

Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472).

“(2) DONATION OF BODY ARMOR.—Notwithstanding section 203 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) is in serviceable condition;

“(B) is surplus property; and

“(C) meets or exceeds the requirements of National Institute of Justice Standard 0101.03 (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

“(3) NOTICE TO ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of a Federal agency who donates body armor under this subsection shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a written notice identifying the amount of body armor donated and each State or local law enforcement agency that received the body armor.

“(4) DONATION BY CERTAIN OFFICERS.—

“(A) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—In the administration of this subsection with respect to the Department of Justice, in addition to any other officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

“(i) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

“(ii) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(iii) The Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

“(iv) The Director of the United States Marshals Service.

“(B) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—In the administration of this subsection with respect to the Department of the Treasury, in addition to any other officer of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

“(A) The Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

“(B) The Commissioner of Customs.

“(C) The Director of the United States Secret Service.

“(5) NO LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not be liable for any harm occurring in connection with the use or misuse of any body armor donated under this subsection.”

(9) section 11011(b) of the bill by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”.

(10) section 11016 of the bill by striking “of 1953”.

(11) section 11017(c) of the bill by striking “section 1 of this legislation” and inserting “subsection (a)”.

(12) Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure—

(A) in subdivision (a)(1)(G) of such Rule, as amended by section 11019(b)(1) of the bill—

(i) by striking “Government” each place it appears and inserting “government”.

(ii) by striking “shall” each place it appears and inserting “must”, and

(iii) by striking “medical” and inserting “mental”, and

(B) in subdivision (b)(1)(C) of such Rule, as amended by section 11019(b)(2) of the bill—

(i) by striking “Government” each place it appears and inserting “government”.

(ii) by striking “Government’s” and inserting “government’s”, and

(iii) by striking “shall” each place it appears and inserting “must”.

(13) part R of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by section 12102 of the bill—

(A) in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(1)(B) of section 1802 of such part by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”, and

(B) in section 1808(b) of such part by striking “90” and inserting “120”, and

(14) section 5037(b) of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended by section 12301(2)(B) of the bill, by striking “imprisonment” and inserting “official detention”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 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 forged 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;

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 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 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 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 relevant laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations” (Public Law 105-235);

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 weap-

ons 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 thereby threatening international peace and security in the region, by refusing to release, repatriate, or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman, and by failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait;

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

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its continuing hostility toward, and willingness to attack, the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush and by firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas members of al Qaida, an organization bearing responsibility for 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 Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of American citizens;

Whereas the attacks on 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 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 justify action by the United States to defend itself;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes the use of all necessary means to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 660 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, repression of its civilian population in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688, and threatening its neighbors or United Nations operations in Iraq in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 949;

Whereas Congress in the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1) has authorized the President “to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677”;

Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it “supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 as being consistent with the Authorization of Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1),” that Iraq’s repression of its civilian population violates United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 and “constitutes a continuing threat to

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 Resolution 688”;

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 “work for the necessary resolutions,” while also making clear that “the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, and the just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable”;

Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq’s ongoing support for international terrorist groups combined with its development of weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of its obligations under the 1991 cease-fire and other United Nations Security Council resolutions make clear 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 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 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 the President has authority under the Constitution to take action in order to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States, as Congress recognized in the joint resolution on Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40); and

Whereas it is in the national security of the United States to restore international peace and security to the Persian Gulf region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq”.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

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

(1) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq and encourages him in those efforts; and

(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 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; and

(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 may be feasible, 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 countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorists 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 is intended 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 authority granted in section 3 and 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 93-148 (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 report shall be considered as meeting the requirements of 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:

H.J. RES. 114

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 defend 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 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 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 development capabilities, which finally 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 relevant 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 resolution of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of its civilian population thereby threatening international peace and security in the region, by refusing to release, repatriate, or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman, and by failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait;

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

Whereas the current Iraqi regime has demonstrated its continuing hostility toward, and willingness to attack, the United States, including by attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush and by firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas members of al Qaida, an organization bearing responsibility for 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 Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of United States citizens;

Whereas the attacks on 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 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 justify action by the United States to defend itself;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) authorizes the use of all necessary means to enforce 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 Iraq in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 949 (1994);

Whereas in the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1), Congress has authorized the President "to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolution 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677";

Whereas in December 1991, Congress expressed its sense that it "supports the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 as being consistent with the Authorization of Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1)," that Iraq's repression of its civilian population violates United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 and "constitutes a continuing threat to 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 Resolution 688";

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (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 "work for the necessary resolutions," while also making clear that "the Security Council resolutions will be enforced, and the just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable";

Whereas the United States is determined to prosecute the war on terrorism and Iraq's ongoing support for international terrorist groups combined with its development of weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of its obligations under the 1991 cease-fire and other United Nations Security Council resolutions make clear 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 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 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 the President has authority under the Constitution to take action in order to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States, as Congress recognized in the joint resolution on Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40); and

Whereas it is in the national security interests of the United States to restore international peace and security to the Persian Gulf region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002".

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

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

(1) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq and encourages him in those efforts; and

(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 regarding Iraq.

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 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; and

(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 may be feasible, 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 joint resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorist 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 is intended 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 joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

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, including those actions described in section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338).

(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 otherwise required to be submitted to Congress pursuant to the reporting requirements of the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148), all such reports may be submitted as a single consolidated report to the Congress.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—To the extent that the information required by section 3 of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1) is included in the report required by this section, such report shall be considered as meeting the requirements of section 3 of such resolution.

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 Report 107-724. Amendments in 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 read, and shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent.

□ 1215

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. HYDE) 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).

GENERAL LEAVE

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.

There is no more grave responsibility that we undertake 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 in Iraq to defend the national security interests of the United States and to enforce the 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 could not impact us. We lived in a splendid isolation, protected by two vast oceans. Before that fateful day, war and disorder were distant rumblings from a far-off land. But on September 11, that distant rumbling hit New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. We have a sacred duty to do all that we can to ensure that what happened on September 11 never happens in America again.

Some may question the connection between Iraq and those terrorists who hijacked those planes. There is no doubt that Iraq supports and harbors those terrorists who wish harm to the United States. Is there a direct connec-

tion between Iraq and al Qaeda? The President thinks so; and based upon what I have seen, I think so also. Should we wait until we are attacked again before finding out for sure; or should we do all that we can to disarm Saddam Hussein's regime before they provide al Qaeda with weapons of mass destruction?

Just a year ago, this Capitol building was attacked when someone mailed anthrax-laden letters to Members of Congress. We have never found the perpetrator. Was that a terrorist attack? Undoubtedly. Was it connected to al Qaeda or Saddam Hussein? We do not know. But it serves as a wake-up call to all Americans. Why do we not take the biological and chemical weapons away from this regime before we find out for sure?

For those Members who are worried about the doctrine of preemption, let me say this is not a new conflict with Iraq. Our planes which have been patrolling the no-fly zone since the end of the Persian Gulf War pursuant to U.N. resolutions have been fired upon by the Iraqi military hundreds of times.

This conflict is ongoing, but now it has become critical that we take the next step. We know Saddam Hussein is a bad actor. We know what he did to the people of Kuwait when he invaded there. We know what he did to his neighbors in Iran when he used chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war. We know that he gassed his own people, including women and children, to put down a rebellion. For those who argue 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 up their armies, invaded 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 New Jersey (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 now lapsed. This is the only time 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 much longer, but given the fact that we have only this short amount of time, that time ought to be divided equally so that those people who are opposed to the resolution will have the opportunity to make their case in the same amount of time as those people who favor the resolution.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 these 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.

□ 1230

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 to present 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 party 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. HINCHEY. 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 every Republican 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. HINCHEY. 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 many people 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. HINCHEY. 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 Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) makes a very valid point. It was my understanding by the resolution that each Member was guaranteed 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. HINCHEY) 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 in the full force and view 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. HINCHEY. 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 will 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. The rule has been adopted by voice vote.

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 now 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 need to debate this issue fairly and openly, and it seems to me and 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 and equitable 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. HINCHEY. 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 chairman 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. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I understand what the

gentleman is saying, and I appreciate it, but again I appeal to the House because I believe a mistake has been made.

A small amount of time, in my view too small amount of time, has been allocated to this debate. This is a matter of such utmost seriousness which involves issues of life and death as well as the interpretation of this body of the United States Constitution and the division of powers between the executive and legislative branches, so much so that to provide such a small amount of time is unreasonable and unwarranted in this case. We have the opportunity to provide as much time as we want. We do not have to limit this debate to 2 days. We can give it much more time than that. In that context, 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 merely like to 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?

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, to move 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 if 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 life and death implications, 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 rule 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 House with an 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 4¼ 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 de-

liberations 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.

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 equitable debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend?

Does the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) yield at this point in time to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I believe we now need to proceed with the debate. I do not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, today we begin a great debate, whether to grant our President the authority to use armed force against the threat posed to our Nation by the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein.

All of us who engage in this debate are patriots. All of us are deeply committed to safeguarding our national security, to promoting peace, and to waging war only as the very last resort. All of us weigh our words and cast our vote in accordance with the dictates of our conscience; and we are, therefore, deserving of each other's respect.

Some argue that the outcome of this debate is predetermined. It is not. Although the language of this joint resolution may undergo little change and its passage is all but assured, the level of support it will command is far from certain.

Will this debate demonstrate to the world this Nation's steadfast resolve, or our lingering doubts? Will it solidify our national unity, or expose national divisions? The answers to these crucial questions are far from predetermined.

It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in strong support of this historic resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

In managing this debate with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), I am committed not only to passing this joint resolution, but to securing for it the broadest possible support; for I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is through a strong show of support for this joint resolution that war can best be avoided.

Against such an implacable foe as Saddam Hussein, peace can only be achieved through strength, the strength of conviction as much as the strength of arms. It is only when the Iraqi dictator is certain of our resolve and of our ability that peace becomes possible.

The strategic importance of this vote is undeniable, Mr. Speaker. We do not

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 murderous shriek of 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, had we acted sooner to stymie 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 if 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, terrorists 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 beachhead of democracy and a beacon of hope in the Arab world. The Iraqi people are freed from the yoke of repression and Baghdad reclaims its greatness as a center of enlightened learning. And the Middle East emerges from the dark shadows of Saddamism.

The choice is clear, Mr. Speaker. We must not allow Saddam's forces of repression to triumph over the forces of liberation. We must not allow tyranny to triumph over freedom. We must not allow fear to triumph over hope.

Although the choice is clear, Mr. Speaker, the course we may be forced to take is not easy. Despite our best efforts, the United States may be forced to act without the unanimous consent

of the international community. Let me remind ourselves that in 1981 the Israelis attacked Iraq's nuclear reactor at Osirak. Although the strike was condemned by contemporaries, it is now applauded by history.

If Congress provides only tepid support for this joint resolution, fear may indeed triumph over hope. Saddam Hussein will undoubtedly seize upon U.S. indecision to divide the international community, to evade inspectors and to continue his deceptions while pursuing his clandestine weapons programs unabated. Weakness in the face of this mounting threat only plays into Saddam Hussein's grand strategy.

Many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, fear that the President seeks to implement a new and untested doctrine of military intervention in Iraq. They fear that a dangerous precedent will be set should we authorize the use of force. I disagree.

It is not the application of the doctrine of preemption we are considering here. We are dedicating U.S. power and prestige to upholding, not challenging, international law. We are devoting our efforts to strengthening, not weakening, the international system. Saddam Hussein and his henchmen are the international outlaws breaking their obligations while suppressing their own people.

Others of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, fear the implications of the United States acting without the blessing of the United Nations. But let us recall 1998, when we were confronted with a similar challenge to the international order, but the United Nations remained divided. To prevent genocide in Kosovo and strategic instability in the Balkans, President Clinton led the United States and our NATO allies to victory against Milosevic.

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, for many of the same reasons our Nation acted 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, not to provoke 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. It is a source of strength, not of weakness.

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 unite in strong opposition to 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.

□ 1300

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 armed 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 price of failing to confront aggression before the bombs started raining down on Europe had become horrendously clear. Hitler had

been allowed 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 the civilized world.

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 wickedness equals clear and 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 rearméd his country and feverishly 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 diplomacy. We have tried sanctions. We have tried inspections. We have established 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 out. He has indiscriminately used chemical weapons on unarmed civilians in his own country, and he has slaughtered any 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. If those who 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. Saddam Hussein must 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 to peace, 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 does not understand 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 almost banal, but the unimaginable destructive power 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 annihilation.

For those convinced of Saddam's murderous intentions, the debate has centered on whether or not we should focus our efforts on assembling a coalition of friends and allies and seek the enhanced legitimacy that approval by the United Nations might render our actions.

I believe that is the wrong debate. We all agree that these are desirable things, and we should do all in our power to secure them. I believe the President and his administration have done and are doing just that.

But the real question, the one which should occupy us, is one of far greater consequence: On whom does the final responsibility for protecting ourselves rest? Is it ours, or do we share it with others? Are decisions regarding our fate to be made in common with others?

I believe there is only one answer. We have no choice but to act as a sovereign country prepared to defend our-

selves with our friends and allies, if possible, but alone if necessary. There can be no safety if we condition our faith 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 safety 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 assaults on that security 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 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.

Vigorous debate in our deliberations is not only desirable, it is essential. The question before us demands it. But the result 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. The allies are watching. Our enemies are watching. Saddam is watching.

They are 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 to act.

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 one or another of us. 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. Within 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 us.

We cannot entrust our fate to others, for others may never come. If we are not prepared to defend ourselves and to defend ourselves alone, if need be, if we cannot convince the world that we are unshakably resolved to do so, then there can be no security for us, no safety to be purchased, no refuge to be found.

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 support the President because 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.

□ 1315

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 this resolution, 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 thank him.

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 does not weaken our cause. 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 that the United States is in 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 that, 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. This resolution, however, is a one-step process. Rather than letting the United Nations do 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 preemption.

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 post-strike 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 critical domestic 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 repair roads 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 have even suggested that Iran is more of a threat to us than Iraq. They are more advanced in their weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, is our next attack on Iran; after Afghanistan, Iraq and then Iran?

