

This new Chicago Marine Safety Station will house resources and personnel of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Chicago Marine Police and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Conservation Police. With Coast Guard, State and city resources stretched thin by the need for heightened security in Chicago and U.S. ports, this project will significantly improve public safety and law enforcement efforts in one of the busiest recreational areas in the country.

On behalf of the city of Chicago, the State of Illinois, and all of us who enjoy Chicago's lakefront, I thank the chairman for bringing this project to fruition.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for his words of support for the Coast Guard. I would like to ask that all Members, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and all Members who have risen today to speak on the bill, and I believe the overwhelming number of Members who will support this bill, to join with us in our effort when we get to the hard part, and this part today is easy for Members to stand up and say they are supporting the Coast Guard authorization. Well in excess of 400 Members voted in support of this measure when we brought it up the first time, but we have some difficult work to do.

There was recently an article in the Washington Post, I believe last week, that talked about our drug interdiction efforts suffering because of the Coast Guard's lack of resources. This is not what we want to see from this body. This is not what this Nation wants to see, and the only way we will remedy the situation is if we collectively join together, put our shoulders to the same wheel and make sure through the appropriations process that the Coast Guard receives the resources necessary to carry out the mission they have been mandated to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited the Coast Guard facilities in my district a number of times. We have the Coast Guard Recruit Training Center, the only one in the Nation in Cape May in the Second Congressional District. I also visited Group Air Station Atlanta City just a couple of weeks ago, and with Captain Durfee, I looked into the eyes of the men and women there, eager to serve their country, well trained, ready to go, boarding ships and checking foreign crews and manifests, making sure our ports are safe, responding to anything in a moment's notice, willing to give up everything for our Nation.

We owe these men and women who have given us so much in their mission of drug interdiction, homeland security, interdiction of illegal immigrants, fishery law enforcement, all the different things, search and rescue operations, all of the things that are in

jeopardy if we cannot get them the resources they need.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would in closing like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and the minority staff for their strong cooperation and help with Coast Guard issues since I have been Chair of this committee. I have appreciated it a great deal. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has been there every inch of the way, as has been the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and their staff. Again, I would like to encourage all the Members to take a close look at the mission that the Coast Guard has been given to do, especially since September 11, and recognize that this is one step in a process that we are fighting through to make sure that these men and women have the resources necessary.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Chairman LOBIONDO, and Ranking Member BROWN and my other colleagues in strong support of H.R. 3507, the Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Early in November I had the opportunity to visit with Commander Gene Brooks, of the Greater Antilles Section in San Juan Puerto Rico, which is responsible for my district the U.S. Virgin Islands. What was very clear from that meeting, Mr. Speaker, is that the Coast Guard is in dire need of assets and personnel to carry out their mission.

Since September 11, 2001 this has become more urgent, as much of what they had been deployed elsewhere, and the primary assignment port security and escorting and protecting defense vessels, and hazardous materials, has taken them almost completely away from their role in drugs interdiction, border patrol and marine safety, as well as search and rescue.

Mr. Speaker, my district has several assets of national significance and importance. Additionally, because the Virgin Islands is a border of the United States we need a well-staffed and equipped Coast Guard. Mr. Speaker, the \$5.9 billion authorized by this bill is a good start. I look forward to working with you and the subcommittee to give this and all the agencies, which secure our homeland, and support our armed forces, all the resources they need to do the job.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3507.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3507.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that

a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### REGARDING MONITORING OF WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT IN IRAQ

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) regarding the monitoring of weapons development in Iraq, as required by United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 75

Whereas the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein engaged the Islamic Republic of Iran, a nation of more than 55,000,000 Muslims, in a 10-year war, during which Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against Iran and his own people;

Whereas Saddam Hussein has pursued a policy of ethnic cleansing against the Kurdish people, killing 5,000 Kurdish civilians with a chemical attack on March 16, 1988, and an estimated 50,000 to 182,000 in the forced relocation of Kurdish civilians in 1988;

Whereas on August 2, 1990, Iraq without provocation invaded the State of Kuwait, a nation of more than 1,500,000 Muslims;

Whereas on November 29, 1990, the United Nations Security Council adopted United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, which authorized nations cooperating with the State of Kuwait to use all necessary means to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait and to restore international peace and security to the area;

Whereas on January 17, 1991, the regime of Saddam Hussein without provocation fired 7 Scud missiles into the State of Israel, a nation of approximately 1,000,000 Muslims and 50,000 Jews;

Whereas on January 17, 1991, Iraq fired Scud missiles into the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, a nation of more than 20,000,000 Muslims;

Whereas on January 29, 1991, Iraq attacked the city of Khafji in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

Whereas the regime of Saddam Hussein is a threat to its neighbors and has demonstrated its willingness to use weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas on February 24, 1991, a broad international coalition of 38 Muslim and non-Muslim nations, including the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the State of Kuwait, the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the Syrian Arab Republic, began a coalition ground operation to liberate Kuwait;

Whereas on April 6, 1991, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of "all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto", and "all ballistic missiles with a range greater than

one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities";

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to "carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities" and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the "destruction, removal or rendering harmless" of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, the process of destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction was to have been completed within 45 days of approval by the United Nations Security Council of the weapons inspectors' plan for doing so;

Whereas Iraq has now been in breach of this requirement for more than a decade;

Whereas the regime of Saddam Hussein consistently impeded the work of United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq between 1991 and 1998 by denying them access to crucial sites and documents and by obstructing their work in numerous other ways;

Whereas on October 31, 1998, Iraq banned the United Nations weapons inspectors despite its agreement and obligation to comply with Security Council Resolution 687;

Whereas on December 15, 1998, the chief United Nations weapons inspector reported that Iraq was withholding cooperation;

Whereas Congress declared in Public Law 105-235 (112 Stat. 1538) that "the Government of Iraq is in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations, and therefore the President is urged to take appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution and relevant laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations";

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 was adopted under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and violations of such resolution that threaten international peace and security may be dealt with through military action pursuant to Security Council Resolution 678;

Whereas the United States has reported that a high risk exists that Iraq has continued to develop weapons of mass destruction since the expulsion of United Nations weapons inspectors, in violation of Security Council Resolution 687 and subsequent resolutions;

Whereas such development is a threat to the United States and its friends and allies in the Middle East;

