

# REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

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

There was no objection.

# FREE DEBATE OVER WAR WITH IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have returned from the work recess. So many of us have had the opportunity to listen to our constituents, and aside from the important business of the appropriations process, I heard a singular cry and that is whether this country was going to engage in war with Iraq.

I am gratified to hear that there will be a full debate in this House and I hope it will not be limited by time. But I have called for citizen summits across the Nation, communities opening up in town hall meetings and PTA meetings and civic associations to discuss one of the most important decisions this Nation has to make. For if this war is engaged and we go into war, there is no determination as to whether this will be a 1-year war or a 20-year war.

The American people must be involved. And although this is the people's House, and I hope we will have full debate, I believe it is crucial to have citizens debate all over this Nation. In visiting with students at the University of Houston, I made this point.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the American people will begin to debate this crucial issue impacting America.

# SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

# AVOID WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I want to start my 5 minutes with a quote

from Jefferson. Jefferson said, "No country perhaps was ever so thoroughly against war as ours." These dispositions pervade every description of its citizens, whether in or out of office.

□ 1915

We love and we value peace and we know its blessings from experience.

We need this sentiment renewed in this Congress in order to avoid a needless war that offers us nothing but trouble. Congress must deal with this serious matter of whether or not we go to war. I believe it would be a mistake with the information that is available to us today. I do not see any reason whatsoever to take young men and young women and send them 6,000 miles off to a land to attack a country that has not committed any aggression against this country. I believe it would be a serious mistake for various reasons.

First, it is a practical reason. There is no practical defense for this. Our military now has been weakened over the last decade, and actually when we go into Iraq, as we may well do, we will weaken our ability to defend our country. We do not enhance our defense by initiating this war.

Besides, it is impractical because of unintended consequences which none of us know about and what might come. We do not know exactly how long this will last. It could be a six-day war, a six-month war or six years or even longer. It could be very impractical by going to war.

There is a military reason for not going to war. We ought to just listen to the generals and the other military experts that are now advising us there is not a good reason to go to war, possibly even start World War III some have suggested. They claim our troops have been spread too thinly around the world, and it is not a good military matter to go into war today.

There is a constitutional argument and a constitutional mistake that could be made. If we once again go to war, as we have done on so many occasions since World War II, without a clear declaration of war and a clear goal of victory, a haphazard way of slipping into war by Executive Order or, heaven forbid, getting permission from the United Nations makes it so that it is almost inevitable that true victory will not come.

So we should look at this in a very constitutional fashion. We in the Congress should assume our responsibility because war is declared by Congress, not by a President and not by a U.N.

This is a very important matter, and I am delighted to hear that there will be hearings and discussion on this matter. I am certainly arguing the case that we should have a balanced approach. We have already had some hearings in the other body, and we heard only one side of why we must do this, but if we have true hearings, we best have a debate and evidence on both sides of this matter rather than

just getting one side up and saying why we must do this.

Actually there are even good political reasons for not going into this battle. War is not popular. It may be popular for the short run when there seems to be an immediate victory and everyone is gloating over the victory, but war is not popular. People get killed and body bags end up coming back. War is very unpopular, and it is not the politically smart thing to do.

There are economic reasons that we must be careful for. We can make serious economic mistakes. It is estimated that this venture into Iraq may well cost over a hundred billion dollars. Our national debt right now is increasing at a rate of over \$450 billion and we are talking about spending another hundred billion dollars on an adventure that we do not know what the outcome will be and how long this will last? What will happen to oil prices? What will happen to the recession that we are in? What is going to happen to the deficit? All kinds of economic ramifications. So we better not make the mistake of going into something that really we have no business getting into.

There is a diplomatic reason for not going. There could be serious diplomatic mistakes made. All the Arab nations nearby and adjacent to Iraq object to it and do not endorse what we plan and insist that we might be doing, and none of the European allies are anxious for this to happen. So diplomatically we are way off on doing this.

I hope we take a second thought and be very cautious in what we do.

# TRIBUTE TO MARLA ANN BENNETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in praise of Marla Ann Bennett, the young San Diegan who was killed in the July 31 terrorist bombing attack at Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Marla was an extraordinary woman who touched the lives of many people in her all-too-brief lifetime. Her brutal murder left a terrible void in those lives and brought forth an outpouring of grief from the Jewish community where she lived: in Berkeley, where she attended the University of California; in Jerusalem, where she continued her studies and found a spiritual home as an American Jew in the Jewish homeland; and in San Diego, where she grew up and planned to return once her studies were completed.

At Marla's memorial service, which was attended by over 2000 people, and in more intimate meetings with her family and her friends, I have shared the community's terrible grief at Marla's death, but also the great joy that she felt in life and shared with