

THERE IS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN AL QAEDA
AND IRAQ

Congress must ask the Bush Administration to distinguish between Al Qaeda and Iraq. The carnage that took place on September 11, 2001, was committed by members of the Al Qaeda terrorist network. Al Qaeda's primary objective is to rid the Middle East of all foreign influence and impose strict Islamic religious rule based on its particular interpretation of the religion. Iraq, rather, is a secular state headed by a military dictator, Saddam Hussein, holding the second largest oil reserves in the Middle East. Saddam's chief objective is to control the entire region's oil reserves and eventually gain greater power in the Arab world.

America's war on terrorism began as a clear campaign against Al Qaeda, not Iraq. Neither Congress nor the American public has been presented with any evidence of a connection between Iraq and Al Qaeda. Though some terrorists may be "present" especially in the northern zone of Iraq, which Hussein does not control, there is no linkage of evidence between them and the government of Iraq. The President asserted in his draft resolution that members of Al Qaeda are "known to be in Iraq" and that Iraq may give weapons to terrorists. His statements are filled with innuendoes, not facts. No intelligence information has been presented to Congress to add certainty to the President's statements.

OIL IS THE PRIMARY UNDERPINNING OF U.S.
"VITAL" INTEREST

Congress must ask: For how long will Americans be asked to die for "vital interests" centered in the oil kingdoms? The economic underpinning of Iraq is oil—the second largest reserves in the world. 95% of Iraq's economy is oil driven. Americans might ask the question: "Why has the U.S. become bogged down in this region so many times in modern history?" and "Why have all of America's major recessions in the past 30 years been triggered by rising oil prices?" In fact, rising oil prices triggered our current recession, and prices are rising again.

During the 1970's, two Arab oil embargoes drove the U.S. economy into deep recession. President Jimmy Carter tried to move America toward energy independence, calling the challenge the "moral equivalent of war." But as world oil prices dropped through O.P.E.C. price manipulation, America lost its edge on energy independence. Though conservation and alternative energy development progressed, their pace was not sufficient to meet demand.

In the early 1990's, America went to war over Iraq's invasion of neighboring Kuwait's oil fields and port access. In October 2000, the USS *Cole*, a Navy destroyer protecting the oil shipping lanes in the Persian Gulf, was suicide bombed in Yemen's harbor. Even now, as the President contemplates invasion, 8% of America's oil originates in Iraq.

Oil is not worth one more American soldier's life, nor any more disruption to our national economy. America needs a national commitment to become energy independent again in this decade, much like the space program of the 1960s that led America into the heavens. Ms. Robin Wright, Foreign Diplomatic Correspondent for the Los Angeles Times has stated, "To build a more peaceful world, the U.S. must deal with the oil issue. It must also deal with the political destiny of people in that part of the world who want to have some say in their futures."

NAKED AGGRESSION IS NOT THE AMERICAN WAY

Yes, Iraq is in gross violation of U.N. resolutions calling for inspections, but America should not pressure Iraq unilaterally, without maintaining that same broad-based

international support. It was proper for President Bush to deliver an address at the United Nations. Our nation has always sought to be a constructive partner among the community of nations. We need to maintain this policy of engagement with the nations of the world.

Naked aggression by a superpower with no evidence presented to its lawmakers is discomforting to the American people and not the way to forge alliances in a troubled part of the world. America, surely, does not wish to be perceived as the "bully on the block" in the most oil rich region of the world where not one democratic state exists.

A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

As a first step, we should support International Strategic Partnership to Eliminate a Common Threat (INSPECT), an alternate resolution encouraging the President to support the recently negotiated inspection plan between the Iraqi Government and international representatives calling for a robust team capable of ensuring that Iraq is no longer in violation of international agreements. The resolution rejects any unilateral military action by the U.S. until Congress is able to grant its approval. In addition, the President must submit a report to Congress, at least every 30 days, on matters relevant to this resolution. According to David Albright, President of the Institute for Science and International Security, "Nuclear threat is not imminent. Because the threat is not imminent, inspectors could be beneficial."

WITH REGARDS TO WAR: IS
CONGRESS RELEVANT?

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the last time Congress declared war was on December 11, 1941, against Germany in response to its formal declaration of war against the United States. This was accomplished with wording that took less than one-third of a page, without any nitpicking arguments over precise language, yet it was a clear declaration of who the enemy was and what had to be done. And in 3½ years, this was accomplished. A similar resolve came from the declaration of war against Japan 3 days earlier. Likewise, a clear-cut victory was achieved against Japan.

Many Americans have been forced into war since that time on numerous occasions, with no congressional declaration of war and with essentially no victories. Today's world political condition is as chaotic as ever. We're still in Korea and we're still fighting the Persian Gulf war that started in 1990.

The process for our entering war the past 57 years and the inconclusive results of each war since that time are obviously related to Congress' abdication of its responsibility regarding war, given to it by article I section 8 of the Constitution.

Congress has either ignored its responsibility entirely over these years, or transferred the war power to the executive branch by a near majority vote of its Members, without consideration of it by the States as an amendment required by the Constitution.

Congress is about to circumvent the Constitution and avoid the tough decision of whether war should be declared by transferring this monumental decisionmaking power regarding war to the President. Once again, the process is being abused. Odds are, since

a clear-cut decision and commitment by the people through their Representatives are not being made, the results will be as murky as before. We will be required to follow the confusing dictates of the U.N., since that is where the ultimate authority to invade Iraq is coming from—rather than from the American people and the U.S. Constitution.