Whereas Congress declared in Public Law 105-338 (112 Stat. 3178) that it should be "the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime";

Whereas the attacks of September 11, 2001, illustrate the global reach of terrorists;

Whereas numerous terrorist groups are seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas Iraq is a sponsor of terrorism and has trained members of several terrorist organizations;

Whereas the regime of Saddam Hussein plotted to assassinate former President

George Bush during his visit to the State of Kuwait in 1993;

Whereas the President has stated that "any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime" and has committed to "pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism"; and

Whereas on November 26, 2001, President Bush warned that any nation that develops weapons of mass destruction in order to "terrorize" others "will be held accountable": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—*

(1) the United States and the United Nations Security Council should insist on a complete program of inspection and monitoring to prevent the development of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq;

(2) Iraq should allow United Nations weapons inspectors "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation which they wish to inspect", as required by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 707 (August 15, 1991) and 1284 (December 17, 1999);

(3) the United States should ensure that the United Nations does not accept any inspection and monitoring regime that fails to guarantee weapons inspectors immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records, and means of transportation which they wish to inspect;

(4) Iraq, as a result of its refusal to comply with the terms of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) and subsequent relevant resolutions, remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations; and

(5) Iraq's refusal to allow United Nations weapons inspectors immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to facilities and documents covered by United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 and other relevant resolutions presents a mounting threat to the United States, its friends and allies, and international peace and security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have the time in opposition if neither gentleman is opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the motion?

Mr. LANTOS. I am not opposed to the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas will control the time in opposition.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to divide my 20 minutes with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to call up House Joint Resolution 75, expressing our strong concern about Saddam Hussein's failure to comply with the weapons inspection requirements established by the United Nations at the end of the Persian Gulf War.

This resolution was introduced December 4 by our former colleague on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM); and I was proud to join him as an original cosponsor of the measure. I also want to express my appreciation for the strong support given to this resolution by our distinguished ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and also by the chairman and ranking Democratic member of our Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

The resolution draws attention to the growing threat to international peace and security posed by Saddam Hussein's refusal to comply with the terms of the cease-fire agreement ending the Persian Gulf War. Those terms were incorporated by the U.N. Security Council into Resolution 687 of 1991, and into subsequent resolutions addressing the situation in Iraq. Those terms required him to afford U.N. weapons inspectors unfettered access to sites in Iraq where weapons of mass destruction might be under development, as well as to other relevant locations and information in Iraq.

From 1991 until 1998, Saddam Hussein went through the motions of complying with these inspection requirements, while doing everything he could to prevent the weapons inspectors from discovering the truth about the history of his weapons programs. Since 1998, Saddam has stopped complying altogether. In other words, since 1998, Saddam's ability to reconstitute his nuclear weapons program, his biological weapons program, his chemical weapons program, and his long-range missile program has not been constrained by international inspectors. There is every reason to believe he has taken advantage of the absence of inspectors to revive these weapons programs.

The events of September 11 demonstrate the severity of this threat, and indeed to all civilized countries as well as the United States. The terrorists who attacked our country September 11 wanted to kill as many Americans as possible. They sought to use aircraft as weapons of mass destruction. There can be no doubt if

they had had access to real weapons of mass destruction, they would have used them to kill as many of our fellow citizens as possible.

Saddam Hussein has a track record of developing such weapons and of using them not only against his enemies but against his own people. So he certainly would have no qualms about using them against us.

Just 2 weeks ago, our committee received testimony from two of our Nation's leading experts on biological weapons. These experts, Dr. Richard Spertzel and Dr. Ken Alibek, agreed that there was most likely state involvement in the anthrax attacks that our Nation has experienced, and that the most likely state to have been involved was Iraq. So we are confronting a very serious threat, something that is literally a matter of life and death. This resolution expresses our very strong desire to see something done about it.

This resolution does not seek to give the President legal authority to use force against Iraq. There is a debate about whether he already has such authority, and I happen to believe he does; but this resolution does not speak to that question. All it says is that Iraq is violating its obligations under international law and that this violation presents a mounting threat to our Nation, to our allies, and to international peace and security. These statements are demonstrably true, and the truly dangerous course would be to remain silent in the face of these facts.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I first want to pay tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), for introducing this resolution; and I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for his invaluable work in refining the resolution and in bringing it so promptly to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 75, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so. Our Nation faces a critical terrorist threat that goes well beyond that posed by the Taliban and al Qaeda. The threat is from Saddam Hussein's Iraq, a nation that is both a supporter and a generator of international terrorism and a proliferator of weapons of mass destruction.

Increasingly, Mr. Speaker, the media is full of speculation as to whether Iraq is the next U.S. target in the war against terrorism. The resolution before us today speaks to that issue. Iraq has had more than a decade to comply with United Nations resolutions requiring it to end its weapons of mass destruction programs. Rather than comply, it has made a fool of the international community.

A vote for this resolution, Mr. Speaker, tells Saddam Hussein this: you

must comply with the terms of your surrender, once and for all, and soon, or you will face the consequences.

In the past half century, no government has so consistently and flagrantly flouted the will of the international community as has Saddam Hussein's Iraq. No national leader has so regularly demonstrated that he is a threat to the lives of his citizens and his neighbors.

Without provocation, Saddam Hussein attacked Iran in 1980, swallowed up all of Kuwait in 1990, the first time, Mr. Speaker, since Hitler that one nation tried to wipe another off the map. He rained missiles on Saudi Arabia and Israel in 1991. He is the only current national leader to have employed weapons of mass destruction, using chemical weapons to attack Iran during the Iran-Iraq war and to murder some 5,000 Kurdish citizens of Iraq itself.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, the cease-fire resolution that ended the Gulf War in 1991, required Saddam Hussein to transfer his weapons of mass destruction and all related capabilities to the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq, widely known as UNSCOM, and to the International Atomic Energy Agency for purposes of destruction. This was to have been done by the middle of 1991, Mr. Speaker. Now, more than a decade later, Saddam Hussein continues to defy contemptuously the requirements of the international community. During the past 10 years, Saddam first obstructed and lied to the inspectors, then he effectively expelled them, and now he will not let them return.

