

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 10, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, as You have given us the great gift of life by which every other gift is judged, we pray that we will be worthy of that gift and be the people You would have us be. As we focus with such intensity on the crisis of the day, may we see clearly the purposes of Your creation and Your good will to all people.

We pray for the leaders of our Nation and the leaders of every nation and all people who work for peace that justice will be our goal and peace the blessed gift of all. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HUBBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the Members to clear the well except for those Members-elect of the 102d Congress who wish to take the oath of office.

Mr. CHAPMAN of Texas and Mr. GUARINI of New Jersey appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, United States Code, sections 175 and 176, the chair appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS DEBATES PERSIAN GULF

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus just finished an absolutely inspiring debate on the Persian Gulf situation. The point was made by my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLARZ, and by one or two others, that sanctions will not work because they will not induce Mr. Saddam Hussein to make a political judgment to roll his forces back from Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, we are not sure whether that is true or not. We do not know. The one thing that we do know about sanctions is that they will erode drastically Saddam Hussein's capacity to dominate, to threaten, to intimidate his neighbors and be a threat to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

The intelligence community tells Members that sanctions will erode his economy by 50 percent in the first year, and Senator NUNN tells Members today that it will be 70 percent reduction of his GNP. We have been involved in 115 cases of sanctions in the last half a century, our country has, and in about a third of them, they have worked. In the third where they have worked, the average by which we have reduced the GNP of those targeted countries was 2½ percent. That is enough to concentrate some kinds and help them make this decision. This is 20 times more devastating impact on the GNP of Iraq. It is going to destroy his economy. There will be no spare parts, no replacement parts for his military. It will bring his economy and bring his military machine to their knees. Sanctions will work. We ought to hang in there with them.

SOVIET AGGRESSION IN THE BALTIC STATES

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the eyes of the world, and certainly people in this country, focus on the Persian Gulf, I think it is important that we be aware of what is apparently about to happen in the Baltic States. That is, they are about to feel the heel of Soviet aggression and oppression. I say "aggression" because the Baltic States were illegally annexed to the Soviet Union as a result of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of World War II. The United States Government has never recognized the legitimacy of the annexation of the three States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

In recent days Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev has moved to tighten his control of the seven breakaway republics that are seeking true self-determination. His reprisals against the tiny Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are particularly severe, and seem to be designed to punish the states that have been in the forefront of the self-determination movement. Throughout the Baltic States, Soviet paratroopers have been conducting sweeps for the tens of thousands of young men who have refused to enter the Soviet Army. These young men had been given permission by their legitimate governments to perform public service in lieu of 2 years in the Soviet Army. It has become increasingly clear, however, that Gorbachev intends to put an end to this practice.

There are numerous other ominous signs. In Lithuania, army troops have surrounded the legislative buildings, the printing plants, and the television stations. In Latvia, Interior Ministry forces took control of the country's printing facilities, denying both the local press and the Latvian Government the ability to publish material. Perhaps most ominous, Gorbachev has suggested that he would extend "Presidential rule" to the Baltic States. Under Presidential rule Gorbachev could disband the national parliaments and ban demonstrations and political groups, effectively putting an end to the self-determination process.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that Deputy Secretary of State Eagleburger summoned the Soviet Ambassador to express our Government's grave concerns about this crackdown. As Mr. Eagleburger rightly told the Soviet Ambassador, continued repression would almost certainly disrupt United States-Soviet relations.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

These three Baltic States, along with Moldavia, have a legitimate case to be exempt from Gorbachev's actions to keep the Soviet Union together. We understand that Soviet President Gorbachev needs to draw a line against the disintegration of his nation yet that line could and should be drawn to let the people of the Baltic States go free.

Mr. Gorbachev should know that America will not watch quietly, if, in fact, he comes down hard upon them, and destroy their independence movement. This will, Mr. Gorbachev, severely damage Soviet-American relations. This Member and America, in the strongest possible terms, urges the Soviets not to take action against the people of the Baltic States. Let them go free and explain quite clearly to the people of the Soviet Union that such action is not a precedent for the dissolution of the Soviet Union, as these three Baltic States and Moldavia were illegally added to the U.S.S.R. during the World War II era.

ANNUNZIO CONDEMNS SOVIET REPRESSION IN BALTICS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly condemn the ongoing Soviet repression of the Baltic Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

The tens of thousands of Soviet troops who have recently marched into these countries are a threat to peace and democracy in the region.

We cannot stand by and watch the Baltic peoples' quest for autonomy turn to ashes without making it clear to Mikhail Gorbachev that future United States-Soviet relations could hinge on this question.

TRIBUTE TO FORT CAMPBELL SOLDIERS

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Fort Campbell, KY. Today, from Fort Campbell there are 16,500 soldiers from the 101st Airborne Division in Saudi Arabia. There are also 2,500 Fort Campbell soldiers from the 101st Support Group [Corps] and another 1,500 Fort Campbell soldiers from the 5th Special Forces Group in Saudi Arabia.

Yes, that's 20,500 Fort Campbell soldiers in Saudi Arabia. There are another 4,000 Army Reserves and National Guard troops in Saudi Arabia on en route who have been mobilized at Fort Campbell. Among the 4,000 are 250 from the Army Reserves' 807th Hospital Unit in Paducah, KY, the largest city in my district.

These men and women in Saudi Arabia deserve our undivided support from Congress. This Congressman, a Democrat, while continuing to hope and pray for peace, supports the President of the United States and the U.N. Security Council in the joint demand that Iraq withdraw its forces from Kuwait before next Tuesday.

Saddam Hussein, you must withdraw your troops from Kuwait now.

□ 1210

REMEMBER ISRAEL

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing moments at the press conference with the Iraqi Foreign Minister yesterday was when Mr. Aziz unmistakably indicated that Iraq would attack Israel.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for a potential war, let us remember who our friends are and where our interests lie. Israel has been an unfailing and loyal ally, the only democracy in the area. They have been remarkably restrained and responsible during the Persian Gulf crisis, despite the overwhelming threat that they face from Iraqi missiles.

Whatever we do in the Persian Gulf, let us do it in coordination and consultation with Israel. Let us put any differences aside that we have had recently. We have always come through for each other, and let that continue.

WHERE IS THE REST OF THE WORLD?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, if Saddam Hussein is a world problem, then where is the rest of the world? Where is Germany? Where is Japan?

While we are protecting their oil, the Japanese are selling hotdogs in Yosemite.

To me this is no new world order. This is the same old world ripoff, and here is how it works. The United Nations, they authorize war. The American people, they pay for it, and then the American sons and daughters die. Then after it is over, the United Nations says, "Well, it was a police action."

I say let the United Nations contract with Interpol this time.

Let me remind Congress, we have a constitutional responsibility here. The American people voted for George Bush, but they did not elect King George.

It is Congress that must declare war, and I am sick and tired of our kids coming back in body bags while we are

protecting the rich people all over the world and every other country.

I say let these other countries get in harm's way on the front lines for a change. You think about it.

U.N. RESOLUTION WAS A MISTAKE

(Mr. OWENS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days we are going to be debating a mandate to attack. It is not a resolution to decide whether or not to support the President, but a mandate to attack. That will be the interpretation of the administration on our actions if we vote to support the U.N. resolution.

The U.N. resolution was wrong. The U.N. resolution was a mistake. The U.N. resolution set January 15 as a date. That is too early a date, or there should be no date at all.

We have the job to correct the U.N. resolution. They made a mistake and we should correct them.

The President's determination that this means we have to rush into an unjustified war is wrong.

We have won a great deal already. Containment has been achieved. Mass killing, mass murder, is not necessary to do this job. The sanction will work.

Oil is not being sold by Iraq. They cannot survive very long with the kind of sanctions that have been imposed, backed up by an embargo. It is too much. They will not be able to survive. They will yield.

The 535 Members of Congress have a duty to make this decision. We are part of the decisionmaking. We will have the responsibility for every death. The responsibility for every death will be ours.

The more personalized war becomes, the less likely we are to have wars.

We should all take this as a personal decision. We are deciding life and death over persons.

The Speaker has said we should vote our consciences. I wish the Democratic Party would take a position, but we have to vote our consciences. When I vote my conscience, my conscience tells me that if I vote to give the President a mandate to attack, I will become an accessory to murder.

I will vote no. I will not be an accessory to murder.

THE BRUTALIZATION OF THE BALTIC REPUBLICS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, while this House of Representatives and the Senate considers the important questions about the Persian Gulf, while our at-

tention is focused on that section of the world, it is critical that we not forget what is happening at this very moment in Lithuania and the Baltic Republics. These small countries have been brutalized by thousands of Soviet troops who are today occupying Vilnius in Lithuania and harassing Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian citizens. These tiny and courageous nations are guilty of only one crime in the eyes of Moscow. They have asserted their right to independence and self-determination.

While we debate the issues of peace and freedom in the Persian Gulf, we cannot forget the struggle of the Baltic people.

Several days ago, Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze warned the world that reactionary forces were taking control in the U.S.S.R. The decision by Moscow to occupy the Baltics is clear evidence that Shevardnadze's fears were not unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, we must protest this Soviet brutality in the strongest terms and do everything in our power to let Mr. Gorbachev know that our peaceful relations cannot continue in the face of this aggression.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, to his everlasting credit, has come to the Congress of the United States, to the Representatives of the people whom he leads, and has asked for a vote of confidence in the crisis that has developed in the Persian Gulf.

This man, who has gained the confidence of the international community, who has gained the confidence of the United Nations through the sanctions and through the resolutions passed by that body, who has gained the confidence of the Persian Gulf Arab States who have become victims or potential victims of Saddam Hussein, who has gained the confidence of the American people in poll after poll on his policies in the Persian Gulf, who has gained the confidence most importantly and has the confidence of the Armed Forces of the United States who are poised in the deserts of the Persian Gulf, now asks for a vote of confidence from the Congress of the United States. We can do no less than all the others who have already reposed and pose confidence in the President of the United States. We must resolve this issue. We must give the President the power that has been implicit already in the United Nations resolutions, and pray that peace will come without resort to force, but we must give that vote of confidence to the President of the United States.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES UNTIL 3 P.M. ON THIS LEGISLATIVE DAY

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses until 3 p.m. on this legislative day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 1991, AND SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, and that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Saturday, January 12, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

IT IS THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO DECIDE ON WAR

(Mr. WASHINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of Congress to make a decision one way or the other on whether we go to war. It is not right for the Congress to hide behind the law and let the President make the decision by himself.

Under our study of history, it is clear that Japan and Germany had constitutions that were written after we ascribed to the United Nations Charter, yet those nations argue and the President argues that the United Nations Charter allows the President to commit our forces to war without a declaration by the Congress, while at the same time the constitutions that we wrote for Germany and Japan abort the necessity of them sending their men and women over there. That logic stands on its head.

How can their constitutions, which are modeled after ours, prevent Germany and Japan from sending their troops? They can send money, but they cannot send their men and women. We have to send ours. It does not make any sense.

It is the duty of Congress to decide.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 63 which is a straight up and down vote on war or not. Either you are for war or you are against war, and you ought not to be able to hide behind any of these other resolutions which do not really speak to the question. The only way the American people will know where we stand is to vote yes or no on a declaration of war.

□ 1220

Let it be said by history that the Congress of the United States saw its duty and we did it.

THE LARGER PATRIOTISM

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, today there is a very excellent editorial in the New York Times on the question before the Congress, the question of whether or not Congress will assert itself in a firm manner with regard to whether or not we go to war.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. DURBIN and I have introduced a resolution which brings this issue before Congress, and I sincerely hope that all Members of Congress will vote to reestablish in practice something that has been falling into disuse; that is, the action by Congress to say whether or not we should go into a war.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1991]

THE LARGER PATRIOTISM

The world's hopes for a diplomatic breakthrough at Geneva have been crudely disappointed. Today Congress begins to debate peace or war; Iraq's intransigence invites an angry vote. What Members of Congress owe America, however, is neither anger nor truculence but their best judgment on what best serves the vital interests of the United States.

At this time, those interests would not be served by the offensive use of military force to expel Iraq from Kuwait.

It would be a mistake for Congress to confuse patriotism with blind loyalty to the President. A strong America is a democratic America, functioning in accordance with the constitutional design. The larger patriotism is to be wise, not merely tough.

From the start, this newspaper has supported Operation Desert Shield, President Bush's deployment of a multinational force to defend Saudi Arabia. We have supported the international embargo that is daily making Saddam Hussein pay for his aggression in Kuwait, and steadily weakens his military potential. And we have supported the President's able assemblage of a broad coalition against naked aggression.

Nor do we shrink from the ultimate prospect of war. There are circumstances that justify, even compel, the sacrifices of war. But those circumstances are not now present.

America's vital interests in the Middle East—the security of oil supplies and the security of strategic allies—are in no imminent danger. As for pushing Iraq out of Kuwait, the embargo remains a plausible lever. The evidence so far, not conclusive but strong, is that it is steadily grinding Iraq down.

Saddam Hussein's crimes offend most Americans, most Arabs and most of the world. But the right response now is not a U.S.-led attack. For Congress to authorize an immediate use of force under these circumstances would be unwise. And to sign off instead on a blank check, leaving it to the President to fill in a future date, would be a dereliction of constitutional duty.

Even if it should come, war promises no neat solution. A limited war that left much of Baghdad's military capacity intact would only inflame future crises with a heightened sense of Iraqi grievance. Yet an all-out war that destroyed Iraq's military potential would create a destabilizing power vacuum adjacent to both Iraq and Syria.

Nor do America's allies in the broad anti-Iraq coalition insist on immediate war. Quite the contrary. France, one of the U.N. Security Council's five permanent members, even now presses for a diplomatic solution. Many allies endorse fighting in Kuwait but not in Iraq. If, as the Administration fears, the coalition is weakening, that's true precisely because of the imminent threat of force, not any strains arising from the long-term embargo.

Congress's constitutional war-making authority fell into disuse during the cold war. Under the thermonuclear shadow, Presidents brushed aside the deliberative mechanisms designed to protect against premature or reckless war. The decisions before Congress now call for a return to constitutional norms.

First, the members must reassert their right to decide when and whether to go to war. Then, turning to the President's request for authority to use force now, they should trust evidence instead of sentiment. So far, America's vital interests are protected; there's reason to believe the embargo is working; the deadline of Jan. 15 is arbitrary.

If circumstances should change, there will be time for a fresh look. For now, the wise, brave vote on war is no.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO FORCE A PAUSE IN AMERICA'S SLIDE TOWARD WAR

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 an Iron Curtain descended over Eastern Europe. The United States was confronted with a choice: Should we send in hundreds of thousands of American young men to engage in an armed conflict to free those countries?

We decided not to. We decided to engage in a strategy of containment. We waited, patiently, with a strategy of military force and trade sanctions, and we slowly but surely brought Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to its knees.

Now it has collapsed like a house of cards.

We have to be convinced, before we vote for war, that that same strategy cannot work to bring a tin-horn Third World dictator to his knees.

The most recent example of where a mistake has been made is in Afghanistan. That is a testament to the failure of a superpower's ability to bring a country to its knees, with thousands of graves of Soviet soldiers in Afghanistan, where they could not bring that country to its knees.

Let us be patient, let us wait. This Saddam Hussein regime will collapse in the sands of Kuwait and Iraq just as the Soviet empire has collapsed under

the weight of trade and military sanctions that we imposed upon that once-great military power.

Mr. Speaker, the Baker-Aziz meeting has ended in failure, and Congress must now decide whether or not to authorize the use of military force to drive Iraq from Kuwait.

In 1946, when the Iron Curtain descended over Eastern Europe, America was faced with a similar choice. We could launch a rash and bloody offensive war to rollback communism, or we could adopt a patient strategy of containment.

We chose containment. We encircled the Soviets militarily and applied a stranglehold on their economy, and we patiently began to wait. Finally, 40 years later, the Soviet empire collapsed like a house of cards. Today, the Soviets are so preoccupied with the Lithuanians and the Latvians and their other internal problems that we're no longer worried about Soviet expansionism.

If a United States strategy of containment could succeed in humbling the once mighty Soviet colossus, why can't a United Nations strategy of containment beat down a tin horn Third World dictator like Saddam Hussein? Has America become so impatient that we prefer war over waiting a year for an international economic blockade to choke an oil-profit thirsty Iraqi economy?

Our Nation's leaders have a moral obligation to pursue all peaceful alternatives before setting loose the dogs of war. But the wisdom and patience of America's cold war containment strategy has been superseded by an MTV foreign policy with a 30-second attention span.

It's time for Congress to force a pause in America's slide towards war. Our choice is clear: We can either give the administration the blank check for war it wants or the reality check for peace that it needs. Let's vote for a policy of patience and prudence. Let's stay the course on economic sanctions and deterring further Iraqi aggression. Let's put an economic and technological stranglehold around Iraq. But let us not necessarily sacrifice the lives of young American men and women for objectives that can be achieved without war if America is only willing to exercise the same patience and resolve we demonstrated in our struggle to contain communism.

GIVE THE SANCTIONS TIME TO WORK

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have deep concerns about our policy in the gulf and I am outlining them in a

separate statement for the RECORD today.

I have had the chance to talk with hundreds of my constituents. There is no support for war in my district. There is not broad public support anywhere for this war. The polls show that when the casualties start, support will drop dramatically, and what we are really seeing is support for a war where nobody dies. But this will not be a simple, quick, or easy war. Thousands of Americans will die.

We have spent 5½ months preparing for war. It is folly to suggest that 6 hours of discussion is our best effort at peace. We should talk for 6 days or 6 weeks or 6 months if we have to—before we ask any American to die in the gulf. Why are we so eager to go to war?

I urge my colleagues to calm the rhetoric, slow the headlong rush to battle, give the sanctions time to work, pursue all diplomatic efforts, and talk this thing through fully and rationally before we undertake such grave action. Let it be said that America brought to this crisis not simply the will to do battle, but the way to achieve peace.

ENERGY SECURITY POLICY

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the membership that in December the U.S. Alternative Fuels Council, of which I am a member, passed a resolution calling upon the President and the Congress and the private sector to proceed forthwith to establish an energy security policy which displaces U.S. dependence on foreign oil.

At present we use in the United States about 1.1 million barrels per day of transportation fuels derived from the Persian Gulf region.

For the record, we have an option to war inasmuch as we have the resources. We have the technology and the capability to produce enough methanol, ethanol and compressed natural gas to displace United States dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

We have that choice, America, and we should take it.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Resolved, That the President, the Congress, and the private sector proceed forthwith to establish a national energy security policy for the commercialization of alternative fuels;

Be it further resolved, That the federal government should promptly take steps to assist the marketplace and remove impediments to the widespread commercialization of alternative motor vehicle fuels. Legislation and administrative action should carefully evaluate costs and benefits of alternative fuels, measures such as fuel economy

incentives, tax incentives, research and demonstration, accelerated fleet purchases, cooperation with states and localities, and other steps. The program should make progress from year to year with a goal that, by the year 2005, alternative fuels will be used for at least 25 percent of all motor vehicle miles traveled. These alternative fuels should be derived from resources other than petroleum, and the steps taken to promote alternative fuels should be consistent with our environmental laws. The term "alternative fuels" in this resolution includes electricity, natural gas, methanol, ethanol, LPG, hydrogen, and non-petroleum components of reformulated gasoline and diesel.

THERE OUGHT TO BE NO LINKAGE WHATSOEVER IN THE PERSIAN GULF

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope, and I know my colleagues do, that the door to diplomacy and for a peaceful solution to this crisis has not been shut. We still have a week to go before January 15, and I would hope that the diplomatic channels will still be open. I think, however, that the French are really barking up the wrong trail when they say, "Let's give Saddam Hussein a face-saver, let's link the Palestinian question," they say, "to this whole question of Kuwait."

Let us make one thing very clear: Saddam Hussein did not invade Kuwait to help the Palestinians. He invaded Kuwait because he is a ruthless, evil dictator and aggressor.

There ought to be no linkage whatsoever. I am glad that the U.S. Congress is finally getting involved because constitutionally it is our responsibility to the American people.

Let us also remember, though, that Kuwait and getting Saddam out of Kuwait, while very, very important, is not the end-all and the be-all. Saddam Hussein has chemical weapons, he has biological weapons and nuclear capability. It is very, very important that we not allow him to sit intact with that so that he can wage aggression a year from now, 2 years from now, and threaten our friends in that area of the world, Egypt, Israel and Saudi Arabia.

I think we ought not to minimize the threat of Saddam Hussein.

LET US PRODUCE OUR DOMESTIC FOSSIL FUELS

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this historic debate, it has been mentioned that we have other alternatives, with ethanol and methanol.

Let me remind my colleagues America has another alternative, and that is production of our domestic fossil fuels.

Alaska's area, 74 miles away from the existing pipeline, that gives us 25 percent of our domestic production, there is 34 billion barrels of oil.

There are Members in this body who oppose opening into that area, small as it is, saying that we do not need the oil.

I am saying to my colleagues and to America it is time that we put a realistic approach to the developing of our domestic fossil fuels. Alaska wishes to have it developed, it should be developed, and I am going to suggest to my colleagues to support my legislation to have this occur.

Let us not keep our domestic oil in the ground, in the meantime talking about going over to the Mideast to solve problems in the Mideast for oil.

Let us do what is right in this body, let us support legislation to open up a small area of Alaska for development of our domestic oil.

WE SHOULD USE FORCE ONLY IF SANCTIONS AND EMBARGO DO NOT WORK

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days we will be discussing a topic that has interest throughout my district—just recently having come from it—and I am sure throughout the United States. That topic basically is should we use force in the Middle East to remove the butcher, the madman butcher of Baghdad and his troops from Kuwait?

I have come to the conclusion that we should use force only if sanctions and the embargo do not work.

As I returned today to my office, I find that there is a resolution which has been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], that provides upon a finding by the President that force is necessary, that sanctions are not working, that the President should be authorized to use that force. I wish the people of my district, the Members of this body to know that I support the Solarz resolution. I think it is the only way to answer that madman butcher of Baghdad, that he needs to get his troops out of Kuwait.

□ 1230

WE CANNOT HAVE 535 COMMANDERS IN CHIEF

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has asked this Congress to endorse the United Nations resolution authorizing the use of force, if necessary, in the

Persian Gulf. We should do so by an overwhelming, bipartisan endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is a disparate group of nations, all with their own interests, but they have, almost to a nation, endorsed a resolution calling for that use of force should Saddam Hussein not remove himself from Kuwait.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, have 535 Commanders in Chief; we cannot have 535 Secretaries of Defense; we cannot have 535 Secretaries of State. We only have one President at a time. It is important that we give the President that kind of support that enables us to work with the other nations that have themselves gotten together to endorse their resolution to support a resolution to prevent the kind of aggression that has occurred in Kuwait.

DO WE STAND UP NOW, OR DO WE STAND UP LATER?

(Mr. MCEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, it was October 22, 1937, that Neville Chamberlain took the floor of the House of Commons after Hitler had marched into the Rheinland, and he said, "Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Commons, let's give sanctions a chance," and indeed we chose to give sanctions a chance, and Hitler went on in 1938 into Austria, and then into Czechoslovakia. He came back, and Hitler said, "That's enough. That's all the further I'm going, and we have declared peace in our time," and he held up the paper as he landed there in London and said, "I have the Fuehrer's signature."

They asked Mr. Churchill of what he thought of this decision not to take action against a dictator when he had invaded a neighbor, and he said, "Mr. Neville Chamberlain has chosen between war and shame and selected both." Indeed we saw eventually they paid a price.

The question is: Do we stand up now, or do we stand up later? Very simply the question is: Do we stand on our principles, or do we hope that somehow or another sanctions; listen to this, my colleagues; if sanctions worked as well as they are working right now, which we know they will not, and they continued for 2 solid years, the standard of living in Iraq would still be per capita twice as high as it is in Egypt at this moment. Now do my colleagues think for one solid second they are not going to surrender because their standard of living is only twice as high as Egypt? My colleagues and I know that is not the case.

The question is: Do we stand up now, or do we stand up later?

THREE AMERICANS MURDERED IN EL SALVADOR

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be debating over the next couple of days the most egregious and most serious matter perhaps this Congress, or any Congress, has faced in a number of years. But I want to talk for a moment not about the Middle East, but about something else that is critical to our national security interest that has occurred to the south of here within the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, we lost three of our military personnel in El Salvador by brutal murder by the FMLN, the guerrilla leftist organization. There has been on the floor of this House over the last couple of years considerable debate about whether we ought to fully fund the support we have given in the past to the Salvadoran Government and to their military operations against the guerrillas and the leftists. It seems to me that once this has occurred like it has down there in the last few days, where the leftists have shown their true colors once more, when they have murdered three Americans innocently after a helicopter was shot down, and somebody went up and actually pulled the trigger on the heads of at least two of them, that there should be no doubt in the mind of the President of the United States and the Members of this body that we ought to go ahead and fully fund the support for the Salvadoran Government and its military in its efforts to subdue these leftist guerrillas and bring about full support for democracy in that war-torn country.

Mr. Speaker, it is an obligation we have, and I hope we let that go forward.

CONGRESS HAS THE AWESOME RESPONSIBILITY TO DECLARE WAR

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to give a 1-minute speech because I do intend to speak on the varieties of resolutions, but I do think it is important to note that during World War II it was the Congress of the United States that officially declared war and voted on that, and that on January 3 we all took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to shirk our responsibilities as Members of Congress, then what we can elect to do is to say that the President can do whatever he wants in that area of the world with respect to force. Or we can take a different position that says, if we in-

tend to do that, he has to come to Congress, and we have that awesome responsibility, which is a matter of fact.

If we do not approve of the Constitution giving Congress the precise responsibility to do that, then I would suggest to my colleagues that they offer constitutional amendments and so on to change the Constitution.

Personally I think the Constitution, which has been part of our country for more than 200 years, has worked pretty well.

The President is the Commander in Chief. The Congress has the awesome responsibility to declare war.

REPORT FROM SAUDI ARABIA

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from the Middle East and visited in Saudi Arabia along with congressional delegation GRAY and SOLOMON, and I just want to report back to my colleagues and to the American people as to what I saw in Saudi Arabia.

Our men and women in the armed services have performed nothing less than a logistical miracle and perhaps the most incredible military buildup in all of history. In 157 days we have put more men, women, equipment, and materiel into that area than went out in all of World War II and the Vietnam War. These men and women are courageous; they are well trained; they are educated; they do understand why they are there; they do understand the issues, and I would hope that in the debate today, as we bring out different sides of these different resolutions, we do nothing that would embolden at all our enemy—that is, Saddam Hussein—and endanger our service men and women serving in that part of the world.

ANNUNZIO CONDEMNS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN KUWAIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in condemning the abuse of human rights in Kuwait.

While Congress and the American people are preoccupied with Iraq's conquest of Kuwait, we must not overlook the hundreds of innocent victims who have suffered since the Iraqi invasion began last August.

I have seen documented reports from agencies such as Amnesty International that have cited the widespread use of arbitrary arrests, torture, and execution of Kuwaiti citizens by Iraqi forces.

I have asked the Department of State to address my concerns, and have also asked them

to look into reports that slavery and similar abuses existed in Kuwait before the invasion.

THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue my own discussion about the Persian Gulf situation. We will be making apparently on Saturday in this House a very momentous decision. We will be voting on three resolutions relating to the Persian Gulf. I do not know of any vote in the last 14 years that I have been in Congress which has been as important as this one will be.

Each of us will have to cast a vote knowing full well that the future peace of much of the world, the lives of many American young men and women may well weigh in the balance. Each of us will make a decision, I hope based on the best judgment that we can muster, using our minds and using our hearts. This will be, if any issue has been a moral question in the last 14 years that I have been here, this will be a moral issue, and I would hope that as we debate, maybe beginning today, certainly tomorrow and Saturday, that no one will question the motives of any Member who stands on the floor today, or tomorrow, or Saturday and speaks on the question of the Persian Gulf, no matter what that person's position might be, whether it might be favoring giving the President the authority to use force or not favoring that, and certainly I hope especially that no one will assert, as some people have reading today's newspaper, partisan motives to any Member who stands on the floor and votes and argues on one side of the issue or another.

Truly we are representatives. We took, a week ago today, an oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to try to represent our constituents the very best way that we can. I think that we must take that responsibility very seriously.

I was very interested to see a Washington Post poll reported in Tuesday's edition of the Washington Post. It asked a question: Would the respondents to the poll be in favor of going to war with Iraq next Tuesday or sometime thereafter if Iraq has not withdrawn from the Persian Gulf by that time. Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of the respondents said yes, they would favor going to war; 32 percent, no.

I think it is polls like that which reassure President Bush that a majority of American citizens support his position. I find that hard to believe based on my own district, because certainly the mail that I have received, the phone calls that I have gotten, the comments I have gotten as I go around my district would not indicate that at all.

But perhaps the clue comes from additional questions asked on the same poll. As I said, 63 percent said they favored going to war with Iraq by next Tuesday if Iraq does not withdraw from Kuwait. But the second question was: assume for a moment that 1,000 American troops would be killed if we go to war with Iraq. Under those circumstances, would you favor going to war with Iraq if it does not get out of Kuwait by Tuesday. On that question, Mr. Speaker, the response was 44 percent in favor; 53 percent opposed.

Then a third question was asked, and that was: assume for a moment that 10,000 American troops would lose their lives in the Persian Gulf if we were to go to war with Iraq. Under those circumstances, would you favor our initiating a war against Iraq. The answer to that was 35 percent in favor; 61 percent opposed. The numbers are almost turned entirely around. This would probably be the first war in the history of mankind that was conducted without any casualties. But clearly when people are asked do they support military action against Iraq, and they are not faced with the consequences of doing so, they are inclined to, for patriotic reasons, because Saddam Hussein is truly an evil person, because of support for the President and all of the rest, they are inclined to support the notion. But if you begin to ask them to consider the possible, indeed likely consequences, then their attitude changes entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I am not terribly surprised that the American people would have neglected to consider the fact that at least 1,000, more like 5,000, 10,000, 20,000, 30,000, 40,000 Americans will lose their lives in the Persian Gulf, because the average American citizen, while he is concerned about matters of war and peace, is also concerned about a lot of other things as urgent requirements of themselves on a daily basis to worry about. I think a lot of Americans are inclined to say, "I don't need to study this issue in great detail. I will turn it over and put my faith in my President and in my elected representatives."

But Mr. Speaker, if the average citizens of this country do not study in detail the likely consequences of war in Middle East, we in the Congress as elected officials have that responsibility. And if the average citizen has not thought in terms of a war leading to thousands of American troops killed, we have the responsibility to consider that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think as we debate today, tomorrow and Saturday and vote on Saturday, I hope that we will bear in mind that there are real consequences which flow or would flow from the initiation of war in the Persian Gulf by the United States, and that those tens of thousands of body bags which the Pentagon has bought

and is still buying would very likely have to be used in the Middle East.

Next, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whereas ordinary citizens have not thought through all of the consequences of war, it is also understandable that ordinary citizens would not be experts on the history of the Middle East. They would not know the centuries of resentment on the part of the Moslems and the Arabs in the Middle East toward Western, what they call imperial nations like Britain and France and the United States. The resentment of most of those people in the Middle East, 700 million to 900 million Moslems, the United States, and other Western nations earlier this century were concerned a lot more about their oil than they were about the people of that area.

□ 1250

So the average American citizen might well have neglected to consider what is likely to happen if war breaks out, if we initiate war against Iraq, about what the reaction will be of the Moslem and Arab peoples who live in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I say again, while we cannot expect our constituents to be expert in the history of the Middle East and, indeed, I suppose we cannot expect ourselves to be genuine experts, we in Congress representing the interests of our constituents do have an obligation to think through the consequences of what we do, and we do have an obligation to have at least some cursory knowledge of the history of the Middle East and what that history is likely to produce in terms of consequences in the Middle East.

I say to my colleagues that we have successfully, or the President and the Secretary of State have successfully and brilliantly brought together a coalition of all of the nations of the world in condemnation of Iraq, but if we think that we can make war on Iraq and use all-out unrestricted force as the President and the Secretary of Defense tell us that they will do and thereby kill tens of thousands of Iraqis including civilians, if we think we can do that and not prompt a counterreaction from Moslems and Arabs in the Middle East, then we are crazy.

If we think that the leaders of Egypt and Saudi Arabia and Jordan can stand by us and other Western powers in the face of Islamic and Islamic Jihad, a holy war, against Western powers, in their view killing innocent Arabs and Moslems, then we are sadly mistaken and, again, I think that we have an obligation, a very strong obligation.

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

Mr. PEASE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. First of all, I wanted to commend the gentleman for the

statement he is making. It is a very learned and an excellent discussion of the problems that we face.

I have here in my hand, and I was going to read it in just a moment, the proposed resolution that is being supported by the President.

It is a declaration of war. It is thinly disguised, but it is a declaration of war. I say that, because I sat here in this Chamber many, many years ago right back here, in August 1964 when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was adopted. It was a declaration of war despite the fact that those who stood in the well and who supported it said it was not. They said specifically in the debate it was not a declaration of war, but all of us know, and history proved, that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was used as a declaration of war and plunged this country in 8 or 9 years of really disastrous war in Vietnam.

Let me read, if I may, and it is very brief, what the President is asking for here: "The President is authorized, subject to subsection (b), to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 678-1990 in order to achieve and implement Security Council resolution," and then it goes on and does all of that.

If we give him that authority, that is a declaration of war, and that responsibility lies heavily upon each of us to do that. That is what we will be debating here in the next few days, and I commend the gentleman again for his very intelligent statement saying that that is an unwise policy. I shall vote against that resolution. I hope and trust all other Members, when they look at it and read the words of it and understand the significance of it, will vote against it.

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEASE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as I came onto the floor, and I also want to commend the gentleman, but as I came onto the floor today, the gentleman was discussing the question of whether or not the economic sanctions, or whether or not it was reasonable to think that the economic sanctions would work to achieve our goals. I did not get a chance to hear his full statement, but I believe he was trying to say he thought that they would.

On that subject, I want to say that I have given this a lot of thought. I think that, frankly, right at the heart of the argument that those people who are saying we have got to go to war now are making in essence, they are saying that the economic sanctions backed up by force if pursued for some period of time will not work, and in addition, I think they are saying that they essentially cannot work because

the coalition that would enforce them will come apart, simply will not stay together.

I would like to say that I do not know. I do not know whether it will work. I know that our own country has enormous staying power. It is often questioned. It is often said that we do not have the patience to do anything, but the fact of the matter is that we stood firm against the Soviet Union for 45 years at great cost, at great economic cost and at great cost in terms of personal sacrifice. We stood firm against the Soviet Union for 45 years. We stood firm as a country against North Korea for 40 years. We still have troops in Korea.

We are still a major partner in the NATO alliance, and it has worked.

The fact of the matter is we do have the staying power, and I think the evidence is that it can work, and I also say that there is a lot of evidence that the sanctions are already working. As a matter of fact, Saddam, unlike Hitler in the 1930's, was appeased. Hitler stayed on the march into country after country, but Saddam has been stopped. He has been contained. He has not been able to go into Saudi Arabia. Yes; he is still in Kuwait, but he is not benefiting from that occupation of Kuwait and, in fact, he is there at great cost to himself.

So the fact of the matter is that the sanctions are working, working beautifully.

I would ask the question: What kind of evidence is there that the coalition would stay together if we go to war? If we go to war, we are going to have a situation where there will be Arab Moslems fighting Arab Moslems. I just ask the question: How long will that be sustained? I do not know the answer to that for sure. I do not think we have any evidence on that question for sure, but my guess is that that will not be sustained at all.

I, frankly, think that the evidence that we have, and we do not have all the evidence, and we cannot say for sure about either of these courses of action, but I would say that the evidence that we do have suggests that it is much more likely that economic sanctions backed by the threat of force as they must be to work, frankly, just like the NATO alliance was backed by the threat of force, like our involvement in Korea is backed by the threat of force, I think the evidence, the historical evidence is that the economic sanctions are more likely to achieve our goal.

I need to point out again that we all share the same goals. Saddam Hussein must not be appeased. Saddam Hussein must not be allowed to benefit from his occupation of Kuwait. We share the same goals. There is no question in any of our minds, I do not think, that Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait.

The question has to do with timing, and I suggest that it is more in our national interest to pursue the economic sanctions, and I will have more to say about this later, than it is the military option at this time.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

□ 1300

Mr. PEASE. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL], in his usual thoughtful way he has brought a very important question to the House floor today. There are those, amazingly, who say that the coalition that they have put together against Saddam Hussein might not last for a year, might gradually erode, if we just allow the sanctions to work, and do not take military action. Those same people apparently think that we can maintain that coalition, particularly the Arab members of that coalition, in the face of Moslems killing Moslems. If the coalition would deteriorate over the course of a year to economic sanctions, and it might, we just do not know, it is my view that the coalition would disappear within 30 days if we get into a shooting war where Moslems are being asked to kill other Moslems.

Let Members be clear about this. Those Members who do not want to go to war do not at all agree that Saddam Hussein ought to be able to benefit from the fruits of his aggression. What we are saying is economic sanctions are working. They can work, and at the very least, we need to give ample opportunity to see if they will work before we turn to aggressive action.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, war should be the last course of action, not the first.

Mr. PEASE. Yes. The only other point I would make is it is very clear that President Bush has decided that sanctions have not worked, and that he will not pursue that course past next Monday night if Hussein does not get out of Kuwait.

So our only chance is for Members to pass a resolution here in the House, expressing the will of the people's House that we ought to allow the sanctions plenty of time to work.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend the gentleman for his leadership, and thank him for yielding to me for this important question of whether or not to declare war on Iraq.

Let me state my position very clearly: If I felt that Saddam Hussein in Iraq or anyone else was a threat to the vital interests of my country, I would vote to take him out. That would go for any threat to the vital interests of the United States. I think one point needs to be made about those vital interests that seem to have been secured

by our some 380,000 troops in the Middle East. That is in the interest of oil.

Make no mistake about it, the United States is implaced in sands on Saudi Arabia and posed to sacrifice the blood of our young men and women to protect the oil supply. That is the reason we are in Saudi Arabia. No other reason.

Now, as a student of our dependence on foreign oil for more than 15 years, I would suggest that whether or not the sanctions work, whether or not we go to war to take Hussein out, that the problem of dependence on foreign oil still remains. Back in 1973 when we had the first Arab oil boycott, we were about 38 percent dependent on foreign oil. Today—that is, last year—we are 52 percent dependent. The projections are, by the Department of Energy, that if we continue our current policy, that by the end of this year we will be 55 percent dependent. Somewhere, somehow, we in this Congress, the President, must address the real problem, which is U.S. dependence on foreign oil, especially that oil that is derived from regions which are politically unstable.

Now, if we take Hussein out, who is to say that there will not be a coup in Saudi Arabia to replace the monarchy there? It is not popularly elected. It is not popular. Who is to say that there will not be another dictator to come along, next year, in Saudi Arabia, and we have to do the same thing all over again? We must replace U.S. dependence on foreign oil.

Now, I would like to make one point, and I will not take any more of the gentleman's time. That is, we now consume as a nation, according to the Department of Energy, 1,100,000 barrels per day of transportation fuels derived from the Persian Gulf region. 1,100,000. That is to be distinguished from the some 17 million barrels of oil a day, a week, we can consume. We derived 1,100,000 barrels from the Persian Gulf region. We have the resources, we have the technology. We have the capability to displace dependence on 1,100,000 barrels of oil today from the Persian Gulf region if we choose to do so. That is to say, we do not have to be dependent on the Persian Gulf. We can displace it with methanol, with ethanol, with compressed natural gas. U.S. products, and that will enrich our own Nation and our economy, and not only will we not have to sacrifice the blood of our Nation, we do not have to sacrifice the economy of our Nation.

Between 1980 and 1990 this Nation paid over \$1 trillion to import foreign oil. No wonder we have a trade deficit. It is absolute madness for this country to continue to go haplessly along its way without an energy security policy.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I will have much more to say about this subject as time goes on during the debate on the question of war. The fact remains, we do not need

to be dependent on Persian Gulf oil. If we had the political leadership and the resolve in our country to displace that dependence, it would be cheaper to our economy and we could bring our troops home from Saudi Arabia.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI], and then to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] for yielding, and let me first reflect just for a brief second on my opportunity to talk with the gentleman last autumn in the Speaker's lobby about another remarkable effort on the part of the gentleman from Ohio in seeking to untangle the tangled threads, at that point, of the budget and tax package.

I once again today tell the gentleman that I think that his work was exemplary last autumn, and I doubt very much we would have succeeded in getting an agreement then, were it not for the gentleman's original and seminal thinking on that issue. I find in the gentleman's statement today that same sort of originality and introspection, and careful insight to a very tangled situation.

We hear so much about this whole situation. I would, first of all, agree with the gentleman, and I think that there are many options that we should pursue before we go into the war option.

I would ask the gentleman if he might reflect for just a couple of seconds with me, if it seems that to buy into the plans that we give the President what some have called, I think with some aptness, a kind of blank check to pursue a war if we adopt that it almost seems to me it requires the deification of Kuwait and its Government and the demonization of Saddam Hussein and his government. It seems like the only way we can achieve this idea of going into Kuwait is by making Kuwait some sort of a remarkably democratic, absolutely pristine example of human rights activity, and in order to carry this thing further, we have to make Saddam Hussein into some kind of a modern-day Hitler who is just lusting after the opportunity of knocking over all the world's powers and controlling not just the Middle East.

Is it not the case that Kuwait is a feudal empire? If you are privileged to have been born into the royal family, then you are a prince?

□ 1310

If you have the misfortune of being born outside the royal family, you are a peasant. Is that not the case? Is not Kuwait something other than the sort of deified image of a purely democratic

wonderfully operated government that we keep hearing about?

Mr. PEASE. Well, the gentleman I think knows the answer to the question. Certainly Kuwait is not a democracy. We are used in our country to fighting for democracy and for human rights. In that part of the country, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia both often show up on lists by human rights organizations of the worst offenders in the area of human rights. Certainly there is no democracy of any kind in either of those countries.

So it is a bit ironic that the President is preparing to spill the blood of thousands of American young people allegedly in defense of those two countries.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] said, we are really defending our oil interests over there. Certainly if we were pursuing energy conservation and had been pursuing it with alternative energy supplies, we would not need to do that.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I would say this finally and then I will let the gentleman proceed, because he has been very kind with his time here. That is with the demonization of Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi nation, is it not the case that while we might dispute how effective these sanctions have been, the reality is that the emplacement of the U.S. forces, which all of us in the House support, has in fact thwarted any effort that that man might have had or his country might have had to adventure or maraud around that area? Is it not the case that he has been absolutely stifled, if invasion had been his original plan, and there is some dispute about those intentions.

If I understand correctly, every analysis I have seen is that he is digging in for the long haul, not getting ready to leap across the border into Lebanon or Turkey or into Saudi Arabia.

Is the gentleman generally satisfied that basically that issue, along with the return of the American hostages and the continuation of the supply line of oil, that goal of stabilizing the Middle East and thwarting his ambitions, those goals have been attained?

Mr. PEASE. I think the gentleman is correct. Our original aim of protecting the Middle East from further aggression by Iraq has been successful.

I suspect the gentleman supported President Bush in August and September, and so did I, in rushing American troops to make sure there was no invasion of Saudi Arabia.

My misgivings began, and I suspect the gentleman's did also, in November when the President changed the character of our intervention from a defensive posture to an offensive posture.

Yes, we have accomplished our original goals there, and I think we ought to take that into account.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Well, let me just finally say that it is a pleasure to serve

with the gentleman from Ohio in this Congress.

It does seem to me that where there is no clear evidence that sanctions will not work, we ought to give them a chance to work.

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PEASE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I had not planned on speaking. If the gentleman from Kentucky could stay for just a second and just share something.

Coming to work today, I listened to National Public Radio. They had a reporter from the Washington Post who was in downtown Baghdad. He said there was a run on the gasoline stations so that people could get gasoline to leave the city, but was asked the question by the interviewer, was there any hoarding in Baghdad, and he said absolutely not, the food is plentiful because the sanctions have not worked.

Second, there are a number of Soviet advisers who have elected not to leave Baghdad and to go back to Moscow because of the lack of food in Moscow and the plentiful food in Baghdad.

Last, this letter, which I guess was released today from William Webster, head of the CIA to Chairman ASPIN, he makes a number of points, if I may read it. He says:

I observed that the sanctions were effective—

When he testified before—

technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

He goes on to say that disruptions in most sectors are not yet serious.

He says:

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next 6 to 12 months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period.

He then goes on to say:

Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically.

He goes on to say:

On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications.

And then he goes on to say, and I will just end with this last comment:

Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq.

Unless this country in a bipartisan way supports what President Bush is doing with regard to the sanctions, and when I listen everyone agrees that the ultimate goal is to have Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait, so he is not rewarded for aggression, we all have read the Amnesty International Report and have seen the actual atrocities that he has committed there and then we have the letter from the CIA, who has been very balanced in this, saying again:

Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the entire letter at this point.

The letter of January 10, 1991, above referred to, is as follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1991, in which you ask for an updated assessment of the impact of sanctions on Iraq and on the policies of Saddam Hussein subsequent to my testimony before your committee in December. In that testimony, as you accurately noted, I observed that the sanctions were effective technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

You now ask me to: (1) address the impact of the sanctions on the economy and populace of Iraq and on the operational effectiveness of its military if left in place for another six to 12 months; (2) address the question of how Iraq's defensive abilities might be affected by the sanctions on the one hand and by having additional time to prepare on the other if sanctions are allowed to work for another six to 12 months; and (3) address the likelihood that sanctions, again if left in place for another six to 12 months, could induce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

UN sanctions have shut off nearly all Iraq's trade and financial activity and weakened its economy, but disruptions in most sectors are not serious yet. The impact of sanctions has varied by sector. The most serious impact so far has been on the financial sector, where hard currency shortages have led Baghdad to take a variety of unusual steps to conserve or raise even small amounts of foreign exchange. For the populace, the most serious impact has been inflation.

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next six to 12 months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period. Iraq's infantry and artillery forces—the key elements of Iraq's initial defense—probably would not suffer significantly as a result of sanctions. Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically.

Moreover, these forces will have additional opportunity to extend and reinforce their fortifications along the Saudi border, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Iraq's armored and mechanized forces will be degraded somewhat from continued sanctions. The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb its training activities. Iraq has large stocks of spare parts and other supplies, however, which will ameliorate the effect of these problems. On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications. While the military, especially the army, has been protected from the impact of sanctions by stockpiling and minimal usage, during a military action the impact would be more profound as equipment and needed parts are expended.

Iraq's Air Force and air defenses are likely to be hit far more severely than its Army, if effective sanctions are maintained for another six to 12 months. This degradation will diminish Iraq's ability to defend its strategic assets from air attack and reduce its ability to conduct similar attacks on its neighbors. It would have only a marginal impact on Saddam's ability to hold Kuwait and southern Iraq. The Iraqi Air Force is not likely to play a major role in any battle for Kuwait.

In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional six to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is politically threatened by the current hardships endured by the populace. Moreover, Saddam has taken few actions that would indicate he is concerned about the stability of his regime. Assessing the populace's flash point is difficult, but we believe it is high because Iraqis have borne considerable hardship in the past. During its eight-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties, and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that sanctions are not working.

Mr. PEASE. Well, if I can reclaim my time, I would just mention to the gentleman that it depends a lot on which newspaper you read which day. I have an article from the New York Times

just a couple days ago indicating that sanctions are working and are hurting a lot.

I think you have to read very carefully the letter from the CIA Director. What he is saying is the sanctions are unlikely to seriously affect the ground forces and perhaps artillery, but they will affect the armored capability and will definitely affect any air capability that Iraq might have.

Let us look at the other side of the coin as well, and that is the sanctions against exports from Iraq. Iraq is losing \$70 million every day in revenues from the sale of oil. Its conquest of Kuwait does it no good at all if it cannot get the oil from Kuwait sent to other markets.

So I think the crux of the question is essentially, do you assume at this point that sanctions will not work and go to war, or do you try to take the time to find out whether they will, admitting that they might not, but to take the time to find out before you send American troops in to kill.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will yield for just one second, in sort of adding a side bar to what the gentleman said, the irony of the whole thing here is that some of this leakage, and I think the gentleman from Virginia, my friend, is probably correct, there is a certain leakage in these sanctions. There is a certain ability for goods to travel back and forth.

The irony here is that some of the very same nations which are goading the United States to send its men and women to war and to death are the very nations that allow this leakage to occur. They are the ones benefitting from this leakage. They are the ones permitting these trucks to go back and forth, winking and looking the other way.

I mean, if we are going to send our people to what for some is a sure death, it seems to me we ought to have the absolute assurance of all those nations who would benefit far more greatly by having Saddam Hussein a piece of history or melted into a ball of glass in the middle of the desert, it certainly is incumbent upon them to do everything they can do to make sure that this sanction is fully in place.

Therefore, I have really sometimes some very negative feelings for some of these countries.

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

Mr. PEASE. I will yield just briefly to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. One, I agree that those countries should.

Second, I think Members on both sides of the aisle of every political persuasion believe that the best way to make the sanctions effective is to support the U.S. resolutions.

□ 1320

And the last comment I would say, in Mr. Webster's letter he says:

During its 8-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

I thank the gentleman for recognizing me and taking this special order.

Mr. PEASE. I am happy to have the contribution of the gentleman from Virginia.

I think it would be a mistake if we made any reference at all to the 8-year war between Iran and Iraq and did not mention the willingness and ability of Iraq to sustain tens and hundreds of thousands of casualties.

If we were facing an opponent who would recognize that he was beat when he was beat, I would feel a lot better. But what I am afraid of is that we will attack Iraq with massive airpower, win control of the air and then be faced with going into a land war, assuming that Iraq would quit. My guess is that Iraq will not quit. If it loses 15,000 people a day, it will do so. The question is if they lose 15,000 a day and we lose 3,000 a day, how long is America willing to sacrifice 3,000 American lives? Life is a lot more precious to us than it is, apparently, to Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the gentleman's point. I just caught the tail end of it.

It seems to me it is an interesting point about how Iraq was sustained during this 8-year period of fighting with Iran. The fact is that they got enormous help from the Soviet Union, enormous help from the West, indeed some intelligence was offered to the Iraqis as to where potential Iranian attacks would come. So the suggestion on the one hand that the Iraqis withstood an 8-year war without buckling ignores the reality that they were being infused with help during this period of time in terms of materiel and all sorts of additional support, which of course, they lack completely today.

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and for taking this special order.

As a preface to my remarks and as a preface to the debate today and tomorrow and Saturday, I think it is essential to point out that Saddam Hussein should take no comfort from this debate, because the debate is not whether or not to take the pressure off Saddam Hussein and Iraq, the debate is what kind of pressure to continue exerting and when to exert it, whether to use

economic force, continue economic force and continue sanctions as the President initially proposed and put into motion or whether to resort immediately to military force.

There are those of us who argue that sanctions and diplomatic initiatives should be given more of an opportunity, recognizing that behind it all is a military option and an increasingly overwhelming military force.

Saddam Hussein should not take heart from this debate. It is simply a question of how the screws continue to get tightened and when the ultimate weapon, that is, military force, is used.

I think it is important to point out that Saddam Hussein does not benefit from his aggression into Kuwait. For instance, Saudi Arabia, which presumably he initially sought to at least intimidate and to take over at the most, Saudi Arabia is now totally safe. Everyone acknowledges that.

The concern is whether or not our oil supplies would be cut off to the West, to Japan, to the United States and thus his stranglehold on our economy. It should be pointed out today there is more oil being pumped in the free world than there was before the Kuwaiti invasion. It is because Saudi Arabia had doubled its capacity, Venezuela and other nations have increased their capacity. So indeed the Nation has more oil being pumped than it did just a few months ago; that is, the world has more oil being pumped.

Finally, Saddam Hussein has to face something now that he did not have to face on August 2, and that is an international coalition with hundreds of thousands of troops of various nations, in the desert, an array of forces, United Nations forces and nations arrayed against him, world opprobrium, which ultimately you have to contend with.

So I do not see where Saddam Hussein has benefitted from his aggression. Indeed, he is only going to suffer further. He is selling no oil, virtually no oil anywhere in the world. Yet so much of their economy, 80 percent of their foreign exchange depends on oil sales. So where does Saddam Hussein benefit?

I have heard the argument that by delay, by continuing to let sanctions take their course, the Iraqi military benefits. Yes, I understand the argument that more and more could be moved to Kuwait and you could dig in and hunker down in Kuwait longer and dig deeper trenches and bunkers and so on.

But that belies the argument that that is not where you are going to strike. At least I hope that is not where we are going to strike, because I have never known one army to thinkingly and knowingly run into the strong points, the strong suite of the other side. You seek to go around, you seek to divert yourself, you seek to go to where they are weakest. It would be my hope, in the first air strikes that

are done, that it is not Kuwait that is attacked, but Baghdad and Basra and Iraq and the Republican guard in Iraq and the strategic strongholds of Iraq. You do not go and stomp on somebody's foot if you have to take off their head. That is exactly what is at issue here.

So Saddam Hussein, I encourage him to move another 100,000 troops, if that is what he wants to do, to Kuwait, because that leaves the heart of what we are all about even less defended than it is today.

Finally, I would like to bring up the point of what it is costing this country. This country is going to spend \$30 billion without the first shot being fired, fire shots and engage in hostile action, because then it is more.

My concern is about the new world order. It is about seeing that the new world order is going to be like the old world order. It sounds a lot to me like it is going to be something like the old world order, which is that Uncle Sam pays the price, takes the sacrifice, suffers the casualties, and gets very little for it. We have our allied nations, for instance, Japan draws 70 percent of their oil from the Mideast, Germany and the European nations, 50 percent, in that category, and with the United States far less. Yet in the Budget Committee hearings just last week, we learned that of the over \$6 billion that has been pledged in direct cash contributions by our allied nations to Operations Desert Shield, that \$4.3 billion, only, has been collected. \$6 billion was not enough, but \$4.3 billion is even worse.

But I think more significantly, or the \$13 billion that was pledged by the allied nations to assist the front-line states—that is, Turkey and the other nations that have to bear the border disputes most vividly—up to \$13 billion has been pledged by allied nations to the front-line states and we cannot get any indication actually how much has been paid. We do not know, because the State Department and Defense Department would not release those figures, if indeed they do know.

So out of the total 20 billion dollars' worth of pledges, we know that \$4.3 billion has been paid in and we do not know how much else in refugee relief or whatever has been forthcoming.

So my concern is that what you are going to get out of this is that after the United States pays the ultimate price and after we take the casualties and after we pay the \$30 billion—which, incidentally, is added to our deficit; it is not in the budget at all, it is additional deficit dollars—we are going to borrow money from our trading partners to fight the war that gets them their oil and then we are going to get the privilege of paying them, with interest, for fighting their war.

So before we engage in that enterprise, I think the economic sanctions

ought to be given every opportunity. This is not a debate, I have to reiterate, this is not a debate over eliminating the military option. President Bush has succeeded, I think, beyond anyone's expectations when he announced the international coalition and assembled it. We supported that.

When he announced economic sanctions in August and September and October, we supported that. When he announced even the buildup on November 8 there were some questions, but basically that gave him an increased military option to use as a bargaining chip, and that was supported.

Did anyone think seriously in September and October, when sanctions were imposed, economic sanctions, that this was a process that would be over by December? Just as you cannot conceive of a 5-day war in serious terms, you cannot have 2 months of sanctions and expect them to work.

This is a long-term process. If there is a new world order, the new world has to have some resiliency and has to be able to endure.

So I think it is important to note this is not a debate over eliminating the military option, it is a debate as to when that option would be used.

So in that case exercising diplomacy and negotiations with the military backup is the wisest course.

I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. PEASE. I am very grateful to the gentleman from West Virginia for his very excellent comments.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we will have an opportunity on Saturday to vote on three resolutions: One will be the Bennett-Durbin resolution, trying to make it clear that the Constitution means what it says, and that is that Congress and only Congress can declare war. I urge my colleagues to support that resolution. One will be the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution to make it clear that Congress wants to have economic sanctions given the opportunity to work before we contemplate using force.

I hope my colleagues will support that also.

Third will be the Solarz-Michel amendment or resolution.

Solarz-Michel-Bush resolution, I should say, to give the President the power as of 12:01 a.m. next Tuesday morning to commit U.S. forces as he sees fit by himself to action in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will oppose that resolution.

THIS DEBATE WILL STRENGTHEN US

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELLUMS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia [Mrs. BOXER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I was in this well, the same spot, about a week ago calling for the debate on the Persian Gulf crisis to come to this Congress so that we can take this issue to the American people, as is our duty and our obligation. I am very, very pleased that the leadership of this House has decided to bring the debate on the Persian Gulf right here, where it needs to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who say it is almost unpatriotic to debate this issue openly in the American tradition. They say it will undermine the administration. They say it is wrong. I say it is wrong not to debate this crisis, this potential war. I say it is wrong, indeed callous, to allow one person to take this Nation into war.

