blessings of freedom wherever duty may call.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on International Relations, I yield 60 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, the resolution negotiated between the President and the House leadership represents an abdication of Congress' responsibilities and Congress share war-making powers, yet the underlying resolution represents an abdication of Congress'
constitutional role. This is the people’s House. Pass this resolution, and the people’s voice will be silenced. Pass this resolution, and Congress’ role in this matter is finished as of this week.

We are being used as a megaphone to co-communicate the President’s resolve. We should have a larger role, an equal role.

The underlying resolution is also troubling for how it is rationalized. The President has justified his action under new doctrines of preemptive strike and regime change. What precedent do these doctrines set, for ourselves and for others? How many wars will start when another country launches a preemptive strike against a nation that it determines to be a threat?

The United States created the institutions and laws that have governed the international system for the last half century precisely because no nation benefits more than the United States from a rules-based international system. There are serious questions about the precedents we set and the dangers we create. This House should reserve to a later time the question of whether or not unilateral military action is authorized by the international system.

We should, instead, pass the Spratt substitute. It reflects four fundamental principles:

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

Second, it contains 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 President gets expedited consideration by Congress on an up or down vote without amendment on the second resolution set forth in the Spratt amendment.

The Spratt amendment affirms that the U.S. should work through the United Nations Security Council first, and unilaterally only as a last resort.

In the war on terrorism, we need more friends and allies and fewer enemies. We are unlikely to succeed through unilateral preemptive policies so poorly received overseas. The Spratt substitute is our best opportunity to disassociate us from invading the Middle East and to keep this Congress relevant in the decisions that lie ahead.

Support the Spratt substitute, and reject the underlying resolution.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY), a hard-working member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RILEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, God has truly blessed America. Through his guidance and grace, we have built and preserved a nation more free and prosperous and peaceful than any in history; and it is written of those to whom much is given, much is required. I believe those words, and they have helped me to make my decision.

Madam Speaker, it is my firm belief that Saddam Hussein is a clear and present danger to the world community. America has been given the ability to stop Saddam; and, therefore, I believe that America is required to stop Saddam. If we do not, no one will.

That much is clear.

The America’s hesitation will be measured in lives lost and nations ruined. I, for one, Madam Speaker, am not willing to pay the terrible price that appeasement will eventually cost.

I ask, if one less nation is willing to help in this endeavor, is Saddam any less dangerous? Americans have learned and learned tragically that we must confront the danger or else we will suffer the aftermath. Appeasement did not work with Saddam; and appeasement will not work with Saddam.

Madam Speaker, tyrants like Saddam do not understand the language of peace. Therefore, Congress must give President Bush the ability to speak the language of peace. But if we hesitate, if we fail to act, I believe history will judge this Congress with a single word, naivé.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I would like to address the points made by my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who gave really a very intelligent and thoughtful presentation of his position in opposition to this resolution. There are a couple of points he made that I would like to respond to.

One, the question of this being an open-ended grant of authority to allow the President to get the United States into the war and analogizing it to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

I remember the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. This is not the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. That resolution also provides that the United States create the international system for the last half century precisely because no nation determines to be a threat.

This is not a blank check; it is a broad, but circumscribed, authority to use the Armed Forces against a current threat.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I share my friend from California’s profound respect for the gentleman from Maine. I work with him on the Committee on Armed Services, and every issue he approaches in a very thoughtful and reasonable way.

I have a very different interpretation than he put on this resolution. The statement that our role is finished after this week as a Congress, I do not read the resolution that way, in two very important respects.

The first is that the resolution explicitly references the War Powers Act and the reporting requirements that the President has under that act to come back to this body, consult with us and pay due homage to our co-equal constitutional responsibilities.

Second, obviously the appropriations process is an ongoing process that gives us a frequent and important role in assessing the decisions that the executive branch makes.

I would also say that the reference to the language of “as the President determines,” it is important to understand what precedes that language.

That precedent is the Spratt resolution, a complete playing out of the United Nations process and the weapons inspection process that so many people wish to see. This was an important improvement in this resolution that the major- ity leader of the Democratic Party was successful in negotiating.