Of course, Saddam Hussein has ignored virtually every United Nations Security Council demand, including those dealing with missing Kuwaitis taken prisoner by Iraq and property looted from Kuwait during Iraq's brutal 1990-1991 occupation. Meanwhile, the state-controlled Iraqi media continued to threaten Kuwait with another invasion.

Saddam Hussein's resort to terror is legendary, including an attempted assassination of our former President, George Bush. Most recently, we have been reminded of his terrorist activities by the capture of a 15-man Iraqi-trained terrorist cell in the West Bank. In view of Saddam Hussein's total disregard of the value of human life and of his demonstrated willingness to use weapons of mass destruction and terrorism to achieve his aims, nobody in Iraq, the Middle East, or the West, including the United States, is safe from his evil designs.

□ 1215

The world, Mr. Speaker, can no longer live with a Saddam Hussein who is developing weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. An Iraqi defector who spent 20 years working on Saddam's nuclear program put it well. Khidhir Hamza wrote in the December 10 Wall Street Journal,

"Saddam's express goal is to continue building up his chemical and biological stockpiles and to ultimately wield a nuclear weapon. Each day we wait we allow him to go further toward that goal."

Mr. Speaker, September 11 has demonstrated that we must take resolute action to prevent disasters before they occur. If our preferred recourse for now is to assure that UN's weapons inspectors return to Iraq, let this much be clear: The only acceptable inspection regime is one that assures, in the words of the UN Security Council resolution 707, "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" to all weapons of mass destruction facilities and documents.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker. Saddam Hussein must provide immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to all facilities where weapons of mass destruction may be hidden or produced and to all documents relating to these programs. An inspection regime that enhances Saddam's legitimacy, while allowing him secretly to continue his weapons of mass destruction programs, is totally unacceptable.

The resolution before us today says, in effect, that Saddam Hussein has one last chance to do what he was obligated to do over a decade ago. I believe, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein poses an imminent danger to our Nation, to our friends and to our allies, and there is little time to lose before we will have no choice but to take much stronger measures. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 75.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to start off by thanking the chairman for having made some changes in this bill. The bill is not nearly as bad as it was at the beginning. However, I obviously cannot support it. But changing the tone was helpful in talking about Saddam Hussein versus Iraq, "Iraq" suggesting the people of Iraq, who are hardly enemies of the American people. Saddam Hussein is a different subject. Also changing the word "aggression" to "a mounting threat." Aggression means that we have to immediately retaliate, I would suppose. Even "a mounting threat" is a bit threatening to me, but at least it is better and moving in the direction of less confrontation with a nation 6,000 miles from our shore that I hardly see as a threat to our national security.

One of the reasons why I take an approach on foreign policy where we are less involved overseas is mainly because I feel that the number one obligation for us in Congress and for the people of this country is to preserve liberty and defend it from outside threats. The authors of this resolution, I am sure, have the same goals, but,

over the years, I think those goals have been undermined. We as a Nation are now probably weaker rather than stronger and we are more threatened because of what we do overseas.

For instance, just this week, we had Stinger Missiles fired at our airplanes. Fortunately, they did not hit our airplanes. But we paid for those Stinger Missiles. And this week there was an attack in India by allies, supposedly, in Pakistan, who are receiving billions of dollars from us at the current time. This vacillation, shifting, on and off, friends one time, enemies the next time, this perpetual war seems to me not to be in the best interests of the United States.

Take, for instance, one of the *whereas*'s in this resolution. "Whereas the Iraq attacked the Islamic Republic of Iran." We keep hearing this all the time. It was horrible. But they were our allies at the time. We were financing them, giving them money, helping them with technology.

So I see this as a perfect example of us always flip-flopping. Not only do we frequently have those weapons that we sell and give to support a so-called friend turn against us, we so often have the opponents in the wars around the world fighting each other with our weapons.

My idea of national defense is minding our own business, being strong, and making sure our borders are secure. After 9/11, we had to go to Germany and ask them for help for AWACS airplanes to patrol our shores. I understand our ports are not necessarily secure, and yet we have Coast Guard cutters down in Colombia and in the Mediterranean Sea. I think if we learn anything it is that we ought to work harder to protect our country and not make us so vulnerable, yet we continue along this way.

We criticize the possibility or suggest the possibility of what might be happening in Iraq, and, out of frustration, this amendment came up because there has been no evidence that Iraq is connected. Not that Saddam Hussein can be construed as any type of a good guy, but there has been no connection, so there had to be some new reason given to go into Iraq.

I tend to agree with the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) that if there was evidence, we probably have, under the authority we have given the President, to go in to Iraq. But that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about the perpetuation, the continuation of the Persian Gulf War, which at the time was designed as a fight for our oil. I think that is what this is all about.

It's been suggested that the anthrax came from Iraq. The mounting evidence today, sadly, suggests that it may well be coming from our CIA. Here we are almost ready to go to war against Iraq at the suggestion that our carelessness and our development of anthrax here in this country may have been a contributing factor to this anthrax being spread in this country.

It is suggested that it will be easy to overtake Iraq because we have had this tremendous success in Afghanistan, and we will have this uprising and the Kurds will be a reliable ally in this uprising. The plain truth is, the Kurds will not be the salvation of our securing Iraq. As a matter of fact, most of our allies, the Turks, although they may be bought and allow us to use their bases, they are very nervous about this plan to invade Iraq.

The whole idea that Iraq is the one that we have to be addressing, when you look at the problems throughout the world, when you look at what is happening in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia has not cooperated, and yet we have troops on their soil antagonizing the people over there, and at the same time, people are saying that all we have to do is invade Iraq, get rid of Saddam Hussein, and everything is going to be okay.

Another "whereas," mentioning UN Resolution 678 it was declared that under Resolution 687, we have authority to go back in today. That is not true. As a matter of fact, 687 gave us the authority to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. That does not mean that we can perpetuate war forever under that resolution.

As a matter of fact, if you want to go into Iraq and follow the rules and you are pretending you are following the rules, you ought to do a couple of things. If you believe in the United Nations, you have to go back to the United Nations, if you believe in the rule of law. Also you have to answer the question, why does this resolution need to be enforced versus other resolutions that have never been enforced? Why is it assumed that the United States has to enforce UN resolutions? When did it come to the point where the UN dictates foreign policy to us?