As my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has said, the Constitution made it inconvenient, made it inconvenient, for one person to take this Nation to war. There are 435 Members of this House. There are 100 in the Senate. We get elected by the people. Our constituents are serving in the Persian Gulf. We need to debate this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we need to show the world that we are indeed the strongest democracy, that debate only strengthens us. They do not debate this issue in Iraq. Saddam Hussein rules by fear, by bullets. We rule by law. This is a democracy.

In addition, when we swear to uphold this Constitution, it includes article I, section 8. Article I, section 8, says it is Congress and only Congress that can declare war, not the United Nations. I say,

That's fine. They can have their views. They can applaud and say, "America, take your treasure in the form of your money, take your treasure in the form of your young people and defend the world." That's fine, but it is up to this Congress to play a role, an equal role, with the executive branch.

So, the time to run and hide is over, and I am very pleased. The time to be counted is here. The time to stand up for what we believe in is here. The time to put our vote on the line is here. And we will do it despite the fact that there are those who say it is unpatriotic, and I challenge them to a debate on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents sent me here to vote those tough votes, and what could be tougher than voting to send kids to die? There can be nothing tougher, and we are going to do that. The debate has begun, and I am pleased.

I came back from the Persian Gulf where I was honored to be part of a 26-member bipartisan delegation, Democrats, Republicans. It was a leadership trip, and some of my colleagues who were on that trip are going to participate in this special order this after-

noon. And I want to talk about what I learned, what is in my heart, and what is on my mind.

Mr. Speaker, in 3 days we went to three countries. We went to Egypt, we went to Saudi Arabia, we went to Israel. We met with heads of state, we met with the young people whose lives are on the line, and we talked to them. We saw the most awesome display of military hardware that anyone can imagine. We saw that on a dock on the Persian Gulf in eastern Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, we thought that if Saddam Hussein could see this, he would never subject his people to this kind of firepower.

I tried to get a lot of answers to questions that have so far gone unanswered, questions I asked the President in a letter in November. I still have not gotten an answer. I guess either he does not have them or he does not feel it is a priority.

One of the questions: What will the casualties be? Civilian? Military? I got some answers from the Israeli intelligence people who, putting together what they thought could happen in the very-best-case scenario, a 2-week war where everything goes, quote, unquote, right, that we would have about 15,000 American casualties, about 3 or 4,000 dead, the rest wounded. That is in the best-case scenario. And who knows how many Iraqi citizens killed?

But if my colleagues ever saw the amount of firepower that is arrayed there, they would have to be thinking 25,000, 50,000, even if we have the smartest, most targeted bombs.

So, the first thing I realized is the awesome power that is at the ready. Generals there told us that it would take a year and a half after a war to bring that equipment home, just to bring that equipment home.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues what else I learned. Our young people are ready for whatever is going to come. They want to come home. They do not want to die.

In addition, the young women there are serving under very difficult circumstances. They are not treated the same way the men in the military are treated.

Let me say that I will not forget a woman from Oakland, CA, who came up to me and said, "I'm so glad to see a female Member of Congress here," and there were three of us female Congresswomen in the party, in the bipartisan delegation, and the women gravitated toward us. They are working very hard, and they are explaining to us how it feels to have to go into the back door to use the gymnasium because the Saudis do not want them to come in the front door. They have to fight to get to have the use of the gymnasium, and then, once they are in there, being subjected to literature trying to convert them. It is tough for them to take.

□ 1340

In the rules our service people are told that women are not allowed to drive in Saudi Arabia. If they are in their military vehicle and in their military uniform, it is OK. However, I was informed that if they do that and they attempt to drive into town in their military car and in their uniforms, they are run off the road by the Saudis.

So this woman from California, who was about 26, came up to me. She said she is married and she wants to go home. She said,

I am here to do my duty, but I don't want to die for the King of Saudi Arabia, I don't want to die for oil, and I don't want to put the Emir back on the throne. Do what you can to settle this another way. Exhaust all other options.

Those are her words.

So many of our people are confused about their mission, but they are ready to do what they were sent to do, there is no question about that.

There are two more points I want to make, and then I am going to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY]. This Operation Desert Shield is called a multinational operation. Our President has stated over and over that it is not America versus Saddam Hussein. Well, I have to say to my friends, that from my experience, from my first-hand knowledge, it is America versus Iraq.

Other people have put their names on a U.N. resolution. They have given a few token dollars and sent a few token troops. Even the Egyptians and the Syrians, who are so much in favor of this operation, have clearly stated they would not take their troops on the ground into Iraq to fight. They will not do that. We will be fortunate, in my opinion, if they even go in to liberate Kuwait. They will be there to defend Saudi Arabia, and very likely they will go into Kuwait, but certainly not into Iraq if it should come to that. And I am going to allow my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], to tell in a very graphic way how we know this.

But we do know this. This is America's war, this is America's kids, and if this is the new world order, then I am sorry, I do not like it one bit for our people.

PAT SCHROEDER has said that "We cannot be the 911 for the world," and I am saying from my experience on the Budget Committee and from being in this body for 9 years, that if this is the new world order, too many of our young kids are going to die all over the world and we are going to pay a disproportionate share of the burden, and here at home we will not be able to do anything for our people after 40 years of the cold war and after having spent so much to get the world on its feet. And the world is on its feet. The Japanese and the Europeans are on their

feet. It is their time to share the burden. And this operation is Operation America Desert Shield, no matter what the words are. That is what it is in reality, and I do not like that one bit. It is not fair, and it does not bode well for the future. Where does it stop?

This is the last point I want to make.

I asked the President in my letter, which he has not answered, what the impact would be for Americans in terms of terrorism moving into our society and into our lives. I could not get an answer, but I got an answer from every head of state we met with, from Egypt to Israel, and they do not often agree on a lot of things. But they agree on this. America will be the target of terrorism. Whether it is in Europe or in this country, we will be the target of terrorism.

Now we know that the heads of state in the Middle East do not take that so seriously. It is their way of life. They have a very incredible way of life over there.

I will never forget this occurrence: When we flew from Saudi Arabia to get to Israel, we could not go directly from Saudi Arabia to Israel because Saudi Arabia does not recognize Israel. That is the way they view life. They do not care that Israel has been there all these years. They do not recognize Israel, the hatred is so great. We had to go all the way around the circle to Egypt, back into Egypt, check into Egypt and then fly. How ridiculous. Is that the way of thinking we are getting into now? Is this what we are buying into, wars for years and years and terrorism for years and years?

No, thank you. There has got to be a better way to resolve problems, and there are better ways.

We have stopped Saddam Hussein with a defensive force at the Saudi line. He has been stopped. Now there ought to be a multinational peacekeeping force to bring stability to the region and let the sanctions work. That is a policy that says to me, "This is a new world order," that says to me, "This is getting beyond war." It does not say, "Yes, we will allow people to be aggressive and become aggressors on other nations." But it talks about peacekeeping, and it talks about defense. It does not talk about the vast arsenal of weapons we have arrayed there and what could come about.

So in conclusion, I am glad I made this trip. I looked into the eyes of the kids who are going to have to pay the price for the failure of diplomacy, for the failure of adults to reason, for the failure of our not being able to see the opportunity for a new world order and a new way to approach problems.

If we keep reaching back to the old ways, it is gloom and doom for our society. It is not clear to our kids. They will be here now, they will be somewhere else later, and they will be dying

for the world, and everyone will say, "Go, America; go and do it for us."

I say that we cannot afford it. It is not fair, and it will not work. It is time for a new kind of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am going to yield to my friend and colleague who was on this trip, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I just want to associate myself with her very fine remarks.

I think one of the very interesting aspects of this that people do not like to talk about is that when we went to visit in the desert one of the first air tactical wings from Langley Air Force Base, we met the F-15 pilots and we had a chance to visit with the pilots, with the tech officers, and with support personnel, and we had a very interesting meeting. We had a chance to meet most of the members of the wing.

When we left to come back, we found out that one of the pilots had crashed and died. The first thing I thought about was, "Gee, I hope it wasn't Biff Mott or one of the other pilots I met. I hope it was somebody else." And then I reflected on that first emotion, and I thought, "It doesn't have to be, nor should it be anybody."

Bringing that emotion to the fore is always met with a certain level of derision. People say,

This is a hopelessly emotional argument you are making here about people dying. Of course people are going to die. That is the nature of warfare.

One of the points that the gentlewoman made that I think is most profound is this idea of the new world order. If we have learned anything in the last several years, certainly in the last several months, it is that things change quickly. We are told that Saddam Hussein has an iron grip on Iraq. I might add that I remember listening to people who told me that the Shah of Iran had an iron grip on Iran and nothing would ever change. Things changed, and changed quickly.

Iraq, as the gentlewoman knows, has not been able to export any oil. It has earned no currency. Ninety percent of its imports, on which it is enormously dependent for material and spare parts and food, have been cut off.

□ 1350

No one has suggested for a moment that the sanctions are not working. The only thing people say about the sanctions is they will take a long time. Yes, they will take a long time. We will have to be patient.

It was the President who counseled patience when the sanctions were initially imposed. It was the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense who said we are going to have to be patient, it is going to take a while. We were patient and there was unanimous belief in this country that the policy of sanc-

tions would not make sense, and that it would take time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. On that point I think it is important to point out, because back in August when the President took the action which I think most of us supported to stop Saddam Hussein from rolling through other countries in the Middle East, and he did, as was pointed out, counsel patience, talked about the sanctions, talked about the need to have this international cooperation and sanctions and embargo, and now we find as they move to the offensive, to the war footing, that they are constantly telling Members of the Senate and House committees that no one can guarantee that the sanctions will work. I do not think that the President offered us a guarantee, nor did we seek one. We thought that this was the best way to approach it, to see whether or not we could go to a peaceful resolution. It was the President who suggested we would have to be there perhaps a year and asked for the American people to gear up for that effort.

But now we are told we have to guarantee that. I think every Member here recognizes that there is some possibility that we may end up in a shooting war. We may not endorse that. We may not vote for that. But nobody asked President Bush or Secretary Baker or the international coalition or the United Nations for a guarantee. And by the same token, if we do not let them run the proper time, they will not work. We know that is true also. If we cut the sanctions off on January 15, of course they will not have worked.

So I think that we ought to make sure that the public understands that the administration keeps raising the threshold as they try to work their way to war. They keep trying to close down the debate by raising the threshold of what the performance level would be. And the gentleman is quite correct, the President offered and counseled us to be patient, recognizing how tough it is, even though those are the most comprehensive sanctions and the most comprehensive embargo we have had on any country in modern times.

People like to tell us that the sanctions will not work because they did not work against Cuba. We were the only country embargoing Cuba. The Canadians, the Mexicans, the Peruvians, the Brazilians, the Europeans, the Dutch were all trading with them. Nobody is supposed to be trading with Iraq at this point.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the gentleman from California pointed out that all of these Western countries are trading. Certainly the Germans and the French may have played the most important roles in letting Saddam Hussein get chemical, biological, and maybe other nuclear capabilities here. But the United States of America was subsidizing Saddam Hussein. Within 10 days before the invasion, in late July, prior to the August 2 invasion, the gentlewoman and, I think, my two colleagues were with me on the floor when we tried to cut off American subsidies to Iraq. At that time, we were trying to tell the administration that this man had murdered thousands of Kurds, had used the most brutal tactics, chemical weapons, biological weapons, and here we were subsidizing him. And indeed now the whole world primarily is supporting the sanctions.

Let me just say one more thing, and then I will yield back to the gentlewoman from California. I am the chairman of the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We have sanctions within our jurisdiction. I have been a member of that committee for about 10 years now. I have never ever heard a witness from the administration or the private sector argue that a 6-month embargo, which excludes foodstuffs and medicine, will bring a government down. I do not recall anyone in the administration when they came to us and we supported the sanctions they took both individually, as a nation, and then through the United Nations. I do not remember them saying that in 6 quick months we would have a resolution to the problem. And worst of all, if we choose the military recourse today, we will guarantee that sanctions do not succeed, and that means that in other areas where we cannot marshal 400,000 Americans and tens of thousands of others, they will not be able to do anything. We are not going to get this kind of force together to try to get Lebanon back as a country. We are not going to be able to duplicate this set of circumstances that brought American military presence and support from the rest of the world for military action at some point in other hot spots of the world.

But if we are successful with this new relationship with the Soviet Union, and this new attempt at international cooperation to deal with outlaws, is not a little patience worth the lives of our sons and daughters who are now in this battlefield?

America has achieved many of its goals, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] pointed out in the caucus. The hostages are home. There is stability in the gulf, and if we put even the 500 sons and daughters that the

gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] estimates as the casualties, and I hope that it would not be even that, but would we save those 500 young men and women if we waited another month, or 2 months, and is it not worth trying that?

Give the President the authority to go to war, but not today. If we need to do that, we can make that assessment another day, and maybe that day comes. As Mr. MILLER points out, there is certainly no reason to take that action here today or this weekend.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the gentlewoman for a minute on this point, if the other gentleman will remain, and I see some of my other colleagues here, on the arguments that the administration makes. Maybe we are wrong. Maybe Mr. ASPIN, maybe the President is right. Maybe this January 15 Saddam Hussein understands nothing but force, and we go in, the aerial bombing works, everybody leaves. There is chaos, there is overthrow of Saddam Hussein. It seems to me that the more I analyze the people who are saying force is the only thing Saddam Hussein understands, there is a catch there, and the catch is, and they all believe almost to a person that the cost of warfare will be light, that war will be relatively short, but the casualties would be relatively small. I do not hear anyone suggest for a moment that this is well worth the expenditure of 10,000 or 15,000 American lives. No one has said that. Yet no one can be sure that the war will be short. It could last 5 days, 6 days, 6 weeks, 6 months.

My guess is, based on what has happened in the Israeli experience, that the war probably will be shorter. But that does not mean that the intensity of modern weaponry cannot inflict enormous casualties on both American and Iraqi boys.

Mrs. BOXER. And I must add women as well.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, and women, women who are there in great number, and the aftermath of a conflict that we will inevitably win has not been examined in any detail.

Let us take the Iraqis at their word. Interestingly, on our trip we found that the Israelis do. They feel that in the opening stages of a conflict that they will be the beneficiaries of the Scud B missiles in Tel Aviv, armed with chemical weapons. They are not going to stand idly by and be attacked and have their civilian population terrorized and threatened. They will respond. What will that mean for American involvement later on?

It is clear that under the best of circumstances we will have hundreds of thousands of Iraqi soldiers imprisoned by American soldiers for weeks and

probably months. We will want to play a role as Kuwait comes back to establish its Government to make sure that they do not wage their own type of jihad. That will require an American presence for a considerable period of time.

So the question becomes if the application of force works as dreamed, we will then have probably a very destabilized Iraq for a long period of time. Saddam Hussein will take on the role of either sainted martyr or fool, I really do not care very much about him. But I think we will have the spectacle of America having killed tens of thousands of Iraqis, and that would be a problem for us. We do not talk about it because they are the enemy right now. But after they are not the enemy, they will have suffered grievously, and we will have been the ones in the minds of the Arab world to have delivered the blow and provided the suffering. That is something that we have to reconcile ourselves to if we choose that path.

Mrs. BOXER. If the gentleman will yield back on that point, he is so correct that we will be the ones, because this so-called multinational force is really a fiction. It is an American force, and we found that out. We saw it with our own eyes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Our allies are prepared to fight until the last American boy dies. I mean, it is the moral equivalent of holding our coats and wishing us well as we go off to battle. The Syrians have already publicly stated that they are not going to do anything other than to defend Saudi Arabia from attack. Do not expect them to be of any help. The Egyptians with their vaunted military tradition might be of some help to us, but they are two divisions and are not likely to be given extraordinary responsibility.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the gentleman will yield further, that brings us back to the question of here we are, we are going to make a decision. We ask for sacrifice from the American people based on America's interests, and I think the gentleman from New York was right. We do not know, and we spend a lot of time researching this and getting new facts on the situation and trying, as some of the Members just returned from a trip to the Middle East, we do not know if the sanctions would ever work. We do not know if a military attack would work like clockwork and everything as the gentleman from New York says; if we are lucky, everything works out great, we do not have a lot of casualties, and nobody can be sure of these things.

But what we can be sure of is that tomorrow Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi military is weaker than it is today. The head of the CIA testified in the Senate that maybe 40 percent of his Air Force does not work. Six months from now 20 percent of his mechanized divisions. He is not getting spare parts. So

now the question is, we are about to risk American life, and there are several propositions before us. One says you have got to act militarily now or you miss the moment. It may be correct. We could be at a point where a day or a month from now we could not use military force. Highly unlikely.

It may be that the sanctions would never work, but the risk is that if we are wrong, American military forces 6 months from now will meet a weaker Iraq, not a stronger Iraq, an Iraq that has been embargoed for a year, that has not gotten spare parts for the military, that has not been getting an infusion of Western American technology and other technology which is a weaker Iraq than our young men and women face today.

So if one takes that calculation, they have the same military opportunities and better ones 6 months or a year from now, and if it can work without the loss, massive loss, of American lives, and we can solve this diplomatically, it is a formula we can use elsewhere in the world.

Mr. DOWNEY. I want to deal with this question of the Fram oil filter analogy with respect to Saddam Hussein: "Fight me now or fight me later."

Prior to August 2, the so-called Hitler was told by our charge, April Glaspie, when directly confronted with the fact that the Iraqis were prepared to go into Kuwait, that the United States does not pay a great deal of attention to these internecine problems among Arab brothers, the green light was blinking for Saddam Hussein.

Prior to August 2, Saddam Hussein had promised and delivered every time; every time he had a weapon, he used it. Saddam Hussein was as brutal before August 2; I mean, he gets an additional high mark for brutality with Kuwait, and that we can all venture to say, but there was no illusion about what a major-league creep this guy was prior to August 2.

But, of course, people made a lot of money on Saddam Hussein. The French, the Germans, the Swiss were all willing to part with the highest levels of technology to provide this dictator with the modern weapons of war.

Had he not invaded Kuwait, I do not think there would be a person here suggesting that we have to fight Saddam Hussein today or fight him at some point in the future when he is stronger.

The gentleman has pointed out the fact that he is not stronger in the future. He is weaker. And I do not discount the fact that at some point in the future we may have to use military action against this guy. I would like to think that it would be with a few other people so that it does not become an American enterprise.

But Saddam Hussein was a very bad and evil man, will continue to be a very bad and evil man, but we do not

have to on January 15 or 16 or 17, spend American lives not to deal with him.

One of the things that we learned in Israel that I think was the most interesting was this question of the nuclear weapons capability of Saddam Hussein given to him by Western allies of ours today. This one person who is in a position to know said categorically he cannot have a nuclear weapon unless the West provides him the ability to do that. Nobody is going to do that. So the sanctions, if they continue to work, we do not have to worry at some point in the future that Saddam Hussein is going to show up with a nuclear arsenal. He does not have that capability. The only way he gets that capability is if we give it to him.

Mr. MARKEY. If the gentlewoman will yield, let me, if I could, just review what the reasons are that are being propounded for the justification for an American military invasion of Kuwait and Iraq. First, oil. Well, right now, we have found that there is no oil shortage in the world. We have replaced all the supplies that were lost.

Moreover, if that is the justification, in 1981, when Ronald Reagan and George Bush and James Edwards, a dentist from South Carolina, as the Secretary of Energy, he came and testified before Congress in his confirmation hearings that his goal was to abolish the Department of Energy, and when told by a congressional committee that might be difficult, he said, "Well," he said, "it might take me a little longer, but the catfish are still jumping in South Carolina in June." That was 1981. That was their policy throughout the 1980's.

Second, nuclear nonproliferation. Ronald Reagan campaigned in 1980 on the platform that nonproliferation is not any of our business, meaning the United States, and since 1981, we have turned literally a blind eye to this international nuclear commerce. We allow the international atomic agency to become a paper tiger without any real sanctions and, as a result, even though the Israelis went in and made a strike at the Osirak reactor in 1981, we joined with Iraq and the United Nations in 1981 in condemning Israel; the United States, the Reagan-Bush administration, condemned Israel with Iraq in 1981. Throughout the 1980's then we, as a government, that is, the Reagan-Bush continuum, have been not in any manner, shape, or form with clean hands in terms of a nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Third, chemical weapons. George Bush three times went to the Senate to break a tie for the construction of new chemical weapons, even as the world was calling for a treaty that would ban their production and, at the same time that the Iraqis were using them against their own people, the Kurds, our Government once again turned a blind eye.

Fourth, and the gentleman from New York has made this point, just as recently as this summer, on human rights and on the question of whether or not we would intervene if the Iraqis moved into Kuwait, April Glaspie, our spokesman, stated quite clearly it was none of our business, and we were not going to interject ourselves.

On the basic justifications which are being used now, they were, as an administration, continuing from 1981 through 1990 on the opposite side of these issues, and now tell those of us who took those positions that we are appeasers. But we were the ones taking those positions on Iraq all along, and now we say in response to them why can we not look at the example of how we isolated militarily and economically the Soviet Union from 1946 on, why can we not look at the experience of the Soviet Union disastrously in moving in their superpower projection of force into Afghanistan in the 1980's and learn the lessons of the last 40 years which is that we did the right thing in bringing the East bloc countries to their knees?

That technological stranglehold, that military encirclement, those trade sanctions worked. This is a paper tiger of a superpower. It was a card castle, and it crumbled.

We can take that approach, and we can be successful, but let us not hear from them in any manner, shape, or form that those of us who supported the President back last August in projecting this military force and supporting an economic embargo are in any manner, shape, or form interested in anything other than the expulsion of Saddam from that region. Let us not hear the justifications which are being propounded right now as being this administration's greatest concerns, because we got there on oil, on chemicals, on nuclear nonproliferation as a result of the policies we were trying to change here on the floor of the House but were rejected by the Reagan-Bush administration consistently over a 10-year period.

That is what the people of this country have a right to hear, and that is before body bags start coming back to this country in a way that families in our country did not hear back in 1965 and 1966. They have a right to answer.

Let me just say this if I could to the gentleman from New York, and that is why I am so concerned right now.

□ 1410

In November 1966, John Waden came home in a body bag to Walden, MA. He was our first casualty. He lived five doors down from me. I was a junior at Boston College. I went to that funeral, that wake, and I asked each adult at that wake, "Why was John Waden dead?" There was not a single adult at that wake who could explain to me what the war in Vietnam was all about.

I swore that if I ever got into a position of power that I would ensure that somebody could explain to that family, to his friends, why that young boy or that young woman had died, and that is what this debate is all about. It is explaining how we got to this point, how on oil, on chemicals, on nuclear materials, on human rights, how we got to this point, and why we have to send in American boys right now, or instead put in military encirclement, trade embargo, and have the patience to wait for that empire to crumble, as it will. If the Soviet Union crumbles, a tin horn dictator from a Third World country will certainly crumble. That is what this debate is all about. That is why it is the most important debate in my 15 years in this body, and I am glad that the gentlewoman from California has addressed this special order at this time.

Mrs. BOXER. I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts how much I appreciate his joining in these discussions. The gentleman is so right. This administration really did not want us to debate. If you remember, when they went to the United Nations, they asked for a January 1 date, not a January 15 date. They were agitated that they had to wait.

I am convinced that one of the reasons was to keep the debate away from the American people.

What we are doing here tonight, this afternoon, is starting a debate that will go on for the next three days.

I want to ask the gentleman from California if the gentleman from New York is complete for now, because I know he is going to take some time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have taken long enough. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to yield some time, as much as he would like of the remaining time, to my colleague, the gentleman from California. Before he begins, I just want to give him my personal thanks for the role he has played in getting this issue before this House. This is the gentleman who did not just feel frustrated and concerned about the fact that this administration was keeping the Congress and therefore the American people shut out of this debate. This gentleman organized this Congress and 82 of us went in on a lawsuit, a lawsuit that was his idea, to bring the whole constitutional question of who has the right to declare war to the courts and to the people.

I believe the decision of the judge really underscored that the gentleman was right and that those of us on the lawsuit were right, because article I, section 8 is so clear.

This gentleman deserves a tremendous amount of credit, not only because he is articulate, intelligent, honest and all those things, but because he has the guts to stand up for what he believes. He has the skills to organize Members of Congress, and I am just

honored that he is here participating, and I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me and I am appreciative and also humbled by her remarks, and I appreciate them very much.

Let me say at the outset that at least in the abstract, the duty of this institution is that people have the opportunity to speak their minds, irrespective of their point of view; but the beauty is only realized if Members of Congress actually exercise their freedom, and that is to express themselves.

I compliment the gentlewoman and all my colleagues here today who are joining in this special order, because they are operating, in my humble opinion, in the finest tradition of a public servant, and that is to attempt to become part of the educative process, to have the audacity, the courage if you will, and the desire to become part of that process to educate as you attempt to lead.

Second, to offer a perspective, to set a framework, to establish the parameters of the debate.

If the gentlewoman will yield further, I would like to contribute to that.

I think that this debate, as I said earlier today in the caucus, is not about whether there are problems in the world that need to be solved all over the world, in the Persian Gulf, in the Middle East, on the continent of Africa and Asia, even in this country.

There are problems that have to be resolved. Only a fool or a knave would come to that decision; but the issue is how do you choose to solve those international disputes?

I came to Congress 20 years ago from the Oakland-Berkeley area against the backdrop of the Vietnam war, a war that split this entire country asunder, that divided young people from their parents, that even divided this institution. I was sent here to raise my voice in the name of peace. I marched into the well where the gentlewoman is now standing on more than one occasion 20 years ago when we were fighting and dying in Vietnam, and I said to my colleagues and I said to the Nation that if you are an advocate of peace, that peace is not simply withdrawing troops from Vietnam. It is withdrawing from the mentality of war and seeing war as an instrument of solving international disputes.

So I stand here this afternoon to participate in this forum, without any shame, because I believe that we as a people have to be bold enough and mature enough to move beyond the cave-man mentality that says we must fight and maim as a way of solving human problems. We must have the audacity to think beyond war. That is what this debate is all about. Do we have the courage to think beyond war?

Strength and power it appears now, testified by the statement that the President of the United States made just a few days ago, and I paraphrase: "And if he is not out of Kuwait by the 15th, we are going to kick his butt."

Those are not RON DELLUMS' words, but the President of the United States.

Now, what does that say? It says in some way that violence and force is legitimate. So the first group of people we communicate with are the young people who are dying all over this country, shooting and killing in random violence, shooting on street corners and shooting into cars and school incidents of violence and anger suddenly turned into death and destruction, because at the top of the mountain the President of the United States says: "Kick butt," because kicking butt is the way to solve problems; so we communicate to an entire generation of young people that it is not about sitting down to attempt to solve problems in some rational and mature fashion. No, it is about kicking butt.

So now our children are armed with AK-47's, 9 millimeter semiautomatic weapons, .357 Magnums, carrying them to school because the name of the game is "kick butt," justified all the way to the Oval Office of the White House.

So in some way that becomes then the macho image.

Again we also communicate throughout the world that Saddam Hussein's reckless adventure into Kuwait was not wrong. You just do not have enough power. So our response was not to deplore violence and force. If he had a problem that needed to be solved with Kuwait, then solve that problem nonviolently; but we posed no alternative. We said, "We don't like it that you use force and if you don't get out, we're going to use force, and by January 15, by God, we're going to kick your butt if you are not ready."

What are we communicating to an entire generation of people? I watch television now every day. Most of the time we do not have time, but during the holiday break between the 101st and 102d Congress, I tried to watch a lot of television because I do not normally have the opportunity, because I want to see what the American people see all day every day. Do you know what I saw? I saw young families being ripped apart, children clinging to their fathers' and mothers' legs saying, "I don't want you to go," seeing bright beautiful young faces marching off to some unknown destiny in the Persian Gulf for what reason? Because we want to kick some butt.

I came here because I believe that we must have the audacity to get beyond that, that our power and our strength lie not in our ability to wage war.

I am 20 years in this Congress, 18 of them on the Armed Services Committee, third ranking Democrat, subcommittee chair of R&D. Let me tell

you something. To you and to the American people, to you, Mr. Speaker, this country has the military capacity, the technological capability to render a hole so large in the Persian Gulf that you do not have enough sand to refill it.

□ 1420

Remember we built all that incredible capability to take out the Soviet Union. And now the Berlin Wall has crumbled, Eastern Europe is now marrying Western Europe, Gorbachev has thrown up his hands saying, "I have got to learn how to feed my miners and feed my people. Let's not talk about war, let's sit down and try to figure it out."

But we have this massive arsenal. So what are we going to do with it? We have never really tested it out, whether the tanks work, whether the guns work, whether the missiles actually hit targets.

We have all this incredible power massed, and I am saying to you there is no way we could lose in a shooting war. But in the longer term we lose because we have lost the opportunity as a great nation to assume leadership in the world, to say, "We disagree with your use of force and we want to show you there is another way to solve the problem." And there is another way to solve the problem.

Can sanctions work? Give them the opportunity. I find it incredibly poetic that many of the people who said, "Well, the sanctions haven't worked by the 15th of January? Let's go to war," taking thousands of young people into harm's way. But when we talk about sanctions in South Africa, the people that did not want sanctions in South Africa, many of them who now support going to war, said, "Slow down, take your time, be patient, let's see if sanctions can work in South Africa."

So the very same people that counsel patience in the use of sanctions now are suddenly enamored of this January 15 date as if there is something sacrosanct about this date, so that we can go to war.

The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency said that these are the most effective sanctions that we have ever levied. Give them a chance.

But even if they do not work, I say to the gentlewoman from California, then let us use other diplomatic means. We all know to a moral certainty that eventually old men will sit down around a table to solve a political problem after young men and women have died. What I want to do is to move the dying aside, let us get to the table first. We all know there is always a deal.

We live in an institution that deals all day every day 365 days a year. This is the joint that makes the deal. We understand dealmaking.

So if anybody thinks that we cannot sit down and negotiate a deal is living in an absurd world. Of course we can negotiate. Does that render us inept? Does that mean that we are some weak, wimpy nation? Who has attacked us lately?

That means other people understand this massive power. But we do not need to use it. Our power lies in our capacity to get beyond it.

What is the new world order? The President uses this comment. I find it fascinating. Several years ago people thought there was a commie-pinko-left-wing-radical idea, the new world order. But now it is being embraced by a conservative Republican President. That is great. Let us seize the moment to define that new world order, what it means.

Does it mean going from threatening strategic war to threatening sophisticated conventional war? Does it go from focusing on the major superpowers to focusing on Third World countries? I think a new world order is a world order where we have the audacity to think beyond war, to stop taking our young people across the seas to fight and die for some cause that could eventually get solved around the negotiating table by gray-haired old men who work the deal.

But you cannot bring back the lives. I am tired of turning on the television sets, crying, seeing these beautiful young people leaving their families behind. Some of them, both men and women, husbands and wives, serving there. Some of these children are virtually abandoned because the husband and the wife are in the Persian Gulf, preparing to die.

And we all know, if you look at their frustrations, they feel fear. Only a fool would not.

I do not think they would want to go to war. Only a madman would want to go to war, because war is killing, death and destruction, nothing more, nothing less.

So I think we ought to have the audacity and I say boldly that anyone who is not willing to feel passionate about this issue in this body has not thought about it. I respect you if you feel passionate on one side or the other, but be upset about it because war is a passionate issue. Peace is a passionate issue.

Sending people into harm's way is something that you ought to care about. If you can march into the well after this debate calmly and serenely to cast a vote to take people to death and destruction, you should not be here. You should be passionate—and I am. My passion is peace. My passion is that we ought to be able to get beyond these absurd ideas.

So that is the nature of the debate that I will take to the floor, that the issue is how do you solve international disputes? I think diplomacy can work.

I think we ought to pose that alternative so that the world sees that we are asserting leadership to move toward a bold, new era, that new world order where peace is the agenda and using international instruments like the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, and the World Court as the instruments that we begin to use to solve problems rather than fighting, shooting, and dying.

Finally, the gentlewoman serves a great purpose: I hope we will continue these efforts over the next several days and, hopefully, in the course of these remarks our American citizens who are focusing now in on what Congress is doing will begin to activate themselves in very powerful numbers because it is important. You and I know that what we do, hopefully, will serve some useful purpose. But the bottom line, it is going to be public opinion because we operate in a political environment. The American people need to let their opinions be known and they need to do it as quickly and as powerfully and as directly as possible. I thank the gentlewoman for her generosity.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my dear friend from California for adding so much to this debate. We have just a couple of minutes, and I am going to close.

When the gentleman talked about the message that President Bush and this administration are sending to the young people, it has never been spoken of before until the gentleman spoke it. But it is so clear that the gentleman is right, because we know all the powers that the President has are written down in the Constitution. But the strongest power he has is his role model. If his message is, as the gentleman says and as he has said, "I want to kick some butt," it is really a very clear message to our young people.

But I want to add something else that maybe the gentleman has not thought much about. It is also a very clear message to the people of the Middle East. Let us think about this.

Here we are, we are going into the Middle East to supposedly help the people there, bring stability there, stop a tyrant there, and what model do we use? Violence.

That is what they have been using for 4,000 years. Family fights family, tribe fights tribe, on and on and on through the decades. You cannot go from Saudi Arabia to Israel, because one country does not think the other country exists.

It is crazy. So the model that the President is bringing is this force. We have another model, and it worked, and it is called Camp David.

When history is written, I say to you, my friends, if war breaks out here, the comparison between this President's use of "our strengths" and President Carter's use of our power and our strength will be compared, and Camp David sent a very strong message. That

message was: If you put people in the room and they look each other in the eye and you close the door and you exert that kind of leadership as America did then, there can be peace even between the most hated of enemies.

So what a moment for us to use this Camp David model.

We stopped Saddam Hussein at the Saudi line. Fine. Let us do the rest of the job in the right way and send the right signal, the correct signal, to our young people and to the people of the Middle East who have so much agony in their lives.

Finally, let me close and tell you this: As our 26 colleagues got on the plane, we had a 15-hour flight and we stopped at Shannon Air Force Base to refuel on our way back to Washington. We pulled along the runway, and there is a sign that has been lit up with lights, and it says, "Welcome to Ireland. Peace on Earth."

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, as I looked at all my colleagues on the plane, we had seen such weapons of death, we had seen the beautiful faces of our kids, and I thought, "Please let those words come true now."

I yield briefly to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, there is something else I wanted to say. I want to thank the gentlewoman for participating in the lawsuit that we brought, and we recognized that, when we brought the lawsuit in the court, that this was a long shot, but that things were moving so quickly that we said, "Wait a minute. All the newscasts seem to be conditioning American people to think that war is inevitable here, that the President is just going to take us to war, that by the 15th or 16th we're just going to war," and probably well up into the 80th or 90th percentile said, "There's no way we can stop this," and we said, "Wait a minute."

With all due respect, the President is our President, but the President is President Bush, not King George, and the President must operate within the framework of a constitutional form of Government.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 11, of the Constitution is very straightforward, that Congress shall have the right to wage war, to declare war, and article II, section 2, gives the President certain powers and prerogatives as the Chief Executive Officer of the country. But he can carry out war once the policy is established. It does not give the President that power.

The Framers of the Constitution, in that sense, were brilliant people because they said that war is too incredible an event to allow one person to walk us there. They said that should be something that the American people participate in, and we set up a form of

government that gives them representation.

So, while the judge was not prepared to enjoin, the judge in that case, he did say unequivocally that the Congress and the Congress alone has the right to declare war. He said in his ruling that he was not prepared, that the court was not prepared, to read out of the Constitution article I, section 8. He said he disagreed with the administration when the administration's argument before the court was the President has the right to define war. The court said, "No, because then you reduce the congressional constitutional authority to a semantical definition by the President."

"Well, this is not a war. We call it offensive action, police action."

And so the judge underscored that we have the right, and I would go further and say we have the moral obligation, to involve ourselves in this decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] for enjoining in that lawsuit.

Sometime over the next few days the Congress of the United States, this institution, is going to be confronted with the Bennett-Durbin resolution which is very straightforward. Are warmaking powers invested in the Congress? And that, if the President seeks to use force to wage war against Iraq, he must come to the Congress, and I think that the overwhelming majority; I would think that 435 Members of Congress, would vote to uphold the Constitution of the Nation, but I am not a fool, or knave, and I understand that that will not happen, and I would like to hope and believe that it will indeed pass. Then the responsibility is on the President and the Congress to deal with this issue as clearly and as cleanly as possible, and I hope that the alternative to the President's desire to use force in the Persian Gulf would prevail, and I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

I see that the time has gone. I hope the American people join us in this debate. We need their help.

IS IT REALLY WORTH THEIR LIVES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have already joined in this debate for taking their time, for making an attempt to educate the country about what this institution is getting ready to do in terms of giving warmaking powers to the President or not giving warmaking powers to the President to engage in offensive ac-

tions in the Middle East, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] who have already participated, and I would hope that others would participate that wish to debate this issue.

I, like my colleague who was just in the well, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], have returned from a trip to the Middle East, to Saudi Arabia, to Israel, and to Egypt, where we had an opportunity to meet with heads of government, with various ministers within those countries, to try to assess the situation, and most of all to talk with our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues how deeply impressed I was with our soldiers as we talked to them during meals and at their stations in Saudi Arabia, how proud I was of their understanding that this is their mission should the decision be made in the Congress. This is something they will have to do. Not that they liked it, not that they agree with it. But it was a certain maturity about that, but also a certain sadness because I remember, as we visited an A-15 Tactical Wing, I talked to a young man who was in charge of ordnance and a number of pilots, and they told me all about the aircraft, and what they thought they were capable of doing, and how proud they were and how ready they felt they were.

Mr. Speaker, after a little while I got back on the bus as we were getting ready to leave, and I was looking out the window, and there must have been 40 or 50 young soldiers, and they had all of the exuberance, all of the cheer, all of the laughter that young people have, the excitement, and I thought how terrible it would be if in a short time their lives were lost and how critical it is for this Nation and this Congress to examine the premise under which we might put their lives in harm's way, that we might in fact take their lives, how we must try to understand is it really worth their lives and so many others? And can we make that decision without full debate?

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, this body is given the privilege of debating these issues. We, as many heard already, were involved in a lawsuit to try to insure that right and that privilege, the privilege for us to debate them, the right of our constituents to have us debate those, to debate the issues of war and peace, no matter which side we were on. But it is something that this Congress must do.

It is also the meeting of our constitutional obligations because the Constitution clearly gives us that authority in spite of what the President says, whether he likes it or does not like it, and the authority is clear.

Mr. Speaker, the Framers of the Constitution said they wanted this to be a

difficult decision. Saddam Hussein did not have to check with anybody when he took hundreds of thousands of his young soldiers and had them die in the Iranian desert. The Ayatollah Khomeini did not have to check with anybody or debate. But this is not a dictatorship. This is not a theocracy. This is a democracy, and it is hard to make decisions, and people are to be involved in those decisions.

We say we are the people's House. Each of us represents some 600,000 Americans. We now represent families who have members of their family overseas, young men who are on the front line, young women who are on the front line. Today, when we send a soldier to the Middle East, when we talk to them on station, when they tell us they are moving to the front, that they are going north, we are not just talking to a young man or a young woman. We are talking to a mother of several children. We are talking to a sister, to a wife, to a daughter. We are talking to a son and to a father. We are talking to a husband and a brother.

So, when my colleagues and the President and others suggest that this will be a neat little war, maybe 7 days, maybe 5 days, maybe 72 hours of heavy bombing, that the casualties will be acceptable; acceptable to who? Acceptable to who? To the brothers? To the sisters? To the husbands? To the wives? Will it be acceptable to them? The casualties will be far beyond the 5,000 because those soldiers do not live alone. They live in our communities, and they are among our families.

□ 1440

They represent our colleagues here. We traveled with KIKI DE LA GARZA, and we saw one of our senior Members who went to visit with his son, a surgeon in Saudi Arabia, who, like so many others, was now starting to move forward. We had to watch as he bid his son goodbye, and as we came home on the airplane we all thought about KIKI and wondered how must he feel, knowing what we know and knowing what we have been told. How difficult that must be.

But that is difficult for every family, and that is what we have got to remember. We like to get into euphemisms, we like to get into abstractions in this body. We cannot do that. We are talking about America's young men and women. We are talking about human lives. That is what this debate is about. That is why it is so terribly important that we have it and that we do not do the political thing. The smart political thing is to just let the President do whatever he feels like doing, and then if he is successful, we will clap our hands, but then if he fails, we will say that he made the wrong decision.

But our obligation is to take part in that decision, not only because we

think we should but because the Constitution demands that we do.

I think we also have got to understand this: What is it that America has already done? Let us remember that the Kuwaitis chose not to have much of an Army because apparently the Kuwaitis do not really enjoy manual labor. They spent a lot of money. They bought some very sophisticated equipment. But on the night of August 2 Saddam Hussein did not take some of his tanks off the trucks because they just drove unfettered into Kuwait City. They chose not to fight. The only thing Saddam Hussein's forces saw in Kuwait City was the taillights of cars heading for Saudi Arabia.

The Saudis have chosen not to have an army because they say the princes like to fly airplanes and they really do not like the drudgery. The people do not like the drudgery of military service. So they have spent billions and billions of dollars buying sophisticated equipment, but apparently they cannot defend their country. They have chosen not to do that, and now it is the burden of American men and women to die to defend their countries. Under some circumstances that may be the right decision. I do not happen to believe it is the right decision now.

We have risked our economy because we went there and the President properly made a decision that that aggression had to be stopped, and if the information led us to the conclusion that Saddam Hussein was going to go to Saudi Arabia, then that had to be stopped.

We risked our people's lives, the lives of our young men and women. We engaged and the President put together—and he is to be commended for it—an international coalition to create an embargo and to create sanctions, embargoes and sanctions like we have not seen in recent decades. We risked our budget because we were told last week that it is \$30 billion without fighting. Some people say it is a billion dollars a day or a billion dollars a week with fighting.

America has risked a great deal to try to restore stability, to stop the naked aggression. What many of us would ask is that others who have an even greater stake risk along with us.

In our meetings with Egyptian officials, one of them said to us, "Well, you have to take military action right away. You have to get rid of Saddam Hussein because if you don't, the people will think that we are not determined to get rid of him."

I said to him, "If you are so determined, why don't you come and fight him with us in Iraq and in Kuwait?"

"Oh," he said, "we would be forbidden. With the Arab Council or the command we are under, we can't go there."

Some people have suggested they will fight in Kuwait but they will not fight in Iraq. Will that make a difference to

the young American soldier who is dead in Kuwait? Will he feel better or will she feel better or will their families feel better knowing that the Egyptians may or may not fight in Iraq?

We are told that the Syrians will not fight, period. I do not know whether they will or not. I certainly would like to be able to tell our soldiers whether they will or whether they will not. We are told that perhaps the French will not engage in it or help us—the French, without whom Saddam Hussein would not have many of the weapons that he aims at American soldiers today, without whom Saddam Hussein would not be well on his way to nuclear weapons.

So let us look at our coalition, our coalition that will not risk their treasures, their citizens, or their soldiers, and yet their fingerprints are all over the crisis, a coalition many of whom had to be paid before they participated, the Egyptians, we were told, maybe as much as \$16 billion to \$20 billion. As far as Syria is concerned, I thought they were an outlaw state that engaged in terrorism, but now they are our allies. They wanted \$2 billion so they could buy more weapons, so they could become even more dangerous in the region. But that was OK.

We are told that we do not have to debate this because the United Nations has acted. I can remember a few months ago we would not take family planning advice from the United Nations, but now we are going to let the United Nations tell us whether or not American young men and women must die. For most of them in the United Nations who voted, most of them have nothing in this region, nothing at stake, but they were willing to hold our coats and tell us to go ahead.

I think we have got to raise these issues over the next 3 days. I think the American public is entitled to know the circumstances by which we got there.

It was said here earlier than many of us were trying to get a grain embargo against Iraq just before the invasion, and the administration was up here lobbying against it and telling us it would send the wrong signal to Saddam Hussein, because after all, he was our ally.

I think we have got to understand that, that perhaps now we are asking American soldiers to make up for some terrible mistakes, some terrible political mistakes that this Government has made prior to their assignment.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman has just been there, perhaps he can update us on whether or not emergency measures have been taken in Saudi Arabia and in other countries. My understanding is that if you are to

visit the major cities, you will still find the young princes driving around in their BMW's and Porsches, and they do not seem to have imposed a draft or any other emergency measure to defend the country. I would assume that is all changing at this point in time?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes and no. There is some indication that over a prolonged period of time, perhaps the Saudis are starting to raise an effective Army, but that still does not address itself to the current situation. But other than that, yes, life pretty much goes on as it did prior to this invasion. But again they have 400,000 young American men and women between them and harm's way.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman addressed very well, I think, the involvement of Syria, but I think we need to discuss the involvement of Syria further, because we have to realize that in good part, certainly the French contributed to the Iraq military capabilities and have encouraged them. But it is also the policy of the Bush-Reagan administrations in the United States to see Iraq as a bulwark against the Iranians, and that has enhanced their status and their power in the region. In fact, my recollection is that it was Iraq that launched the war against Iran, and the United States said nothing. It was Iraq that first used poison gas, in violation of all international conventions, and the United States said nothing.

It was Iraq that blew up the U.S.S. *Stark* and killed the sailors, and then they said, "We are sorry, but you can't interview our pilot because it was a mistake and we can't let you interview that pilot." We accepted their apology. We did not insist, even though credible military experts said that it could not have been a mistake, that that plane was not equipped to inflict the damage that plane inflicted.

□ 1450

There was more than one plane, or the plane was specially equipped. Yet we did not insist, and finally they used poison gas against their own people, the Kurds, and that was the last straw here in the Congress. We began a debate in July to cut off economic and food assistance to Iraq, but that was opposed by the Bush administration, by the Secretary of State, and by the President.

Then there was a puzzling conversation.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think also the record will show that one of the reasons we were engaged in that attempt to cut off that assistance was that they were taking food aid and using the money to buy weapons, contrary to the law. But again, the administration told the committees of this Congress, "You can't look at this. We don't want you to raise this subject, because, after all, they are our allies."

Mr. DEFAZIO. Then there was the puzzling conversation of Ambassador Gaspie with Saddam Hussein as reported in a transcript revealed by the New York Times. I have asked Secretary Baker if he could either confirm or deny this because it is so troubling, and if we are going to engage in this debate we need to know what went before. But I will give just one quote, and we can take any one of a number of quotes.

Ambassador Gaspie to Saddam Hussein:

We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflict, like your border disagreement with Kuwait. I was in the American Embassy in Kuwait during the late sixties. The instruction we had during this period was that we should express no opinion on this issue and that the issue is not associated with America. James Baker has directed our official spokesmen to emphasize this instruction. We hope you can solve this problem using any suitable methods.

If we were prepared 8 days later to go to war because of the movement of troops into Kuwait, I think that Ambassador Gaspie might have expressed herself or the concerns of the U.S. Government just a tad differently than in this transcript. I hope it is an inaccurate transcript.

Mr. MILLER of California. I find it interesting. I think the gentleman raises an important point, that we have been told, the world has been told and the American people have been told that there can be no negotiations, and yet we have spent a decade negotiating with Saddam Hussein. Those negotiations only led him to be more powerful, better equipped and more dangerous to the region, and this administration that negotiated with him now suggests that somehow it would be unseemly if they negotiated with him again.

So rather than do that, they will create the atmosphere for what is surely going to be negotiations down the road by killing thousands of young Americans, quite possibly. That is what we have to remember, that there is a long history of this administration and the previous administration negotiating with Saddam Hussein. And we have to remember that again before we ask young Americans to give up their life for the position of this administration.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, now it appears that we are lurching toward embracing perhaps the one worst terrorist nation in the world or in the region, and that is Syria, and Hafiz Asad, who is at least complicit in the murder of 240 marines in Lebanon, and in the downing of Pan Am Flight 103 and various other terrorist actions, and at least he harbors those responsible, and yet his enemy is our enemy and therefore we can make a common cause and put these things behind us.

I thought that the laws of the United States precluded us from extending any

aid or in any way cooperating with nations that are still on the terrorist list, and it is my understanding that Syria is still on that list of nations that are engaged in terrorist activities. And if we think about what is the long-term effect here, we have embraced Iraq to counter Iran. Now we are embracing Syria to counter Iraq. After we decapitate Iraq in this war, if that is what happens, what then is next in the region? How do we instill a new government in Iraq? How do we balance the forces in the region? Will we have to occupy Iraq? Will we have to defend Iraq against Syria or Turkey or Iran in the near future in order to gain so-called or restore so-called balance in the region? I wonder what the long-term policy objective is of the United States, and I hope perhaps that was made clearer to the gentleman than it has been made to me in recent months, or perhaps during his trip, or perhaps there was some gem of a plan that was revealed by your meeting with some of the other heads of state in the region.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would like to respond to the gentleman. I was on the trip as well, and in Egypt we did get some hint of what the American role was. They want us to do the fighting and then get lost. They are paranoid. They think if we do not go to war right away that our grand design is to stay there as though this was some sort of a vacation spot for our troops, and dictate where the oil might flow over the next couple of months and years.

So it was clear to me that we are serving the ageless capacity of a mercenary force, as the gentleman from California suggested, for other people who are incapable, unwilling, or unable to defend themselves.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, one other thing that I was interested in hearing about the gentleman's trip, when I listened to the other side that is arguing for this declaration of war that the President wants, they are saying if we do not do this now, the coalition will fall apart. I also hear the gentleman saying maybe the coalition is going to fall apart if we do it, and this coalition is really, really shaky, and we are reacting in our own best interest rather than some long-term thing.

But I thought the gentleman was going right to the point of one of the major arguments made by those who are backing the President, and that is we do not have time to negotiate, we cannot talk any more, we cannot, and if we do not do this right now these wonderful allies are all going to disappear.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman raises a very crucial point because she is right. The administration is selling the notion that if

we do not act now the coalition will fall apart. We were given very substantial evidence on our trip to the Middle East that when we do act much of the coalition will not act with this.

Now let us reverse it. Let us ask the flip side. If we do not act right away, if we go for another 6 months or another year, what is it that this coalition will do?

Now we have decided that Saddam Hussein is a world class criminal. But this coalition apparently will now start engaging in commerce. Apparently the French will want to get right back in there and start selling nuclear triggers to Saddam Hussein. The Germans will want to send their scientists, let their companies trade with him. Is the gentleman telling me that is what American lives are worth, that the coalition will not fight with us, but should we decide to tough it out, because we do not want to expend American life, the coalition will start undermining us, that the Saudis who we are protecting will engage in arrangements? We are the ones keeping the wolf away from the door. Is the gentleman telling me that somehow the Egyptians, whose tail we are saving, will now start making arrangements, that the Germans will engage in commerce, that the Japanese will start engaging in financial transactions? This is our coalition? They are telling us if we do not make a snap decision to kill American boys, to kill American women, that they want to go back to the old world order where they engage in this kind of commerce? These are our allies?

That cannot be. That cannot be. George Bush would not make that kind of a coalition. That cannot be. Is that why we are rushing to war, because somebody will decide? We were told when we were in the Middle East that there are American contractors who are waiting and trying to bid on the rebuilding of Saddam Hussein's helicopters after the war. Talk about patriotism, talk about the waste of lives.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Admiral Crowe testified in the Senate on this point. He said:

I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities, but too fragile to hold together while we attempt to seek a peaceful solution.

I think that speaks for itself.

But more importantly is the support of the Egyptians and the Saudis. I think there are only two potential weak links in this coalition. I do not think anybody expects our European friends to suddenly decide to undermine the coalition. In the case of the Egyptians, they have been the recipients of \$20 billion in aid since they sent their two divisions into the desert. The Syrians have received \$2 billion in aid from the Saudis. So this coalition

building has been profitable for the two weakest links in the coalition chain, and I dare say that there is not a shred of evidence to suggest that the coalition is going to be dismembered, on top of which the other point that is made incessantly here is that the presence of American troops undermines Saudi Arabia.

□1500

Yes, we undermine a feudal state with the off-chance that we might have to drag it kicking and screaming into the 20th century. That was directly contradicted by one of the generals who briefed us who suggested to us that the Saudis at the working-class level have been excited, involved and happy to work with the American forces there, and that there has not been the sort of tension, distrust and problems that other people have suggested.

So I would put to rest this argument of a coalition fragility based on the facts, based on what we saw and based on the rationale that this coalition has no place else to go. If we do not pull their chestnuts out of the fire, they are in serious trouble.

Mrs. BOXER. If the gentlemen will yield, why would this coalition break up? They are not doing anything of substance. They are not risking their treasure in the form of their kids or their dollars. The gentleman talks about the Europeans.

Let us take a look at this chart. The Europeans, the Netherlands gets 100 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, no ground troops; Japan, 63 percent, no ground troops; Spain, 59 percent of its oil, no ground troops; Italy, 36 percent of its oil, no ground troops; Australia, 22 percent of its oil, no ground troops. We get 11 percent of our oil. We have 300,000 ground troops.

I ask the Members: why would they leave the coalition? What a deal they have, and I must ask my colleague if he will, at this point, tell his colleagues the phrase he used during this trip to describe whether we were known as Uncle Sam or a new kind of uncle, because otherwise I will have to put it in my words.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman raises a point. When we look at what America has sacrificed and what America has done today and what America would be prepared to do tomorrow for stability in this region, and when we see what those who have so much more at risk in terms of their economies or the existence of their countries, what they have done compared to what we have done to date not counting the notion that we will now start losing American lives, I think it raises the question of whether we are Uncle Sam or we are Uncle Sucker, and I think that the gentleman makes a point.

In reality, this coalition has no other place to go, but should they decide to go somewhere else and to undermine the efforts of this President and this country, then they are not worthy of our support and clearly not worthy of the deaths of our young men and women in the Middle East.

Either there will be a new world order where countries will hang together to stop aggression by use of economics, by use of embargoes, by the use of negotiations, by taking all of our talents and our creativity and all of our might to solve this peacefully, or there will be an Old World order where Americans end up dead, our economy ends up broke, and our Government deep in debt.

George Bush is going to get to make the choice, and this Congress is going to get to make the choice, and I think that is the question: Uncle Sam or Uncle Sucker. The choice is the Congress'.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I commend him for the special order.

I would like to recount a story told by one of our colleagues from the gentleman's own State of California who went to a meeting of NATO parliamentarians, European Congressmen, so to speak, after our last election and before Thanksgiving.

She confronted these parliamentarians asking them why their countries were not making a greater contribution in terms of personnel or resources, and the response of the European parliamentarians almost was incredulous. They said:

Wait a minute, it is the United States that wants to be a military superpower. You are the ones who are expected to be doing this. We just want to be economic superpowers.

I would suggest to the gentleman that in the long term that being a military superpower and all that that entails is a recipe for disaster for our economy and our future.

While the gentleman was on his trip, our Committee on the Budget asked the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to appear before the House Committee on the Budget to outline the exact cost of Operation Desert Shield and what our allies were going to contribute. I am sorry to report that the State Department and the Department of Defense refused to attend that hearing, but other experts came and said that we will spend in the first year at least \$31 billion for Operation Desert Shield if fighting does not break out.

As the gentleman from California can remember, that \$31 billion plus interest is exactly what we were planning on saving this year because of that tor-

tured budget agreement which we agreed to just a few weeks ago.

The sad part of the situation is that with very few exceptions our allies are sending checks, America is sending its children to fight in Operation Desert Shield, and we can discuss at length the cost in terms of dollars to the American taxpayer, but that is almost irrelevant in comparison to what we are really standing to sacrifice if we do wage war.

What we are standing to sacrifice are the lives of a lot of young men and women. I might say that I have been troubled by one particular disclosure over the last several weeks more than any.

Several Senators returned from the Persian Gulf area and reported that the war would be over in 5 days. One of my colleagues from the State of Illinois said, "No, it will be over in 4 days. I think there will only be 20 casualties." Just the day before yesterday the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services issued a report saying that he thought this was going to be a new war, that in fact would have light casualties. I do not know if this is waging war in the age of microwaves or what, but the idea is it is going to be a quick war, and not too many people get killed, and it will be over very quickly.

I would say that that is really a sad commentary, that many of these people are not leveling with the American people about the scope of the disaster that may lie ahead for victory.

Mr. MILLER of California. We had an opportunity to discuss this with Israeli intelligence, and as the gentleman knows, they have been involved unfortunately in a number of wars in the Middle East in this area of the world, and they have obviously monitored wars that have taken place between Arab nations in this part of the world.

When we told him about the analysis suggesting that this war would be over in perhaps 5 days, or after extended massive bombing, that that would pretty much be the end of it, he said he did not think so. He said, in fact, there is no precedent in military history, and he said that also recognizing that we have not seen this kind of buildup in armaments and technology and so forth.

