

This has been done in the sincerest belief that a policy of peace, trade, and friendship with all nations is far superior in all respects to a policy of war, protectionism, and confrontation. But in the Congress I find, with regards to foreign affairs, no interest in following the precepts of the Constitution and the advice of our early Presidents.

Interventionism, internationalism, inflationism, protectionism, jingoism and bellicosity are much more popular in our Nation's capital than a policy of restraint.

I have heard all the arguments on why we must immediately invade and occupy Iraq and have observed that there are only a few hardy souls left in the Congress who are trying to stop this needless, senseless, and dangerous war. They have adequately refuted every one of the excuses for this war of aggression; but, obviously, either no one listens, or the unspoken motives for this invasion silence those tempted to dissent.

But the tragic and most irresponsible excuse for the war rhetoric is now emerging in the political discourse. We now hear rumblings that the vote is all about politics, the November elections, and the control of the U.S. Congress, that is, the main concern is political power.

Can one imagine delaying the declaration of war against Japan after Pearl Harbor for political reasons? Or can one imagine forcing a vote on the issue of war before an election for political gain? Can anyone believe there are those who would foment war rhetoric for political gain at the expense of those who are called to fight and might even die if the war does not go as planned?

I do not want to believe it is possible, but rumors are rampant that looking weak on the war issue is considered to be unpatriotic and a risky political position to take before the November elections. Taking pleasure in the fact that this might place many politicians in a difficult position is a sobering thought indeed.

There is a bit of irony over all of this political posturing on a vote to condone a war of aggression and force some Members into a tough vote. Guess what, contrary to conventional wisdom, war is never politically beneficial to the politicians who promote it.

Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt were reelected by promising to stay out of war. Remember, the party in power during the Korean War was routed in 1952 by a general who promised to stop the bloodshed. Vietnam, which started with overwhelming support and hype and jingoistic fervor, ended President Johnson's political career in disgrace and humiliation. The most significant plight on the short term of President Kennedy was his effort at regime change in Cuba and the fate he met at the Bay of Pigs. Even Persian Gulf War 1, thought at the time to be a tremendous victory, with its aftermath still lingering, did not serve

President Bush, Sr.'s reelection efforts in 1992.

War is not politically beneficial for two reasons: innocent people die, and the economy is always damaged. These two things, after the dust settles from the hype and the propaganda, always make the people unhappy. The euphoria associated with the dreams of grandiose and painless victories is replaced by the stark reality of death, destruction, and economic pain. Instead of euphoria, we end up with heartache as we did after the Bay of Pigs, Korea, Vietnam, Somalia, and Lebanon.

Since no one wants to hear anymore of morality and constitutionality and justice, possibly some will listen to the politics of war, since that is what drives so many. A token victory at the polls this fall by using a vote on the war as a lever will be to little avail. It may not even work in the short run. Surely, history shows that war is never a winner, especially when the people who have to pay, fight, and die for it come to realize that the war was not even necessary and had nothing to do with national security or fighting for freedom, but was promoted by special interests who stood to gain from taking over a sovereign country.

Mr. Speaker, peace is always superior to war; it is a political winner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GROWING CONCERN OF CHILD MODELING ON THE INTERNET

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is of prime importance, I hope, to many American families and their children; and it is as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Missing and Exploited Children that I rise today, because I have introduced legislation that deals with a growing concern of child modeling on the Internet.

What occurs is that young girls, 10, 12, 13 years old, are encouraged by their parents and aided and abetted by individuals to display themselves on the Internet for viewership, if you will, people who pay a fee, a monthly fee in order to view the site. I am not going to mention the names of the sites, because I do not want to encourage anybody to go, but to understand the gravity of the situation we are facing. The girls initially pose in not very suggestive ways. They may be appearing next to a horse; they may be outside in their bathing suit; they may be holding a tennis racket. As time goes on, they

are encouraged to pose more provocatively for their viewers. They are asked to expose themselves, they are asked to wear things like belly dancing outfits, they are asked to emulate an activity that is highly inappropriate for somebody their age. Many of these parents are deceived into thinking that the person witnessing their child on the Internet is another young person, a young girl or boy who is taking part in this little modeling expedition and encouraging their children or their friend to continue their activities as a child model.

What we found out through investigation at the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is that often, the people that are paying \$19 a month to view these sites are pedophiles. They are often people who are depraved and who are looking at 11- and 12-year-old girls, and they are e-mailing each other back and forth saying, why do you not do this or pose like this. It is such a serious problem that I have designed legislation that I hope will answer some of the concerns.