So, there are a lot of questions to answer about this desire to immediately go into Iraq. I think it actually poses a threat to our security, more than it helps us. So I am suggesting that we go more cautiously.

I am glad this resolution has been toned down a little bit, but it does represent those individuals who think that we should be at war with Iraq today, and I disagree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and I each be given an additional 5 minutes, as we have other colleagues who wish to speak on this.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in whole-hearted support this joint resolution highlighting Saddam Hussein's refusal to allow weapons inspections and the threat that this refusal poses to international peace and security.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for bringing this measure to the floor at this time. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) for his sponsorship of this very important measure.

There have been no substantive UN inspections in Iraq for more than 3 years, and there are numerous reports of Iraqi attempts to reconstitute its weapons of mass destruction. Having openly admitted to having produced anthrax and other biological agents, Iraq could transfer that capability to terrorist organizations it harbors, including the notorious Abu Nidal Organization and the Abu Abbas group. We must not risk Iraqi biological agents falling into the hands of such barbarians.

Iraq's weapons and biological programs must be stopped once and for all. Some in our Nation and in the Arab world contend, why go after Saddam now? He has been relatively quiet recently. That faulty rationale reminds us that following the bin Laden bombings of our two embassies in Africa, we heard similar arguments, that these threats are far away and that bin Laden cannot succeed if he were to attack the United States. That threat was minimized by the prior administration, regrettably resulting in the September 11 barbaric attacks on our Nation.

We must not repeat those risks when it comes to Saddam Hussein. He already invaded Kuwait, used chemical weapons against the Kurds and Iranians, fired ballistic missiles at our troops, at the Saudis and the Israelis. It is questionable if Saddam would be deterred by any U.S. military power. It is a risk we must not take.

Hopefully, this resolution is an important first step in our renewed campaign against Saddam Hussein. Not only does he need to be stripped of his weapons of mass destruction, but he should be ousted from power. He has shown no regard for international law nor for the Iraqi people, who, along with his neighbors, would welcome and be gratified to be rid of him. He has turned what should have been a rich, progressive nation into a bellicose, bully and pariah, working with an indigenous opposition.

We gave the Afghan people a brighter future. Working with the Iraqi opposition, we should give the Iraqi people no less. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this important resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my friend,

the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution. More than 10 years have passed since the United States and coalition forces defeated Iraq, but the potential threat posed by Saddam Hussein remains today.

This is a man who has used chemical weapons against his own people. This is a man who invaded Kuwait and lobbed SKUD missiles into Israel and Saudi Arabia. This is a man who must be dealt with once and for all.

□ 1230

Between 1991 and 1998, Saddam Hussein played a game of hide and seek with his weapons of mass destruction. He would impede the progress of U.N. inspectors as it suited his needs, never fully adhering to U.N. Resolution 687 before expelling UNSCOM in 1998.

As the famous proverb goes, “When the cat is away, the mice will certainly play.”

The Iraqi regime has spent the last 3 years developing and perfecting its chemical, biological, and nuclear program, while the international community has stood idly by. Inaction and indifference may have been the prevailing sentiments; but on the morning of September 12, we woke up to an entirely new and different world with a new and different attitude. We awoke to a world that values dialogue over destruction and peace over terror.

Mr. Hussein: no more delays. No more deliberations. No more deceptions. Your time is up. If you insist that you have nothing to hide, then allow the inspectors back into Iraq to do their job immediately. Failure to do so will answer all of the questions that we have.

The security of this region depends on it. The security of the world depends on it. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It has been said that there have been no inspections in Iraq; and yet the International Atomic Energy Agency was in Iraq this very year and this was the report: I am pleased to confirm that between 20 and 23 January 2001, a 4-person IAEA team carried out a physical inventory verification of the declared nuclear material remaining in Iraq under IAEA seal. For its part, Iraq provided the necessary cooperation for the inspection team to perform its activities effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott).

(Mr. McDermott asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDermott. Mr. Speaker, neither the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

PAUL) nor I think Saddam Hussein is a nice man or good for the world. However, we rise in opposition to this resolution because of the way it is being done, the time in which it is being done, and what is implied by this resolution, but not clearly stated.

No one disputes Iraq's behavior. We encouraged the Kurds to rise against them, and then we abandoned them. We encouraged the Shia down in Bosnia to rise against them, and then we abandoned them. But we have not in this place forgotten what Saddam Hussein is about.

The question is, Why is there sudden rush to do this 48 hours before the Congress adjourns for a month, giving the President apparent unlimited ability to act?

Now, after September 11, with the exception of one person on this floor, we authorized the President to do what needed to be done with respect to the acts of 9-11. Things have gone reasonably well. They are not through yet. We do not know where Osama bin Laden is. We do not know whether we are precipitating further problems by al Qaeda going into Pakistan. We now have India on the borders, armed. We have all kinds of questions being raised about that area that have been precipitated by our actions. I think, certainly, we knew that some of that would happen, but we were willing to take that risk.

Now we come out here to pass a resolution. This resolution says: the President of the United States should insist on monitoring weapons development in Iraq. Nobody out here disagrees with that.

Iraq should allow U.N. weapons inspectors into Iraq as required by Security Council Resolution 687. No one disagrees with that.

Iraq remains a material and unacceptable breach of international obligations. No one disagrees with that.

And now we come to it. The refusal of Iraq to admit U.N. weapons inspectors into any facility covered by the provisions of Security Council Resolution 687 should be considered an act of aggression, an act of aggression against the United States and its allies.

This is the resolution that is laying on the table out here as the one that is being passed on this floor. I know someone is going to stand up and say, we have changed it. When we are doing it at 100 miles an hour, it is no wonder that Members who care cannot figure out what is going on.

So I would say to everybody here who is going to come down here and vote on this, just ask ourselves, are we back in 1964 in the House of Representatives when they brought the Gulf of Tonkin out here? They brought the Gulf of Tonkin into the Senate; and they were about to vote on it, and only two Members of that body voted against it, Ernest Gruening of Alaska and Mr. Morris from Oregon. A third member raised a question. His name was Nelson, Gay-

lord Nelson from Wisconsin, and he said, I want to put in an amendment here that says that this does not authorize the putting of troops on the ground in Vietnam.