But he wanted to be very clear with us that we should not be working off the premise that this will be a neat, clean, little war in a matter of days.

Mr. DURBIN. Concluding very briefly, I will just say that those who have been spreading this information around about how few casualties are at risk even if the United States prevails do a great disservice to the American people. They have to be told the facts as we understand them, that if this turns out to be a land war of any proportion that we could stand to lose literally thousands of American lives, and that should be the very basis and the fun-

damental questions which we ask first before this Congress makes a decision as to whether or not we will declare war.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have been, I think, asking and raising some very important questions and points in this debate on our actions and proposals in the Middle East, especially the gentleman from California and others who have just returned.

In fact, of course, the armed forces arrayed in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and Iraq today are the largest concentration of ground forces since World War II that have been arrayed against one another, and so lest anyone have any questions or doubts about what the consequences will be if there were an absolute confrontation between those forces, I think added to that, the weapons of 1990, not the weapons of 1940, which unfortunately are much more effective in terms of what their impact is on those troops and on those people in that region.

I think we have a very important point in history. One can only speculate, in fact, and my colleagues and I have asked questions of the Secretary of Defense concerning the number of casualties, U.S. casualties, that might occur, and in each instance when I have been present and those questions have been raised and when I have read of those questions in the news media by virtue of the responses from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State they have deferred to answer those questions. They would not speculate. They would not answer those questions. So I think they would be quite significant.

I know colleagues have raised questions about surgical aerial strikes. We have had some examples of that in Grenada in terms of the accuracy of those types of strikes when they bombed hospitals for the mentally ill, and they did not do it viciously, they did not do it intentionally, but those are the types of limitations that exist even with these types of modern weapons.

I would like to raise one more point, and that is, I think, one of the critical points, and that is the point of timing in the January 15 deadline.

True, this is a construct that has been created by the administration, by our allies, and by others. It is not a construct that we need to endorse in terms of effectively dealing with attaining the objectives or goals in the Middle East with regard to the removal of Iraq from Kuwait.

□ 1510

Indeed, some of the goals that have been outlined with the threat of force have been achieved. I firmly believe, of course, that the continued imposition and stand of sanctions, of the blockade, of diplomacy, and of course, the defensive deployment of some troops, whether or not we need the number of troops, of course, is another matter will work; but this sort of concept or construct of a window of opportunity, which is generally dictated to us by others, by our so-called coalition of support, is an interesting one because there are religious holidays, because traditionally there has been animosity between the various individuals in the coalition. It seems to me not just that the sanctions would work, but that if we are really trying to demonstrate a new means in terms of solving problems like this that I think are going to continue to occur in the future, that it would be well for us to try to begin to work and demonstrate that, yes, the Syrians and many other countries that are involved in this have to demonstrate some discipline in terms of staying the course.

I do not think we do ourselves a service simply by recognizing and giving in to that, rather than building the type of stick-to-it-iveness that is necessary in order to solve this problem.

Finally, I would just add briefly, and I know other Members want to talk and I appreciate the opportunity to address this, and this is the whole question of this new world order and what it is going to be like.

You know, one of the sad realities of the 1990's is that indeed small countries, Iraq with some less than 20 million population now has arrayed the fourth largest army with an impressive arsenal of weapons, but many other countries now have the capability to gain conventional arms, surface-to-surface missiles, surface-to-air missiles, a whole host of armaments that can indeed cause them to threaten the so-called superpowers, threaten a country like ours, or like the Soviet Union or other countries that have been considered to be part of the first or second world. So these Third World countries coming of age, we just as a nation and as a participant in the global government structures that we have, have to find a means to deal with these problems other than just the military option.

I suggest some of them are inherent in the approach we are taking here. Maybe the threat of military force certainly is one of them but the use of it has to be in proportion to the nature of the problem. I think that proportionality is very important.

The first question, we raised many questions about the cost of this, who is doing their part and who is not, but the first question in this should be the moral question. Yes, it is American

lives, but we are literally talking about hundreds of thousands of other lives in the Middle East that will be lost and who will pick up the pieces, who will occupy Iraq, who will build these countries back up? What will we have attained in terms of accomplishing that and how we address ourselves to the next Saddam Hussein that will be present someplace on this globe, another problem we have to solve, because indeed we know today if it is our mission as a nation to be the world's policeman, to play this particular role, that many of us are eager to play, that indeed we will be faced with this dilemma again and again.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I really want to thank the gentleman for his insight, and in a way I would kind of like to play Devil's Advocate, because I agree so much with the gentleman that I think maybe his just having come back from that region, maybe he can give me something else.

I listened to all the arguments for why people should go for the President's declaration of war this morning, and I think the gentleman has very effectively undone them, the bit about well, the alliance will collapse if we do not go immediately. I think the gentleman pointed out they all could collapse and his is a very weak alliance and we do not know what it is.

Obviously, the burden-sharing issues, obviously the constitutional issues; I do not think anybody in the world thinks it is a good idea to draw a date and say, "OK, if it isn't done by then, we go to war."

And certainly under the Constitution we are supposed to be there as a balance to any one person doing something crazy like setting a date.

I also hear the gentleman talking about the vision thing. We know domestically the administration has been accused of not having a vision. The vision thing has become kind of a joke for "Saturday Night Live"; but I really hear the gentleman saying, too, we have a vision thing problem internationally. Is that correct, or is there something I am missing?

Can the gentleman play Devil's Advocate and come up with any reason why someone should vote the other way? At this point I just do not get it. The gentleman very effectively knocked down everything that I heard this morning.

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, I think the gentlewoman makes a good point, because I am not sure that this is a representative vision. I appreciate that it has been cloaked in the notion of a new world order, but I almost feel like David Letterman. What are the 10 reasons why the United States is in the Middle East?

We thought we were there to stop naked aggression. We have in fact done that.

Some said earlier we were there to restore the Emir, but the American people said, "I don't want my children dying to restore the Emir of Kuwait and the royal family."

We were later told that we had to go there and maybe start hostilities because the President had had it.

Then we were told by Secretary Baker that our children were going to die in the Middle East because it was American jobs.

Then we were told, "Let's get sophisticated, America. This is about oil."

Then the American people said they would pay a little bit more rather than kill their own kids.

Then we said, "Well, it is about lower gas prices, because we know people are sensitive to that." And they said they would pay a little bit more rather than kill their kids.

We are told that we now have to move because the President is out of patience. None of those have held up.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the only thing he left out was jobs. We were told it was jobs.

Mr. MILLER of California. Jobs, you know. That is not going to work.

Finally, they took a poll and they saw that Americans were upset about nuclear weapons, that Saddam Hussein might have nuclear weapons.

One of the things we learned on our trip when we were told by Government officials, two very interesting points, as again we go to risk our most valuable assets—our mothers and fathers, daughters, sons, and brothers and sisters.

We were told that without the help of the European community, Saddam Hussein could not be as far along the road to nuclear weapons as he is today, but that he cannot complete the nuclear weapons circle without additional help by the European community.

Has the President asked the Europeans to take the pledge that they will not help Saddam Hussein get the nuclear weapons? I have not seen that.

So we are apparently willing to risk nothing. The President has not asked Americans for a single sacrifice. He has not asked us to drive less. He has not asked us to stay home on a Friday night to save oil or to save energy or to help our economy, but he is fully prepared to put 5,000 or 10,000 American casualties on the line.

I think the test for us will be in a constitutional sense and in a legal sense when we vote over the next couple of days, what is the compelling reason that this administration gave you as a Member of Congress that you voted to send young men and women to war, a declaration of war?

Forget the euphemisms about supporting the U.N. resolution. The United

Nations will not go to war. American men and women will go to war. The United Nations will not live in the desert. American men and women will live in the desert. The United Nations will not go broke financing this war. American taxpayers will. The U.N. economy will not suffer. The American economy will suffer.

So there had better be a very, very compelling reason why the Congress of the United States would vote to go to war.

I think as the gentlewoman from Colorado has pointed out, we have listened to reasons for 5 months. They have changed reasons more than I have changed my clothes. None of them have held up in front of the American public, other than trying to scare them, because when you take apart their arguments, they do not hold up.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, one of the issues we hear so much about is the comparison between this situation where the gentleman has just come back from and 1939 when Hitler was rolling through. Was there anyone in that region that really felt Saddam Hussein was ready to roll some more? Did they really think that this was like Hitler? Did they really think he had not been stopped adequately? My impression is he got totally stopped. This is it, and no one thinks he is going to go an inch further, and the question is now how we push him back.

□ 1520

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the point was that people believed that, left to his own, yes, we would, but he has not been left to his own. We are watching one of the most effective embargoes and program of sanctions in modern times. We clearly have been willing to send American troops, military equipment, aircraft carriers, to stop him. He has been stopped. So, no, nobody was suggesting that he is now just going to leap forward again. Nobody believes for a moment that that is what it is.

I think it is important that everybody understands that if the coalition truly works together, Saddam Hussein cannot roll like Hitler rolled in 1939. This is not 1939. That was a very clever analogy to whip up the press. They spent a great deal of time trying to find some comparisons and get the American public rolling.

It is not the reality of the situation, period. It is not to minimize the danger of Saddam Hussein or his wickedness or his evilness, but it is not to suggest that this is an analogous situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. I think, in fact, the case is even stronger. Had we—had the world done to Adolf Hitler what the world is now doing to Saddam Hussein,

he would have collapsed very, very quickly.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is right. Our country was trading with Mussolini when he went to North Africa. There was no embargo.

Mr. MOODY. Right. This embargo, this embargo, these sets of sanctions which are now being decry by the administration as inadequate, have cut the national income of Saddam Hussein's country in half.

This country is in a state of agitation because we may suffer a 2-percent loss in our GNP. Can you imagine the status around here if our income was cut at the rate of 50 percent instead of 2 percent?

Not only that, 70 percent of the food imports, of the foodstuffs are imported into that country. And almost all of the spare parts, and military capacity, which is degrading. The Hitler analogies are totally absurd. Had this world done half—if the world had done one-tenth to Hitler what it is doing to Saddam Hussein, Hitler would have been stopped. Instead, the world went on with business as usual.

I have a couple of more points that I would like to make later on.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman has made a very important point.

If you remember, one of the concerns of this administration was that the American people would not take kindly to or withstand or endure Iraqi children starving on CNN as the embargo began to work. Now we are being told that the embargo will not be held up because people are not starving. The point of the embargo was not to starve the Iraqi people. We believe many of them are victims of Saddam Hussein. The purpose of the embargo was to close down the Iraqi economy, to deny Saddam Hussein the replacement parts for his warmaking machine and to engage in the suffering of his economy.

All of the evidence suggests that that in fact is happening. But because we see oranges in the marketplace on CNN, we say we must abandon it.

Our generals told us the simple fact of the T-72, Russian tanks, sitting in the desert under Saddam Hussein's control, the tanks are disintegrating by simply sitting there. His warmaking capacity is getting less day after day.

Secretary Cheney told us that it already has taken a toll on his air force. It will take its last toll on its soliders. But it was also suggested over the weekend that it was starting to take a toll on his mechanization. And that they will not be able to be as maneuverable a month from now as they are today, they will not be able to service this warmaking machine.

The sanctions are in fact working in a military and an economic sense. True, children are not starving. But should that really be the goal of this

country? That children starve at the behest of Saddam Hussein?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. If the gentleman would yield, but children will die violently if the war begins. I think there is something incompatible about an administration that says that we cannot have the sanctions because children will starve, in one minute and in the next one it is saying we are going to have a short, fast war because we are going to have saturation bombing. How can you say that we cannot let children starve, but it is all right to drop bombs in massive numbers in order to ensure a non-Vietnam result—a quick, sudden, overwhelming show of force that will engulf hundreds of thousands of civilians, including children?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. McDERMOTT. If the gentleman would yield for a question: All the listening and all the reading I have done over the last few months I have not heard anybody talk about casualties beyond those who will die. When you were over there on the trip, did they talk at all about the effects on the American society and the psychological injuries of this war?

Mr. MILLER of California. No. Unfortunately, that has not been much of a discussion either there—I tried to make that point in my opening remarks, that apparently now we are arriving at a conclusion rapidly that 5,000 dead American soliders is acceptable. The point is that those 5,000 are members of families and that the ripple effect for our society is going to be much greater than that in terms of the national tragedy.

Clearly, that was not—when we discussed it with the Israelis, they suggested that, you know, that was within the realm of possibility but they expected the war to be longer and not to be as neat as that scenario. Then you had to discuss the wounded, those that would return without arms or without legs, blinded, impaired in other ways, as we saw from Vietnam.

So this will not be neat. The Congress ought not to get tricked into the belief that we will not be responsible for the sanctions.

Mr. McDERMOTT. That really is the point of my question. Most people, when they talk about this war, want to analogize either to Hitler or to Vietnam. The administration always dismisses the analogy of a Vietnam. They say it is not a jungle, it is a desert.

But the real analogy, from my personal experience, is that this is a war where a President is trying to take the country into a war when the people are not united behind him. That is what happened in Vietnam.

In my experience—I spent 2 years of my life when, I was never going to be

in politics, I was going to spend my time in academic medicine. Well, I wound up being down in Long Beach, at the Long Beach Naval Station, taking care of casualties coming out of Vietnam. They were marines and sailors who were in those reverine boats. And they came home to a country that did not respect what they had done, that questioned what they had done, that said—they raised questions about everything about that war.

Each morning, I would get up and read the Los Angeles Times, and this would say, "We are winning the war."

Then I would go over and talk to the marines just back from Vietnam who would say, "It is all a lie, all the numbers a lie. The leaders are lying. We are not winning; we are losing." And the effects of that we are living with in this country right now.

No one, in talking about this war, is willing to talk about drugs, the homelessness, the prisons that are filled.

We lost in this country more Vietnam veterans by suicide than were killed there. There have been more than 60,000 Vietnam veterans who have committed suicide.

Now, those are the kind of effects that this administration refuses to bring out into the open and discuss before you start a war where the American people are divided.

I think that in many ways it is easier, in some ways, for people to have died in Vietnam than to have come back and lived.

This administration refuses to talk about what it is going to do to the American society if we go in divided.

I think it is crucial that the gentleman's trip was made, that he is raising his voice in this special order, to make the American people think about the broader issues, because it is not simply body bags.

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would just say to my friend from Washington that he has made a great contribution because as a physician he knows what war really means in a perspective very different than most of us. I want to add another point, having come back from the Persian Gulf: This conflict, if you will, war, will have a different kind of casualty, as the gentleman has stated, my good friend from California. There are families there, there are whole families over there. Husbands and wives are over there, they have left children at home. In one case, the general who was briefing us on deployment has two of his kids coming over because we have a professional military now.

Families follow one another.

So the kind of effects that we are going to have here, that we are already having, from little kids who are left crying at home as both parents go off, as moms go off, as dads go off, is unreal. I would say to my friend from

California—he is the founder of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families—and he has brought to this House information about the stresses that we have on families under ordinary circumstances.

I would ask him to comment from his experience on what this new Army is going to do to our people.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would comment, I think it is a testimony to the notion that probably war is in fact obsolete because of the kind of punishment that it now inflicts not only on the vanquished but on the victors, that the price becomes so high for those who perceive that they have won that the victory becomes terribly hollow.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I only have 2 minutes left, and then there is going to be an additional hour of time here. Let me just say this, that I want America to think, and I want Members of this Congress to think between now and the time we vote, of the gift that we have already given the world since August 2.

Mr. Speaker, no other country could have done what we did. Military people around the world are amazed at the ability we had to project those military forces on the Saudi border and to stop Saddam Hussein. We have spent billions of our treasury. We have given our sons and our daughters, and mothers and fathers, and our brothers and our sisters to stop this madman. We should be proud as Americans. We should be proud that we were able to react, that we were able to deal with that problem.

But we should also be clear thinking and clear eyed about whether the next burden is our burden alone. Is it just America's to die on the battlefield, or is it a risk that all of us should share in the world community? Is it just America's burden to die while others stand back and reap the benefit?

We talk about the U.N. resolution. The United Nations was created to keep peace, not to make war. We can create, because Saddam Hussein has nowhere to go, we can create a U.N. peacekeeping force in this region over the next 180 days, or the next year, and we can start sharing that burden with other countries of the world because it cannot just be our place in the world to die on the battlefields of the world.

We gave them a gift. We gave them a gift, and it was very valuable and is very valuable today. But we should not be stampeded into believing that somehow we will not be complete as a nation unless we engage in the war-making power, that somehow this will all be for naught or a failure, because Saddam Hussein is stopped cold in the desert.

And if there are those who choose to smuggle, if there are those who choose to break the sanctions and the embargo, we should, as a world community,

deal with them, not simply because of their failure, because of their immorality, kill our young people in a warmaking capacity. We should deal with those nations and those manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, if the French cannot stop selling weapons to Saddam Hussein, then we should not buy French products. If the Germans cannot stop selling warmaking capacity to Saddam Hussein, we should not buy German products. We should understand there is another way to address this problem, and it is not just through the barrel of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, that cannot be the message to the world, and that cannot be the role of this Congress. We must think through what we have already done and the gift we have given at no small price to our constituents, to our neighbors, to our taxpayers, to our families, at no small price. Be proud during this debate of what has taken place and understand the perils of what is yet to come, and the responsibility, and keep in mind the following at the end of the debate:

Has a compelling reason been given to us which makes us believe that we should take 430,000 Americans, put them in harm's way, and risk their lives, and risk their future, and risk our economy, and risk our debt? That is the question.

But it must be compelling, not the reasons we have been given over the last 5 months that have dribbled out of the White House, and each one has fallen flat with the American people. They must be compelling because the lives of those young people are compelling. Each one of them is an American flower in bloom. Each one of them had a job. They have a family, they have relationships, they have a love. They have an occupation, they have a future and a career, and the one thing they said to all of us is they want to come home to that future, to that career, to that family, to their children, to the love, to their dreams.

They will do it if we ask them. We had damned well better be careful about how we ask them and know the reasons that we ask them because, when we look into their faces, they are not just a soldier. They are not just a nurse. They are not just a tank commander. They are not just a jet pilot. They are not just a maintenance person. They are children, they are mothers and fathers. They are our brothers and our sisters. They are our sons and our daughters.

Mr. Speaker, very often this country has struck up the bands, and the louder the bands play and the more flags we display, usually the less principle-based war we have.

There will be great ceremony at Dover Air Force Base to try to honor each and every one of them as a hero. They will only be heroes if we are clear

and compelling in the reason we send them forth.

If it is not for the highest purpose, no amount of Army bands, no amount of American flags, no amount of politicians' speeches can make them heroes.

They are willing to serve. They ask the same from us, to serve, to serve them and the rest of our constituents in this debate and in our votes.

NEGOTIATIONS OR LOSS OF LIFE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I guess I am going to speak 5 or 10 minutes, and I am going to yield to my colleagues who are here, and I am told we will be doing the rule at 4 o'clock, and then we will come back to this.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to believe that I am in my 17th year in the House of Representatives, but it is nonetheless true, and, as I reflect back on that period of time, I cannot remember a more important issue that I have had to deal with than the one that is currently before us. It is the most important issue that I have dealt with, and my guess is it is probably true with most of my colleagues, that this responsibility of war and peace dwarfs all of the others.

Mr. Speaker, I got into politics; my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is a great hero of mine; waging a lonely fight against the war in Vietnam. I got involved in local politics and then ran for Congress because I felt that our involvement in the war in Vietnam was wrong, that it was a mistake, but that the only way to change policy was to do so peacefully and democratically, and I chose a political career, and I was fortunate enough to be in a position, along with many others in 1975, to bring down the final curtain on that sorry chapter of American history which we call our involvement in Vietnam.

I believe, as many of my colleagues do, that the history of the world is strewn with the lost opportunities for people to try and settle their disputes without the resort to violence, and it seems to me that that is one of the central issues that we address today, this idea that the new world order, and we have heard that discussed and probably will hear more as time goes on, is about the prospect of sitting down and negotiating our differences without the catastrophic loss of life.

The first thing that we will discuss is something that may seem arcane to the American people, and that is this issue of congressional prerogatives. When those overweight and older, middle-aged men 202 summers ago got together in Philadelphia, cramped in a crowded room in Philadelphia during

the summer, they decided that one of the most important things that they wanted to invest in the people's branch of government was the decision to send people to war. Their memory was of George III who had involved the force of the then-British empire in a war on American soil and in wars that were to come in Europe.

□ 1540

They remembered the activities of the czars, they wanted to have a check on that power, and they put the sole responsibility to declare war in the hands of the Congress of the United States. Interestingly, under the Articles of Confederation the responsibility of the Commander in Chief flowed back into the Congress, and they found that to be cumbersome, so they wanted to have a Commander in Chief solely for the purpose of command decisions and not for the purpose, as some have argued, to make policy willy-nilly. And we have sometimes—certainly we have in the last 50 years—lost sight of the historic view of the Commander in Chief, which is more of a functionary role than a policymaking one.

So the first order of business which is important for the Congress to assert is this natural authority. I hope we do that and do it vigorously.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he goes on to the next point?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes a very important point, and I think again in the spirit of being educative, article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution asserts that the clear authority with all power to declare war is vested in the Congress, that the Congress shall have the right to declare war. On many occasions the President of the United States has asserted his authority as Commander in Chief, saying, "I don't need to come to Congress. This is something I can do as Commander in Chief."

But any student of the Constitution reads that in article II, section 2 of the Constitution we define the duties of the President in his or her role as Commander in Chief. I find it interesting and fascinating that when one looks at the Federalist Papers, which framed the discussion and which are the historical documents of the discussion and which are the underpinnings of our Constitution, Federalist Paper No. 69, in defining the President's role as Commander in Chief, says that in that capacity the President has less power than the King of England and less power than the Governor of New York. And at the time that the Constitution was being debated, the King of England could take troops to war on his word; the Governor of New York could take the militia to war.

The Constitution is very clear, and the Federalist Paper that underpins it is very clear, that the President in his role as chief executive officer, as the gentleman aptly pointed out, can only conduct the war, but only the Congress can establish the policy and make the decision as to whether we shall or shall not go to war.

As I said earlier, in the previous special order, that was in this gentleman's humble opinion the brilliance of the Framers of the Constitution which said that no one person should have the right to take us to war, that that has to be a difficult decision, a cumbersome decision, and that is appropriate and we need to demand that prerogative and the American people need to support us in that reality. Otherwise, what is all the battle for, if it is not to maintain the integrity of our society based on the rule of law and the constitutional form of government?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes an excellent point. Also we will recall that the Republic that the Founders were concerned about was a fragile one 200 years ago. They were threatened by Indians and by outside forces. The idea that five or six militiamen could get together with a weapon posed a real and present danger to communities. So they wanted to keep the responsibility in the hands of the people. It seems to me that that would be axiomatic except for the fact that our former colleague, who is now the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Cheney, does not seem to have learned that lesson. He has a more imperial view of the Presidency and has been quoted on several occasions as having said that he feels that the President already has the power, if he chooses, to go to war in order to deal with this real danger that Saddam Hussein poses.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, another former Member of the House, the President of the United States, George Bush, said I think as recently as yesterday that should we decide in this body on Saturday not to grant him authority to go to war, he feels no compunction, that he can go to war anyway. So it is not only Secretary Cheney who has not read the Constitution lately.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes an excellent point, and hopefully the Congress will speak to that issue directly on Saturday.

The issue we have at hand has gone through many permutations. Let me just say that I know there will be many on the other side who feel deeply that the use of force is the appropriate way to reduce potential American casualties, that in the long-term interests of

the United States the use of force is the appropriate way to deal with a despot like Saddam Hussein. I respect that view. It would be my hope that during the course of the debate we do not try to characterize this in partisan terms but just in the terms of people who look at history differently and come to the conclusion about the way to achieve ends differently.

There will be substantial numbers of Democrats who will be supporting the President, and I hope there will be a substantial number of Republicans who will be supporting the Democratic proposal to let the sanctions work.

We have discussed the question of sanctions ad nauseum here, but I think it bears a little rehashing. Time is on our side. The United States of America is winning. This rush to judgment suggests one of desperation, a desperate desire to deal suddenly with events that are getting out of our control. We are in control of events.

It is the world versus Saddam Hussein. The only people who are on Saddam Hussein's side are some people in Jordan and other Arabs in the Middle East who are not particularly well organized nor, for that matter, effective. So we have the luxury of time, and that is one of the central disputes that we see played out today.

The President of the United States says, "Well, look, you've got all these people in Kuwait who are suffering under the Iraqi boot."

There is no question that they are suffering, and our hearts go out to them. There were 700,000 Kuwaitis on August 2 in Iraq. Thankfully, the vast majority of them, 550,000, have left Iraq, but that still leaves 150,000 under the jackboot of this world class criminal, and the sooner they are liberated, the better.

The other question that is raised all the time in support of this quick action is this idea of the coalition not being held together. I think in the course of discussion we have heard that the coalition shows no signs of fraying. The European allies are embarrassed by their paltry role in this operation, the Germans, the French, and the Swiss for providing the Iraqis over the years with the weapons of war that now face Americans, and the Germans and French for supplying the technology for them to build nuclear weapons. My guess is that they are not a problem. They are not going to suddenly decide to do business with Saddam Hussein as long as he occupies Kuwait.

As for the Syrians and the Egyptians, they have done very well in this coalition. The Egyptians have been the beneficiaries of \$20 billion in economic aid from ourselves, from the Saudis, from the Germans, and from the French. This has been good business for them. They are unlikely to decide to turn their backs on the alliance. President Mubarak was emphatic the other

day when our group met with him, by saying that this is a matter of principle, that it is outrageous that someone like Saddam Hussein has occupied Kuwait, and that they cannot allow it to stand. So I do not think he is going anywhere.

As for the Syrians, if that weak link in our chain is a problem, let us just put it in perspective. Hafez al-Assad is a half-step below on the big list of who is good in the world. This is the butcher of Hama, who is responsible directly for the death of 35,000 of his own citizens. To call him an ally-terrorist is probably the only way to characterize this man appropriately. The Syrians have indicated they are not going to invade Kuwait, that they are not going to invade Iraq, and that their purpose in this coalition is to sit idly by and hold our coats while we go in and defend the Saudis. So I do not worry about whether the Syrians are going anywhere, and I do not think any of us should.

As for the Saudis, where do we expect them to go. As my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has characterized them, this is a group of people who have chosen to fly airplanes as opposed to fighting on the ground. They need us desperately, and they are not going anywhere.

□ 1550

So I think it is fair to say that the coalition is strong and likely to be supported for some time to come. We lose nothing by our patience here in waiting for the sanctions to work.

I see the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. I know she has a prior meeting. I would be happy to yield to her at this time.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank the gentleman for putting this debate in historical perspective in terms of the power to declare war, as well as bringing us up to date on what is going on there, coming off his trip just a few hours ago.

In the beginning of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] he mentioned the new world order. That seems to be part of this debate, what is the new world order.

The Secretary of State yesterday and the President talked about a defining moment in history, that this crisis could present us with a defining moment in history.

Indeed, it has. Unfortunately, I do not like the definition that it is taking from the standpoint of the administration, and indeed also from the standpoint of the Solarz resolution which will come before this body tomorrow. It is plain and simple a declaration of war, and I do not think we want to go down that path.

When we talked about this defining moment of history, I recall a recent North Atlantic Assembly's meeting in

London a couple of months ago, the political arm of NATO meeting there, where we were all celebrating the fact that the cold war was over, the Berlin wall was down, and that we could now look forward to a true peace, a peace built on détente, diplomacy, and dialog, and not a peace built on deterrence alone.

We celebrated recently. Here we are at the first opportunity, with the first major conflict to come before us, and already we are reverting to our former types, our former selves, where we are resorting to militarization in order to solve a conflict.

If the sanctions are not working, and I believe that they are working to a certain extent, why aren't they? Are we not clever enough to make them work? Considering the alternative, obviously, they are preferable to dying, as has been pointed out by many of our colleagues.

So the choice we have is to choose between the sanctions and going to war. Clearly my constituents, who gathered 6,000 strong at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral on Sunday evening of this week in an ecumenical service, 6,000 men, women, and children, speaking out against the use of force and the use of violence, prefer that we go down the path of peace and that we in this defining moment say in a civilized way, as we go forward, that Saddam Hussein was barbaric in his behavior; that what he did placed him outside the circle of civilized human behavior, that we will isolate him politically, diplomatically, and economically, but we will not be as barbaric as he is, but we will be smart and clever and we will isolate him.

We think that is the preferable course. But to those who choose a declaration of war, I have two practical questions. One is, we have been told one of the reasons for having this war was that it was to ensure the stability of the region.

What if we go to war? What if we win the war? Do our colleagues who support this resolution guarantee that the region will be stabilized if we win in that region?

I propose that instead we will launch an era of violence which will beget more violence, and we will be doing a grave disservice to future generations by not keeping the peace now and acting in a civilized way, instead of resorting to acting in the manner of Saddam Hussein.

Another question I have for them is another practical question, and that is, do you think the American people sent us here to send us to war, a war that would be paid for by money we borrow from our allies who are economic competitors, to protect the oil they use? Is that a reason for us to go to war? Is that a way for us to indebt a future generation?

So I maintain it is a bad proposition all around for the American people, and I would hope that in the defining moment we have before us, instead of choosing war, instead of as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] pointed out our economy being affected very negatively, instead that we choose peace, we choose sanctions, for all the idealistic reasons that we all share in terms of peace being better than war, and nonviolence being better than violence, but also for all the practical reasons about what do we get for it, and who pays for it.

Mr. DOWNEY. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has made an excellent point. I think one of the other aspects of this that we should never lose sight of are the varying goals of this policy. Initially it was to defend Saudi Arabia. Then it became to return the status quo in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

American forces keeping the world safe for Saudi feudalism and Kuwaiti feudalism is not my idea of how we want to spend American lives. American soldiers, who are currently in the desert, ready to die, to protect Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, were all given a handbook that describes the do's and don'ts in Saudi society. It was inappropriate for women to drive. Indeed, the world that we will return to, if everything goes as planned, is a world that should be changed to begin with.

Every place else on planet Earth, democracy is breaking out, or has already broken out, except in the Middle East. Yet we are prepared to say it is okay, women, nobody votes in Saudi Arabia, and women do not drive. The Sabah family, the Amir who we will restore to the throne when this is all said and done, has absolutely no interest whatsoever in democracy.

I suspect the President needs to understand that if American forces have to fight, if that is what it comes to, do not expect our good friends, the Saudis, or our good friends, the Kuwaitis, to live as you used to live, ignoring the will of thousands of people in your own society who would prefer a more peaceful, a more opportunistic government than the one you have given them.

So even under the best of circumstances we return to some very, very strange places, if everything works according to plan, and war never works according to plan. War is not neat. It is messy. It never goes as you expect.

I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. I would like to associate myself with the comments of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on several counts. One, what it would mean to win that war.

I think we need to consider what will this region be like if in fact the war takes place. If the war takes place in a

way which we are told it will, mainly a massive, overwhelming strike of American forces by land, air, and sea, involving possibly hundreds of thousands of casualties and total destruction of the Iraqi infrastructure, including its military infrastructure, then what happens? Do we then become the long-term landlord of the Middle East? Do we then become the guarantor of the standard of living of the new society in Iraq? Are we going to occupy Iraq for 20 years, for 45 years, the way we did with Germany, or even 1 year or 5 years?

What happens to our position in not only Iraq, but in other Arab countries, when we are the country which bombed women and children and noncombatants to their deaths by the scores of thousands? What will other Arabs think around that part of the world?

Will it really be safer for Western interests, will it really be safer for Israeli interests, one of our allies in the region? Will it be safer for the somewhat shaky regimes that are our friends, Egypt and Morocco, which we do work with closely? Those regimes are not immune from street demonstrations that could easily take place if in fact we won the war.

Stop and think for a minute, what does winning mean and what comes next? We tend to focus very much on the short-term military solutions, thinking once the war is over, everything will be fine, and it will not if the war in fact takes place at all.

Another point I would like to make, if I could have the gentleman's time, and I appreciate the time, would be the question of sanctions.

The heart of the Hamilton-Gephardt proposal is keep the sanctions working, apply the sanctions, even ratchet them up if necessary, and keep diplomatic efforts going.

Those of us that support that I think have the burden of proof to argue, to rebut the proposition that the sanctions are not working, and that diplomacy will not work.

How do we know that diplomacy will not work and sanctions are not working?

Had we taken that approach with the Soviet Union 40 years ago that we are being asked to take with Saddam Hussein, we would have had nuclear war. Can anybody in this Chamber tell me Saddam Hussein is worse than Stalin? Stalin was a tyrant of the first order.

Mr. DOWNEY. With a big army.

□ 1600

Mr. MOODY. With a huge army, different, but in its own way terribly powerful, he murdered 20 million of his own people in different societies within the enormous space called the Soviet Union, very much the way Saddam Hussein has treated his neighbors. And we felt it would have been totally irresponsible to force a military confronta-

tion with Stalin. We decided instead to go on the same path, containment, put a circle around them, if you will, draw a line in the sand, in this case allowing East Germany at the edge of Czechoslovakia and the outer edge of the other satellites to keep him from moving an inch. We had the Berlin airlift to impose that kind of policy.

We have now seen that containment and other policies short of war in fact have paid huge dividends and avoided the entire conflagration that would have enveloped Europe, and would have reduced Europe to rubble, and to radioactive rubble, and probably caused literally millions of deaths had we not adopted the wiser policy of containment.

It is not as though we liked Stalin. He was terrible, as terrible as Saddam Hussein is in Kuwait, but it does not necessarily prove the argument. We did not like Stalin or agree with him. He was as bad as anything we have seen recently, and yet it was in our interest to pursue a non-war policy, and we see how that is paying off in terms of free nations. Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, et cetera, are now free, and this was the wise policy, and it was not a weak or a wimpy or a nonfirm policy.

Finally, let me say in terms of diplomacy, no one can say that a 6-hour meeting in Geneva is the full extent to which we should give diplomacy its chance. It should be the beginning of the talks, not the ending of the talks.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree with the gentleman.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and then I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him for taking this special order. He has spoken out most eloquently. I wonder if from his experience I might ask for a couple of observations about two very important concerns in a Democratic society. I have thought, given all of our experience in Vietnam with that war, that even the Weinberger-Reagan-Bush administration had promulgated as basic doctrine that no offensive war could be taken without broad consensus and in essence authority of the American people. Does the gentleman feel, and I know I do not, that there is consensus now to launch an offensive war coming from his end of the country?

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the gentleman for asking me the question. The communications that I have received in my office suggest that there is strong opposition to the use of force. My guess is that I am probably hearing more from those people who are connected these days with the peace movement than from the average citizen, but I think at best we are looking at a 50 percent or 60 percent support for the use of force,

which I think will dwindle to a fraction of that number once the consequences of war are seen.

So no, we are not going ahead with any sort of strong consensus for the use of force.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. My mail has been running about 10 to 1 against offensive war, and even the polls that say the American people would authorize it say that 53 percent say that with 100 casualties their support goes to 44 percent, and at 10,000 casualties it would go to 25 percent. But I think it is also very interesting when we consider that the administration really is not comfortable with the Congress being active on this issue. It appears to me that they are not comfortable at all with the idea of the American people being informed as to future consequences.

In essence, in the last 3 or 4 days, as many Members know, the administration appears to have put a total lid on press activities in the gulf. In essence, there is only 38 people to be allowed and two teams, and they purport a plan to censor all dispatches. Anything that Dan Rather or the New York Times is going to be able to use is going to have to go through a board. Could I get the gentleman's reaction to that?

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree. I think as the great war correspondent of the Crimean War found out, the first casualty of war is truth, and I do not think that is any different now than it has been for the last 130 years.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I would just take 2 minutes to compliment the gentleman in the well. As I do that, I would like to say that those of us who are opposed to the requested Presidential authorization to declare war do not lack patriotism.

I would like to advise the gentleman in the well and my colleagues that at age 17 when this country was engaged in the greatest conflict of this country, I joined the U.S. Marine Corps, and within 5 years after my discharge, my unit, my reserve unit was called up to serve in a police action. So I want my constituents and I want all of the Members to know that those of us who stand in opposition to the resolution giving the President carte blanche power to declare war in the Middle East do not lack in patriotism.

We are not afraid of war, but my friends, we are afraid of casualties. I would like to say that the Presidential resolution requested is a declaration of war. I know that many Members will get on the floor and argue in favor of it and state that it is really not, we are going on with the negotiations, we are saying this, and it is a copout. It is passing the buck to the White House.

The White House has already made it clear what the White House wants to do, and I would hope that the White House does not stand in the place of those rulers that Plato once referred to in saying that a ruler is often setting some stage for a war to go in motion so that he can prove to his own people that they need a leader. I hope our President does not adopt that policy, and would continue with the sanctions firmly.

We have backed our President on the sanctions. We have backed the military presence in Saudi Arabia, but not to the size of the offensive capacity that we now have.

We say, Mr. President, let the sanctions work. Save American lives until it is clear that those nations who will benefit most from this are willing to pay for it with their lives and their dollars.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 27, Rept. No. 102-1), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 27

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may recognize the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees, for a period of general debate of twelve hours, equally divided and controlled, on the subject of the situation in the Middle East. It shall be in order for the majority leader, or his designee, after consultation with the minority leader, to move to extend the period of debate and said motion shall not be debatable.

SEC. 2. After the conclusion of general debate, it shall be in order to consider in the House a concurrent resolution, consisting of the text printed in section 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Bennett of Florida, Representative Durbin of Illinois, or their designee. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. After disposition of the concurrent resolution provided for in section 2 of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House a concurrent resolution, consisting of the text printed in section 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Hamilton of Indiana, Representative Gephardt of Missouri, or their designee. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. After disposition of the concurrent resolution provided for in section 3 of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House a joint resolution, consisting of the text printed in section 3 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Michel of Illinois, or his designee. The joint resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit, if offered by Representative Michel, or his designee.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 27 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-EXANDER). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 27?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 27.

□ 1610

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-EXANDER). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] wish to state a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MURPHY. It is not strictly in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, but it is.

As I understand the reading, there will be no amendments offered to any of the three resolutions? Is that correct?

Mr. MOAKLEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. Then I had proposed an amendment that would attach the cost and a proposed tax to the Solarz resolution that would not be in order.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman was not yielded to for that purpose.

Mr. MURPHY. I will wait until the gentleman explains the resolution. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for consideration in the House of three measures on the Persian Gulf.

The first is a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Congress must approve any offensive military action against Iraq, to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], or their designee.

The second is a concurrent resolution regarding the United States policy to reverse Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], or their designee.

The third, Mr. Speaker, is a joint resolution authorizing the use of U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the three resolutions is printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany the rule. Each resolution will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto.

The rule provides 12 hours of general debate on the situation in the Middle East equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leader, and after consulting with the minority leader, it will be in order for the majority leader or his designee to move to extend the period of debate, and the motion will not be debatable.

Mr. Speaker, after general debate is concluded, it will be in order to consider the Bennett-Durbin concurrent resolution, and after the Bennett-Durbin concurrent resolution is disposed of, it will then be in order to consider the Hamilton-Gephardt concurrent resolution. After the Hamilton-Gephardt concurrent resolution is disposed of, Mr. Speaker, it will then be in order to consider the Michel joint resolution.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit if offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] or his designee on the joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are having a debate on this issue, and I am glad that each of us in the Congress will have the opportunity to stand up and be counted on this very important issue.

I commend Secretary of State Baker on his diplomatic efforts to attempt to persuade Saddam Hussein to end his brutal occupation of Kuwait. I regret, however, Mr. Speaker, that this moment in time the Iraqi leadership lacks the common sense and the basic humanity to do the right thing.

However, at the appropriate time, I will vote yes on the Bennett-Durbin resolution to reclaim the constitutional authority of the Congress to authorize war. It is reasonable, and I will vote yes on the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution to urge that sanctions be extended. That is also reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of conscience, I cannot vote to endorse offensive military actions by the United States against Iraq at this time, and will vote no on the Michel resolution, for I do not feel that is reasonable.

As my colleagues know, I am no pacifist. I am no peacenik, and I come from an area south Boston—where every

street corner is named after a youngster who was killed in service for this great country. During World War II at the age of 15 I joined the U.S. Navy, and I served in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in my heart it was the right thing to do, and I believe it was the patriotic thing to do. I have never once regretted my involvement or my participation in that noble struggle. I felt that it was to defend my country and protect the truly vital interests of my country.

In the past few weeks, like many of my colleagues, I have received countless calls from concerned citizens on this issue, and I have talked with many parents whose children are over there in Saudi Arabia as well as many relatives of men and women stationed in the Arabian desert. They are trying desperately to understand whether the issue at stake is so compelling and so vital to the United States that it is worth sacrificing their son's life or their daughter's life or their husband's life. They have asked me whether everything short of sacrificing the lives of their loved ones has been done to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. They have asked me whether or not there is a way to achieve a united goal without any human casualties, and they have asked me repeatedly to do everything I can to bring their son or daughter or niece or nephew or their husband or their wife home safely.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not believe we have given sanctions enough time to work. We have not exhausted that pressure.

When the President of the United States invoked the sanctions last August, he said it would take up to a year before we would know whether they would be effective. It has only been 6 months. What is the rush?

I think it is time to be reasonable. It is not time for political posturing. It is not time to second-guess how our votes will be interpreted in some political poll 6 months from now. It is simply a time to be reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, if all other methods of diplomacy and pressure fail, if sanctions, given the time to work, prove fruitless in removing Saddam from Kuwait, at that moment we as a united Congress and as a united nation will most assuredly and swiftly remove him from Kuwait, but until I can look into the eyes of the mothers and fathers of the children and brothers and sisters of the loved ones of our men and women in uniform and say without hesitation, yes, we are at war because it is our last and our only resort, only then, Mr. Speaker, should this Congress be willing to authorize war.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to act, and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is the Chair advised as to how, since the illustrious chairman of the committee has gone to great lengths to point out the fairness in which the time has been divided, I did not hear any discussion about the allocation of time, Mr. Speaker, to those in opposition to the rule itself. He has explained how the time for the proponents and opponents, majority and minority, have divided up the time when we get to the main questions which are the three resolutions, but my inquiry is: what is the allocation of the division of time between those who are in favor of this rule, Mr. Speaker, and those in opposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is recognized for 1 hour. He traditionally yields, and in this case has yielded, one-half of that time to a minority member of that committee, in this case the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, the Chair did not answer my parliamentary inquiry. It was not whether the majority or the minority, because in this instance I believe the Chair will find that as soon as the issue is joined, the minority and the majority agree on the rule. What about those of us who are opposed to the rule and would like to be heard on it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has stated, under the rules and traditions of the House, the manner in which the allocation of time has been provided and the Chair has followed those traditional rules of the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has responded, the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts who has yielded time to the gentleman from New York, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1620

Mr. SOLOMON. I would just say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intent of the minority to yield time in opposition to the Republican Members on this side of the aisle, so that they will be heard.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am personally going to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] to speak on the rule. If the gentleman from New York wants to yield the gentleman from Texas 5 minutes, then I think we might clarify the situation that he finds himself in.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I already have time in opposition scheduled on this side, so I could not do that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and I would urge all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle to support it. This rule does justice to the magnitude of the decision which all Members of Congress are now facing.

The question of war and peace is the most important issue any Congress can be called on to decide. And I would note right here at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this rule provides for 12 hours of general debate over the next several days.

When we add in the amount of time that will be spent debating each individual resolution, we find that the House will be devoting a total of at least 15 hours' worth of debate time concerning what to do in the Persian Gulf.

I can advise the Members of Congress that not since Congress declared war on Germany in 1917, has so much time been devoted to a debate concerning the issue of war and peace; so this rule does provide an adequate amount of time to debate this momentous question.

This rule also provides for an adequate range of specific policy options to be debated, and I would at this point commend Speaker FOLEY and the Democratic side of the aisle, the leadership of both parties, for treating this issue fairly on the floor of the House.

I am confident that the specific resolution I support, House Joint Resolution 62, will pass decisively. And so there is nothing in this rule that can somehow thwart or prevent the House from working its will. I urge the Members to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, turning now to the three resolutions that will be considered under the terms of the rule, I would like to reiterate my strong support for House Joint Resolution 62, the Solarz-Michel bipartisan mandate in support of the President of the United States of America.

I returned from the gulf this morning, Mr. Speaker, at 6:30 a.m., and I am now more convinced than ever that this bipartisan resolution best addresses the urgency of this hour. I have met with our military men and women in the gulf. I can tell the Members that you can be so proud of each and every one of them.

They really do represent a cross-section of this great country of ours. Their morale is the highest. Their preparation has been thorough, and

their readiness is at the highest possible peak.

Secretary of Defense Cheney told the Republican Conference early today that America has never before had fighting forces of the high caliber that we have today in the gulf, and I agree wholeheartedly.

I am convinced after having met with President Mubarak of Egypt over the weekend, his Defense Minister and his Foreign Minister, and after having met with key American diplomats and military commanders throughout the entire gulf region that the Solarz-Michel resolution is the only option before us that can come to grips with the realities of this terribly, terribly important situation.

I have great respect for the gentlemen who have offered the other two resolutions. I believe those gentlemen are sincere and that they are making a principled stand for what they believe in. But, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I also believe that the practical effects of their resolutions, if enacted, will be to convey an impression that America is unsure of itself, that American resolve is weakening, and that is all Saddam Hussein needs to hear. To convey such an impression, particularly at this hour, is to invite disaster for those young men and women serving in the gulf right now. It is to invite the very eventuality that those gentlemen wish so devoutly to avoid.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, after the disgraceful display of arrogance and impudence that was put on by the Iraqi Foreign Minister yesterday in Geneva, we must do nothing less than pass the Solarz-Michel resolution, and we have to do it decisively to send the message.

The Iraqi regime evidently does not take seriously the question of war and peace. It is time for us, you and I on this floor, to make one more try in the name of the American people to impress upon the Iraqi regime that America emphatically does take seriously the question of war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, passing the Solarz-Michel bipartisan resolution is the only means available to us to send out that message one more time. The Solarz-Michel resolution was crafted in very close consultation between the administration and a distinguished array of Members with extensive foreign policy experience. The list of cosponsors includes distinguished Members from both parties and all points of the political spectrum. This is a truly bipartisan resolution which is reflective of the best traditions in this House.

Our good friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. STEVE SOLARZ, the principal sponsor of this resolution, has said many times that America is always most effective abroad when we are united at home.

The Solarz-Michel bipartisan resolution is the best vehicle behind which

Congress and the American people we represent can unite. This is the resolution which is most consistent with the national interest and the unequivocal stand of the world community, as expressed in 12 resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, 26 Members traveled to the gulf, to Saudi Arabia, this past week and talked to hundreds and hundreds of American young men and women. Those young men and women in uniform asked the 26-member delegation of liberals and conservatives and moderates of both political parties to please stand behind them. That is what we are here for today, because if we really want peace in that region, the only way to get it is through the threat of force; that is what we will be doing if we pass the Solarz-Michel bipartisan resolution here today. I urge support for that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I must reluctantly oppose the rule which is on the floor for adoption at this time, and I would like briefly to tell the Members of the House why.

When we were in the Rules Committee, there was another resolution which was not reported out. That was a resolution that did not equivocate, did not put conditions subsequent. It was a straight up declaration of war.

The strongest message I would say to my good friend on the Republican side, the strongest message we can possibly send to Saddam Hussein is not to say the Solarz language, we may declare war if these conditions are met. The strongest message we can send is a declaration of war now.

Why do then we say that we want to declare war, and deny an opportunity for the Members to even vote on a declaration of war?

House Joint Resolution 63 was laid out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] before the committee. The committee in its wisdom did not report that resolution. I am not here to complain because my name is on it. It does not matter whose name is on it. As we both know, when this matter goes in history, it is not a question of names. It is a question of where we stood.

I believe that the President of the United States and our military people, if they are going to be put to war, they ought to know clearly whether Congress stands, with no place to hide. There is still a tiny twig to hide behind in the Solarz resolution, because as you know from having read it, I am sure being the learned scholars that you are, it says that we will declare war if the President determines that two subsequent conditions are met. So that leaves room for a Member who wants it both ways.

I agree with the President and I agree with Secretary Baker when they say that in this matter, we ought not to be able to have it both ways. The people of this country ought to be entitled to know clearly today, tomorrow, and Saturday, not obfuscated by language and legalese, but straight up when the votes are counted.

Are we ready to declare war on Saddam Hussein that day or for our troops to be put to battle Monday or not?

We will not have a straight-up vote on that because of this rule, and that is the reason I am complaining. I know that I am going to get run over on this. I may get one vote which is mine, and that may be all of it, but I want the RECORD to reflect and history to reflect that when we vote on these three resolutions, whether it is the Durbin resolution, which really just reincorporates the Constitution. The Constitution does not need our help. It does not need underlining or exclamation points by us. It means what it says. It says that the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

Then we move on to the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, and respectfully, I would suggest that those say to stay the course. They do not pretend to be a declaration of war; but the Solarz-Michel resolution pretends to be that which it is not.

You cannot take a pig and put an evening gown on it and stop it from being a pig. This is not a declaration of war, so those Members who want to vote for it and then hide behind it and say, "Well, I vote for it, but the President didn't meet the conditions subsequent" may be able to say that.

□ 1630

So those Members who want to vote against it and then hide behind it and say, "By God, I would have been for it had the conditions changed," would be able to do that. In this hall that is known as cover. There is one day here where there ought not be any political cover. If you are for war, then, by God, let us get a straight-up declaration that says, "Resolved in the U.S. Congress, we are at war with the nation of Iraq."

Now, what stronger hand could we give the President for those who want to give him a strong hand? What stronger hand could we give him than not putting all these little niceties on there about what may happen later? By God, if we are for war, let us get up and say we are for it. The President asks for it, the President wants it, the Constitution demands that we do that which we are elected to do. It is not a popular decision, it is not a political decision, it is not a partisan decision. But if we are going to send men and women to kill and die in Iraq, on foreign soil, they ought to know where their elected Members of Congress stand.

Unless we adopt a resolution that is straight up, straightforward, we have not done anything but whistle in the wind. I ask the Members to vote against adoption of this rule. I know it is going to be adopted anyway. But you have the opportunity to know the difference because I am telling you right here it is going to be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, this truly is an example of Congress handling the most fundamental question in the worst possible way. This is clearly a constitutional question that we are about to debate. Congress does have a responsibility to speak to something as fundamental as whether our soldiers will be asked to risk their lives in pursuit of a policy.

And how do we handle so basic an issue? We set up a process by which the House of Representatives and ultimately the Congress will speak with mixed voices. We will speak with mixed messages, mixed messages to our troops, to our allies, and most fundamentally to our adversaries. This is an issue that should be voted up or down without seeking political cover.

Politics should be the last consideration in what we are doing here. And yet this resolution is more of a political document than a way of addressing our fundamental constitutional responsibilities.

It allows everyone to seek some political cover in the course of debate and in the course of the votes. Choosing war or peace should be a yes or no answer, not a series of "maybes." This rule allows Congress to say, "Maybe yes," "Maybe no," but does not ask us to take any responsibility for our actions.

That is unacceptable. The vote on this rule should be "no."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the Nation must make a stark and a very grave choice, whether to rush to war or whether to stand firm in the gulf and give sanctions and international pressure a chance to work. We support the goals of the President's policy. And Saddam Hussein must know that this country is united against his aggression and determined that he must leave Kuwait.

We support the use of troops to enforce the economic sanctions and international pressure.

But January 15 is an arbitrary and unrealistic deadline.

The sanctions are working. They have achieved, as many of my colleagues have suggested, many of the

goals we set out: protect Saudi Arabia, keep the oil flowing, get out hostages released. The present policy is working.

Today in the paper the senior Senator from Georgia, SAM NUNN, had a piece in which he talked about the sanctions and the embargo. Iraq, he says, "is unique in its vulnerability to economic embargo. The international blockade has succeeded in cutting off almost 100 percent of Iraq's exports, mostly oil, stopped over 90 percent of all imports, and reduced its gross national product by 50 percent. Over time, experts estimate that Iraq's GNP would be down 70 percent."

Diplomatic initiatives are still alive. We had a terrible setback yesterday, there is no question about that. But the Secretary General is active, the French and Algerians are active.

January 15 is too soon to declare this policy a failure and to rush to war. There are those who believe a war in the gulf will be a short war, that casualties will be few, the consequences contained.

There is not such thing as a short war, an easy war. In fact, no war is ever really over. Ask the families and friends of the veterans of our last war. Since I have been in public life, since 1972, a good part of every one of my days in public life is devoted to dealing with the problems and the aftermath of that last war, and the lives of the people who fought that war have forever been changed.

We have over 400,000 men and women on the front line. We are proud of them, and we stand behind them 100 percent.

But we believe that the best way to support them is to make sure, to make sure that we do not ask them to make the ultimate sacrifice unless it is absolutely necessary.

The war in the gulf will not be a short war for us at home either. Our economy is already in recession, our budget deficit is looming larger and larger, the burden of war will cost us billions. Already it is costing us \$2 billion a month.

Mr. Speaker, the President has built an impressive international coalition behind this policy. But for America to send our own sons and our own daughters out to die alone in the desert with little frontline support from our allies is wrong. And for our American people to still be paying the overwhelming cost of this military venture, while Japan and Germany have not met their commitments, is unacceptable.

War is the least predictable and the most painful of our options in the gulf.

It must be our very last resort. Support Hamilton-Gephardt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. YATES]. The Chair would remind Members of the precedents and the rules of the House under which Members are re-

quested not to refer to the content of speeches of Members of another body.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the leadership on both sides of the aisle support the resolution that is before us. But this is a week for voting our conscience. I have to rise in opposition to this particular resolution.

After all, why are we here? We are here because the Congress of the United States wants to contribute to the world's response and decisions of how we respond to Saddam Hussein.

Yet I must ask each and every one of you when this debate is completed, what signal will we have sent? We in the House of Representatives, as 400,000 Americans are going to lay down their lives in the Persian Gulf, find ourselves running for political cover under three different resolutions.

It is like we have gone to the restaurant, we have picked up the menu, and we want a smorgasbord of options.

Ladies and gentleman, this is a question of war or peace, this is not a question of which entree would you like to order, which do you find most pleasing. Think of it: We will pass one, perhaps two, perhaps three different resolutions under this rule which are contradictory. Then we will await the Senate, which probably will not pass any resolution at all. I ask you what message 3 days before January 15 does that send to Saddam Hussein?

□ 1640

Does that commit this Congress to support the U.N. resolution? Of course not. It sends a confusing signal. If we want to be a part of the world community, if we want to support what the United Nations, the Arab League, and the allies and enemies from the past the world over have united behind in condemnation of the invasion of Kuwait, then we ought to have one resolution. It ought to be whether we support the use of force in all means to implement the U.N. resolution, and we ought to vote it up or down, put our names, put our votes, on the line, and have the courage to say yes or no, not run for political cover.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to a growing chorus of grave concern about the specter of a bloody, early war against Iraq.

No one disputes the fact that the brutal August 2 invasion of Kuwait was immoral, unjust, and reprehensible.

No one disputes the President's initial decision to send United States Armed Forces to Saudi Arabia, to deter further Iraqi aggression.

No one questions the President's diplomatic maneuvering in weaving to-

gether a broad coalition to counter Saddam Hussein's ruthless aggression.

No one doubts the fundamental goals of forcing the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait; the restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity; the maintenance of international peace and security in the Persian Gulf; and the protection of American citizens abroad.

What we do dispute and what we do question is the means of achieving these fundamental goals.

From CIA Director William Webster to former JCS Chairman Admiral Crowe, every piece of information Congress received supports the notion that economic sanctions are working and will continue to work. Iraqi oil exports—virtually their sole source of foreign revenue—have been shut down. Over 90 percent of imports have been cut off. The result—in a few short months—has been an estimated 50 percent reduction in the Iraqi GNP. Over time, experts predict that figure will reach 70 percent. As SAM NUNN commented, Iraq is becoming "an economic basket case."

In my judgment, we are well on our way to bringing Saddam Hussein to his knees. Sanctions over time will be utterly devastating.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gephardt-Hamilton alternative to the President's resolution authorizing force. 400,000 American lives are too precious to jeopardize, when staying the course on economic sanctions appears so promising.

If we opt to give sanctions a chance to work and Saddam Hussein attempts to attack Saudi Arabia or assault American troops, then the resolution provides the President with the appropriate authorization to immediately utilize American military force.

Prudence and patience will save lives and achieve U.S. goals. I urge adoption of the rule and the Gephardt-Hamilton alternative to a blanket authorization of force at this point in time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the newest member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, what an incredible way to get started on the Committee on Rules.