So 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 immediacy of the 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. McDERMOTT) 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 BREAU observed that "with America so divided on this issue, a strong burden remains on the administration to demonstrate the need for military action to address the threat posed by Iraq."

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 bear testimony 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 collective 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 our eyes on the 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, consensus, and careful calculation.

Mr. Speaker, 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 thank 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 settle-

ment 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 know this: 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 forth the possibility 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 decided 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 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.

Accordingly, I oppose 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 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 multi-lateral 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 balancing 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 resolutely has led this country, skillfully assembled the international coalition against terror, and has made necessary and appropriate use of America's military power.

□ 1330

Presidential historians argue and teach that presidents grow fond of foreign and military exercise of power because they can more readily 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 judgments will be sound.

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 other trouble 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 front takes this threat seriously and takes preventive action against the tyranny of the Iraqi government to disarm before any of the events of September 11 are repeated. Accordingly, I fully support President Bush's ongoing efforts to demand Iraqi compliance with all previously adopted U.N. resolutions.

Saddam's continued breaches of these U.N. resolutions constitutes a real threat to our Nation and to our interest in the region, a threat that we can no longer ignore. Yet, in the same fashion that we have responded to Saddam Hussein's continued threats, we must be fully committed to the reconstruction of Iraq as a unified and a democratic state in the event of a military strike that topples Saddam Hussein.

President Bush has characterized Iraq as part of an "axis of evil" and has identified the key threat from Iraq as its development of weapons of mass destruction and the potential for Iraq to transfer those elements to terrorists.

We all know that Iraq has worked to rebuild its weapons of mass destruction programs in the 4 years since the U.N. weapons inspectors were forced to leave Iraq. We know, too, that Saddam is using mobile facilities to hide biological weapons research and even had placed underground some weapons of mass destruction; and there is a growing belief that in a few more years Iraq is going to be able to develop a nuclear weapon, if not sooner.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq has used chemical weapons against its own people, the Kurds, and against Iraq's neighbors in Iran. Moreover, Iraq did not hesitate in 1991 to send Scud missiles to strike at the very heart of Israel. Even if U.N. weapons inspectors return to Iraq, there are no assurances that Iraq is going to become free of weapons of mass destruction. The threat to our Nation's national security interest remains and, hence, this legislative need to provide President Bush with a maximum amount of flexibility to respond to this crisis.

In summation, no other living dictator matches Saddam Hussein's record of waging aggressive war against its neighbors; of pursuing weapons of mass destruction; of using weapons of mass destruction against its own people and other nations; of launching ballistic missiles at its neighbors; of brutalizing and torturing its own citizens; of har-

boring terrorist networks; of engaging in terrorist acts, including assassination of foreign officials; of violating his international commitments; of lying and cheating and hiding weapons of mass destruction programs; of deceiving and defying the express will of the United Nations over and over again.

As our President has noted in his recent speech to the U.N. General Assembly recently, "In one place, in one regime, we will find all these dangers in their most lethal and aggressive forms."

Accordingly, 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 drastically change our lives, harm our national security, and one that could forever shatter the fragile stability that we have carefully rebuilt since September 11.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "War is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong and multiplies, instead of indemnifying, losses." Multiplies, 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 could unleash the violence that we all seek to avoid.

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 tinderboxes of Pakistan and India, China and Taiwan, North and South Korea? Are we prepared to strike first in Iran, 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, "Destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends." And yet here we are thrown headlong into a decision that could cost thousands and thousands of Amer-

ican men and women their lives, could put our personnel in embassies all over the globe in harm's way, in danger, could unleash another round, another decade of untold suffering among innocent Iraqis, and we are told that we have no other choice.

By rushing into war, we alone will bear the burden of seeing this conflict to its blood end, most likely in the streets of Bagdad among innocent families and U.S. troops engaged in door-to-door combat. By rushing into war, we alone will be responsible for splintering the international coalition that has been built to fight the imminent threat posed by the terrorists, al Qaeda. And by rushing into war we alone will fuel far more extremist passions against the United States, a whole new generation of terrorists bent on our demise.

It will strain our military. It will cost us tens and tens, if not hundreds of millions of dollars, and it will erode any cooperation from Arab and Muslim nations in tracking down and neutralizing the remaining al Qaeda cells.

Instead of fighting a war against terrorism, we will have the potential instead of fighting the war against a quarter of the world. I am not ready to support a resolution that could take American people down that road. The sabers continue to rattle, the war drums pound louder every day, and it is quite clear that many people here believe that preparing for war ensures that it will truly happen.

I know that, as we talk of the enemy and of war, it is not popular to talk of the suffering of the other side. Our enemy here is Saddam Hussein and his brutal regimes, not the Iraqi people. Little discussion is being devoted to the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, a challenge that the American people will understand eventually and a challenge that we have a moral responsibility to deal with, regardless of victory.

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 prematurely each year because of sanctions. 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.

I saw those children not a week ago in hospitals. I talked to those mothers who cannot feed their children because of the protein deficiency in their diet which has caused 25 percent of the children born in Iraq to have low birth weight. I have talked to doctors who have delivered babies who have said to me, The mothers used to say to me

when the child was born, is it a male or a female? Now they say to me, Is it normal or abnormal?

The costs are already been horrendous, and the question we have to ask ourselves is, is there not another way? I believe there is. Vote against this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. 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 preemptive 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.

□ 1345

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.

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 time.

Until September 11, we knew what the dangers were, but we chose to ignore them. We knew Saddam was developing nuclear weapons and had biological weapons. We knew that al Qaeda had killed hundreds at our embassies in east Africa. We knew of these dangers, and we did not act.

On September 11, the dangers did not change. America changed. We now look seriously at these threats, and we know that our victory in the Cold War does not immunize us from future danger.

Saddam Hussein has killed hundreds of thousands. He has gassed his own people. He has risked his own life many times, all in an effort to expand his power.

If he had nuclear weapons, he could smuggle one into the United States—after all a nuclear weapon is about the size of a person—hide it in an apartment building in some American city, and prove to us that he had it hidden there. Saddam could then blackmail America into inaction, as he invaded Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, et cetera. We would then never be able to quench Saddam's lust for additional power, and his imitators would be spawned as they, too, would seek nuclear weapons in an effort to become regional vice-roys.

There are two approaches for dealing with this threat. One, associated often with the Vice President, is to invade now, no matter what. This approach has a legalistic version that says we must invade Iraq unless it immediately complies with all U.N. resolutions, including the resolutions that say Iraq should stop oppressing its own people. I do not think Saddam Hussein is going to morph into Mother Theresa; and if that is what it would take to prevent an invasion, we might as well invade now.

The other approach is not to focus on every U.N. resolution, but instead to demand robust inspections to make sure Saddam does not develop weapons of mass destruction.

Neither of these approaches is perfect, but I would point out that the invade-now approach has a number of flaws, including the fact that even if we achieve regime change today, 10 years from now we may be faced with another hostile regime in Baghdad, a Ba'athist regime or Ayatollah-led regime. War is not the perfect answer and I must admit that inspections are not perfect either.

I would have preferred a resolution similar to one I put forward in the International Relations Committee that garnered the support of the vast majority of Democrats on that Committee. That resolution would authorize the use of force only if Saddam interferes with a robust inspections

program, only if, for example, he continues to try to lock the inspectors out of his presidential palaces.

We will not get the opportunity to vote for such a resolution, but we got the next best thing. Last night the President said he wanted to disarm Iraq without war, if possible. He said he would propose to the United Nations a resolution demanding a robust program of inspections, and effectively promised the world that if we got those inspections, we would not invade.

So this is where we stand today. Only one question is before us now. Will this resolution, when it comes to final passage, pass with 325 votes or 375 votes? That is important to the world because if America looks divided, Saddam may "call our bluff." In 1991, the resolution authorizing the use of force just barely squeaked by each House. Saddam was misled. Saddam defied us and refused to withdraw from Kuwait, and war became necessary.

France, Russia, and China will take America more seriously if we look unified. And that is why I call on all my colleagues, because all of us desperately want to avoid war, to vote for this resolution, because if we look unified, Saddam is more likely to capitulate on the issue of inspectors.

We cannot expect foreign tyrants to understand our political system; and in the next month, they will hear the most violent and loud political clashes on pharmaceutical costs and Social Security. Let us help Saddam understand the resolve of America. Let us pass this resolution by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) the chairman of our Subcommittee on International Relations and Operations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, a year ago we stood in this Chamber trying to recover from the shock that no longer were U.S. interests threatened by terrorists; but the United States itself, our people, our way of life, our very existence was the target of terrorists. We were awakened and disbelief turned to a commitment, a commitment that we would work together as one Nation, one government, and take every appropriate and necessary action to prevent another day like September 11, 2001.

We afforded the President the resources and the broad support to ensure a swift, effective and successful campaign against a global terrorist network that killed thousands of our citizens on that fateful day a year ago.

That campaign was built on the impression, the understanding that our military objectives must also have a political objective, a requirement that was underscored by Secretary of State Colin Powell when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and so it was that we not only dismantled the al Qaeda operations inside Afghanistan, but also helped the Afghan people free themselves from the oppression of the

Taliban regime, thereby diminishing future threats from Afghanistan by helping democracy to finally take root.

What we are authorizing the President today and the resolution that is before us, Madam Speaker, is not much different than what we afforded him a year ago. We steadfastly supported this effort a year ago as the debris of the World Trade Center continued to burn. Now that time has passed, the smoke has cleared, the fires have subsided. 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 in bombmaking, harbors these terrorists 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 friends and our allies with weapons of mass destruction. Thus, if we do not act now, when?

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, that Iraq had 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 in violations of United Nations restriction.

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 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.

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."

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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader in peace and humanitarian issues.

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 issue and on so many other issues 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.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution authorizing a unilateral first strike against Iraq. Such an action could 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? It 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.

□ 1400

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 because we oppose the Iraqi government? We still do not have the answer to that question.

For all of these reasons and more, on Thursday, I will offer the Lee amendment to H.J. Res. 114, incorporating my legislation, H. Con. Res. 473, currently supported by 37 Members of the House. This amendment calls on the United States to work with allies to disarm

Iraq through United Nations inspections and other diplomatic means.

Those inspections succeeded in destroying thousands of tons of weapons in the 1990s, despite Iraq's attempts at destruction, and they can work again. It was a search and destroy mission.

Now, today, as we face this vote, there are many questions that remain unanswered. Where is the proof that Iraq poses an imminent, clear, and present danger to the United States? What is our objective here, 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 unmet domestic 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?

Going to war would result in substantial loss of life. We better be able to answer these questions before we spend \$200 billion plus to create a new regime in Iraq.

Now, remember, we all have to focus on the fact that it was not weapons of mass destruction used on 9/11. This blank check to authorize a first strike would not restore peace and security. I am convinced that it will inspire hatred and fear and increase instability and insecurity.

There have been those who have questioned the patriotism of opposition and have claimed that those calling for war have a monopoly on this virtue. Yet I believe, like many, that it is our patriotic duty to seek each and every nonmilitary solution to eliminating the weapons of mass destruction. Containment, deterrence and disarmament should be our goal. That has been and continues to be the American way.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rush to war. It is morally wrong, financially irresponsible, and it is not in our national security interests. We have options, and we have an obligation to pursue them.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), a senior member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. KING. I thank the chairman emeritus for yielding me this time; and, Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution. In doing so, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the bipartisan leadership of this House for coming together and forging a compromise which will give the President of the United States the power he needs in

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 this moment 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 here today to 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 passed to date.

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, and we should go 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 their argument is. They say we should use more 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 collusion. 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 the war against terrorism because of our policy on Iraq.

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

Let me just say, in conclusion, that I respect those who have 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 united 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 and rough 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 yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. 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 passage of this 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 turn to force.

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 other parts of the world, and define plans for Iraq after Saddam.

While I am firmly committed to using diplomacy first and our military only if we must, I cannot ignore Saddam Hussein's track record of disdain for international law. With everything we know about his aggressive pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, it would be irresponsible not to at least make plans for what we may need to do in order to counter the threat that he poses.

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 our allies but he will also put meaning into the will of the international community as expressed in the United Nations resolutions.

On a personal note, should the use of force 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 work 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. SMITH), 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. HYDE), 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 terms and conditions that ended 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 as a result of 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 botulinum toxin would result in massive deaths and casualties and a regional or global epidemic that might not be stoppable.

And now, as we all know, Hussein 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's drive 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 for 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 promote peace by disarming Hussein's 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 to the hilt by the international community, with a clear, nonambiguous mandate to inspect without condition, to have unfettered access to suspicious locations, and to compel Iraqi disarmament.

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 inspectors 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 peacemakers.

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.

□ 1415

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 our constituents, 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 Israel 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 precise military strikes, I hear the viewers and readers of Black Hawk Down reminding us how things can go horribly wrong, all lessons learned by Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton.

Unanswered are those critics, including my colleagues, who fear not that the United States would ultimately be defeated by Saddam Hussein, but that the young American soldiers lack sufficient preparation and equipment for chemical and biological warfare and could suffer horrible losses.

I was intrigued with the insight of my own son about to return to Southeast Asia calling this a policy of national insecurity, putting him at great-

er risk in the weeks ahead traveling amongst the Muslim populations in Asia, while increasing the likelihood of terrorist violence here at home.

Our constituents describe a much more complicated world, one where the United States has yet to develop a coherent strategy for democracy in the Middle East, a world where other elements are at least as great a threat. Persuasive cases have been made against Iran and North Korea. Remember the axis of evil.

And we are not yet finished in Afghanistan. President Karzai is barely the mayor of Kabul. It is uncertain whether we or the countries who supported us there are ready to do the job.

In addition, it is important to point out that this is not Munich. No one talks of appeasement. If Saddam Hussein takes one step outside his borders, his forces will be annihilated. There is no question about it.

