

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

ABC CODES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the billing code system in the United States permits insurance reimbursement for health services and facilitates review of patient access and utilization of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the way we determine health policy, evaluate health care services and codify those services for reimbursement impacts our health care system in dramatic ways. In health care reimbursement, if there is no code for the product, it will not get reimbursed.

Many Americans use complementary and alternative health care procedures, including nursing, chiropractic, acupuncture, naturopathic medicine, nutritional and botanical therapies. Too often there is no insurance reimbursement or inadequate reimbursement for these health-promoting services. And one reason is because there is no standardized tool to code these services and products. As a consequence, those who can afford it pay out of pocket and those who cannot are denied access.

Right now the Current Procedure Terminology code, or CPT codes as it is called, is the only approved coding standard available for insurance reimbursement. It is geared strictly to services provided by physicians and does not have the capability to represent services by other licensed providers including nurses. The CPT codes cover only about a quarter of all health care services used by Americans, leaving out three quarters of all health care products and services used to stay healthy and prevent disease. This creates critical gaps in knowledge about the health care marketplace.

On January 16, Health and Human Services Secretary Thompson authorized a pilot test of a new coding practice in accordance with the provisions and regulations governing the Health Insurance Portability Act that facilitates electronic transactions. These new codes supplement CPT codes and support tracking, measurement and analysis of the economic and health outcomes of complementary and alternative medicine, nursing and other forms of integrated health care. We have the opportunity as a result of this action to make major strides in addressing pressing issues in health care, accessibility, quality and cost management.

Mr. Speaker, this new technology is a set of alphabetic codes, called ABC codes, that function in a manner simi-

lar to the bar codes in the retail industry. This innovative new technology can provide us as health policy-makers with a more complete and accurate picture of the way U.S. health care is managed, financed, and delivered in terms of what works and what does not.

□ 2100

Head-to-head comparisons of conventional, complementary and alternative care are necessary to identify and advance the most health-promoting and cost-effective health care practices.

Mr. Speaker, I learned about the ABC codes because they address many health care services that have been largely ignored and undervalued and because studies show it is much more cost-effective to prevent disease than to treat it after it has developed.

The developers of ABC codes have designed ABC codes to fit into existing health care data fields, software application and information systems. So the cost and burden of implementation is small, but the benefits are large, and ABC codes help payers identify when reimbursement is justified as it relates to whether the provider is licensed under State law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to pay close attention to this pilot program to learn of the value of integrating complementary health care and assisting us in developing a model of care that is more cost-effective and health promoting.

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). I think his comments are especially pertinent this evening in consideration of the debate that is going on in this Capitol. So I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. I greatly appreciate the gentleman giving me some of his time. The gentleman is on this floor on a very regular basis making some very important remarks about very important issues, and he will continue that, but the gentleman is right, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight is a very, very important night. There is a debate going on in this town that is highly important to the future of this country. The debate is so important that I hope the American people are tuning in and understand what is going on in this country.

Because, Mr. Speaker, there is a gentleman that has been nominated to serve on the D.C. Court of Appeals bench. The gentleman's name is Miguel Estrada. Miguel Estrada is exactly the type of highly qualified lawyer that America needs on the bench in this country. His story also mirrors Amer-

ica's best heritage of individual achievement and the blessings available to those who choose to hitch their futures to our republic. He represents the best tradition of hard work, perseverance, dedication and integrity. He built a strong record of academic excellence in leading universities.

The left often opposes conservative judicial nominees on the basis of an unfavorable rating from the American Bar Association, but in this case, Mr. Speaker, even the ABA recognizes that Miguel Estrada is well qualified. In fact, Al Gore's close legal adviser and former chief of staff Ron Klain had this to say about Estrada: Miguel is a person of outstanding character, tremendous intellect and with a deep commitment to the faithful application of precedent. The challenges that he has overcome in his life have made him genuinely compassionate, genuinely concerned for others and genuinely devoted to helping those in need.

Former President Bill Clinton's Solicitor General Seth Waxman said, During the time Mr. Estrada and I worked together, he was a model of professionalism and competence. In no way did I ever discern that the recommendations Mr. Estrada made or the analyses he propounded were colored in any way by his personal views or indeed that they reflected any consideration other than the long-term interests of the United States. I have great respect both for Mr. Estrada's intellect and for his integrity.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have it. Objective observers from the other side of the aisle recognize that Miguel Estrada is a highly qualified and intellectually gifted legal superstar who would immediately raise the standard of the bench on his first day.