I would, first of all, like to extend my thanks to the distinguished chairman of the committee and our great new ranking member for welcoming me to the committee, but what a way to welcome a new member to the Committee on Rules. I also want to thank Republican Chairman Emeritus, JIMMY QUILLEN.

It has been amazing and very tragic in one way, that we have to deal with an issue like this, but in another light, Mr. Speaker, it is extraordinarily gratifying to see that, as Senator Vandenberg said, as my friend, the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] reminded me, in 1948, partisanship does end at the water's edge, and I think that this rule itself does demonstrate just that. Republicans and Democrats alike are supporting the process whereby we are allowing three proposals to come to the House floor which can be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I know which one I am going to support. I am going to support the package that has been put together in a bipartisan compromise with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] offering it here, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and our leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I believe that is the most balanced approach, and I think that is the one that should send that message to Saddam Hussein that the 28 nations in this coalition will not stand by and allow him to roll over this tiny nation of Kuwait and continue the kind of tragic human rights violations which we have seen perpetrated over the past several months.

I am convinced that this rule is the way for us to go, Mr. Speaker, and I have to say that, while there is going to be some very healthy debate which will take place during the next 12 hours and when the resolutions come following the general debate, I am proud to be a new member of this committee.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] as a new member of the committee also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

Once in a while, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of serving in this House can become an awesome responsibility. Once in a while, we are asked to cast a vote that is not only historical, but one that we know we will live with and remember for the rest of our lives. Soon, I'm afraid, we're going to have to cast one of those votes.

It's a pivotal vote. It's a vote that is going to affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of people; soldiers and citizens, innocent victims, mothers and fathers, wives and widows.

It's not a political vote. No matter how this vote comes out today, neither party will win or lose. Each Member has to search his or her conscience and decide what is in their heart. This isn't a vote for or against the President, or for or against the Democratic leadership.

For myself, I intend to vote for continuing economic sanctions. And I'll vote to retain the constitutional prerogative of this House, and of the Congress, to declare war when we—and the people we represent—see no alternative. And as a Member of this House,

I can't vote to authorize war in this case.

I'm concerned that America should have to fight this fight alone. I know our allies are behind us, but why aren't they beside us?

I'm confused about our objective in the gulf. Is it to protect Saudi Arabia? Is it to expel Saddam Hussein from Kuwait? Is it to rid the world of an awful menace in the person of Saddam Hussein? If we go to war, what is it that we are asking American soldiers to fight and die for? If we don't know what we're fighting for, how will we know when the war is over?

Finally, I'm sad that we seem to have the will to wage war, and yet we don't have the heart for the poor and hungry. Nobody blinks while we spend \$30 billion for Desert Shield before a single shot is fired. Why can't we show the same resolve for the poor in our own country? Or for children who are starving around the world?

In the end, Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe there is no alternative to war in this case. I cannot believe that sanctions and diplomatic pressure will have no more effect. The sanctions have worked and can continue to work. War should be the last thing that we decide to do, certainly not one of the first. In a little while on the floor of this House we will be asked to choose. For myself I believe that, while we still have a choice, we must choose peace.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Staten Island, NY [Ms. MOLINARI].

□ 1650

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I rise also in support of Resolution 672. I do so after coming back from a very informative congressional delegation trip through the Middle East.

One thing we are not going to hear a lot of my colleagues say is that no matter where we were in Israel, in Egypt, or in Saudi Arabia, there was magnificent support for this President, there was magnificent endorsement for the movements he has made thus far to forestall the aggressions of Saddam Hussein, and there was universal acceptance of the fact that if President George Bush did not move as decisively and as efficiently as he did within 48 hours of the initial invasion of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia would have been next.

We have heard a lot of talk today, and we are going to hear it for the next 3 days. We hear this: Why only America? Where are our allies?

This is not the first time in our history that America has not shirked from our responsibility to be the world leader and keeper of the international peace. It would be a wonderful world if we had our allies side-by-side in the same strength and the same commitment, but that has never been the case,

and that should not deter us from protecting ourselves and our futures.

What are our options? I do not want to stand here and have anyone say that if I support this resolution and my colleagues support this resolution allowing this President to make the decision to authorize force, we do not care about the poor and the hungry. That is shameful. What we do care about is giving some options to the international community. What I do care about is giving Saddam Hussein the financial ability to accelerate his nuclear capabilities. I care about his ability to continue to use chemical weapons. That is unconscionable. He used chemical weapons on his own people. Is he not going to use them on his Arab neighbors and some day on us?

I care enough about the poor in this country to say that there should not be one man, woman, or child who has to live their lives in fear of the terrorist attacks that have been invoked in the past.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). The time of the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] has expired.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, as for Saddam Hussein, let me ask, have economic sanctions worked? Has he suffered at all? No. If anything, he has dug in even more in the last 6 months, and we have not seen any change.

What is the change going to be? We know there is linkage. If we allow additional time for sanctions, his troops will get stronger. Ours are as strong as they are going to be. His troops can go home and work the fields and be with their families. Ours stay in the deserts of Saudi Arabia.

We may go in and lose some of our allies. My colleagues have already criticized that. But again I ask, what are our options? This is a difficult question for all of us, and none of us will shirk our responsibilities. It is the most difficult vote that any of us will be called on to ever cast, and we are all aware of the implications of it.

I wonder if some of my colleagues who oppose this resolution are aware of the critical implications of forestalling possible military action and not giving the benefit of the doubt to George Bush and the other world leaders who recommend tightening adherence to U.N. Resolution 678.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the last time the United Nations authorized war, it was Korea. There were 20 nations involved, and here is what happened: 95 percent of the casualties were

Americans, 90 percent of the soldiers were Americans, and the American taxpayers paid for about 95 percent of this war that was later called a police action in Korea.

Now, let us look at the record. Over 80 percent, 430,000 troops in the gulf, are Americans. There are 130,000 allied troops, they say, but over 70,000 of those troops have said they will not attack Iraq. What I am asking here today is this: Did we forgive Egypt's \$7 billion debt so they can bury American dead in the desert?

Let there be no mistake, Congress has a powerful constitutional responsibility today. The American people voted for George Bush, but they did not elect King George. There is only one constitutional body, one instrumental vehicle, to send this Nation to war. It is this Congress, and let us not let anybody use any rhetoric to get around that. And I say that if George Bush attacks Iraq without an explicit declaration of war from this Congress, it should be an impeachable offense. I am not going to hold back on that.

I am going to vote for this resolution. It provides for an opportunity for debate, and let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, it has come down to that particular time. But my point is that I have an amendment I want brought up, and I have a resolution here on burden-sharing. Where is Japan, and where is Germany? While we are protecting their oil, they are buying our national parks and they are buying our landmarks. We are letting them rip us up in trade. We are financing all their problems, we are underwriting their economies, and we are wondering why we are going bankrupt.

This is more than an issue of Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein is the world's problem, and he should be challenged by the world. Everybody should be participating in stopping this man.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the rule, but I would hope before it is all over there would be some understanding of America's contribution after contribution, actually subsidizing the world while we are going bankrupt. This is another good example of it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is not the way I would have written the rule, but that is why we have a Rules Committee. That is why we have rules. I suspect there might be 400 different versions of this rule if it was wide open. We have to have some order.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that there ought not to be but one resolution. But we have three. There really is only one, and that is Solarz-Michel.

If we adopted one of the others and it passed over in the Senate and somehow became law, suppose Saddam Hussein would elect to unleash a preemptive strike; would that mean the President would have to come back to this body to get permission to respond? I do not think anybody would want that.

No, we should adopt the Solarz-Michel resolution.

We hear that we should give the sanctions more time, that we should give them a year.

Did we not read the letter this morning from Judge Webster of the CIA, who pointed out that if it went another year, in his considered opinion, with all of the intelligence that the CIA has, Saddam Hussein would not be forced out.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I say that Saddam Hussein is no fool. If you or I, God forbid, were in his shoes, would we not wait to see if the Congress is going to cut the President's legs off at his knees before we did anything?

The best way to avoid war is to adopt Solarz-Michel. Then Saddam Hussein will know there is no way out, that he is up a blind alley and it is either he must get out or Armageddon. Then we might avoid this war.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that tomorrow or Saturday, or whenever we have a chance to vote, we will vote in overwhelming numbers for Solarz-Michel.

□ 1700

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, already this shapes as a divisive debate, and it should not be. I think the important factor is that this debate is taking place at all. In fact I want to commend Speaker FOLEY and Majority Leader GEPHARDT for encouraging a bipartisan debate. At one point there was concern that the Congress would be shirking its responsibility. It is not. But as we move ahead in this debate, let me state that I believe that this is an eminently fair rule. It deals with all the options and points of view that our colleagues can express, the role of Congress, support for military force, or support for economic sanctions.

As we begin this debate let us see if we can find four areas where we can be united. First, whatever we do, we all support our men and women in Saudi Arabia. That should not be an issue. We all support everything that they are doing in that part of the world.

Second, I think it should be clear that we all support the Congress acting the way we constitutionally have to. This is an American war. There are 400,000 American troops. If we had not taken this action in the next few days, we would have been shirking our responsibilities and our duties as Members of Congress.

Constitutionally I believe the President had no grounds to exclude us or the American people from this decision.

Another thing we should not be divided on is the issue of burden sharing, regardless of how the outcome of this debate turns out. Germany and Japan, especially, our friends, are not doing their share. Japan's contribution to the Persian Gulf is less than what Sony paid for Columbia Records. Germany's contribution probably is less than the Oakland Athletics' payroll.

Yes, that is being facetious, but we should be united on that factor.

Finally, a message to Saddam Hussein. This debate is not a result of policy division in the United States, this debate is democracy in action. On these four points I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can be united.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include for the RECORD the results of a series of questions concerning the Gulf Crisis I raised with my constituents at recent town meetings in New Mexico.

Town meeting results in Santa Fe:

1. Does the UN Resolution give the President enough authority to initiate military action in the Middle East after January 15? Pro 14. Con 237.

2. Should economic sanctions be given up to a year to work? Pro 24. Con 0. Abstain 186.

3. Should economic sanctions be given a unspecified period of time to work? Pro 192. Con 3.

4. Are sanctions a waste of time? Pro 5. Con 0.

5. Can the Gulf Crisis be solved without reference to Palestine-Israeli issues, Lebanon, etc.? Pro 61.

6. Can the Gulf Crisis be solved only in conjunction with other Middle East issues (Palestine-Israel, Lebanon, etc.)? Pro 101.

7. Should Saddam Hussein be allowed to save face through some sort of compromise arrangement? Pro 159. Con 17.

8. Is the role of Congress to declare war (or does that belong to the President)? Pro 204. Con 1.

9. Absent the President calling Congress to debate a war declaration, should Congress take the initiative? Pro 200. Con 0.

10. Do you believe the US and Iraq will be at war in early January? Pro 44. Con 65. Abstain 115.

11. Should the US unconditionally withdraw its troops from the Persian Gulf? Pro 163. Con 44.

12. Should the US troops be placed under UN command as part of a peacekeeping force in the Persian Gulf? Pro 147. Con 3.

13. Would you engage in civil disobedience if the US initiates a war against Iraq? Pro 134. Con 18.

14. How should I (BR) vote on a declaration of war against Iraq? (Pro: Give the President authorization to declare war; Con: deny the President authorization to declare war.) Pro 5. Con 18.

Other town meeting polling results:

1. Does the UN resolution give the President the authorization to attack Saddam Hussein on January 16?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	14	6	12	29	11
Con	55	58	91	140	79

2. Do you believe that economic sanctions should be given time to work?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	61	51	55	95	68
Con	21	9	52	40	21

3. Should Congress assert its authority to declare war to prevent the President from initiating a strike?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	84	59	118	133	89
Con	1	1	8	3	4

4. Do you believe the US needs a national energy policy? Unanimous in all towns.

5. Should I (BR) vote for a declaration of war?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	(not voted)	1	9	48	19
Con	(not voted)	59	117	86	56

6. Should the US join a multinational UN peacekeeping force for dealing with Kuwait?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	44	25	73	154	63
Con	9	7	22	2	0

7. Should the US give Saddam Hussein a face saving option?

	Los Alamos	Taos	Las Vegas	Rio Rancho	Farming-ton
Pro	36	57	112	73	52
Con	35	1	9	56	26

The following questions were asked in Los Alamos:

1. Should Congress call a special session to debate the crisis? Pro 72. Con 0.

2. Should the US put a reduced number of troops (200,000) under UN command in the Gulf? Pro 29. Con 4.

3. Can the Gulf crisis be resolved without reference to other Middle East problems (i.e., Palestine-Israel, Lebanon, etc.)? Pro 51. Con 25 (i.e., linkage).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, but with the greatest of reluctance. I support it only because we are out of time and because Congress must act now, this week. The rule should allow, as many Members have said, for a clear up or down vote on the request of the President for authority to use force to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait should he not leave voluntarily. Instead, the rule allows equivocation.

We could send the wrong signals. Sometimes that is not important, but it is here, because here the wrong signals to Saddam Hussein could be fatal. He understands force, not subtlety; he understands strength, not confusion. That is why we must support only the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution.

Under the rule, however, we could vote to both grant the authority under this bipartisan resolution and to require a grant by voting for the Durbin-

Bennett resolution, and this would be confusing.

As I say, if we had more time we could prevent that. But I support the rule, because if both of those resolutions pass, it would be clear to us, even if not clear to Saddam Hussein, that even if Congress grants such authority, it would have been accomplished by adoption of the bipartisan resolution.

It is too bad this might be confusing, but it is critical that the President have direction now, and it is critical that the Congress speak now, and this rule at least allows that.

Mr. Speaker, we should support the request of the President for a grant of authority consistent with the U.N. resolution by voting for the bipartisan resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. We should reject the Durbin-Bennett resolution and the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution. We must leave no doubt where the Congress stands, and we must leave no doubt where America stands.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-EXANDER). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY], who just returned from Saudi Arabia at 6:30 this morning.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished rules leader for yielding to me, and I joined this debate happily. This is an appropriate debate. This is a pure exercise of democracy, to have this Chamber debate the most serious question that we will probably decide in our congressional careers.

This question, of course, will not come up in Baghdad. The Iraqi Legislature will probably not have this option. That is why I stand today in favor of the resolution of the President, the U.N. resolution, because of our goal, who support this resolution, is simple: It is to stop Saddam Hussein now.

This is a debate about timing. Those of us that support the President say we stop him today. Those that do not say tomorrow or the next day is sufficient.

I must tell Members on the other side of this argument that this is not the message we got from our troops, our young men and women, when we were in Dhahran 2 days ago.

I cannot think of a better way to frame this argument than one that was made to me in the chow line at the base we were visiting. A young woman, who, by the way, was wearing her standard issue gas mask right at her hips, the way they all do, a constant reminder of what Saddam will use against our men and women, when I asked her what she wanted, she said, "I

don't want to go to war." I said, "Neither do I. That is why I am here." I said, "What about the proposition that has just been introduced, that perhaps we should roll back the deadline until February 15?"

She said, "Give Saddam another month to kick my behind? Forget it."

That is what we should do with other proposals: forget them, because they will not save lives. They will not protect our young men and women, who, by the way, should not be called kids in this debate, because they are professionals. They are professionals prepared to do a job. If you go and inspect these bases, you will see a discipline rate at near zero, no problems with morale, no problems with medical. Our pilots are ready, but they are afraid another month may cost them that edge. Do we want to commit pilots to an air assault when they are not ready?

All I can say is we will not agree for the next 3 days on who should win this debate, but we must concur on who should lose, Saddam Hussein, who will watch every minute of this debate. The one thing that all of the Arab nations agree on is their passion for CNN. If we want Saddam to watch this debate, send him the message. We are there to liberate Kuwait. We are there to stop Saddam now.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The crux of the debate will be whether the President should be authorized to use force when he judges that it is necessary to carry out our goals and those of the United Nations. Some want to force the President to wait, even if it is against the President's better judgment as to how we can accomplish our goals.

Remember this: Sanctions definitely carry enormous risks. The coalition could fall apart, leaving us alone in the desert and dividing the world.

U.S. soldiers tell us not to jeopardize their lives, Mr. Speaker, by making them sit and wait indefinitely, damaging their morale and damaging their effectiveness, and forcing them to fight an even more dug-in enemy.

I remember the marine that told me when I was out in the desert, "I cannot get my men up every day if I do not have some time period that I can rely on. What you do to me and my men is to jeopardize their lives by making us sit in this desert indefinitely without any prospect for resolving this problem."

The world has stood together and continues to send the strong message to Saddam Hussein: The changes for a peaceful resolution of this problem lie in resolve and they lie in clarity. Do not, I repeat to the House, do not undercut the message that the world is

sending, destroying any chance for a peaceful resolution of this problem.

If Saddam Hussein is unreasonable and will not listen to the world and the use of force is necessary, do not hurt our ability or the ability of the world to be able to be successful with the use of force, protecting American lives and the lives of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Michel amendment that will come and rejection of those substitutes that undercut, send confusing messages from the United States, and destroy our ability to resolve this in any kind of a peaceful way.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

□ 1710

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that this body is debating this momentous issue. For over a month I have urged the Secretary of State, the President, and the Speaker to bring this issue to the floor so the House could debate a resolution similar to the U.N. resolution. That has been done.

I rise because I have heard some of the speakers on the other side of the aisle who are opposed to a U.N.-type resolution telling us that we should wait, just wait. I agree that Saddam Hussein is a bad guy, but wait, do not act now, do not increase the military pressure now? Why should we wait? Is it because diplomatic initiatives are going to have a greater chance of success? The United Nations has passed 12 resolutions. Do we want six more? The European Community has had diplomatic initiatives. Secretary Baker has been stilled in Geneva. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has been involved.

We have had economic sanctions for over 5 months, and is there the slightest evidence in the last 5 months that these diplomatic or economic initiatives have changed Saddam Hussein's mind? No.

But if we wait, with no evidence that waiting is going to produce results, what are the consequences of waiting? What are the consequences of rejecting a U.N. resolution authorizing the President to act with the coalition after January 15? What sort of message will that send Saddam Hussein?

The message will be you have another year, you have another year to pillage and rape in Kuwait. You have another year to threaten your neighbors, and yes, we will be sending him a message that the United States has broken with the United Nations and the coalition, that the Congress and the President are divided. We will be sending him a message that he can send his troops back to the farm while we have to spend to keep our troops there.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that if we wait, if we do not pass this resolution, if we do not act now, we run the risk, we increase the risk of a war later, and we increase the risk of a much greater, bloodier conflict at the later date.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield our final 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], the newest member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and I rise in strong support of this rule which was worked out with the cooperation of not only the Speaker and the minority leader, but the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will speak precisely to those on our side of the aisle, this rule is very, very important. Sure, it allows certain options and discourages some, but on an important question of this magnitude we should not be engaged in a gag rule.

There are three options. There is one on a procedural question. There is a second one that does what the United Nations says, and that is that we will support the effort in the gulf with our allies. The third option is that we do nothing.

I believe that this will allow us to clarify our position. This debate over the next 48 hours will allow us to telegraph to the world where we stand so that there will be no misunderstanding in this vital effort to achieve peace in our time. It allows us to expeditiously respond to the request of the President and allows us to stand shoulder to shoulder with our allies, 27 nations that have sent troops.

We have heard it already suggested that the United States should sit back and do nothing, that we should wait, that we should let the others carry the burden, such as Turkey with \$800 million a month being lost, with the 30,000 British troops, with our allies around the globe, not only the Arab League but also the Communist bloc nations, with the Soviet Union, every civilized nation on the planet saying that this type of aggression cannot stand.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Amnesty Report that was presented to us points out that there has been bayoneting of pregnant women, there have been random murders, total destruction of every decent facility in Kuwait. Now the question is, Do we stand idly by?

We chose to do that in the 1930's. We stood idly by and did nothing in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, we did nothing in France, nothing in Bulgaria, nothing in the Netherlands, nothing in Poland. It was not until well into 1941, December, 5 years after the aggression had taken place in Europe that the United States chose to act.

Ladies and gentlemen, the world has learned from those mistakes. We now stand united with our allies around the

globe that at the very first act of aggression and murder the world will put a stop to it. We can do no less. If Mikhail Gorbachev can do it, if the Arab League can do it, certainly the Congress of the United States can do it, and that option is being presented to us over the next 48 hours.

The question will be about the cost, and indeed it is costly. The burden of world leadership is great, and \$3 out of every \$4 is paid by our allies, but our \$1 is significant.

We should support this rule. We should communicate to the President our support so that we can give peace a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). All time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has expired.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, to conclude debate on our side, I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me and for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I do support the rule for it allows us to frame this debate and consider these grave constitutional issues as well as the question of war and peace. We have some clear choices and this rule is clean.

The crux of this debate has been called the question of whether we go now or go later. I was interested to hear the previous speaker saying if we do not go now we run the risk of war. But what is going now other than war? And war will bear a terrible burden not only on a number of innocent civilians in that part of the world, but on our own troops as well.

Conservative estimates are that if we turn to ground fighting, which we must in the end because aerial bombardment alone will not do it, the losses will be from 1,500 to 3,000 casualties a day, a day on Americans.

So the question of going now or later is an important question, and each option has its own cost and its own probabilities of success.

The crucial issue in that is are the sanctions working. Some people have lightly dismissed them. The previous speaker said that they are doing nothing at all, the sanctions are not doing anything at all. They are working. By all accounts they are having a terrible toll on the economy and society of Iraq. Yes, Saddam Hussein is still eating well, but that is not the issue. The point is that the economy of that country has been dealt a devastating blow by the sanctions.

We in America are worried about a perhaps 1-percent or 2-percent drop in our GNP over the next year. They have received at once a 50-percent cut in GNP in that country. Imagine the chaos which would ensue if anything approaching that would happen here.

This is not a weak response. This is a very strong response.

The next crucial question is will the alliance hold. We were told this morning that the alliance will not hold for sanctions, that it will begin to deteriorate. If it will not hold for sanctions, then how important is it to these allies that we are supposedly protecting if they will not even go with us on sanctions? Why would we be shedding American blood to save them?

Furthermore, if the alliance does not hold on sanctions, then certainly it will not hold for war. In fact, several of our allies have already announced that if we go to outright war that they will not hold the alliance with us.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gephardt-Hamilton amendment which is the second of the three options. It allows us to substitute diplomacy and diplomatic efforts and political pressure for outright war.

For those who say that diplomacy has run out, I say no, that one meeting of 6 hours, as grueling as that may have been, that that is not the end of the road and should not be allowed to be. It has broken the ice, and talks should now continue by any and all means necessary.

The real issue before us is not how bad Saddam Hussein is. We know that he is terrible, and Stalin was terrible, Idi Amin was terrible, and others. The question is not whether we will win. We will win. The question is not can aggression be rewarded. It is not being rewarded. It is not now, it will not be rewarded. But the question is how we best go about achieving our goal in a way that is the least costly to American lives and to innocent lives everywhere.

I urge support of the Gephardt-Hamilton substitute.

□ 1720

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). All time has expired.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the House will now begin general debate on the subject of the situation in the Middle East.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] will be recognized for 6 hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 6 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for this evening, I yield control of the time on our side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will control the time on the majority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in the 14 years that I have served here, I do not believe we have had a more serious or a more solemn or a more important debate and discussion of an issue. It is not often that we discuss the questions of war and peace in committing our country and our people to military action.

Later in the debate, I hope to speak about the merits of the proposal that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and I have offered through the Committee on Rules and will be considered by the entire House.

But at the outset of this debate, there were some things that I wanted to say to the Members about the debate, because I think it is a debate that is so very important and will be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, first, I wanted to say that in this debate and in this vote we are not Republicans. We are not Democrats. We are Americans. The vote, in my view, is a matter of conscience. There is no, and will be no, group of Democrats constituted as Democrats whipping the vote, trying to get people to vote on behalf of the Democratic Party. We expect and want all of the Members to vote their conscience; what in their heart and their mind is the right thing for the country to do.

This decision transcends politics and political posturing. Politics cannot be involved in a decision of life and death, in a decision that is so important to the future of our country.

Each of us, every one of us, wants the President to succeed. Each one of us wants the country to succeed, and each one of us wants to support the men and women who are serving on behalf of America in the Persian Gulf tonight.

The second thing I would like to say is that this debate will be passionate and heartfelt. It is about the strategy that our country should follow in the days ahead, and the feelings will run, and should run, deep. But I hope in the passion of the debate that all of us will assume what is obvious and right, and that is the motive of everyone in this House is right. I assume and believe that the President wants what is best and right for our country and our people, and I assume and believe that every Member on this floor, every Member in this House simply wants what is right and best for our country.

We agree on the goals that are to be achieved. We agree on what is being attempted in the Persian Gulf.

Where we have some disagreement is on the exact strategy and the timing of

this strategy to achieve those goals, but I assume and I hope everyone assumes that every other Member's motive is right and pure and for the national interest.

Finally, I want to say tonight that if Saddam Hussein listens to this debate, and we are told that he does pick up some American television, I hope that he will take no comfort from this debate. We are united in our purpose in this country and in this Congress.

Some have expressed concern that when there is a division of opinion, even on strategy, that that lends help to the other side. I hope that we would never mistake disagreement on means as disunity within our country.

I cannot remember a time when our country has been as unified around a set of goals, as focused on what we are trying to do, in as much agreement and unity as I think we are tonight.

The genius of our democracy and our country is that after the debate and the disagreement and the discussion is finished, the representatives of the people vote, and after we vote, we become one.

There is no disagreement tonight in Iraq about the policy of the Government of Iraq. There is no debate in the Parliament of Iraq about what Iraq should do or what it should not do. There is no disagreement or discussion allowed in front of Saddam Hussein. It has never occurred, and when it has, there have been harsh consequences for those who disagreed.

Not so here. We disagree because we represent the people of our country, and obviously there will be disagreement on important questions, but then we vote, and after we vote we become one.

Alexander Hamilton said, "Here, sir, the people govern. Here they act by their immediate representatives." And even if the view that I support and hold passionately is not agreed to, I support the unity of our country when the vote is taken.

Would that it were that Iraq had such a democracy? I submit to the Members tonight, ladies and gentlemen, that if Iraq had such a democracy we would not be here tonight. We would not have 400,000 of our people in the Persian Gulf, and we would not be in the position that we are in.

I thank God for this country and for this democracy. I thank God for the right of our people to have their views heard and discussed and debated in this place, and when we finish, we will be unified behind a common goal.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, we are going to have a system of rotating managing on this side. For the time being, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], will manage the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the time on the minority side will be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

There was no objection.

□ 1730

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I first pay my compliments to the distinguished majority leader for the tenor of his remarks. He is the majority leader in this body. I happen to be the minority leader. Later on, we will be supporting differing resolutions because we have a difference of views on this. However, I would applaud and certainly subscribe to the expression of the distinguished majority leader, that after all the debate is over and it has been concluded, we will abide by the will of the majority when all is said and done. That is our system. Even if it carries by one vote, that is the way we operate in this country, to give everybody an opportunity to have their say.

I am happy and proud that the resolution which I support, the bipartisan resolution, is one that is in the form of a joint resolution that would obviously go to the other body, require the signature of the President, and then we would all be speaking with one voice.

Mr. Speaker, as this debate opens, the United States of America has over 370,000 troops in the gulf area. They are face to face with troops of a ruthless dictator. Our troops will be aware of every word we say in this debate. So will the dictator.

The question we have to ask ourselves is this: When this debate is finished, will the House be seen as a tower of strength or as a tower of Babel? I speak from the prejudice of being a combat veteran of World War II and those of our generation know from bloody experience that unchecked aggression against a small nation is a prelude to international disaster. Saddam Hussein today has more planes and tanks, and frankly, men under arms, than Hitler had at the time when Prime Minister Chamberlain came back from Munich with that miserable piece of paper. I will never forget that replay of that movie in my life. I have an obligation, I guess, coming from that generation, to transmit those thoughts I had at the time, to the younger generation who did not experience what we did. Saddam Hussein not only invaded Kuwait, he occupied, terrorized and murdered civilians, systematically looted, and turned a peaceful nation into a wasteland of horror.

He seeks control over one of the world's most vital resources, and he ultimately seeks to make himself the unchallenged anti-Western dictator of the Mideast. Either we stop him now and stop him permanently, or we will not stop him at all.

Now, the President has clearly presented the reasons why we cannot stand by idly in his words: "We're in the gulf because the world must not and cannot reward aggression. And we're there because our vital interests are at stake."

Now, we are told by some that we must show patience. We must wait for sanctions to work. We must wait 6 months or a year before forces are used. We must stay the course. My question is this: Stay what course? A course that allows Saddam to know he is free from surprise attack, free from sudden offensive movements for 6 months, a year, or more? I guess to Members who advocate that course, I would say to those members, what would they do about the attitude of the American people in that interval period of time? How long will the American people put up with that? How long would that delicate coalition last that we have pulled together, currently? How long will they stay that kind of course? Not to mention our troops abroad an extended period of time, in that kind of an environment, when, frankly, over an extended period of time we would have to be thinking seriously of rotation and all that that implies.

Therefore, I think during the course of this debate, those who advocate that course are going to have to answer some of those questions. Patience and delay can be virtues when they help bring military or diplomatic goals, but when patience and delay become foreign policy goals in themselves, as I fear they have with some of our colleagues, they are no longer virtues.

I understand principled pacifism which holds that nothing justifies the taking of a human life. I grew up in that tradition, and I respect it, because World War II caused me to come to grips with the very same question in my mind and in my conscience. However, what I cannot understand is a policy that asks Members to believe that after 6 months or 1 year, that the alliance will still hold, our sophisticated equipment will be in better shape after frying in the desert, our troops will have higher morale and better readiness. Such a policy is not just an uncertain trumpet to the men and women in our armed services, it is a veritable brass choir of indecision, doubt, and confusion. Patience at any price is not a policy. It is a cop-out.

We will be told by those who want delay that they do not want to risk American lives in combat. Let no one in this Chamber or anyone else lecture me on the horrors of war. I see my friend, the gentleman from Florida and several others, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], similarly, who know of all the horrors of war. We have seen it at its worst. The memory will remain within our heart and minds for the rest of our lives. It is

Saddam Hussein who will be responsible for those who make the supreme sacrifice, and Saddam Hussein himself. If Saddam Hussein convinces his neighbors he can survive this crisis, he will become something more than a former hit man with delusions of grandeur. He will be someone who has triumphed over a worldwide coalition. If Members seriously think that that wouldn't be a sinister event in the history of the 20th century, I think those Members are fooling themselves.

In our democracy, we elect our President to speak and act for Members, primarily in foreign affairs, that our message might be clear and unmistakable. We in the Congress have our role to play, and we cannot shirk our responsibility. This is the time, it seems to me, for Members to rally around the Chief and give him the support he deserves for our well-crafted bipartisan resolution.

May I, in conclusion, thank my colleagues, my cosponsors of this joint bipartisan resolution, for the excellent work that has been done on this side of the aisle, and on our side of the aisle by those who are listed as sponsors of our bipartisan resolution. I hope the debate will go forward on a very high plane, that the distinguished majority leader said this is the time to really come to grips with probably one of the most important issues we will have, certainly in this Congress, and for some Members, during the tenure of our Congress here. We hope it is conducted on a high plane, and that ultimately, then, come to a resolution of it sometime Saturday, and will abide by the will of the majority. Hopefully that will be in strong support of the action the President has taken thus far, and feels he may have to take in the future.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my enormous admiration for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], who just finished speaking. He asks us, Will this House be a tower of strength, and move ahead with military hostilities, or will we be a Tower of Babel and chatter among ourselves in impotence and futility?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will be a tower of wisdom, a tower of good judgment, a tower of prudence. I hope we will be a group of men and women who can define our goal.

Now, what is our goal? My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] said today that there is no guarantee that sanctions, which I support and believe in, will induce Saddam Hussein to pull out of Kuwait. He may very well be right. It may be a short time. It may be a longer period of time. It may be never. However, Saddam Hussein and his whole society may be destroyed by sanctions before he will pull out of Kuwait. The question re-

mains, What is our major goal? Forcing Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait to make possible restoring the Sabah family as the rulers of Kuwait should be far from our top priority.

To date, the President has responded to Saddam's naked aggression in admirable fashion. I have placed my full support behind the President's and the United Nation's economic sanctions policy and I see no reason to change course now.

□ 1740

Our top priority should be removing Saddam Hussein as a 900-pound canary towering over the Middle East as a ruthless, cruel, vindictive, utterly amoral presence, terrorizing and intimidating his neighbors and threatening the security and peace of the entire region. I think our goal should be to remove Saddam Hussein's poisonous presence from the map of the Middle East.

Our top priority should not be restoring the Sabah family to its throne in Kuwait city. During the decade of the eighties, the Sabah family was one of our most bitter, hostile opposition voices in the United Nations. They opposed us over the decade of the eighties just about to the extent that the Soviets opposed us at the height of the cold war. They opposed us between 88 and 91 percent of all the U.N. votes, just about the same as the Soviets at the height of the cold war; so restoring the Sabah family to their sovereign monarchical rule to me is not a top priority. Removing Saddam Hussein as a threat to the region is, and for that purpose sanctions will work.

Why will they work? Well, in the last half century the United States has been engaged in approximately 115 different cases of sanctions. In about a third of them, sanctions worked quite well. In those 35 or 40 cases where we applied sanctions successfully, the average impact on the target countries where they worked was about 2½ percent, a 2½-percent reduction in their gross national product. It does not sound like much, but it was enough to get their attention. It was enough to change their course of conduct and their behavior where it counted to us in the international arena.

Last month, the Joint Economic Committee had a day of hearings and heard from a number of leading experts. The witnesses agreed that sanctions would work, that this was a classic case where sanctions would work, and why? It is perfectly obvious why. They only have one cash crop, and that is oil. It does not grow in the fields. You cannot cut it down and put it on the backs of donkeys and send 100 donkeys over the mountain with their contraband. It does not work that way. A portion of it goes out by pipeline to Turkey and a portion of it goes out by pipeline to Saudi Arabia. Both of them

are cooperating totally with the U.N. coalition. There is a total oil cutoff from that country. Some 98 percent of its foreign earnings have been obliterated. They are not making a nickel from all that oil under the ground and they do not have anything else to merchandise.

About 90 percent of their imports have been stopped, their imports of chemicals that they urgently need for their war machine, their imports of spare parts, replacement parts. There is some smuggling coming across the border from Syria, from Jordan, from Turkey, and from Iran; but nothing to speak of. The sanctions are going to work and they are predicted to have an impact, not of a 2½-percent reduction of the Iraqi economy, but of a 50-percent reduction.

In today's Washington Post, Senator SAM NUNN of Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, writes that he thinks they will have a 70-percent impact, that sanctions will reduce the Iraqi gross national product by 70 percent over time. That is a sanction program that is working effectively, inexorably, tightening the noose that will bring Saddam Hussein to his knees, that will destroy the Iraqi economy and reduce the Iraqi military machine gradually to the point of strangulation, and remove him as a threat to peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we have said it before and we must say it again, we have arrived at this point in the history of our country because the President of the United States needs the Congress of the United States to give him a vote of confidence as he proceeds to solve one of the most monumental problems ever facing the civilized world. That vote of confidence has already been earned because the President has received the confidence of the international community, of the United Nations through the resolutions that they have passed, through the victims and potential victims in the Persian Gulf region of Saddam Hussein, through our Arab friends and neighbors, through other aspects of the world rhetoric in this crisis in the Persian Gulf, and most importantly, he has received expression after expression of confidence from the Armed Forces of the United States, our own young people, our fellow Americans who are poised in the deserts of Saudi Arabia; he has received their confidence. They are willing to do their duty and they are there because they are performing their duty, and the American people in different ways have expressed their confidence in the President of the United States.

We can do no less. And what does he ask us to do? He asks us, through the parliamentary devices that are available to us, to give him additional power, not power to declare war, not power to wreak vengeance on anyone, but the power of the American people, the spirit of the American people to bring about peace, to bring about a solution to this vexing and horrible problem that exists in the Persian Gulf.

We are then asked to give him the wherewithal, the ability, the power, as it were, to bring about a needed solution to a world problem, and only he, through the exercise of this power, is able to do it.

A vote of confidence is not one where we can shrink back and say it is going to be a limited one, that we must wait for this to occur or that to occur. The power to do good, to bring about peace must be a power that he can wield at the discretion and with the sanctions of the United Nations and the good will of the American people and the vote of the Congress, buttressing every manner and means of his actions from here to the final solution of this problem.

We must support the President of the United States because he is our leader. He is the Commander in Chief and the one to whom the world now looks for a solution to the Persian Gulf crisis.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today, many Americans are aghast as the United States stands on the brink of a war that could result in more American casualties and unforeseen disaster than ever occurred in the Vietnam war.

The administration's plans for a new world order could result in the deaths and wounding of thousands of young Americans on far desert sands and an accelerating plunge into a recessionary morass economically.

In southwestern Indiana the overwhelming sentiment I hear in coffee shops and at the supermarket, in town forums, and on courthouse squares is a feeling of incredulity not only that we are so close to war, but that the President appears more than willing to take us there. And mothers of young servicemen stationed in the gulf have plaintively asked, "Is anybody listening? Can't Congress do something?"

Although I haven't polled my district on the issue, my mail is running about 10 to 1—in conservative Middle America—against an offensive invasion. Phone calls today appear to be running about even. But all indications are that the consensus and support for war deemed necessary in the wake of Vietnam are truly nonexistent. I had thought that this was a prerequisite under the Reagan-Weinburger-Bush-Cheney doctrine.

My constituency, like Americans all over, strongly backs the President on his initial commitment to stop Saddam Hussein dead in his tracks and to defend Saudi Arabia. This has been done successfully, even masterfully.

The President is winning. Why mess it up with an unnecessary war with unpredictable consequences?

My constituents ask, as did Admiral Crowe, "What's the rush?"

As Admiral Crowe has said:

The embargo is biting heavily ***. It is dead wrong to say that Baghdad is not being hurt; it is being damaged severely. That goes for the Iraqi military as well, which depends on outside support. *** Most experts believe that it will work with time. Estimates range in the neighborhood of 12 to 18 months. In other words, the issue is not whether an embargo will work, but whether we have the patience to let it take effect.

The Director of the CIA has similarly indicated that the embargo is working.

Although Saddam Hussein has not announced a pullout and conceivably may not ever do so, the simple fact is that with any allied will whatsoever, Iraq under Hussein has no hope of technological or industrial progress, as long as Iraq remains entrenched in Kuwait.

It would be a grievous mistake for the administration to abandon the sanctions and launch an offensive war. The two armies deployed in the Persian Gulf Desert are the most lethal and technologically advanced forces ever gathered. Combat will be brutal, massive, and unpredictable.

Some casualty estimates from expert military sources have been in excess of 50,000 over months of combat. Some estimates have been less—say in the area of 1,000 casualties. This latter figure is most unlikely. We won't be embarked on a Grenada holiday. But even so, why suffer 1,000 casualties if we do not have to?

In addition, it is unclear whether there is sufficient logistic and other support for U.S. forces should combat occur. It is disheartening to read that our medical personnel in the gulf are having problems getting the equipment they will need to best serve our men and women.

Serious questions need to be answered as to whether the allies will support, cooperate with, and participate in offensive actions. Much has been made of the willingness of other nations to provide forces for the gulf action, but there is virtually no discussion of what they would do should combat occur. I ask, if Saudi Arabia and other Arab forces aren't really there to fight, why should our youth suffer the brunt? To be this close to an offensive launch against Iraq without a commitment of total allied Arab support is ludicrous.

I specifically asked the administration about what support we will have from our allies. Secretary Cheney replied:

Each nation that has deployed forces to the region has worked out an arrangement if you will, those who have troops in Saudi Arabia, with the Saudis. I am sure there probably are varying levels of commitment. Their commitment now is to have forces there. Some of them are fully committed to defending Saudi Arabia should there be conflict, and some of them, I would guess, would go further and join in an effort to liberate Kuwait. So it varies. Each one of those governments will have to make in a sense a political decision as to whether or not they would participate in the kind of action that would be required were we to use force to implement the U.N. resolutions.

As the new world order develops, we may be bogged down in the Mideast with 400,000 of our best young people in peril. Japan, which gets 85 percent of its oil from the Mideast, is sending only some noncombatant personnel. Germany, which imports 94 percent of its oil and is highly dependent on the international oil market, if not directly on gulf oil, can get off with some minesweepers and miscellaneous equipment. If fighting breaks out, U.S. troops will bear the brunt of the fighting and "allied casualties" will mean U.S. dead. Meanwhile, Gorbachev is bringing military repression to the Baltic regions.

And at home the people hope for the administrations' greater commitment to jobs, the economy, health care, homelessness, drugs, the deficit and the environment. Everyone knows these crucial matters will be on the back burner if the Middle East is burning.

And so, we approach several of the most profoundly important votes of the Congress in our history. As is the case with many Presidents of both political parties, our President is loathe to share power with the coequal Congress in matters of foreign policy.

But the Constitution puts us here with a job to do. And the American people—of all points of view on this conflict—overwhelmingly demand that the Congress vote on a declaration of war before launching any offensive hostilities.

Such power ultimately is not up to one man, but the collective wisdom of the people through their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, if the President launched an offensive war in the Middle East, it would be the most tragic mistake of his career. He should show his leadership by helping bring peace to this strife-torn region.

Vote "yes" for the Hamilton-Gephardt amendment. It is a vote for life and the vote of a lifetime.

□ 1750

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a tragedy of historical proportion if we do not support our President in his leadership in this crisis that we face.

A tragedy if we do not support the resolutions of the United Nations, and it would be a tragedy akin to the tragedy of Munich, a tragedy akin to our rejection of the League of Nations, which led to sowing the seeds for the Second World War.

Indeed, if we here reject our President's call for support, we will bear the burden, we will be responsible for destroying the opportunity for a new world order.

We must be very careful, Mr. Speaker, that we face harsh reality rather than wishful thinking. Goodness knows we all want to believe that sanctions would work by themselves. We yearn to believe that sanctions could get us out of this crisis. But we must face the hard facts.

In the Intelligence Committee we have sat for hours, indeed days, wrestling with this issue. And while much of the information is classified, at least this much can be said: First of all we have excellent intelligence on the warmaking capabilities of Saddam Hussein. Ladies and gentlemen, sad to say, there is absolutely no evidence, none whatsoever, that he is beginning even the most preliminary preparations to withdraw. Further, there is no evidence that sanctions will work.

Now, we have heard the assertions that sanctions will work. In fact, we have even heard references to Judge Webster, Director of the CIA, suggesting that sanctions would work.

I am sure nobody wants to misstate Judge Webster, nobody wants to not quote him accurately. So perhaps those statements were previously made inadvertently.

We have a letter dated today from Judge Webster in which he says emphatically that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and there was no evidence when or even if he could be forced out of Kuwait.

So much for Judge Webster saying that sanctions would work.

The sad, hard evidence is that there is no evidence that sanctions can work, and indeed we must face that reality. In fact, all of the evidence in the intelligence community worldwide suggests that it would take not months but years at best for sanctions to work, 2, 3, 4, 5 years.

Surely the coalition is not going to stand together for that period of time. Yes, there will be people hurt if sanctions continue, but it will be the people of Iraq. All the evidence shows that the military has the capacity and the capability to remain strong for several years.

The military in Iraq has a massive stockpile of spare parts and those spare parts are not being used, sitting there

in the desert. Yes, sad to say, there is leakage in the embargo. And in fact, critical selective parts are the ones that can be most easily smuggled into Iraq, and it is also sad to say that there are hundreds of companies and individuals which are already trying to smuggle parts into Iraq.

So the sad conclusion that we must come to, the harsh reality, rather than the wishful thinking, is that unless Saddam withdraws voluntarily within the next few days, only force will remove him. We must face that as a responsible Congress and recognize that we must support the President.

Finally, the issue of burden sharing: 75 percent of all the incremental costs incurred in Desert Shield during 1990 have been borne by our allies and not by us, and 40 percent of the troops in the Persian Gulf are our allies' troops, not only our troops.

So there is a substantial burden sharing.

Now I quickly acknowledge there are some who are not doing their fair share.

Japan is a disgrace. There must be a reckoning. But that reckoning should come after we deal with this international crisis.

Let us support the President and do our duty.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the gentleman from Indiana and Congressman GEPHARDT's resolution. I think it fits exactly what we know about leadership. What we have learned over and over and over again about leadership is, first, you commit the Nation and then you commit the troops.

□ 1800

Tonight we are talking about are we going to go even further and commit the troops way beyond where the Nation is committed. I think the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution fits exactly where we are in our commitments. No. 1, it protects U.S. forces. It allows use of force, if our U.S. forces overseas are attacked. That is very important. No. 2, it keeps our commitment to defend Saudi Arabia and use force if Saudi Arabia is attacked. The American people support that, and that makes sense. Then it also allows for use of force if the sanctions are violated in any manner, and that is our commitment, and that makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, what it does not do is say that we are going to put everything out there and go for it on the 15th. I do not know why we cut off our options and decided that on January 15 we had to give the President what is the equivalent of a declaration of war. That makes no sense to me. That cuts off

our options and really allows Saddam Hussein to dictate to us, a very powerful nation, what we will or will not do after the 15th.

Therefore, I think we in this legislative body should not give up that very important constitutional, democratic prerogative we have to exercise our judgment.

I have heard Member after Member come down and say we must support the President. I grew up in a family that had hanging over its fireplace the following applique, and it said, "We owe allegiance to no king." That is what this democratic principle is all about. This is not a country where we recognize that one person has all the wisdom. Every one of us has feet of clay, and the best judgment we can have is a lot of collective judgment in this wonderful Republic.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that the U.S. Congress stay the commitments that have been made that the American people support, which we do with Hamilton-Gephardt, but do not give up our right to stay in the loop. We gave it up much too long, but we are now getting in the loop. We must stay in that loop, and we must make sure before we commit the lives of our young people and many lives of innocent civilians in Saudi Arabia and all sorts of other countries in the Persian Gulf region, we really have exhausted every other remedy.

Now I just heard the prior speaker in the well talking about Judge Webster. I was on the Committee on Armed Services when Judge Webster testified about the sanctions, and Judge Webster said the sanctions are working vis-a-vis shutting off things coming into Iraq. The important thing about this embargo is that what Iraq must do is get its oil out to get cash in to be able to buy anything.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will let me finish, I think what the gentleman was saying is he was quoting the letter from Judge Webster saying, "If they are successful, it does not necessarily say it's going to change Saddam Hussein's mind." No, no one is saying it is going to change his mind, but let me tell you what it is going to change. It is going to change his economic conditions, it is going to weaken the supplies to his military, it is going to weaken his reinforcements. Every day that we keep those sanctions on, Saddam Hussein gets weaker and weaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to the gentleman is we are a superpower. There is no one who questions whether or not we can take care of Iraq today or much later than today. That is not the issue. Everybody knows that. The real issue is every day these sanctions are in effect; No. 1, he gets weaker, so he is easier to take care of; but, No. 2,

the potential of his own people finally catching on, or others in the region finally catching on and being able to do this without bloodshed, I think becomes a higher and higher probability, and therefore I think it is very important that we allow the sanctions to go on for a longer time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Nation is committed. The Nation is committed, I think, to supporting President Bush and the Solarz-Michel resolution. In fact, I kind of regret that we have three different resolutions to vote on because I am fearful that a lot of the people who are going to vote for the President's resolution are also going to vote for the other two resolutions, which in my mind would be a copout. I think we ought to stand up, vote for or against the President's resolution and be recognized that way.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Persian Gulf, as many of the Members here were, and I am sure that all of the people back home would be very proud of the men and women who are serving us there. One of the things that we were asked when we were there by the men and women of the various branches of the service is how do the people back home feel and do they support us while we are over here, and this debate during the next 3 days I think is very, very important. It is a legitimate issue to talk about sanctions, and those people who believe we ought to wait for sanctions to work I think are going to find that, no matter how long we wait, there is no way that sanctions in and of themselves will chase Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. I think he would see the men, the women, the children, the babies in his country starve to death before he would leave because of sanctions. Saddam Hussein has plundered Kuwait, and when we find out the atrocities that he has committed against the people of Kuwait, I am sure that we are going to be extremely upset.

As has been said before and will be said again, Saddam Hussein does have chemical weapons, he has got biological weapons, and probably in the not-too-distant future he will have a nuclear capability. The President of the United States does not want a war. I do not want a war. None of us wants a war. But the question is how long do we wait. If we wait for sanctions to work for a long period of time, it is just going to give Saddam Hussein another opportunity to heap misery on the people who live in Kuwait.

This is a well-thought-out resolution. Frankly what it says is that the President must certify to the Congress and the American people that this country has tried every single diplomatic way to peaceably get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, and if at that time he has

determined that nothing has worked, then this resolution authorizes him to proceed with military action.

This is one of those issues, and I know we all look at polls. We all see how many people have written us supporting what the President wants to do, how many people want to wait for sanctions to work. But to me this is an issue, the most important issue obviously that I will ever vote on when I am in Congress, and probably the rest of us, too. This is an issue that we cannot look at the polls. We have to do what we think is right regardless of what our constituents think. Yes, we need to listen to them. They have good ideas. But this is an issue that we have to support the President.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the right way to go, and I would urge my colleagues that are going to support this resolution that the President wants us not to vote for the other two resolutions. I do not intend to. I am going to stand up and be counted. Support the President. He is doing the right thing, and I think it is a cop-out if we vote for the other two resolutions.

So, I urge my colleagues, and I do believe that this will pass, I think it will pass by a reasonable margin, and I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to compliment my colleagues. I thought I would come here today and see much more rancor, and we have not had it, and I compliment my colleagues because first and foremost I would like to say that reasonable men can differ, and certainly even the President, who may have a policy, and those of us who may oppose that policy, can differ, and can do it reasonably.

We have here in my estimation two issues. I hope we can resolve at least one, the constitutional issue of whether or not the Congress does have to participate by performing its constitutionally required function of exercising the power to declare war.

□ 1810

Of the three resolutions we are considering, the President's resolution, in my estimation, in effect if not in words, is clearly a declaration of war, and that is how it should be. I hope we do not stand in this well 6 months or 1 year or 2 years from now, or after what may happen, and have anyone say that is not the authority that this House was delegating to the President of the United States. Once the resolution supporting the President's position is passed, there is no question in my mind, and I hope there is not a question in the minds of my colleagues, that no future action really has to be taken by the Congress of the United

States for the President to go to war. The full decisive powers of war and peace will rest with the President.

I am satisfied in my mind that such a resolution will comply with the Constitution. I am not satisfied that the Congress should give that prerogative to the President without being an active participant in that decision, but if we wish to give him that power and give him a blank check, let us recognize that that is what we are doing when we vote on that resolution.

That takes me to the second question. Should we or should we not go into war now? Should we authorize the possibility of the President's putting us to war now? The question in my mind, and in the minds of many people I talk to, although they are patriotic and I consider myself patriotic also, although they are willing to serve and willing to die for this country and for freedom, is this: Why are we really there? Do we have a moral imperative for war?

I have to confess that at this moment I find no question that we were justified in the actions and the support this Congress gave to the President on August 2. He did the right thing. We should defend the oil of the world. We should defend our friends when they are about to be invaded, and we did that, and we did it successfully.

The action taken by the President on August 2, also supported and defended Americans who were in jeopardy in a foreign country. We protected them, and we did it successfully.

We are now at the last two parts of what the President says is a four-point program: Whether or not we regain the State of Kuwait and whether we reinstate the Emir of Kuwait and his government. I do not think this is such a morally pressing problem to the American people that they want to be the police force of the world to accomplish these goals. I can think of many places in the world that warrant intervention by American Armed Forces to protect democratic principles far more than the intervention in Kuwait.

But I, too, like so many of my friends and so many of my constituents, sometimes hear the outlandish statements that Saddam Hussein is making, to the point that I feel like putting on my uniform and going back in and voluntarily being a one-man hit squad.

Our emotions are there. We resent his arrogance. We resent his insult to the President of this country and to the world. We know we are right and he is wrong. But right and might must be exercised properly.

There is not any question in this Chamber, nor should there be any question with the American people, that we are capable of inflicting upon Iraq and Saddam Hussein a vicious attack of military might like the world has never seen. We do not even suggest that that is a possible issue. The ques-

tion is when and how, particularly when that might should be used. It is important for the President to understand that he has the luxury of time to debate this question. We have time to develop a moral imperative of why America and American men and women should fight in Kuwait. We have time to structure an international code of criminal conduct which will be used in this and future regional conflicts. I am pragmatic enough to recognize that peace in our time has not come and we should take this time to structure it.

First and foremost, we should however, take the time to wear down the Iraqi Armed Forces before we use our might, so that if our forces are committed, they are faced against the least powerful force possible. If we wait for sanctions to take effect Iraq's military will be weakened and fewer of our soldiers will die. If the one luxury we have in this Republic is time, the second luxury is the one we are taking tonight. We have the opportunity to debate. The third luxury we have is the right of deliberation.

Finally I want to say that if majority decides, to declare war, even if my vote was in the negative, I will stand with the majority decision of the Congress and the President. If we go to war, I want to assure the American people that I will support the American Army in the field. They will have been directed to fight through a constitutional process, which we are undertaking tonight.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's request that we pass a bipartisan resolution which authorizes the use of force by the United States to implement the U.N. Resolution 678.

I have arrived at this decision with a great deal of difficulty and with a tremendous amount of empathy for the young men and women in our Armed Forces who may be put in harm's way.

I say this because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] mentioned a little earlier, I have personally experienced the horrors of combat in World War II. I was honored to have received—I say received because one does not go out in the morning and try to win a Silver Star, a Bronze Star, a Purple Heart, a French Croix de Guerre, and a Belgian Fouragier.

All of us have hoped that the current crisis could be resolved without using force. We still hold out that hope. The President and Secretary Baker have worked relentlessly and tirelessly to find a peaceful solution to this problem, and they continue to do so. I am very proud of both of them. Hopefully, Saddam Hussein will soon realize that he has made a serious error in judg-

ment and withdraw his forces from Kuwait. But one way or another, it is important that the expansionist designs of Saddam Hussein be checked as of now.

The United Nations' resolution sets the date of January 15 for Iraq to withdraw its armed forces from Kuwait. If we, the Congress, waver from that date and ask for concessions from the other signatories, we would put at risk the other governments that have stood with us.

The United States cannot be the country to back off first. As the long-recognized leader of the free world, we have a responsibility to maintain the coalition because this is the first test of the new post-cold war era as to whether or not we are going to allow an unprovoked aggression to stand. If it does stand, I think it would set a dangerous precedent.

Is it right that we are defending the oil fields and the pipeline supply for oil? It may very well be. If left alone, this unscrupulous man could control 70 percent of the world's oil supply, which could have very serious consequences for the economies of all nations and for the economic well-being of America. But if Saddam Hussein were to corner the oil market in the Middle East, he would no doubt use his profits to fuel his military machine. This would put us all at risk. It would put at risk all of the governments in the region who have stood with us and asked for our help in seeing that the menace of an Iraq with nuclear or chemical weapons would not be allowed to become the dominant military force in this part of the world.

Quite clearly, Saddam Hussein must be stopped sooner rather than later. Twenty-seven nations have sent forces to the Middle East, and they have trusted the United States to be supportive. If Congress denies our Nation's Commander in Chief the backing he needs, then we are asking our American service men and women to stay indefinitely in the desert sand while Iraq strengthens its positions, both militarily and politically.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President has acted responsibly and in the best interest of our country, and I urge support of the bipartisan Solarz-Michel Resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

□ 1820

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which would authorize the use of military force to push Saddam Hussein's Iraqi force out of Kuwait if Saddam has not ended his occupation of that country by January 15.

Saddam Hussein has thumbled his nose at international law. He has spat upon it as he makes his own rules in

the volatile region of the Middle East. He has brutalized and destroyed the sovereign State of Kuwait. He has threatened to use his deadly weapons to burn his enemies. He is aggressively developing a nuclear capability to add to his formidable arsenal of chemical and biological weapons. Make no mistake about it. If we shrink from our responsibilities today, tomorrow we will face him at the end of the barrel of another gun, but next time it will be loaded with nuclear weapons.

We must recognize that Saddam Hussein does not build weapons as a means of deterrence: he builds weapons to use them. Indeed, he has already demonstrated this by using deadly chemical weapons against his own people. Thus we must recognize the seriousness of his threatening statements, because Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man.

Diplomatic overtures on our part have been met by arrogance, intransigence, and further threats to our allies in the region. Saddam will not change his dangerous ways unless he is convinced that he will suffer for his actions. In this regard the U.N. resolution authorizing the use of force has sent a clear message to Saddam that the international community is totally committed to check further Iraqi aggression and to deter future use of the deadly weapons which Saddam has in his arsenal, as well as the nuclear arms he is rushing to obtain. As a Congress we must add our voice to this international demand.