It is interesting how recently the polls are starting to more accurately reflect the mood of the American public that has been expressed to us for months. But regardless of what the polls say, some things are just wrong. Unilateral preemptive action as an operating principle is wrong. Delegating the unfettered authority to this President or any President to wage war is wrong. Missing the chance to build a more secure future with a more coherent foreign policy is also wrong.

This debate does not yet capture the nature 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. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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 threat to our national security. 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 enforce U.N. resolutions. 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 dictates of the 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 the arguments may be, this policy is new; and it will have ramifications for our future, and it will have ramifications for the future of 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 plan to go to war comes up 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 proper 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 instructions; and that is why, as 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? He said the U.N. did not give him permission to.

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 an air 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 zone comes from U.N. Resolution 688, which instructs 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, which 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 wars to the executive 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 dozens 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, which 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 force their long-standing desire to see an American invasion of Iraq. Despite all of the information to which I have access, 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 to give him both the authority and the 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 U.S. through its 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 repression of the Kurds and Shi'ites was condemned, but there was no authorization for "no-fly zones," much less airstrikes. The resolution only calls for member states to "contribute to humanitarian relief" in the Kurd and Shi'ite 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 pilots, isn't 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 years. According to last year's Patterns of Global Terrorism, Iraq has not been involved in terrorist activity against the West since 1993—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 Seymore Hersh's article from Nov. 1993:

Three years ago, during Iraq's six-month occupation of Kuwait, there had been an outcry when a teen-age Kuwaiti girl testified eloquently and effectively before Congress about Iraqi atrocities involving newborn infants. The girl turned out to be the daughter of the 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 journalists and by human-rights groups. (Sheikh Saud was subsequently named Minister of Information in Kuwait, and he was the government official in charge of briefing the international press on the alleged assassination attempt against George Bush.) In a second incident, in August of 1991, Kuwait provoked a special session of the United Nations Security Council by claiming that twelve Iraqi vessels, including a speedboat, had been involved in an attempt to assault

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 Iraqi military raid, and that the Kuwaiti government knew there hadn't. What did take place was nothing more than a smuggler-versus-smuggler dispute over war booty in a nearby demilitarized zone that had emerged, after the Gulf War, as an illegal marketplace for alcohol, ammunition, and livestock.

This establishes that on several occasions Kuwait has lied about the threat from Iraq. Hersh goes on to point out in the article numerous other times the Kuwaitis lied to the US and the UN about Iraq. Her is another good quote from Hersh:

The President was not alone in his caution. Janet Reno, the Attorney General, also had her doubts. "The A.G. remains skeptical of certain aspects of the case," a senior Justice Department official told me in late July, a month after the bombs were dropped on Baghdad. . . . Two weeks later, what amounted to open warfare broke out among various factions in the government on the issue of who had done what in Kuwait. Someone gave a Boston Globe reporter access to a 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 books" on the alleged plot in an effort to play up the "continuing Iraqi threat" to Western interests in the Persian Gulf. Neither the Times nor the Post made any significant mention of the Globe dispatch, which had been written by a Washington correspondent named Paul Quinn-Judge, although the story cited specific paragraphs from the C.I.A. assessment. The two major American newspapers had been driven by their source to the other side of the debate.

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 (the Kurds in the village of Halabja).

Reality: It is far from certain that Iraq used chemical weapons against the Kurds. It may be accepted as conventional wisdom in these times, but back when it was first claimed there was great skepticism. The evidence is far from conclusive. A 1990 study by the Strategic Studies Institutes of the U.S. Army War College cast great doubts on the claim that Iraq used 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 State Department abruptly, and in what many viewed as a sensational manner, condemned Iraq for allegedly using chemicals against its Kurdish population. The incident cannot be understood without some background of Iraq's relations with the Kurds . . . throughout the war Iraq effectively faced two enemies—Iran and elements of its own Kurdish minority. Significant numbers of the Kurds had launched a revolt against Baghdad and in the process teamed up with Tehran. As soon as the war with Iran ended, Iraq announced its determination to crush the Kurdish insurrection. It sent Republican Guards to the Kurdish area, and in the course of the operation—according to the U.S. State Department—gas was used, with the result that numerous Kurdish civilians were killed. The Iraqi government denied that any such gassing had occurred. Nonetheless, Secretary of State Schultz stood by U.S. accusations, and the U.S. Congress, acting on its own, sought to impose economic sanctions on Baghdad as a violator of the Kurds' human rights.

Having looked at all the evidence that was available to us, we find it impossible to confirm the State Department's claim that gas was used in this instance. To begin with. There were never any victims produced. International relief organizations who examined the Kurds—in Turkey where they had gone for asylum—failed to discover any. Nor were there ever any found inside Iraq. The claim rests solely on testimony of the Kurds who had crossed the border into Turkey, where they were interviewed by staffers of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. . . .

It appears that in seeking to punish Iraq, the Congress was influenced by another incident that occurred five months earlier in another Iraqi-Kurdish city, Halabjah. In March 1988, the Kurds at Halabjah were bombarded with chemical weapons, producing many deaths. Photographs of the Kurdish victims were widely disseminated in the international media. Iraq was blamed for the Halabjah attack, even though it was subsequently brought out that Iran too had used chemicals in this operation and it seemed likely that it was the Iranian bombardment that had actually killed the Kurds.

Thus, in our view, the Congress acted more on the basis of emotionalism than factual information, and without sufficient thought for the adverse diplomatic effect of its action.

Claim: Iraq must be attacked because it has ignored UN Security Council resolutions—these resolutions must be backed up by 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 dozen or so resolutions currently being violated by Iraq, a conservative estimate reveals that there are an additional 91 Security Council resolutions by countries other than Iraq that are also currently being violated. 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 has anthrax and other chemical and biological agents.

Reality: That may be true. However, according to UNSCOM's chief weapons inspector 90-95 percent of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons and capabilities were destroyed by 1998; those that remained have likely degraded in the intervening four year 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. As one recent press report stated:

One 1986 shipment from the Virginia-based American Type Culture Collection included three strains of anthrax, six strains of the bacteria that make botulinum toxin and three strains of bacteria that cause gas gangrene. Iraq later admitted to the United Nations that it had made weapons out of all three. . . .

The CDC, meanwhile, sent shipments of germs to the Iraqi Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies involved in Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs. It sent samples in 1986 of botulinum toxin and botulinum toxoid—used to make vaccines against botulinum toxin—directly to the Iraqi chemical and biological weapons complex at al-Muthanna, the records show.

These were sent while the United States was supporting Iraq covertly in its war against Iran. U.S. assistance to Iraq in that war also included covertly-delivered intel-

ligence on Iranian troop movements and other assistance. This is just another example of our policy of interventionism in affairs that do not concern us—and how this interventionism nearly always ends up causing harm to the United States.

Claim: The president claimed last night that: "Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles; far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey and other nations in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work."

Reality: Then why is only Israel talking about the need for the U.S. to attack Iraq? None of the other countries seem concerned at all. Also, the fact that some 135,000 Americans in the area are under threat from these alleged missiles is just makes the point that it is time to bring our troops home to defend our own country.

Claim: Iraq harbors al-Qaeda and other terrorists.

Reality: The administration has claimed that some Al-Qaeda elements have been present in Northern Iraq. This is territory controlled by the Kurds—who are our allies—and is patrolled by U.S. and British fighter aircraft. Moreover, dozens of countries—including Iran and the United States—are said to have al-Qaeda members on their territory. Other terrorists allegedly harbored by Iraq, all are affiliated with Palestinian causes and do not attack the United States.

Claim: President Bush said in his speech on 7 October 2002: "Many people have asked how close Saddam Hussein is to developing a nuclear weapon. Well, we don't know exactly, and that's the problem. . . ."

Reality: An admission of a lack of information is justification for an attack?

Also worth mention:

President Bush claimed that our deposing Saddam Hussein. . . .

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, the President continues to make his case before the Congress, before the American people, and before the United Nations to garner support and legitimacy in the case against Saddam Hussein. There is no question about any of the facts the President has cited in making the case for urgent action against the threat posed by the Iraqi current regime.

Only the deliberately obtuse can doubt that Saddam Hussein is a murderous, rapacious dictator with an addiction to aggression, and a long record of gross miscalculations.

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.

Madam 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 Iraq's 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 his 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 we must answer, the single 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 technology 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 defeated 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.

□ 1430

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 presidencies 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 global security. The global idea that 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 something should be done about Iraq. 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 scorn international concerns and reservations without lasting harm to our larger and longer-term objectives.

While I am prepared to endorse the President's request for authorization to use force to respond to the threat by Iraq, I continue to have grave concerns about the administration's complete failure to explain what an unsupported war on Iraq will do to our efforts to establish a stable global order. I continue to have grave concerns about the administration's complete failure to explain how an unsupported war in Iraq will advance international cooperation in the war on terror. And I continue to have grave concerns about the administration's complete failure to explain how we will restore a post-Saddam Iraq to the family of nations.

Madam Speaker, all that being said, we must recognize Saddam Hussein's regime is a reign of evil, promising the world nothing but terror and death. A decent people have an obligation to confront evil in its womb.

Madam Speaker, I will support the resolution, but I fear that defeating Iraq and deposing Saddam are likely to be orders of magnitude much easier than repairing a potential breach in international perceptions about our Nation's intentions and our values.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Over the next few days, this House is taking up yet another momentous decision in a session that is sadly full of historic challenges. The American people are watching and listening to our debate today. History is watching and listening to our debate today. And make no mistake, the Iraqi regime is watching and listening and weighing our words carefully.

This debate can be a debate in the highest and best sense of that term, a serious exchange of ideas and opinions. That is the only opinion, that is the only mechanism that will do justice to this body, a body that has all too often been saddled with great and momentous decisions.

But for that debate to be potentially realized, however, we must understand what our resolution is about and what it is not about. Despite what a misguided few will argue over these next few days, we are not debating a choice between war and peace. If it were only that simple.

Make no mistake, I stand for peace, firmly and proudly. The real peace coalition is more than a handful of members who give themselves that label in the media. The real peace coalition is comprised of nearly everyone in this body today. As Americans we must all stand for peace.

The real issue before us is how we secure that peace in long run, peace for our children and peace for their children. The real debate is over what means will give us 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 enforcement waiting in the wings. 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 alone, but, again, we are 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 the threat of force I am afraid is 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 diplomacy. 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 5½ 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. 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 stockpiled in the former Soviet Union. They are dangerous even in our own stockpiles. 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 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 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 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 allow weapons inspections a chance to proceed before concluding 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 threats 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 civilians. 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 of war, also.

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 Kurds in northern Iraq. He may even decide that, with nothing to lose, why not give them 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.

An attack on 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 other sovereign nations who seek 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 will make will shape our 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.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this resolution to authorize the President of the United States to unilaterally go to war with Iraq.

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 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 hand of a dictator like Saddam Hussein. They are also dangerous stockpiled in the former Soviet Union. And they are dangerous even in our stockpiles. Control and destruction of weapons of mass destruction are essential to our national 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.

In the absence of an imminent threat to the United States (in which case the President already has the necessary legal authority as Commander-in-Chief to respond) . . . in the absence of that 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 allow weapons inspection a chance to proceed before concluding 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 use to address the threats 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.

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 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 civilians. War against Iraq could endanger our allies in the region, like Israel and Turkey. War against Iraq could reinforce anti-American, extremism 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. He would use them against American troops. He would use them against Israel. He would use them against the Kurds in northern Iraq. He may decide that with nothing to lose, why not give 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.

An attack on Iraq would likely be perceived by some as an attack on Islam, generating more anti-Americanism and encourage radical fundamentalists.

In addition to the military dangers posed by an invasion of Iraq, we must consider the post-war challenges. Rebuilding Iraq will be a major challenge that will take many years and a great deal of money. There is no history of

democratic government in Iraq. The Iraqi opposition is disorganized and divided, despite U.S. efforts to pull them together. The economy and infrastructure is in ruins after years of war and sanctions.

If we look at previous wars and occupations that the United States has undertaken, success has meant an extended commitment of time, resources and American forces. 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 maintain military forces on their soil and in their 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 Iran 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 other in the region, even Afghanistan.

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 pose an imminent threat to the United States, we 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 enough evidence of an imminent attack from Iraq and therefore must act now. 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. If Saddam Hussein cooperates, 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 coercive inspections 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, just as I believe the U.S. 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 should come after 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.

□ 1445

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman 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 me time.

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 attack that struck America over a year ago, and we must act to ensure that our way of life is protected and preserved.

It has been asked almost in unison across America how that fateful 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 a 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 will simply serve as a preamble to countless acts of terrorism across American soil.

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

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 diplomatic solutions, then 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 cease-fire 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 supported weapons inspections, 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 Saddam 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.

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

Unlike the Gulf War in 1991, we are not dealing with a threat posed by Iraq's conventional forces. 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 involves Iraq's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction which could devastate our Nation on a scale that 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 innocent Americans 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 join 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. Economic 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 deadly potential. Saddam must clearly understand that swift and decisive force will be the automatic consequence, should he continue to ignore and avoid the inspections regime he agreed upon.

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 are called upon to make 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 securities 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.

Madam Speaker, I want to apply hindsight. Hindsight inevitably is 20-20. But as I apply hindsight, my train of thought reverts to the Second World War. I wonder aloud how, if there had been four or five or even two or three additional Winston Churchills who would have dared stand up to Adolf Hitler, would the Second World War have been averted. Perhaps. I think certainly its impact would have been diminished if that had occurred.

Saddam Hussein, in my opinion, is the modern day version of Adolf Hitler. I have read that he is not as astute as Hitler. I do not know their respective intelligence quotients; but I do believe that Saddam is as brutal, as wicked, 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 distaste 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 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.

I 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 Iraq must do 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.

□ 1500

President Bush himself last evening said, this is avoidable. It lies upon his table, and he can act accordingly. I urge him to do so. We do not want war. I think most people do not want war. But the time to act is now. Because, not unlike Hitler, if he is permitted to continue to defy the U.N., to violate this resolution or that resolution, who knows when he may well attack?