So I believe that this resolution does not run the risks that the gentleman
from Maine referenced, I think that we have our continuing constitutional role, it is our obligation to exercise it, and that the President's determinations follow a careful engagement at the United Nations and an acute assessment of the success or failure of the weapons inspection process.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, is there anything in this resolution that would prevent the President from committing 500,000 troops to a war in Iraq without further congressional action?

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I indicated that this was a broad, but not unlimited, delegation of authority to use force for a specific purpose, the elimination of the weapons of mass destruction and the need to eliminate them and the supporting and harboring of terrorism. But this bill, as I said in my opening comments, would not allow U.N. weapons inspectors to be continually used as puppets.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, it gives me an unusually great deal of pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services, someone who is uniquely qualified to speak tonight on this issue, who is a decorated combat veteran of both Vietnam and the Persian Gulf War, and knows Saddam Hussein on a personal basis.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for his genuine recognition.

Madam Speaker, there is no one in this body, no matter what political philosophy one ascribes to, that doubts that Saddam Hussein is not a leader for a peaceful political world.

Having been in war, I am not one who rushes into war quickly or blindly, nor am I one who cowers when our country and our Nation is threatened. Madam Speaker, in 1991, I flew through the smoke and the ashes of the fires in Kuwait ordered by Saddam Hussein in the Gulf War, and in that war I saw the death and the destruction this dictator is capable of. I saw missiles launched at our troops. But, more importantly, if we doubt Saddam's intentions, I saw nearly three dozen missiles launched at Israel, a country not even participating in that war. Innocent lives were lost.

After the Gulf War, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 687 which stated that Iraq must disarm. That resolution created the U.N. Special Commissions to verify Iraq's elimination of their weapons of mass destruction.

Throughout the 1990s, as weapons inspectors went throughout Iraq, it became more and more evident that Iraq had no intention of disarming. Saddam no longer gave U.N. inspectors the unrestricted access they needed to ensure Iraq no longer possessed weapons of mass destruction.

From 1991 to 1998, the U.N. passed 16 resolutions mandating that Iraq allow weapons inspectors complete and unfettered access, and each time Iraq refused.

Today, we find Iraq with 30,000 liters of anthrax and other biological weapons, thousands of gallons of chemical weapons, and months away from possessing nuclear weapon capability.

I support sending U.N. inspectors back into Iraq to verify their disarmament, but not under the previous resolutions which Iraq has never followed. The only way to ensure the success of a weapons inspection team, or any weapons team, is to pass a new resolution that would add very tough consequences for noncompliance. We cannot allow U.N. weapons inspectors to be continually used as puppets.

Since President Bush's address at the United Nations last month, Iraq has already changed its position four, yes, times on the level of access U.N. weapons inspectors will have, the latest of which is not complete and unfettered access.

While the use of military force is and must be the last option, it is an option that must be discussed here, must be debated here and, ultimately, granted to the President.

I support the bipartisan resolution we are currently debating, authorizing the President to use military force if necessary. President Bush is responsible for our country's security, not the United Nations. I will not tie the President's hands by allowing the United Nations to decide when, how, and if we will protect the United States and its citizens. After the events of September 11, we must do everything in our power to protect the people of this country.

Ironically, Saddam Hussein was the only world leader to fully condemn what happened on September 11 and has stated on many occasions his hatred for our country.

Saddam Hussein supports international terrorism, including paying $25,000 to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers, and he shelters many terrorist organizations with a history of killing Americans, like the MKO and the Palestine Liberation Front.

Recently, Saddam Hussein's media promised the American people that if their government did not change its policies over Iraq it would suffer even more devastating blows.

I am convinced that, given the opportunity, Saddam would use his weapons of mass destruction against us, whether directly or indirectly through selling them to some terrorist organization.

That must not happen. We cannot let a catastrophic attack on American soil be the smoking gun that he possesses such weapons. We must not cower. We must not back down. We must stand united and grant the President the authority he needs to protect this Nation and its people. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

Mr. Net submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3295) to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards for States and units of local government with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes:
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