Today on John Walsh's show we talked for an hour about this very topic, and Mr. WALSH had on two mothers, two daughters, and two of the promoters of these Web sites in order for us all to hear from them why they thought this was an appropriate and legitimate act for their child to pursue. Oftentimes they said it was to raise money for the child's college, even though one of the girls on the show quit school and was now being home schooled because she said she had asthma and could not conduct the hard work of school because of her condition. Nonetheless, she would find time in her day to be a child model. What we heard was startling, that they would allow their child to come into contact of people of such ill repute.

Now, again, I urge people to listen to what I am saying. I am not suggesting that young girls cannot be models, and I am not suggesting that there is not an appropriate place in commerce for young people to display their talents; but what we are finding on these particular Web sites, and it was first brought to my attention by a local NBC affiliate in Florida, in Miami, WFTB, they had done an investigation on somebody who actually happened to live in my district and they went on to find these cases where the girl was posing. All I want to suggest to people is first, to my colleagues, look at the legislation.

There has been much written about this legislation in the mainstream media. There has been much discussed, in fact, on national radio shows about this very topical issue and the legislation I have sponsored. We hope we can generate the debate in order to have parents hear our voices on what I hope is a clarion call for them to be very, very careful of what they subject their young children to.

If we look at almost every case of abduction, every case of rape, every instance where a child has gone missing,

typically, when they find the suspected person who has committed a crime, when the agents, the police officers raid the house, they often find reams of pornography, reams of material that uses young children in a provocative, nasty, and disturbing way. So there is a cause and effect between the harm caused to these children and their activities or the utilization of this type of material.

Now, not every girl is going to be molested or harmed, and I understand that. But what they have to be aware of is that too much is occurring on the Internet today that should cause parents considerable concern. First and foremost, I urge every parent to make certain that the computer they use is in the family room where they can observe their young children using the computer.

□ 1645

The person that may be chatting with their child may not be the person who purports to be on the other end. They may say they are a fellow student from school. It may turn out to be the neighbor next door who has ill intent on their child. We should warn our children not to be engaged in conversations with adults on the Internet, and certainly warn them never to meet a parent or adult out in a public setting after a chat on the Internet.

I hope my colleagues will look at this legislation very carefully and consider cosponsoring it, because I do think there is an appropriate time now to address some of the growing concerns on this issue. I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

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

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO LAUNCH ILLEGITIMATE FIRST STRIKE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in opposition to the President's efforts to launch an illegitimate first strike against Iraq. The President's war fervor threatens the lives of thousands of American soldiers and Iraqi civilians, ignores international law, undermines our fight against terrorism, and may make average Americans less safe. Yet, the President presses for an invasion.

It is true that Saddam Hussein is a dictator. He is a bad man, and the world would be better off without him. But the world will also be better off if the United States works within the scope of international institutions instead of launching an unprovoked first strike against Iraq.

America's greatest asset is our moral authority, not our military power. Attacking a sovereign country unprovoked forfeits that authority completely.

It is true that Saddam has repeatedly violated United Nations resolutions, but it is also true that only the United Nations has the authority to enforce those resolutions. Furthermore, none of those resolutions call for regime change in Iraq, an often-stated goal of the President's.

On top of all of that, a first strike invasion of Iraq could actually undermine America's vital interests in the Mideast and around the world. It is unfortunate but true that Iraq's neighbors mistrust the United States even more than they mistrust Saddam Hussein.

Invading Iraq could have drastic repercussions by energizing extremists looking to overthrow governments across the Mideast. Such an outcome is even more likely if Saddam Hussein responds to an invasion by retaliating against Israel. If he succeeds in killing Israelis and polarizing the Mideast, what then?

The President claims Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are more than can be justified for aggression. In America,

we must hold ourselves to a higher standard. Those weapons programs are frightening, but policy must be based on fact, not fear.

It is believed that Saddam's nuclear weapons program was 95 percent destroyed by 1998, when the U.N. inspection teams pulled out. There is no reason to think that a new round of weapons inspectors will not be just as effective. Meanwhile, President Bush has sent a message of his own by backing out of the ABM treaty, refusing to sign the Kyoto treaty, refusing to be a party to the mine ban treaty, withdrawing the U.S.' signature to the International Criminal Court treaty, and embracing the use of mini nukes.

Is it any wonder that other nations hesitate to support a first strike invasion when we in the United States ignore the same international standards that we accuse Saddam Hussein of disregarding? We must take a long, hard look at our own policies to ensure that we do not violate the same rules we expect others to follow.

As a Nation, it is our responsibility to live up to our own democratic ideals. We owe it to our children to exercise the full range of diplomatic options in Iraq so we can prevent a war that will cost thousands of lives while at the same time giving a boost to our real enemies: The terrorists who planned September 11.

War represents a failure of civilization. It is a last resort. America's strength is our commitment to moral action, and a government based on the rule of law. That law must never be silent, and our sensibilities must never be intimidated.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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