Madam Speaker, the time to act is now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in violation of the Rules of the House and directs the Sergeant-at-Arms to restore order.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

I rise before my colleagues today with a high degree of frustration as we consider the grave prospect of authorizing the President to send our uniformed men and women into military action in Iraq. I believe I speak for all Members of Congress when I say that I am awed by the moral weight of this decision. We all know that any mili-

tary action would likely lead to an immediate and substantial loss of human life and have untold implications on the security of our Nation in years to come.

Madam Speaker, no one desires to be on the opposite side of our President in times like these, but I regret to tell my colleagues that I am unable to support this resolution in its present form. I would like to add to the RECORD the statement issued by 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 moral authority of the United States, 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 be costly and 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 by solidifying 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 produce 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 op-

tion 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 also 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 time personal wealth and retirement savings are being decimated. 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. BEREUTER. 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 gentleman 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 1944 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 be able 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. Secondly, 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 I asked, 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 should 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 unleash even more of the 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 Shiites could create such a mess following a war that we could find ourselves against a religious fundamentalist state that could 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 fight, 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 through the United Nations.

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 us today has been made more difficult 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 through 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 imminent. 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 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 act-

ing. 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.

□ 1515

But let me add, I think we can do better. It would be my intention to continue to pursue an amendment to this resolution similar 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 regime change. The way the 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. BEREUTER. 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 were not before us; but 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 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 another great American, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), 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 denunciation of 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 our President and the American people will not tolerate the slaughter of innocent people anywhere.

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.

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 pa-

triot 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 is a clear and 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 option of unilateral 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 both of whom 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 still 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 who fled Afghanistan 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 what 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 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, today we are taking a necessary step to hold a tyrant accountable for his actions. For over a decade now, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has thumbed his nose at every resolution approved by the United Nations Security Council. He continues to develop weapons of mass destruction to repress the Iraqi people, to support acts of terrorism, and to deny unconditional access to United Nations weapons inspectors.

Further, he continues to evade the United Nations economic sanctions by violating the principles of the oil-for-food program in order to solicit illegal arms and materials to develop weapons of mass destruction.

It is now time to hold Saddam accountable for his refusal to abide by specific agreements made with the international community, especially when his actions can be devastating, not only on his Middle Eastern neighbors but also on the citizens of our country.

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, against our citizens 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 without 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 leading the world 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.)

□ 1530

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 conscience 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 him who 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 hang in the balance, but, as our President has said, potentially the lives of millions. For we decide today whether and in what manner our great Republic

might call upon its military arsenal to compel a persistent enemy to disarm and embrace the civilized world and its principles.

Madam Speaker, the United States does not seek to start a war. We seek to finish one. For Saddam Hussein has been America's warring foe for more than a decade.

In 1991, we ceased hostility. We ended the battle. But, Madam Speaker, his war took no respite. It shows no mercy.

And yet if in some horrible, yet possible, day Saddam and the metastasizing network of terrorists he harbors and protects bring to America another World Trade Center, another Pentagon, another Oklahoma City or Khobar Towers, when, and not if but when, Saddam creates and uses nuclear weapons, what will we tell the American people then?

Will we tell the survivors that we did not realize that Saddam Hussein had never finished his war against America? Will we tell them we thought the war was over? Will the judgment of the American people find that, even though we knew of the danger, they will accept that we waited for public opinion, for world opinion to congeal across the globe?

It is my profound hope and fervent prayer to the God who intervenes in the affairs of men, by whose hand nations rise and fall, that well before this Nation fires a single shot in anger that Saddam Hussein would relent and disarm, that he would see and believe the strength of our resolve, that he would know the lengths to which we will go and the price we are willing to pay to protect freedom. Then his own mind would be turned and the cup of conflict and destruction which is now poised might pass us by.

But, Madam Speaker, that cup is at hand. It is appropriate, even necessary, that this Congress, this day, authorize this President to use the full and unrelenting force of America's moral and, yes, if necessary, military might to eclipse the night of terror and usher a dawn of security and freedom. Our enemies should pay heed to our resolve.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I also would offer that our soldiers and their families should also heed the word that has comforted so many of our heroes throughout the history of this Nation and all of those who have said in their hearts of the Lord, that he is my refuge and my fortress and the God in whom I trust. Let them be comforted with the knowledge that surely he will save you from the fowler's snare, from the deadly pestilence. He will cover you with his feathers and under his wings you will find refuge. You will not fear the terror of night, nor the arrow that flies by day, nor the pestilence that stalks in the darkness. A thousand may fall at your side, 10,000 at your right hand, but it will not come near you. You will only observe with your eyes and see the punishment of the wicked.

May it be our prayer as our new heroes are forged in this act of Congress and during the ominous days ahead.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), our good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, this vote is the most important vote that many of us will cast in our congressional service. This vote is not one to be taken lightly or in haste. We have asked our young people who serve in our Armed Forces to put their lives in harm's way for our Nation. This vote and debate must be in the most serious of nature.

It is our job as Members of Congress to protect our people, to make sure Americans can raise their families and go to work without the fear of attack. Our defenses did not work on September 11, 2001; and we saw the devastation that killed 3,000 people. Our job is to protect our fellow Americans; and that is why, after a great deal of listening, discussing and learning, I will support the resolution.

Our Nation does not go to war easily. We are inherently a peaceful Nation. We want to be left alone, to live our lives, to raise our families and enjoy the freedoms of our country. We had to be attacked to enter World War I and World War II. But when they attack or threaten our Nation, we respond.

As with other Members of Congress, during August I was at home in Houston meeting with my constituents, doing town hall meetings and listening to the people I am honored to represent. My Houston constituents were as surprised as I was at the aggressiveness of our administration in relationship to Iraq. It sounded like we were beating a war drum. The impression it left on many people was the administration will wage war no matter without regard to Congress or international support. Many people wondered what this threat that suddenly in August Iraq became the prominent issue discussed by President Bush.

My folks were and are more concerned about our deteriorating economy, increasing unemployment, drop in the stock market, the increasing national deficit. This deficit was and is increasing without addressing additional unemployment assistance, without addressing the loss of health care, without addressing increased spending for education, without addressing the plunging stock market or without addressing a jobs program that reverses our economic decline.

My folks are still concerned about their everyday lives, and that is true with this as previous generations. We need to protect our people but not lose sight of our economic problems.

I will work with the President to protect our people, but let us not forget we must revive our economy. Tax cuts, permanent or temporary, are not working. We need an economic revival plan, not more foreign entanglements.

Saddam Hussein has been a problem for last month, the last 6 months, and

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 bipartisanship is evident in several changes contained within the resolution, issues like compliance with the War Powers Act, language more clearly defining 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 am pleased because 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 hear coming from Bagdad 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 Ft. 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 let there be no doubt that the penalty for noncompliance will be severe.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 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. Do we sit back and allow Saddam Hussein to keep his weapons of mass destruction and hope that he voluntarily chooses not to use them against us, our allies, or do we take action to separate him from those weapons of mass destruction?

I support this resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq for two reasons: First, Saddam Hussein has thumbed his nose at the United States and the United Nations by failing to destroy his weapons of mass destruction, failing to destroy his long-range missiles, and by kicking out the U.N. weapons inspectors in 1998.

A second reason to support this use of force against Iraq is because time is of the essence. Saddam Hussein is now less than a year away from developing nuclear weapons, according to reports we have received in the last month from the CIA and the International Institute for Strategic Studies. The only thing Saddam is missing now is enriched uranium. We know he has 200 Ph.D.s working around the clock on this process. We also know he could assemble these nuclear weapons within

months if he obtains the enriched uranium on the black market from foreign sources. And we know from a recent CIA report that he has up to \$3 billion to spend to obtain this enriched uranium as a result of his recent sale of oil on the black market.

Given these facts, does anyone really believe that it is beneath Saddam Hussein to bribe some down-and-out vulnerable nuclear scientist from North Korea or Pakistan who regularly works with enriched uranium?

But even if Saddam Hussein is not successful in obtaining nuclear weapons within a year, time is still of the essence. Because we know that Saddam Hussein has chemical and biological weapons of mass instruction such as anthrax and nerve gas which he could easily give to terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda. And we know that Saddam Hussein is sympathetic to al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden because, after September 11, Saddam Hussein callously told the world that he was happy that thousands of Americans were killed. Specifically, just after September 11 Saddam Hussein said, "Bush wants me to send my condolences, but if I do that I would be lacking respect for my 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 on notice. Saddam Hussein is a remorseless, pathologically aggressive dictator with a history of striking without warning, a history of using weapons of mass destruction to kill people, and a burning desire to have his finger on the button of a nuclear weapon pointed in our direction.

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 saw the dark cloud on the horizon but passively chose to look the other way.

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 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 gentlewoman 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 vigilant efforts to protect the security of the United States. We stand 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 perhaps even 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 now before we can let the weapons inspectors back in, before we can find any evidence of an imminent threat? What information have we have recently obtained that has led the President to believe the war is absolutely necessary now?

□ 1545

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 us 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 five have supported this type of uninformed unilateral action. This is not the support of the United States people.

Some of my colleagues have made the tortured analogy that 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 1991. We have been given no 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 intelligence that answers these questions, he must provide it to Congress and 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 try to appease someone like Saddam Hussein; but what it is is a question of acting alone or at most with one ally versus building 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 national security. We have successfully built an international coalition to combat 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 oppose this resolution today.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to yield 4 minutes 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 disarmament 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 condemned 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 World War I, the international community came together to form the League of Nations in order to resolve international conflicts without war. Stiff requirements were placed on Germany 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, allowing Hitler to build his military and his territory.

The appeasers of the 1930s were content 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 Poland and launched World War II, did the world finally realize his true intentions and take stock of the enormity of the failure of appeasement; and to defeat 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 ambitions of 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, more deadly weaponry, no matter how horrific. 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, Congress 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 millions of Americans and others by our inaction.

I commend the President for recognizing the need for this resolution. By passing this resolution, Congress will show that the U.S. speaks with one 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 irrelevance and ineffectiveness that 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 disarmament through diplomacy and inspections. These efforts alone could bring more security to the world and could prevent conflict if Saddam Hussein cooperates fully with the demands laid out before him by the Congress, the President, and the United Nations; but if disarmaments through diplomacy 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 those who live 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 distinguished 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 wisdom 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 Congress has to do a lot of personal soul searching. There should be no finger pointing, no questioning of patriotism. This is the American way of life, the American Congress at our best, democracy 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 support 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 about what happens after we get into Iraq. We have to stay the course. We cannot pick up and run. We have to make sure that democracy sets root in that country.

Thirdly, there is a question about our war against terrorism and other nations that support terrorism. For me, Iran and Syria have supported terrorism 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 thousand lives were lost, including many of my own constituents. The Cold War arguments of deterrence and containment I do not think apply anymore.

In this era of terrorism, the U.S. has to be proactive. When there 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 million 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 removed him then, and I am consistent. He has weapons of mass destruction. He flaunts U.N. resolutions. He supports destruction of our ally Israel. 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 resolution because it is an improvement from the original resolution that was sent down by the White House. This resolution does not give a blank check. This resolution limits the scope. This resolution is no Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This resolution strikes the right balance.

I am willing to look at some of the amendments. I am willing to listen to what our colleagues have to say; but in

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 against 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 "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

□ 1600

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I would like to remind everyone that we are not really talking about a resolution. We keep hearing this "war on Iraq," "war on Iraq." We are not talking about a war on Iraq. That is totally misleading. We are talking about helping the people of Iraq liberate themselves from this monster and, in doing so, alleviating a major threat to the security and well-being of the people of the United States of America.

There is nothing for us to apologize about in terms of helping those people free themselves from a tyrant who is renowned in the world among all tyrants. We are talking about helping them, liberating them. They will be dancing in the streets, waving American flags, just as people of Afghanistan still are grateful to us for freeing them and helping them free themselves from the horror of the Taliban and bin Laden, who held them in their tyrannical grip for years.

And let me remind those people who are so concerned, and, by the way, there will always be the hand-wringers among us, believe me. There would be no action that we could possibly take that is going to get the support of people who will always find an excuse for doing nothing. It takes courage to step forward.

This job in Iraq will be easier than what happened in Afghanistan. I spent a long time familiarizing myself with Afghanistan, as my colleagues know. Afghanistan, perhaps 10 percent of the people supported the Taliban. Perhaps that many. Nobody supports Saddam Hussein in Iraq. He has almost zero support among the people. They are

frightened to death. Even his Republican Guard has been purged, and they now are not reliable for him. They are waiting for us to help them free themselves. They are, and will be, friends of the United States.

We are not declaring war on Iraq. We are declaring that Saddam Hussein must go. And Saddam Hussein must go for the sake of the people of Iraq and for the sake of the safety of our own people.

And let me note this. Rebuilding Iraq will be much easier than building Afghanistan. Iraq has enormous resources that have been channeled away by Saddam Hussein to develop chemical and biological weapons and to develop nuclear weapons. Those billions of dollars can be put to use to build a better Iraq, and the people will applaud us for helping them to that end.

No, this is much easier than the job in Afghanistan, yet we have the naysayers among us who would lead us in the other direction. Twelve years ago, we heard similar naysayers. It was this urge to be overly cautious that led to, I would say, the devastatingly wrong decision not to finish the job we started. Twelve years ago, and this is not going to be partisan, because I will have something to say about Republicans in a minute, the majority of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted 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. When 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 finishing 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 President. Let us face it. First, he 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 have some sort of preemptive 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? Instead of having 3,000 people, as on 9/11, we would have millions, or at least hundreds of thousands, of Americans slaughtered.

This 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, for prescription drugs, health care, Social Security, and Medicare.

Americans demand that we fix the economy. Workers want to know what has become of their pensions. Families worry about their health care. Seniors 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 saving Social Security and Medicare. They want us to pass an energy policy that will make us a 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 this resolution, because there is nothing more frightening and the prospect of Saddam Hussein or any terrorist using poison gas, germs, or radi-

ation 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 says in 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."

Even without 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 in uniform continue 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 against Iraq, and we may not, our 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 from us.

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 possible to ensure 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.

