

how you actually use the machinery of government and public funds to try and accomplish important goals, then Joe Early would be very, very high on your list of people to consult.

He was, in particular, interested in medical care. He was very proud of the first-rate complex at the University of Massachusetts Medical School that he represented, and the hospitals. He took on, to some extent, from Tip O'Neill, the great leader of the Massachusetts delegation, an interest in and an advocacy for the National Institutes of Health. Joe Early did as much as any man who served during that period to help America establish the position of leadership in health research, in providing the kind of resources that has done so much to improve the quality of human life.

So now that Joe is in retirement, I want to just take this opportunity to express my appreciation to my colleague from Worcester (Mr. McGovern), Joe Early's successor, for taking the initiative in naming that post office after Joe Early because it is as much as we can do to pay tribute to a man who understood as well as anyone what the job of being a Member of the United States House of Representatives entailed and who used to the fullest the powers of this job to make life better for the people of this country.

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.)

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

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

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

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

IN TRIBUTE TO ARMENIA'S 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Armenia Republic on the nation's 11th anniversary of independence. On Saturday, September 21, citizens of Armenia as well as people of Armenian descent here in the United States and around the world celebrate their independence from the former So-

viet Union. I traveled to Armenia along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who is also in the House Chamber this evening, during the August recess, my fifth trip there since independence, and I witnessed firsthand the spirit and determination of the Armenian people. Their spirit has to be strong, Mr. Speaker, because they have suffered a dual, coordinated blockade by Armenia's two hostile neighbors, Azerbaijan and Turkey, for the preponderance of the young country's life. Despite this overwhelming burden, Armenia is currently poised to become a full-fledged member of the World Trade Organization and has identified joining the European Union to be its next priority.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has a fundamental national interest in bringing about stability in the strategically located Caucasus region and in supporting those emerging nations like Armenia that share our values. I was very pleased to see that Armenia was one of the first countries to pledge military and logistical assistance after September 11 and continue to hope that all parties that contribute in the war on terrorism can use that coordination as a catalyst for direct cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, it was the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 that allowed the Armenian people to reestablish a state and a nation, to create a society where their language, culture, religion and other institutions would prosper. The people of Armenia have endeavored to build a free and proud nation based on the principles of democracy and a market economy. The tiny, landlocked Republic of Armenia is surrounded by hostile neighbors. Even in the face of this enmity, Armenia continues to implement economic and democratic reforms. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have publicly noted Armenia's economic progress in recent years. Despite this progress under special and difficult circumstances, I saw firsthand that the economic reality of daily life for the people of the Republic of Armenia continues to be extremely hard.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Republics of Turkey and Azerbaijan will respond positively to Armenia's repeated offers to normalize relations. Specifically, I hope that Turkey will allow for the exchange of diplomats and allow the free flow of goods and people across the borders. And I hope that, with the active participation of the United States, we will resolve the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict in a manner that guarantees the security and self-determination of the people of Karabagh.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Armenian people well on the occasion of their independence day and, more importantly, in their ongoing effort to establish good relations with their neighbors and their effort to build a vibrant democracy so that their children may prosper in the homeland of their ancestors.

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE COSTS OF WAR

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Members of Congress must thoughtfully reflect on their neighbors' concerns and not serve as a mere speed bump on a fast road to war. This Administration has failed to provide evidence to us here in the Congress, either secretly or publicly, that Saddam Hussein, a despicable dictator, represents an imminent threat to Americans, that he had a role in the tragedy of 9-11, or is in any way directly linked to the al Qaeda terrorist network, or that his danger to the world has significantly changed since 9-11. If such evidence exists, the President should come forward and ask for a declaration of war. Instead, the President has today submitted to the Congress the draft of a sweeping resolution that would, if approved and implemented fully by the Administration, commit thousands to death and extract billions from the pockets of American taxpayers.

It is interesting to contrast this resolution with that enacted in August of 1964 upon which the Vietnam War was fought, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. At minimum, this Congress would do well to narrow the President's request today to the overly expansive language of the Gulf of Tonkin, which did at least limit the Commander in Chief "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." The resolution also provided that we would react if a member state of a particular defense treaty of which we were a member was "requesting assistance in defense of its own freedom." President Bush is seeking much, much greater authority than the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

I believe that it is very important for Americans to realize that launching a war against Saddam Hussein, despot that he is, will entail costs far beyond the battlefield. In addition to questioning why young Americans will be almost alone to die in order to win this war, there will be extraordinary costs that will touch the lives of every family in America—costs that will certainly require reaching into the pocket of every taxpayer in this country.