Saddam understands force. He should understand the seriousness of the U.N. resolution and the consequences he will suffer should he choose to ignore the meaning of that resolution. We can add significant weight to that message by passing this resolution.

We, on the other hand, must understand that the resolution is not a warning flag which portends an inevitable war. Indeed, it may be the vehicle which avoids the use of the very force it authorizes, as Saddam Hussein must surely realize that war with the United States can only bring him certain and devastating defeat.

In hearings conducted by the House Armed Services Committee, it became clear to me that while sanctions have had a negative impact on the morale and ability of Iraq to wage war, they alone will never be successful in bringing down Saddam. Furthermore, to have more significant impact than they have had thus far will require many months—months that our men and women in uniform will continue to live in the hostile environment of the desert—months during which the fragile alliance will begin to fray and perhaps completely unravel—months that we do not have.

As a Vietnam veteran, I have special understanding of the horrors of war. Though my service was at sea in the

Gulf of Tonkin, pilots from the carrier on which I served never returned and friends in country were casualties of that awful conflict. I do not want to see the United States go to war; and I do not want to see American lives lost as a result of such conflict if it were to occur. I submit that my fellow veterans, among them our President and military leaders, do not want to see the United States go to war either. They have been there and they, too, know the human cost of war.

But we must also know the cost of weakness in the face of aggression. History has shown again and again that failure to stand up to aggression leads to conflagration and a world consumed by war.

Thus the standoff in the desert is a true test of strength and resolve. At this critical point in time, a point at which every action we take and every statement we make may have critical consequences in terms of its impact on progress toward settlement of the gulf crisis, Congress must resolve to work toward unity of purpose, not toward divisiveness or narrow political concerns.

We must speak with one strong voice to be heard by Saddam Hussein. Failure to do so allows Saddam to profess that the United States is not united fully against him. He will surely exploit this division in his attempt to derail forces allied against him.

Congress must add its voice to that of the United Nations in reaffirming our firm commitment to the supremacy of international law.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER] who proceeded me for the eloquence of his comments.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the course of our discussion so far about supporting the President. I rise in support of the President and of the resolution that he asked us to adopt. But I would not rise to do so, nor would any Member of this body rise to do so, if we were supporting the President in a position that was not honorable, which was not just, which was not correct, and which was unworthy of our support.

None of these considerations need even to bother us as we discuss this or alternative resolutions, because this body, and the other body, in October have already commended the President for the policies he enunciated on behalf of the American people, and for his conduct of our diplomacy in the aftermath of Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait on August 2.

We have in this body and the other body commended the United Nations for the then 11 resolutions that had

been adopted by the Security Council. There is no issue, there is no dispute about American foreign policy or its objectives. We are down only to the question of what methods are to be used to implement and achieve those objectives.

There are those who say we must not authorize the use of military force and that we must allow economic sanctions to work and to give it all the time that is required for them to work.

I appreciate that latter view, but it flies in the face of the overwhelming burden of the testimony that we have heard in our hearings, that economic sanctions alone without a credible threat of force will not work and will not achieve our objectives.

Saddam Hussein has demonstrated through his foreign minister with Secretary Baker yesterday that he is not inclined to do that which we must require of him because he obviously does not believe yet there is a credible threat of force.

If this body adopts any of the resolutions before it except for the Solarz-Michel resolution, we will have sent an unequivocal message to Saddam Hussein that you do not have any threat of force against you which is credible at all. We will have said to him in one resolution, do not worry about it at all. You do not need to worry about a threat of force at all until some undetermined period when the Congress may get about another and further protracted debate, and then force a military action.

The other alternative is he has an indefinite period of time while we sit and wait to determine whether or not economic sanctions alone will work. The evidence is they will not.

It is assumed by those who say let economic sanctions have time to work that nothing is going to change while we wait and that time is irrevocably on our side.

The burden of the evidence, the intelligence that has been gathered and is available to us, suggests that time is not on our side, that time is on the side of Saddam Hussein.

We have the opportunity by overwhelming passage of the Solarz-Michel resolution to send the inalterable, unequivocal message to Saddam Hussein, that he will face military consequences unless he adheres to the U.N. resolutions. That is the message we need to send. It should be unequivocal, and it is the only message most likely to make it possible to achieve the objectives we all agree are legitimate, without the necessity of force, and if force must be used now, that it will be much lesser force than will be required if it must be used later, and I think will be irrevocably and inextricably required.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to authorizing offensive military action at this time.

There is no question in my mind that Saddam Hussein's brutal takeover and annexation of Kuwait represents an outrageous violation of international law and civilized behavior. The manner in which Hussein has ravaged Kuwait and its inhabitants, held thousands of foreign nationals as hostages or human shields, and threatened to destroy those that oppose him has brought Iraq's deplorable human rights record to an alltime low. It is very clear to me that by opposing Iraq's naked aggression, we are on the right side of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, despite my view that now is not the time to authorize offensive action, I think that President Bush deserves credit for his initial response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. His effort to organize a worldwide coalition against Iraq through the United Nations and his decisions to defend Saudi Arabia deserve praise. In addition, his orchestration of international sanctions against Iraq was an impressive display of diplomacy and statesmanship. I applaud these actions and the objectives stated for the United States in these efforts.

At the same time, I have had serious problems with some of the administration's performance. I find it deeply troubling that our allies have failed to carry their share of the Desert Shield load. Once again, it seems to be assumed that the United States will bear the greatest burden in both costs and lives. The sight of American officials traveling the globe to solicit funds from our allies for an operation that is more in their interests than ours, presents an uncomfortable picture of a post-cold-war world in which America bears the brunt of our collective security burden.

Furthermore, the United States permitted four United Nations resolutions condemning Israel, our staunchest ally. By appeasing the so-called sensitivities of some of our coalition partners, I fear that we may have sent a signal to some that may lead them to think that we have abandoned our most trusted friend in the Middle East.

In this instance, there are two critical decisions before us. The first concerns who has the power to declare war or authorize the use of offensive force. I adamantly disagree with President Bush's assertion that he does not need congressional authority to wage war against Iraq. The Constitution is very clear on this point: Congress shall have the power to declare war. In order to make this point absolutely clear to the President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Bennett-Durbin resolution.

The second, more problematic decision facing this Congress is whether we should authorize offensive military action on or after January 15. While I re-

spect those who hold the view that war can never be a viable option, that is not my position. I firmly believe that there are causes worth going to war for and there are instances in which war cannot and should not be avoided. It may well be that war will be required of us in the Persian Gulf as the only vehicle for saving the region from a greater catastrophe at a later date. But the case has not been made for a war now.

In addition, there remain serious questions of timing and strategy about which I disagree with the Bush Administration. I am by no means alone in this assessment. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr., told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that immediate military action would be contrary to sound military judgment. Another former Chairman, Gen. David C. Jones, agreed with this sentiment. Even more chilling is the fact that one of the highest ranking officers in the Persian Gulf theater, Lt. Gen. Calvin Waller, flatly declared that our forces are not ready for offensive action. Assuming these experts are credible—and I do—the administration's fixation on January 15 has no military or diplomatic rationale. If this is the case, what is the rush?

Also, given the flurry of diplomatic activity now taking place, why must we close the door to a diplomatic solution by January 15? The sanctions and embargo are having an impact. Nobody expected that an embargo against a country with the natural resources of Iraq would be an overnight success. For each day we wait the sanctions only become more effective and take their toll on Iraq's ability and desire to hold out. If we authorize war now, we could be precluding any solution other than bloodshed. I realize that some commentators claim that we can defeat Iraq in a short period of time with limited casualties. This might be true. Nevertheless, history, and more recently, Vietnam, have taught us that it is a folly to predict the course of war. Once we cross the Saudi border, there is no way of predicting precisely and completely what will result.

While I do not support authorizing military action at this time, I believe there is a definitive shape any diplomatic solution must take. First, Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait cannot be an end in itself. As long as Saddam Hussein's military power remains intact, Iraq remains a threat to American interests and friends in the region. I do not doubt that if Hussein is allowed to walk away from this conflict, military intact, he will become an even more dangerous, long-term threat. Our goal—whether through force of diplomacy—must be regional security and the limitation, containment, or removal of Iraq's offensive capabilities. Only the elimination or vast diminu-

tion of Saddam Hussein's demonstrated destructive powers can justify the sacrifice of military and civilian lives.

Second, Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait must be total and prompt. There can be no doubt that Hussein did not benefit from his naked aggression.

Finally, there can be absolutely no linkage between Hussein's occupation of Kuwait and Israel's control of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Hussein took Kuwait in an unprovoked act of aggression while the West Bank and Gaza came under Israel's control as a result of a defensive war against Arab attackers. Arguments linking these two issues are fallacious and ill-conceived. To lend any credence to Hussein's claims is only to play into his hands. Saddam Hussein did not invade Kuwait on behalf of the Palestinians. We must not allow him to claim the slightest bid of credit for any movement on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, when an exhaustive and rational search for peace has failed, I, with other Members of this body, will have no course but to support rational military action. When I am convinced that war is the only manner in which we can settle the crisis in the Persian Gulf, I will support an authorization of offensive action and do everything I can to see that our troops will win quickly and decisively.

Mr. Speaker, if the time comes for war, I will vote for war. Now is not the time.

□ 1830

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, history will be made this week as we in Congress vote on whether or not to authorize the use of military force in the Middle East.

Throughout the years, securing peace and freedom and deterring aggression has been costly. As history tells us, turning a blind eye to Hitler-like aggressions now can lead to a future of grave consequences for all nations of the world.

The lessons of World War II and other wars must lead us here today.

The President has asked the Congress for a resolution supporting the use of force in the Gulf as a last resort. Many of my friends on the liberal side of this question oppose any use of force in this situation—they argue that the conflict is not about naked aggression, not about the rape and destruction of Kuwait, not about human rights atrocities, and not about a united world standing against the totalitarian despot Saddam Hussein.

They argue that the conflict is over economics, self-interest, greed, and money. In short, they argue that the conflict is over oil and only oil, and that oil is not worth sending our young people to die for.

I tell those voices, if this conflict is only about oil I agree with you; not one drop of American blood should be shed over a commodity like oil.

I have been saying for years that this country can be much more energy independent than it is now. With a little cooperation from this body, my own State can and will continue to play a major role in reducing American dependence on foreign oil and gas.

With foresight we can utilize a mix of conservation, oil and gas, hydro, clean coal, and yes, nuclear power to ensure that this Nation can supply itself with all the energy it needs, forever.

I urge all my colleagues, especially those who say they cannot support the President because they feel this conflict is simply over oil, to join me in support of my bill calling for increased American energy production.

Many of us feel this conflict is not simply about oil. We feel that while oil is part of the conflict we also feel there are loftier principles involved.

I believe there is much more involved here than oil and money. I have asked myself is Saddam Hussein an outright aggressor? Has he willfully invaded and sacked a neighboring country murdering and torturing its citizens?

The answer is "Yes."

Does Iraq possess chemical weapons? Will he likely possess nuclear weapons and has he indicated the potential to use them?

Again, the answer is "Yes."

Is Hussein likely to have territorial desires beyond Kuwait? Yes.

Has Hussein had over 5 months to comply? Has the President of the United States proposed 15 separate dates for face-to-face meetings? Answer: Yes.

Should Hussein be stopped and Kuwait restored? Answer: Yes.

For those of us who feel the conflict is larger than our need for oil the undeniable conclusion is that Iraq must leave Kuwait and do so in compliance with the wishes of the entire world community.

The key remaining questions are when—and how? I want to provide time for the embargo and diplomacy to work.

I want to avoid the death of even one U.S. service man or woman. And I want peace. I also want to let the Saddam Husseins' of the world know that illegal invasions will not be tolerated and will be stopped.

This country has maintained a solemn commitment to protecting peace through strength. The new world order we are beginning to see is a direct result of that commitment and we must join the world in sending a signal to all those fanatics who would hold us hostage.

History teaches us that we should give peace every possible chance but it also teaches us that we cannot abide peace at any price. For accepting peace regardless of the costs only sets the

stage for much more costly and devastating conflicts in the future.

Upon his return from his last visit with Adolf Hitler, the great appeaser Neville Chamberlain was told by Sir Winston Churchill, "you had a choice between war and dishonor, you chose dishonor and you will have war anyway".

The longer we rely on the embargo and diplomatic efforts, the tougher and bloodier the conflict will be if those efforts fail.

Nearly the entire world has set January 15 as the deadline for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. How long after the deadline should we continue embargo and diplomatic efforts? I do not know.

I know that at some point, whether 1 day, one week, one month, or one year after the deadline we must decide if the costs and risks of continuing diplomatic efforts outweigh their benefits. That awesome determination and decision lies at the outset with the President and then that decision must be confirmed or rejected by us in this great body.

As our Chief Executive and our Commander in Chief, the President must have flexibility in that initial decision. Congress can and should encourage the President to use every means possible to find a peaceful solution and we can and should authorize the use of force as one last resort option.

To the cynics I say that there has been open discussion, there has been consultation with Congress, there have been diplomatic initiatives and this president has operated in good faith. He has united the world against Iraq, he has brought our hostages home, and he has stood unquestionably for the rule of law and justice.

I urge my colleagues to give the President and our troops our full support.

History has taught us that Congress has a legitimate role to play in judging and influencing the actions of presidents.

President Bush has acted in good faith; let us give him the authority to use force if necessary. Let's stand united as a nation and let us send a clear and unmistakable message of American resolve.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to extend congratulations to my colleague, LEE HAMILTON. Not only has the gentleman from Indiana been my friend, but our districts adjoin across the Ohio River, and so I have had the opportunity to observe his performance for many years. I am now happy that the merit that we knew he had, but was somewhat hidden under the bushel basket, is now for the entire country and the world to view because

he is certainly bringing great dignity to this debate.

□ 1840

I would like to extend congratulations to the majority leader, who has shown his leadership on this issue, as well as the budget issue last autumn; Speaker FOLEY, because it is Speaker FOLEY who showed the courage and the tenacity to bring this issue up as it ought to be brought up; and certainly last, but not least, the President of the United States, who has these tremendous and weighty burdens on his shoulders which all of us join in praying God that they be discharged in a way that will bring the situation in the Mideast to a speedy and, we hope, peaceful conclusion.

I think there are some postulates that ought to be talked about here as we get the debate started. One is that all Members, whichever resolution of the three before us that Members would support, all Members are serious and have approached this with a great deal of thoughtfulness.

As one who has served in this body for over 20 years and having observed the debate for the last day or two, I think this is really going to be one of the high points of congressional service for all of us.

I think another postulate is that Saddam Hussein is a vile, mean, and evil man who ought not to be condoned in any fashion by any civilized nation of the world. I think I ought to say as a veteran of the U.S. Army, back in the 1950's, that I believe wars need to be fought from time to time, that they are not totally avoidable. My belief is that this one ought not to be fought now, but I believe many of us approach on the premise not just that all wars are bad but that this war may not be necessary now.

Whatever is voted up at the end of the debate day after tomorrow, I think it is our responsibility as Members of the House to support the men and women in Operation Desert Shield, to be sure they have the materiel and all the support necessary to carry out their function.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong and proud support of the gentleman's resolution. I intend, also, to support the resolution of our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], which I think establishes correctly that the real power to declare war is vested in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, in the Congress, and not in the President.

But the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is a stay-the-course resolution. It allows that the sanctions currently in place be continued, and that those sanctions be tightened. It makes sure that all the diplomatic efforts which are under way are continued and strengthened. It keeps the forces we have in place so that they would be

available to thwart any attack or to mount an offensive action if that is deemed necessary and voted up by this body at some time in the future.

However, unlike the Solarz-Michel resolution, this one before us does not give the President a blank check or a *carte blanche* authority to take an offensive action.

I have to ask these very simple questions, Mr. Speaker. Why would we need to go to war right now or at midnight on Monday night, the beginning of January 15? The President's objectives have largely been realized. Our hostages have been returned. The oil supplies are protected. Saudi Arabia nor any other nation in the area is threatened. The area is stabilized.

The two other things the President desires to be done, that Kuwait be rid of Saddam Hussein and his forces, and that the Sabah family be returned to the throne in Kuwait, I do not think are needed at this actual moment in time, needed eventually, but not right now needed enough to warrant going to war.

I hear so much about this fragile coalition which might fall apart unless a war is fought at midnight Monday night or soon thereafter. If the coalition is that fragile, then maybe it is not really a coalition except in name only.

Many of the members of the coalition are not paying the money they pledged. Many of the members of the coalition are not sending their men and certainly not their women into this fight. So what is the coalition? Maybe that coalition is not really one anyway, and so it should not be the determining factor of whether we send our men and women to a sure death in some cases, in order to preserve this coalition.

I liken this to: this argument: "We will hold your coat while you do the fighting." That is what this is. There are a number of nations in the so-called coalition that said, "Hey, we will hold your coat, but we want you guys to do the fighting, and we then want you to pay for the fighting." They have not ponied up the money. They are not going to. They do not send us their troops, and they are not going to. But they want the benefits of our war. I do not think that is fair. I do not think that is something this House and this Congress ought to do.

The whole idea here is to demonize Saddam Hussein and deify Kuwait. Kuwait: We hear so much about Kuwait. We have got to restore the Al Sabah family; this is a great nation that has been run over by an aggressor.

I will sum up by saying that Kuwait is a feudal dictatorship, a feudal kingdom. Its people do not vote. The majority of the people who lived within the bounds of Kuwait before the takeover were not even Kuwaiti citizens. They were guestworkers or U.S. people who

were there doing work for the oil companies.

The fact of the matter is there is nothing free and democratic. There is nothing devoted to human civil rights in the nation of Kuwait. Why, pray tell, should we sacrifice ourselves and our future to restore that?

Mr. Speaker, I think what we ought to do is continue the sanctions, make sure they do not leak, make sure these members of the coalition who are knowingly allowing these leaks to take place not to take those actions, and then let us see what happens.

If later down the road we have to take offensive action, we will do so. We should do it. But it ought not be done now at this point in time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody in America wants war. We are all concerned about our young men and women who are over in the Middle East. We want all of them to come home safe and sound.

I just got back from a trip with 25 of my colleagues. I met with many of the young people from my district and across the country. They understand what it is all about. They want to do their job, but they sure miss their families. They are concerned about their jobs and businesses back home. And they want to get it resolved as quickly as possible.

Some of the people who have spoken up here today said, why do we not give sanctions time to work? Why do we not let this thing go on for a while and freeze Saddam Hussein out?

Let me read to the Members what the head of the CIA said in a recent report, William Webster; he says, "Our judgment remains that even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months," and that is keeping our young people out there in that desert for 6 to 12 months, "economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam Hussein to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq." He went on to say, "Saddam probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold together, and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him."

This man is a real butcher. The people of this country and the world need to know what he is capable of and what he has done.

Amnesty International reports recently the following facts: "Eyewitness accounts tell how Iraqi forces have tortured and killed many hundreds of vic-

tims, taken several thousand prisoners and left more than 300 premature babies without their systems of survival," took their incubators away from them out of the Kuwaiti hospitals. "The report catalogs 38 methods of torture used by the Iraqi military. Iraqi forces have gouged out peoples eyes, cut off their tongues and ears, and shot people in the arms and legs, used electric shocks, and raped many victims. Moreover, the Amnesty International report notes that 'the massive scale of destruction and looting suggests that such incidents were neither arbitrary nor isolated, but rather reflected a policy adopted by the Government of Iraq.'"

Our country, our Government, our Congress needs to ask a number of questions. First of all, will sanctions work? The CIA says no. But are we going to keep our young people there indefinitely while we let them go on and on, these sanctions?

Saddam Hussein's popularity in the Arab world continues to grow. He is facing down the Great Satan of the West to quote the late Ayatollah Khomeini.

As his popularity grows, the destabilizing factors take place throughout the Middle East. Do we want to wait until he develops a nuclear capability? We know he has been working on that for a long time. Some say 6 months, some say 1 year, and he will have it. Do we want to wait for that, thus endangering our troops in the Middle East but perhaps Western Europe, the Middle East for sure and maybe even ourselves? Because he is also working on an intercontinental and intermediate system of delivery. He has been working on that for some time.

Do we want to wait until his popularity grows in those Arab States until he becomes such a hero that he will get people volunteering for military service for him from all over the Arab world? I can tell the Members that leaders of the Middle East are concerned about that. They are concerned about people volunteering to support him from Egypt, from Syria, from Jordan, and from Iran, all over that area, and if he gets millions of more followers and his military power grows as he digs in over there, we are going to have to face a much more formidable force in the future.

□ 1850

What Arab leader will stand with Members as we have today if his power grows? Make no mistake about it, it is because he is standing up and we have to negotiate with him.

One thing is sure. If we wait, the cost will be much greater than it is today. We all want, and we all pray for a peaceful resolution of this crisis. But if war is to come, and we all hope it does not, but if war is to come, I hope our President will press the attack until

there is complete victory, complete victory. No half measure. Not one American life is to be sacrificed in this conflict, and then we settle for half a loaf. We must fight to win if this has to happen, a complete victory, so that no tyrant in the future will feel he can do this again. We must support the Solarz-Michel amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at this debate tonight because no one has told Members what it is really about. The Solarz-Michel resolution is a declaration of war. Let me repeat that: The Solarz-Michel resolution is a declaration of war. War has been declared by this body twice in my lifetime.

In 1941, a battle that really began in 1935, culminated in a final declaration of war in this Chamber after the Japanese attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor and declared war on the United States. The second time in my lifetime it was declared in this Chamber was on August 4, 1964, when the Congress passed a resolution, a resolution far less damaging than this resolution, a resolution which in its terms was said to be defensive, a resolution in which the sponsors said it was not a declaration of war, but history will show that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was a declaration of war that this Congress struggled with for 8 years to get back under control. Through three Presidents: President Johnson, President Nixon, and President Ford.

Let there be no mistake about what is being done here. We are being asked to declare war. Oh, yes, it does not have all the ribbons on it, and all the high-sounding phrases, but it is just as strong as any declaration of war that has been issued in my lifetime. As I say, I have been through two of them.

Now, do we want to go to war? I may eventually vote to go to war, but it is not the time to go to war now. We have been successful in what we sought to do with the manning of Operation Desert Shield. We stopped Saddam Hussein's expansion in that area of the world. We secured the release of our hostages. In fact, of all hostages. And while, as the speaker said a while ago, the people are going to rush to Saddam Hussein to fight on his side, that is not what the people in the rest of the world are doing today. They are streaming across the desert to get out of Iraq. They are not streaming across the desert to get in to fight.

I heard and read what the Director of the CIA said. He said he expected that the sanctions would not be effective as far as dislodging Hussein, for 6 to 12 months. He did not say the sanctions were not working. Everybody who has been over there and who has talked to the military leaders over there, and who have talked to the CIA as I have,

knows that the sanctions are working, and that given a reasonable length of time, the sanctions will work. However, what are we going to do if we declare war, as we may do here in 2 or 3 days? Are we going to vote for the taxes that are necessary to finance this war? We are already running a deficit without any of the Desert Shield costs of \$320 billion. That is, \$320 billion for next year. War is estimated to cost over \$1 billion a day, over and above what we already owe on it, and we already owe \$30 billion on it.

Who among these Members is going to stand up and vote for a draft? I ask Members, are you going to vote for a draft? Members should not declare war 2 days from now unless they are. The recruiting for the Army has already dropped off. Oh, yes, a few join the Air Force, a few may join the Navy, and some of the real gung-ho types may join the Marines, but the Army is the one that is going to do the fighting here, and the Army infantry is the one that is going to get killed.

During the Vietnam war my wonderful wife took it upon herself to go out to the hospitals here, and most of them were in the Army hospital out here at Walter Reed. There were very few in the Navy, practically nobody in the Air Force, and she visited the wounded. Those that were able to move, and to walk or to ride in their wheelchairs, she brought them down here and fed them lunch in the Member's dining room.

I went to the funerals. Let me tell Members, that is a very sobering experience. Those young men did not know why they were fighting. They felt betrayed. They were pitiful. However, that war that we declared right here on August 4, 1964, went on for 7 years under the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. That was not nearly as strong, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] knows that, because he was here and he spoke on it at that time. It was not nearly as strong, and the speakers at that time denied that it was a declaration of war. However, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] said today, before the Committee on Rules, that this was tantamount to declaring war, and he is the chief sponsor of this so-called bipartisan resolution.

Now, let there be no doubt, if that bipartisan resolution passes 2 days from now, we have effectively declared war. Get ready to vote for a draft. Get ready to vote for increased taxes. Get ready to go out to the hospitals and to go to the funerals that are going to result for all of this. We do have another choice, and that other choice is to let the sanctions work. They are working. They will work.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no blinking at the fact that we are going through greater crises, or as great a crisis as we faced during the Cuban missile crisis. Like then, I think we should focus on a diplomatic solution.

There is a lot of talk of war here in this Chamber, a lot of hysteria. I think we should focus on peace, and how we can come to a peaceful resolution. The paramount question as I see it, is what can Congress do to promote peace. I think to promote peace, I think we should stand shoulder to shoulder with our troops in the Persian Gulf, and shoulder to shoulder with the American people and with the President of the United States.

□ 1900

I would like to refer to a letter that the President sent to Members, I think it is important that we take these words very seriously. The President said to Members:

I am determined to do whatever is necessary to protect America's security. I ask Congress to join with me in this task.

I can think of no better way than for Congress to express its support for the President at this critical time.

This truly is the last best chance for peace.

I think that is what we should be focusing on: Peace, and by standing with the President at this time in the next few days, we can achieve that. I believe that, and I think all of you believe that, too. To do otherwise would be to send the wrong signals.

Barbara Tuchman in her famous book, "The Guns of August" talking about how the world slipped into the First World War, she said:

Every nation miscalculated and that is why the war came. The Germans, the French, the Russians, the British, all miscalculated. No one wanted the war, but they all miscalculated.

What is taking place today? One miscalculation after another, and I think that we have to stand firm so that there is no miscalculation.

Some people say, "Don't vote with the President." Who should we vote with, Saddam Hussein?

We are all elected, yes, but there is only one person in America who is elected by all the people, and that is the President, and he speaks for all the people.

Yes, under article I, section 8, the Congress does declare war. Yes, we have a moral duty to speak out, but we cannot have 535 Commanders in Chief. We can have only one Commander in Chief, and that is the person who is elected by all the people.

Now, before you have a shooting war, you have a psychological war, and that is the war we are in right now. We have to win the psychological war if we are going to prevent a shooting war, and that is why this is so important.

I understand the arguments that our allies are not doing their fair share,

that we get only 24 percent of the oil out of the Persian Gulf, that the Japanese get 85 percent. That is all true. I realize that. I realize that many times the world looks to America as a dairy cow to be milked, when America is only a strong horse willing to do its fair share, and that is going to change.

But the world is not as you and I would like to see it. The world is as it is, and tonight we have almost 400,000 young Americans in the Persian Gulf and we have to stand with them. We have a duty to them. We have a duty to their families and we have a duty to this country. We must back the President.

I, like you, get hundreds and hundreds of letters. I must have had 300 telephone calls in my office today and hundreds of letters every day. Here is a letter from Mrs. Peter Schumacher in Green Bay. She says:

I am writing to you to ask you to do everything in your power to bring the Middle East crisis to a peaceful solution and to completely avoid war. I believe a nonviolent solution can be attained. Your prayers, my prayers are with you and the Congress.

I think that is what the American people are saying this evening. I think this puts into a nutshell how the American people feel. We want peace and the resolution that the President sent to us is not a resolution to start a war. It is a resolution to stop a war.

Let us focus on peace. Let us stand united and we are going to achieve peace.

Diplomacy without bargaining chips, without leverage, will make hope of a diplomatic solution just an illusive dream.

We can resolve the problem in the gulf through diplomacy. I really believe that, but we must give the President the tools and the leverage with which to do the job. These days between now and January 15 are crucial. We must keep true faith with our soldiers in the Persian Gulf. We must keep true faith with the families of the soldiers in the gulf. We must keep true faith with the American people and we must keep faith with each other. If we do that, we are going to have peace in the gulf.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning my 23d year as a Member of this House. During that time I have been exceedingly privileged to represent the people of the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin. I have to say that this vote which we will cast this weekend is for me the heaviest responsibility that I have had to bear in the 23 years that I have represented my constituents.

With all my heart, I wish I could support the President in every respect with respect to his policy in the Middle East. I have supported everything he has done up to this point. But my obli-

gation to the Constitution which I took an oath to uphold just a little over a week ago, my obligation to the constituents who I represent and my obligations to my own conscience dictate to me that today I have to take another path, and therefore I will be supporting the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, rather than the resolution requested by the President.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, as you know, supports the use of force to enforce the embargo, to repel direct attack against either Saudi Arabia or United States troops, but it urges more time before we actually decide to wage war without actually precluding a decision to wage war in the future.

What I would like to do is simply to take some of the arguments which we have heard being made by those who are suggesting that we ought to pass the resolution requested by the President this weekend.

First of all, the argument is made that if the Congress ratifies the U.N. resolution, it is simply putting the stamp of approval on an action taken by the United Nations, which had been promoted by the United States. I would suggest that it is one thing for the United Nations to authorize a member state to engage in offensive military operations, but for the legislative body of a member state to ratify that resolution really is, as the gentleman from Florida indicated, tantamount to a declaration of war by that state without forthrightly saying so.

Furthermore, it takes the U.N. resolution to an even higher level. It ratchets it up one additional level. It is one thing for the United Nations to authorize a member state to engage in offensive operations, but very frankly, many of our allies, especially in Europe, are sending a lot of advice and an occasional check, but it is Americans who will spill most of the blood when the shooting starts. When the fighting starts it will be largely Americans, not French, not Germans, who will be the dying. After the war it will be Uncle Sam and Uncle Sam's taxpayers who will be asked to pick up the pieces, to put Humpty-Dumpty in the Middle East back together again and the long-term costs will be enormous.

I have a good friend whose husband was a Middle East scholar and who herself was born in the Middle East, born in Aleppo, now in Syria. She said to me a few weeks ago:

Dave, never forget this. Remember that in the Arab world we have had family quarrels for hundreds of years and we will continue to have family quarrels for hundreds of years, and just because one of the family members is now asking you to step in and solve the family squabble does not necessarily mean that that same family member will not be blaming you for the entire squabble five years from now. That is just the way the Middle East is.

And I think she is correct.

She said something else. She said:

Remember in the Middle East people think in terms of 500 years of history, not in terms of 5 years of history, and whatever you do will be with America in that region for generations to come.

And she is right.

Second, proponents of the President's new position charge that sanctions will not work, but the fact is when sanctions were first applied, the administration told us that they would take between 6 months and a year to work. Sanctions were adopted with that time frame in mind.

The question with respect to sanctions is not whether or not Iraq can import oranges. The question is whether or not, in the foreseeable future, those sanctions have a significant chance to hit Iraq hard enough to change their political conduct and it clearly has not been demonstrated that they will not.

The burden of proof is not on those who say that we should not go to war. The burden of proof on that subject is on the shoulders of those who say that we should.

We are told that the sanctions are not working, they are not going to hit Iraq hard enough.

□ 1910

And yet oil exports represent 50 percent of Iraq's GNP. Iraq has completely lost its ability to export that commodity.

That means over the next few months Iraq is likely to experience a GNP drop of somewhere between 50 and 60 percent.

The United States is now concerned because we are worried about experiencing about a 3-percent drop in our GNP in the coming recession. That difference between what is going to happen to us and what is going to happen to Iraq clearly demonstrates the gigantic stress that continued sanctions could put on the Iraqi economy.

Nobody has conclusively demonstrated that they will not work. We have more time.

We certainly have more time to allow sanctions to wear down the effective operating capacity of the Iraqi army, when they will experience an increased need for spare parts. If we do have to attack, we ought to attack when they are at their weakest, not when they are at their strongest.

Third, the argument is made that if we do not act now, Iraq may obtain a nuclear capability that would one day even threaten the United States.

Well, it is possible that Iraq might eventually obtain a limited nuclear capability, but as is the case with sanctions, the issue before us at this point is not whether we should attack but whether we should attack now.

To say that we are required to engage in a military bloodbath today to minimize the theoretical possibility that down the line Iraq might achieve

nuclear weapons is to me a giant leap in logic.

We have ample time to take military action before that event occurs, and anybody who has been briefed on the subject knows it.

The fourth assertion is that Saddam cannot be allowed to control 50 percent of the world's oil reserves because he might ratchet up the price and squeeze down the world's oil production.

But again that is a hypothetical that might require action in the future. It does not require action now.

Saddam today does not control 50 percent of the oil reserves of the world. He controls somewhat less than 20, and the United States relies on Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil only for about 4 percent of our supplies. We can handle that loss now because of the increased production from Saudi Arabia.

U.S. casualty estimates from a gulf conflict are currently estimated to be somewhere between 1,000 dead, ranging up to approximately 10,000 dead, depending upon the scenario.

Our European allies rely on Middle East oil for a far larger share of oil than we do. Yet their people will not experience anywhere near the casualty rates that America's young people will face in the gulf. I simply do not believe it is worth losing even 1,000 American lives at this point to guarantee the rest of the world their continued oil supply, at least until we have exhausted, I mean exhausted rather than tested, all other possibilities.

Up to this point, Saddam has not been able to manipulate the supply of oil as alarmists feared he might be able to do in the future. If that occurs in the future, we may have to attack, but we do not have to do it now.

Fifth, the comparison to Hitler is preposterous. We have the military power to wipe out Saddam any time the West chooses. Saddam poses no offensive threat to the world, at present, as Hitler did in 1939.

The offensive threat he poses to the Middle East has been contained. George Bush has already taken the steps which Neville Chamberlain refused to take in the 1930's.

If we are going to try to draw historical analogies, we at least ought to try to draw the right ones.

Last, we are told that we need a new world order. Well, I believe in a new world order. I want to see it come about. But the new world order that the President is proposing and is asking Congress to endorse appears to me to be the same old order idea that the United States should serve as the world's policeman. If that is to be the new world order, the only difference between it and the old is that American troops will die enforcing U.N. resolutions instead of enforcing our own unilateral policies.

That is not enough of a change in the world order to suit me. The new world

order I want to see is one under which the civilized nations of the world would be prepared on a systematic and unified basis to totally isolate politically and economically any nation which invades its neighbors and which reserves, as the last resort, collective military action to repel aggression.

That new order should mean that military action ought to play a lesser rather than a greater role in world events.

Secretary of State Baker said yesterday, "Now the choice lies with the Iraqi leadership."

I have a great deal of respect for the Secretary, but I simply am not willing to allow Iraq to make life-or-death decisions about American lives. That is why I will vote against the resolution requested by the White House and for the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

If you really believe that we ought to take the last step for peace, then you ought to not vote to go to war. You ought to vote to try to maintain the peace, and that is the key difference between the two approaches.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for all but a handful of us in the Chamber and the membership at large, this is our first opportunity to vote on the issue of war and peace. For all of us, this is a very, very difficult situation, the toughest of votes that anyone will cast in their service here in the Congress.

It is a vote that the Congress must take. This Nation must speak with one voice on the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

So I want to commend first of all the leadership on both sides of the aisle for the way that they have framed this debate and for the way that this debate has been handled in this Chamber.

It is with the highest regard which I have for the Members and for our ability to deal with a very difficult issue that I come to the floor today.

Make no mistake about it, this resolution, specifically the bipartisan resolution that is offered by Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. MICHEL, is not just the President's resolution, it is not just the Michel-Solarz bipartisan resolution, it is, indeed, an affirmation of the U.N. resolution that they have passed, the most specific one being the 12th resolution which essentially allowed this Nation and the allied nations, all 27 strong, to take appropriate action to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait on August 2, the world changed and it changed dramatically. An entire nation, a member of the United Nations, disappeared, was obliterated from the political map.

Iraq's action was a brutal act of self-aggrandizement, and the suggestion that it was done to help resolve the Israeli-Palestinian question is simply absurd.

As the President and the Secretary of State said earlier this week, Iraq sorely miscalculated the response of the world community.

Like the original act of naked aggression, the international response also changed the world. Under the scope of the leadership of President Bush, old enemies became allies, other less immediate matters were put on the back burner and the voice of the community of nations was clear: "Saddam, Iraq, your occupation of Kuwait will not and cannot stand."

Some have argued that the United States and the allied forces involved in Operation Desert Shield should wait a longer period of time before military action is warranted. The question is: What is there to wait for? Should we wait until Saddam Hussein completes his rape and pillage of Kuwait? Should we wait for the coalition of nations against Saddam to splinter? Should we wait until the morale of the allied forces has declined to the point of being ineffective? Or should we wait for the sanctions to bring Saddam to his knees?

While waiting with the hope that sanctions may work would be the easiest thing to do, however, it may not be the wisest. No one who argues for sanctions can assure that they will prove effective.

□ 1920

However, we have all seen the press reports that economic sanctions are not now working. Food and goods remain plentiful in Iraq, and the Iraqi people are experienced in sacrificing when ordered to do so by their dictator.

We also know that sanctions alone rarely, if ever, work. A full-scale embargo could not force tiny Nicaragua to change its policies. Two year's worth of sanctions could not bring Panama to its knees. Surely, we all recognize that Iraq is more self-sufficient than Nicaragua or Panama, and Saddam Hussein more ruthless than Ortega or Noriega.

Some think we can contain further expansion by the Iraqi nation. Of course some thought we could contain Hitler's war machine 50 years ago. The containment is not; repeat, not, the stated policy of this President, the United Nations or the world. Reversal of Saddam's action is our policy, and it is the right policy. If the gulf crisis does not represent a justifiable military action, I simply do not know what would. If the United States, the only true superpower on the globe, cannot work its allies to stop Saddam now, what dictator will we ever stop?

Simply put, if not now, when? If not us, who?

I say we cannot wait any longer. We have waited for over 5 months for Saddam Hussein to comply with the U.N. resolution.

Mr. Speaker, given the strong votes by the United Nations, an especially historic, unanimous vote authorizing force after January 15, is it not too much to ask the U.S. Congress to pass a similar resolution? Many of those who have urged past Presidents to work closely with the United Nations are today arguing that even U.N. authorization is not now sufficient. How embarrassing for this Nation would it be to see this resolution fail?

Mr. Speaker, let us have the courage of this Nation's convictions. Let us have the courage of the men and women who represent us so well in the Persian Gulf. Let us make a firm and correct decision in supporting the United Nations, and supporting our President and indeed supporting our Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for this and his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to going to war over Kuwait right now, a war that would be largely an American war, and I want to talk about why. Let us first talk about what this is not. It is not anything from which Saddam Hussein ought to get any comfort. The consensus that he is a vicious thug who has behaved immorally and who must be opposed is virtually universal. Indeed for some of us that conviction pre-dates others.

I commend to Members the current issue of the Readers Digest. There is an article in there which lists the favors the Bush administration did Saddam Hussein before August of this year. We had votes on the floor of this House earlier in 1990 as to whether or not to impose sanctions against Iraq, and those sanctions first won, and then they lost because, among other things, the Bush administration said, "No, don't do it."

We are told we have to go to war with Saddam Hussein now because he may have a nuclear capacity and because of his chemical and biological weapons. He used some of those weapons during his war against Iran, and subsequent to his acknowledged use of those weapons the Bush administration was his defender on the floor of the House. The Bush administration sent Ambassador Glaspie to speak well of our relations. People make mistakes. But an administration that so badly misread Saddam Hussein before August ought to be a little hesitant in reading lectures to some of us who were critical of him before August about how to do it.

Neither is this an example of why we must follow the United Nations. The rush of some of the most conservative Members of this Chamber to an embrace of the United Nations is a very

impressive one. It is, however, I think, a touch suspect. What we have is a case of bootstrapping. This administration called in every American chit, \$7 billion for the Egyptians and a lot of other things, to get a vote through the United Nations to authorize force. We pushed hard for that resolution. Having worked hard to get the United Nations to do it, we are hardly now obligated to follow what we forced, not forced, but pressed the United Nations to doing.

I commend the President for going to the United Nations. He has done a wonderful job in getting international support against Saddam Hussein to some extent. In fact, I wonder why the President trashes his own policies, because we are also told now that sanctions are not going to work. The Bush administration acts like sanctions are something that the Canadians made them do. Sanctions were George Bush's policy after August. He opposed sanctions against Saddam Hussein before August. He was then for sanctions afterward. Anyone who voted for sanctions at the United Nations, anyone who advocated them as a policy, who thought they were going to work between early October, when they first became effective, and now, was kidding himself. Of course, the sanctions have not worked yet. They have not been in effect since August 2, remember. They went into effect subsequently, after blockades and other things. No one serious about sanctions thinks they would work this quickly.

We are agreed that Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait. The resolution for which I am going to vote contemplates the use of force to get him to do it, but let me now talk about one last point where I think it would be a very grave error to go to war now rather than possibly later.

A war which would be largely unilaterally American would be a mistake morally, politically and in every other way. I join the gentleman from Wisconsin and others. The day when the rest of the world can sit back and expect America to be supercop, and superbank, and supermom and superdad has ended. And yet the President seems eagerly to be embracing that. He seems to be willing to pay a price in extra American effort for what he sees is influence, so the rest of the world sits back. A war in which the Americans do all the dying, and all the shooting, and all the spending and all the bleeding is not only morally unfair to the American people, it is unwise.

If we have a situation in which Saddam Hussein is defeated by what is seen to be an American effort, the consequences after that in the Middle East will be bad for all the things about which I care, bad for the moderate Arab leaders in Egypt and Morocco, bad for the Israelis, bad for all of us who think that responsibility and moderation ought to come forward. Indeed

I am sure there are radical elements, the most anti-Western and irresponsible elements in the Arab world, who would like to see an American attack on Saddam Hussein because they know they will survive it, and they will use the fact that America defeated Saddam Hussein as further grounds for destabilization.

The alternative is to give sanctions more time to work so we can honestly say they have been tried because no one; let us repeat, no one, who is for sanctions thinks they could have worked in this short period of time, and, as long as we press now, we do it unilaterally. Let us get a genuine U.N. participation. Let us ask Perez de Cuellar, and Mitterrand and others to try to intervene to avoid bloodshed. Let us ask them to do what they can to get Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait.

Then, if he does not, let us talk about a genuinely multinational force in which no nation dominates, which has a very large number of people which marches to the border of Kuwait and says to Saddam Hussein, "We give you a certain amount of notice, and then we move in." That has much more chance to win successfully without bloodshed. It has obviously the virtue of minimizing the bloodshed here, and it has the advantage of not further destabilizing the Middle East.

The Bush administration's policy in Iraq was quite wrong before August. The President then did the right thing in trying to mobilize support against Kuwait, and I support him for it, but to plunge unilaterally into an American war against Iraq at this point would be very much a mistaken policy, and I will vote to oppose it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons and many convictions that people are going to have, and have expressed already and will be expressing over the next 2 days about why they will be supporting or why they will be opposing the resolutions that are going to be before this body, and, as many have said who have been in this body much longer than the four terms that I have been here, this is the most significant vote which we have ever cast.

□ 1930

I would hope that with that we will put into it the emotions each of us should feel. I assure the Members that I have very mixed emotions about this vote. I have the emotions of a Representative who has constituents in the region. I have the emotions of a Representative who has constituents who have relatives in the region, and I have the emotions of a father who has an active duty marine son. So I assure the Members that I have emotions, and

that I view this very, very carefully as I look at these votes.

But I have no doubt about the conviction I believe strongly. That conviction is that I believe we are going to have to vote in full and, I hope, very, very strong support of the U.N. resolution that will provide the opportunity that if there is no other option, we can use military force.

I have heard people say there is no way they will support the use of the United States military to return the Emir of Kuwait to Kuwait. I share that same concern. I would not vote to use military force simply for that reason alone. But it happens to be Kuwait that an individual with naked aggression invaded, and they happen to have been the recipients of that aggression. I wonder where and at what point we would vote to in fact make an effort to stop that type of naked aggression.

Many people are saying, let sanctions continue to work. I do not disagree. I believe sanctions to a great extent have worked, but I believe that the reason they have worked and worked to the extent that they are creating tremendous amounts of pain in Iraq is because there is behind that the threat that we may also use military force. Those threats of military force have caused concern, and we have seen significant increases in the number of sorties and the number of military operations that have gone on in Iraq because of their concern that the United States might invade. But if we send them a message that for a year we are not going to invade but we are going to allow those sanctions to sit there, are they going to continue those operations? No, they are going to stop them. They are probably going to bring their boys home and let them go on R&R back to Baghdad for several months before sending them back to the front lines. We cannot expect those sanctions to have the continued kind of force they have if in fact we remove any resolve for the potential for military force.

There are those who have said that Saddam Hussein has not received the message that we are serious, but I assure the Members he will receive the message that we are not serious if, in fact, we do not provide the opportunity to use military force.

Some have said we are there only because of a failed energy policy. Let me assure the Members, as someone who represents a very strong energy state, that I am concerned about the energy policy of this country but I am also not so naive as not to recognize that if we had the best energy policy we could craft, there still happens to be the majority of fossil fuel reserves in that part of the world, and whoever controls that part of the world is going to have a significant say in the energy policy of this world. So it is not due to a failed energy policy. I hope we learn

some lessons from this, and I hope we move forward with some conviction to do something about it.

But that is not why we are there. We are there because there is someone with naked aggression who wants to control that economy and who wants to control those reserves.

I am concerned, and I share the frustrations of those who have said we do not have the resolve of the other people who are in that part of the world and we are not getting an equal share of burden sharing. That concerns me a great deal, but it does not give us the opportunity to shirk what I think is our responsibility for being there. I have seen no one who has objected to the fact that it appeared that the Iraqis were going to invade Saudi Arabia. If in fact they had not stopped because of a rapid movement by American forces that they did not anticipate, they were going into Saudi Arabia, they were not just going to overtake Kuwait. Yet, if we pull out of that region and if we do not have the resolve to go forward, where and at what point in time do we begin to have the opportunity to stop this naked aggression?

Mr. Speaker, it is a very difficult vote. It is one in which I think we have to recognize that if we grant that authority, that authority may very well come true. But it is that kind of vote that I think puts this Congress and I think it is the kind of vote that puts the American people behind a resolve, and I think that resolve is that we are going to support this President in that effort and in the United Nations resolution, that if there are no other solutions available, military force can be used.

The date of January 15 does not indicate that we have to start a war. It just simply says that if nothing else happens, that is a possibility. I think it has got to be a real possibility or I think we are going to have Saddam Hussein in Kuwait and in other parts of the world for the rest of our lives.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, in the months since Saddam Hussein's takeover of Kuwait, several thousand people from Washington State have filled my mailbox, flooded my phone lines, caught me in the grocery store and on the street, and crowded into my town hall meetings—all to express their concerns about the tension-filled events in the Persian Gulf.

The American people have raised their voices, and now they are demanding that Congress live up to its responsibility to decide what turn history will next take.

Until recently, most of us believed the administration was not gung-ho for war as the way to solve differences between peoples. We supported the Presi-

dent's initial placement of troops to block Iraq and defend Saudi Arabia; and we supported the President's moves to rally the world community and crack down on Saddam Hussein with sanctions and blockades.

We succeeded. Iraq did not invade Saudi Arabia. But when Congress left town to face the 1990 elections, something happened to our well-thought-out plan to unite the world against a dictator. The President suddenly doubled our troop level in the gulf and turned what had been a defensive posture into an offensive posture.

What a shocking development. Only months before, millions of Americans heard their President assure them, "The mission of our troops is wholly defensive. They will not initiate hostilities."

There are those who say that by not supporting an early use of force, we will be showing Saddam Hussein a House divided, a people without the will to stay the course. Nothing could be further from the truth. This body stands united with the President in our determination to work with the world community to force Iraq out of Kuwait. But the debate before us is not about ends, it is about means.

The Solarz resolution is a declaration of war, just as surely as the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was a declaration of war. If we pass this resolution, we will be giving authority to one person—one person alone—to decide to send 400,000 troops into combat whenever he chooses to do so. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution demonstrates the firm commitment of Congress to reverse Iraq's brutal and illegal occupation of Kuwait. But the leadership resolution preserves to Congress the constitutional authority to determine when it is time to use force.

What has happened to the idea of relying on war as a last resort, rather than a first resort? We must give sanctions an honest chance. Military and foreign policy experts from across the political spectrum—including two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have said sanctions are working and should be kept in place an additional 12 to 18 months.

We have not spent enough energy; we have not spent enough time; and we have not put enough work into sanctions. We cannot make the judgement today that sanctions are not working. And there has not yet been any attempt by the United Nations to assert its role by calling an international conference or by calling upon the World Court to exercise its judgement on a solution. There are other options to solve problems without resorting to violence.

Yet this administration emerged from Wednesday's negotiating session in Geneva, intent on pressing us toward a tragic war. We spoke of a "new world order" when the Berlin wall crumbled,

but I'm afraid we are poised to return to Old World tactics if we resort to force to resolve differences rather than relying upon international bodies and multinational efforts to bring the Iraqi leadership to its senses.

Experts tell us we will not be ready to fight by January 15, but the President indicates he has every intention of sending the international force, comprised mostly of young American men and women, on the offensive. Where is the burden sharing in this effort? The American people do not want to risk thousands of lives and expend \$1 billion a week playing world rent-a-cop for wealthy sheikdoms.

Saddam Hussein needs to be convinced through negotiation that he should get out of Kuwait, because no one really knows what will happen if we choose to use force now.

But we do know some of the costs of using force.

War is not a simple righting of wrongs. It is about tears and pain. It is about lost arms and legs. It is about paralyzed bodies lying inert in already overwhelmed veterans hospitals. It is about shattered dreams and shattered families and children losing their mothers and fathers. It is about sending America's children to kill and be killed.

Yesterday I received a message from Janis Bynum, who works in my Olympia office. She wrote not as a political supporter, nor as an employee, but as a mother. She says of her son Tony:

I have no doubt that if called to fight he would go with resolve, as he does with all his challenges. He is a beautiful, loving young man and it is breaking my heart to think that he may die for something so unclear. I would be opposed to military action even if I didn't have a son—but I would do it with anger and determination, instead of with tears in my eyes. Do your best.

I want to let Janis know that I will do my best. Doing our best does not mean viewing this as an either/or situation. Doing our best means doing our utmost to pursue every option for a satisfactory international resolution of this situation. At a time as critical as this in the history of our world, we can do no less than our best.

□ 1940

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just spent 5 of the most intense days of my 25-year career in public service meeting with our servicemen and women and our allies in the Mideast.

I have come home from that trip with one very clear message—this Nation must stand behind its principles and its troops. It must show Saddam Hussein and the world that the United States is ready to defend what it knows to be right.

Mr. Speaker, this debate we are having is a healthy one—and it is one the

American people expect, they have asked us to have, and we are having it, and it is right.

But Mr. Speaker, this debate must serve to tell Saddam Hussein in no uncertain terms that we mean business. It must tell Saddam Hussein that his type of brutal and inhumane treatment of innocent people, peaceful people, and his arrogance toward the rest of the world, must stop.

Let us not fool ourselves about just how serious this situation is. This man has made it very clear that he is not bound by any standards of human and moral decency that we know. He has at his disposal some of the most heinous and deadly weapons—and he has already shown himself very willing to make use of them.

Mr. Speaker, when I was with our young women and men now serving in Operation Desert Shield, I was extraordinarily impressed with their spirit, their enthusiasm and their professionalism.

But, perhaps the most impressive thing about these troops was their candor: of course, there are places they would rather be. Of course, they would like to be with their families and friends. Of course they pray as we do that Saddam Hussein will take a peaceful path toward resolution of this crisis.

But above and beyond all of that, these people were saying to me that they want to get on with the job, and that they are ready and prepared to go. They want to do their job and then come home.

We are all immensely proud of our Armed Forces. Of course, we must be. But I suggest if we do not pass the Solarz-Michel resolution, and pass it very strongly, we are deflating our troops. I do not mean we are just letting the air out of their tires.

As to the sanctions and other negotiations, I am mindful that Saddam Hussein is not embarrassed, he is not ashamed. He is power hungry, and he is ruthless, and he is not going to leave because he is a nice guy or because we ask him to.

Do we care? It is just Kuwait. Or maybe it is just Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Or maybe it is just Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Or maybe it is just Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the rest of the Mideast.

Those who care feel maybe we can scare him out with a threat of force, or ultimately we may have to chase him out with the use of force. I am hopeful, yes, for a peaceful negotiated settlement, but I am not optimistic we are going to get it.

If we do not nip this in the bud, I suggest we are certainly going to be worse off in 6 months or a year, worse off economically, worse off militarily, worse off geopolitically.

Certainly Saddam Hussein will be more dug in. Certainly he will gain a

lot of credibility in his neighborhood. We and our allies in the international coalition will have lost credibility, if not some of our high tech capability to the elements out there.

I think it is true, and I think many others do too, that our forces can get more done now with less risk of casualty.

Sanctions are becoming the law of the West. Two intelligence organizations I respect most highly, ours and the Israelis, have suggested years before the sanctions may in fact do the thing we hope, which is force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. We are dealing more with a sieve than a sanction policy.

On the other hand, decisive action now does two very important things for us. It gets the workable solutions in the Mideast, and that is an area we have been looking for workable solutions for a long time, and it helps set the rules of global behavior at a time when we are looking for the rules of global behavior.

I think that the evidence is very clear, time is in fact working against us.

Borrowing a word from Peter Marshall, I urge my colleagues now to stand for something, lest they fall for anything, by supporting Solarz-Michel, and opposing the other resolutions. Most Americans feel President Bush has done an outstanding job to date. When we are finished in Congress, I hope we have done as well, recognizing that our last best chance for peace is in the bipartisan resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution before us, and in opposition to the Michel-Solarz resolution, which is a declaration of war and hands that all-important constitutional power over to the President to in fact go forward.

I have heard a great deal in this debate about support for our troops in the Middle East. All of us want to support them. But I think the most important thing we can do is when we have them in harm's way, is to base the decision that places them in an offensive posture on the best judgment that we have at our disposal. That is the most important thing we can do for them.

After that, if we do not do well in that, then I think we have done the greatest disservice, not just to these troops that are carrying out our policies, but to the constituencies that we represent.

Our constituencies are talking to us. I am hearing from them. I want to suggest on this House floor that the people in Minnesota that are calling me, and across this country, are overwhelmingly opposed to a declaration of war and the type of power and action that is being proposed by the President and

apparently supported by some in the coalition.

We hear a lot of discussion about the new world order. What is this new world order? For 50 years during the cold war the actions of the United States militarily and economically and otherwise, politically, have been checked by the Soviet Union.

Similarly, the Soviet Union's actions as a superpower have been often checked by the United States.

But today, all of that has changed. Today we have an era where cooperation can occur between these great powers, both economically, militarily, and socially. So the first and the second world have to come together, and we have to consider what is happening in the Third World.

That is what we are facing here. We put ourselves in harm's way. We place ourselves in a position in terms of policy in which we are not limited. We are not whipsawed back and forth any more as we once were in terms of these policies. We have only ourselves to control our action in this Congress, and that is why it is important that we do not surrender this particular responsibility to the United Nations, or to any other coalition, or any other allies, but that we singularly make that decision ourselves.

In the Third World today we see what is happening. We talk about Iraq as if it is something that came up out of the ground like a mushroom. But it has been around a long time.

The reason that Iraq is what it is today is because of oil. Oil is what has built this war machine. Oil is what has sustained this. The fact of the matter is, with sanctions and other sources in place in terms of control, we limit the growth of that.

But the fact is, we do not have an energy policy today, and we do not have the opportunity to address and control that. The fact is, there are going to be many Third World countries today, and I think we have to live in a world where we have to realize the type of armament that can be obtained by these countries and threaten, yes, threaten even superpowers, as for instance is the case in the Middle East.

Today in the Middle East we have the largest ground deployment of troops that has existed on the face of the Earth other than during World War II.

□ 1950

I think it is important to understand when we start to talk about casualties and the harm that is going to occur under those circumstances that we recognize what can happen with not 1940's weapons but 1990's weapons, conventional weapons, but weapons that can cause a great deal of harm.

Then I think we have moral questions that we have to ask ourselves, not just with regard to United States lives that are very important to me

and to all of us in this Chamber, but also the moral question about how will we be judged when tens of thousands of Iraqis and other civilian fall under the flak from that type of armament. Is that a proportionate and proximate way to solve the problem that we have before us by a declaration of war?

We will be responsible for that, and I think the policies that we set in place we will be judged by for a long time into the future, and the American people and the public in terms of what is it prepared and willing to do in the future will judge what actions we take in this particular instance as to whether we should be, of course, involved in these types of roles.

There are systemic problems in this, clearly. The absence, for instance, of allied or coalition support is one that is most disturbing, and the seeds of that go back to August. But I think it is most apparent now, the very weakness that has occurred in terms of burden sharing, that has occurred in terms of having actual men and women and material on the ground in these particular places instead of just giving us advice.