Now, Bill Fulbright went down to the White House and said to Lyndon Johnson, Lyndon, old Gaylord is going to put an amendment on here that we cannot put troops on the ground. And Lyndon Johnson said, well, you just go up there and tell old Gaylord I have no intention of putting any troops on the ground. Mr. Speaker, 500-and-some-odd thousand later, 55,000 deaths, and Lyndon Johnson did not have any intention of putting anybody on the ground. We can understand why Gaylord voted no.

I do not know what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and his colleagues mean by this: a refusal by Iraq to admit the United States weapons inspectors be considered an act of aggression against the United States. Is that a declaration of war? Well, if it is a declaration of war, then maybe the Geneva Convention should now be called in.

The President of the United States, when we gave him this carte blanche in Afghanistan to do whatever he thought necessary, now we have military tribunals, secret tribunals. We have people all over this country being held without charge, in secrecy, with no access to attorneys, because the President deems that is what we are going to do.

Now, I do not want to go home having given the President carte blanche to do whatever he wants for the month of December and January in Iraq.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.) The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott) an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. McDermott. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest that my dear friend from Washington is in vain against a resolution that does not exist. We have taken the word “aggression” out. We took it out a long time ago. I do not know how it crept into the gentleman's copy, but I hope his other notes are more accurate.

Mr. McDermott. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Illinois should know that this was picked up in the Speaker's lobby on the table where it is his responsibility to put the bills that are being considered on the floor. If this is not what it is, then he is going too fast, and that is the whole point of what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and I are saying.

We may not disagree. We may agree ultimately we need to go to Iraq, but not at 100 miles an hour without anybody understanding. Because this is

what the gentleman put out there for me to read, and I learned to read in about the first grade, and I am reading what was here. If that is not what was supposed to be out there, I certainly would like to see people explain why this was put in on December 12, passed out of committee on the December 12, and is here, and we cannot get the right version printed to be in the House.

My colleagues do not care about the process, and the United States Congress is losing its power by this kind of action. When my colleagues walk away and allow people to put stuff out here without anybody reading it, they do not know. We may soon have a package of stimulus out here that repeals some parts of the campaign finance law. We are all watching carefully to see if we can catch it; but when we do it at 100 miles an hour, I have to vote against it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, strong support of this resolution.

Ten years ago, the United States of America and our allies blew it. We had the opportunity to eliminate a major threat to world peace and world stability and a major dictator and tyrant to the people of Iraq, and we did not do the job. We did not finish the job.

Now is the time for us to finish that job. By not finishing the job before, we permitted, for example, the Kuwaitis to suffer with hundreds of their people still being held prisoners of war, MIAs, prisoners of war, the equivalent of 50,000 Americans would be held today without us knowing what Saddam Hussein has done to the Kuwaitis and still does to them. Saddam Hussein still has a vicious dictatorship; and Saddam Hussein is at war with the United States, most importantly.

I am very happy that the gentleman from Texas does not want us to be at war with Iraq. But the fact is, Saddam Hussein is at war with us, no matter where we would like to be. And if we permit Saddam Hussein to have nuclear and chemical and biological weapons, weapons of mass destruction, he will kill millions of Americans. Make no mistake about it. He has a blood feud with us.

We are not talking about a war with Iraq; we are talking about a war with Saddam Hussein. We should liberate Iraq in the same way that we have liberated Afghanistan, now that we have the chance and the opportunity to do so.

How did we liberate Afghanistan? We simply supported the people; we helped the people liberate themselves from the Taliban tyranny. The people in Iraq hate Saddam Hussein much more than the people of Afghanistan hated the Taliban. By helping them liberate themselves, we are protecting our own population from a holocaust, we are

protecting the world for peace, and we are doing what is right.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rohrabacher).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman was to find out that China was much more involved in the Taliban and the terrorist attacks on 9-11 than anything Saddam Hussein has done, would the gentleman be willing to do to China what the gentleman is willing to do to Iraq?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me put it this way. The answer is yes, but I would not right away. Like the President says, we must do things sequentially, and we must be absolutely committed to the job. If we do things sequentially, the next order of business is taking care of the threat in Iraq. And if China is, yes, helping terrorists murder thousands of Americans, yes, we should help the Chinese people overthrow their dictatorships as well.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, would the gentleman do the same thing to Pakistan and Syria and Saudi Arabia and Egypt?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the President of the United States that this is a sequential battle against terrorism. If those countries are engaged in supporting terrorists who kill thousands of Americans or continue a belligerency that threatens millions of our lives, yes, one at a time, we have to take care of them. If we do not, millions of our people will pay the price. Who could have ever guessed that by not taking care of Afghanistan, thousands of our people would be dead?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my old friend, for his generosity. I can assure him I will not abuse it. I am also happy to join the former chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), in this discussion.

I want to just throw this out because I may not be correct; but is this measure, H.J. Resolution 75, a way of us expanding the war to Iraq? I assume the answer is yes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this measure is the exact opposite of what the gentleman has just suggested. It

demands of Saddam Hussein what he agreed to 10 years ago: full and complete access to places where weapons of mass destruction are produced. It gives him one chance, one final chance to do what he agreed to do when he surrendered 10 years ago.

□ 1245

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his comment.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who is more an expert on foreign affairs matters than I, said "Now is the time to finish the job." I guess that is not very ambiguous, is it? And then he went on to explain something that could be troublesome: we are not at war with Iraq, but we are at war with Saddam Hussein.

Well, that introduces a new concept. I am only on the Committee on the Judiciary. Our impressions have always been that nations declare war on another, we do not declare war on terrorists or a head of a country, or anything else.

I see the gentleman from California in the aisle there.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's quote was a little bit mistaken. I said that we are not at war with Iraq, but Saddam Hussein is at war with us.

Mr. CONYERS. Okay. That is much better, because that means, then, that we do not have to declare war on China's leaders, either. They are at war with us, not the people? Did I get that right? I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That was only based on if the assessment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) was correct and they are supporting terrorists and planning to kill thousands of Americans. Then, yes, they are at war with us.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, could we not tailor this document a little more narrowly than bringing China into this? The gentleman did not do it. All right.

Let me go to the next part. I asked my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), about the hearings. I was told that there were no hearings, no witnesses; but there was a markup last Wednesday.

Is that right? I have to get something right down here in the well before I return my time. Okay. That much is right.

