

Conyers	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Peterson (PA)	Weller	Wilson (NM)	Wu
Cooksey	Jefferson	Petri	Wexler	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Costello	Jenkins	Phelps	Whitfield	Wolf	Young (FL)
Coyne	John	Pickering	Wicker	Woolsey	
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Pitts			
Crane	Johnson (IL)	Platts			
Crenshaw	Johnson (E. B.)	Pombo			
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy			
Culberson	Jones (OH)	Portman			
Cummings	Kanjorski	Price (NC)			
Cunningham	Keller	Pryce (OH)			
Davis (CA)	Kelly	Putnam			
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (MN)	Quinn			
Davis (IL)	Kerns	Radanovich			
Davis, Jo Ann	Kildee	Rahall			
Deal	Kilpatrick	Ramstad			
DeFazio	King (WI)	Rangel			
DeGette	Kingston	Regula			
DeLauro	Kirk	Rehberg			
DeLay	Knollenberg	Reyes			
DeMint	Knolleberg	Reynolds			
Deutsch	Colbe	Rivers			
Dicks	Kucinich	Rodriguez			
Dingell	LaFalce	Roemer			
Doggett	LaHood	Rogers (KY)			
Doyle	Lampson	Rogers (MI)			
Dreier	Langevin	Rohrabacher			
Duncan	Lantos	Ross			
Dunn	Larsen (WA)	Rothman			
Edwards	Larson (CT)	Royce			
Ehlers	Latham	Rush			
Emerson	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)			
Engel	Leach	Ryun (KS)			
English	Lee	Sabo			
Eshoo	Levin	Sanchez			
Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Sanders			
Everett	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin			
Farr	Lewis (KY)	Sawyer			
Fattah	Linder	Saxton			
Ferguson	Lipinski	Schakowsky			
Filner	LoBiondo	Schiff			
Fletcher	Lofgren	Schrock			
Foley	Lowey	Scott			
Forbes	Lucas (KY)	Sensenbrenner			
Ford	Lucas (OK)	Sessions			
Fossella	Luther	Shadegg			
Frank	Maloney (CT)	Shaw			
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Shays			
Frost	Markay	Sherman			
Gallagly	Matheson	Sherwood			
Ganske	Matsui	Shimkus			
Gekas	McCarthy (MO)	Shows			
Gephardt	McCullom	Simmons			
Gilchrest	McDermott	Simpson			
Gillmor	McGovern	Skeen			
Gilman	McHugh	Skelton			
Gonzalez	McInnis	Smith (NJ)			
Goode	McIntyre	Smith (TX)			
Goodlatte	McKeon	Smith (WA)			
Gordon	McKinney	Snyder			
Goss	McNulty	Solis			
Graham	Meehan	Spratt			
Granger	Meek (FL)	Stark			
Graves	Menendez	Stearns			
Green (TX)	Mica	Stenholm			
Green (WI)	Millender	Strickland			
Greenwood	McDonald	Stupak			
Hall (TX)	Miller, Dan	Sullivan			
Hansen	Miller, Gary	Tancredo			
Harman	Mollohan	Tanner			
Hart	Moore	Tauscher			
Hastings (FL)	Moran (KS)	Tauzin			
Hayes	Moran (VA)	Taylor (MS)			
Hayworth	Morella	Terry			
Hefley	Murtha	Thomas			
Herger	Myrick	Thompson (CA)			
Hill	Nadler	Thompson (MS)			
Hilliard	Napolitano	Thornberry			
Hinchey	Neal	Thune			
Hinojosa	Nethercutt	Thurman			
Hobson	Ney	Tiahrt			
Hoefel	Northup	Tiberi			
Hoekstra	Norwood	Tierney			
Holden	Nussle	Toomey			
Holt	Oberstar	Turner			
Honda	Obey	Thune			
Hooley	Olver	Udall (CO)			
Hostettler	Ortiz	Udall (NM)			
Houghton	Osborne	Upton			
Hoyer	Ose	Visclosky			
Hulshof	Otter	Watkins (OK)			
Hyde	Oxley	Watkins (OK)			
Inslee	Pallone	Watt (NC)			
Isakson	Pascarella	Watts (OK)			
Israel	Pastor	Waxman			
Issa	Payne	Waxman			
Istook	Pelosi	Weiner			
Jackson (IL)	Pence	Weldon (FL)			
	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (PA)			