There is no substantive basis for opposing his candidacy beyond the vicious and intellectually dishonest tenets of an all-consuming leftist ideology that is driven entirely by an appetite to destroy anyone standing beyond its control.

The left is inflamed by any prospective judicial candidate with the courage to oppose their unrelenting, small-minded, intolerant hostility to the traditional foundations of American life: faith in God, reverence for tradition, respect for the true rule of law and the recognition that we are all ultimately accountable for our actions.

That last point in particular, Mr. Speaker, summons the deepest venom and bile from the left. They attempted over the four decades beginning in the 1960s to put forth a vast and sordid swindle upon the American people. The left claim that men and women could take any action, that they could ignore our most sacred and sacrosanct traditions, that in service of convenience they could callously destroy and step forward without consequences.

Now we know better. We know that the left's malevolent campaign to undermine the notion of truth itself comes at a frightful price. Their malignant hold over the intellectual life of

this country must be exercised, and men and women who are willing to speak the truth offer our only hope of reclaiming our culture from the grip of a hedonistic, reckless and destructive descent into nihilism.

They oppose anyone who would reject the long reckless reach of the plaintiff's bar into everyday lives with frivolous and destructive lawsuits. The left are wracked with malice by the prospects that a Republican judicial appointee would approach the Constitution with reverence as a fixed defining document that offers a true north for the breadth and reach of the Federal Government.

The left prefers instead legal anarchists who approach the Constitution as a malleable document, subject to political manipulation and susceptible to the faddist legal theories of the moment.

Because Miguel Estrada is committed to upholding our founding principles and preserving the integrity of the rule of law, the left is targeting him for destruction. This we cannot and we will not allow.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the other body is working late into the night, and I hope that the American people will tune in to C-SPAN that is carrying the other body's debate because it is a critical debate to what is going on in this country today. It is a critical debate, a debate that the Nation is having today, a debate that is so vitally important to the future of this country.

To take a man from Honduras, an immigrant that has worked his way up, realizing the American dream, going to college, getting his law degree, working in courts and working for the President of the United States, trying to advance an agenda that is vitally important to American people; but because he may have a name that is different than most, because he is a Hispanic, he is a danger to the left, and they are treating him as dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is vitally important that we as Americans stand and support Miguel Estrada in his quest to serve on the D.C. Court of Appeals, and I would urge this House to stand up with Estrada on this evening, a very important evening for this country, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves, I would like to point out a couple of things about Mr. Estrada.

First of all, the American Bar Association has given him the highest qualifications. These are the people that go in, regardless of race and economic status, they take a look at their legal qualifications. He is at the top of the book. He is at the top of the group. He is at the top.

Second of all, I think it is very important some of the gentleman's remarks. He is a leader, a recognized leader in the Hispanic community. Why are they picking on him? They

cannot pick on him because of substance. I think there is a double standard back here.

The Democrats on one hand stand and say they feel strongly about the Hispanic community, but when the going gets tough, where are they to be found? It is people like my colleagues sitting over here that have enough guts to stand up when something is going wrong and say, how can you do this? Or the American Bar, which by the way is nonpartisan, has said he ranks at the very top. And here we have the Democrats taking on what is going to be the first opportunity for a Hispanic in the history of our country to be named into this position, and it is the Democrats who take one of the most highly qualified attorneys in this country, according to a bipartisan group, the American Bar Association, and are at this very moment seeking to destroy him.

The gentleman's comments were well taken.

I would be happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

It is rather strange that it is okay to be Hispanic, but a person has to be Hispanic with a particular point of view. In this country, can my colleague imagine that a person has to be a Hispanic that only believes one way, that only believes the way that the left would have them believe, that is only controlled by the left?

But to have somebody that has brought himself up from poverty and present himself to the United States for a very important prestigious appointment, to have to kowtow to the control of the left because he may not think the same way they do, that he may not believe in the same things that they do, is just outrageous, and the American people need to see what is going on here in this town tonight.

They need to understand what is going on in this town tonight, and they need to reject those that would reject Miguel Estrada.