□ 1615

He has retained a cadre of nuclear scientists and technicians and capability to constitute nuclear weapons programs.

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 Congressional 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. I have talked with 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 my congressional district.

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 1998, 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 longer-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 proven technology. He has shown an irrational motivation, and I fear that unchecked he will have nuclear weapons capability and the capability to deliver it by missile against our allies or smuggle it into the United States to be used against the American people.

I am not prepared to let this happen. We must remove this capability sooner rather than later. Former NSC specialist on Iraq Ken Pollack was absolutely right in his book "The Threatening Storm." For me the most vital argument is this: fighting sooner is less costly than fighting later. Today Saddam Hussein has a limited quantity of weapons; tomorrow he will have more. Today Saddam Hussein's forces are weak; tomorrow they will be stronger. Today 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?

Madam Speaker, in 1938 Britain and France were stronger than Nazi Germany. They knew Germany would challenge them at some later time. They knew Germany was belligerent. They knew that Germany was rebuilding its armaments and its decision makers were not rational; yet they chose to wait. The cost of waiting was millions of lives, the devastation of their homelands, and mass destruction. There is no parallel between Hitler and anyone else on the world stage, but the world has an obligation to learn from history's mistakes.

Finally, we must learn other lessons as well. We have an obligation to ad-

dress the long-term issues that will arise from this conflict. We must help the Iraqi people rebuild a democratic society, and we must ensure that those who fight bravely for our freedom today are not forced to fight a bureaucratic and budget battle for their health and veterans' benefits tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I close by returning to my daughters. I do not want them or any children in America to grow up in a world dominated by Saddam Hussein with a nuclear weapon; nor do I want to increase the risks to the young Americans that we will commit to battle today by committing them to a harder battle against a nuclear-armed Saddam Hussein tomorrow. We are all dedicated to peace and freedom on both sides of the aisle, but we know from history that freedom is not free. For all of these reasons, I support the use of force in Iraq with the very strong belief that we must go to war only as a last resort, but also in firm agreement with President John Kennedy: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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.

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 devastation of 9-11 must never again be allowed to come to our shores. 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, and we have heard the debate 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 on his neighbors and even 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 world.

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 and must act 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 Nations in disarming Iraq. 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 as the representatives of the United States is sobering. To cast a vote to send America's troops into harm's way to face

what could be the supreme sacrifice for freedom is our most solemn duty. But to wait and do nothing could lead to weapons of mass destruction being used against the United States, our allies and others, resulting in the death of thousands and thousands of people. It is not a vote we seek with eagerness, but we all must do what we believe in conscience is the right thing to do; and I believe the right thing to do is to help make the world a safer, more secure and peaceful place where people can live in freedom without fear of tyrants and terrorists.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, no person or nation should doubt our country's commitment to eradicating the threat of terror. That is why I voted last year to support the President's actions in Afghanistan. But before we authorize the President to go to war with Iraq, Congress must have clearer answers to several crucial questions.

What is the nature and the urgency of the threat to the United States posed by Saddam Hussein? What is the clearly defined mission of our troops? Is it to eliminate Iraq's potential chemical, biological or nuclear weapons? Is it to remove Saddam Hussein from power and establish a friendly regime in Baghdad? Is it to engage in nation building, to create a democratic Iraqi government and society?

What is the extent of the international support? What will be the position and role of the United Nations? Which nations will provide troops, planes and ships for the military operations? Which nations will provide financial support to pay for the military operations in the aftermath?

Will the military operations in Iraq make it less or more likely that America will suffer from terrorist attacks? Finally, what is the exit strategy to withdraw our troops from Iraq? When and how will they be withdrawn once they have accomplished their mission?

Madam Speaker, we must ask these questions, and we must have answers to these questions. We have made mistakes other places in the world. We certainly did not ask or answer all these questions in Somalia. In Korea, we had our troops there 50 years. These questions must be asked and answered.

Madam Speaker, I listened to the President's speech last night, and I look forward to the debate in this House over the next few days. However, at this point I have not heard any clear answers to the questions I have posed here today. For that reason, Madam Speaker, I cannot yet support the resolution authorizing the President to go to war with Iraq.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

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

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.

□ 1630

Are we to move ahead protecting America and free people by authorizing the use of military force against 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 that 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 and 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.

But we do know one thing for sure. It is the Congress and the President's responsibility to protect this 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, but 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 us and 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 Florida (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 act to defend freedom, confront a 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 on 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.

It is in this regard that I have contemplated 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 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

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 this 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.

Since the Gulf War, 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 diplomatic 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 give 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 partnership with nations that share 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. BEREUTER. 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 diplomacy, essential 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 an earlier White House counsel'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 is 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 exceptional 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 unfettered 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 for U.N. inspectors. The international community now has this forceful proposition before it: Either an effective U.N. weapons inspection pro-

gram 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 on the necessity of military action against Iraq and especially the involvement of Congress, the resolution the House has before it today 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 or the use of the authorization for 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.

□ 1645

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 (A) 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 Iran and 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 U.S. recovered unused 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.

The evidence is clear too, obtained from numerous verifiable sources, that Saddam attempts to develop nuclear weapons, that he did so in the past and today again. Ongoing attempts by Saddam 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 has and 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 logically brings the House to the question of why at this time Congress should authorize the future potential use of military action by the administration.

This Member believes it is clear that the threat Saddam poses will only intensify. The U.S., the Western democracies, and Iraq's neighbors should never have permitted Saddam to hamper and then bar the reentry of U.N. weapons inspectors.

In the 11 years since the end of the Gulf War, and certainly in the 4-year absence of such inspections, Americans are now in more danger because of that collective lack of resolve to enforce WMD disarmament and because of the commercial and foreign policy goals of some of America's European allies and Russia.

Now, of course, in a post-September 11 world, the U.S. knows all too well that mass terrorism has been waged against civilians, in this country and abroad. It is a terrible part of the equation that the American President and the Congress now must responsibly consider. Does the U.S. now have a rea-

sonable basis to conclude that Saddam is not an imminent threat against the United States? Is there a clear justification for attempting to override the conclusions of the Commander in Chief?

The answers are, unfortunately, no. Delaying action is a greater risk to America's national interest, the security of our citizens, than the uncertainties that always attend a war and its aftermath. The resolution authorizing the use of force, or one that we might craft by amendment, is an authorization this Congress should approve.

As the House takes this extraordinarily important step, fully mindful that Congress in passing the resolution authorizes putting members of the U.S. Armed Services in harm's way, and recognizing no citizen in this country is assuredly safe now from related terrorist events either, Congress has additional important responsibilities. Congress needs to take every step to assure that the executive branch has given adequate consideration and provided contingency planning and resources on the following questions, which, bear in mind, are beyond the questions about adequately helping and preparing and deploying our military force.

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 task 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. military action strengthen 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 supported or is perceived 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 illustrative. 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 accomplishing them in 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 it is 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 to 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, one thing 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 had disputes, that we were there to talk about those 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, "And if you 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 do not expect that I would want 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 around Iraq, 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 United Nations and we will prove to 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 taking their 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 leader-

ship 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 not be what 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. GEPHARDT), 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 necessary and that Iraq will abandon its strategy of delay and evasion and instead act responsibly.

□ 1700

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 thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last night in his address to the United States on the administration's policy towards Iraq, 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 tenuous, 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 intend to support the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

As poignant 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 the end we 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 military 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. We risk losing the moral high 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 this body or 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.

Mr. Speaker, the Spratt resolution very clearly lays out where the Congress stands with respect to the Iraqi regime and their flagrant disregard for international law, their flagrant disregard for the U.N. Security Council resolutions. But it also says that the administration should try and do what every administration going back since the beginning of the United Nations has done, which is to build a broad-based coalition, just as President George Herbert Walker Bush did in 1991 that worked so masterfully in Desert Storm.

Should that fail, it gives the President the authority to come back to the Congress and then ask for an authorization of war. We can do this now without risking the United States, putting the United States at grave risk,

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 homeland here.

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 it in a way that protects 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. BLUNT), the deputy chief whip.

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, Aflatoxin, a biological weapon that has no battlefield use, something 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, 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. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, 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 ter-

rorism 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 and act soon. 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 passage of such a U.N. resolution, 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 be comfortable supporting any 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 U.N. cannot have a veto, but 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 war against terrorism.

It is more important that we do things right than that we do things fast, because the fight against terrorism is a long-term, not a one-week struggle, and we must think long term. Over 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 wanted Congress with them on 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 effort is well thought out. Based on discussions 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 al Qaeda, 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 despotism 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 a deteriorating economy. We must have a strong economic base if we are to have the social 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 met 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.

□ 1715

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 wants 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 talking about a year ago after the September 11 attack. There were accusations of who knew what when and what could have been done to prevent that kind of attack.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is what we can do: we can take a stand. We can inform ourselves of the seriousness of the information that is now available to us to know that this is a real threat. We can have strong support in this Congress so that the United Nations Security Council is going to pass a strong resolution there with ramifications for enforcement.

That is what we can do for this country, and that is what we can do for the free world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the decision to declare war is one of the most important responsibilities our Constitution has charged to us as Members of Congress.

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 at all. 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 11377 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 war 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, 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 Palestinians 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 seriously injured 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, 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 focus the authorization more clearly 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 secure Iraq's compliance with existing U.N. resolutions. None of our allies, save 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 attests 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 using force 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 provision is critical, as I believe 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.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Winston Churchill is

purported to have once said: "An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last."

I contend that Saddam Hussein is that crocodile. For more than a decade, 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 stolen military equipment. 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 said, it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place under the leadership of a merciless dictator.

Some critics have argued 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 is wise to give other nations like Russia, China, and France veto authority over the national security interests 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 peaceloving 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. LEVIN. 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 of weapons of mass destruction; 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.

□ 1730

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 any decision as to how and when to use 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 to go it alone in a war against Iraq now, before the U.N. Security Council has acted further, or not? Before Iraq has responded completely to those demands or not? Before a new inspection regimen occurs or not? Before we might use force as a member state in compliance with U.N. resolutions?

I believe there is a role for Congress and the American people in evaluating

the success or failure of those efforts in reaching any decision to authorize unilateral military action in a war against Iraq. From the very beginning, the thrust of the administration's approach has been to discount collective international efforts and towards unilateral action by the U.S. Urged by a broad array of critics, the President went before the U.N. He delivered a strong speech urging that the U.N. live up to its responsibilities. The President was appropriately applauded for that speech.

It is critical that we keep the emphasis on achieving collective international action. That does not mean, and I emphasize this, that we are ceding a final decision to the U.N. Quite the opposite. We are leading the way for the U.N. to act.

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 emphasis needs to be on forging collective action through the U.N., with a strong resolution requiring unfettered 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 changes 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 preemptive 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 action rather than unilateral will 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, stability in the region, 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 the emphasis in the right place both in terms of the U.S. using its superpower status to try to achieve collective international action, allowing for the use of military force in that context and, importantly, in preserving an adequate role for the elected representatives of the public in this U.S. Congress 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 our 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 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 mass 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's call for action; 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 it 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, these 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 Bahrain that have killed and injured U.S. military men and women. These 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 continues to block, ignore or defy the 16 separate U.N. resolutions. He clearly has no interest in yielding to the international community.

Amazingly, there are some in the international community who want to give Saddam additional opportunity. They believe that the 16 U.N. resolutions are insufficient evidence of Saddam's intractable opposition to inspections. I disagree. Saddam has had his opportunity. Unless inspectors are immediately allowed unfettered action 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 the fate of our Nation.

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 the 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 5½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

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 our allied countries of 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 Iraqi skies to enforce the United Nations Security Council's resolutions which he agreed to abide by at the conclusion of 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 festering 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 Iraq'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 must not wage war without making every effort to achieve our goal without further bloodshed. We must not take a go-it-alone approach. Rather, we should assemble an international coalition among the family of nations of the world to 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 terrorist network. The wounds of 9/11 still ache. America has unfinished business with Osama bin Laden and his fanatical 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 terrorists, 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 republics 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 that we have arrived at language 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.

□ 1745

They are well trained, highly motivated 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 Security, 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 education 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 President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "Let every Nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty."

Saddam Hussein is the world's leading threat to human liberty. I support this resolution as a last resort to eliminate 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 support of giving the President the tools he needs to protect the lives of Americans at home and around the world. The United States and United Nations have tried sanctions. We have tried inspections, we have tried no-fly zones, we have tried treaties, peace talks and 16 different Security Council resolutions. 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 intention of allowing inspections inside his palaces or weapons facilities. Saddam Hussein has no intention of allowing his scientists and families to be questioned outside of Iraq as President Bush has asked for; and Saddam Hussein has no intention of giving our government or the family of Scott Speicher, the downed American pilot, any information on their son's whereabouts.

Saddam is a blood-thirsty madman who cannot be left to his own devices. If left alone, Saddam Hussein will continue to build biological and chemical weapons and obtain a nuclear capability.

Last night, the President told us that Saddam is now building unmanned vehicles and airplanes to disperse those weapons almost anywhere. As a representative 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 Congress to fight in combat and the only Member held captive as a POW in Vietnam, I know we cannot fight a war from the Congress of the United States and win. Our President, with the passage of this authority, can and will deliver.

Let us learn from our Vietnam experience 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 Committee on Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and a real leader in our delegation.

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 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 national security of the U.S. against the continuing threat posed by Iraq. That is it. That is the key part of this, despite all the whereases and everything else.

So, with this resolution, Congress will preauthorize the first-ever preemptive war in the history of the United States, a war that may be fought unilaterally, without a single ally, conducted without restraint or clear objective, potentially in violation of the U.N. charter and widely accepted international law. I do not believe our Nation's founders would think that this was the proper use of our authority under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

What is so extraordinary about Saddam Hussein and the threat he poses that would justify this broad grant of authority? What has changed 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 intelligence services can find the slightest link between al-Qaeda and Iraq. So that cannot be the reason.