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—61

□ 1314

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding scleroderma."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 383, having been on official business, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 378, on closing portions on the conference on H.R. 5015, Department of Defense Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 379, on motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3210, the Trade Act of 2002. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 380, on approving the Journal. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 381, H. Res. 513, Recognizing the Historical Significance and Timeliness of the United States-Ireland Business Summit. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 382, H.R. 3880, a Temporary Waiver for New York Areas for Clean Air Transportation Conformity and Metropolitan Planning Requirements. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 383, H. Con. Res. 320, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Scleroderma. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4687 An act to provide for the establishment of investigative teams to assess building performance and emergency response and evacuation procedure in the wake of any building failure that has resulted in substantial loss of life or that posed significant potential of substantial loss of life.

□ 1315

REMEMBERING THOSE KILLED ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

(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. Mr. Speaker, in a solemn way I recognize that this week will be a week that America turns toward each other seeking to embrace and seeking to love, mourning those whom we lost on September 11, 2001, and celebrating the unsung heroes, and the families who have survived.

I stand before this House today to simply offer my deepest sympathy and that of my constituents of the 18th Congressional District of the State of Texas to all of those who experience this great loss as we come upon September 11, 2002. It is my desire to simply offer these words of sympathy because I love you and appreciate the sacrifice you made for this Nation. I conclude by simply saying, The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). 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.

QUESTIONS THAT WILL NOT BE ASKED ON 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. Mr. Speaker, soon we hope to have hearings on the pending war with Iraq. I am concerned that there are some questions that will not be asked and maybe not even allowed to be asked. Here are some questions I would like answered by those who are anxious to start this war: Is it not true that the reason we did not bomb the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War was because we knew they could retaliate?

Is it not also true that we are willing to bomb Iraq now because we know it cannot retaliate, which just confirms that there is no real threat?

Is it not true that those who argue that even with inspections we cannot be sure that Hussein might be hiding

weapons, at the same time implying that we can be more sure that weapons exist in the absence of inspections?

Is it not true that the U.N.'s International Atomic Agency was able to complete its yearly verification mission to Iraq just this year with Iraqi cooperation?

Is it not true that the intelligence community has been unable to develop a case tying Iraq to global terrorism at all, much less the attacks on the United States last year? Does anybody remember that 15 of the 19 hijackers came from Saudi Arabia and that none came from Iraq?

Was former CIA counterterrorism chief Vincent Cannistraro wrong when he recently said there was no confirmed evidence of Iraq's links to terrorism?

Is it not true that the CIA has concluded there is no evidence that a Prague meeting between 9-11 hijacker Atta and Iraqi intelligence took place?

Is it not true that northern Iraq, where the administration claimed that al Qaeda was hiding out, was in control of our allies, the Kurds?

Is it not true that the vast majority of the al Qaeda leaders who escaped appear to have safely made their way to Pakistan, another of our so-called allies?

Has anyone noticed that Afghanistan is rapidly sinking into total chaos, with bombings and assassinations becoming daily occurrences; and that is according to a recent U.N. report, the al Qaeda "is, by all accounts, 'alive and well' and poised to strike again, how, when and where it chooses"?

Why are we taking precious military resources away from tracking down those who did attack the United States, who may again attack the United States, and using them to invade countries that have not attacked the United States?

Would an attack on Iraq not just confirm the Arabs' worst suspicions about the United States, and is this not just what Osama bin Laden wanted to have happen?