But the basic question I think is the moral one. The basic question is the control, the controlling rights and the responsibility in terms of declaring war, and that is the question we have before us tonight, my colleagues.

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

Mr. Speaker, If there is any member in this body who thinks Saddam has any business in Kuwait, I have not heard that sentiment expressed.

The issue is not whether he should be there, but what we are going to do to get him out.

Many Members of this body, and many other Americans, wonder why it is necessary to risk the lives of young American men and women in an area thousands of miles from our shores.

They wonder why it's necessary to push Saddam out of Kuwait, a country not much bigger than Connecticut with fewer people than Mississippi.

If this were another small country at another point in time. I might agree. But the fact is that Kuwait is a country that occupies a critical piece of the world's geography at a critical time in the world's history.

Iraq is flexing its muscle in a region that contains most of the world's oil. The Persian Gulf holds 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, and if Saddam is not stopped, he could one day control it all.

I've heard it said that young American men and women should not go to war to keep the lid on the price of oil. If that's all that was involved, I would agree.

But oil is not just another commodity. It's what runs the world economy. It heats our homes, drives our cars, and

powers our factories. Oil is to the world's economic life what water is to the Earth's plant life.

An irresponsible dictator like Saddam could effectively close down much of the world economy. And those who would suffer most would be Third World countries and the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe—nations that simply don't have the money to pay for high-priced oil.

But oil is not the only issue we face. It is dwarfed by a much larger political issue, an issue that truly has historical dimensions.

The invasion of Kuwait has regional and world-wide implications.

The regional implication is clear. The control of so much oil would give Saddam the revenues to mount the most powerful military force in the world. He would be in a position to wage war and destruction in the Middle East for years to come.

But the political stability of the entire post cold-war world is at stake as well.

The big superpower face off is over. Many nations who kept their powder dry all these years will not be looking for opportunities to settle old scores and change old borders.

They will be watching how the world community reacts to Saddam. They know talk is cheap. All the speeches in the United Nations all the speeches in this Congress and in parliaments throughout the world won't restore Kuwait to the Kuwaitis.

Saddam must come to know that words will be backed up with actions. And those who would imitate Saddam must be given a graphic demonstration that crime does not pay.

The Kuwaiti people have watched their children killed, their women raped, and their property stolen. The leaders and people of the world must be shown that justice will be done not only to the lowest, but to the highest, as well.

Amnesty International has detailed the allegations of torture inflicted on the Kuwaiti people by the Iraqi army of occupation.

Kuwaitis have had their faces slashed, their eyes gouged out, their tongues and ears cut off, their hands pierced with nails, their fingernails extracted. They have been subjected to 38 different types of torture, most too gruesome to mention, but all documented by Amnesty International.

All over the world, would-be Saddam Husseins are watching how Saddam is treated.

Some experts urge us to go easy on Saddam, to be mindful of his sensitivities. We are encouraged to find a way for Saddam to save face—at a time when his soldiers are mutilating the faces of thousands of Kuwaitis.

I understand the concern of those who counsel patience. It is not an easy decision to ask young American men

and women to risk their lives in such a war.

But the sanctions are clearly not working and the dangers of inaction are even greater than the dangers of action.

Time is not on our side. Time is clearly on Saddam's side, and he knows it.

He knows that time will begin to wear on the American troops, that the desert heat will begin to melt their resolve.

He knows that the window of opportunity for the United Nations forces will close with the onset of the spring and summer months, and that no military coalition will last until the window reopens.

He knows that time will allow him to build up his defenses, and that well-defended Iraqi positions will mean higher and higher casualty rates for the U.N. forces.

Saddam knows that time will begin to open holes in the embargo that has attempted to cut off his country from economic essentials and needed military supplies.

Above all, he knows the old phrase, that possession is nine-tenths of the law, that the longer he can hold onto Kuwait, the harder it will be to force him out.

Time is Iraq's friend; time is America's enemy.

The President has stated clearly what he and the hundreds of thousands of American troops over there need from us. They need the congressional authorization to do what's needed to get Saddam out of Kuwait.

To vote "yes" on the resolution authorizing the use of force will send a message to Baghdad that our President's letter to Saddam was not an idle threat, but a credible warning.

I urge my colleagues to give the President the power he needs to convince Saddam Hussein that he has no other alternative but to leave Kuwait.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great somberness because I too feel that this will be the most significant vote that I have ever cast in my time in the House or will ever cast. So I do so with a great deal of concern and sense of responsibility.

I do so also because I represent West Virginia, and West Virginia is a proud State, and a State that serves. Members will find in the Persian Gulf tonight 2,000 of our Air National Guard, Army National Guard and Reserves that were called up, in addition to thousands more in active duty. West Virginia bears the distinction of having one of the highest numbers of veterans per capita of any State in the Nation. West Virginia in Vietnam suffered the highest number of casualties per capita, and in Korea it was the same rate.

So West Virginians serve and West Virginians do not hesitate when the call goes out.

So as I talked to my constituents and we mulled through this, I think that I speak for many of our concerns. I think I speak for those who support the President and supported the President from the first day, because I supported the President from the first day as he dispatched troops to Saudi Arabia to protect that country from being overrun. I speak for those who supported the original commitment that the President made, both in troops and in gathering together the international coalition that has so far proven effective and that was able to impose economic sanctions in a manner that was thought impossible just months before. I speak for those who supported international sanctions, understanding that it would take time to work, but understanding that this was a chance to stop Saddam Hussein. I speak for those who even supported the additional buildup on November 8, which I supported, feeling that the President should get the additional troops he needed to give him that bargaining chip that was so important, that military option that was not only a military option but an overwhelming military option.

I think I also speak for my constituents tonight though who while supporting the President also have a gnawing sense of uneasiness, who say we are willing to fight when the cause is right, we are willing to stand, we are willing to answer the call, but we are uneasy about what we are about to get into. If one is uneasy, then one should not be drawn into an immediate declaration of war, because that is what we also must recognize, is that this is a declaration of war, the Solarz resolution. It is characterized as such. It permits the President after January 15 to launch military action. It may not come with the bells and the whistles. It is a declaration of war.

There is an alternative, and that is the Hamilton resolution. That Hamilton resolution says that military force is still the President's option, that military force is still very viable and that indeed Saddam Hussein may still face the military might of this country. But what it says is that the sanctions have to be given a chance to work, that the allies must be approached about their fair share of the burden, burden sharing, that the President must explore and have exhausted several other steps before the military option is exercised.

□ 2000

I think there is another fact that must be recognized. We all were disappointed with the collapse, after 6 hours, of the talks between Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz, but let us be candid with one another. Did we really think they were

going anywhere? Did we really think that talks conducted in 6 hours over network TV were going to resolve this? We all know that it is only the backdoor diplomacy that is going on we hope right now in many capitals of the world that is going to resolve this.

People speak about sending a mixed message to Saddam Hussein. Some outside of this Chamber have even criticized this debate that is occurring, but I happen to think that this shows Saddam Hussein what a democracy is, and it shows those overseas exactly how strong our system is.

Some would say there is a mixed message. Let me talk about a mixed message for a second. Saddam Hussein has received a mixed message. He received it from day one. He received it, for instance, when the United States was implicitly supporting Iraq in its war against Iran and by reflagging Kuwaiti vessels. He received it when the U.S.S. *Stark* was hit by an Iraqi missile and 27 of our sailors died. He received it when his country has been on the terrorist list of this Nation for many years, and yet still was able to receive favorable treatment in several areas. He certainly received it when at the conclusion of the war with Iran he introduced gas as a weapon and gassed 8,000 Kurds, many of them his own countrymen. The response of the United States was to continue constructive engagement. He received it when in this transcript that has not yet been denied by the State Department our Ambassador on July 25, I believe it was, right before the August 2 invasion, gave no hint that the United States would react adversely to any sort of threat to Iraq. He received it again on July 27 when many of us in this Chamber voted to cut off favorable treatment and agricultural exports that Iraq was getting, and yet the administration lobbied against it. So there have been confusing messages sent.

The good news is perhaps out of all of this we stand united now to show what Saddam Hussein is, the kind of tyrant he is, and what many of us have been pointing out for many years.

I am concerned about the New World order, because the New World order looks a lot like the Old World order, and that means that Uncle Sam pays the bill and does the fighting and then turns it over to someone else. I am concerned it is going to cost \$30 billion this year simply to position ourselves, much less the cost of offensive action, and yet the brunt of the Operation Desert Shield is being paid for by the United States.

Incidentally, that \$30 billion is the same as a 30-cent gas tax. And the Members will remember the anguish over a 5-cent gas tax that was passed here just a few months ago.

So what is going to be the outcome? The United States will borrow money from our allies to fight the war that

benefits our allies so the United States can then repay with interest the money we borrowed to fight for them. I think that our men and women overseas deserve better.

Some would say that the coalition will break up. Is our coalition so fragile in this New World order that it cannot sustain the test of time? We banked on it back in August, September, and October.

I think it is important to note what this debate is not. This debate is not about whether military force is ruled out. It is certainly not and is uppermost in the Hamilton resolution as it is in the Solarz resolution. The main difference is that in the Hamilton resolution, which I support, the President must first explore sanctions more thoroughly. He must first explore diplomatic maneuvers more thoroughly. Then he must come back to Congress and ask this Congress for a resolution of support to use our troops, restoring congressional authority as well as permitting the representatives of each of our districts to have their say.

Finally, I would like to say what this debate is, is that opportunity, because make no mistake about it, that this debate must occur. That those of us elected to represent somewhere between 500,000 and 650,000 persons each are the most direct representatives that our people have, and we are the most direct tie that they have to this, and so it is only right that they have a voice in this.

This debate is not about whether military force will be used. Military force may still be used under either resolution. The debate is whether this Congress tonight or on Saturday enacts a declaration of war that permits the President to put troops in the field immediately, or whether indeed sanctions and those other means we all applauded just a few short months ago will be given the fullest measure of chance to succeed before military force can be used.

And finally, to Saddam Hussein, I would point out take no heart from this debate. In fact, I think you should worry a great deal about it, because what it shows is a Congress that is united, a Congress that is committed to recognizing the use of military force, a Congress that recognizes the option, a Congress that has supported the President consistently throughout, a Congress that has legitimate differences about when that force might be used, but a Congress that recognizes it may be necessary to use that force, and if that time comes is prepared to authorize that.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution. I do so looking at the fact that

some three decades ago this Nation faced a similar situation, a situation involving this country and the Soviet Union.

At that point in time in October 1962, then-President Kennedy made the following statement to the American people:

My fellow citizens, let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can foresee precisely what course it will take, but the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing. The 1930's taught us a clear lesson. Aggressive conduct if allowed to go unchecked and unchallenged ultimately leads to war.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush was confronted with the situation in Kuwait on August 2, he took action. He took action supported eventually by 12 consecutive U.N. resolutions. He took action that was supported by this body and the other body in public votes in this Chamber and the other Chamber. He took actions that not only were supported by 28 nations militarily on the ground in the theater in and around the nation of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, he took action that has been supported by 54 nations with monetary support and/or military action in the theater of the Middle East, and he took action that has been supported consistently by the American people in every major national poll that has been taken concerning the efforts of the President's leadership. He took the action that said that we had to apply sanctions, and those sanctions, in effect, could begin to bring some action on the part of the Iraqis in terms of pulling out of Kuwait. He began actions diplomatically to try to convince the nations of the world that we had to bring pressure to bear on Saddam Hussein to convince him that it was in his best interests to pull out of Kuwait.

Third, he took action to provide the threat of force to enforce the sanctions and to let Saddam Hussein know that we, in fact, at some point in time would have to enforce the U.N. resolutions.

There are some things that we have agreed upon as a nation and as an institution. We have agreed certainly that Hussein's actions are unacceptable, and that we have to take action to deal with that. We have agreed that the plight of Kuwait is something we cannot allow to stand.

Later on this evening I will be doing a 1-hour special order dealing with the human-rights violations in Kuwait itself, something that the American media has largely ignored for the last 5 months.

Finally, we have all agreed that sanctions are necessary. The problem then comes down to where do we disagree. The disagreement comes into play in terms of timing and how long we should allow the sanctions to take effect before we see action and before we

resort to force as required by the U.N. resolution.

Some would say that this decision is easy. It is sanctions versus war, and they would say that there are those in this body who want war.

I can tell the Members that I do not know of anyone in this body or the other body who wants any of our young people to be subject to hostilities. I myself, like many Members, have direct relatives in the theater. I have a nephew currently deployed in the Middle East and a second one about ready to go over to the Middle East. We have Members of this institution who have sons in the Middle East at this very moment on the front lines of our forces in that part of the world. None of us want hostilities to occur in the Middle East, but it is not that easy.

There are those who say to let sanctions take time. The distinguished majority whip this morning, upon returning from a trip to the Middle East, said that it could take 2 years before sanctions could, in effect, work, and have the results that we want them to have.

The key concern that I heard from 37 hours of testimony that I sat through along with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services listening for 3 consecutive weeks of the effectiveness of our sanctions were things that we have to consider as an institution. First of all, if sanctions are allowed to work for 12 to 18 to 24 months, are we going to be able to sustain our current presence in the Middle East.

We currently have almost 400,000 troops deployed. Are we going to be able to have a rotation policy to replace those marines, two-thirds of which are deployed in the Middle East theater? Are we going to be able to replace those units that the reserve capacity has already been totally used up in terms of deployment in the Middle East? Are we going to have to resort to what Secretary Cheney did this week, and that is calling up almost 1 million Reserve Forces?

□ 2010

Or perhaps even the worst, what many experts told Members in our hearings on the Committee on Armed Services, would be to maintain a long-term presence at the current level to enforce sanctions. How many who want sanctions to work are willing to stand up and say, "Yes, and I also support the draft necessary to provide the troops to allow that rotation of policy to take place"? Even more than just our troops, how about the presence of the Arab nations? As we all know, for the first 50 kilometers inside of Saudi Arabia along the Kuwait border, there are no American troops deployed. Not one American troop. The 90,000 troops who border Kuwait and Saudi Arabia are made up from Arab nations. Has anyone asked the question of those Arab nations, if they can sustain their

military presence along that border for 12 months? For 18 months? Or for 24 months? Or are we going to end up with a situation 12 months from now where the only troops left in the desert that are enforcing the sanctions are, in fact, American troops? And then our American troops are staring down the faces of Iraqi troops on the inside of Kuwait. That is a very grave concern that I have, that no one has yet asked.

No hearing has brought in representatives of the Arab nations to ask if they have the military capacity to sustain their presence in the Middle East, as they currently are, in front of our American Forces. So this, in fact, is not an easy decision. Are we going to be able to see the Soviets maintain their support of the effort in the Middle East? Are we going to see the other Arab nations, the other European allies?

We have all today just gotten a copy of a letter signed by 50 members of the European Parliaments, asking the United States to immediately provide linkage to the Palestinian question and other Middle East problems to the situation in Kuwait dealing with Iraq. Also asking the United States to immediately call a conference. These are things that this body has gone on record, as in absolute opposition to.

Therefore, my question is, how long can we in effect, sustain the sanctions? This vote that we will take this week on Saturday is not a declaration of war. It is saying that we want the President to consult with Congress. We want him to come back to the Speaker. We want him to meet and to deal with the President and the Senate. But the bottom line is that we want to show our unanimity of purpose as a Nation, as an American people, that we want a peaceful resolution of this crisis. I say this vote, this Saturday, is for peace. It is for a chance for our President to show to Saddam Hussein that we are together, that we want him out of Kuwait, and that we want to restore the stability in that part of the world that is so necessary for this Nation, and for all the nations of the Middle East. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in firm support of the U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 678 enacted on November 29, 1990 which authorizes military force against Iraq providing Saddam Hussein has not withdrawn his forces from Kuwait by January 15, 1991.

I believe extraordinary effort has been made by the United States and the United Nations in an effort to resolve the heinous acts committed by Iraq against Kuwait, a U.N. member and a United Arab Council member. The President's actions during the 5 months leading up to this debate have been very much in order. Further drawn out debate would not help, and, in my opinion, would even seem to be taking

on a hint of begging and pleading to Tariq Aziz to accept the demands of:

No negotiations, no compromise, no attempts for an Iraqi face saving, and no rewards for aggression.

These demands have, on a number of occasions, been clearly spelled out.

To me, the insulting and unmovable stance of the Iraqi Government reached a level of intolerance which the American people should not accept. The ultimatum given to Iraq to be out of Kuwait by January 15 is a decisive one, and I concur with the perception of many who have contacted me that threats made by the United Nations and the administration must be followed through and not delayed.

The word "oil" has been used frequently—that is, "is American blood worth shedding for oil?" I assume this means oil profits. I want to take a few minutes to comment on oil.

Oil is a major energy source. If in the hands of a manipulative country, oil could be the source of great power. A prime concern for the last 40 years of the NATO Alliance has been that the Soviet Union was posturing to take control of the oil and minerals of the world. If this had occurred with a substantial portion of the oil in the Persian Gulf region, the Soviet Union would have, without question, controlled Europe and possibly Japan. The end result could have been the isolation of the United States with severe economic demands and extreme energy costs, coupled with political concessions by the free world.

Oil is a resource which should be made available to all countries at an affordable market price, not by extortion or methods of intimidation. Oil should not be held hostage by thug countries such as Iraq.

There is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein would be in Saudi Arabia today in control of its oil if the United Nations had not acted wisely and decisively. I suggest also that the current prices of oil at \$27 to \$35 per barrel would be rather modest compared to the world price that Saddam Hussein would be able to set under such conditions as a world power broker. Our staunch ally, Israel, would also be in an untenable situation which might jeopardize their survival.

Mr. Speaker, our economic and diplomatic alternatives have expired. Therefore, we must prepare ourselves for what likely remains our last option to expel Saddam Hussein from Kuwait unconditionally and unequivocally. I do not take lightly the notion of authorizing possible military force to get Iraq out of Kuwait. I have contemplated the consequences of such an action, and they are devastating. A military offensive will undoubtedly cause pain, suffering, and death. But Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has already caused much pain, suffering, and death.

It is clear to me that Saddam Hussein is not interested in further negotiation. This was evident by his unwillingness to select one date for a meeting in Baghdad when presented with 15 dates by the Bush administration. This was also evident in Minister Aziz's failure to deliver President Bush's letter to Saddam Hussein.

While no one would advocate war over diplomacy, we find ourselves in a precarious situation. Our adversary is unwilling to budge, and we are unwilling to budge. At some point, we must draw the line.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a well written account of statements made by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, LES ASPIN, and also a statement with a thoughtful point of view by my fellow townsman and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, SAM NUNN.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1991]

ASPIN: WAR WOULD START WITH AIR STRIKES, ESCALATE TO GROUND BATTLES

(By Molly Moore)

If U.S. and allied forces are ordered to war with Iraq, they plan a phased attack to drive Iraqi troops from Kuwait and would begin with air strikes against airfields and communications sites inside Iraq, escalating into ground battles with Iraqi forces in Kuwait, according to House Armed Services Committee Chairman Les Aspin (D-Wis.).

Aspin, drawing on public hearings and private discussions with military leaders, said that under current war plans, American and allied bombers and attack planes would begin the war by blasting airfields, missile sites and chemical and nuclear installations inside Iraq in an effort to preempt Iraqi strikes against forces in Saudi Arabia and against Israel.

That attack would be followed by massive air assaults on major military supply depots, field command headquarters and communication lines inside Kuwait and first-tier troops assembled on the border of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, Aspin said.

If several days of aerial battering do not force an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, the war would intensify with a large-scale ground assault against Iraqi forces in Kuwait, according to Aspin's assessment.

Aspin said he based his war scenario on hours of public hearings with current and former senior military officials and on private discussions, which he said bolstered the credibility of the assessment. He said he released the report to help focus this week's congressional debate on President Bush's request for the use of "all necessary means" to drive Iraq from Kuwait.

"When Congress votes this week on authorizing the use of military force to push the Iraqis out of Kuwait, this is the military campaign they will be voting on," said Aspin. "It's the first time we've been able to know in advance how a war would likely be conducted. And it's the first time Congress and the nation can make a decision on war based on this kind of information."

Aspin's report parallels the integrated air and land attack scenarios now being portrayed by some senior U.S. military officials. It is the third in a series of "white papers" Aspin and his staff have compiled on the allied options—economic sanctions, diplomacy and war—for addressing the Iraqi invasion.

The report leans heavily on portions of public testimony by Gen. Colin L. Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Aspin said he continued to favor a vigorous diplomatic effort to avert war but said he will vote to authorize Bush "to use force to liberate Kuwait."

Aspin added that while he does not believe American and other anti-Iraqi forces can win a "bloodless" victory, "prospects are high for a rapid victory with light to moderate American casualties" of about 3,000 to 5,000, including up to 1,000 deaths.

That estimate is disputed, however, by military analysts and some officials who estimated that the casualty rate could exceed 18,000, including more than 3,000 deaths, in a

brutal air-land confrontation with the heavily armored and entrenched Iraqi forces now assembled in Kuwait.

Iraq has moved more than 540,000 troops into Kuwait and southern Iraq, according to figures released yesterday by the Defense Department. About 360,000 of the 430,000 American troops ordered to the Middle East are now in position and ready for potential combat, U.S. officials said. An additional 245,000 Arab and allied troops are in place on the Arabian peninsula, according to Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams.

Aspin said U.S. forces in the gulf "may not reach their peak readiness for combat operations until early February" and said it would be "better to wait" until then if the United States resorts to war.

Aspin said military officials have told him that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein is not a direct target of the air strikes and added that if Saddam is at his "summer home" during the attack he will be safe but that Saddam could be subject to attack if he is at one of the major Iraqi military command centers.

Aspin said some military officials believe the first phase of air strikes against critical targets inside Iraq could last as long as a week with up to 2,000 air missions a day. Those officials estimate 70 to 80 American and allied aircraft would be shot down or crash during that phase of the conflict.

In the next phase, bombers and attack planes would attempt to destroy supply depots, command headquarters, rail and highway communications lines into Iraq and some of the front-line Iraqi forces in Kuwait. Some officials estimate that up to 300 pilots and crew members could be killed and another 1,500 wounded during both phases of the air war.

But Aspin said he agrees with many, Army and Marine Corps officials who have said the military will be forced to move into the third phase—a major ground assault—in order to push Iraqi forces out of reinforced revetments, bunkers and ditches where they have entrenched a powerful armor and infantry force.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SAM NUNN

Our Nation has engaged in many "gray area" conflicts where the Congress has permitted and even supported military action by the Commander-in-Chief without providing specific authorization or formally declaring war. Ordering over four hundred thousand American troops into battle to liberate Kuwait is not a gray area. In this case, the Constitution is clear. It is essential, to comply with the Constitution and to commit the Nation, that Congress give its consent before the President initiates a large-scale military offensive against Iraq.

At the heart of the debate that begins today on the floor of the House and the Senate will be a deeply felt difference of opinion—not over the ends of U.S. policy in the crisis, but over the means of attaining them. I continue to favor President Bush's original strategy—economic sanctions, a continued military threat and patience. War should be a last resort, and I do not believe we have yet exhausted all the other possibilities for achieving our goals:

1. Iraq is unique in its vulnerability to economic embargo. The international blockade has succeeded in cutting off almost 100 percent of Iraq's oil exports, stopped over 90 percent of all imports and reduced its GNP by 50-60 percent. By summer, the Iraqi GNP would be down 70 percent or more, the country will be an economic basket case, and

Saddam Hussein may be in jeopardy with his own people.

2. The economic sanctions are international and supported by virtually the entire world. A war—no matter how successful, will be 90 percent American and will be viewed as an American crusade by much of the Arab and Islamic world. When the war starts and the dying begins, the American people will have every right to ask, "Where are our allies?"

3. CIA Director Webster has testified that sanctions will increasingly weaken Iraq's military power through shortages of spare parts and munitions and equipment breakdowns. In addition, the embargo is a very effective mechanism to impede Iraq's quest for nuclear weapons and sophisticated delivery systems—which should be one of our continuing goals after any resolution of this crisis.

In early November, President Bush abandoned his strategy of liberating Kuwait by maintaining an economic stranglehold on Iraq. Rather than preparing for the long haul by planning a rotation policy for American forces deployed in the region, he directed a buildup of American forces to a level that could not be sustained and that reduced our ability to respond rapidly to unforeseen military contingencies in other regions.

A sanctions policy is not perfect but has to be weighed against the alternatives. To those who say that economic sanctions do not guarantee Iraq will withdraw from Kuwait and conclude we must go to war after January 15 absent a diplomatic settlement, I reply: what guarantees do we have that a war will be brief and that American casualties will be light? If we fight, we can and must win. But no one knows whether a war will last five days, five weeks or five months. Our policy and our military planning cannot be based on and expectation that the war will be over quickly and easily. In large measure, the scope and scale of the hostilities, once begun, will be determined by Iraq's willingness to absorb massive punishment and fight on. An Iraqi military collapse is possible but can not be counted on.

I would also ask, what guarantees do we have as to the aftermath of the war? Here, too, caution is in order. Has anyone in the Administration begun thinking about what happens after we win? The President's declared goals include establishing stability in the Persian Gulf and protecting U.S. citizens abroad. Maintaining U.S. influence and leaving a stable balance of power in the region would require a fine-tuned war which would be difficult to achieve. Considering the wave of Islamic reaction, anti-Americanism, and terrorism that is likely to be unleashed by a highly destructive war with many Arab casualties, it is difficult to conceive of the Middle East as a more stable region where Americans will be safe.

Doubts have been raised about the coalition's staying power. However, the United States possesses sufficient military power to enforce a total oil embargo unilaterally if necessary. Moreover, as Admiral Crowe testified: "I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution."

If Congress authorizes the President to wage war or he initiates it on his own, what kind of war should be waged? I am afraid too many recall our most recent conflicts in bumper sticker terms:

"Vietnam: long, drawn out—bad";

"Grenada/Panama: quick, decisive—good."

The problem is that a war with Iraq will be far different than any of these conflicts. In preparing for and planning for possible war with Iraq, we must get beyond bumper sticker analogies. Above all, we must play to U.S. strengths and exploit Iraq's weaknesses. Our strengths are our air power, our maritime forces, our ground force mobility, and our ability to use technology for selective destruction of Iraqi targets.

If war comes, Iraq's fondest hope is that the U.S. will commit substantial ground forces to frontal assaults, thus giving Iraq a chance to inflict heavy casualties. Saddam's military leaders are not fools. They realize that they will lose any war with the U.S., but entertain the hope that high U.S. casualties would weaken our resolve.

Are there military lessons to be learned from Vietnam? Of course. We should hit military targets with awesome power at the beginning of any conflict, as well as knocking out power and communications, electrical, nuclear and chemical facilities. At the same time, we should not "over-learn" the Vietnam lesson. We in America like instant results. We want fast food and fast military victories. However, our Nation places a higher value on human life, especially on the lives of our men and women in uniform. Depending upon developments after the first wave of air attacks, a short war may be possible and may save lives. But we must avoid "instant victory" demands and expectations which could cause a premature and high casualty assault on heavily fortified Kuwait by American ground forces.

If war becomes necessary, we should not tell our military commanders, to get it over with quickly no matter what. The order should be—"Accomplish the mission with whatever force is required, but do so in a way that minimizes American casualties—even if it takes more time." Making continued Iraqi occupation of Kuwait untenable with air and naval bombardment plays to our strength. Rooting the Iraqis out with ground forces going against heavy fortification plays into Iraq's strength.

Finally—a message to Saddam Hussein. In the next few days, you will hear an impassioned debate emanating from the U.S. Capitol. These will be the voices of democracy. Don't misread this debate. If war occurs, the Constitutional and policy debates will be suspended, and Congress will provide the American troops whatever they need to prevail. There will be no cut off of funds for our troops while they engage your forces on the field of battle.

President Bush, Congress, and the American people are united that you must leave Kuwait. We differ on whether these goals can best be accomplished by administering pain slowly with the economic blockade or by dishing it out in large doses with military power. Either way—you lose.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFazio].

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk this week and tonight of appeasement and Munich, and we all know that those who did not learn from history are doomed to repeat their mistakes. There are some lessons to be learned from Munich. A very good lesson: Do not attempt to appease dictators with territorial ambitions.

But let Members look at the record to see what led the United States to this juncture. If there is any date in

this debacle that should go down in infamy, it is November 26, 1984. That is the date that the United States restored full recognition and diplomatic ties with Iraq, despite the fact that "No one had any doubt about his"—Saddam Hussein's—"continued involvement with terrorism," said Noel Koch who headed the Defense Department Counterterrorism Department in the 1980's.

The real reason for taking Iraq off the list was to help them win in the war against Iran. In 1985, Abu Abbas, the architect of the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, found a safe haven in Baghdad, but we will continue to recognize Iraq. George Habib, radical Palestinian leader, also eventually placed his headquarters in Baghdad, and yet we still gave full recognition to Iraq.

We began to staunch the flow of arms into the Persian Gulf, thank God, at last. Let us bring some peace to the region. Did we staunch the flow to Iraq? No. In fact, we encouraged the flow of arms to Iraq. We attempted only to staunch the flow of arms to Iran, in our tilt toward Iraq. We reflagged ships in the Persian Gulf, after Iraq began to attack shipping in the Persian Gulf, not Iran. Not that Iran was the good guys in this whole matter, but let Members remember Iraq's role. They attacked the U.S.S. *Stark*, and they killed our soldiers. They said, "Gee, we are sorry. It was an accident. But you can't interview our pilot. You can't examine the plane that did the attack," despite the fact that credible military analysts said that plane could not have inflicted that damage if it had its normal armament, or if there were only one plane. But we said, "That's OK. We accept your apology. Too bad about the dead sailors. You are too good a friend of ours, Iraq. We know you would do nothing like that on purpose." They used poison gas against Iran in violation of all international law and covenants. We said nothing. They used poison gas against their own people, the Kurds. The United States reacted very meekly. We did not want to upset our friends. We did not want to upset the Iraqis. No, no, we do not.

On July 25, perhaps the other day that should go down in infamy, our Ambassador, April Glaspie said, as is purported in the transcripts, the only transcripts available, which have not been refuted by the Secretary of State, to appease Saddam Hussein, in an unprecedented manner. "We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait, and the transcript goes on. If we were going to send a message, that would have been the time to send a message."

July 27, the House of Representatives finally acts to stop the appeasement. We voted to cut off economic aid that was being converted to military uses by Saddam Hussein. Later that day, the vote was reversed under heavy

pressure from President Bush and Secretary of State Baker.

Finally, the appeasement stopped. It stopped on August 2, with the invasion of Kuwait. So if Kuwait is our Austria, if we look at history, then we did change history because we finally learned, because we did not cede the Sudetenland. We did not cede Saudi Arabia. We finally acted decisively. We stopped the invasion of Saudi Arabia. We imposed the most successful economic and political sanctions and blockade in world history. They are working. The hostages have been returned. Oil has flowed unfettered from the gulf, and until yesterday the price dropped. We have been told that somehow the coalition will not hold, or the American people do not have the staying power or the patience for sanctions. If the coalition cannot hold together through a little bit of time and sanctions, how can it hold together in a bloody and lengthy war? The United States people, I have no doubt, that the people of America will stand firm behind the sanctions. No one should doubt the staying power of the American people.

Who was it who stood in Europe for nearly 50 years after World War II and won the Korean war? Who is still on the border in Korea? It is the United States of America. We have stood strong when the cause was just, and we are standing strong now for the sanctions, a strategy that is working. There should be no misinterpretation of this debate. There is no solace for Saddam Hussein in either of these resolutions before Members, but one is quite clearly an unbridled declaration of war. The other continues the sanctions, continues the successful strategy, and will bring true and lasting peace in that region, if it is successful. I urge the Members to vote for Hamilton-Gephardt.

□ 2020

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I just could not yield to the temptation to go home this evening after having been one of those who just returned from Desert Shield. After hearing some of my colleagues who were over there as a part of the great Codel, I felt it necessary to at least put into the RECORD what I know to be the facts.

I never thought I would live to see the day when there was such little regard for human life as is the case in this situation. I never thought I would live to see the day where there would be such blatant contradiction when it comes to mistreatment of people around the world, including here.

We have got our own sanctions going here against people who are poor and

hungry and yet we ask them to put their lives on the line, to support some wealthy people who inherited their wealth, who do not have to even lift a drink of water for themselves. They can hire their servants to do it.

I happen to represent a district where I am advised, according to a Chicago reporter by my office this morning which has been deluged with calls, 80 percent of the people who are in the armed services over in the desert are African Americans. Some are there because they could not find work. They joined the Reserves, and some are there to supplement their incomes. Others are there because it offered an opportunity for them to continue their education or achieve one. If they knew that they were going to be faced with a decision of possibly giving up their lives for people who will not risk their own, this is the situation that exists over there now.

Now, there is no question, I cannot in good conscience vote for—I do not care what you call it, it is the President Bush resolution. I do not care what you name it. It is his position.

God knows I am as patriotic as any of you, but patriotism to me means that we ought to make democracy work wherever it is possible. Government of the people, by the people and for the people is what I was taught years ago.

We are in the position now where this Congress if they vote in favor of that resolution that is now being sponsored by Congressman SOLARZ and Minority Leader MICHEL of Illinois, both of whom I have great respect for, if we vote in favor of that, it is a declaration of war. I do not care how you put it. I do not think that is right.

I have two nephews over there. When I was over there, I could not even find them. I was told that one of them is in the Medical Corps almost to the Kuwaiti border and we did not have time to go there and try to locate them.

Now, do you think that I feel right in being in a position where we are going to decide that oil is more important than human life?

Oh, we changed our position a little bit, since that would not stick. We started to talk about preservation of the lives of the hostages.

You know who the hostages were allegedly? They were people who were over there working, making money.

Is it right to do it?

I sat there with the delegation and heard Shamir, the Premier of Israel, who is not supposed to be threatened by Saddam. He made it clear that he did not want to engage in war, but they would be standing up to any threats against Israel, which they have every right to do.

I have had a position for years that Israel and the PLO had a right to a homeland. People have got a right to

live in human decency. This is what is involved.

We met with Mubarak. It was raised with him. He thanked us for the almost \$7 billion we gave him.

Do you know how many houses we could build with \$7 billion?

We have got to tell our own people that we cannot afford a national health program. It costs too much.

I just want to close by saying, God knows, let us stand up and do what is right. Fight for the right, for people to live in human decency here at home first.

God knows we should fight crime on the streets.

We went all the way to Panama, you know, to put Noriega out of business and stop the influx of drugs. I have not seen where it is working yet.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the Constitution of the United States that was given to me by the late Spark Matsunaga, a Member of this House and subsequently a Member of the U.S. Senate. We have an institute founded by the Members of this House and the U.S. Senate in the State of Hawaii, the Spark Matsunaga Institute of Peace. That is how much Spark Matsunaga was thought of by the Members of this body and the other body.

I could not come here today to represent the people of the State of Hawaii and to represent the legacy of Spark Matsunaga if I did not stand by this Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I raised my hand with everyone else in this body and I swore to uphold this Constitution, and I hold it dear.

I am not the first.

In a letter to his law partner and subsequent biographer, William Herndon, Lincoln responded to Herndon's fear that his opposition to the Mexican-American War could mean political suicide.

The provision of the Constitution giving the war making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always that the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention, understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where Kings have always stood.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The Congress shall have power to declare war.

The Congress shall have the power to declare war, not when it is convenient,

not when someone feels maybe it is OK to do it. The Congress has to declare war.

The fundamental question of who and what institution in and of our democracy may make war is the crucial one to be answered not only in this crisis, but in the inevitable ones to come.

What then are the interests involved, the U.S. interests? I do not believe the President nor his administration has made a case for what the United States intends or desires with respect to Iraq in terms of what are deemed vital American interests, either in the context of national security, regional stability, or military objectives.

□ 2030

On the coalition of the United States and its United Nations partners and its Arab partners and its coalition partners, the coalition is barely that. It does not remotely approach the status of an alliance. The states involved in the immediate region of the Persian Gulf are as likely to oppose us as to side with us, depending on strictly self-defined gains or losses. One need only observe that we are looking to Iran and Syria for support, to realize the line drawn in the sand by the President could disappear with the slightest shift in the political wind.

The European Community and Japan are likely to do little more—and let me tell you as a representative from out on the Pacific Rim, you should listen to what I am saying here—the European Community and Japan are likely to do little more than cheer us on. They are likely to look to the Soviet Union for future oil production and supply, particularly if the situation deteriorates into war in the Persian Gulf.

They will be making the deal with the Soviet Union.

The United Nations is sharply divided on the question of anything other than Iraq leaving Kuwait. Even then a compromise involving Iraqi access to the gulf and some oil concessions have consistently been floated, even by the Secretary of State, as a possible solution to the crisis.

All of this leads us inescapably to the issue of who is in charge of policy on these and other related questions. My answer is, without equivocation, the Congress. The President carries out but does not control policy to the exclusion of the Congress on the issue of war. On the contrary, this Constitution makes it explicitly clear that the power to make war and to establish conditions for its cessation rests with the Congress.

War is supposed to be difficult, to begin with; it is supposed to be a matter of debate with all sides heard and confronted.

We do not want a President where kings have always stood. We do not want a President where kings have always stood. Historian Barbara

Tuchman wrote in 1973—and I want to remind my friends back in Hawaii that the first time I came to Washington, DC, was with 500,000 people in front of the Pentagon in 1967, because the Congress of the United States had abdicated its obligation and turned over the warmaking powers to the President exclusively and the people had to come out to try to make the Congress do the right thing.

She wrote in 1973, when contemplating the great lesson of Vietnam,

One control that I believe the American people now owe to the world is to limit the capacity of their own executive to wage presidential war; a war that is not sufficiently and clearly in the national interest to sustain a declaration by Congress cannot be warranted.

I began with Lincoln, let me close with Lincoln. I can look to no greater source.

Addressing the question of the Mexican-American War and whether President Polk had "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced it," Lincoln said,

Let him remember he sits where Washington sat, and so remembering, let him answer, as Washington would answer. As a Nation should not and the Almighty will not be evaded, so let him attempt no invasion—no equivocation.

We can and should do no less.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of concern that I come with you tonight. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], on an annual basis comes to me and asks me to support his foreign operations bill to give money to foreign countries abroad.

The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, I think I can accurately say, is a close friend of mine, one whom I have a great deal of admiration and respect for.

On an annual basis, I look him squarely in the eye and tell him, "Absolutely no."

My friends, what we are talking about tonight is the ultimate in foreign aid.

We are talking about surrendering the lives of our countrymen for a cause as ill-defined, as vague and as not representative of what is our national interest as any in this country's immediate past.

When President Bush responded in August to the situation of what was going on in the Middle East, he took an appropriate action.

We had a national security interest in drawing the line in the sand because of the situation of oil and the import that that had to this Nation. The oil in the Mideast was the national security

interest that this country had and this country had to deal with.

It acted appropriately and it acted in a fashion which I applaud.

Where I departed company from this administration and where I have grave problems with the course this Nation is taking, is that we began to go in an escalation of what I viewed to be a road to war.

And today and on Saturday we are going to face a vote. Make no mistake about it, the diplomacy is almost at an end. They are asking for a declaration of war.

War is a horrible thing. Before I can look into the eyes, as I have in the last 2 weeks, of the mothers and fathers in my district who ask me, "Why is my son going to die?", I have to give them an answer that I am capable of rendering with what I believe in my soul to be correct. I have got to have a valid reason with which I can tell them we are standing upon "Why are we doing something?"

Here, my friends, I am not elected to be a representative from the country of Japan; I am not elected to be a representative from the European Community. I was elected by the people of eastern Kentucky to be a Representative of the United States of America. I took an oath to uphold the situation and the Constitution of the United States of America. And in the American interest we get only, what, about 18 percent of our oil from the Mideast? Or less than that. What do they get? Japan gets 63 percent, and many of the European countries get between 40 and 70 percent.

What sort of fairness, I ask you, is that? Are we once again being asked to go forward and say we are going to do the fighting for the rest of the world? That is not a security interest, that is not a national interest that we have in this country. That is playing world policeman once again as we did in Vietnam.

My friends and my colleagues, I hate war. There may be a time to fight and to engage, but if so, it should be done with the world order where all nations are contributing and not the United States putting forth the casualties and borrowing to pay for a war that is not in this country's national interest.

It is in the world interest. We are going to have situations arise again and again in the future of this country, and I would ask you: Is the United States going to be asked to borrow money from its people or to pay for it? Are its sons and daughters going to be asked to die again and again?

If there is a new world order, then I would submit that that new world order must be one where all nations must together combine in an attempt to try to correct and, together, oppose aggression wherever that aggression arises.

That has not been the case in the situation to date. Let us let sanctions have a period of time in which to continue. Saddam Hussein has not gained from this action. He is not selling the oil. He is not profiting from this presently.

These sanctions are having an effect, cutting his GNP, figures tell us, by one-third. Let us let them have a chance to operate.

But before we send our sons and daughters to fight the battles for the world and before I look once again in the eyes of the fathers and mothers in my district, let us make awful, awful sure why we know in our hearts that we have a good reason for sending them to die.

I ask for your vote on Saturday against war in this country and in the world.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA].

□ 2040

Mr. FOGLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues our Nation faces the prospect of a disastrous war.

Throughout our history, we Americans have risen to the challenge and fought wars when necessary. During World War II, young Americans fought and died to fight the spread of fascism. Hundreds of thousands of young soldiers died during the Civil War to preserve the Union and to end slavery.

We face a historic decision.

We all agree on the goal—that Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait.

I say to my colleagues that we have two options in front of us: Letting the sanctions take hold, continuing diplomatic efforts and pressure—or war.

The first option is to continue the President's original strategy. We have seen witness after witness testify that the sanctions are working. CIA Director William Webster predicted that the Iraqi economy will be largely shutdown by next spring or summer. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff William Crowe argued that sanctions should be given a chance to work.

This option also includes keeping the pressure on Iraq and continuing diplomatic efforts.

People have talked about the need to stand behind the United Nations.

I agree. The administration emphasizes that we should embrace U.N. Resolution 678.

I say we should endorse U.N. Resolution 660, the very first resolution the United Nations passed. This resolution was passed on August 2 and set the stage for this historic showdown.

U.N. Resolution 660 directs Iraq and Kuwait to begin intensive negotiations for the resolution of their differences.

Thus, the United Nations has seen the need for diplomacy from the very beginning. We should embrace the wisdom of that very first resolution.

I believe that a diplomatic solution is possible—but issuing an ultimatum is not negotiation. Serious and sincere negotiations—either direct or through third parties—should be pursued strenuously.

The other option is war.

Today, over 400,000 American men and women are in the Persian Gulf. They face the Iraqis toe-to-toe, rifle barrel to rifle barrel, tank to tank.

Many experts predict that war will bring up to 40,000 American men and women home in body bags. Others say that the losses may be 500 or 1,000. But whether there are 500 American soldiers dead, 40,000 dead, or just one—that is too much sacrifice, when peaceful efforts could still succeed.

President Bush has painted himself into a corner. By holding to the position that there can be no talks until Iraq has completely withdrawn from Kuwait, Bush has virtually eliminated the possibility of a negotiated settlement. He has made war the only option.

But war is not our only option.

We have a historic opportunity to settle this conflict and punish Saddam Hussein without war.

According to Sun Tzu, an ancient Chinese philosopher,

To win 100 victories in 100 battles is not skillful. To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill.

Let us use our skill as the greatest nation in the world. Let us subdue the enemy with the skill of diplomacy, not the blood of American young men and women.

Let us prevent this disastrous war.

Vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are coming to the close of the beginning of an extraordinary debate.

Mr. Speaker, in my youth and in my naive part of my life I tried to consider the picture of the Congress of the United States debating a declaration of war, and make no mistake about it. That is what this debate is about at the end of the day, whether we will vote to take this Nation into war, whether we vote for or against a declaration of war. I envisioned an extraordinary session of Congress with every Member of Congress on the floor in rapt attention, all of the media broadcasting throughout the Nation, the galleries packed, America poised because we were embarking upon an extraordinary venture: to deal with the question of

whether we would go into war or move beyond it.

But those were my naive days, for the Chambers are not packed, the gallery is not packed, and America is not standing still focused rigidly on whether the most precious treasure that they have, their future, their young, their children, shall go to fight and die.

The leadership on both sides of the aisle have, and I think correctly, suggested that in order to move beyond partisanship, rancor, and personal challenges, that this debate be considered as a debate of high conscience, that since we are debating life and death, and war and peace, that each Member would come to that debate as a matter of conscience. So, it would seem to me that the issue before us is not whether we stand with the President, but whether we can stand with ourselves at the end of the day.

What then is a great moral test? I would suggest the following:

The press has written about the fact that there are two or three Members of Congress who have young children, who have sons and daughters, serving in the Persian Gulf, in harm's way. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of this body, that each of us, each of us operate as if we had children ourselves in the Persian Gulf, that each of us had a son and a daughter in the Persian Gulf.

What then is the moral test? What then is the test of conscience? When we consider war, we consider worst-case scenarios. Here it is, Mr. Speaker:

Each of us not only must consider that we have children there, but that they come back broken, harmed, and maimed, and then consider that we could look at them and apply this test when they ask us as their parents who happen to function in the Congress of the United States, "Pop, Mom, did you make the right decision? Was this necessary?" And each of us better be able to answer that question to our children.

The press has said, "Can a Member be objective if their children are in the Persian Gulf?"

I ask, "How more objective can you be than to determine whether your own children, flowing from the body of their mother, can die in the Persian Gulf?"

My answer is: No, this war is not necessary, and, yes, there were alternatives, that the strength of this Nation is not whether we can play the game of going to war.

I challenge the perspective that says that we have to play brinksmanship and threaten war in order to produce peace. I would suggest in this situation we are not creating a climate for peace. We are only walking ourselves inevitably to war.

Why am I saying that?

□ 2050

The administration lays out three options: The economic option, the diplomatic option, and the military option of offensive challenge.

With respect to the economic option, the administration said sanctions will not work. The very same people who said be patient when we applied sanctions in the context of South Africa now are saying we should be impatient about applying sanctions in the Persian Gulf. They never really were committed to sanctions, so let us take that off the table.

The diplomatic option, diplomacy. We live in an environment where deals are made every day. This is the deal-making capital of America, so diplomacy is about making deals.

So is it diplomatic to fly several thousand miles to say, "I have been sent by the President of the United States to say to you," paraphrasing, "if you are not out of Kuwait on or about January 15, we are going to kick your butt?" Is that diplomacy? Or is that an ultimatum? That paints you into the same corner that you paint your adversary.

So if you remove the economic option and the diplomatic option because they were not real, and understand, America, that that was not diplomacy yesterday, do not be fooled; so we walk inevitably to war, because now we have threatened. You can only threaten somebody that blinks.

These shining-faced young children in the Persian Gulf have a right to survive and to live. What this debate is about is a declaration of war, and I am saddened by the fact that we are not here listening to every word that is being said. What more grave responsibility can we assume than taking our children in war, plunging this Nation into death and destruction, with the mighty capacity of this country?

I stand here as an advocate of peace. During the remaining hours of this debate, I will challenge and fight hard so that we move beyond the absurd mentality of war. Our children have a right to inherit a peaceful future, and that is what this, gentlemen, is all about.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

REINSTATEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders granted for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] today be reinstated, with the exception of a 5-minute special order that will go ahead of those that will be offered by the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF TIME OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my special order of 30 minutes set for this evening, and in lieu thereof accept a 5-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

THERE'S NO NEED TO RUSH INTO A WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, sometimes our own words pale in relationship to those of others. This column by Al Sicherman appeared in today's Minnesota Star-Tribune. It comes to us I think in the midst of this debate as fresh as cold water on the face in early morning.

Al Sicherman writes:

I'm not a political scientist, a military analyst or an expert on the Middle East. But I am someone with a dead son—a son whom I last saw in a body bag, a son who will be forever 18—and from that perspective I know that we have not exhausted every avenue short of war, and that there is not yet an irrefutable need to foreclose those other options—not when the cost will be that more of our children wind up in bloody body bags.

When I picture war, I no longer picture bombs falling from high-flying, anonymous planes onto smoke-shrouded anonymous targets. I picture families burying teenagers.

And missing them, and missing them, and missing them. For all the rest of our days.

A little more than a year ago, my son Joe died in a fall from his dormitory window after taking LSD.

I wrote then about what a wonderful, funny kid Joe had been, my regret that I had never impressed upon him how treacherous even one experience with a drug like that might be, and mostly, for the benefit of other kids and other parents, about burying Joe—how awful and ugly and final it was: the incredible forward momentum of his life suddenly and forever stopped. No new stories, no career; just the endless images of the body bag under the coffin lid and shoveling dirt into his grave.

And what have I learned? How did the world benefit from the stupid loss of a sweet kid?

What can I tell you? Some folks read Joe's story together as a family, and they wrote to tell me that it had moved all of them—that it had allowed the parents to say to their kids, through tears, what they hadn't been able to say, as clearly before: We love you and we are scared for you.

And it allowed the kids to understand, through tears, how bound up their lives are with their parents.

Still here we are talking about war as "kicking ass," as something we might as well get over with instead of waiting around. Talking about death as though it were too bad, but better than boredom.

I suppose there are situations in which the wholesale ending of human life is appropriate or unavoidable. I certainly know that this is not one yet. One of the strongest les-

sons I learn from Joe's death is that things that happen to other people really happen to other people, and that few of us truly recognize that and act upon it. The other lesson is the finality and the evercontinuing emptiness of the death of a child.

If we go to war simply because we set a deadline and it passed, people will die. Those people will be our own sons and daughters and brothers and sisters, and the children of our neighbors and coworkers and friends. And the children of Iraqis who haven't had a whole lot to say about their choice, either. And years from now they will all still be dead.

I know that many will say that this kind of discussion undercuts the president's policy; that it makes the United States look weak and suggests to Saddam Hussein that all he has to do is wait us out.

But it is not weakness to do absolutely everything possible to avoid wholesale slaughter. Impatience in the pursuit of just objectives is not a virtue. So what if we have to keep our troops stationed in the Saudi desert with nothing much to do? Would we really rather that they died so that we can stay on deadline?

We'll send them letters and packages to keep up their morale. We'll learn to make chocolate-chip cookies that don't melt. And we'll maintain and tighten the economic and diplomatic pressure on Saddam Hussein to leave the country he invaded.

I'm sure that there are many who strongly disagree, including perhaps parents of youngsters killed in other wars. But debate is better than the fatalism that seems to have struck our country. I keep hearing that this war is inevitable. I can't see why. I can't imagine why Congress can discuss taxes on capital gains but needn't discuss whether our children should die.

On the first anniversary of Joe [my son's] death, I ended my regular column with a postscript asking parents to hug their kids. Not long ago I got a letter from a woman who said she had hugged her son before and since, but that on that morning she had given him a very special hug—"one in which you realize how delicate and fragile human life really is." A month later her son's car hit a tree, and he was killed. The purpose of her letter was to thank me for that hug—for the reminder of how very much a child's life means to a parent.

Can we all think about that right now?

Perhaps the time will come when war is absolutely and clearly and unarguably necessary. That is not yet the case. I wholeheartedly support the president and our troops in the sanctions against Iraq and the defense of Saudi Arabia and the other countries in the region. But I cannot support a decision to throw our children's bodies at each other because we are out of patience.

If you agree—or even if you disagree—please write, phone or wire your congressman and the president.

And hug your kids.

□ 2100

POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF CONTINUED SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today, we have had on the floor a debate for

many hours that does this Congress proud, and I was proud to be a Member from New York participating in it. I would like to add a few comments to those that I made earlier.

We had discussions to the effect the sanctions are working very well, that they are shrinking the Iraqi economy at a pace that is unprecedented in the history of sanctions. The average sanctions that work pretty well in the 35 or 40 cases where we have been involved since World II reduced the GNP of the target country by about 2½ percent. The sanctions that area now being applied to Iraq are shrinking the Iraqi economy by a rate 20 times the average rate of sanctions when applied to countries in a way that worked quite well.

But now we hear that we are going to have to wait, that it is going to take a lot of time, it is going to be hard to keep the coalition together for sanctions, it is going to break apart under the strain of waiting.

Mr. Speaker, if there is not enough determination and commitment among our partners in the sanctions process to sit and hang tough for a matter of months, a year, a year and a half, two years if necessary, if the strain of waiting in a bloodless application of sanctions to reduce and shrink and destabilize the entire Iraqi economy and degrade the ability of Saddam Hussein in effect to wage war by denying his military machine the spare parts, the replacement parts, the various chemicals, lubricants that are necessary for a war machine, if mere waiting is going to affect that coalition, if the coalition that President Bush put together so artfully is so fragile and so feeble that it is going to be put to great strains simply by waiting, imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen in the event of a hard-fought confrontational war with body bags flowing back to the United States, and body bags flowing back with the bodies of Arabs to our Arab partners. If that coalition is so frail that it cannot withstand a period of waiting, watchfully waiting while we shrink the Iraqi economy and deny Saddam Hussein the ability to wage war, can we honestly think that there will be more patience, that there will be more fortitude, there will be more resolve, there will be more commitment in the event of a shooting war? I think that is preposterous.

I wish to state that our strength is in the existing coalition of nations that will stay the course on sanctions, and I wish to give President Bush enormous credit for the adroitness and the skill and the thoughtfulness with which he put together this coalition of nations that are now implementing the U.N. resolution so successfully. Sanctions are working and we all owe a debt of gratitude to President Bush for the artful, highly professional and skillful way in which he put that coalition together.

But it boggles my mind to think that that coalition will crack and break under the strain of simply waiting rather than the incredible strain that would be placed on that coalition in the event of an all-out shooting war. Can anyone doubt that the cost of a year's wait while we apply sanctions is a fraction of the cost of a month's cost of a shooting war?

Let me also add there is one more great advantage to a wait of a year or a year and one half or two years. Mr. Speaker, one of the things and perhaps the most important thing that can flow out of this whole incredibly tragic situation that we find ourselves in, perhaps the one bright spot that could flow from that would be a determination by the civilized nations of the world that we will never again arm a Third World despot, an irresponsible, mindless tyrant with the sophisticated weapons of mass destruction as we have in the case of Saddam Hussein. Mr. Speaker, it is we in the West, the developed countries of the West who have created Saddam Hussein. We have given him his unconventional weapons, his nuclear, his gas, his chemical weapons capability.

Let me describe the poison gas connection. The following countries have contributed in a major way to Saddam Hussein's possessing now these weapons of mass destruction: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Switzerland, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. A total of 207 firms in these countries have, taken together, built Saddam Hussein into a position where he threatens the peace and stability of the entire Near East region, 86 companies from Germany, 18 from the United Kingdom, 18 from the United States of America, 16 from France, 11 from Switzerland, 17 from Austria, 8 from Belgium and so on. Saddam Hussein is a creation of the civilized, developed countries of the West.

The one good thing that would come out of a tough sanctions program might take a year or a year and a half is the ability of these countries to work out an arms denial program so that no tyrant, no Saddam Hussein, no Qadhafi, no Khomeini, no Idi Amin in the future will ever threaten their neighbors, will ever threaten the peace and stability of vast regions. This is one of the great payoffs that could come from a year or a year and half of working with sanctions. The world could organize an arms denial program that would make it possible never for us to face this desperate catastrophe again.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate truth in today's world of video is the reality that if an event is not on CNN or network, it simply does not exist for millions of Americans. That means for most Americans the tremendous suffering of the Kuwaiti people does not exist because of Saddam Hussein's media blackout of Kuwait.

It is certainly unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that over the last 5 months we have heard a lot of debate about our posture in terms of responding to the invasion of Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi military into Kuwait.