The President went to the U.N. 3 weeks ago, and he repeated in Cincinnati a long litany of charges against Iraq, most of them true. Saddam Hussein is a brutal psychopathic dictator. He has committed crimes against humanity. He used chemical weapons against Iranian troops, against rebellious 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 Saddam was allied with the U.S. against Iran.

He has violated a number of U.N. resolutions, 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 proven ties to terrorist groups, including 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 something else going on here. Perhaps it is because the President brought a number of people from his father's administration who felt that they were frustrated 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,

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.

They are deaf to 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 adventure, and 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 this 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 list is long and frightening.

The administration proponents of this resolution would have us believe we have no option, but we do. Continued containment, deterrence and intrusive, unfettered inspections. There is a long list of the success of the last 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 in 1991 of samples of indigenously 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 regime. We should go with our allies under the auspices of the United Nations. We should root out and destroy his weapons of mass destruction. We have an opportunity and a proven alternative before us, unfettered inspections, destruction of the arsenals; but it is not clear that that is the sole 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 our troops and unleashing our military might unless we are 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 other peoples, to expand our borders. We are rightly proud of our history of 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 prefer this path for it speaks to our respect for others, and we follow this path because 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 a disgrace 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 or another preemption has to be part of our national defense. Perhaps this is more clear to those of us who once lived in the shadow of the World Trade Center or those of 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 not immoral. 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 were passed as part of the ceasefire 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 canisters 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.

□ 1800

I will vote for the resolution, but I say to the President that I am voting for all of it. I am voting for the part that encourages that all diplomatic measures possible be taken, including a final round of inspections. Use of force as a last resort must truly be a last resort.

And to my colleagues who seek disarmament and concession for Saddam, as do I, I would urge we consider the need to demonstrate with no uncertainty that we mean business. The best way to avoid the use of force, I would argue, is to authorize the use of force. Cajoling, negotiating, strong language, harsh proclamations alone will not work against Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein must understand today that the jig is up, no more delay, no more obstruction. We will take your weapons either with your assent or without it.

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. Members of the al-Qaeda terrorist organization are 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, experiment data, an accounting of nuclear materials and documentation of foreign assistance. Iraq employs capable nuclear scientists and technicians and retains physical infrastructure needs to build a nuclear weapon. Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes used to enrich uranium 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, and we are showing 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 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 these resolutions. Every time the Iraqi regime fires a missile at our military, it further expresses its contempt for the U.N. resolutions, for America, and the international com-

munity. We should move forward to address this issue within the U.N., but the U.N. must move forward as well.

Mr. Speaker, I must also stress my concern for the innocent Iraqi people who continue to suffer under the regime of Saddam Hussein. This regime has forced them to suffer immeasurably, and my heart goes out to those people and their families. As we consider the use of force against Iraq, we must focus on the Iraqi people and ensure that any military action fully minimizes any civilian casualties. Our action must be taken to help the Iraqi people, not force them to suffer even more than they already have.

Mr. Speaker, in order to preserve the security of the United States, our interests and our allies, I urge my colleagues to join me and all of us supporting this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on International Relations conducted 2 days of spirited debate last week and has reported out a bipartisan resolution that I believe all my colleagues can and should support. The resolution before the House today clearly lays out the case for the use of United States Armed Forces against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein.

What brings us to this point? Why must we consider taking such grave action? Let us review for a moment the recent history of Saddam's reign.

He has already used chemical weapons against Iran and against his own people. He has launched an ethnic cleansing campaign against Kurdish people, killing thousands of civilians. He has invaded Kuwait. And during the ensuing Gulf War, he conducted an unprovoked missile attack against Israel.

Following his defeat in the Gulf War, Saddam agreed to eliminate his nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons program and to end his support of international terrorism. He has done none of that. In fact, he has repeatedly violated 16 United Nations' Security Council resolutions designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security.

We know that Saddam possesses and manufactures chemical and biological weapons. We know that he seeks nuclear weapons. Many of us believe that, given nuclear capability, he would no doubt use it against his enemies, including, and perhaps most especially, the United States, for which he has shown nothing but disdain.

We also know that the Iraqi regime continues to serve as a supporter and sponsor of international terrorism, and that members of al-Qaeda, the terrorist

group responsible for the murder of thousands of Americans on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq. Saddam, of course, praised those attacks on innocent people.

We know that Iraqi military forces continue to fire upon American and British military aircraft as they seek to 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 and 67 times in the last 2 weeks.

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 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 world community. He has terrorized 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. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Be they Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist, Sikhs; be they white, black, yellow, red, or brown, blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

Today, 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 West and 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.

War is bloody, it is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes and aspirations of people. As a great Nation and blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual, "I am going to lay my burden down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more."

For those who argue that war is a necessary evil, I say that they are half right. War is evil, but it is not necessary. War cannot be a necessary evil because nonviolence is a necessary good. The two cannot coexist. As Americans, as human beings, as citizens of the world, as moral actors, we must embrace the good and reject the evil.

As Ghandi said, "The choice is non-violence or nonexistence." The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said, "We must learn to live together as brothers and sisters, or perish as fools." There is something greater than military victory, bigger and greater than regime change and toppling governments. It is to this greater good that as a Nation and as a people we must aspire.

The scriptures say, "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul?" America's strength is not in military might but in our ideas. America ingenuity, freedom, and democracy have conquered the world.

It is a battle we did not win with guns or tanks or missiles, but with ideas, principles and justice.

We must use our resources not to make bombs and guns but to solve the problems that affect humankind. We must feed the stomach, clothe the naked bodies, educate and stimulate the mind.

We must use our resources to build and not to tear down, to reconcile and not to divide, to love and not to hate, to heal and not to kill. This is the direction great nations should move.

War is easy, but peace, peace is hard. When we hurt, when we fear, when we feel vulnerable or hopeless, it is easy to listen to what is most base within us. It is easy to divide the world into us and them, to fear them, to hate them, to fight them, to kill them. War is easy, but peace is hard. Peace is right, it is just, and it is true. I know it is not easy to love thy enemy. No, peace is hard.

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.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, my brothers and sisters, sometime, some place, leaders of a great Nation will have the courage to say, "We will lay down the burden, the tools and the instruments of war. We will wage peace, not war." And that nation will be blessed, for they shall be called the children of God.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 precautionary measures. 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 killer, a killer who we all know had murdered 5 people in Montgomery County, Maryland, and now is expanding his range.

The question has been asked this entire weekend, What motivates this person? Why is he doing what he is doing? Last night if one listened to the news stories, there was an answer given, a profile. The profile gave his motive; it gave his weapon. We all know his weapon is a high-powered rifle. It showed the geographic area he was operating in.

But what caught my attention was his motive. They said he is not a serial killer because a serial killer selects a certain type of victim. They said no he is motivated by something else, he enjoys killing. It is sport. He must kill again. He is what we call a thrill killer.

In that regard he shares something with another thrill killer, a thrill kill-

er we know as Saddam Hussein, a thrill killer that is not equipped with simply a high-powered weapon, but we have heard the litany of weapons at his disposal. We are also told that he started out killing members of his own family in his own village and then he moved on to members of his cabinet, members of his political party, his countrymen, whole villages at a time, then Iran, then Kuwait. Then in the Gulf War, the first two victims of this thrill killer were two majors from the Alabama National Guard that served at the same base I served in in Birmingham, a thrill killer.

What is the response to a thrill killer when we identify, when we learn the identity of that thrill killer who started his rampage in Maryland? Will we react with resolutions? Will we try to establish a dialogue? Will we restrict him to home? Will we give him a notification that we would like to inspect his home from time to time? Will we simply rage about the violence and say that we are good people and he should not do these things?

Thank goodness when we find him it will not be the United Nations that goes after him; it will be the Montgomery County Sheriff's Department, and we will not have to build a consensus all over the United States among every sheriff's department and every group 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."

I close by saying that what this Congress needs to do is give our President what he needs to prepare our Nation 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 role our constituents 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 his condition. This was merely a training exercise taking place with the Kuwait military, and one person lost his life and another may because of a senseless act of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Members to join me in a minute of silence to give thanks to these 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, he has taken the steps they have asked him to take prior to asking 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 that the United States will not 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 treatment 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 and liberty, 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 he needs 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 3 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 a failure to preempt the use of weapons of mass destruction far more.

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 Ken-

edy 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 deserve a united Congress behind the 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.)

□ 1830

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 can argue, as 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 you 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' resolutions 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 dictate 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.

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 back to the 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 or not 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 be part of or whether the United Nations will assemble a multi-lateral force to go in and to deal with the violations and the failures to keep the agreements that the United Nations has passed when he surrendered to the multi-national force in 1991.

But I suggest to my colleagues that if we do it in the manner which was presented in the resolution, not only do we undermine the idea of working with the United Nations, I believe that in the long term we undermine our position in the world and our moral authority to conduct these activities. I think when we combine this with the announcement by the Bush administration of its doctrine on national security of preemptive strikes, preemptive war, it is a declaration of war. Be it preemptive or be it defensive, it is war. That is what it is about. We can dress it all up into fancy policy language, but the question is whether or not American men and women will be called upon for that sacrifice to this country.

I think that, when we do that, we have got to make the case to the Congress and to the American people; and I think it is clear that case has not been made. I think it is also clear that the American people believe that we have got to deal with Saddam Hussein. I do believe that the President set out that course of activity when he went to the United Nations and rightfully asked the United Nations to take the action in support of those resolutions.

The suggestion is here that somehow if we pass this resolution this will give meaning to the United Nations because they will know, whether they do it or not, we will do it anyway. I suggest it is just the opposite. That suggests to the United Nations that they really need not act because somehow the

United States alone will take care of Saddam Hussein, even if that violates the tenets of the reason the United Nations exists, so that nations can act together. But if the United Nations does not act, then they remove the means by which we can prevent the unilateral action that so many people say they do not want.

At the end of the day, I believe we have an obligation to vote against this resolution. I believe that if we are unsuccessful in the United Nations, then this President should come back to this Congress of the United States, make his case that Saddam Hussein/Iraq are an imminent threat to the United States, and let the Members of Congress vote how they will when that case has been presented and keep it out of just the notion of giving speeches and going to the newspapers. Come to the Congress and make the case. To date, the administration has not done so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), a senior member of the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

If I had not been one who was given intelligence briefings, I may well have opposed this resolution. But since I know the facts, I support it.

I am a mother and a grandmother, and no one knows the horrors of war more than I do. None of us wants to rush into this war.

For months, our President has demonstrated that he will exhaust all avenues for peace before taking military action. However, we must remember that America has been trying for years to stop Iraq's weapons program through diplomacy; and it has not worked. Saddam Hussein threatens America and his allies at home and abroad.

It is easy to point out that Saddam is not at present invading other sovereign nations. However, it is not 1940. Saddam Hussein does not have to leave home to wreck havoc on humanity all around the globe. We Americans cannot understand the mind of a tyrant or a terrorist. If we think we can just live and let live, we must understand that they read that as weakness; and they will not let us live.

America has always achieved peace through strength and not always by going to war. Remember the Cold War. Some say, if we attack, it will further inflame the Muslim world. But we do not have a problem with all Muslims, only terrorists and tyrants. People who have been taught hate and have nurtured that from birth, hate for America, they do not need further cause. It is ingrained in their psyche, and pacifism on our part will not change that.

I am hearing people today say, well, let us wait until we see what they do and then we will discuss what we do. Or Saddam Hussein will not have weapons

of mass destruction for another 10 years. Let us wait and see.

Wait until they attack us and kill who knows how many more Americans? What will then be the satisfaction in being able to say, well, gee, I guess President Bush was right?

President Bush is not the aggressor. 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 not only 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 towards different goals and priorities, 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, virtually 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 in the 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 absent a forceful statement of conviction from the United States.

This resolution which will pass the House of Representatives by a strong bipartisan vote tells the world of our resolve. Having reached those conclusions, I am now prepared to 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 need wisdom and strength for the days ahead. My prayer for all of us is that we might be granted just that as we continue down this path together.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we all stand in this Chamber once every 2 years in January and hold up our right hands and take an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States of America and defend our great Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That same Constitution that we swear an oath to defend gives the President of the United States the right to serve as Commander-in-Chief and to also conduct foreign policy.

Today, our President has come before the Congress and asked us to support a resolution so that he can conduct for-

eign policy and that if he needs to serve as Commander-in-Chief, defend our Nation against an enemy who is both foreign and domestic. Because Saddam Hussein, as leader of Iraq, has engaged in terrorism, has sponsored terrorism, has said repeatedly that he wants to do the United States of America harm.

Some would have us believe that we should not take Saddam Hussein at his word, that we can continue to use diplomatic means to try to get him to back away from developing biological weapons and chemical weapons and to get him to back away from calling the United States the Great Satan, things of this sort.

□ 1845

It has not worked in the 11 years since we were last in the Middle East; there is no reason to expect that it would work today. But that is an option.

Others would have us believe that if we just go to the United Nations and get one more resolution, one more sanctions resolution, that somehow Saddam Hussein, although he has violated repeatedly every other U.N. resolution, one more U.N. resolution he might honor.

The proof is in the pudding. If we wait for the U.N. resolution, there is a probability, almost a certainty, that our great Nation will probably be subjected to some sort of an act of terrorism that is in fact orchestrated by Saddam Hussein.

So I think the President is right when he says that he wants to work with the U.N., he wants to get international cooperation. But the fact of the matter is that the Constitution that we swore an oath to defend says we have to protect our great Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We cannot wait for diplomatic means; we cannot wait for U.N. resolutions that might or might not have an effect in the future.

What should we do? We should vote for this resolution. What if we do not? Well, Iraq has used chemical weapons in the war against Iran. It has used biological weapons in the war against Iran. It has developed at least six chemical weapons and eight biological weapons. It is developing the means to develop a nuclear weapon. It is developing the means to transport these biological and chemical weapons by bomb and by missile.

So I think the time is now to act. I think we vote for the resolution. We show the President of the United States we will support him as Commander in Chief, if need be. He certainly has conducted our foreign policy.

We prepare for the worst; but, hopefully, by doing this, we will yet engender some solution that does not require the use of military force. But if it does, as the resolution says, we should give the President that right.