Mr. MCINNIS. Again, reclaiming my time, in my opinion, this is the clearest example of a double standard that we have seen in a long time, and it is taking place right now in front of the American public; and the American public ought to stand up and say, look, just because one is not on the radical left does not mean they should not have an opportunity as a Hispanic leader, as one of the top-rated attorneys in the country by the American Bar Association, to take a position that has never before been held by a Hispanic.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman being here and I appreciate him yielding time to us, and I think I and my colleagues are going to go over to the other body and witness what is going on.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the majority leader taking time to share these comments with myself this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I thought long and hard before I came over here to the House floor tonight. My comments are coming from the depth of my heart of which I feel very very strongly about. I want to go through a couple of things with all of my colleagues this evening because I know most of them feel the same way I do. They understand our job responsibilities to the American people, our job responsibilities not only to the American people, but to the world.

As the President said in his State of the Union address, freedom is not just a gift to America, freedom is a gift to all humanity; and this Nation leads the world and has led the world throughout its history, throughout the history of this Nation as the one who carries the banner of freedom, as the one who has the ability and not just the ability, excuse me, but has the courage, the profound courage, to stand up for other countries that are not as fortunate.

It is the United States of America that today, when we match it against any country in the history of the world, not just the history of the United States, but any country in the history of the world, it is the United States of America that has gone to arms more often than any other country to defend another country. It is the United States of America that goes to military assistance; not to conquer, the United States did not go out and attempt to conquer other countries. That is not our mission in this life.

Our mission is to go out and allow freedom to spread throughout this world. It is the United States of America that today, if we take a look at all the food assistance in the world, it is the U.S.A. that provides 60 percent of it. It is the U.S.A. that provides more educational opportunities than any other nation in the world. It is the United States of America that provides more medicine to other countries than any other country in the world. It is the United States of America that allows more opportunities to immigrants than any other country in the world.

There is a reason that in the United States of America we have problems with immigration. Do my colleagues know why? Because of the fact we do not have any lining up to get out of this country. We have people lining up by the hundreds of thousands that want to come into this country, the country of great promise, but this country only achieved this position of strength through a position of commitment.

That is when we see something wrong going on, either against our citizens or against the citizens of our friends, we must take a position. We must stand up. In part, nobody else has the capability to do it.

Then sometimes when, as the case that I am going to go through with my colleagues in some detail tonight, there are other countries that have the capability to stand up and do it, but they will not stand up. When the going

gets tough, that is when we count our friends.

□ 2115

There are a lot of people who will want you to be the first one out of the foxhole. But the fact is not a lot of people will follow you as you go onto that battlefield under heavy fire.

Now, let me say right at the onset of my remarks, the President of the United States has done a tremendous job. The Secretary of State, Colin Powell, has done a tremendous job. Condoleezza Rice, Don Rumsfeld. Thank goodness, in this time of need, George W. Bush put together this kind of A squad. I do not care whether you are a liberal Democrat or a conservative Republican. The fact is when you take a look at a Condoleezza Rice, when you take a look at a Colin Powell, whether you agree or not, the fact is you have to say they are good. They are class. They are the top. They are the A squad. And fortunately, in this time of need, we have the A squad running this country.

Now, I want to go over this evening, number one, what I think our ultimate responsibility is to the American people, to the constituents that we represent. I want to go over a little background of Iraq and talk a little bit about Saddam Hussein, who unilaterally, by himself, has killed more Muslims than any other known person in the history of the world. He has killed more Muslims. Killed more Muslims. And that, by the way, includes men, women and children. He is the only leader alive today that we are aware of that has used chemical weapons and things like anthrax and other types of poisonous weapons to kill his own population, to kill his own people. He would just as soon take to war against another country, but use it against his own people. So I will talk a little about the history of this madman.

I will talk a little about the situation we face in regards to our allies, particularly the French and the Germans, who have stunned the world of NATO, which for 50-some years has been a close-knit organization, an organization in which the loyalty and the dedication to your fellow members has never been questioned, has never been questioned. Their moves in the last week and a half have shaken the very foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I will be going to Europe this week to participate in NATO meetings, and I can tell you that I am taking a message to my colleagues in Germany and Europe and Belgium and Luxembourg. My message is: Have you thought about what you are doing? Look what you are doing to the family. I know we may have a family dispute, we may have an inter-family dispute, but look what you have done to the family. The steps that the French and the Germans have taken this week reach far beyond the fact they refuse to provide assistance to the country of Turkey, which

by the way is the most Muslim country in the world, a nation that has stood up against radical terrorists, against the radical believers of the Koran who have read it inaccurately. Yet our colleagues in France and Germany have refused to stand up, and they have really cracked the foundation of an organization that some now say has served past its due time.