□ 2110

We have seen our national news media travel to Baghdad. We have seen all of our nightly news broadcasters from Ted Koppel to Peter Jennings go to Baghdad to interview Saddam Hussein, to talk to Tariq Aziz, to tell their side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, throughout these entire 5 months of this invasion of this sovereign country, a member of the United Nations, we have not seen any of that media cover anything inside of the nation of Kuwait. We have not seen any media able to interview people inside of Kuwait. We have not seen the atrocities that have occurred to the people in that nation. We have not even seen the International Red Cross allowed to go in to deal with the kinds of human rights violations and concerns that they typically deal with in even the most barbaric nations on this Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight because I would like to take a small portion of the time of this body to provide some information that for the past 5 months has not been available to the American people, to provide some of the real human stories and tragedies of what has happened to the Kuwaiti people, all of them perpetrated by Saddam Hussein and his military. Mr. Speaker, I do this not as someone who has not been interested in human rights issues. I belong to the Human Rights Caucus and I have since I have been in Washington and under the leadership of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], and my other good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Over 200 Members of this institution have worked on human rights violations around the world. Just in the past year alone, 1990, I was personally involved in seven human rights cases in the Soviet Union, in Nepal and Czechoslovakia in two instances, Singapore, East Timor in two instances, in Nicaragua, in the Ukraine, El Salvador in two instances. I have written letters on human rights cases in Africa and Asia and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that in the 4 years that I have been here I have never seen the human rights violations that have occurred since August 2 in the nation of Kuwait. We have seen a lot of rhetoric thrown around Washington about what is happening and not happening, why we are in the gulf, why we have sent our troops there, but we have not seen the documentation and the visual evidence of what has occurred to innocent people, to mothers, to sons, to fathers, to children. We have not heard the stories up until December 19 of this year when Amnesty International, the most respected human rights organization in the world, documented their second and most extensive report of the human rights violations in Kuwait. That document, which I have made available to every Member of Congress and which sits in the office of every Member of this body and the other body, is something that every individual should read. It is certainly not the first time that we have experienced human-rights violations, but I can tell the Members that in the 4 years that I have been here I have never seen the kinds of violations, examined in detail, that are contained in this document, violations that are not just isolated incidents but are a clear-cut pattern of the Iraqi military under the leadership of Saddam Hussein.

We might ask why would this man allow these kinds of atrocities to occur. He probably is not aware of them.

I would like to start out with an article that was in the Washington Times on January 7 which says that one defector from Iraq who has now come over to our side, and in fact he was the Iraqi leader's personal bodyguard, has been providing our Western governments with gruesome details of torture by the Hussein regime including the grisly murders of prisoners who were immersed in acid baths. They literally dissolved, said the official to Western sources. This is not an exception. This type of treatment and torture and inhumane activity is documented and is referenced in the Amnesty International report.

Just recently under the leadership of the task force chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], this institution in late De-

cember held hearings and brought in witnesses and those who had seen and heard about some of the incidents detailed in the Amnesty International report, but it is time that we went beyond that and placed it on the record in terms of the atrocities that Saddam Hussein has perpetrated on the innocent people of Kuwait.

A former interrogator in his early thirties, arrested on September 22 after being found in possession of a leaflet giving information on chemical weapons to innocent citizens, was detained for 1 week principally at a police station near Kuwait City and was subjected to beatings, kicking, burning of the skin and sexual torture.

Another case cited by Amnesty International, a 17-year-old student arrested in early September after being found in possession of a gun and leaflets containing information on weaponry was detained for 36 days in detention centers in Kuwait City and later in Basra and subjected to beatings, mock execution, beatings on the soles of the feet and electric shocks and threatened with sexual torture.

A 32-year-old office clerk arrested on August 3 as he returned home after buying foodstuffs from the local cooperative society was detained for 5 days at a local police station and subjected to beatings, electric shocks, and was shot in the leg at point-blank range.

A 22-year-old student arrested on August 24 following house-to-house searches in the district of al-Rawda; he was detained for 8 days in al-Rawda, and in neighboring police stations, subjected to beatings, kicking, and once again torture to the feet. Cigarettes were extinguished on his body, and his leg was slashed with a knife.

A 38-year-old man arrested on September 5 after another detainee allegedly revealed he was active in the armed opposition in Kuwait was detained for 1 week at the Kuwait general staff headquarters in the district and later in Basra. He was subjected to beatings, mock execution, exposure to hot and cold temperatures, electric shocks, and suspension from a rotating fan.

A 31-year-old man was arrested on September 14 at his home during a traditional male gathering where social and political issues are discussed by the people of Kuwait. He was detained for 3 weeks at local police stations and private homes in Kuwait City, and then taken to Basra. He was subjected to beatings, electric shocks, mock execution, and was forced to watch his relatives being tortured. He himself was tortured in front of them.

These are all instances documented in the Amnesty International report.

There were reports that there were incidents involving babies, and those people who were ill in Kuwaiti hospitals. The report provided by Amnesty International goes into great detail

about the documented reports of the incidents involving innocent citizens in hospitals.

I would like to refer to some of them. Over 300 premature babies are reported to have died after Iraqi soldiers removed them from incubators which were looted and taken up to Iraq. The deaths were reported at al-Razi and al-'Addan hospitals as well as the maternity hospital.

According to a Red Crescent doctor, Premature babies at the maternity hospital died after Iraqi soldiers took them out of their incubators. This happened in August, in the early days of the invasion. A total of 312 babies died in this manner. I personally took part in the burial of 72 of them in al-Rigga cemetery.

This is a sworn statement of a Red Crescent doctor who was able to tell the story to Amnesty International.

Another doctor working at al-'Addan hospital whose brother was a volunteer gravedigger reported that 36 premature babies were buried in one day alone in August. An eyewitness account of such deaths at the hospital was provided by a 15-year-old Kuwaiti girl, this time before our own congressional Human Rights Caucus on October 10, and I quote her:

The second week after the invasion, I volunteered at the al-'Addan hospital. I was the youngest volunteer. While I was there, I saw the Iraqi soldiers come into the hospital with guns and go into the room where 15 babies were in incubators. They took the babies out of the incubators, took the incubators and left the babies on the cold floor to die. It was horrifying.

Another Kuwaiti doctor working at al-Razi hospital quoted earlier in this same part of the report told of other cases that he knew of:

There was a woman that I know who for a long time was not able to bear children. This year she gave birth to quadruplets, three boys and a girl. The babies were placed in incubators because they were born in the seventh month. Two hours after the birth, the woman was told to leave the hospital. The next day she received a telephone call from the hospital telling her to come and take her babies.

□ 2120

She said she could not take care of them as they needed special care and nutrition. So they said to her, "As you wish." The woman rushed to the hospital and found her babies out of the incubators. She took them home, and the following day they all died.

The Amnesty International report is filled with instances of this type. Documented cases, from eye witnesses, and personal experiences, cases where people were thrown into a skating rink in Kuwait City, mass amounts of innocent citizens, just placed there to rot, with no proper attention paid to their well-being. Cases where people were executed in front of their family members in terribly inhumane circumstances.

Additional cases provided by Amnesty International: a 25-year-old law

student at Kuwait University, according to eye witness reports, she was killed on August 8 when Iraqi troops fired at a group of 35 women demonstrating peacefully against Iraq's annexation of Kuwait. Another woman in her mid twenties was reported to have been killed in the same incident, as well as two boys, aged 13 and 16, who died after being shot in the head and heart respectively.

Mr. Speaker, none of this has been able to be shown to the American people. Our media in this country has been manipulated. They have all traveled to Baghdad. The nightly news will be there tonight. They will be there interviewing, but not one held Saddam Hussein accountable to allow them to have access to Kuwait City, to talk to innocent people, to allow the American people to see all parameters of this debate, and to see the kinds of human rights violations that have occurred on a regular basis since August 2, by the hundreds—not by the few—that I am citing here this evening.

A middle-aged British man shot dead by Iraqi soldiers on August 11 near the Kuwaiti border with Saudi Arabia as he was trying to flee the country. Two other British men traveling with him who did succeed in crossing the border stated they witnessed the killing. Another writer on Islamic affairs in his early thirties living in Kuwait City, according to information provided by Amnesty International by two medical personnel of the Red Crescent, his body was found in a rubbish bin and was brought to their headquarters at the end of August. Two doctors who examined his body stated that he had been tortured prior to execution, and I quote:

His beard had been plucked out. His toenails extracted. And his body bore burn marks consistent with the use of a hot metal implement.

The reasons for his arrest and execution were never revealed.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of examples are rife throughout the Amnesty International report, and any debate of the resolutions that we are considering today would not be complete unless the American people had access to that, which they have been denied the right to understand what has been happening to innocent citizens inside of this sovereign nation. These are mothers. These are fathers. These are children. These are human beings that we are talking about that have been tortured and butchered by the Butcher of Baghdad.

Another individual, age 44, head of a cooperative society and president of the numismatic society, he was publicly shot by a firing squad outside of that same society on September 7, apparently for refusing to take down a photograph of one of the leaders of Kuwait, and to replace it with a picture of President Saddam Hussein. Another in-

dividual was arrested on September 2 and killed. A medical doctor to Amnesty International said his body bore extensive burn marks consistent with the use of electricity and hot metal. Cigarettes had been extinguished on his body. Another individual, administrator with a cooperative society, married, eight children—eight children—his body was found in a rubbish bag in an area adjacent to Kuwait City on September 8. His hands were tied, and his head wrapped in the flag of Kuwait. He had been shot twice in the head just above the ear. The reasons for his execution were unknown. When arrested, he had just left his house apparently to make arrangements for the setting up of a new bakery in his district.

Mr. Speaker, these stories have not been brought out. More importantly, the American people have not seen the visual implications of what Saddam Hussein has done. There have been very few visual portrayals of what has occurred inside of Kuwait since the August 2 taking over of that nation. It has been very difficult, because Saddam has closed the borders down. None of our media has been allowed access to that nation. Unfortunately, they chose to give access to the leader of Iraq, and his capital city of Baghdad while refusing to force him to allow them to have access to innocent Kuwaiti people.

This is my first photograph. It shows the facial view of a 28-year-old Kuwaiti man whose identity has been withheld, the victim of an attempted extrajudicial killing, interviewed by Amnesty International. According to his testimony, Iraqi soldiers shot him on August 24 as he had just finished distributing food from a local cooperative to people's homes. He stated that the soldiers started firing at him as soon as they saw him, and he ran away. One of the bullets penetrated his neck, existing at the mouth. He suffered serious damage to his jaw and was fortunate to survive. He was admitted to Mubarak Hospital for preliminary treatment, and underwent surgery at a hospital in Saudi Arabia. It was documented by Amnesty International.

Mr. Speaker, two additional photographs taken from these documented cases by Amnesty International inside of Kuwait. These are photographs of the bodies of three unidentified persons. The bodies were found in the streets of Kuwait City and brought to the headquarters of the Red Crescent in the period of late August and early September. Amnesty International interviewed the doctor who took these photographs. He stated that the victims had been tortured, beaten, and burned prior to their execution. There was no autopsy examination, but the following is the medical opinion of the British forensic pathologist. There is clearly blood soaking the body which has most likely arise from either a wound to the head, neck or chest. A

striking feature of the photograph is the dark staining of the hands which may represent oil or a similar substance being used to burn the victim before his death.

Mr. Speaker, these are the examples that have been on the news every night since August 2. These are the stories of innocent citizens that have never been told, so when we debate in this body, and we try to make this a cold debate about emirs and rich people, let Members not forget there are innocent human beings tortured brutally, and documented by the most respected human rights group in the world, Amnesty International. Whether Members agree with the President's policy or not, this body deserves an oath to the American people to bring the stories forward and to discuss them openly, because this is one of the reasons why we are in Saudi Arabia, attempting to rid Kuwait of the aggressor, because of the atrocities he has put forth on the people of Kuwait.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, page 37 to 40 of the Amnesty International document, perhaps is the worst, because it provides 39 specific examples of what Saddam Hussein and his terrorists have done in Kuwait to innocent people. These are not things that someone made up in this institution. These are documented types of torture and ill treatment that have been reported to Amnesty International, investigated, and need to be looked at as we consider the debate here over the next several days.

1. Beatings on all parts of the body, involving punching slapping, delivering Karate-style blows and kicking with heavy army boots. Implements used for beating include canes, metal rods, whips, steel cables, hosepipes, rubber truncheons and rifle butts.
2. Falaga: prolonged beating on the soles of the feet. Sometimes the detainee is then forced to walk or run.
3. Suspending the detainee by the feet, or by the arms which are tied behind the back.
4. Beating the detainee while suspended from a rotating fan in the ceiling.
5. Breaking of the arms, legs or ribs; dislocating elbow and shoulder joints.
6. Lifting the detainee high up in the air and then dropping him, sometimes resulting in the fracturing of bones.
7. Applying pressure to the fingers with a clamp-like instrument.
8. Slashing the face, arms or legs with knives.
9. Extracting finger and toenails.
10. Boring a hole in the leg, apparently with a type of drilling tool.
11. Cutting off of the tongue and ear.
12. Gouging out of the eyes.
13. Castration.
14. Hammering nails into the hands.
15. Piercing the skin with pins or staplers.
16. Shooting the detainee in the arm or leg at point blank range, followed by deprivation of the necessary medical treatment.
17. Rape of women (including virgins) and young men.
18. Inserting bottle necks, sometimes when broken, into the rectum.

19. Tying a string around the penis and pulling it tightly.

20. Pumping air using a pipe through the anus, particularly of young boys.

21. Applying electricity to sensitive parts of the body, including the ears, lips, tongue, fingers, toes and genitals. Sometimes the detainee is doused with water prior to the administration of electricity. The electrical instruments used include electric batons as well as wires fitted with clips (like those used to recharge car batteries but smaller in size).

22. Burning various parts of the body, including the genitals, with domestic appliances such as electric irons, with heated metal rods, or with a naked flame.

23. Extinguishing cigarettes on the eyeballs or on various parts of the body, including the genitals, nipples, chest and hands.

24. Pouring hot and cold water alternately over the detainee.

25. Placing the detainee in a cold, air-conditioned room for several hours, and then immediately into a heated room.

26. Pouring an acid-like substance onto the skin.

27. Pouring caustic substances onto the eyes, causing blindness.

28. Plucking facial hair, particularly the beard, with pincers or pliers.

29. Placing heavy weights on the detainee's body.

30. Spitting into the detainee's mouth.

31. Exposing the detainee to the sun for several hours at a stretch without water.

32. Subjecting the detainee to mock execution. This includes holding the head below water to the point of near suffocation; going through the motions of execution by firing squad; and holding a gun to the head or in the mouth and pulling the trigger.

33. Forcing the detainee to watch others being tortured, or to hear their screams.

34. Raping or torturing the detainee's relatives in his or her presence; threatening the detainee with such acts.

35. Threatening the detainee with torture methods such as the electric chair [al-Kursi al-Rajaj], or with death by immersion in an acid bath, which I referred to earlier.

36. Deprivation of medical treatment.

37. Deprivation of sleep, food, water, fresh air and toilet or washing facilities.

38. Degrading the detainee by using obscene language or insults.

Mr. Speaker, this is not some list that I drew up. This is a list of documented cases and referrals brought to the United Nations, to the Task Force on Human Rights of this institutions, just this past week to our own Foreign Affairs Committee, as documented by Amnesty International and as highlighted to us this past week by 30 of our own hostages who are now free, who heard or saw this type of activity occur throughout the period of August 2 until now.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy is that the American people have seen nothing of this from the news media. They have heard nothing of the torture of innocent people.

Just this past week we saw Tariq Aziz speak for 45 minutes following a meeting that he had with Secretary Baker. In the 45 minutes he spoke, he did not once mention Kuwait. He talked about linkage. He talked about Palestinians. He talked about all the

other issues, but he never mentioned the country of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, I will venture to say that as we proceed to this debate, this body has got to remember that we are talking about the persecution, the humiliation, the killing and the torturing of innocent human beings.

There are stories in the Amnesty International Report and stories in this booklet which recently was published, called the "Rape of Kuwait" by Jean Sasson documenting torture to children, not just those innocent premature babies in hospitals, but innocent children, publicly humiliated and killed in the country of Kuwait.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, this information has not been given the attention in the media that I feel it should have been given, primarily because of Saddam Hussein's ability to manipulate our media in not giving access to Kuwait City.

As I stated at the outset, Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate truth in today's world is that video is reality, what our people see on the television set, what they see before them is what is there and what is news. If an event is not on CNN or if it is not on the network news, it simply does not exist for millions of Americans, and perhaps even for us in this institution. That means for most Americans all of these atrocities did not exist up until now, because the attention has not been paid to them.

We refer to Kuwait as some foreign nation where the people living there are not human beings, and that is unfair.

Whether we agree with the President or not, we owe it to innocent citizens to bring forth these cases, and the atrocities of Saddam Hussein as we talk about trusting this man, as we talk about allowing us to work with him. This is not a normal human being that allows this kind of activity to go unchecked for so long by his military establishment, who repeatedly refuses to allow the International Red Cross and every other major international group, including Amnesty International, to go in and check and see independently whether or not these things are still occurring; and yet today we have begun a debate on what our next course of action should in fact be.

I would hope that as this debate unfolds that we would not forget the innocent people of Kuwait, would not forget those mothers and fathers and husbands and wives and grandparents and children who simply want what all of us want in our country, and who have been invaded by a barbaric nation, a military that has tortured their people and that has caused the worst kind of treatment imaginable to any human being.

This is the scenario that today still exists in Kuwait up until August 2, a member nation of the United Nations.

We who work so diligently to correct human rights' violations, the 200 of us who belong to the Human Rights Caucus and who work day in and day out to bring to the forefront any human rights case, whether it is a single person in Nicaragua or whether it is a person, a Soviet Jew in the Soviet Union, or whether it is someone who is brought to our attention through the media, we work to correct that and bring it to the attention of the Government, the American people and to right that wrong.

And yet here we have hundreds and thousands of documented cases that up until this point in time have not reached the American people, and that is a tragedy. That is an absolute tragedy.

The 30 American detainees, the hostages who just now have been freed, have voluntarily come to Washington and right now are in this Nation's Capitol throughout the Halls of Congress, talking to Members about what they saw and about what they heard.

They put out a document that I would like to refer to in winding down my comments on the human rights violations. This is a document provided by the hostages who are right now here in Washington meeting with Members of Congress and their staffs.

It says:

U.S. policy must concentrate on America's long-term interests there, beginning with full implementation of U.N. resolutions regarding Iraq's aggression against Kuwait.

Number two. All observations indicate that Saddam Hussein has no intention of quitting Kuwait voluntarily.

Number three. Sanctions are having little impact on Iraq.

Number four. Iraq is systematically strangling Kuwait and terrorizing the Kuwaiti people.

Number five. Since August, Kuwaitis have put their lives on the line time and again to protect Americans.

We heard that today in our press conference.

And last:

Morale is low within Iraq's occupation forces who appear poorly prepared for war.

One of the lead American hostages, Ernest Alexander, is one of my constituents. He lives in my town of Media with his family. He is a very loving father and husband. I have met with Alex, as he is called, extensively in my office. I have heard him talk about these cases and I saw him look me in the eye and say, "Congressman, how come the story hasn't been told? How come there is no discussion about the innocent Kuwaiti people and what has happened to them? How come there is no nightly broadcast where we can relay what we have seen firsthand in terms of terrorists acts of Saddam Hussein and his military?"

All I could tell Alex was, "I will do my part as one Member of Congress and as a member of the Human Rights Caucus to take these documented cases and bring them to the only forum available to me, a special order."

□ 2140

So tonight I bring these stories, just a few samplings of what has been going on in Kuwait since August 2.

As we consider the debate over the next 3 days let us not forget the innocent victims of Saddam Hussein's aggression. As we talk about our solutions to dealing with Iraq and this man, let us not forget what he has done as documented by Amnesty International.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for organizing this special order on the human rights situation in occupied Kuwait.

In the midst of this debate on congressional authorization of the use of force in the Persian Gulf, it is particularly important and timely for the full picture of Iraqi aggression and human rights abuses against Kuwait to be laid out for all the world to see.

On January 8, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard from three panels of witnesses about the full extent of the summary executions, arbitrary arrests and detentions, and torture and rape perpetrated by the Iraqi Army on Kuwaiti civilians.

The testimony presented to our committee by former American hostages in Kuwait and Iraq, Kuwaiti citizens, and representatives of Amnesty International and Middle East Watch, left little doubt that these abuses are clear violations of human rights law.

Our committee members heard ample evidence that Iraq is violating the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, both of which have been ratified by Iraq. During the course of this special order, I expect that there will be numerous references to the flagrant Iraqi violations of international humanitarian law noted in U.N. Security Council Resolution 670, which was adopted on September 25, 1990 by a vote of 14 to 1.

When you sort out the significance of these abuses and how they might compare to those in other countries of the region, you cannot help but come to one very compelling and inescapable conclusion: the Iraqi authorities have embarked on a clear and deliberate policy of wholesale destruction of the entire nation of Kuwait.

The systematic destruction and looting of the homes, businesses, and museums in Kuwait and the policy of mass terror directed at all Kuwaiti men, women, and children is designed to eliminate the soul and spirit of that nation. That is what we are confronting in the current debate on the gulf crisis.

Since the August 2 invasion of Kuwait, human rights groups, as well as escaped Kuwaiti nationals and former American hostages, have detailed widespread human rights abuses by Iraqi forces.

These abuses include the arbitrary arrest and detention of thousands of civilians and

military personnel; the widespread torture of persons in custody; the imposition of the death penalty and execution of hundreds of unarmed civilians; and the systematic use of rape to drive Kuwaiti women and their families from the country.

In addition, hundreds of people in Kuwait remain unaccounted for. To date, Amnesty International estimates that 300,000 Kuwaitis have fled their country and that several hundred thousand foreign nationals working in Kuwait have also left.

Despite numerous efforts, no human rights group has been allowed to enter Kuwait. Not even the Red Cross can get in the country to perform its humanitarian role. In fact, the Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister has threatened with mutilation any person attempting to go to Kuwait to investigate human rights abuses without Iraq's permission.

According to Middle East Watch, scores of people in Kuwait, including physicians and hospital volunteers, were summarily executed in September and October. Many of these were murdered in front of their families. Iraq has yet to give an accounting of people who have been killed in Iraqi custody. Middle East Watch estimates that more than 5,000 people were arrested and more than 600 people were killed in the first 3 months after the invasion.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to study the record of human rights abuses in occupied Kuwait. It will provide compelling evidence that Iraq has moved into Kuwait with no thought of withdrawal or accommodation to the citizens of that country that is in danger of disappearing altogether.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the Kuwait task force of the Human Rights Caucus today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the atrocities committed against the citizens of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, what can one expect from an individual who began his career in public service as the official state torturer? The details of beatings, rapes, and summary executions sicken all of us. With the evidence obtained by Amnesty International, Middle East Watch and other human rights organizations, there should be no doubt that Saddam Hussein is an evil totalitarian dictator capable and guilty of murder and torture.

It is difficult to comprehend a mentality that denied a pregnant woman access to medical care, that murdered two teenage boys in front of their family, and kept several hundred hostages, some used as human shields, for several months, in order to defend a brutal invasion which to this day has been justified only by empty, baseless arguments and claims.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the cold war, and the wondrous expansion of democracy throughout our world, it is Saddam Hussein who is still holding the world hostage. If this unprovoked act of aggression is left to stand, a message will be sent to all the dictators of the world; that it is permissible to invade a smaller country, that it is alright to torture and murder, that it is alright to use chemical and biological weapons even against your own people.

Mr. Speaker, there has been and remains a considerable debate over the United States'

involvement in this conflict. As the member of the United Nations with the most resources and the best ability to support the U.N. resolutions, the United States should not turn its back on Kuwait and the world. Rather, we should set the example for peace and security which will define our post cold war world.

It is clear that the recent inflexibility of the Iraqi Government may make a forceful implementation of the U.N. resolutions a necessity. It is imperative therefore, even at this late date, that the U.S. Congress send a strong signal to Saddam Hussein that the American people and their Congress support the 12 U.N. resolutions, including the use of force.

Even at this late date, there remains a possibility that Hussein will withdraw from Kuwait. However, Hussein still looks to the U.S. Congress to confuse the issue and thereby weaken the United Nations effort. We must not afford him this luxury.

As we consider the broad, diverse issues associated with our position in the Middle East, let us not forget during the debate those individuals who in their terror and pain hoped for succor from the United Nations and the United States.

WHY I WILL VOTE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S RESOLUTION ON THE PERSIAN GULF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. I think he very graphically brought not only to this Congress but also to the people of our country the type of individual with which we are dealing in Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that tonight I come to this Chamber with a very heavy heart. I am very saddened that our olive branch that was offered yesterday by Secretary Baker to Mr. Aziz was rejected. I think President Bush put it very well when he said that our offer of peace was stiff-armed.

It saddens me that peace was offered, peace was in the grasp of Hussein, and it was not accepted.

I just pray that peace is still possible. I pray that the United Nations mission is successful.

I am reminded of my father, who passed away last year, who was in World War II, a bombardier on a B-24 Liberator.

Throughout my lifetime he expressed to me how terrible war was and how he hoped his two sons would never be involved.

I have heard some other speakers tonight talk about having to face mothers and fathers. Consequently, I think the votes that will be taken tomorrow and Saturday were perhaps the most important votes that I have ever taken in my 10 years as a U.S. Congressman.

I have to also say that I do not think that they are the most difficult votes. They are most important because we are talking about the possibility of the loss of American lives, a tremendous sacrifice, the most precious sacrifice that can be made by any nation; but a sacrifice that might have to be made.

As a Republican, I plan to support my President; as an American, I plan to support my President as Commander in Chief.

There were times that I was not able to support the President. I could not support President Reagan when there was a vote to commit troops to Lebanon, because I could not discern a purpose.

I will never forget going to a meeting with Secretary Shultz and Secretary Weinberger, looking for the purpose, looking for a strategy, trying to find a reason. And I could not.

I did not support the President in that particular endeavor.

The same thing could be said when I was asked to support the President on the sale of AWACS to Saudi Arabia back in early 1981.

One of the first votes I had to cast as a freshman legislator, I was called by President Reagan and asked to support his position. I could not find a purpose, and consequently I could not support the President of our country, the President of my party.

But this is an altogether different situation because I have looked for a purpose, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who preceded me, did a very good job of explaining the atrocities that have been felt by the people of Kuwait. It is very easy to project and understand that those same atrocities could be felt by the people of that entire region.

I think it is fair to make analogies to Adolf Hitler, that there could be an Adolf Hitler in the Middle East in Saddam Hussein. Here is a person who used chemical weapons on his own people; here is a person who took incubators out of hospitals in Kuwait and let little babies die.

I just hope the American people understand the type of human being Saddam Hussein is and understand the problems he has already created in this country.

The price of gasoline since his invasion of Kuwait has gone up 24 cents per gallon on an average across this great country. Our economy has been pushed into a recession. The stock market just yesterday, under the prospect of peace, jumped by over 40 points and then when the news came from Secretary of State Baker that those hopes for peace were dashed, the stock market dropped 79 points, which was a 30-point net loss.

Closer to home, in Houston, TX, Continental Airlines declared bankruptcy, giving as the main reason that higher cost of aviation fuel precipitated by the invasion of Kuwait.

So those who wonder if we have been affected in this country, it does not take much investigation to see that, yes, we have been affected. But again, if you project forward and if you expand these thoughts and think what would happen if this tyrant dominated the entire Persian Gulf, the Middle Eastern region where the largest concentration of oil reserves are, you understand what could happen not only to the economy of the United States but to the economy of the world.

Consequently, I think President Bush acted not only promptly but he acted properly to protect American interests.

I think the President has been masterful in marshaling world opinion and the involvement of all the countries that are involved.

Secretary Cheney said today in a briefing that he held for us that our allies have paid 75 percent of the incremental costs thus far of this peace effort. Now, I think there should be a greater burden sharing both in terms of financial resources and the commitment of troops. But if you look at what our President has done, he has made this a universal situation of opposition to Saddam Hussein.

In my mind, there is no question that our President, as Commander in Chief, has the authority to act. If you look at what the intent of our Founding Fathers was, the Framers of the Constitution, their intent was that we in Congress in our collective wisdom decide what size the military should be for national security needs, but not to control that military once it was established.

Our real power is in the ability to authorize and appropriate moneys. But if you look at the precedents since 1789, there have been 218 instances of foreign involvement by U.S. troops. Congress, by joint resolution with Presidential signature affixed, has formally declared war only five times. In all other instances the President, utilizing his constitutional authority, deployed American forces without the specific approval of Congress.

Now, the first two instances of such use were by President John Adams in the undeclared war with France between 1798 and 1800, and Thomas Jefferson in the war with Tripoli between 1801 and 1805.

I certainly think John Adams and Thomas Jefferson knew the intent of the Framers of our Constitution.

History and practice have never held that the war declaration clause of the Constitution is a restraint on the Executive to utilize Armed Forces abroad. I am not afraid to let my constituents know how I plan to vote.

I plan to support the President as our Commander in Chief. I think he has identified a clear purpose that has a national security interest of this country affixed.

He has gone about, in a prepared way—in fact one of the points made by Secretary Cheney today was the degree to which we are prepared, the degree to which we have information, the degree to which our troops are ready to act if called upon.

So, to me, this body should be talking in a unitary voice so that we do not send a conflicting signal. I am very concerned, as many other Members of this body are, that Mr. Saddam Hussein does not understand what this debate is all about. He feels there is division in this country. But he needs to understand that our President has put together a multinational force. There are 12 United Nations resolutions; there are 28 countries participating in this effort. In fact, there are 250,000 foreign troops participating with our own troops.

□ 2150

But we do have Americans who are at risk. We need to make sure that the young men and women who are serving our country so bravely and so courageously in that Middle Eastern theater, that they know as a country that we are behind them 100 percent. To me, to not back the President will undercut his power, and there have been those who have said, "Why now? Why not wait? Let's give sanctions a chance to work."

Just last week a Soviet freighter was found to be carrying weapons to some other country, but most people feel that those weapons would have ultimately wound up in Iraq. That border with the countries surrounding Iraq is a sieve. There is no real evidence that sanctions will work in the short term. We are giving Saddam Hussein the time to fortify and make it difficult for our people, if in fact we have to use force, and we also need to keep in mind that there are some holy months coming up. The month of fasting begins in March. The Muslim pilgrimage begins in June. The summer will be on in that particular region shortly making it very difficult to operate.

I think at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, we need to recognize that our President, as Commander in Chief, having worked with the Members and leaders of this great institution, and leaders of the world, has put together an effort of solidarity to do what is right, but in doing what is right to protect vital American interests. And I think we owe our President, as Commander in Chief, our support, and I think we owe our troops that 100 percent backing by the Congress that they so richly deserve.

MAKING THE RIGHT DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I sat in the Chamber today, and listened to many of the special orders that were given, as well as much of the debate, I have had the particular occasion to listen to my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS]. I want to compliment them both. I think they make very cogent points and ones that should be brought to the attention of the American people.

I, too, feel constrained in my speech today because I know that Saddam Hussein watches what we say here in this Chamber. He apparently feels that he can discern the opinion of the American people. He may take a misreading from that. Let me first address my attention to him.

Anything you have heard today, Mr. Hussein, you should take as the honored privilege of free men to debate under a Constitution that we all hold high. You will be most mistaken to assume that this is an indication of division in this Nation. On the contrary, it is merely the method and means, through deliberation, that a free people arrive at a concerted end. This body, and our Senate and our President, ultimately will act, regardless how I vote or my other colleagues that may not be in the majority. Once a majority is struck, the die is cast in this democracy, and you need not think of division anymore. If in fact the President's resolution succeeds, there will be unanimous support for any effort he undertakes, as difficult and as time consuming as it may be, and you should take little solace from the thought that America will not rise to the cause. It certainly will.

So, Mr. Hussein, you should not have a good sleep tonight from what you hear from this Member of Congress because what I am about to say is not directed to you. It is directed to the American people and my colleagues with the hope that we can deliberate these next few hours to determine what the best course for this Nation and the world is at this moment in time.

I will address my next remarks to the President. I indicated today early in a speech that I have a great deal more admiration for this body and the other body because there has been little rancor and much serious debate, serious thought. My colleagues and myself have attempted to look at every aspect that faces the American people and this Congress on this solemn occasion. Today I rise to discuss some of the issues, some of the important factors that I must resolve in my mind to satisfy myself that I have done my best, I have done my duty and that I have upheld my oath to the Constitution of the United States.

To the President I would like to say, and to those who think that there are only two choices, to support the President or not to support the President, that is not the issue. The issue is to support the Constitution and do our duty as elected Representatives to deliberate and represent the interests of all the American people, not only the living, but also the future, because what we do here in these next 2 days will affect the lives of American citizens and indeed the world, not only tomorrow, but next week and next year. Indeed the quality of life, the nature of our Constitution, the way we react to strain and stress in the world for many, many decades to come, long after many of us who serve here will no longer walk the face of this Earth will be affected by our actions here tonight.

To the President I say, "Mr. President, don't you suggest that any Member of either side of this body challenges or questions your courage. Quite frankly it's just the opposite. We know your war record. We know the hard decisions you have had to make these last 2 years, and I have watched you particularly these last 5 months, and I see the great strain on you physically. I know that, if I could see the strain on your mind, it would also be reflected. None of us are certain that we're right, and I'm sure you'll never know you're right or wrong, but you must use your best judgment."

"Regardless of what that judgment is, I want to congratulate you in one respect, and I want to congratulate the leadership of the Congress, because many of us in Congress felt that the larger scale debate, and the decision to make war, is something far more important that would long survive the name of Saddam Hussein and indeed Iraq. It will set a precedent to determine how our Constitution will apply in the future. Today's actions will help future generations determine who is to exercise the greatest power free men have to exercise, the decision to go to war, and whether we would follow the dictates of our Constitution, the dictates of our heart, our emotions, or some measure other than constitutional law. The fact that you have now requested the Congress of the United States to participate in this decision-making process serves you well, Mr. President. The fact that the leadership of this Congress has recognized your request and has submitted three resolutions to this body and other resolutions to the other body indicates that the constitutional process will finally resolve this dilemma."

We will have an opportunity over these next several days to debate the most fundamental issues of man, the most fundamental issues facing this Republic. We will all try and add the best we can to this debate. We will all try and discern what the best course of action is for this country, and then we

will pray to God we made the right choice and the right decision.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, few of us will suffer the personal consequences of our decision. Nevertheless, we will ultimately chart a course for hundreds of thousands of American service men and women who will feel the direct result of our decision. We make a decision tonight for millions of Americans who only hope that they do not have to, in their lifetime, witness war. If they need to, however, they will, and they will be as organized and unified as America has always been in a time of need.

□ 2200

I am going to support two of the three resolutions that come to a vote on Saturday, the first of which is very clear, and actually probably the most important. This resolution clearly states that the Congress of the United States will reassert to the President and the country that the constitutional authority to declare war resides in this body and the other body, and is not something that is entertained individually or singularly by the President of the United States.

I was worried that that issue would become obscured, and that the Americans would not realize how fundamentally important it is. The Founding Fathers, when they designated the power to declare war in this body, recognized that this was the only body that directly represented a large mass of the people. This House consists of the people's Representatives, and we are charged with the responsibility to debate, deliberate, and exercise our best judgment, to expend the lives and the fortunes of their fellow citizens.

No higher responsibility resides in an elected official. Every one of us, with great trepidation, realizes that when the final vote is taken, it will, in a way, be a vote for execution.

In my life I have only had one other opportunity to clearly send men to their death, and that was in the Vietnam war. I was selected by the President of the United States to serve on a Selective Service Board. I remember the most difficult decision that I ever made was 2 days before the suspension of the Selective Service, my board was called upon to select four draftees out of six. One of the six had a physical exemption to service and did not qualify. One of the six was a conscientious objector who was entitled to a hearing that was later invalidated due to the suspension coming into place before the hearing was held.

That left only four, and two of those four were married, and two of those four returned to this country in a bag. I often wish that we could have delayed that hearing or meeting, and all four of those men today would be living and well, but we did not. I swore at that time to perform my duty, and I did.

Just 1 week and 1 day ago I stood in this well and I took another oath, and the major portion of that oath was to protect, support, and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is what we are doing here today, tomorrow, and Saturday. God forbid that we not do it to the best of our ability.

Mr. President, I would like to talk to you tonight, because I have misgivings about a policy we might embark upon. It is not a misgiving that I fear Saddam Hussein. It is not a misgiving that he is a vital, vicious, tyrannical leader of the lowest kind, and that this world is filled with many leaders of that stripe. I do not deny that he has killed his own people or that he has invaded another country, nor will I deny that there are many wars going on tonight, many deaths occurring around the world, and many more that will occur in the future.

It is because of the fall of the Wall and the semidissolutionment of the Soviet Union in terms of military power, that I recognized for the first time in my lifetime we had an opportunity for peace.

I was not so idealistic as to believe that there would never be war again, but I truly believed that we would have a decade or two of non-world war status, of regional wars, of police actions, of needs for a world police force. That is what I envisioned in the desert on August 2.

Mr. President, I was fishing when Iraq invaded Kuwait, but I immediately went to the nearest television and watched and listened intently to the actions taken. I can tell you, although we were out of session at the time, that I was pleased with the actions you took, and I subsequently supported it by voting for the resolutions of support that went through this Congress.

I think America had a national interest to secure the oil resources for itself and the world from further invasion. I think the United States has a national interest to come to the aid of a friend when it is viciously invaded, and I supported the deployment of hundreds of thousands of American troops in Saudi Arabia.

I think it is the obligation of this Government to be certain that its citizens abroad are not held hostage, abused, or mistreated. All the following actions then occurred. The hostages were freed, the American citizens were protected. Our friend Saudi Arabia was not invaded. And we have come to a standstill. We have not yet freed the land of Kuwait, and we have not put the Amir back in power.

These are important questions, and they are arguable. Quite frankly, Mr. President, I have a very difficult time thinking about fighting for a monarchy or for an amir, when so much of the world is striving for democracy and so seldom are we able to come to the aid

of real democracies in this world. But they are friends of ours, and they have stood with us. If we can, we should help them. But at what price, when, and who should make that decision?

I think you confuse me, Mr. President, because beside the four points you laid down, you then started to talk about a potential nuclear threat. Having heard the debate and the testimony over these last several weeks, I and the American people can clearly conclude that sometime in the next decade an individual like Saddam Hussein may have the capacity to get nuclear weapons. If he does or if he threatens to, there is no question in my mind that we would have a much higher reason to go to war. But I think at the present time that is not a threat.

The next question that we have, Mr. President, is if it is our objective to remove the political leadership of Saddam Hussein? I have heard it intimated, but never stated. I do not believe that should be a role of the American Armed Forces nor of this Government now.

Do we rise to protect oil? Not cheap oil, but, yes, the resource of oil and the ability to every economy of the world, including our own, to have access to it? That is very important.

That has been and continues to be a substantive issue, important not only to this Nation, but all nations of the world. But certainly we do not fight, nor do we suspect that you sent our troops to Saudi Arabia, to preserve cheap oil. That would be an unfair allegation. It would be a cheap charge.

Mr. President, I know that when an individual such as yourself leaves private life and goes to public life many people question your motives. Let it never be said that I or my colleagues question your motives in this regard. We know that you will take your oath as solemnly as we take ours, that you have a position that may differ from some of ours, and that we know this republic is great and large enough to allow those opinions and that debate to take place.

That is what is happening tonight. We are raising the questions. I hope that the membership of this House and the American people as they deliberate this issue are raising these questions in their own minds. We are not doing it emotionally, without reason, but we are emotionally involved. We are not doing it mindlessly, through passion, but we are passionate in our thoughts. We are not doing it politically, because when a question of war or peace arises, it transcends politics in this country. There is only one single intent tonight, and that is to arrive at the proper course for this Nation to take at this time of great peril.

□ 2210

What we do question, Mr. President, is why now? Some have said we cannot

sustain the forces that we now have in the Middle East for a continued period of time. Some have said that there are religious holidays coming up. I do not think the timing of war should be determined by those factors.

If the mighty Armed Forces of the United States need more material we should be willing to appropriate additional funds on your request, particularly if it means not going to war but instead maintaining the embargo and the sanctions that we now have in place. If that is the question, let us get on with the job.

On the other hand, if you feel that diplomacy cannot function at all, I think we are faced with a tough decision, because diplomacy ultimately will have to prevail either before the war, during the war, or at the end of the war. We will not be at war indefinitely. At some point in time reasonable men or rational men must meet and negotiate a conclusion to what we are about to undertake.

The question may arise that we cannot keep this coalition together indefinitely. Mr. President, I compliment you on the coalition you have put together, but let us not delude ourselves or the American people that this is an equal burden that the world is sharing. It is an extraordinary American burden, and to a greater extent tokenism on the part of our allies. To that end, I think a delay before final action would give you the opportunity to further impress upon our allies that they too have a greater burden in this adventure and they too must participate.

If they leave that coalition, it is much better that we know it today, before we go to war, than to have them leave our side on the battlefield or disclaim their association and responsibility with us when the time comes to pay the price.

No, I have a question and the American people have a question, Mr. President, of why we must act now, and what is our objective. I am not sure that you know or that we know. I am not certain we have the power nor the ability to remove a single political individual from power. We have not been terribly successful at that in the past if we study the Panamanian invasion and our surgical strike at Qadhafi. But we do have the might not only to kill Saddam Hussein, but many hundreds of thousands of his citizens. But because we have that might, do we now have the right, and is it the right time for America to act?

I have listened to the testimony of our CIA Director and seven of the last eight Secretaries of Defense, and they have related that the embargo has been working, and that 6 to 9 months from now a major part of the Iraqi Air Force will be inoperable, a major part of the armored vehicles in the Iraqi Army will be inoperable. Why not face a weakened army 6 or 9 months from

now, rather than a much stronger army prepared to do battle today?

The logic of why to go to war today escapes me. If your enemy is getting weaker, and if you have the capacity to strangle him or make him hemorrhage, why do we not pursue that capacity?

Mr. President, you told the American people and this Congress when you adopted your policy on August 2, that we would use the embargo and economic sanctions, and the experts have told us that it has never worked this successfully, so we have the most successful embargo and sanctions in place that we have ever had in just 5 short months. Later we are told they are not sufficient. Did any of us dream or imagine that in 4 or 5 months we could stagger a nation today to its knees by an embargo or sanctions? I certainly did not, Mr. President. I thought the course of action you took in August was the right course of action. The testimony by the Secretaries of Defense and the CIA indicates it is working, and nothing has indicated to me that there is a change from that, other than the fact that there is some arbitrary time constraint that you and the United Nations have placed as to when we must go to war.

I think there are questions to answer. I think I agree with Senator SAM NUNN when he took the position that if war is absolutely necessary at some time, we will pursue war, but it should be our last resort. Not a drop of American blood or a dollar of the American Treasury should be expended except for useful purposes and except when no other option is possible, and when the evil is determined to be so bad that there is no other course of action.

I do not think we are in that position, although I think you are in a difficult position because you have made very strong statements. I want to say to you, Mr. President, we in this House, we, the American people, will not hold you accountable for overly strong statements that you may now find necessary to deviate from. That will be taken merely as the act of negotiation and diplomacy. I think I speak for most of us and most of the citizens I represent, that we would much rather have to explain reversing a hastily conceived course of action than explain an act of devastation to our own people and to many other innocents in the world.

I really applauded the concept of a new world order, but I guess the way I define a new world order would be a time in our history when East and West, when communism and democracy would no longer be in strife, and that world war would be something that was no longer a threat. I saw the Wall fall in 1989. I have seen the Eastern bloc destabilize and democratize, and we now see the Soviet Union in almost civil war.

We have talked of peace and we have talked of the potential of the peace dividend. Where is that dividend today?

My colleagues from Pennsylvania and from Texas made some interesting cases today. They certainly made me annoyed at Saddam Hussein. I can tell Members that sometimes when I hear the statements of Saddam Hussein or see his actions on his own people or his enemies, I recognize him as an uncivilized beast. Quite frankly, it makes my blood boil to the extent that I myself would like to see the man fall under the guns of war. But then I stop and I recognize that he is not the only vicious man in the world, and we have tended to make him appear over these last 5 months to be the only great threat to all of mankind.

I have not been convinced that in fact he is. But if I were, there would be no question, that I would support any act to remove him from the face of the world.

I do not think we have arrived at that point yet, Mr. President. I thought the new world order would be the responsibility of the United Nations, the world community coming together and recognizing, although we do not have absolute peace in our time, we do have a lessening threat for armament, but that we will have regional disputes and regional wars that will require police force action. Little did I know, Mr. President, that you decided to unilaterally name yourself chief policeman of the world, because that is the role we are now talking about. We do not have a genuine coalition of the United Nations here in the battlefields of Saudi Arabia.

□ 2220

Instead we have the overwhelming military might of the United States and a mere token presence of some of our friends. In addition, we do not have the economic burden-sharing of the industrial nations of the world. Instead we have profiteering by the industrial nations of the world at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.

Where are all of our friends? They urge us to fight. They support our decision to fight. But they fail to show up for the fight. They fail to put on their uniforms. That is what is annoying to the American people.

If that is the new world order, Mr. President, if you envision America will be the police force for the world, we must fundamentally disagree. On the other hand, if you feel, as I do, that this world needs a police force, then let me suggest that we take the time between now and the final determination to go to war to structure such a police force. Let me also suggest that the capital of all the industrial world, and that the men and women of all the industrial world, share their equal burden in this pursuit of peace. You will

have my support and the support of the Congress.

But if in fact this is just another justification for the continuation of high defense expenditures by this Government, or to circumvent the appearance of unilateral order by talking about some coalition, then I do not think you have made your case, and if that is your case, I do not think I agree with your conclusion.

There is no justification why Japan, which was raised by this Nation from the ashes of war these last 45 and 50 years, cannot share its fair burden in manpower and in treasury. We have the time between now and when the final decision to go to war must be made to see that Japan shares the burden and shows its true colors.

Where is our friend Germany? Yes, they have an Eastern bloc and an Eastern Germany to rebuild. But, Mr. President, I listened to some numbers from my friends as they debated earlier. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] mentioned the atrocities, and there are atrocities. I would not deny them. We are dealing with vicious people in the Middle East, in Iraq.

But what we did not tell the American people is this very night 2 million Americans are sleeping outdoors because we have not found a way to provide them with proper housing. What we did not tell the American people is this very day and every day of the year 30,000 children starve to death somewhere in the world, and that is a pretty big human tragedy. But we are not carrying on a war to solve that tragedy.

Mr. President, we did not even tell the American people that just 2 months ago we passed a budget to attend to a deficit, and we cut \$800 million out of the Veterans' Administration budget and as a result 38,000 American former veterans will not get service in VA hospitals. And that number will grow much greater next year if we must pay for a war.

What we do not tell the American people is that when the casualties return from overseas, in order to give them space in our veterans' hospitals, we will have to evict existing veterans who are now in our VA hospitals. It is a matter of priority and, Mr. President, I do not embarrass myself to argue priority, because the American people ask me today and, God forbid if war begins, they will ask me after the bodies start returning home, "What priority did you use to go to war or support war, and what did you do to stop war?"

I am here tonight as a single Member of Congress merely attempting to say, Mr. President, that this is a tough decision, but not an easy decision, and it certainly is not pressed by time. The January 15 deadline is an arbitrary deadline, Mr. President, but there is no reason why it cannot be changed. We have an opportunity to take the period between January 15 and whenever war

is determined to be absolutely necessary, that period of time, whether it is 6 months, 12 months, or 18 months, and develop the structure of an international police force that would be fair and share the burden. We could form an international criminal code of conduct to send notice to the world that certain actions like Saddam Hussein has taken are criminal acts against humanity and that when such actions are committed they justify, and may even necessitate an act of war, and would be the moral imperative to the American people.

Further, Mr. President, we could take these 18 months to examine our consciences and the consciences of our many friends who manufacture the munitions around the world and who sold them to these we are now called upon to fight.

I saw our Government provide \$8 billion in the last several years to this very dictator. Many of us objected to that policy, but the President's will prevailed and we gave aid to those who are now our sworn enemies. Just a week before Kuwait was invaded, I saw a request for an additional \$1 billion in credits that we knew were not being used for food substances but, in fact, were being diverted for the purchase of weapons.

We know that our friends in Germany and France have sold amazing amounts of weaponry to this very individual who tonight we discuss as an archenemy of mankind.

Worse than that, Mr. President, I question our appearance as being a sane nation when this very day our new comrade in arms in the Middle East is Assad of Syria, a known terrorist and supporter of terrorism, considered to be a vicious dictator, no different than Mr. Hussein, but now he is on our side. I wonder how long.

I wonder what will happen if when we take this precipitous act that we talk about, this act of war, and if there is an attack on Israel and if Israel responds to that attack, I wonder how many of our new friends in the Arab world will remain our friends. I sometimes wonder whether we will still be guests in the sands of Saudi Arabia. I also wonder whether the King of Saudi Arabia will still be in charge of Saudi Arabia.

I think these are questions we should ask. I think these are questions that we should address before we go to war.

Mr. President, I have not heard any discussion of a second thing that we should talk about. What happens if we win? If we win with the present burden that America will have to carry, the cost to this country will be several hundreds of billions of dollars. Our economy will be rather ravished. The price of oil will probably double. The economy will go into a tailspin.

We may win the war, but in the process of doing that, we may become a sec-

ond-rate economic power. We may lose the peace.

Are we going to provide the same kind of economic aid for Iraq after it sues for peace, that we provided to Japan, Germany and Panama? Are we going to play cops and robbers, cowboys and Indians, supply the world with weapons, create our enemies, engage in war with our enemies, and then spend our treasury to rebuild our enemies? If that is the new world order, America can hardly afford it.

I think the big question should not be whether we go to war on January 15. The big question should be, first, is war absolutely necessary? Are there any other alternatives to war? And, Mr. President, I think the answer to that question is yes. The sanctions, the embargoes, are working.

□ 1030

They may not be perfect, but they are better than any have been before. Will we have time? Our troops are not under attack. Our country is not under attack. If there is a war on January 15, as it is presently set up, it will be America taking the precipitous action, not Iraq.

Mr. President, if Iraq attacks any of our forces in the Middle East, you will have the unqualified support of the Congress to bring the full might and force of the American military against Saddam Hussein, and Iraq, and we support you and always would.

Mr. President, let it never be said that the debate and the argument here today is one of not supporting our troops in the field. I have spoken to no Member in this House, that has ever intimated to the slightest degree that once a decision is made, to go to war that the troops of the United States should not have the full support and confidence of this Congress. Once we make the decision to go to war all of us, both those who support that decision and those who oppose it, will agree to provide any material assistance or help they need to fight. That should not even be a question. It is not a question of whether we support our President. It is a question of whether or not the power to declare war is a power that our Founding Fathers declared to be the sole province of the Congress as the duly elected representatives of the people, or whether the President should exercise that power unilaterally, or whether or not we will delegate it to him by the resolutions to be passed Saturday. The constitutionality of that and the legal questions involved disturb me, Mr. President. However, I think the President's resolution, although it is not called declaration of war is, in fact, the moral equivalent to a declaration of war. The only difference is that this Congress will not say we declare war on Iraq, but this Congress will have delegated that au-

thority to the President of the United States.

In my estimation, it may not be constitutionally pure, but the intent is sufficiently clear that I do not question that you shall be granted the power. I think however, that you will listen to our arguments and our concerns. I know you will take them under consideration. But you will have that power. Beginning at midnight, January 15, you will be the most important person in the world. You will have the heaviest burden in the world. I pray you have the strength and fortitude, as well as intellectual, moral, and mental power to make a decision, not only for 250 million Americans, but for the 5 billion people that live on this planet. You will draw the course of history and determine where this world will go in the decades and centuries ahead.

I know you understand and love this country, its Constitution, and its people, as much as any man that will talk on this floor over the next 2 days. We wish you well. If the decision is war, we will support you, and we will support the armed forces of the United States. If you have the opportunity, the ability, or the cleverness to find a way not to go to war, I know I speak for the overwhelming majority of the American people, when I say that we will support and thank you. But if you do go to war, if we go to war, let us not spend one more life or drop of American blood than is necessary.

Now I would like to close with a final message to Mr. Saddam Hussein: Enjoy your sleep tonight. You have caused a great consternation in this country and around the world. You have robbed many people of their rights as human beings. You have violated international law. You have become a criminal of man. You should get no solace from the debate here, Mr. Hussein, because what you see here is what your people do not have—democracy in action. This is what this country has lived and died for, for more than 200 years. Do not ever think that we do not have the spirit or resolve to do it over and over and over again, as long as there are madmen like you anywhere on the face of the Earth. We will proceed with deliberation, with thought, and hopefully with right on our side. I urge my colleagues to think of the foundations this country was built on, as we consider and vote on the most important decision we will make in our tenure in the Congress of the United States.

I have spoken of the issues that disturb me, both constitutionally and practically. History and the journal of this RECORD will reflect my thoughts as it will those of my colleagues. History will reflect on the final decisions that we take: Did we take the right path or the wrong path? No one will know today, tomorrow, or even for months or years to come. But let it be said that somewhere on Earth in 1991

there were reasonable, rational men, who differed in their thought, their perception, and their philosophy, but who had the ability to debate and to discuss their thoughts in a free atmosphere under the Constitution of the United States. It is with that opportunity and with the pride of that document that I know the American people will listen and will deliberate with us. We will then say an extra prayer that the President exercises the great powers he may soon receive only after the soberest of deliberations.

THE JUST WAR DOCTRINE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in a solemn hour for the American democracy, for our young men and women so faultlessly serving in the Persian Gulf region, and for the ideals and purposes symbolized in the charter of the United Nations. As this Congress contemplates the fateful but necessary step of authorizing the use of U.S. Armed Forces to help effectuate the lawful resolve of the international community, the message must unequivocally be delivered: the criminally carnivorous aggressor regime in Iraq must unconditionally disgorge Kuwait.

What law and morals demand from the Congress at this time is not a declaration of war against Iraq. Rather, law and morals demand a declaration of liberation of Kuwait, a commitment to law enforcement at the international level.

Very precisely, what we confront in the gulf is the prospect of undertaking a just law enforcement action under the authority of the United Nations—employing the awesome and shattering instruments of war—to thwart the brazen aggression of a ruthless outlaw regime. In the judgment of this Member, contemplating a declaration of war at this time would be inappropriate: because traditional war, per se, is not only undesirable but actually outlawed under modern international law; and, perhaps more significantly, because it would dangerously shift the locus of this confrontation from Saddam versus the world to Saddam versus the United States.

Law and morals, along with the common interests of states, are very much at stake in the Persian Gulf. As my colleagues well know, perhaps the oldest paradigm in the Judeo-Christian tradition of governance is the moral imperative of a search for peace. Peace must be the goal of moral leadership. Yet peace, properly understood, cannot merely be defined as the absence of war. After all, if this were so, then a

small nation suddenly subjugated and enslaved by a rapacious and unscrupulous neighbor might, after a spell, be considered at peace when in fact its citizens refuse to reconcile themselves to an unconsented fate.

But we know from history that humankind does not accept enslavement with abject acquiescence. It goes without saying that peace with a society implies the existence of peace within the individuals who make up such a society. In this context, rights and liberties must be accorded nation-states no less than individuals. In the words of Churchill, true peace "is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands."

There is also in the Western tradition a hallowed tenet that the triumph of aggression, which the Greek historian Thucydides aptly described in his History of the Peloponnesian War as the stark process of "putting people to it," may constitute a greater evil than resort to violence to vindicate an unjust wrong. This honorable and ancient doctrine, developed by ecclesiastics and jurists, followed by statesmen, instinctively accepted by the peoples of many countries in tradition and right, is the doctrine of just war. What is this doctrine? Briefly, it holds that for war to be considered just, it must be animated by a just cause and informed by righteous intention, that it be undertaken by a lawful political authority and only as a last resort, and that rectifying actions be proportionate to the wrongs committed.

I raise the just war issue, what might at first blush seem to be an esoteric concern, for two interrelated reasons. First, the issue of war involves the gravest of moral questions. Second, not merely the theory but the history of international relations since the First World War embodies the distinction between just and unjust causes of war. The Covenant of the League of Nations, the U.N. Charter, and the charter of the Military Tribunal at Nuremberg all reject the "realpolitik" doctrine of "staatrason"—the tyrannical notion that might makes right.

Instead, modern world politics are founded upon a conception of international society analogous to the laws and customs on coercion in domestic societies, that resort to violence in international affairs must be regarded either as lawful police action or crime. In other words, resort to armed force in international society is legitimate only if it is used on behalf of or in service to the fundamental principles and purposes undergirding international law.

Thus the moral philosopher Michael Walzer observes that, "aggression is the name we give to the crime of war." Indeed, the founders of the United Nations were determined, in the words of

the charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * * and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest." Similarly, the U.N. General Assembly has defined aggression as "a crime against the peace, for which there is responsibility under international law." Specifically, the signatories to the charter undertook in article 2(4) to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

In postwar American diplomacy, the classic exposition of this principle was stated by President Truman in October 1945, when he declared that the fundamentals of American foreign policy would rest in part on the proposition "that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations organization comprised of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing to use force if necessary to ensure peace."

The concept of international law enforcement through collective security, therefore, is embodied in the U.N. Charter and is an integral part of international law, as well as—through the supremacy clause in article VI of our own Constitution as applied to treaties—the law of the United States.

In other words, a congressional declaration of war in this circumstance would be contrary to the purposes of the United Nations. It might also frustrate our diplomacy and perhaps needlessly prolong a potentially bloody and unpredictable conflict with Iraq, because of the legal and political complications associated with the problem of war termination. Indeed, as Americans understand, it is in part for this latter reason there have been only five declarations of war in our history and none since 1941. Rather than the declaration of war analogy, the apt legal comparison in the current circumstance would be closer to Korea than to Vietnam or World War II, though all historical analogies are to some extent imprecise and potentially misleading.