So I intend to vote "yes" on the resolution, "no" on the Democratic sub-

stitute, and hope we can move in a unified way to support President Bush and defend our Nation as we said we would when we took the oath of office when we stood up here in January of 2 years ago.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), a senior member of the Committee on International Relations and vice Chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the most important choice that any Member is called upon to make, that of war or peace, of life and death, I begin with the earnest view that in the defense of our beloved country there are no Democrats or Republicans, only patriots. Together we exhibited this idea after the attack on our homeland on September 11. I, along with others, voted to give the President unprecedented powers and resources to fight the war against terrorism, bin Laden and al Qaeda. That is the war I want to stay focused on. I have voted in the past for the use of force in the national interest and security, and I stand ready to do so again.

But I am not willing to invoke that power in the passion of the moment, or at the beat of someone's drum. So I say, Mr. President, I have yet to see your evidence of the clear and present danger, the imminent threat to the United States.

I listened intently to your speech at the United Nations and to that of Secretary Powell before our committee. You cited a long litany of Saddam Hussein's violations of U.N. resolutions, and these violations are real. But, Mr. President, they were real when you took office nearly 2 years ago. They were violated before you took office, and they were real before September 11. Why the rush now?

Mr. President, I have heard you describe Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological; and, yes, Saddam Hussein has had those weapons since you took office and before you took office. Yet you did not beat the drums of war then.

Yes, Saddam wants to acquire nuclear weapons; but that has always been his goal, both before and after you became President. And yet, Mr. President, you did not beat the drums of war then.

Saddam does not have nuclear weapons, and the estimates are that it may be years before he can achieve that dark reality. Who did we attack after September 11's tragedy? Was it Saddam Hussein? No, it was al Qaeda and Public Enemy Number One, bin Laden.

This September, Mr. President, you challenged the United Nations to act or be irrelevant. I agreed with you in that assessment. But you cannot ask the United Nations to act and be relevant while you tell them that we, nonetheless, intend to be a Lone Ranger, regardless of their actions.

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 exploration of viable alternatives, 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. President, 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 invade 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 use 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 Musharref in Pakistan hold on to power or will he 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 left 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 to preemptively 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 at home that leaves us ill-poised to have the resources to prosecute the multiple wars the President has asked us to pursue.

A war against Iraq could be a dangerous blow to our fragile economy 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 a 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 blank check 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 sets an unwise 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 we have 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.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his generosity in yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the intentions of this Congress and the people of this Nation are turned to the question of war. I would greatly prefer that we take the floor of this People's House tonight to engage the keenest minds and truest hearts of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the difficult and persistent struggles for better health care and financial security for our seniors, economic and social justice for people of color in this Nation, and to begin again to set this country on a course that will revive the prospect of economic growth for our business community and for labor.

In fact, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, given a choice, I would rather we wrestle tonight with the issue of how we might as a government meet our obligation to care for our aging and disabled armed service veterans.

But instead, tonight we face the prospect of war. And a new generation of good Americans from cities and towns all throughout our districts, who, like their grandparents and parents before them, will be the ones who will answer the call to duty. From my perspective in my district, they will come from neighborhoods like South Boston and Dorchester and Hyde Park and West Roxbury and all across the city of Boston. They will come from the historic blue collar city of Brockton and from the proud communities and historic communities in Braintree and Milton and Norwood and Dedham and Bridgewater, whose streets and town commons are marked row after row with memorials of heroes past, from battles that begin at the birth of our country to the present, and whose grandsons and granddaughters will now be asked to serve in the defense of our freedom.

We have been asked tonight to decide whether the President of the United States shall be granted the authority to use military force to eliminate the threat posed by the regime in Iraq led by Saddam Hussein, in the event that all diplomatic efforts fail.

This is a question that weighs heavily on me, and it is the gravest question that will confront this Congress.

After attending with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle numerous briefings at the White House and with

defense officials, as well as independent briefings with foreign policy experts, including the former chief U.N. weapons inspector during the Clinton administration, I have come to the conclusion that the danger to the American people as a result of a failure to act against Iraq is simply too great.

In reaching my decision to support this authorization resolution, I have focused on the undisputed facts: Saddam Hussein has developed and deployed chemical and biological weapons. Despite Saddam Hussein's denials, we know that he has actively sought to develop a nuclear weapon since the early 1970s, a pursuit that he accelerated during the Gulf War.

□ 1900

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 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 to a different conclusion, but 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 ago, confronted by the specter of Kuwait brutally 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 war aims. He said, "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 unfulfilled.

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 buried our dead, cared for our wounded, 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 regime change short of the use of the military option.

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 this: Should the U.N. fail in its mission, we will have very little choice but to act.

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 perpetrated by hidden worldwide terrorist organizations is the new national defense reality. The massacre at the World Trade Center on September

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 recognized risks.

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 biological, chemical, or nuclear 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 simplest route for 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?

Al Qaeda terrorists 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 charged against 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. Wake up and 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 compliant. We must 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. Vote "no" on the resolution to declare war on Iraq.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an ideal world, we would all choose peace, words could be trusted, and war would be unnecessary.

But we do not live in that world. Our world has tyrannical thugs and fanatical terrorists who choose to make us their enemy.

Supporting the resolution that would send Americans to war is not easy. We all know young people that wear our Nation's uniform and we know that when we send Americans to war, some do not come home.

But we also know that 3,000 people died right here at home, the result of fanatical terrorists. We know that we must lead. The world wants America to lead. We need to keep that line in the sand, but if we must wage war, we must also wage peace. We must show the world that we are not aggressors, that we want peace and stability and that America will stand to improve the region and improve stability.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, before all of America, President Bush declared our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but does not end there. Without fully disarming Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction, America and our allies cannot be safe; and the war on terror cannot be won.

□ 1915

The safety of all Americans, both here and abroad, is directly threatened by the weapons of terror already developed by Iraq. We must not allow America's cities to become the testing grounds for Saddam's nuclear capabilities, which is just around the corner. We must now act to protect our children, our neighbors, and our future generations from the evils that lie ahead.

The case against Saddam Hussein and his regime is clear. He continues to stockpile chemical and biological weapons and actively seeks nuclear capability; he threatens his neighbors and has stood in defiance of U.N. resolutions time and time again. Saddam must be stopped before we find him and his evil regime dispensing terror within our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. Speaker, this week marked the 1-year anniversary of American efforts to drive al Qaeda from Afghanistan and liberate the Afghan people from the Taliban. We have already 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 other 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. It did not link the authorization in any way to the essential negotiations now occurring within the United Nations Security Council.

Critically, in my mind, the resolution also 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 President asking three critical questions: 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. Through meetings and hearings by 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 creating anarchy that could destabilize the Middle East and create legions of new terrorists.

In the history books, Mr. Speaker, this resolution will constitute only a footnote, and any conflict with Iraq will constitute but a paragraph; but Iraq's future beyond Saddam and the role we play in its transition will fill a chapter, as its implications cascade far beyond Iraq to the rest of the region.

That is why, with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), I drafted a resolution that would deal with all these points. Through the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and others, the resolution before us now incorporates almost all of them.

This resolution authorizes the use of force, but strongly supports the President's efforts to work through and with the United Nations to enforce its resolutions and to force Iraq's compliance with them. It expresses a strong desire to work multilaterally, but reserves the right to act alone if we must. It requires certification, before force can be used, that diplomatic efforts will not achieve the goal of Iraqi compliance and that actions entailing military force will be consistent with the global war on terrorism.

Finally, the resolution requires the President to report to Congress both on the conduct of any military action and on what comes next.

This is not a perfect resolution, but it is a resolution that simultaneously supports the United Nations and our men and women in uniform who every day risk their lives to defend our national security. It makes clear to Saddam Hussein that we will work with our friends and with our allies, but that his efforts to blackmail the world with his weapons of mass destruction will not succeed.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart, great hope, and mindful of the responsibilities borne by Congress alone that I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), a combat Vietnam veteran who was wounded during his service and is chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank 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 those men and 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 facts: 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 torturing 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. Those are the tenets upon which a democratic process finds its strength. They are absolute, in an absent way, 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 for the United States, the only country in 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, hope, 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 Committee on Resources.

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 we are asked to make as a Member of this body. 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, unprovoked, 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.

I supported 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 with Iraq. 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 which 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 war 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 our men and women to wars 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 remotely thought the door to peace would be ajar.

I wanted to deliver a message to the Iraqi leadership that President George 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.

My repeated message to Iraqi officials during my trip was to allow the unconditional and unfettered access by

U.N. inspectors. I told them the moment was right if the fruits of peace are to be harvested.

□ 1930

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? No. No. It certainly 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 Iraqi leadership.

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 international 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 hit these sites.

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, during which time 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 know we all are and will continue to seriously reflect and ask what is in America's best interest. I know that we will all continue to seriously reflect and ask what is in America's best interest here, and I do hope we not take as gospel what one particular country in the region tells us nor follow their agenda above our own. We should plan what is best for America in the whole region and our future, not to be perceived as siding and consulting and planning every detail with another country. Only one voice and one view is needed.

Let us consider the feelings, whether public or private, of all of our allies in

the region. Let us recognize the tremendous strains and pressures we put upon the very effective coalition that President Bush has put together to fight the true terrorists, al Qaeda, America's war on terrorism. I strongly support those efforts. That is the war that should be ratcheted up. That is a direct and imminent threat to the United States for which we have proof.

So I say to my colleagues as I conclude, let us defeat this resolution. Let us recognize that we must tread carefully in a region that is already volatile, where U.S. military engagement could tip the region into further chaos and further bloodshed. I urge defeat of the pending resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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. SWENEY), he has been waiting for 2 hours; and he has been very kind. We want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWENEY), a man who lost friends in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center.

Mr. SWENEY. 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 fully well what we contemplate here. 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 not only 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 charge 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 de-

fend 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 to flout more than a dozen U.N. resolutions.

The United States through its actions will rise to the occasion and help channel the greatest intentions of the United Nations. By doing so we will, as a Nation, help the U.N. make its case for relevance in this world and propel it forward. It is wholly appropriate, Mr. Speaker, 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 surely 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 he has 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 and recklessly fired at U.S. aircraft patrolling a U.N. no-fly zone established so the U.N. community could protect his own people? Is it preemptive 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 when he embraced the doctrine 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 plentiful 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.

We must prove to the world that we will not tolerate such a ruthless and belligerent regime as it continues to threaten world stability. We cannot

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 legislative body. 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 set aside for those who will ultimately vote for final passage to a man who has offered this House a very thoughtful amendment in the nature of a substitute, the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget, a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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 this resolution 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 second vote by Congress to approve 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 in some quarters it will be 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, particu-

larly 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 of this war, as 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 inspection, if they work, but through 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 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 stiffens 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, all retired, Chuck Boyd, Wes Clark, 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, the outcome after the conflict 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 without an 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.

□ 1945

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 appear at 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, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful for impotence."

Our actions here in Congress speak to the world, and our resolve can only

strengthen our case. For its own sake, the U.N. must act, not just engage in endless chatter.

That our Nation is willing to stand up to the most despotic and corrupt regime speaks not only to American leadership but to our vision for humanity. We desire only to see the peaceful development of Iraqi society and to witness Saddam Hussein's veil of insanity lifted from the minds of the Iraqi people.

We cannot sit idly by while Saddam Hussein stockpiles weapons of mass destruction to use against our allies and for distribution to those terrorists that would use them to attack America.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq poses a clear and present danger to the United States security and to the stability of a peaceful world; and, Mr. Speaker, in the words of Edmund Burke, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), a leader of that delegation, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Saddam Hussein has been a menace to the international community. He has used chemical and biological weapons on his own people and in the war he started with Iran. Saddam Hussein has defied the United Nations by failing to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction and by repeatedly obstructing monitoring and verification by U.N. weapons inspectors.

Nobody in this House doubts that Saddam Hussein is a treacherous dictator, but Congress has not been presented a compelling case that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to the peace and security of the United States that must be dealt with immediately.

The President's resolution coincides with his introduction of unilateral preemptive military action as a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy; and in fact, this resolution gives the President the authority to conduct a unilateral preemptive war against Iraq. That is a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. Such a strategy invites other nations to assert their right to use unilateral preemptive action outside the U.N. charter. In my view, a world where nations rely on unilateral preemptive force as a tool of foreign policy would be an exceedingly more dangerous world than we live in today.

In asserting the right to use unilateral preemptive force in Iraq, the administration appears unconcerned about the consequences of an attack on Iraq, but unilateral preemptive force is virtually certain to further destabilize the region. Pakistan, a nuclear power, and Saudi Arabia, probably the most despotic Islamic regime after Iraq and the country of origin for 17 of the 19 suicide terrorists responsible for the

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 these countries and throughout the Islamic world to their cause. Thus our unilateral preemptive action could threaten the peace and security of Americans and American interests around the globe.

War with Iraq will clearly divert attention from the war against al Qaeda, which is not yet won, and from Afghanistan, which we and our coalition allies are committed to rebuilding. Furthermore, unilateral preemptive action would make the quest for peace between Israel and the Palestinians more difficult. Were Saddam Hussein to launch weapons of mass destruction at Israel, Israel would likely respond with overwhelming force.

Like many of my colleagues, I favor working through the U.N. to disarm Iraq by the strongest possible resolution, for unconditional inspection of any and all sites in Iraq and the destruction of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. If Iraq refuses to allow full and unfettered inspections and refuses to fully disarm its weapons of mass destruction, military force may become necessary; but that action would best be sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council and be a deliberate, multilateral response to Saddam Hussein's refusal to disarm rather than the unilateral preemptive action we are asked to authorize today.

As all of us are aware, the decision to authorize the President of the United States to commit troops to battle is the gravest decision that we can be called upon to make. War with Iraq will bring untold American and Iraqi casualties. War should be considered only as a last resort after all possible alternatives have been exhausted by the international community.

For these reasons, I cannot in good conscience vote for the resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a gentleman with a long and distinguished military background.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to support the resolution before us today. Yet in my heart of hearts I hope it will never be needed.