How can Hussein be compared to Hitler when he has no navy or air force, and now has an army one-fifth the size it was 12 years ago, which even then proved itself totally inept in defending itself?

Is it not true that the constitutional power to declare war is exclusively given to Congress? Should presidents, contrary to the Constitution, allow Congress to concur only when pressured by public opinion? Are presidents permitted to rely on U.N. permission to go to war?

Are you aware of a Pentagon report studying charges that thousands of Kurds in one village were gassed by Iraqis, which found no conclusive evidence that Iraq was responsible, that Iran occupied the very city involved, and that evidence indicated, according to this Pentagon report, the type of gas used was more likely controlled by Iran, not Iraq?

Is it not true that between 100,000 to 300,000 soldiers have suffered from Persian Gulf War syndrome from the first Gulf War, and that thousands may have died?

Are we prepared for possibly thousands of American casualties in a war against a country that does not have the capacity to attack the United States?

Are we willing to bear the economic burden of a \$100 billion war against Iraq, with oil prices expected to skyrocket and further rattle an already shaky American economy? How about an estimated 30 years occupation of Iraq that some have deemed necessary to build democracy there?

Iraq's alleged violations of U.N. resolutions are given as reason to initiate an attack, yet is it not true that hundreds of U.N. resolutions have been ignored by various countries without penalty?

Did former President Bush not cite the U.N. resolution of 1990 as the reason he could not march into Baghdad, while supporters of a new attack assert that is the very reason that we can march into Baghdad?

Is it not true that, contrary to current claims, the no-fly zones were set up by Britain and the United States without specific approval by the United Nations?

If we claim membership in the international community and conform to its rules only when it pleases us, does this not serve to undermine our position, directing animosity toward us by both friend and foe?

How can our declared goal of bringing democracy to Iraq be believable when we prop up dictators throughout the Middle East and support military dictators like Musharaf in Pakistan who overthrew a democratically elected President?

Are you familiar with the 1994 Senate Hearings that revealed the United States knowingly supplied chemical and biological materials to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war and as late as 1992—including after the alleged Iraqi gas attack on a Kurdish village?

Did we not assist Saddam Hussein's rise to power by supporting and encouraging his invasion of Iran? Is it honest to criticize Saddam now for his invasion of Iran, which as the time we actively supported?

Is it not true that preventive war is synonymous with an act of aggression, and has never been considered a moral or legitimate U.S. policy?

Why do the oil company executives strongly support this war if oil is not the real reason we plan to take over Iraq?

Why is it that those who never wore a uniform and are confident that they won't have to personally fight this war are more anxious for this war than our generals?

What is the moral argument for attacking a nation that has not aggressed against us nor is able to, even if it so wished?

Where does the Constitution grant us permission to wage war for any reason other than self-defense?

It is not true that a war against Iraq rejects the sentiments of the time-honored Treaty of Westphalia, nearly 400 years ago, that countries should never go into another for the purpose of regime change?

Is it not true that the more civilized a society is, the less likely disagreements will be settled by war?

Is it not true that since World War II Congress has not declared war and—not coincidentally—we have not since then had a clear-cut victory?

Is it not true that Pakistan, especially through its intelligence services, was an active supporter and key organizer of the Taliban?

Why do those who want war not bring a Declaration of War Resolution to the floor?

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO LINK BETWEEN SADDAM HUSSEIN AND AL QAEDA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today's press reveals that the Bush administration has decided that they can find no linkage between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, despite some of the offhand remarks of Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President CHENEY to the contrary. The intelligence agencies, turning all of their resources to this, cannot find existing links.

So that means that the President and his administration will have to make the case against Saddam Hussein to this Congress because the authorization passed by this Congress last fall was for the President to respond to those who were involved in the attacks and those who harbored or sponsored such attacks. That means a straight-up debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, hopefully a free and fair debate, over the wisdom of the first-