While a congressional declaration of war would be inappropriate, the constitutional duty of Congress is clear. Not only does the Constitution vest the power to declare war in the Congress, but it further contemplates that a status or condition fairly described by armed hostility between the United States and another state—whether declared or undeclared—must be legislatively authorized.

The Framers of the Constitution did not entrust the war power to Congress to protect Congressmen; they did so to protect the American public. They believed that the gravest of all governmental decisions—the making of war—should not be the responsibility of a

single individual. It should be taken by a democratically elected, geographically and socially balanced legislature after careful debate and deliberation. It would either be tyrannical or irresponsible for a Congress of, by, and for the people to shirk its responsibility and transfer the power to make war to the Presidency. In America, after all, process is our most important product.

In this context, neither the Congress nor the Executive can duck the fundamental question of constitutional fidelity.

Perspective is always difficult to apply to events of the day, but it would appear that in late 1990 a watershed development in international politics occurred. Largely due to the steady and patient diplomacy of this administration, the full Security Council overwhelmingly passed Resolution 678, authorizing the possible use of force to achieve U.N. objectives in the gulf. For the first time in modern history, a credible system of collective security—predicated on the understanding that force may be required to keep the peace—appears on the threshold of being born.

Here I would observe that if one American political party has been historically identified with advocacy of collective security and the multilateral diplomacy it implies, it is the Democratic Party. Collective security was the watchword of Woodrow Wilson, who literally drove himself to death defending this principle against strident critics. Franklin Roosevelt, arguably the greatest president of this century, insisted that collective security principles be espoused in the Atlantic Charter, an authoritative statement on American aims in World War II, and ultimately in the charter of the United Nations itself.

Yet today it is a Republican President who, in opposition both to the isolationist and go-it-alone interventionist themes that have ambivalently marked much of this century's conservative tradition, is in the vanguard of credible collective security endeavors. In paradoxical contrast, liberal leadership in Congress appears to be careening toward a repudiation of the philosophical heritage of Wilson and Roosevelt, as well as Truman and John Kennedy in favor of more flocculent wait and see nostrums which lack leadership as well as historical perspective.

From an historical perspective, observers of crises that involve aggression over the last half century frequently look to the European cities of Sarajevo and Munich for juxtaposed historical analogy: Sarajevo implying excessive rigidity in the international system, Munich implying not enough spine. In this case, Munich appears to be a more apt historical analogy than Sarajevo. On the other hand, to the degree there is an historical parallel, per-

haps the most relevant is related to an East African capital, Addis Ababa.

As this Congress understands, some 55 years ago the League of Nations was faced with an analogous crisis. In 1935, Fascist Italy, then considered a world class power, invaded and eventually subjugated Ethiopia. With great fanfare, the United Kingdom led 50 other members of the league in a decision to enforce the covenant of the league by imposing economic sanctions against Rome. Mussolini declared that any sanctions which might affect his military capabilities, especially regarding oil, meant war. Confronted with this brute threat, Britain and her allies recoiled.

In "The Gathering Storm" Churchill later observed:

The measures passed with so great a parade were not real sanctions to paralyze the aggressor, but merely such half-hearted sanctions as the aggressor would tolerate * * * [British leadership had] led the League of Nations into an utter fiasco, most damaging if not fatally injurious to its effective life as an institution.

Likewise, at issue with the Kuwaiti crisis is less an outcome where individual nation-states may be winners or losers, but one in which the international system has an enormous stake. From challenge springs opportunity and in this context the President is precisely right to suggest that a new international order is at issue. Hopefully, once the storm clouds have passed, the international community will be able to conclude that the United Nations has finally functioned as its founders intended. But if this conflict is not resolved in a manner which at least restores the status quo ante, then our current international structure—and in particular the United Nations—will be seriously deranged and grievously jeopardized.

In this regard, as the prospect for conflict increases, the danger of unintended martyrdom also rises. The United States must be careful to ensure its policies not turn a tin-horn Hitler into an Islamic Allende.

Hence, I would urge the administration to make it clear to Saddam that a Nuremberg-like tribunal will inevitably be established in the wake of any military confrontation with Iraq and that in addition the United States will give serious consideration to advancing within the U.N. system a creation of an International Criminal Court to hold accountable individuals who violate international conventions to complement the World Court which exclusively adjudicates disputes between states.

I raise the notion of creating a criminal court at this time because terrorist crimes, usually directed against individuals, small states or relatively small groups of people, challenge nonetheless the rule of law. There could be no more appropriate potential defend-

ant to proceedings in such a court than Saddam Hussein for his brazen violation of civilized norms of behavior in his invasion of Kuwait, in his use of human shields, as well as poison gas, which has been outlawed by both the Geneva Convention of 1925 and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972.

Potentates, whether petty or mighty, who through naked aggression attempt to take the world hostage must be held accountable. The trouble with negotiations which do not lead to a complete abdication of ill-gotten gains is that terrorism may be perceived to be rewarded rather than punished. The challenge for the world community is to prevail without overreaching; to hold Saddam Hussein and his murderous gang of militarists accountable without excessively shedding Arab or Western blood. The key to avoiding the prospect of terrorism begetting more terrorism is that careful, internationally sanctioned legal repercussions commence, not unilateral, indiscriminant retaliation.

Accordingly, President Bush should inform Iraq in no uncertain terms that if Iraq refuses to disgorge Kuwait, Saddam and his henchmen can be expected to confront a Nuremberg-like tribunal for crimes against humanity.

The prospect of creating such a tribunal, which I believe should be authorized by the Security Council before any hostilities commence, holds several advantages. It emphasizes that America and the world's dispute is with Saddam Hussein, not the Iraqi people. It sets precedent for, and thus helps deter, future dictators. It warns Saddam and his fellow criminals that harming foreigners, including Americans, will not go unpunished; nor will violations of the rights of native Kuwaitis or for that matter Iraqi citizens. International norms of decency and law, as Nuremberg suggested, cannot be obviated by illegal orders of dictators or their subordinates.

The possibility of convening an international tribunal could also shorten or preclude a conflict by making Saddam susceptible to apprehension before or shortly after hostilities break. In addition, the specter of trial allows an implicit plea bargain: security for Saddam against what would surely be a foreordained verdict in exchange for the freeing of Kuwait.

The simple announcement of the creation of a tribunal would have the effect of incarcerating Saddam in his own country. He wouldn't be able to leave because of the prospect he could be arrested anytime, anywhere.

It would also underscore that what is at issue is not traditional warfare with patriotic rationalizations, but criminal behavior abhorred and defined to be illegal by the entire civilized community of nations.

Surely reasonable men and women can agree in a just war context on the

moral and legal authority of the Security Council to authorize the initiation of a police action to reverse Iraqi aggression in Kuwait. After all, one of the most persistent and vociferously debated questions of political science has been resolved: the international community has set forth a framework of laws and established a mechanism for dispute resolution. It has decreed that when common interests are at stake, when law is violated, it is the responsibility of the entire international community to enforce fundamental norms of international behavior.

As demonstrated in overwhelming votes both in the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council, a consensus has been reached in the world community that Saddam Hussein launched an illegal war of aggression. The Security Council, pursuant to its explicit powers under the charter, has decided that a law enforcement action against Iraq would be both warranted and just. Indeed, those 54 nations that have contributed or offered to contribute militarily and/or economically to the enforcement effort in the gulf have received the specific sanction to do so by a spectrum of precise Security Council resolutions. In short, there is a clear consensus within the international community that police sanctions against Iraq are justified.

The central issue in classic just war theory is the cause question. Just war theorists from Augustine to Grotius typically referred to an offense that was a just cause for war as an "injuria," a term that meant both injury and injustice. There were three generally accepted just causes of war: defense, recovery of property, and punishment. Wars waged for the first cause were by the very nature defensive. Wars taken to avenge injustice and to punish the perpetrators of injustice were offensive in the sense that defense of one's own territory was not at issue. It is this latter category of just war theory, which is implicated by United States' policy in the Persian Gulf.

Here, the apposite analogy is Grotius' reference to domestic law enforcement, where force may be used to apprehend criminals and to bring them to justice.

In this context, the record is clear. Saddam is an international criminal with a long rap-sheet. More than this, he is a atavistic tyrant, a primordial throw-back to the depraved satraps of an earlier and violent time. This is, after all, a man whose regime has waged two wars of aggression in 10 years and waged them utterly without compunction or regard to the laws of war.

Not only is Saddam a menace to the region, but—with his biochemical weapons capability, nascent nuclear weapons capability, and proven proclivity to use weapons of mass destruction against his own as well as foreign

peoples—his regime represents a threat to international law and order. If Saddam's brand of brigandage is rewarded, it will become a replicated model in other corners of the Earth. Judgment about proportionality must include such considerations. Lives jeopardized today in the sands of Saudi Arabia may represent lives spared tomorrow, in other distant niches of the world's terrain.

Thus the United States and the international community have a powerful geostrategic interest in preventing Saddam and his fellow Iraqi militarists from swallowing a neighboring state, and oppressing its population. While developed as well as developing countries have a geoeconomic interest in preventing Iraq from directly or indirectly controlling nearly 50 percent of the world's crude oil reserves, the larger issues relate to the moral rather than economic equation.

The United States and the world community simply have a compelling interest in upholding civilized norms of international behavior. The Iraqi ravaging of Kuwait and the systematic terrorization of its citizens must be brought to an end. The forced evacuation of foreign nationals creating upward of a million refugees and the savage holding of thousands of international citizens as human shields must not be rewarded.

Here I would observe, particularly in the just war context, that decision-making for the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces includes far more than calculations related abstractly to aggression or economic blackmail. When innocent human beings are allowed to be raped as a terrorizing instrument of state policy, when Kuwaiti citizens are executed at a steady 10 per day rate, when a capital city is not just being systematically pillaged, but a culture eviscerated, moral people have an obligation to do more than simply wring their hands and suggest that resolve be diluted by the sands of time.

In this context, the United States—with strategic and economic interests comprehending the entire circumference of the globe and, most importantly, with the moral burden that our history of sacrifice so nobly places upon us—has an obligation to uphold the structure of a civilized international political order based upon the rule of law. It is with a profound understanding of philosophy and history that President Bush has creatively sought to advance his far-reaching "new world order" theme.

In this context, it cannot be overemphasized that if this conflict is not resolved in a manner which at least restores the status quo ante, not only the United States, but the international system that is largely our inspired creation will be undercut with incalculable consequences.

Saddam must realize that whereas at issue for the United States and the world community are calculations as to the magnitude of possible casualties, the issue for him and his country is life and death. Iraq will be a viable country at the turn of the century only if he opts to rejoin the community of civilized nations.

Likewise, the United States must realize that there are many parties in the Middle East who believe the West has given insufficient attention to their concerns. And citizens of many countries, including our own, believe governments have been slow to respond to siren calls for more forthcoming arms control.

In this regard, it is impressive how American public opinion when polled reflects more concern about the prospect of Iraq obtaining nuclear weapons—that is, efforts to circumvent the strictures of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty—than any other factor. In addition, the public has reacted with serious concern to Saddam's threats to utilize the poor man's weapons of mass destruction: Biochemical weapons. Common sense would indicate that if the United States is to insist on restraining the spread of deadly chemical and biological warfare agents as well as nuclear arms, it must recognize that other countries have every right to insist that the nuclear powers assume new restraints and bring nuclear testing to a halt. As discourse commences on strategic arms reduction talks with the Soviet Union, so should discourse commence on an internationally binding nuclear test ban and a regional Middle Eastern approach to arms control, including the possibility of enacting a verifiable nuclear weapons-free zone in the region.

Turning to the notion of "last resort" in just-war theory, this concept has applied principally to offensive war. The core of "last resort" requires that peaceful means for rectifying injustice be explored before a punitive response is undertaken.

To probe prospects for a negotiated resolution of the issues at stake, the administration has the obligation to walk the extra mile for peace. Recognizing this obligation, the President properly authorized a ministerial level dialog with Iraq. But Saddam, revealed no flexibility on compliance with U.N. resolutions during Secretary Baker's Geneva talks. His emissary even refused to receive a personal letter from President Bush and escalated Iraqi threats with a bloodcurdling suggestion that the State of Israel will be attacked in the event the international community attempts to free Kuwait.

One can only conclude that after 5 months of unproductive private and public diplomacy, Iraq's dialog with its Arab neighbors as well as the world community has largely been a cynically contrived and manipulative "dia-

logue des sourdes," a tactic violative of every principle and convention upon which peaceful international intercourse is founded.

Nevertheless, as both President Bush and Secretary Baker have emphasized, one should always hold open the quest for peace. Even though Saddam and his regime represent the classic aggressor, there are circumstances in the region around which—if the Iraqi leadership were to respond out of self-interest—compromise might still develop. This Member, for instance, is particularly optimistic about the Secretary General's mission to Baghdad.

One possible approach for the world community to consider would be to augment its current menu of options in the gulf crisis with a new carrot-and-stick policy aimed at achieving U.S. objectives without resort to force.

Both sides, for example, appear to be locked in irreconcilable positions, with Saddam insisting that Kuwait remain part of Iraq and President Bush insisting that the status quo ante be reestablished. In this circumstance, one option for the world community to consider is to propose as a carrot to Saddam—in conjunction with Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions—the placement of the Rumalia oil fields under international control. If all or a part of the wealth generated from this enormous field could be directed under the United Nations Development Program or an Arab development bank, some of the economic inequities of the region could be forthcomingly addressed.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge of diplomacy is to put yourself in your adversary's shoes and seek common ground when little seems to exist.

One of the principal if transparent rationalizations for Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was the claim that the Kuwaitis were stealing oil from the Rumalia field for the benefit of the al-Sabah family rather than the poor and dispossessed of the region. Kuwait is a small country with disproportionate if not unseemly wealth. Ironically, the best way to secure Kuwait's sovereign borders may be to internationalize part of its greatest resource—oil—and redistribute the petroleum profits of a few for the benefit of the many, especially the children of the region. Using the field as a carrot and ceding its proceeds to the have-nots of the Arab world could help Saddam save face in an Arab context without allowing him to profit from aggression. At the same time it might help satisfy Islam's call for Zakat, or almsgiving to the poor.

In addition, to the extent that Iraqi access to the Persian Gulf for a deep water port has been claimed by Baghdad to be one of those grievances leading to its conflict with Kuwait, in the context of an unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, the international community ought to consider future guarantees for the protection of an

Iraqi off-shore oil unloading facility. In modern times the definition of a port need not entail the characteristics of a city resting on land. A metal platform may be more durable than a deep-water landing and more useful than a sand-encrusted island.

Saddam may aspire to martyrdom, but if he leads his people from prosperity to ruin; if from the cradle of civilization, uncivilized judgment is prolonged, he will go down in history as an anti-prophet, one of civilization's most injurious criminals.

From an American perspective, there is little support for war based solely on a desire to lower the price of gasoline a few cents or return an undemocratic government to power. On the other hand, there is a profound recognition that Kuwait is a legitimate state, that aggression should not be rewarded, and that the Iraqi terrorism and torture must be brought to an end.

In just war doctrine, particularly as developed after Aquinas, significant attention has been accorded the establishment of judicial proceedings against perpetrators of injustice. In the context both of just war and as an additional stick which Saddam should be made graphically aware, the world community must underscore to Saddam that legal accountability is the real linkage with which an aggressor must deal. Linkages asserted by aggressors, however meritorious the causes espoused, amount to blackmail and must be treated as such.

Nonetheless, it is undeniable that one of the problems with any potential peaceful settlement with Iraq rests with the concept of linkage. The President is correct in suggesting that formal linkage to other issues is spurious when none was originally intended by Saddam and when the making of such linkage implies rewarding aggression. On the other hand, whether we prefer it or not a new world order implies not only greater attention to international law and international institutions but in the American philosophical tradition, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

Thus the U.S. Government has little option in the months and years ahead but to deal more forthrightly with the Palestinian issue. It also has little option except to be more forthcoming on the test ban issue. At the risk of hyperbole, the first order of a new world order should be negotiation of a comprehensive test ban. Erecting effective barriers to the spread of nuclear weapons demands restraint be accepted by the United States as well as developing countries like Iraq.

In a legislative sense, the issue today is whether to support the President's policies and judgments or see them undercut by a congressionally led policy of delay and implicit vacillation.

If through a patient strategy of military containment and economic sanc-

tions alone the United States and its coalition partners could compel Saddam to surrender his ill-gotten gains without resort to force, then this Member would be profoundly supportive of that particular policy.

But I fear that though these unprecedented economic sanctions will severely pinch Iraq's economy, they are unlikely alone to be sufficient to evict Saddam's 500,000 troops from Kuwait. What does the evidence reveal?

In an economic sense, the sanctions appear to be having an effect. The Director of Central Intelligence estimates that the sanctions have barred more than 90 percent of Iraqi imports and more than 97 percent of exports. Saddam has been deprived of roughly \$1.5 billion of foreign exchange earnings monthly, about equal to a third of Iraq's total national product. Iraq's financial holdings and line of credit abroad have been frozen, and Baghdad has no access to Kuwait's international holdings.

In addition, Iraq's economy would appear to be unusually exposed to sanctions as a form of coercive diplomacy. It is dependent on oil for 95 percent of its exports, and is dependent on imports for 30 percent of its GNP. Moreover, Iraq imports as much as two-thirds of its peoples' normal caloric intake, over 70 percent of grain consumption, and over 90 percent of sugar and vegetable oils.

According to one congressional study, Iraq may well deplete its available foreign exchange reserves by this spring, leaving it little hard currency with which to entice large-scale smuggling. With the welfare of Iraqis reduced to an amount equal to 48 percent of its GNP, and with little access to key imports, Baghdad will probably be compelled to shut down many of its productive facilities in order to keep militarily critical enterprises functioning.

Although sanctions will affect the Iraqi military, CIA Director Webster has testified that it will only affect Saddam's troops at the margins. Iraqi ground forces, in particular, may not be significantly affected by sanctions even over time.

But will Saddam, a dictator who evinces little concern for the welfare of his people, submit to the will of the world community based on coercive sanctions alone? Will sanctions likely cause a popular revolt or military coup to depose him? According to Director Webster's testimony on December 4, 1990:

Despite mounting disruptions and hardships resulting from sanctions, Saddam apparently believes that he can outlast international resolve to maintain sanctions. We see no indication that Saddam is concerned, at this point, that domestic discontent is growing to levels that may threaten his regime or that problems from the sanctions are causing him to rethink his policy on Kuwait. The Iraqi people have experienced con-

siderable deprivation in the past. Given the brutal nature of the Iraqi security services, the population is not likely to oppose Saddam openly. Our judgment has been, and continues to be, that there is no assurance or guarantee that economic hardships will compel Saddam to change his policies or lead to internal unrest that would threaten his regime.

Meanwhile, will the remarkably diverse and unprecedented U.N. coalition remain intact? Will the troubled world economy and the economies of many developing countries, including the newly democratic nations of Eastern and central Europe, stand the strain imposed by a lengthy continuation of this crisis? Sanctions-only advocates must be willing to contemplate growing economic chaos in Buenos Aires, Budapest, Manila, and Prague, as well as a lengthened recession in the United States, with no assurance of success and increasing evidence that the international community will be far more fractured a year from now than today.

And all the while, will Saddam continue to practice his cruel barbarism against the Kuwaiti people? Will his military continue to dig in, to fortify, and strengthen their sand redoubts. Will Saddam use the intervening months to augment and perfect his weapons of mass destruction, most dangerously his biological warfare capabilities? Biological warfare, after all, is far more dangerous than nuclear and any unscrupulous dictator can make far faster progress on germ development that may spread as fast as a common cold than nuclear weapons which, as destructive as they are, have more defined limits. These weighty concerns must be factored into any conceivable scenario for a sanctions-only strategy in the gulf and any considerations of just-war doctrine.

No one should be under any illusion that Saddam is engaged in a patriotic struggle, either for his people or a pan-Arab cause. Nor is the American response fundamentally a patriotic defense of our own borders. Rather, it is the fulfillment of a solemn obligation to uphold our own interest, sanctified by treaty, to act in concert with others to uphold the fundamental principles of civilized conduct that are the foundation for a peaceful world order. If force must be used to roll back the Iraqi conquest, it will be an act of law enforcement rather than an act of warfare. In this sense, our troops will be acting as constables or marshals enforcing the law abroad, rather than simply as soldiers of a single state.

Warfare is sometimes described as the scourge of nationalism, but in this instance the use of force is intended to be authorized to defend an international collective security system, to undercut rather than bolster narrow, destructive nationalism.

In the final measure, the decision whether instruments of war will be employed rests more with Saddam than

decisionmakers in Washington. As a Member who is probably as apprehensive as anyone about the long-term ramifications of conflict, and the long and obscure vistas war opens up, I am nonetheless convinced that Congress should continue at this point to give the President every benefit of doubt. This is a time for American unity; a willful undercutting of executive branch policies makes further aggression and continued oppression more, not less, likely.

For those of us who believe Saddam has no rational choice except to blink before the 15th, unless America blinks first, I would only suggest that undercutting our President at this critical juncture would drive a stake into international order. If this Congress sends a message of no confidence to the executive branch, it will be sending a message of no mandate to Secretary General de Cuellar in his critical mission to Baghdad. The prospect of a peaceful resolution of the dispute will decrease with Saddam being invited to conclude American leadership is flaccid, lacking in backbone.

On questions of war and peace, there is a societal imperative for caution; but it must be understood that ambivalence is not synonymous with statesmanship and that anxiety is no substitute for leadership. The possibility that this Congress would demonstrate less resolve and adherence to principle than the U.N. Security Council simply defies explication.

We have a number of precise objectives in Kuwait, but the primary one is surely to achieve all others with the least loss of life, Arab as well as Western. My sense is the President's two-track policy—preparedness for dialog as well as war—holds the best chance to effectuate the will of the United Nations, as well as to achieve long-term peace and stability in the world's most explosive geostrategic cauldron.

In 500 B.C. the Chinese sage Sun Tzu wrote in the classic "The Art of War" that "Supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Almost 1,000 years later, the Roman General Belisarius counseled that, "The most complete and happy victory is this: to compel one's enemy to give up his purpose, while suffering no harm oneself."

It may be a paradox, but I am convinced that the prospect of peace in this medieval Middle Eastern setting is clearly enhanced by preparation for war and the avoidance of political equivocation in Washington. The prospect of war looms more dangerously if Saddam concludes that he has punctured American resolve.

In this context, it is my judgment that Congress best advances the imperative for peace by making Saddam aware that, as concluded by Congress—which is the reflection of the will and judgment of the American people—a

police action was with Iraq would be just, although undesirable.

Likewise, the administration must understand the admonition of Sun Tzu that "when you surround an army leave an outlet free. Do not press a desperate foe too hard." As the British military historian and strategist B.H. Liddel Hart warned: "Never corner an opponent."

The prospect of a peaceful resolution of this international drama is real, if both sides can come to an understanding that based on Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait good faith efforts can be undertaken to deal with disparities of wealth in the region and the problem of displaced people.

Aggression cannot be rewarded, but Saddam as much as any leader in the world has in his grasp the possibility of changing stripes. Instead of continuing to oppress his and the Kuwaiti people, he has the extraordinary opportunity of becoming a champion of the oppressed of the region. Such a tantalizing opportunity as much as the threat of ruin of his own country must bring him to his senses. For reasons of self-interest as well as historical judgment, Saddam is likely to blink. Accordingly, I would urge my colleagues to recognize that good can come from this confrontation, that order can be achieved, that use of force can be avoided, but only if American resolve is not fractured. Accordingly, in the strongest terms, I urge adoption of this bipartisan approach to American foreign policy.

□ 1220

CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express appreciation to the acting Speaker this evening and all of the clerks, and the recording clerks and the teller clerks and the people in the TV crews. We are moving on toward midnight here in Washington, and all of these individuals who are working very late hours are also a part of this debate, and we want to especially recognize them this evening.

I am beginning my ninth year as a Member of the Congress of the United States, and never in that period of time have I asked for an hour in order to express views on an issue such as this. I consider this to be the most important set of votes that I will cast in my congressional career, certainly my congressional career to date. I will be one Member who will be supporting the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, and I am a Member who is not prepared to give the President a blank check in the situation in the Middle East.

Let me speak this evening as one of the Members of Congress who grew up during the Vietnam era, whose friends fought and died in that battle where America lost over 50,000 of its finest young men and women in that conflict, and in an equal tragedy, since that time, another 50,000 have died here at home from war-related illnesses and suicide. Theirs is largely an untold story. They fought an undeclared war, one that split the Nation in two, and left our troops subject not only to the abuses of war, but the equal abuses of coming home to a Nation divided.

The State of Ohio and the district that I represent are patriotic beyond measure. We well understand the meaning of duty. Our Veterans of Foreign Wars, the VFW has the second largest membership in the United States, even though we are not the second most populous State. Ohio's American Legion sends more boys and girls to Boys' State and Girls' State than any other State in the Union, and we are not the most populous State in the Union.

We are home to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and dozens of other Active and Reserve units. In fact, Ohio leads the Nation in the number of Active and Reserve members of the Armed Forces who have enrolled in the G.I. educational benefits program. Most of our medical and naval reserve units have already been called; others are on standby.

Our citizens have the experience and willingness to serve and fight, but they want to understand why. We as Members of Congress hold a sacred trust with our troops in the field as well as our citizenry here at home. There must be no doubt about why America moves to war. The reasons must be crystal clear and the objectives honorable. War must be the very last of resorts, not the first.

I appreciate our congressional leadership responding to the pleas inside this body to hold this debate and discussion prior to January 15. I wish it had come earlier, last year in fact, because in many ways decisions made by the Executive have already placed us in a position that if we support our President fully now we automatically approve the deaths of hundreds and thousands of our own U.S. forces. What a position to be in.

Yet, the Constitution demands our involvement, and like the President, we also take on oath of office to protect our Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We must discharge our duties, and if Saddam Hussein is listening to this debate, let him understand that in America we allow for debate, even in our highest legislative bodies, for we fundamentally believe in the capacity of our people, through their elected representatives, to make their opinions known, to be represented.

In this debate we respect those who disagree with us, but we will defend with our last breath their rights to express their views. That is why the United States is the most stable political republic on the face of the Earth. It is why we love this land and her remarkable people.

The American people have a right to Congress that meets its constitutional responsibilities. This branch of government is not an extension of the executive branch nor its handmaiden. Each of us is elected in our own right and is sworn to the very same oath as the head of the executive branch, our President. Each of us must uphold the oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

When I was privileged to be sworn in as a Member of Congress, I promised myself that I would never be a party to any undeclared war. The Vietnam experience was too divisive and lacked the national will to carry forth national policy.

Today we are afforded our constitutional rights to debate war before it happens, and so we should.

I speak tonight on behalf of every mother, every wife, every father, every husband and relative who has a loved one serving our Nation in the U.S. military. All of them must be assured by our actions here in the Congress and the President's actions that all diplomatic and peaceful means toward resolution of this conflict have been exhausted before the war option is triggered.

How can anyone in this body honestly say that all diplomatic means have been exhausted? Our Secretary of State spent all of 6 hours in a meeting the other day. One cannot even conclude that any negotiations even occurred. It was another press event at which ultimatums were delivered by both sides.

Our troops deserve finer and more committed efforts. Even as we speak, diplomats from around the world are trying to find a keyhole through which negotiations can begin. In the meantime, the economic sanctions are locked in place. They will take time to be fully felt. It is no secret, over one-half of Iraq's GNP is tied to its ability to sell its oil, and it is unable to do that. Sanctions will exact a heavy toll as the months proceed and allied cooperation on these sanctions is the one area where we can say our allies are helping us fully. They certainly are not helping us with the money to pay for this massive deployment, nor with significant troop strength, combat troop strength that is battle-hardened.

Letting the economic noose tighten slowly around Iraq is a much more credible posture for the United States at this juncture than becoming an aggressor nation ourselves to respond to Hussein's aggression. War should only

be a last resort. The lives of our people and civilians in that region are much too precious.

During this debate, it is important to place on the record reasons about why America should be involved in this conflict. Of late I have become more and more concerned that the debate has centered on the how of it all. We read about perhaps air strikes will happen first, and then perhaps ground forces. And then we read estimates of how many will die, 500, 1,000 10,000 perhaps more. The Department of Defense has ordered 50,000 caskets just in case, and now over 16,000 body bags. We see on TV our troops being immunized and donning gas masks. What we do not hear enough about is why we are there, and for how long and the causes for which we are fighting.

□ 2330

First, we heard that America was there to deter aggression and restore the legitimate Government of Kuwait. That did not ring to the American public, so a new rhetoric was forthcoming. America, it was said, was there to preserve key resources. Oil was never mentioned outright, but other words were: Jobs, economic security, and then the real clincher, the American way of life; then later the administration began talking about Iraq's nuclear capability and its potential threat in the future.

I would like to examine each of these issues. The President says that America must stop aggression. If this is so and America is the world's policeman, why did not America intervene and stop aggression when the U.S.S.R. invaded Afghanistan or Hungary or Czechoslovakia in years past? If the Soviet Union soon occupies the Baltic States which long for democracy, will America stand up for those subjugated peoples, or how about when Turkey invaded Cyprus? Where was America then? Or when Israel invaded Egypt, or when China moved into Tibet, or, in fact, where was America during the Iran-Iraq war? We seemed to be on both sides of that one depending on what month it was. Or how about when Syria went into Lebanon as recently as a few days ago? Where was America then in standing up to aggressors? Why does America now see only this particular Iraqi aggression as in its vital interests?

There is only one common denominator that explains President Bush's rush to war, and that is oil, on which the Western World for too long has become increasingly dependent.

Although some of the oil companies have been nationalized, the distribution and marketing of Middle East oil is a Fortune 500 company activity. What are the interests of Aramco and British Petroleum and Shell and Exxon and Gulf and Texaco and Mobil and Chevron?

It is surprising how very little has been written about the role of the international oil companies, and the silence is deadening. Yet we can read very clearly in economic reports that come out. In December of last year, the New York Times reported that as a result of the Middle East situation there was an average fourth quarter gain of 64 percent in forecasted new profits for the 12 major oil companies. The companies included Amoco with a 57-percent increase in profits, Arco, a 61-percent increase in profits, British Petroleum, whose major interest is in Kuwait, a 112-percent increase in profits, Chevron, a 113-percent increase in profits, Exxon, a 41-percent increase in profits, Mobil, a 42-percent increase in profits, Phillips, a 265-percent increase in profits, Texaco, a 110-percent increase in profits, and Unocal, a 500-percent increase in profits.

Fourth quarter earnings for oil companies have significantly increased. Big oil companies have sold crude at about \$30 a barrel in this quarter, or \$10 a barrel more than in the corresponding quarter a year ago. That is a 50-percent increase.

As well, the inter-Arab oil conflict inherent in this invasion of Kuwait by Iraq concerns control of oil and access to the Persian Gulf. In the book entitled "Oil Turmoil and Islam in the Middle East," the author discusses the dominant role of Saudi Arabia over her neighbors as a source of potential envy, conflict, and unrest in the Arab world. To quote,

Saudi Arabia's apparently boundless wealth fuels Saudi influence in the Arab world, often to the consternation of her neighbors. Saudi wealth and predominant share of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries' proven reserves give King Fahd control over any decision concerning the collective use of Arab oil. If the share of oil exporting nation's reserves controlled by Saudi Arabia's political allies is added to the Saudi share, the conservative bloc in that region controls fully 75 percent of all of those Middle Eastern countries' total reserves. In comparison, the so-called radical oil producers, which include Iraq, Libya and Algeria, control only 19 percent of Arab reserves, seventy-five percent versus nineteen percent. Production capacity also strengthens the conservative bloc's hand. From 1973 to 1975, the conservative bloc produced an average of 70.3 percent of the Arab exporting nations' total output. The Saudi share alone averaged nearly half. Saudi Arabia is the only member able to increase production significantly. At any time the Saudi fields could increase production by 3.5 to 4.5 million barrels per day. Out of their additional production capacity, all of the other nations' of 7.5 million barrels per day, the radical states combined can produce only 2 million barrels per day, only about one-third of it, which obviously weakens their bargaining position in their own inter-Arab union.

In summary, it is ironic that while the radical states have consistently advocated the use of the oil weapon, it is the conservative states which control

the issue. The inter-Arab tension is historic and growing.

The Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries could never use politically their oil wealth without the cooperation of the Saudi-led conservatives. Without Saudi consent, the oil weapon is quite like a large artillery piece without ammunition. Therefore, the conservative bloc can render impotent any maverick attempt by the radicals to impose an oil policy similar to that of 1973.

The conservative members actually control the use of oil for itself and the other Arab States. The conservative bloc's influence on the use of the oil weapon is manifest in its foreign currency reserves. The reserves allow the petroleum exporting countries to cut production drastically for several months without significant loss or suffering.

If the radical states, Iraq, Libya, Syria, attempted to reduce production significantly, the consequent impact on their domestic economies would likely lead to civil unrest and to political instability.

The combination of factors such as oil production, reserves, surplus capacity and surplus capital makes Saudi Arabia and its conservative allies the only states capable of determining when, whether, how, and for how long oil could benefit Arab foreign policy. It is not hard to understand what is at the base of the simmering unrest in the region of Saudi Arabia and her allies, and that unrest is all tied to oil money and the control of it.

If we look at maps of that part of the world and each of those nations, they are largely deserts with the population concentrated in the areas where oil is drawn, refined and ultimately shipped.

In fact, if we look at the eastern edge even of Saudi Arabia along the gulf, the largest concentration of United States citizens living outside the United States works for Aramco on Saudi Arabia's eastern border.

For the last several decades, America has become more and more dependent on Middle East oil. Germany and Japan are even more dependent, but it is interesting that these nations are nearly silent on the war option that this Congress is considering but quite vocal on using diplomatic and economic sanctions for a long period of time.

For our Nation which has failed to develop energy independence to now ask our troops to fight for continued access to a diminishing oil resource halfway around the world, in my judgment is morally wrong. I would rather take the billions of dollars the United States is investing in the deserts of the Middle East and judiciously bring money, our money, and our troops back home.

Our Nation that landed a man on the Moon in 10 years can be energy self-sufficient by the 21st century, just 10 years from now.

□ 1140

America saw this crisis coming. This is not news to us.

Over 15 years ago, Senator Frank Church of Idaho, magnificent American, held hearings in the Senate on the role of multinational oil companies and concluded that if the world failed to set up international institutions capable of resolving Middle East oil-related disputes and distributing those profits fairly, the world was headed for armed conflict. Then, in the late 1970's, at the height of the U.S. energy crisis, President Carter warned the energy challenge was the "moral equivalent of war." Some Members may be old enough to remember that phrase. However, during the decade of the 1980's the Reagan-Bush administration failed to followthrough on developing an energy policy for America. They did not lead this country for our people. They fought this Congress on filling the strategic petroleum reserve, and they fought Congress on developing alternative fuels. They resisted conservation efforts in everything from home construction to energy-efficient engines.

So now, our people, our neighbors, are being asked to send their relatives, America's troops to make up for political blindness at the highest levels of this government. Oil is not worth the loss of life of one person from my district or any other district in this country. Let's spend those billions of dollars being wasted in the desert, let's spend them here in America to develop our clean coal technologies, our agriculture and alcohol fuels, hydrogen and solar power, and create thousands of jobs here at home in communities from coast to coast, where people are looking for work.

Even if the United States invaded Kuwait tomorrow and took all of it, all of its oil, how many years of oil lie under the ground of Kuwait? Only 30 years. While here in America we have over 1,200 years just in recoverable coal reserves that can be mined and separated into clean fuels with the new technologies available to us. Of course, the oil companies do not want to do that, but this is certainly within the capacity of the Nation which landed a man on the moon.

Now, this is a time of deepening recession in America, and we know that 75 percent of America's world trade deficit is due to oil and auto imports. Over half of our energy is imported. At the same time as we do that, we have States like Texas and Louisiana and Oklahoma, and Members can go all the way from Lorain, OH, and Denver, CO, and all the mining States around this country in deep recession where people are in need of work. The answer to the energy problem lies within our own borders. Not sending America's best to fight a desert war for a dwindling resource.

Even if America took control of Saudi Arabia, of Kuwait and Iraq, and all of their oil, we still have more recoverable, twice as much, just recoverable coal reserves underground in this Nation, if we but have the will to develop it. Our goal should be to take care of our business here at home as soon as possible. Let us put America back on a sound economic and energy footing so we can remain the standard bearer of liberty throughout the world, and do so not by the force of our arms, but by the greater power of the ideal of our democratic republic, the oldest functioning democracy on the face of the Earth.

Now, America has no treaty obligations in the Middle East akin to the Versailles Treaty which bound us to Western Europe's defense after the First World War. Rather than coveting oil, America rather must ask what is our proper role in a region where we have systematically seen the collapse of the old order—the oil-rich monarchies that kept the oil flowing from the Middle East for most of the century. Of late, we have seen much change. Recall with me, we have seen the Shah of Iran deposed, much to the surprise of most of the West. We have seen the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, assassinated. One week he was on the cover of Time magazine as Man of the Year, and shortly thereafter, dead in his own land. We have witnessed kings in that region overthrown in Libya and Iraq. Saddam Hussein overthrew a king. We have seen unrest in Sudan, and certainly in Israel, and we saw for 8 years in the 1980's Iran-Iraq war in which over 500,000 of their citizens died.

This is the time of America to recognize that the old order in the Middle East, based on kingdoms, not democracies, is being torn from within by power pressures for change. Before going to war, America must ask how deeply, and for how long does the United States intend to police inter-Arab politics to preserve the old order. What is America's obligation to bolster the power of monarchies in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and for the Emirate of Kuwait?

Fundamentally, the Middle East needs an inter-Arab version of NATO to resolve the continuing disputes in the region which will continue whether America is there or not. America cannot be the sentry at the gate for all the upheavals that will be forthcoming in that region in years hence, but we can be a constructive force, with our allies, to forge a Middle East version of NATO.

Let me continue for the record.

The President likens this conflict to World War II. But unlike World War II, the United States has no Treaty of Versailles binding us to mutual security pacts in the region. In World War II, America fought to preserve democracies. In this instance, we are doing

just the opposite. We are fighting to preserve kingdoms and emirates because of our dependence on their oil. We are fighting to preserve governments that have invested the bulk of their revenues outside the nations in which their leaders reside. Saddam Hussein is likened to a Hitler. But just last July our own government told him the United States would not intervene in inter-Arab border disputes, and just a few years ago the Reagan-Bush administration officially recognized the Government of Iraq, and the Bush administration fought the Congress as recently as last summer on trying to place sanctions on Iraq for its human rights abuses. During the Iran-Iraq war United States Arms were channeled to Iraq by the Reagan-Bush administration. So which Iraq is it that the administration now claims we must fight against? Did the Iraqi nation change its stripes, or did we?

After World War II the United States waited in Europe and supported NATO for over 40 years—to stem the tide of Soviet expansion. Why must we now choose the war option rather than patient, deliberate sanctions? In World War II, Hitler systematically rolled over the industrialized nations adjoining him. Though Hussein is an aggressor, he has been turned back in his adventures, by Israel, by Iran, and will be turned back in Kuwait as well.

If he is a Hitler, he is certainly much less successful, and he is not an industrial power as Germany before and during World War II.

We know for the 8 years of the Iran-Iraq war, the Reagan-Bush administration supported Iraq and Saddam Hussein. In fact, up until last August. Members of this Congress tried to enlighten the Bush administration of the human rights abuses going on in Iraq, but our repeated warnings fell on deaf ears. Then, all of a sudden last August, the administration began calling Hussein a new Hitler. Why was he not a Hitler in July or a year ago, or when President Reagan and Vice President Bush recognized the nation of Iraq. When did he change? Within 1 month, we saw the administration trying to transform the desert dictator into a Hitler. Somehow it does not ring true when the United States Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie and our own Deputy Secretary of State John Kelly told Congress and Hussein both back in July that the United States would not interfere in inter-Arab border disputes, and then within hours, the United States had deployed 200,000 troops. Two months later, 200,000 more troops. And on a dime, the administration reversed itself and said the situation was vital for U.S. interests.

By contrast, the United States waited in Europe and NATO for over 40 years.

□ 2350

We withstood the insults of Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and so many other dictators. The world loves America, not because of the strength of her arms, though security is essential in today's world, but more because of the force of the idea of freedom and our liberties. It is these ideas to which emerging nations aspire. Let us not be distracted by those who would use force as a first means in this most recent test of national wills. Those with the will to wait out sanctions will be victorious in the end, and thousands of lives will have been saved. This is a lesson for America to teach the world.

Now, on the nuclear threat, some say it is Iraq's nuclear threat that America should fear, but America has withstood nuclear threats to date, all of them. We acknowledge this is a dangerous world. We also know mutual assured destruction is the only answer other than total disarmament by all powers to withstand a nuclear threat. Our ultimate posture must be that nuclear decimation by one power will be met in equal or greater force by another. It is this mad system which holds the violence in check.

America cannot really stop Iraq, nor China, nor Pakistan, nor the dozens of nations that will seek to operationalize this terrible technology as we move into the 21st century.

We must be diligent in moving to limit and disarm where possible, but in the end our ultimate weapon is our own ability to wreak havoc on would-be aggressors. Such is the world we have helped to create.

As far as the importance of the U.N. resolution, let me commend the President and the Secretary of State for seeking allied support. This is essential and the first test of the new world order; but those nations who signed that commitment have a largely verbal commitment. They do not have combat troops in place in any manner similar to the U.S. deployment, nor have they committed real money. Even Japan and Germany, whose economies are chugging along, have not met their early obligations expected as of this month.

This Congress cannot fulfill its responsibility by approving a blank check resolution such as the U.N. resolution or the administration's proposal. It simply puts too much faith in an uncertain future that no one at this point can predict. We must preserve our congressional prerogatives.

Now, the President says that the United States must restore the legitimate governments in the region. We all desire this; but an equally important question is how legitimate are any of these governments in the eyes of each other when their borders were largely drawn by the colonial powers who physically vacated the region over the last 20 years and who were more inter-

ested in oil than in democracy. It was they who initially let the big oil companies draw the borders between these nations and then drained the oil fields for generations, ignoring the fact that the politics of the region might catch up to the economy someday.

One of the fundamental problems of the Middle East is that certain families became extremely wealthy and did not invest enough of their oil profits in their own homelands. They put their money in Western banks, they sent their children to frolic in the jet set capitals of the world while the vast majority of the people there remained poor.

Let us look at Kuwait, a most interesting nation to check the balance sheets on. Kuwait's economy, and some have called Kuwait a large oil well, is dominated by the Kuwait Petroleum Co., which is effectively a holding company with a large number of subsidiaries involved in the production and distribution of petroleum and natural gas.

Another source of Kuwait's power is the large worldwide investment portfolio which is believed to yield revenues equal, if not larger, than income from petroleum exports. And where is that portfolio invested? The Kuwait investment authority is located mainly in the United States and Great Britain. Thus we see Britains rush to join the gulf effort. The Kuwait investment authority holds nearly 10 percent of British petroleum.

The New York Times reported back in December that the fourth quarter profits for B.P. are estimated to increase 112 percent this year.

Kuwait also holds investments in the United States which total nearly \$50 billion in assets overall. These investments include a \$3 billion portfolio of stocks and securities managed by Morgan Stanley. Undisclosed portfolios managed by Citibank and Chase Manhattan, gold reserves at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, a stake in the partnership led by the Gordon Investment Corp. that plans to buy Columbia Savings and Loan \$3 billion junk bond portfolio.

Kuwait's investment in Britain includes 10.5 percent of the Midland Bank, 11 percent of Travel and Financial Services concern of Hogg Robinson. They are the owner of the St. Martins Property Corp., builders of London Docklands Development. They also hold gold reserves at the Bank of England.

Kuwait's investment authority holds \$8 billion in stocks and securities in Japan, and the Kuwait Petroleum Corp. also has European holdings of more than 4,500 service stations in Hungary, Italy, Britain, Scandinavia, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and four oil refineries in Europe. Not bad for a nation of less than 2 million people of which only about one-

third were ever allowed to vote within the nation of Kuwait in the first place.

Is it any wonder to use that revolutions, both religious and military, have plagued the region in most recent years. The region's indigenous politics is just emerging and subject to violent change. The world will not be able to contain those pressures.

The United Nations would best focus its efforts on how to create a Middle East multinational peacekeeping structure as part of the solution to this situation and to resolve other border disputes.

In talking with the citizens of my district, I have listened closely to what they have been saying to me. They want to support our President, but fundamentally they do not believe in an early rush to war. They want to give tough sanctions a chance to work.

Many have said to me, "MARCY, don't let America become the bad guy in the Middle East."

They say to me, "Why aren't our allies paying their fair share of the cost of this? Where are their troops?" They ask me.

Many have said that dying for oil is not worth the price.

In fact, I am getting these little canisters in my office now from citizens saying, "No blood for oil."

Many have asked me how they can conserve in their households, in their buying of automobiles, how they can cut down on their energy consumption per year. Frankly, more women have asked me that question than men, but I have been surprised at how many people in my district have asked me that question. They do not want their neighbors to die in the Middle East.

Others have said to me that they are willing to pay more for gas if it will save lives.

For the record, I will enter some of their other statements for history.

In sum, let me say that I support our President so long as our troops remain in a defensive posture. Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait and we should give tough economic sanctions sufficient time to work, but 4 months just is not realistic.

We should develop our own energy-sufficiency, and I await the President's State of the Union Address in this regard, and we should set a national goal to make this Nation energy self-sufficient by the 21st century, and if we set our minds to it, we could do it.

We should work to transfer the Armed Forces currently in the Persian Gulf into an international peacekeeping force and downsize America's commitment slowly as the sanctions take effect and we are able to replace our troops with those from other nations as well.

□ 2400

And we should support the President in all diplomatic initiatives and other

government-to-government efforts to reach settlement in the region.

I think that doing this we would exhibit to the best of our ability what President Dwight Eisenhower not so many years ago wisely counseled and described as "patient courage."

Mr. Speaker, I submit the additional comments I referred to previously.

WAR CANNOT HAPPEN WITHOUT BODY BAGS

The Washington Post-ABC Poll shows that 68% of the American public think the Congress should be more actively supporting the President's policies in the Persian Gulf. Of the same people interviewed for the poll their support for the use of force diminishes as soon as casualties are mentioned. When asked if they would support the use of force if it meant the loss of 1,000 American lives, 44% favor the use of force and 53% oppose. When asked if they would support war if it meant 10,000 casualties 35% favor the use of force and 61% oppose force. One is forced to conclude that support for the President is support for war. War does not take place without body bags.

Who is fooling who? The Defense Department just placed an order for 16,099 body bags with a company in Philadelphia. Why is the Defense Department not leveling with the American public and telling us how many casualties to expect.

JOBS

Secretary of State James Baker has stated that one of the reasons we are in the Persian Gulf is to protect jobs. It is estimated that 3,000 U.S. nationals were employed in Kuwait. Should President Bush risk the killing of 3,000 soldiers to save 3,000 workers? Does that make sense?

The cost of Operation Desert Shield is estimated to be \$1 billion a month. A few months ago the Bush Administration claimed that we were involved in the Middle East to protect jobs. One billion dollars would be more appropriately invested in the United States to develop new jobs.

What is the point of fighting over oil fields when in a war they will be destroyed thus driving up the price of oil again.

KUWAIT INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

Kuwait's economy is dominated by the Kuwait Petroleum Company which is effectively a holding company with a large number of subsidiaries and partially owned companies involved, directly and indirectly, with petroleum and natural gas. Another source of economic power is the large and presumed worldwide, investment portfolio of Kuwait, which is believed to yield revenues equal if not larger than income from petroleum exports.

All main industrial activities in Kuwait are related to oil, natural gas, or the booming construction industry. Efforts to foster other industries have been hampered by the small size of the domestic market and lack of natural resources other than hydrocarbons.

The Kuwait Investment Authority is located mainly in the United States and Britain, thus we see Britain's rush to join the Gulf effort. Kuwait Investment Authority holds 9.8% of British Petroleum. The New York Times reported on December 26, 1990 that the fourth quarter profits for British Petroleum are estimated to increase 112%.

Kuwait also holds investments in the United States which total \$45 billion to \$50 billion in assets overall. These investments include a \$3 billion portfolio of stocks and securities managed by Morgan Stanley; undis-

closed portfolios managed by Citibank and Chase Manhattan; Gold Reserves at the New York Federal Reserve Bank; a stake in the partnership led by the Gordon Investment Corporation that plans to buy Columbia Savings and Loan's \$3 billion junk bond portfolio. (Washington Post, August 6, 1990)

Kuwait's investment in Britain includes 10.5% of Midland Bank; 11.3% of travel and financial services concern Hogg Robinson; Owner of St. Martins Property Corp., builders of London docklands development; Gold reserves at the Bank of England.

Kuwait investment authority holds \$8 billion in stocks and securities in Japan; 72% of Torras SA, a Spanish industrial holding company with interests in 170 different companies in chemicals, paper, food and financial services; 37% of Dao Heng Holdings, holding company for one of the six biggest of 30 or so local Hong Kong Banks.

The Kuwait Petroleum Corporation also owns Santa Fe International, a California-based engineering and oil exploration company purchased in 1981 for \$2.5 billion and has European holdings of more than 4,500 service stations in Hungary, Italy, Britain, Scandinavia, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and 4 oil refineries in Europe.

OIL COMPANIES FOURTH QUARTER PROFITS

On December 26, 1990, the New York Times reported that as a result of the Middle East situation an average fourth quarter gain of 64% is forecast for 12 companies. The companies included Amoco (57%), Arco (61%), British Petroleum (112%), Chevron (13%), Exxon (41%), Mobil (42%), Phillips (265%), Texaco (110%), and Unocal (500%).

Fourth quarter earnings for oil companies have significantly increased. Big oil companies have sold crude at about \$30 a barrel in this quarter, or \$10 a barrel more than in the corresponding quarter a year ago. This is a 50 percent increase.

"Talk and negotiation are the only ways we can really solve problems. The President should temper his words and soften them. Otherwise, he will only create unnecessary tensions and risk an armed conflict."

"As a democracy we must have discourse and debate and it cannot be stifled because the Administration feels it will expose a divided or unsupportive American people. I am unsupportive and I expect the truth is that the nation would be deeply divided by war."

"He (President Bush) has not communicated to the American people the reasons why we are in Saudi Arabia. Regardless of the cause, I feel it is not worth losing American lives. Can the President go to war without a national debate? Without Congress' consent? And just what are the goals in the Gulf? I believe he has gone too far, too fast. I know I speak for the majority of Americans when I say our hope is for our service people to return home unharmed."

"I hope you and the other Congressmen and women will consider all of the alternatives to war. I wouldn't want my brother to get drafted and killed in another Vietnam. Would you?"

"According to the Constitution the power of declaring war belongs to Congress. I hope as a Member of the Congress you will remind the Executive Branch that they don't have the power to declare war. Tell George Bush we don't want another Vietnam."

"The statements that we do not want war, and yet the continued exchange of threats makes me wonder if we might not be looking for an excuse to engage the Iraqis in battle."

"As a father of three sons, ages 21, 19, and 18, I also have a deeply personal stake in the decisions you make."

"The irony is that both our own rhetoric and Iraq's rhetoric have fed upon the other and have consequently dragged us both further into the mire of non-communication and closer to military confrontation. Recent positive action by both countries (the call for face-to-face negotiations, the release of hostages) have lost momentum in the face of dogged insistence upon rhetoric."

"We should remember to try to give peace a chance. The military option should be the very last resort. The United States must exhaust all possible negotiations before ever rushing into war."

"Congress must be able to have a say in this matter. As the Constitution so clearly states, Congress represents the American people. Therefore, only Congress can express the will of the people. President Bush must consult with Congress before taking any other action. It is the only way we citizens can either provide or deny our support."

"Since Iraq invaded Kuwait I have not heard one person say we should go to war over it. I honestly do not believe that war would be supported by the U.S. population. A serious energy policy would get a lot more support."

"We feel that there has been an insidious movement to divert attention away from domestic problems by calling up the troops and sounding the call to battle. We can hardly afford the costs of maintaining our armed forces in Saudi Arabia and ought to withdraw. This President may need to lose face in order to establish once and for all that, while the President may be Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces after war has been declared, he or she may not threaten or attack another country without the consent of Congress."

"It appears that George Bush is single-handedly leading us into a war that is not what most citizens feel is justified or necessary. . . . U.N. Security Council approval of the use of force does not make it right for us to take the offensive and attack Kuwait. War does not solve anything, and in this case, bombings would destroy the oil anyway."

"I hope that you as a Member of Congress will consider all alternatives to military force, and make sure that George Bush realizes that he does not have the authority or support of the citizens to declare war. This country cannot afford another situation like Vietnam. Diplomacy and withdrawal should be the words rather than war."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today on account of official business.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DYMALLY of California (at his own request) for the week of January 7, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FIELDS, for 60 minutes each day, on January 10 and 11.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WASHINGTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. UNSOELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes, today, and on January 11.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 60 minutes, on January 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCEWEN, for 60 minutes each day, on January 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on January 11 and 12.

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes, on January 11.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIKORSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes each day, on January 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18.

Mr. SIKORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. UNSOELD, for 5 minutes, on January 11.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 60 minutes, on January 12.

Mr. POSHARD, for 60 minutes, on January 11.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 60 minutes, on January 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WASHINGTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. GINGRICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIKORSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. LEHMAN of California.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. FAZIO.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock midnight) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 11, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-18-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

263. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request that the House of Representatives and the Senate adopt a Resolution stating that Congress supports the use of all necessary means to implement U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 (H. Doc. No. 102-27); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and order to be printed.

264. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

265. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

266. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

267. A letter from the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

268. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

269. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

270. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Claims court, transmitting the court's report for the year ended September 30, 1990, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 791(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

271. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting the report on the

operation of the International Coffee Agreement for the period October 1, 1989 to September 30, 1990, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1356n; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

272. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination 91-9, and justification thereto; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 27. Resolution providing for debate and consideration of resolutions on the situation in the Middle East (Rept. 102-1); Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 472. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to establish certain boundaries for the Eleven Point River, MO; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 473. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to make it unlawful to obstruct the operation of, or harass any activity permitted under, a grazing permit or lease, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mrs.

BENTLEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LAGO-MARSINO, and Mr. BATEMAN):

H.R. 474. A bill to amend title V of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow speeches, appearances, and articles by officers and employees of the United States if unrelated to that individual's official duties or status; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 475. A bill to ensure compliance with article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, to provide reports to the Congress and the American people on the human and financial costs of war as well as plans for financing war, to authorize regular reviews by the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office of the human and financial costs of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr.

BONIOR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CARR, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 476. A bill to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself, Mr.

MICHEL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma,

Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McEWEN, and Mr. BLAZ:

H.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to authorize the use of U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON:

H.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to declare that a state of war exists between the United States and the Government of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to designate January 13, 1991, as a national day of prayer for members of American military forces stationed in the Middle East, and for their families; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the United States shall guarantee to each person the right to employment opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1991 as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 13, 1991, through October 19, 1991, as "National Radon Action Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the Columbian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution designating the oak as the national arboreal emblem; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to grant asylum to those individuals who seek asylum in the United States rather than serve in the South African armed forces in support of apartheid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution concerning the rights of the people of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution designating May 3 as "Polish Constitution Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should continue to levy stringent

economic sanctions against Iraq, rather than resort to military action, and that any decision to use offensive military action must be executed only with the full consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the contract dispute involving Bucheit International, Inc. and Prince Mishal Bin Abdulaziz al Saud of Saudi Arabia be resolved through negotiation or the submission of the matter to arbitration as required by contract; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H. Res. 28. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for debate on major policy issues; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 477. A bill for the relief of Global Exploration & Development Corp. Kerr-McGee Corp., and Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALLINGS:

H.R. 478. A bill for the relief of Norman R. Ricks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOLLUM:

H. Res. 29. Resolution for the relief of Global Exploration & Development Corp., Kerr-McGee Corp., and Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp. to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 8: Mr. TORRES, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 53: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. APPELATE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. LENT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. YATES, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 68: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JAMES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 113: Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 160: Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 179: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr.

PALLONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 207: Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 242: Mr. KYL, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 249: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RAY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BAKER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 298: Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 303: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 317: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STARK, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. APPELATE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 321: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 371: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RAY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 381: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 385: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. YATES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 393: Mr. BORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. PEASE.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. LENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. APPELATE, Mr. BERREUTER, and Mr. POSHARD.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 11: Mr. MINETA, and Mr. SHAYS.