I want to visit a little about what we do after this is all done, and I think it is very important. Because what other country in the history of the world, show me one other country in the history of the world that after they engage in a military conflict with another nation believes that it is as important to rebuild the nation that they just went to war with; that it is more important to rebuild that nation than to walk away. The United States of America did it in World War II with the Marshall Plan.

The United States of America built Japan. In fact, the aid we gave Japan, I can remember in the 1980s, when people were saying, my gosh, we restored this country, we saved this country from going into oblivion. We saved this country. We helped rebuild this country. We wrote their constitution and we put a general in charge, and now Japan is overtaking us in the business community. Remember those days in the 1980s? This Nation is not a Nation that seeks to conquer. This is a Nation that seeks to do good and do good for the right cause and for the right people. And this is also a Nation, although reluctant to do so, it is a Nation that is prepared to take that sword and show its terrible wrath against the evil people of this world. And, of course, Saddam Hussein fits at the very top of that list.

Let us visit just a little about Iraq. We all remember the situation in the Persian Gulf. And I have heard many people criticize, including myself, when I asked the question many times, Why did we not take out Saddam Hussein in the first Persian Gulf War? Why did we not do it? What kept us? We had a superior Army, and the so-called Republican Guard of the Iraq armed forces folded. They folded like that. In fact, many of the guard surrendered to unarmed American photographers, newspaper reporters. And we went, Why did we stop at Baghdad? Why did we not go in and take care of the problem?

Initially, I criticized the first George Bush. But when we take a look at what happened, it was not the President of the United States. Not at all. It was the United Nations. It was the United Nations mandate. That was the only authority, assuming we followed that mandate, the only authority this Nation and its coalition had, which was to take Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, but not to go in and have a regime change. So as a result of the United Nations actions 12 or 13 years ago, it was the United Nations that kept Saddam Hussein in power, and it has been the United Nations, which resolution

after resolution after resolution has turned a blind eye towards violation after violation after violation. Keep in mind that this country knows when it is called upon to do good for other countries.

My district is in the Colorado Rocky Mountains. I had the good fortune, the privilege, actually, of being in Aspen, Colorado, when George Bush, Sr., flew in to the news, as he was in flight, flew into the news that Iraq had just taken a smaller country, Kuwait. Had invaded it. Had invaded that country. It was Margaret Thatcher and George Bush, Sr., in Aspen, Colorado, that made the decision that the action taken by the Iraqi country and by Saddam Hussein would not stand. Remember those words? The President said this will not stand.

We prepared militarily. We built a coalition. But we yielded to the leadership of the United Nations, or at least the restrictions imposed by the resolutions of the United Nations, and that is that we not go into Baghdad and have a regime change. Furthermore, we yielded to the United Nations, who basically set out the terms of what the negotiation should be on the surrender of Saddam Hussein. These surrender terms allowed Saddam Hussein to stay in power. It allowed him to stay in power, but under very, or what we thought at the time, were very tough and stringent conditions. And those conditions being that he would never again arm that country with weapons of mass destruction; that he would allow inspectors into his country for the rest of the history of that country; that he would turn over to the allies and to the United Nations inspection forces all his weapons of mass destruction; that he would list the weapons of mass destruction that they still had in their inventory.

This was term after term after term after term that the United Nations insisted upon during the surrender. What happened? Violation after violation after violation.

Now, keep in mind that I think our responsibility as Congressmen to this Nation, and frankly to the world, but our ultimate responsibility is to provide for the security of the people of this country. I cannot think of any other responsibility that rises to the level of protecting the security of the people that live within these borders and our friends outside these borders. It, in my opinion, is an absolute obligation. And should we fail through negligence, or in this case what I would consider gross negligence, because we know what Iraq has; we know, at some point, what Iraq's intentions are, it would be a gross failure of our ultimate responsibility if we did not answer to the call, if we did not send fire trucks to this fire.

Sure, the fire is dangerous. Sure there are a lot of resources and a lot of fire trucks that we are going to have to send to that fire, but we have to send them.