Mr. Speaker, is there some reason that we did not have witnesses? Silence. All right. Then the only other thing that I could add, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been a change. There was original language that considered that Iraq's refusal to admit U.N. weapons inspectors pursuant to Security Resolution 687 should be considered an act of aggression against the United

States and its allies, and that language has been struck.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, we did have hearings, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, on December 4. We had two of the inspectors who were over and were shut out by Saddam Hussein, and a lady expert on arms control from the Clinton administration. So we had hearings.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Okay, so none of my premises have been right so far. It is like the Detroit Lions who broke their record last week. Maybe I can do something here.

Okay. Now, am I right that we have substituted new language for this statement? I have them now. The original language was that Iraq's refusal to admit U.N. weapons inspectors pursuant to Security Resolution 687 ". . . should be considered an act of aggression against the United States and its allies," and that language has been removed; and we have inserted new language. Does anyone challenge that in the body? Okay. All right. I got that in.

And the new language says that 687 and 707 and other relevant resolutions "present a mounting threat to the United States, its allies, and international peace and security." Does anyone have anything to help me understand that better?

So, essentially, instead of an act of aggression, we have put in "a mounting threat," and I notice there seems to be general agreement on that. So we have had hearings and we have had a markup. We modified the language for people who may be nervous about where this might be going.

But I must confess, as I return to my seat, I am not sure if we should be expanding the war to Iraq.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the emphasis in this H.J. resolution is that resolutions have been passed, and one in particular, a U.N. resolution against Iraq, must be enforced. I made the point earlier that there are many resolutions that are not enforced, so this one is special and has to be enforced; and the assumption is that it is the responsibility of the United States to do the enforcing.

Everybody knows that I am not too keen on the United Nations, but I am not too keen on the idea that we can use the United Nations as we please. Sometimes we follow the rules, and sometimes we do not. I think if we are participating, the argument should be that we should follow the rules.

There is no U.N. authority for us to use force against Saddam Hussein without a new U.N. resolution. It would be very difficult to legally mount another invasion of Iraq right now without a U.N. resolution. It would not go along with UN rules.

The other question I have about the rule of law and trying to follow the

rules of the United Nations would be: Where have we gotten the authority to enforce the no-fly zones? The no-fly zones are really a contention in the Middle East, and have been a contention for a long time, because that, in combination with the embargoes and the sanctions against the Iraqi people is what the Arabs believe to be so detrimental to the children who have died in Iraq.

Whether Members agree with that or not, or they want to put all the blame on Saddam Hussein, is beside the point. Millions if not billions of Muslims and Iraqis happen to wonder about that policy: Where did we get the authority to continue bombing for now going on 12 years?

This legislation says that we know exactly what is going on in Iraq. I pointed out that the International Atomic Energy Agency has been in Iraq this year and found out that there is no evidence of nuclear weapons being built.

But there is one gentleman who has been in Iraq many times under the U.N., as a U.N. inspector, Scott Ritter. He has been there 30 times. Probably even the best junketeer in Congress I will bet has not been over there 30 times, but he has been there 30 times inspecting.

He was on a television interview the other day, and had an opinion as to what is going on in Iraq. I do not think Members can jump up and say Scott Ritter is not a true American, that he is not a true internationalist, that he does not know what he is talking about. But this is what he said on television when they asked about whether or not he thought Saddam Hussein and Iraq was a threat to our national security.

He said, "In terms of military threat, absolutely nothing. His military was devastated in 1991 in Operation Desert Storm, and Iraq has not had the ability to reconstitute itself in terms of weapons of mass destruction. We know that we achieved a 90 to 95 percent level of disarmament. Diplomatically, politically, Saddam is a little bit of a threat. In terms of a real national security threat to the United States, no, none."

Because he is a little bit of a political and a diplomatic threat, we are making these plans to pursue war or in reality continue the war because the Persian Gulf war has not really ended.

So once again, I ask my colleagues who are going to be voting on this shortly to think about it. If it is unnecessary and does not have any effect, why bring it to the floor? There would be no purpose. If Hussein is aligned with the terrorists, the President already has authority to do something about it. So what really is the reason for this, especially when it was first announced that this would be an act of aggression, which is really what they feel in their hearts, in their minds, what they want this to be? It has been toned down a little bit. But this resolution is a support for expanding the war

and continuing what has been going on for 12 years.

Quite frankly, I think there is a better diplomatic way to handle things. I think it is a shame that our Secretary of State has not been given more authority to have his way on this issue, rather than being overruled by those and encouraged by many Members here in the Congress who want to prepare for war against Iraq, because of this fantastic success in Afghanistan, a country, probably the poorest country in the world that did not even have an airplane; and now, because of this tremendous success, we are ready to take on the next country.

But one thing that we have to realize is that there is a great chance, and there is some evidence, and I may get a chance to quote this later, that China may well have been involved. Now, the gentleman from California said, OK, so let us go after China. Everyone knows we are not going to go after China in the same manner we are planning to go after Iraq.

We are going into Iraq for other reasons, other than reasons of national security. That is my firm belief. It has a lot to do with the announcement when our government propagandized to go to war in the Persian Gulf War and it was to go to defend our oil. I still believe that is a major motivation that directs our foreign policy in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the same arguments made, or I have read about them in the twenties and the thirties, that our borders are all we need to worry about, and do not worry what happens in Europe.

During the twenties and thirties, that is what we did, we pulled a blanket over our heads, and a man named Hitler rearmed, and over across the Pacific Tojo rearmed, and the result of our indifference to what was going on was that millions of people died, millions of people died.

The gentleman from Texas says that the only business we have is to secure our borders. I suggest our borders do not end with California or New Jersey or New York, but what happens in Europe, what happens in Asia. In today's world, never mind when we walked away from the League of Nations, in today's world our borders are everywhere.

Why do we have to do it? Because we are the strongest country in the world, and if it does not get done by the United States, it will not be done.

Now, the gentleman disparages our concern for oil. Imagine, and it does not take a leap of imagination, if Saddam Hussein controlled the Persian Gulf, what that would do to the economies of the world. Talk about lines at gas stations; it is very important. No.

Now, about these inspections. The International Atomic Energy Commission conducts these inspections, and

they are a joke. They are an embarrassing joke, because they only look at the premises that are declared by Saddam Hussein. The U.N. was kicked out because they conducted real inspections. They were intrusive, and they found things over there that embarrassed the International Atomic Energy Commission.