As a representative of more military personnel than any other Member of this body, I do not take our discussion on the use of military force or vote on this resolution to authorize the use of force lightly.

The families of Virginia's 2nd Congressional District know firsthand the effects of the war on terrorism. To date, two Navy Seals from the district I represent have been killed while fighting to eliminate al Qaeda terror-

ists in Afghanistan. Others lost their lives in training accidents while en route to the Persian Gulf.

These families and many others throughout southeastern Virginia understand why this war resolution is necessary, particularly at this time in our Nation's history. On Saturday, we will commemorate the second anniversary of the attack on the USS Cole where 17 Norfolk-based sailors lost their lives during a terrorist attack in Yemen. We will never forget the aggression that was waged against our military and Nation by these terrorists.

Today, we debate a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to use force against an enemy who constantly strengthens his grip on a terror-stricken people, has defied a peace-loving world, and aids terrorists who sow seeds of fear around the globe.

There is much we know about Saddam Hussein's regime of terror. He has ignored 16 resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council calling on him to dismantle and to destroy all weapons of mass destruction within his arsenals.

He has defied the cease-fire agreement from the Persian Gulf War that ordered him to eliminate all missiles with a range greater than 90 miles. Yet he continues to build weapons of mass destruction, and he possesses SCUD missiles that can reach distances of 400 miles. These weapons give Saddam Hussein the ability to attack American bases and allies such as Turkey, Israel, and other neighboring nations with chemical, biological and, in time, nuclear warheads.

We know from experience that Saddam Hussein is not afraid to use his weapons. Saddam Hussein does not respect human rights or human life. Iraqi citizens speaking words of dissent often find themselves or a member of their family, including their children, being tortured to death.

Saddam Hussein is an aggressor who threatens every nation and every person on Earth. No one knows when, where, or how he may use his weapons of terror. What we do know is his bad history shows that he will use these weapons against his enemies, including the United States.

Waiting for a smoking gun is a risk that America cannot afford to take. If unfettered 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 our troops.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. 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 his nation of weapons of mass destruction.

My constituents and I share the same concerns about this resolution. As in any war, we face 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 chemical and biological gear?

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. While this is 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 this 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 or 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.

□ 2000

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 we show lack of resolve. That is why I am supporting 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 organized system of denial and deception to frustrate both inspectors and outside intelligence efforts. Unfettered access to him does not include the presidential palaces. 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 many acres. One of these palaces is about the size of Washington, D.C., 40,000 acres, with thousands of buildings, including warehouses. That 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 Hus-

sein'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 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, and mustard agents against his own people, in one case killing 5,000 innocent civilians in one day.

Well, then, what kind of a history does he have with these kinds of things? Saddam Hussein's regime has invaded two of its neighbors and threatened others. In 1980, Iraq invaded Iran and used chemical weapons against Iranian forces. In 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait and was responsible for thousands of documented cases of torture, rape, murder, and on and on the story goes. 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 justice.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman 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 belittles Members of Congress who 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 improvident 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 death power to declare war bestowed on the Congress by the framers.

The majority resolution is an equally perilous violation of the rule of law itself and of 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 all nations. 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 fight 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 classes, 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. They would 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 reclaiming our constitutional right to declare war and reclaiming two centuries of American principles. Let Congress speak up so that none 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 man-made 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 never be used.

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 later, 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 ignored the rules, 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 innocents.

As a matter of fact, let me just share this one few-minute story with my colleagues. We were hosted during that trip to Kuwait City by a citizens group who showed us a videotape that had been taken a week or so earlier, while the Kuwaitis still occupied the city. 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 blindfold shooting him, firing-squad style. And has he lay there drooped 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 SCUD attacks. And, of course, in 1980 through 1998, during the war with Iran, he used weapons of mass destruction. He killed people with gas by the thousands.

And so this is the kind of a guy that we dealt with, where we realized we had to have a northern no-fly zone to protect his own people, the Kurds, and a southern no-fly zone to protect his own people, the Shiites.

So I guess I would make two points in kind of finishing up here. We know from history the nature of tyrants, and Saddam has demonstrated time after time that he is a typical tyrant of our time and one who has to be dealt with, apparently, as a tyrant. We know that he rules by fear. In fact, the Ba'hist regime is held together only by fear. They gassed the Kurds, as we all know, their own people. They execute anyone

who poses an opposition to the Ba'hist party, even Saddam's own family. So I say to my colleagues, we know what Saddam is like.

The second point I would make is that while Saddam has not changed, something else has. Something else has changed a great deal, despots of the past. The Hitlers, for example, by and large, killed people one at a time. If an individual did something they did not like, or in Hitler's time if someone was a Jew, or they said something that was against him, he would simply shoot them and think nothing of it.

□ 2015

But that has changed because Saddam has the potential to kill people by the thousands. So we tried to deal with him as a possessor of weapons of mass destruction in the conventional way through the U.N. 16 resolutions, and here is the list:

In 1991 we started by saying in a resolution through the U.N., Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War. He did not do it.

In 1991, a second resolution, Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless under international supervision of all chemical or biological weapons. He did not do it.

In April 1991, a resolution, Iraq must immediately end repression of its own civilization. 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.

On March 27, 1996, Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to weapons of mass destruction to the U.N. and IAEA. He did not do it.

Beginning in 1996, we passed resolutions in the U.N. that said Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors. Did he not do it.

In June 1997, Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to U.N. officials. He did not do it.

A similar resolution on March 2, 1998. He did not do. September 9, 1998, Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA weapons inspectors. Again, 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.

So 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. It possesses 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 that failure to act is 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 Hussein 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 Madam Speaker, 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 since the end of the Persian 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 should heed the advice of four dozen U.N. weapons inspectors who told this Congress and this country on the record that there will never be effective disarmament of the Iraqi arsenal of mass death until there is a government in Baghdad that fully cooperates with that effort.

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 that we should take lightly. 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 had to die to frontally take on 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 Czechoslovakia. He returned to Parliament, 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 booed 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 understanding, and the military 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 on heavy water. What did 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 built.

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-111s, 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 have heard our past Secretary of Defense, and now Vice President, when he gives that great talk about the yo-yos of war. We are prepared, we 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 those 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.

□ 2030

I object, however, to the approach that the Bush Administration is taking to deal with this particular problem. The administration has pursued a head-long, 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 and only then should we consider unilateral action against Iraq.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), 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 powers bestowed upon this or any other 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 the use of force that we contemplate 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 massive death and forego 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.

How can we in the aftermath of 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 stockpiles of Saddam's terrible 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. I urge our 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, unfettered, 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 servicemen and women into harm's way.

But in the end, Madam Speaker, should all else fail, we cannot entrust the future of the world's greatest democracy and the very lives of its people to a man who trades not in hope but in destruction, to a man who rules not by favor but through 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 unequivocal 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 and beyond, 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 for which they are prepared 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 before us 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.

Our military is the most highly trained and well-equipped fighting force in world, and we owe 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.

Mr. MCHUGH. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services, very active.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

Madam Speaker, a vote to place the men and women of our Armed Forces in the harm's way is one of the most crucial decisive votes I will ever have to make. Having fully considered the matter, I am convinced that Saddam's continued possession of weapons of mass destruction poses a significant threat to the United States. If he continues to refuse to comply with the demands to disarm, the use of force will be justified.

Information provided by the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency and testimony received by the House Committee on Armed Services clearly establishes that Saddam Hussein currently possesses chemical and biological weapons and is actively pursuing nuclear weapons. Saddam has already demonstrated his belief that the use of weapons of

mass destruction against both his own citizens and his enemies is a legitimate means to preserve his power and achieve his goals. Saddam's capabilities and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction pose a threat to the security of the United States.

This threat to our national security is imminent. The attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrate that our enemies have embraced nontraditional warfare. They will not operate under traditional notions of warfare and will not confine their methods to conventional combat. Saddam's options for employing chemical, biological, and radiological weapons against the United States and our Armed Forces are not limited to bombers and missiles and artillery shells. In fact, Saddam's most effective uses of weapons of mass destruction could come through surrogates that obtain these weapons by Iraq.

I know some urge reliance on additional inspections and sanctions. While I applaud the President's proposal for a new U.N. Security Council resolution and hope that U.N. member nations will follow the United States' lead in confronting this threat, we must remember that, after more than a decade, U.N. actions to this date have simply not worked. I am convinced that an inspection regime dependent upon Saddam's compliance will not result in disarmament.

Since 1991, Saddam has flagrantly violated the conditions of cease-fire that ended the Gulf War. As a part of the cease-fire, Saddam agreed unconditionally to give up his weapons of mass destruction. However, Saddam has retained possession of chemical and biological weapons produced before the Gulf War and has restored his ability to produce these weapons.

Additionally, Saddam is vigorously pursuing a nuclear weapons program. It appears that if Saddam were able to acquire fissile material, he would be able to as quickly assemble nuclear weapons in a manner of months, not years.

On September 16, 2002, Saddam promised the United Nations unrestricted access for weapons inspection in Iraq, but the U.N. agreement announced on October 1 does not provide such access. Saddam's presidential palaces, which are comprised of vast tracts of land and hundreds of buildings, are not open to inspection without prior notice. Under this program, Saddam will show the inspectors and the world empty buildings, while covertly continuing his weapons programs. One of his former weapons developers has testified that this was Saddam's regular practice while the U.N. inspectors were taking their action in other places.

□ 2045

Faced with these facts, I am convinced that Congress must give the President the authority and the flexibility he needs to confront this threat. The authorization of use of force against Iraq in this resolution does just

that. While we hope the diplomatic efforts will be successful, we must be prepared to act if they are not. Certainly military action against Iraq, if it becomes necessary, will involve risk. However, the risk posed by delaying action are even greater. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a person who has put in a tremendous amount of time and effort in this very important matter.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Spratt substitute and in opposition to the underlying resolution.

Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, a brute, a danger. Were this simply a referendum on him, the vote would be unanimous. But Saddam is not on the ballot.

The two questions before us are, first, how do we diminish the threat from Iraq without empowering Islamic fundamentalism and creating new recruits for terrorist groups; and, second, how do we avoid setting a dangerous global precedent for other nations to launch unilateral preemptive attacks as a legitimate tool of public policy?

Our country is strong enough to attack Iraq and win, but we ought to be wise enough to achieve our ends with allies and without war. In the past year, terrorism has threatened us as never before. We should face that new threat resolutely, but not frighten our own people by overstating the risk to Americans.

Some who support the resolution have morphed Osama bin Laden into Saddam Hussein and Saddam into Hitler and Stalin, yet the classified briefings that I have received do not lead me to conclude that the threat is imminent. We have time to work with our allies to enforce U.N. resolutions.

Actions often have unintended consequences. An invasion of Iraq to enforce U.N. resolutions may cost hundreds of Americans lives, maybe more, and thousands of Iraqi lives. But the future is obscured to us and predictions on this floor can easily turn out to be wishful thinking.

The resolution negotiated between the President and the House leadership has two fundamental shortcomings. It is still a blank check. I quote: "The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate."

The Gulf War resolution of 1991 did not delegate decisions on "force as he determines." The post-September 11 use-of-force resolution did not use the words "as he determines." Not even the Gulf of Tonkin resolution used the words "as he determines."

Under the Constitution, the President 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 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 rule-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 in Iraq should be authorized.

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 disarm Iraq without inflaming 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 price of 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 Hitler, 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 Saddam's language, which is force. But if we hesitate, if we fail to act, I believe history will judge this Congress with a single word, naive.

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. At that particular time, based on an incident on the high seas, Congress quickly and without much discussion authorized a response that hardly anyone in either Chamber believed was an invitation to a massive expansion of U.S. participation in Vietnam. The subsequent use of that resolution to justify that action was not known at the time.

Here it is totally different. We know what we are talking about. We are talking about authorizing the use of force, i.e., war, against Iraq, a major difference between now and the Gulf of Tonkin. This is what we are debating, this is what the American people understand this authorization to be, and the after-the-fact justification of the war in Vietnam based on that resolution is not what is taking place here. It is up front, and we know it.

Secondly, it is not open-ended. The President's original proposal was quite open-ended, but H.J. Res. 114 is much more limited. The language author-

izing the use of force to restore international peace and security in the region was deleted. The joint resolution and the report from the Committee on International Relations made quite clear that the threats that are the basis for using U.S. Armed Forces are Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and the missile programs, the means to deliver them, and its support for international terrorism, not all the different resolutions passed by the U.N. that Saddam has violated.

Page 42 of the committee report provides that the President is authorized to use force against Iraq to defend the national security of the United States from the continuing threat posed by Iraq "which primarily consists of its continued possession, development and acquisition of chemical and biological weapons and prohibited ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons and its continued support for and harboring of international terrorists."

That resolution also provides that the authority is to be used against Iraq's continuing threat, that of yesterday and today, not of some potential and new threat at some point in the future.

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. What precedes it is an exhaustion, 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 majority 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 we the American Congress and we the American people understand at the time, unlike the Gulf of Tonkin, just what we are discussing and debating; and no one has made a claim that this is not an authorization of the use of force, very specifically directed against Iraq for specific purposes.

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.

□ 2100

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 be-

came 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, botulism 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 if Iraq fails to comply. 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 four, 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 tragic 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 condone 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 himself 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. NEY 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 107-730)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Help America Vote Act of 2002".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR ELECTION ADMINISTRATION IMPROVEMENTS AND REPLACEMENT OF PUNCH CARD AND LEVER VOTING MACHINES

Sec. 101. Payments to States for activities to improve administration of elections.

Sec. 102. Replacement of punch card or lever voting machines.

Sec. 103. Guaranteed minimum payment amount.

Sec. 104. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 105. Administration of programs.

Sec. 106. Effective date.

TITLE II—COMMISSION

Subtitle A—Establishment and General Organization

PART 1—ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Sec. 201. Establishment.

Sec. 202. Duties.

Sec. 203. Membership and appointment.

Sec. 204. Staff.

Sec. 205. Powers.

Sec. 206. Dissemination of information.