Controversial language is being highly debated in an effort to satisfy political constituencies and for Congress to avoid responsibility of whether to go to war. So far the proposed resolution never mentions war, only empowering the President to use force at his will to bring about peace. Rather strange language indeed!

A declaration of war limits the presidential powers, narrows the focus and implies a precise end point to the conflict. A declaration of war makes Congress assume the responsibilities directed by the Constitution for this very important decision, rather than assume that if the major decision is left to the President and a poor results occurs, it will be his fault, not that of Congress. Hiding behind the transfer of the war power to the executive through the War Powers Resolution of 1973 will hardly suffice.

However, the modern way we go to war is even more complex and deceptive. We must also write language that satisfies the U.N. and all our allies. Congress gladly transfers the legislative prerogatives to declare war to the President, and the legislative and the executive branch both acquiesce in transferring our sovereign rights to the U.N., an unelected international government. No wonder the language of the resolution grows in length and incorporates justification for starting this war by citing U.N. resolutions.

In order to get more of what we want from the United Nations, we rejoined UNESCO, which Ronald Reagan had bravely gotten us out of, and promised millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer support to run this international agency started by Sir Julian Huxley. In addition, we read of promises by our administration that one we control Iraqi oil, it will be available for allies like France and Russia, who have been reluctant to join our efforts.

What a difference from the days when a declaration of war was clean and precise and accomplished by a responsible Congress and an informed people.

A great irony of all this is that the United Nations Charter doesn't permit declaring war, especially against a nation that has been in a state of peace for 12 years. The U.N. can only declare peace. Remember, it wasn't a war in Korea; it was only a police action to bring about peace. But at least in Korea and Vietnam, there was fighting going on, so it was a bit easier to stretch the language than it is today regarding Iraq. Since Iraq doesn't even have an Air Force or a Navy, is incapable of waging a war, and remains defenseless against the overwhelming powers of the United States and the British, it's difficult to claim that we're going into Iraq to restore peace.

History will eventually show that if we launch this attack—just as our sanctions already have—the real victims will be the innocent Iraqi civilians who despise Saddam Hussein and are terrified of the coming bombs that will destroy their cities.

The greatest beneficiaries of the attack may well be Osama bin Ladin and the al Qaeda.

Some in the media have already suggested that the al Qaeda may be encouraging the whole event. Some unintended consequences do occur, what will come from this attack is still entirely unknown.

It's a well-known fact that the al Qaeda are not allies of Saddam Hussein and despise the secularization and partial westernization of Iraqi culture. They would welcome the chaos that's about to come. This will give them a chance to influence post-Saddam-Hussein Iraq. The attack, many believe, will confirm to the Arab world that indeed the Christian West has once again attacked the Muslim East, providing radical fundamentalists a tremendous boost for recruitment.

An up or down vote on declaring war against Iraq would not pass the Congress, and the President has no intention of asking for it. This is unfortunate, because if the process were carried out in a constitutional fashion, the American people and the U.S. Congress would vote No on assuming responsibility for this war.

Transferring authority to wage war, calling it permission to use force to fight for peace in order to satisfy the U.N. Charter, which replaces article I, section 8 war power provision, is about as close to 1984 "newspeak" that we will ever get in the real world.

Not only is it sad that we have gone so far astray from our Constitution, but it's also dangerous for world peace and threatens our liberties here at home.

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

(Mr. GREEN of Texas 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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.)

PUT AN END TO CORPORATE ABUSE AND HELP EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a bevy of cases in which corporate executives plunder their own business, work with insiders, and do dastardly things in their business world. We have seen them use every kind of device known to mankind to avoid their responsibilities to their debtors, to their

employees, to the retirees, to their fellow insiders even. And so we have done great things in trying to curb that kind of practice.

Yesterday, I introduced H.R. 5525, which takes another step down the road of protecting the employees and the retirees of a given company that might have corporate executives going down the wrong paths. My bill would simply state that if such a corporate executive should go bankrupt or a business like that go bankrupt, that retirees under that corporate structure will be protected with respect to their retirement so that the bankruptcy would not absolve the retirees benefits that would accrue to them if the corporation kept alive.

And so protecting retirees is one of the aspects of our bankruptcy reform bill for corporate executives. The other one would be to make sure that employees currently on the payroll are not robbed of their potential pay checks by a bankruptcy that absolves or tries to absolve the corporate executives from meeting their salary and wage obligations to the employees. We allow the bankruptcy courts to take that into consideration when such a bankruptcy occurs so that the employees can be protected.

This is a national extension of the work that we have been doing over 5 years now to reform the bankruptcy laws of our country. Do you recognize the fact that the current law which we are trying to change and which we are within a quarter of an inch of trying to change that the current law under bankruptcy allows one of these corporate executives to take millions of dollars, escape to a State that has a homestead exemption and then purchase a big mansion in one of these places where the full value of that mansion would not be subject to creditors or to employees or anybody else?

We have changed that in our bankruptcy reform bill. And so everyone should recognize that one of the good things that comes out of bankruptcy reform is further safeguarding against corrupt corporate executives and streamlines a system that for so many years really required streamlining.

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 gen-

tleman 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 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 Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND 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. FARR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FARR of California 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 Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CHANGE IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER (during the Special Order of Mr. KUCINICH). Pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair announces that in the appointment of the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the bill H.R. 4, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) is appointed, in addition to the appointment from the Committee on Resources, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

VOTE "NO" ON IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker and the leadership for providing me with this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a few moments ago that 25 Members of Congress, in temperatures that outside