I just suggest to the Members that this is very important; that it is a challenge and a threat to civilization to have a monster like Saddam Hussein who used chemical warfare on his own people to have access to the facilities to create nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1300

We are not calling for war, we are calling for enforcement of the U.N. resolutions that were agreed to by Saddam.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker. Who gets to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has the right to close. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 30 seconds remaining on his time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) be granted an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PAUL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 30 seconds remaining on his time. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has the right to close.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, very quickly, borders are important because that is what our Constitution gives us the authority to defend. Our Constitution does not give us the authority to defend Europe or anybody else. Also we have a moral authority to defend ourselves and not to pretend that we are the policemen of the world. What would Americans say if China were in the Gulf of Mexico and said it was their oil and had troops stationed in Texas. That is the equivalent of us having our Navy in the Persian Gulf and saying it is our oil and placing troops in Saudi Arabia.

Using gas on our own people? I understand a few people died at Waco, and it happened that illegal war gasses were used during that operation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose House Joint Resolution 75 because it solves none of our problems and only creates new ones. Though the legislation before us today does wisely excise the most objectionable part of the original text of H.J. Res. 75—the resolution clause stating that by not obeying a U.N. resolution Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein has been committing an “act of aggression” against the United States—what remains in the legislation only serves to divert our attention from what should be our number one priority at this time:

finding bringing to justice those who attacked the United States on September 11, 2001.

Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator. The Iraqi people would no doubt be better off without him and his despotic rule. But the call in some quarters for the United States to intervene to change Iraq's government is a voice that offers little in the way of a real solution to our problems in the Middle East—many of which were caused by our interventionism in the first place. Secretary of State Colin Powell underscored recently this lack of planning on Iraq, saying, “I never saw a plan that was going to take [Saddam] out. It was just some ideas coming from various quarters about, ‘let's go bomb.’”

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 64, passed on September 14 just after the terrorist attack, states that, “The president is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on Sept. 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons.” From all that we know at present, Iraq appears to have had no such role. Indeed, we have seen “evidence” of Iraqi involvement in the attacks on the United States proven false over the past couple of weeks. Just this week, for example, the “smoking gun” of Iraqi involvement in the attack seems to have been debunked: The New York Times reported that “the Prague meeting (allegedly between al-Qaeda terrorist Mohamad Atta and an Iraqi intelligence agent) has emerged as an object lesson in the limits of intelligence reports rather than the cornerstone of the case against Iraq.” The Times goes on to suggest that the “Mohamad Atta” who was in the Czech Republic this summer seems to have been Pakistani national who happened to have the same name. It appears that this meeting never took place, or at least not in the way it has been reported. This conclusion has also been drawn by the Czech media and is reviewed in a report on Radio Free Europe's Newsline. Even those asserting Iraqi involvement in the anthrax scare in the United States—a theory forwarded most aggressively by Iraqi defector Khidir Hamza and former CIA director James Woolsey—have, with the revelation that the anthrax is domestic, had their arguments silenced by the facts.

Absent Iraqi involvement in the attack on the United States, I can only wonder why so many in Congress seek to divert resources away from our efforts to bring those who did attack us to justice. That hardly seems a prudent move. Many will argue that it doesn't matter whether Iraq had a role in the attack on us, Iraq is a threat to the United States and therefore must be dealt with. Some on this committee have made this very argument. Mr. Speaker, most of us here have never been to Iraq, however those who have, like former UN chief Arms Inspector Scott Ritter—who lead some 30 inspection missions to Iraq—come to different conclusions on the country. Asked in November on Fox News Channel by John Kasich sitting in for Bill O'Reilly about how much of a threat Saddam Hussein poses to the United States, former Chief Inspector Ritter said, “In terms of military threat, absolutely nothing . . . Diplomatically, politically, Saddam's a little bit of a threat. In terms of real national security threat to the United States, no, none.” Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we even stop for a moment to consider what

some of these experts are saying before we move further down the road toward military confrontation?

The rationale for this legislation is suspect, not the least because it employs a revisionist view of recent Middle East history. This legislation brings up, as part of its indictment against Iraq, that Iraq attacked Iran some 20 years ago. What the legislation fails to mention is that at that time Iraq was an ally of the United States, and counted on technical and military support from the United States in its war on Iran. Similarly, the legislation mentions Iraq's invasion of Kuwait more than 10 years ago. But at that time U.S. foreign policy was sending Saddam Hussein mixed messages, as Iraq's dispute with Kuwait simmered. At the time, U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie was reported in the New York Times as giving very ambiguous signals to Saddam Hussein regarding Kuwait, allegedly telling Hussein that the United States had no interest in Arab-Arab disputes.

We must also consider the damage a military invasion of Iraq will do to our alliance in this fight against terrorism. An attack on Iraq could destroy that international coalition against terrorism. Most of our European allies—critical in maintaining this coalition—have explicitly stated their opposition to any attack on Iraq. German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer warned recently that Europe was “completely united” in opposition to any attack on Iraq. Russian President Valdimir Putin cautioned recently against American military action in Iraq. Mr. Putin urged the next step to be centered around cutting off the financial resources of terrorists worldwide. As for Iraq, the Russian president said. “. . . so far I have no confirmation, no evidence that Iraq is financing the terrorists that we are fighting against.” Relations with our European allies would suffer should we continue down this path toward military conflict with Iraq.

Likewise, U.S. relations with the Gulf states like Saudi Arabia could collapse should the United States initiate an attack on Iraq. Not only would our Saudi allies deny us the use of their territory to launch the attack, but a certain backlash from all gulf and Arab states could well produce even an oil embargo against the United States. Egypt, a key ally in our fight against terrorism, has also warned against any attack on Iraq. Egyptian Foreign Minister Ahmed Maher said recently of the coalition that, “If we want to keep consensus . . . we should not resort, after Afghanistan, to military means.”