Let me give some kind of comparison here. I think in a lot of aspects a medical doctor has the same type of responsibility to his patient or her patient. A medical doctor's responsibility is to provide for the security of their patient, security in the terms of their health. What is the health of the patient? How can we preserve the life? What can we do for this patient? The security of that patient. And sometimes that means the doctor has to give some pretty tough advice.

In this particular case, think of going to the doctor and you have sort of a hurt in your foot. So you say to the doctor, Doctor, my foot kind of hurts, but it is not really a big deal, I do not think. I am just kind of coming in here because my mom told me I needed to come in and see you. I wanted to get her off my back, so I am coming in to see you. So as the doctor, you come back to your patient and you say, I have some bad news and I have some good news. The bad news is you have cancer in that foot. The good news is we can take care of it now.

Now, it is going to require some sacrifice. It is going to require some pretty dramatic action, action that you never anticipated when you walked into this doctor's office, but nonetheless that action is required. And the patient looks at the doctor and says to the doctor, Doctor, I do not want to hear this. I do not want to hear this. It is going to disturb my lifestyle. It will interrupt me going to work, my work schedule. I did not come in here to hear I have cancer. I came in here just because my foot was bothering me a little. I do not want to hear it.

Or the patient says to the doctor, okay, Doctor, but I want to go home and pray about it. The patient wants to pray it away. I do not want this happening to me. Well, prayer is very important, do not get me wrong. I say prayers everyday, and thank goodness we have some guidance from our supreme being. But the fact is that alone does not do it. Does not do it.

Or the patient says to the doctor, I just want to go home and go to sleep and tomorrow I will wake up and it will all be a bad dream. But the doctor says to the patient, before you leave this office, keep in mind that today we can take that cancer and it is in the foot. If you wait too long, that cancer, the next time you come in here, that cancer will have spread throughout your body, and then my options are extremely limited. So I cannot allow you to go out of this office without being fully open with you and telling you that.

And that is exactly what we as Congressmen, that is exactly the fundamental responsibility that we have to the generation behind us and to the generations that live with us, and that is to be straightforward. We have an opportunity today to stop that cancer while it is still in the foot. To ignore that, to pretend that it is not occurring, to somehow kind of say, let us

sleep on it and it will go away is a huge, huge, huge misstep in our obligations.

In fact, I think, I truly think that the failure to stand up to this threat that is so imminent and imminent to future generations, failure for us as a body to stand up to this threat is nothing short of treason. That is how strongly I feel. We know it is there.

Now, this Congress has not neglected its duties. This Congress has stood up and given to the President of the United States the authority the President needs to go in and engage in whatever operation, whether it is a peaceful operation or a military operation, to fix the problem. But this problem needs to be fixed now.

And the President, in my opinion, has been very patient. The nations across this world have been very patient. We have gone through 17 resolutions with the United Nations. Each resolution has been violated. Each resolution has been broken. At one point, Iraq kicked the inspectors out. Iraq has continued time after time after time to hide these weapons, to play a game of cat and mouse.

What would happen if Iraq surrendered those weapons? Do you know what would happen to Iraq if it joined the world economic community? It would be one of the wealthiest countries in the world. They would be able to provide for their citizens. Saddam Hussein could provide a standard of living for his citizens that would match many of the industrial countries in the world.

□ 2130

The people of Iraq could have education. The people of Iraq could have the kind of medication and health care that most industrial countries enjoy. The people of Iraq could enjoy the fruits of their hard work, but instead this horrible leader has focused on one issue and that is a self-serving image of himself to be a creator of disaster. And we have an opportunity to step forward.

Let me say what happened. We have got some examples in history where, when the obligation was there, the team that was responsible to handle it did not do it, did not carry out their responsibilities, and I want to speak briefly about that example.

Germany, World War I, Germany used poison gas. Germany in its surrender, very much, there are a lot of similarities between Germany and Iraq, Iraq in the Persian Gulf War, Germany in World War I. Germany surrendered to the international community. In fact, it is kind of weird how close those conditions that Germany surrendered upon are similar to the conditions that Iraq surrendered upon.

Germany agreed not to produce any more weapons of mass destruction. Germany agreed to allow inspectors into its country. Germany agreed to surrender all weapons of mass destruction or gas or weapons like this to the allies, to the world community.