□ 1615

This week on the front page of no less a publication than the Wall Street Journal, President Bush's top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated that the cost of waging this war in which this Nation is about to embark may rise as high as \$200 billion. That is "billion" with a "B". That is billions that take away the hopes and dreams of so many of us for the opportunities that this country could afford. That is \$200 billion with a "B" that could be available to ensure a life of dignity for many older Americans; and provide economic security, healthcare, prescription drugs, and strengthen Social Security for our baby boomers. That is billion with a "B" that will not be available to assure the educational hopes and opportunities of a generation of young Americans. It is billions with a "B" that will be spent on war in Iraq, instead of being spent to address our many other types of security needs here at home.

The \$200 billion estimate, as high as it is, may be misleadingly low. We do not know whether this includes the prolonged occupation of Iraq and all of the associated costs, which Vice President CHENEY has admitted are an essential part of this war; the rebuilding of Iraq, installing a new regime, wherever that might come from, as well as, of course, the much higher prices all of us can expect to pay as a result of increases in the price of oil.

According to the same Wall Street Journal article, other Administration economists say their main fear is that an Iraq war could lead to a sustained spike in [oil] prices.

This estimate also does not include the cost of the war widening if, for example one of our few allies decides to become involved, and as a result other oil suppliers no longer supply that oil and there is additional regional conflict.

"Whatever the bottom line," the Wall Street Journal reports, "the war's cost would be significant enough to make it harder", much harder, "for the Bush Administration to climb out of the budget deficit hole," which, I would add, grows deeper and deeper.

So I would urge our colleagues to review this resolution very closely, offer their ideas, informed by their constituencies, and seek to work with President Bush to bring us together in favor of effective international arms inspection, instead of leading us into a war that cannot be justified based on present evidence.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEED FOR WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. DOGGETT), to place on the record this evening information important to the American people.

One of the questions I have on this resolution that President Bush has sent up to the Congress, the joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq, is the first question of why now, 7 weeks before an election?

Just about a week ago, the President properly appeared before the United Nations, and he talked about the grave and gathering danger of what was occurring inside Iraq relative to Iraq's development of nuclear weapons and biological and chemical weapons. But the President did not say an imminent danger. In other words, 7 weeks before an election in this country, why does a grave and gathering danger require us to take precipitous action against another nation state? I would ask the President if action is not imminent, why now? Why now are we faced with this resolution, 7 weeks before congressional elections? It is very, very curious timing.

One of the other questions I would ask the President is who is the enemy? Now, we know who caused the carnage over New York and Pennsylvania and at the Pentagon, and we know al Qaeda is a Middle Eastern-based terrorist network, but their base is not Iraq. So I would say, what is the connection between al Qaeda, where our attention should be focused, and Iraq?

I have gone to every single briefing here in the Capitol this week trying to get the evidence from the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, former ambassadors from that region, weapons inspectors that have gone into Iraq in prior years. They have established no connection between al Qaeda and Iraq. So, who is the enemy? Who is the enemy, Mr. President, and why are you trying to pass this resolution at this point?

Our forces are engaged in many places on the globe, certainly keeping order in the Balkans. But now we have the Afghanistan situation facing us with terrible, terrible disruption inside that country, with terrorists coming back, the Taliban, the leftovers, creating difficulties in that region of the world. And I think it is very important to recognize that moving into Iraq will be a significant military undertaking.

Who is the enemy? Who is the enemy? We are not saying that Saddam Hussein and that despotic regime functions in a way that we consider acceptable on the face of the Earth. But what is the justification for now?

Let me mention also, is it just a coincidence that in Iraq, which holds the second largest supply of the world's oil reserves, is there any possibility that in the resolution the President has sent us where he talks about defending the national security interests of the United States and restoring international peace and security in the region, that it might have anything to do with the oil that sits underground in that particular country?

We know that about 2 years ago in October one of our destroyers, the U.S.S. Cole, was suicide-bombed in Yemen Harbor, and we know that we are extended in that part of the world to protect the oil lanes that are supplying this country every day.

I say to myself when I look at the President's plan for energy that he sent up here earlier this year, what a disappointment to me as an American, a 21st-century American, that he has us wed to oil as the future, a diminishing resource.

We should be moving to a carbohydrate future, not a hydrocarbon future in this country. We should be moving toward a hydrogen future, not a petroleum future. We should be moving to a photovoltaic future, to a fuel cell future, not a petroleum future. So both domestic policy and the flawed energy document released and our foreign policy are totally tied together in this wedding of oil and politics that has been the heritage of this country for the last 70 years.

It is time to change. America wants to move on. In fact, if we removed oil as a proxy for our foreign policy, what a different world this would be.

I think it is important to remind the American people that the current recession that we are in, causing significant damage across this country, including in districts like mine, was triggered by rising oil prices. Lots has happened since that occurred; but nonetheless, look at what you spend at the gas pump and watch international events and how they are tied to oil.

I would just say that it is time for America to change. I look forward to future debates on this resolution and the future direction for this country that is domestically independent and at peace in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN 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 California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ESTABLISHING THE TRUTH ABOUT IRAQ

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