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this push to seek out another country to bomb next. Media and various politicians and pundits seem to delight in predicting from week to week which country should be next on our bombing list. Is military action now the foreign policy of first resort for the United States? When it comes to other countries and warring disputes, the United States counsels dialogue without exception. We urge the Catholics and Protestants to talk to each other, we urge the Israelis and Palestinians to talk to each other. Even at the height of the Cold War, when the Soviet Union had missiles pointed at us from 90 miles away in Cuba, we solved the dispute through dialogue and diplomacy. Why is it, in this post Cold War era, that the United States seems to turn first to the military to solve its foreign policy problems? Is diplomacy dead?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this legislation, even in its watered-down form, moves us closer to conflict with Iraq. This is not in our interest at this time. It also, ironically enough, could serve to further Osama bin Laden's twisted plans for a clash of civilizations between Islam and the West. Invading Iraq, with the massive loss of life on both sides, would only forward bin Laden's hateful plan. I think we need to look at our priorities here. We are still seeking those most responsible for the attacks on the United States. Now hardly seems the time to go out in search of new battles.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), to the author of this very contentious resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, a couple of statements.

Saddam Hussein kicked out the U.N. inspection team in 1998 in breach of the cease-fire agreement. If you think we are moving too fast, vote no. Last time I checked, it is December 2001. So if we are going too fast to make you feel comfortable, vote no.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) says that Saddam Hussein is a minor threat to this country. If you believe that, vote no. But you ought to go visit the CIA, and you ought to talk to our intelligence communities. He is building missiles beyond the agreement, cease-fire agreement, for a purpose, to kill people.

I admire the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) so much because he suffered from the politics of appeasement. This is not 1964. This is the late 30's. This is Neville Chamberlain coming back. Peace in our time. What a joke. There will be no peace in our time as long as we have the politics of appeasement and let a guy like Saddam Hussein get away with building mobile biological weapons systems, larger missiles, procuring materials that could only be used in nuclear weapons. For us to sit back would be a national travesty, a world travesty. Never again shall we do this.

The hour is at hand. Immediate action must be taken by this Congress to support our President. We should have U.N. weapons inspectors on the ground now. And if he says no, that is a mounting threat to this country because he is procuring, as I speak, weapons of mass destruction.

No more head-in-the-sand politics. Act now or pay later, America. Let us act now to get rid of the tyrant who has abused and killed his own people, who is procuring weapons of mass destruction, substantial evidence to that fact. A failure to do so, we will pay dearly later.

Have we learned anything from September 11? I think we have, and I have every confidence in this body that they will reject the notion that we are moving too fast and that Saddam Hussein is a minor threat.

This resolution makes common sense. It makes legal sense. It is the morally right thing to do. America is a great country, and as the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) said, we have to act greatly when we are threatened.

This is not about any other nation. It is about us. We are the target of Saddam Hussein. Us and Israel and his Arab neighbors. Anybody who does not want to do business they way he does. We are a threat. Let us stand up to this dictator. No more of the politics of appeasement. Let us vote as a united body.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) have shown us we can work together for the common good. They are an example for all of us to follow. Please vote. Act now or we will pay later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 75, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3275, by the yeas and nays;

Senate amendment to H.R. 2657, de novo;

Senate amendment to H.R. 2199, de novo.

Further proceedings on the remaining postponed questions will resume later today.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

#### TERRORIST BOMBINGS CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3275, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3275, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 36, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—381

Abercrombie	Ehrlich	LaHood
Ackerman	Emerson	Lampson
Aderholt	Engel	Langevin
Akin	English	Lantos
Allen	Eshoo	Largent
Andrews	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Armey	Evans	Larson (CT)
Baca	Everett	Latham
Bachus	Farr	LaTourette
Baird	Ferguson	Leach
Baldacci	Filner	Levin
Baldwin	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Fletcher	Lewis (KY)
Barcia	Foley	Linder
Barr	Forbes	Lipinski
Barrett	Ford	LoBiondo
Barton	Fossella	Lofgren
Bass	Frelinghuysen	Lowey
Becerra	Frost	Lucas (KY)
Bentsen	Gallegly	Lucas (OK)
Berkley	Ganske	Lynch
Berman	Gibbons	Maloney (CT)
Berry	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Biggert	Gillmor	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Gilman	Markey
Bishop	Blagojevich	Mascara
Blumenauer	Goodale	Matheson
Blunt	Goodlatte	Matsui
Boehlert	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Boehner	Goss	McCullom
Bonilla	Graham	McCrery
Bono	Granger	McHugh
Boozman	Graves	McInnis
Borski	Green (TX)	McIntyre
Boswell	Green (WI)	McKeon
Boucher	Greenwood	McNulty
Boyd	Grucci	Meehan
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Menendez
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Mica
Brown (FL)	Hall (TX)	Millender-McDonald
Brown (SC)	Hansen	Miller, Dan
Bryant	Harman	Miller, Gary
Burr	Hart	Miller, George
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Jeff
Callahan	Hayes	Mink
Calvert	Hayworth	Mollohan
Camp	Hefley	Moore
Cannon	Herger	Moran (KS)
Cantor	Hill	Moran (VA)
Capito	Hilleary	Morella
Capps	Hinojosa	Murtha
Capuano	Hobson	Myrick
Cardin	Hoeffel	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Carson (OK)	Holden	Neal
Castle	Hooley	Nethercutt
Chabot	Horn	Ney
Chambliss	Hostettler	Northup
Clement	Houghton	Norwood
Clyburn	Hoyer	Nussle
Coble	Hulshof	Oberstar
Collins	Hunter	Obey
Combest	Hyde	Ortiz
Condit	Inslee	Osborne
Costello	Isakson	Ose
Cox	Israel	Pence
Coyne	Issa	Peterson (MN)
Cramer	Istook	Peterson (PA)
Crane	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Crenshaw	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pelosi
Crowley	Jefferson	Pitts
Culberson	Jenkins	Platts
Cummings	John	Pombo
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pomeroy
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Portman
Davis (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Putnam
Deal	Kanjorski	Quinn
DeFazio	Kaptur	Radanovich
DeLauro	Keller	Rahall
DeLay	Kelly	Ramstad
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Rangel
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Regula
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Rehberg
Dicks	Kildee	Reyes
Dingell	Doggett	Reynolds
Dodoley	King (WI)	Riley
Doolittle	King (NY)	
Doyle	Kingston	
Dreier	Kirk	
Duncan	Kleczka	
Dunn	Knollenberg	
Edwards	Kolbe	
	LaFalce	