What happened? It was not very long where Germany, just like Iraq, started saying to the inspection teams, "Wait a minute, this is sovereign territory, you have no right to enter this part of our country and inspect whether we are hiding weapons in there." And the international community, primarily led by France, by the way, gave in. They refused to force Germany to live up to its agreement. They refused to acknowledge the fact that the Germans had lied and the Germans had used those weapons in a very lethal fashion against the world and that they were not surrendering those weapons.

So they did not know what to do with this hot potato. Germany was not allowing the inspectors to carry out their duties. In fact, Germany kicked the inspectors out, just like Iraq did.

So what happened? What did the community do? The international community led by France, they turned it over to a group called the League of Nations. What did the League of Nations do? They talked tough just like the United Nations did, but they blinked, and when Germany continued to refuse to follow the agreement that they made, that they made, the League of Nations stood down. The League of Nations backed off.

What happened? Well, Germany rebuilt its inventories. Germany, in fact, had been lying about the weapons that it in fact possessed. The League of Nations became a paper tiger, and today there are very few people that one can stop who can tell them what the League of Nations is. And the United Nations faces the same challenge.

Keep in mind that under President Clinton on the bombing, the air war against Kosovo, against Milosevic, keep in mind that it was the United Nations which refused to pass a resolution supporting the air war in Kosovo. And now the United Nations stands up and beats on their chest as if they are the ones that saved Kosovo. Fortunately, President Clinton, through his leadership, was determined that that was what was necessary, and frankly he turned out to be right and the United Nations was wrong.

Keep in mind that these resolutions that the United Nations has passed are simply a reflection of the agreements that Saddam Hussein and his country agreed to. These are not conditions imposed by outside countries upon the sovereign immunity of Iraq. These are conditions that Iraq agreed to, and Iraqis themselves have time and time and time again broken the very things that they agreed to.

Now let us take a look at what kind of weapons Iraq has. I listened to some of the people that are protesting this action. I am appalled by the fact that they are ignoring the cancer that exists. I am appalled by the fact that they gunplay to the world, through public relations, a very sophisticated public relations campaign, that they underestimate the threat of these weapons, that they somehow think

that we can trust Saddam Hussein, that they somehow think if we love him and hold his hand and talk warm and fuzzy talk with him, maybe share a piece of apple pie with the guy, that he is going to come clean and be a good neighbor.

This is a neighbor who has a vicious past. My guess would be that some of these protestors are some of the protestors that lead protests to disarm American citizens and take on battle with the National Rifle Association, but yet take a totally opposite stand when it comes to Saddam Hussein.

Now let us just see how serious this threat is. We are not talking about 13 empty missiles or shell casings. We are not talking about a couple Scud missiles that exist out there. Let us take a look at what we are talking about.

I refer you to the poster. This is the history of chemical weapons that Iraq has. These are weapons that Iraq has used in the past. So first I want to show this, and then we are going to progress from this poster to the next poster, which demonstrates what their inventory is. But just for those people out there that are in these protest lines, I think you have every right to be there, but I disagree fundamentally with the direction that you are leading a lot of innocent people. You are going to get them killed, in my opinion. You are leading them down the path of disaster if you ignore the history that Iraq has proven to the world.

Let us take a look at the history. My poster, Iraq's history of chemical weapons use. Date: 1983; type of agent, mustard; around 100; target, Iranians and Kurds. Keep in mind that Saddam Hussein has led his Nation on two invasions against other countries outside its borders, not in retaliation but in an offensive action. They attempted to invade Iran, and they did invade Kuwait.

October, 1983; mustard gas; casualties, 3,000; victims, Iranians and Kurds. And I should point out that the Kurds were Iraqi citizens.

February, 1984; mustard gas, 2,500 people. These are equivalent, 3,000. That is like the New York Trade Center and the Pentagon, 3,000 people, and he got them with mustard gas. The same thing, mustard; 2,500 Iranians.

March, 1984, Saddam Hussein, 100 more Iranians.

March, 1985, Saddam Hussein kills 3,000 other people through the use of these chemical weapons.

February, 1986, mustard gas, 8,000 to 10,000 people. Remember, these are not fighting men. These are men, women, and children that were extinguished, they were eliminated, they were murdered in cold blood though the use of chemical weapons as ordered by Saddam Hussein, 10,000 that time around.

1986, thousands, they cannot even estimate how many thousands were killed in that attack by Saddam Hussein using this type of weapon.

1987, mustard gas, 5,000; 1987, mustard gas, 3,000.

