

percent of Iraq's annual imports. Under the U.N. oil for food program, Russia's total trade with Iraq was somewhere between \$530 million and \$1 billion for the 6 months ending in December 2001. According to the Russian Ambassador to Iraq, Vladimir Titorenko, new contracts worth another \$200 million under the U.N. oil for food program are to be signed over in the next 3 months. Soviet-era debt, someplace between \$7- and \$9-billion was generated by arms sales to Iraq during the 1980 to 1988 Iran-Iraq war. Our soldiers will have to face many of these weapons on the battlefield in the coming days.

Russia's LUKoil negotiated a \$4 billion, 23-year contract in 1997 to rehabilitate the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq. Work on the oilfield was expected to commence upon cancellation of U.N. sanctions on Iraq. The deal is currently on hold, obviously.

In October of 2001, Salvneft, a Russian-Belarus company, negotiated a \$52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field in southern Iraq. In April of 2001, a Russian company received a service contract to drill in the Saddam, Kirkuk, and Bai Hassan fields to rehabilitate the fields and reduce water incursion.

A future \$40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement, reportedly signed in 2002, would allow for extensive oil exploration opportunities throughout western Iraq. The proposal calls for 67 new projects over a 10-year time frame to explore and further develop fields in southern Iraq and the Western Desert, including the Suba, Luhais and the West Qurna and Rumaila projects. Additional projects added to the deal include second phase construction of a pipeline running from southern to northern Iraq, and extensive drilling and gas projects. Work on these projects would commence on cancellation of sanctions.

One Russian company over the past few years has signed contracts worth \$18 million to repair gas stations in Iraq. The former Soviet Union was the premier supplier of Iraqi arms. From 1981 to 2001, Russia supplied Iraq with 50 percent of its arms.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to understand who our friends are in the world and how they make their decisions. The negotiations over this U.N. resolution has been, I think, a certain lesson on this topic. It is one that will not easily or not quickly, I hope, be forgotten. The challenges ahead of us are great, but make no mistake. If Saddam Hussein were to succeed in developing, in keeping these weapons of mass destruction, the chemical weapons, the biologic catastrophes that could come from the biological weapons and certainly his efforts over the years to try to develop atomic weapons, if that were to be let go undone, it would be tremendously difficult to deal with the other problems that the free world is facing in Iran, in North Korea, let alone the rogue nations with ty-

rants as dictators that might decide, well, Iraq got away with it and they were able to do great bargaining for themselves. If we develop these weapons, then we are going to be in better shape to threaten, coerce, blackmail, if you will, for better deals for our country.

The challenge ahead is great. The technology and the ability of many of these countries to develop these kind of devastating weapons is now available, almost on the Internet. So I think today it is so important that we strongly support our military troops, that we thank the 30 to 50 countries that have decided, according to Secretary Powell, to support us in this effort. Maybe this is the beginning, but the United States has taken on this responsibility. In past actions through World War I, World War II, all of our wars, the Korean War, even Vietnam, they were all for good humanitarian reasons, to make sure that freedom and justice and the rights of people were helped throughout the world. That is part of what we are going to be going after in the next few days, to try to make sure that not only these weapons in Iraq are disassembled and destroyed, but that we keep other countries from making the same effort and having the same threat on our liberty and freedom.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report prepared by my Administration on the participation of the United States in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during the calendar year 2001. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress).

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2003.

CONGRESSIONAL DUTIES IN CONNECTION WITH CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING IRAQ

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to come to the floor this evening to continue a very important discussion that deals with our duties and responsibilities in connection with the circumstances surrounding Iraq.

I begin with a review of the duties that we have. First I pray for our sol-

diers whose roles are pretty well defined, and I would like to point out that we in the Congress have a duty as well, a constitutional duty, that requires under the Constitution that we alone can decide war. And why is that? Because of Article I, section 8. It is important for us to note that this duty is nondelegable. We cannot pass it off. We cannot turn it back. It can only be done by us. So the question of who decides becomes very important.

On this past Monday, the President of the United States said he has decided that he will begin this war, and that this is a matter that did not require him to consult with Congress, that there was no debate in the Congress, that it was a matter that he has been telling us in innumerable ways on innumerable occasions precisely what he was going to do, and that Saddam Hussein's time has run out, and there are no more options, and that negotiations are futile, and that the United Nations can do what they want, that everybody has to decide in the family of nations, that they are either with us or against us, and that it does not matter whether the inspection regime required by the United Nations has been concluded or not.

□ 2000

It does not matter whether the United Nations approves or disapproves. He has decided what he will do, and he is going to do it. Why war? And why now? A war could be justified only if our national security is threatened. There has not been the case made that that is the present circumstance, and it of course has to be weighed very carefully against the death and the destruction not only that we put in our own military's path but also the innocent people in another country who will likely be killed in the course of this activity. And of course none of this has been debated by the Congress. But what about the tactics of the 43rd President of the United States? He has repeated on more than one occasion that war is the last resort. "My last resort," when everyone knows that it is his first objective. How can he be declaring that war is the last resort, that he has exhausted negotiation when actually he is short-circuiting the whole process?

And then we have the coalition, the fig leaf coalition of the willing, which bears not that much analysis. Who they are and why they are there speaks generally for itself. And then of course we have the central issue here that there is no compelling evidence that Iraq is a current threat to our national security. None. We waited for the grainy photos of the Secretary of State when he was supposed to have conclusively made the case. We have waited for the Secretary of Defense when he was supposed to have conclusively made the case. We waited for the President and the Vice President when they were supposed to have made the case. It was the Vice President who first announced early on that Iraq had nuclear