1988, hundreds, mustard gas, nerve agents.

How much clearer can it be? I mean, it would be one position if somebody came up and said, "Look, we think this guy might kill somebody with these. It is a threat, but he has no history of it."

We can use history to give us some kind of guidance of what is going to happen in the future. This is a cold-blooded killer. His only interest in being nice right now is to win the public relations battle in the international community. He knows that George W. Bush and the team of Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice and Dick Cheney, he knows that that team is determined to do what is right. He knows that that team will not allow this threat to exist. So he is attempting, and frankly he is doing a pretty good job of it, to win a public relations battle throughout the world that, "Look, forget what" thou "has done in the past and believe what I am going to do in the future. I am going to be a good guy. It is America, it is America that is causing this problem."

So for everyone this evening who thinks that somehow we are dealing with a paper tiger or we are dealing with a threat that really does not exist, look at the history, look at the history of cold-blooded murder. Take our disaster of September 11 and multiply it and multiply it and multiply it, and we will get to the number of casualties that Saddam Hussein has carried out just through chemical weapons just as soon as other methods of war, which have killed hundreds of thousands of people, primarily Muslims, by the way.

Now let us take a look. We know through our intelligence, through the admissions made by Iraq after the surrender in the Persian Gulf that these following locations, and I will not go through each location, but every point on this poster to my left, every point on here is a weapons production facility, and a lot of these facilities are being utilized.

Let me refer to the next poster. This is one of those facilities, here to my left. It is very hard to see, but this is one of the facilities. On November 10, 2002, somehow the Iraqi leadership, Saddam, got word that the inspectors were going to be there. So on December 22 when the inspectors showed up, now take a look at what has happened.

The facility has been sanitized. It is an attempt to fool the American public. It is an attempt to fool the world. It is an attempt to divert our attention into thinking that this individual, who has twice in his history invaded other countries, who has murdered more Muslims than any other man alive, who has, through the use of chemical weapons, killed members of his own civilian population, who is responsible for hundreds and hundreds of thousands of deaths, and yet he is being persuasive with the world community in some areas in persuading them that he means no evil, that he is not a man of evil, that in fact America is the country of evil. Take a look at that sanitation.

Now let us take a look at what Iraq has under their last admission after Persian Gulf War Number One. If any poster should get your attention this evening, it should be this poster to my left.

These are inventories, not calculated by the intelligence communities of the rest of the world; these are inventories that Saddam Hussein himself admitted that he has and now refuses, time after time after time again refuses to turn those inventories over, refuses to account for those inventories and instead says to a couple of hundred inspectors in an area the size of the State of California, "Find them if you can." That is the message out there, "Find them if you can."

Take a look at what type of weapons we are speaking of. Mustard gas, 2,850 tons. 2,850 tons.

Take a look at the sarin nerve gas, 795 tons of sarin nerve gas.

VX nerve gas, and let me tell everyone about the VX nerve gas. After the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein said he never made VX, he never made VX. In 1995, under pressure from the international community, he admitted that he made VX. He admitted he made VX, but only a few milligrams. Now they admit to 3.9 tons of that.

Nerve agent, 210 tons; anthrax, 25,000 tons; uranium, 400 tons; plutonium, 6 grams. This individual is a very, very dangerous individual.

No other country in the world is capable of leading a coalition other than the United States of America. The United States of America will go forward with a coalition.

Now, when we take a look at the national press, the world press, one would think we have no European support outside of our long-time solid friend of Britain. The fact is we have lots of support on the European continent: Spain, Italy, Portugal, Hungary, Bulgaria. There are a number of different countries that support the position of the United States, that understand that this is not a problem that is unique to this country.

It is a problem that is spread across the entire world. It is a problem that threatens the safety of everybody in this world. And yet there is a coalition that is willing to stand up and do something about it.

And do not be mistaken about NATO. The majority of NATO, the vote that went against us, was 16 in favor of the United States and three against us. The shock of NATO is that a country like France, who now, as we know, are pretty fair-weather friends, meaning they are a friend when it is convenient for them; and the Germans, it is unprecedented in NATO's history that a partner would refuse to help a fellow partner, such as Turkey, in their time of need.

□ 2145

But the fact is do not underestimate the strength that we have within the membership of NATO. There are a lot

of people in this world, there are a lot of countries in this world, that realize that this cancer must be addressed now; and we are attempting to do it.

I think we have an obligation to try and address it in the approach that has the least amount of impact; peaceful if we can do it, but do not let this game go on and on, because I am telling you that cancer spreads day by day, and that cancer does not discriminate on its victim. It will attack every man, woman and child alive. And it has no mercy. This cancer will show no mercy.

We can stop it today. And if these means of peaceful approach through the United Nations will not work, if the United Nations will not accept its responsibility and stand up to this madman, it is then inherent in the history of this country and the moral obligation of this country to stand forward and stop that cancer. That is our obligation.

It may not be what seems to be politically correct with some of the population with the French. And by the way, if you want to take a look at what is the incentive of the French and Germans to turn and invest against their long-term friend, the United States, take a look at their oil contracts with Iraq. I have heard people say this is all about oil. Well, with the French, it is. That is where they are getting their oil. Take a look at their long-term business contracts.

When I go to Europe this week, I am going to ask the French and my colleagues in Germany, Where is your investment? Where is your best, solid thought for an investment? Is it with the United States of America and the coalition of Spain and Italy and Bulgaria and Portugal and the British, or is your investment better with the country of Iraq and Saddam Hussein?

I know that we have an obligation to go in and do something about this cancer, but we also have an obligation, and we have accepted that obligation, to be there when we take the cancer off, the aftermath of what happens, after, for example, a military conflict.

This Nation will take into Iraq within hours, within hours of a military victory, we will supply that country of Iraq with medicine they have never seen under Saddam Hussein. We will supply them with food supplies and feed their hungry stomachs to the extent they have never experienced in their lifetime, many of them. We will offer that country, more than anything else we could give them, freedoms that they have never dreamed of under Saddam Hussein.

The United States of America will not rule Iraq. Iraq will rule Iraq. But it will rule it under a leader who cares about the people of that country, who does not place military weapons in school yards and missiles in hospitals. There are only good things that can happen to the country of Iraq if the United States of America and the world community stands up to its obligations.

There is a cost of leadership. Do not just stand up and say you are a leader. A leader is called upon when the challenges get tough. This is a tough challenge, and it is a long-term obligation to give these people what they deserve, and that is freedom, that is health care, that is food, that is the ability to do business.

It is our time. It is our time and our allies' time to stand up and get rid of this cancer. And if the French and the Germans and Luxemburg and Belgium do not have enough guts to do it, then get out of our way, because we are going to do what is right.

This Nation throughout its history, oh, sure, we hit a bump in the road here and there; sure, we made mistakes. This is not a mistake; this is an obligation. And I am confident that under the leadership of our fine President, this Nation will meet that obligation.

A year from now we will look back at many of these naysayers and I will say, now what do you have to say, because it will be our Nation that gave these people their freedom. It will be this Nation and people like the British and our good allies that had enough guts to do what is right.

And make no mistake, as that phrase is commonly used, this team down there in the White House and this Congress which has authorized that team in the White House, we will do what we need to do to give the Iraqi people exactly what they are entitled to.

I can tell you as a United States Congressman, I stand here with a great deal of pride, knowing that I am carrying out my fundamental responsibility to the people of this Nation and to the people of this world, and that is to provide security, to provide freedom, to share our wealth of food, to share our wealth of medicine. We will do the job. We are a can-do Congress. We have a President and an administration that is can-do. We will get the job done, and we hope that the world community will join us. The majority of them, I am confident will. Those allies like the French and Germans, who become weak-kneed now, at some point in time will look back and see it was probably one of the most serious mistakes they ever made.

So it is time for the people of this Nation to stand up in support of its leadership, and they have. We will not betray you. We will not let you down. We will do what we are charged to do, and that is to go out and protect not only our Nation and not only our friends, but the oppressed people of Iraq. And we will destroy those weapons of mass destruction. Iraq, for one, will never be a country, after we are finished, that will have the capability to once again make tens of thousands of casualties through the use of poison gas on innocent civilians.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective February 12, 2003, I will take a leave of absence from the Science Committee for the 108th Congress due to my appointment to the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

BOB ETHERIDGE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective February 12, 2003, I hereby resign my position on the Committee on Small Business due to my appointment to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Sincerely,

DANNY K. DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective February 12, 2003, I am hereby taking a leave of absence from the House Small Business Committee due to my appointment to the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. LANGEVIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science: