

Subtitle B—Coverage of Commission Under Certain Laws and Programs

Sec. 811. Treatment of Commission personnel under certain civil service laws

Amends 5 U.S.C. 7323(b)(2)(B)(i)(I) and 3132(a)(1)(C) to specify that Commission personnel are covered by the Hatch Act and that the Commission is excluded from the Senior Executive Service.

Sec. 812. Coverage under Inspector General Act of 1978

Amends section 8G(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to provide for coverage under that Act.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. State defined

Defines State to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the United States Virgin Islands.

Sec. 902. Audits and repayment of funds

Requires recipients of grants or payments under the Act to keep records consistent with sound accounting principles to facilitate an effective audit. Authorizes each office that makes a grant or payment to audit or examine books, documents, papers and records of any recipient which are deemed pertinent to the grant or payment. Stipulates that the provision applies to all recipients of grants or payments under the Act. Requires that all funds provided under the Act are subject to mandatory audit by the Comptroller General at least once during the lifetime of the program, with the same access to records as the grant-making office. Stipulates that the Election Administration Commission is deemed the office making the grant with respect to General Services grants or payments. Requires that, if the Comptroller General determines that an excess payment has been made or the recipient is not in compliance, the recipient must pay the grant-making office an amount that reflects the excess payment or the proportion representing noncompliance.

Sec. 903. Clarification of ability of election officials to remove registrants from official list of voters on grounds of change of residence

Amends the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify the ability of election officials to remove from the voter registration list the name of an individual who has not responded to a notice from the registrar of voters and who has not voted in two or more consecutive general elections for Federal office.

The minimum standard requires that removal of those deemed ineligible must be done in a manner consistent with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA). The procedures established by NVRA that guard against removal of eligible registrants remain in effect under this Act. Accordingly, H.R. 3295 leaves NVRA intact, and does not undermine it in any way.

Sec. 904. Review and report on adequacy of existing electoral fraud statutes and penalties

Requires the Attorney General to conduct a review of existing criminal statutes to determine whether additional statutory offenses are needed to secure the use of the Internet in elections and whether existing penalties are adequate with respect to such offenses. Requires the Attorney General to submit a report on that review to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, and the House Administration Committee.

Sec. 905. Other criminal penalties

Stipulates that individuals who provide false information with respect to registering to vote or voting, or conspire to provide such false information, will be fined, imprisoned, or both in accordance with 42 U.S.C.1973i(c).

Sec. 906. No effect on other laws

Stipulates that nothing in the Act, except as specifically provided in section 303(b), authorizes or requires conduct prohibited by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, or the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or may be construed to supersede, restrict, or limit those Acts.

From the Committee on House Administration, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

ROBERT NEY,
VERNON J. EHLERS,
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE,
THOMAS M. REYNOLDS,
STENY H. HOYER,
CHAKA FATTAH,
JIM DAVIS,

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of secs. 601 and 606 of the House bill, and sec. 404 of the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

BOB STUMP,
JOHN M. MCHUGH,
IKE SKELTON,

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 216, 221, title IV, secs. 502 and 503 of the House bill, and secs. 101, 102, 104, subtitles A, B, and C of title II, secs. 311, 501, and 502 of the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of secs. 221-5, 241-3, 251-3, and 261 of the House bill, and sec. 101 of the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
CONSTANCE MORELLA,
JIM BARCIA

(Provided that Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas is appointed in lieu of Mr. Barcia for consideration of secs. 251-3 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference),

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of secs. 103 and 503 of the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

WILLIAM THOMAS,
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr.,
CHARLES B. RANGEL,

For consideration of the House bill and Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference:

ROY BLUNT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 114, AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Committee on Education and the

Workforce, but in his other life he was a nuclear physicist and a person who certainly knows the danger of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, this past Sunday during a pancake breakfast at a firehouse in my hometown, one of my constituents approached me. "Why have we gotten into this headlong rush into war," he asked? "Why haven't we first exhausted all the other possibilities for dealing with Saddam?"

His questions reflected both my feelings and those of so many other Americans: Where is the pressing need to send our Nation, our servicemen and women, into a potentially bloody, costly war that could threaten rather than strengthen our national security?

I will vote "no" on this resolution.

It is true that Saddam Hussein has for years presented a threat to his own people, to the Asian region, to the world. His relentless pursuit of weapons of mass destruction is unconscionable. We have a legal and a moral obligation to hold him accountable for his flagrant violation of international law and his maniacal disregard for human decency.

I applaud the President for refocusing international attention on the Iraqi threat. This is something that I followed with concern since I worked in the State Department 15 years ago on nuclear nonproliferation. However, I believe it is at the least premature and more likely contrary to our national interests, the national interests of the United States, for Congress to authorize military action against Iraq now.

As I reviewed the arguments for and against this resolution, I found myself returning repeatedly to some basic questions. Would a unilateral American military attack against Iraq reduce the threat that Saddam Hussein poses? In other words, would a Saddam facing certain destruction be less likely or more likely to unleash his weapons of mass destruction on his neighbors, his own people, or on Americans? Will a unilateral military attack against Iraq strengthen our greater and more pressing effort to combat al Qaeda and global terrorism? Will it bolster our ability to promote our many other national security interests around the world? In other words, will it make Americans more secure? I believe the answer to all of these questions is a resounding no.

Why should we undertake actions that make more likely the very thing we want to prevent?

Madam Speaker, I also believe that the reaction to such a unilateral act would irrevocably weaken the international coalition we have built to fight terrorism across the globe. Yes, Iraq is one of the major threats facing international order, but it is by no means the only dangerous one. We cannot allow our contempt for the Hussein regime to detract us from achieving our long-term security goals.

Now, while I have no doubt that our military would successfully depose Saddam Hussein, we risk inflaming rather than diminishing the terrorist threat to the United States. We are adding a likely threat to our security.

The administration has tried and failed to prove that Saddam's regime is an immediate threat to American security, and it has simply failed to explain to the American people what would be the costs and what would be our responsibilities in a post-Saddam Iraq.

This resolution would give the President a blank check, in the words of my constituents, and would allow him to use Iraq to launch a new military and diplomatic doctrine, a dangerous, unwise doctrine.

I believe that by taking unilateral, preemptive military action against Iraq, we would set a dangerous precedent that would threaten the international order. I believe that we can and should take the lead in eliminating the threat posed by Saddam Hussein not by taking unilateral military action. I believe that if we consult actively with our allies in the region, in NATO, in the U.N. Security Council, we will be able to undertake effective inspections and end Saddam's threat. I do not believe that we need the permission of our allies to take action, but I do believe that we need their partnership to be successful in the long run.

Madam Speaker, we can and we will disarm Iraq and end Saddam's threat. The United Nations and the international community may recognize the need to take military action. The American people will understand and be prepared for that possibility. Now, they are not. Now, they are saying that, for the United States, war should and must always be our last recourse.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), an active member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, not as some would mistakenly say in strong support of war but, rather, as history will proclaim, in strong support of an America free from the fear of terrorism.

Today, this House finds itself debating at one of the most significant crossroads in our fight against terrorism, as we ask why we must now focus our attention on the most powerful terrorist in the world, Saddam Hussein.

I ask this question of those who would have us close our eyes and sit on our hands: Can we afford to wait any longer?

Since September 11, 2001, the United States has worked to ensure that future attacks on our soil do not occur. We did not choose that fight. We did not choose to have thousands of innocent victims perish in brutal attacks. But we now have to win this fight against all of those who would seek to use force against the American people.

It is no longer enough to punish evil after it has destroyed innocent lives. We must fight to ensure that evil does not succeed and protect the innocent as well as punish the guilty. Such a threat lies in Saddam Hussein if he is not disarmed and ousted as leader of his regime in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia is home to many servicemen and women. They are not statistics, they are not numbers, they are my friends, my neighbors, and members of my church. But, Madam Speaker, they are ready to remove the Iraqi leader who seeks to destroy the freedoms that we as Americans hold dear.

The President addressed last night, and I think it is important to reiterate today, that we have a duty to act now to prevent a first strike attack by Iraq. Procrastination will only increase the threat that terrorist agents will once again cross over into our borders. But why now? Because over the past 11 years, the international community agreed on 16 United Nations Security Council resolutions designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security. Because the world witnessed what an unchecked Saddam Hussein was capable of doing, and the world has waited while Saddam Hussein has violated each and every resolution that the United Nations has put forward.

To those who today cry, wait, wait, wait, I ask, if we have waited over 11 years for Saddam to fully disarm his chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction under the supervision of inspectors, how much longer should we wait? If we have waited 11 years for Saddam to disarm all ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers, how much longer should we wait?

□ 2115

If we have waited 11 years for Saddam to agree to not use, develop, construct, or acquire any weapons of mass destruction, how much longer should we wait?

If we have waited 8 years for Saddam to agree not to enhance military capability in southern Iraq, how much longer should we wait?

If we have waited 6 years for Saddam to report shipments of dual-purpose items related to weapons of mass destruction to the U.N. and IAEA, how much longer should we wait?

And if we have waited 5 years for Saddam to give immediate, unfettered access to the Iraqi officials whom U.N. inspectors want to interview, how much longer should we wait?

And if we have waited 4 years for Saddam to reinstate U.N. weapons inspectors to have full and unrestricted access to weapons production facilities, how much longer should we wait?

Madam Speaker, we have waited long enough. We cannot wait until Saddam completes reconstruction of his weapons factories. We cannot wait until we

are allowed to read the certificate of occupancy posted on the walls of these facilities, announcing more fear and terror to the free world. We cannot wait until he has nuclear capabilities. We cannot wait for history to repeat itself while trying to appease yet another unchecked dictator.

Now is the time to act. Now is the time to fulfill our obligation to protect the American people. Now is the time to pass this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a person who has personally gone in harm's way in the war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, so he knows the devastation of war.

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, as one of the 435 Members of this House, I have found this issue facing us for the last several weeks and months just one of those visceral, gut issues that just tears us up.

I have my space shuttle tie on this morning. I got up this morning and wore it because the space shuttle is way there, and right now every 90 minutes they are looking at this magnificent globe and they are seeing this beautiful Earth. We are down here debating about the ugliness; they are up there seeing the beauty. It tears me up, and I know it tears up all Americans as we are debating this.

I have to take some reaction with the previous speaker. Just because I disagree with the resolution on the floor does not mean I have my eyes closed, and it does not mean I am sitting on my hands. It may mean that I have a different and better approach, and we would do better to listen to each other than to accuse folks of being blinded and somehow not seeing the world as it is.

The very process that we have set up here, in which we divide time between yes and no and yes and no, I think there are a lot of people in this House that have a lot of questions, and a lot of questions are being asked by people who are already staking out a position. Even those of us who have decided have a lot of questions about what is happening.

We all want to be loyal to our President. That is not an issue. I know that my Republican friends have had their leadership come and say, we have to be loyal to our President. He is all our President. We all want him to do well. The issue is, how can we best help our President, George W. Bush, do well?

I will tell the Members one thing, overstatements do not help. Comparing, on one side, Saddam Hussein or Iraq to Nazi Germany, or on the other side comparing Saddam Hussein to Vietnam, they do not help. This is a peculiar situation facing the world now, and we had better deal with it, recognizing it is a peculiar situation never before faced in the world.

We all have proof Saddam is a bad guy; that is not the issue. The issue is,

how do we approach this particular bad guy at this moment in history? We had better approach this with some humility. This Congress has done a lousy job of predicting budget surpluses and deficits in our own Congress for 1 year, and yet we are now making predictions on both sides about what the world will look like if we do or do not take certain actions. We had better approach this with a great deal of humility about our ability to predict future events.

One thing that I have done, as a lot of Members have in the last few months, is try to spend time with as many military officers as I can. A lot of them are retired. There are a lot of doubts being expressed by people who have retired from the military.

The Philadelphia Enquirer has a story today: "Officials' Private Doubts on Iraq War. Some military intelligence and diplomatic sources say hawks are overstating the danger that Baghdad poses," talking about doubts being expressed by those in the military.

We still have a couple of days left. I would encourage the Members who are still asking those questions to take the time to sit down with retired military or even their close friends within the military and just say, in complete and honest candor, what do you think? Maybe that will help resolve some of those questions.

The United Nations, those of us who think that the United Nations would be helpful in this process are not turning over the national security to the United Nations, but it is a different fact situation for this Congress and for the American people if we go alone or if we go with the United Nations.

That is not an unreasonable question to ask: Is it different if the United States goes alone? Is it different if the United States does it with the United Nations? I am one of those who thinks that we would be much stronger in the future if we go with the United Nations. It does not mean I am turning over the national security to the United Nations.

Is there anything wrong with the Congress deciding this very specific fact situation several weeks or months from now if the President decides we are going to have to go alone in this business without the United Nations? That is a different fact situation than if the United Nations is behind us. It does not mean we are turning over the national security to the U.N.

Resentment. I do not know how we can predict these future events, but the resentment of the Arab world, I just talked with General Zinni a few days ago, is as great as he has ever seen. If we mishandle the situation, it will be even greater. I would encourage Members to be analyzing this situation: What do our words and actions do for the next few years with our relationships with Arab countries?

I think our number one strategic goal and interest in the Middle East is

to solve the security issues for the Israelis and Palestinians, even if it means 40,000 or 50,000 U.S. troops stationed there for years. What best helps that situation to be resolved? I think a lot of Members are saying that taking out Saddam Hussein may help, but we can sure come up with scenarios that it may not help guarantee the security of Israel and a peaceful Palestinian state.

The commitment to rebuild, I was talking to one of my colleagues in Arkansas, talking about our commitment to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan. He said we have never fulfilled our commitment to rebuild the Delta after the Civil War. Why do we think we may actually follow through with our commitment to rebuild Iraq and rebuild democracy in Iraq? It is a very important issue.

Probably the overriding issue for me is war should only be used as a last resort. So the overriding question for me, in addition to what best helps reduce the risks of something happening to Americans, is have we reached the point where this is the last resort? I do not think we have reached that point.

The President said last night that we may not have to go to war. Those of us who very much are loyal to our President are saying, Mr. President, you would get a bigger vote for your resolution if you would say, first let me try it at the United Nations. If I am not successful, then I will come back to you, because then I would know that war unilaterally for America is the last resort. But we are not at that point today.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has offered an amendment with several of us that I think resolves a lot of these issues. It will get a bigger vote, if it was the base resolution, it would have a larger vote if the President would support it than the underlying resolution. It would send a strong signal to the international community.

It would say to the President, if you get the U.N. behind you in a way that you find satisfactory, you are authorized to use force; however, if you are not successful, please come back and let the Congress analyze the fact situation representing the American people at that time, and let us together decide what is best with the authorization of force in this very difficult world that we face today.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues who care so much about these issues.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I do feel compelled to respond to one point that my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, made. We need to make clear that the leadership and the President have not come to any Members of the body and asked them to support him as a matter of loyalty or for anything else.

There are 435 Members of this body who will each come to their own decision on the justness and the rightness

of this cause, and each of us will vote as a matter of conscience as individuals; and the President and leadership have not twisted our arms, or even asked us to do anything otherwise.

Madam Speaker, the President has asked the Congress for the authority to use force against Iraq. This week the Congress will consider a resolution giving him that authority. I will be voting in favor of the Joint Resolution.

There is a very high standard and a narrow set of circumstances that would cause me to vote to authorize the use of force other than in self-defense against an armed attack against the United States or its allies.

Over the last month, I have listened to briefings and testimony, reviewed evidence, read reports and sought out independent experts to ask questions about Iraq and its nuclear, chemical and biological weapons program. I believe that, if left unchecked, it is likely that Saddam Hussein will cause these weapons to be used against the American people. The effect of such an attack would be devastating. We cannot wait for him to strike first.

The evidence that Iraq has and is further developing weapons of mass destruction is convincing. Iraq has chemical and biological weapons including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas and anthrax. We believe he may have other deadly diseases he is making into weapons. Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons program before the Gulf War and is seeking to develop nuclear weapons again.

Saddam Hussein's intent is more difficult to discern. I believe the evidence of his ultimate intent to use these weapons or cause them to be used against the American people is strong enough that we cannot afford to ignore it. Iraq is developing missiles that can hit neighboring states and is building unmanned aerial vehicles to spread chemical and biological agents. I am concerned that Iraq is exploring ways to use these aerial vehicles for missions targeting the United States.

Saddam's aggressiveness, hatred of the United States and willingness to use chemical weapons is clearly established. Iraq has invaded its neighbors and has used chemical weapons against its own people. He is a brutal dictator and a tyrant. Being a brutal tyrant does not justify the use of force by America; the world has plenty of tyrants. But his past behavior provides context and credence to the assessment of his intent.

We are a moral people. We do not covet anyone else's territory or resources. We do not seek to destroy other civilizations or involve ourselves in the internal affairs of other states. The decision to authorize the use of force in advance of any attack is a grave one which I do not take lightly.

One of the defining characteristics of international relations in the twentieth century was the steadily declining legitimacy of the use of force by states other than in self-defense. This trend enhanced the stability and order of the system of sovereign states that has developed since the sixteenth century.

At the zenith of our military power, wielding enormous political, economic and social influence, America must not squander our moral authority by yielding to the temptation to justify using our military power preemptively other than in highly unusual circumstances. While the current threat posed by Iraq meets that high standard, we should be careful to acknowledge just how high the standard is. Otherwise, our rhetoric and actions could be used

to justify erosion of the general prohibition of the use of force by other states, undermining the stability of the system we seek to bolster.

I am voting to authorize the use of force against Iraq because it possesses and is further developing weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver those weapons and because I believe that Iraq intends to use those weapons against Americans.

We should not go to war because another country represses its own minorities. Repression of minorities is a widespread human rights violation. We should not go to war because another country has failed to account for missing prisoners of war, as disdainful as that is. We should not go to war because another country simply possesses weapons of mass destruction. There are at least 12 states that already possess nuclear weapons, including some of our allies as well as former adversaries. Possession of these weapons alone is insufficient justification. We should not go to war because a country is trading outside of a sanctions regime.

Iraq is doing all of these things. But the set of circumstances that justifies this authorization to use force is very narrow and is related to Iraq's chemical, biological and nuclear weapons program and Saddam's intent to use those weapons against Americans. There is no objection to wait for him to strike first. We have a limited right of anticipatory self-defense and we must exercise it in this case. We cannot make a clear statement about the imminence of the threat from Saddam nor is it likely we would ever be able to until it was too late. In that sense, the threats of the twenty-first century are unlike those of the past. With these weapons, imminence is imperceptible and the risk of inaction is incalculable.

The joint resolution supports the President's diplomatic efforts to build a coalition to confront Iraq. Iraq has defied resolutions of the UN Security Council with impunity. The President was right to go to the UN and make the case for action against Iraq. In some respects, this current crisis is a test of the UN's continued relevance. If the UN is not willing to act collectively, we will have to build a coalition of states outside of the UN to act. This is, without doubt, a turning point for the United Nations as an institution.

Our top foreign policy priority must be to win the war on terrorism. There are ninety-plus states cooperating in that effort—for the most part involving their law enforcement and intelligence services. By building international support for any action against Iraq we can minimize the possibility that any of those states will distance themselves from this cooperation. Perhaps more importantly for the long term, military action against Iraq is bound to stir opposition among some in the Middle East. It will be easier to manage resentment if we build a coalition of states, including states in the Gulf Region.

While much of our attention has been focused on whether we should confront Iraq, in making my decision to support this resolution, I have also considered whether we can. Over the last year our military forces have been at increased operational tempo fighting a war in Afghanistan and defending the homeland. While Saddam's forces are considerably smaller than they were during the Gulf War, so are ours. I have been repeatedly assured by our military commanders and our civilian defense leadership that we have the forces,

munitions, logistics, communications systems, spare parts, and the people it will take to prevail. They are trained and combat readiness levels are restored or being restored.

I have also been assured that our military strategy will be tied to our political objective. I opposed the use of force in Kosovo because we had a military strategy that used limited air power to achieve a largely humanitarian mission to prevent door-to-door ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. I have been assured that we will act with the full power of the U.S. military, giving them the force necessary to win and come home again.

The Congress authorizes the President to use force if all other means fail. We do not command the military or instruct the diplomats. I hope that, faced with the military might of a united coalition led by the United States, Saddam will choose to end his nuclear, chemical and biological weapons program and disarm. I hope this will not require military action, but it may.

People who have served in uniform are often the most reluctant to go to war—and I am no exception to that general rule. We know the risks; we know the limitations; and we know many of the likely participants. There are great risks in this potential action. But those risks will not diminish over time. And there are also great risks of inaction.

We did not choose this challenge. But faced with it, we cannot turn away.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her leadership tonight; and at this time I would like, as one of the newest Members of Congress and the most junior member of the Committee on Armed Services, to join in support of this bipartisan resolution.

I am here tonight with a number of different perspectives. The first is that I am a military parent. Additionally, I am a member of the Army National Guard. Also, I am a desert war trainee and a Member of Congress.

The most important role that I have tonight is that I am a military parent. I am very proud that I have three sons in the military. My oldest son, Alan, is a first lieutenant in the field artillery of the Army National Guard in South Carolina. He has just returned from advanced training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

Additionally, I am very proud of my son, Addison, Jr., who is a Naval Academy graduate and an ensign in the U.S. Navy, and he is currently at USUMS, the uniformed services university medical school here at Bethesda, Maryland.

Finally, I have another son, Julian, who is a junior at Clemson University, which is in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM). He is a member of the Army ROTC, and his heritage is extremely significant to me. His grandfather, Julian Dusenbury, was awarded the Naval Cross for his service at Okinawa in the seizure of Shuri Castle.

Finally, I am here also as a member of the National Guard. I am the only

Member of Congress who is serving currently in the National Guard, and I am very proud of the people that I serve and work with. I know that they are trained and they are competent and they are dedicated to protecting America.

I am here as a person who, 2 years ago, and I may have the most recent desert war training, served at Fort Irwin in California, the Mojave Desert, at the National Training Center in a rotation. I know that the American military is trained and ready for military service.

As a Member of Congress, I know, Madam Speaker, that today we are discussing one of the most important decisions that we as United States Representatives will ever face. The question before us is whether or not to support the bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of American military force against Saddam Hussein and his Iraqi regime as part of the continuing war on terrorism.

There is no doubt that each of us brings different perspectives to this debate, and for good reason. This is the people's House of Representatives; and, therefore, we should reflect the different people across this great country.

In the case of Iraq, Saddam Hussein has proven himself to be a brutal dictator in possession of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and aggressively, according to the British Prime Minister, seeking nuclear capabilities. He has shown his willingness to use these weapons even against his own people.

Saddam has continually harbored and supported known terrorist organizations, including members of the al Qaeda, the terrorist group linked to the murderous attacks on September 11 in New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

Saddam has also attempted to assassinate a U.S. President and fired thousands of attacks against American and British Air Forces in the no-fly zones of Iraq.

In his own country, Saddam Hussein has carried on one of the most cruel and barbaric regimes in the world, murdering political enemies, raping the wives of his foes, and torturing their children.

So what are we to do about this madman? Saddam Hussein is an enemy of the United States. This is a Stalin and a Hitler who has the capability of murder of thousands of innocent American men, women, and children, and who supports and harbors terrorists.

In history, there have been some enemies of freedom and liberty that respect nothing but the threat of superior military force. Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime is such a threat. America has become the target because America is the world's symbol of freedom, liberty, and democracy. As one of America's great Presidents, Ronald Reagan, showed us in the Cold War, peace is achieved through strength, as he achieved victory in the Cold War.

While I have no desire to see my children sent to war, we may be left with no other choice. I can assure the Members that as a member of the military, as a military parent, that the American military is ready and willing to answer the call to preserve freedom and liberty for generations to come, and to stop the threat posed by Saddam Hussein to the innocent lives of the American public.

□ 2130

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a fighter for human rights.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, when September 11, 2001, happened, I was in New York City. And as the enormity of what terrorism could do to my city hit me, I was stunned. Then I wept with all of those innocent people who were simply doing their jobs and living their lives when one moment of hate lost their lives. There has, however, not been any conclusive evidence that links al Qaeda to those responsible for the tragedy with Iraq.

Some question whether those who oppose this resolution are forgetting those who died on September 11. Some question our patriotism. Though I should not have to affirm my patriotism, I say simply that I love my country, I love my city of New York, and I am not afraid to deal with those who attacked it. It is the most basic of our purposes as a national government to defend our Nation. But here we speak of a different matter.

If our ultimate goal is to disarm Iraq and all chemical and biological weapons, how does giving our President this right to go to war accomplish that goal? Would not working with the U.N. to implement a program of rigorous inspections move us closer to our goal?

This new doctrine announced by the President that the U.S. has the right to engage in a preemptive strike, which he seeks to implement through this resolution, frightens me and establishes a troubling precedent. This is a doctrine better left unused. It contravenes a half century of developed international law of which the U.S. has been a champion. Taking this idea to its logical conclusion means that India and Pakistan, for instance, nations with nuclear weapons and a history of conflict, may no longer feel bound by the limitations on the use of force that have been agreed to by the family of nations. The U.N. would become irrelevant, and the checks and balances that membership in the U.N. places on its members states will no longer apply.

Even if we have strike and successfully defeat Iraq militarily, will this make our Nation a safer place to live?

The administration often talks about regime change in Iraq and the need to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Yet in 1991 we decided against regime change because of concern of the overall stability of the region. What has happened since that time that has changed the goals of military action?

As a Nation we need to plan and think beyond what passage of this resolution and a military victory would mean. The U.S. would need to expend at least the next 10 years involved in occupation, reconstruction and rebuilding. That is the point that no one seems to talk about, the fact that after we defeat Saddam Hussein we have to stay in Iraq, some experts say, at least for 10 years.

One point also that surprises me that very few people, if any, bring up is, has anyone told us how we will defend Israel when Saddam Hussein and his madness, against the wall, decides to attack Israel? Those of us who support the State of Israel know that that is not part of this discussion at all.

The last point that I would like to make is that we should, in our expending a lot of energy in trying to reach out to young Arab men and women, to tell them, to show them that we are not their enemy. By attacking an Arab country when even our allies in the Arab world do not support us will only, in my opinion, grow the hatred against this country. At the expense of sounding ridiculous, it could be said that it would be an increase in al Qaeda membership.

We were founded on the principles of justice and strong morality. We have to be careful now that as we take and embark on this road we do not hurt ourselves while we try to help ourselves.

We embarked on a war against terrorism. Now we are being told that attacking Iraq is part of that war. Yet Osama bin Laden, from all accounts, is still alive; and there is still work that has to be done.

This is by far the most difficult vote that anyone can take. But I end this speech tonight as I began it and as I spoke 11 or 12 years ago. We have to be careful. We have to know what we are doing, and we have to know the severity of our actions. I will vote against this resolution because I cannot agree with the course that our great Nation is embarking on, one that brings the threat of war closer and the goal of peace further away.

Madam Speaker, it is our children we will be sending to war. It is the people of Iraq we will engage in a war. We should think and think. And, Mr. President, I suspect that you will get the support of this Congress. Use this power wisely.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), another member of the Committee on Armed Services and an officer in the Naval Reserve and a veteran of Northern Watch as well as Kosovo.

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

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, 140 years ago a gentleman from Illinois wrote the following:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with this occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and we shall save our country."

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

"We say we are for Union. The world will not forget we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we know how to save it. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free, honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve."

"We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of Earth. Other means may succeed. This could fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous and just, a way which if followed the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless."

Abraham Lincoln wrote those words on the eve of his most important decision. The occasion before us here is also drenched in significance.

I am often asked whether I am a dove or a hawk on the question of Iraq. I prefer to be an owl, one who approaches this with steady, firm judgment.

I believe we must deal with the enforcement of the United Nations Security Council resolutions requiring Iraq to disarm as part of an international coalition. Diplomatic efforts must be our primary effort, with a use of armed force only as a last resort.

Along well-settled principles of constitutional and international law, the United States may declare war only with the formal approval of the Congress; and we should try to endeavor to operate with the approval of the U.N. Security Council.

As a veteran myself, I believe that making the decision between war and peace is the most sacred duty of the Congress. Many people who never saw war are quick to urge military actions. Veterans can report with firsthand experience that waging war is a cruel and blunt instrument to be used only by a free people as their last choice. In my own experience, war has taught me to be the best friend of our State Department, a place where diplomacy is always the preferred course of action.

I used to work in the State Department, and I applaud Secretary of State Colin Powell in his efforts to build a large coalition of like-minded nations

to enforce the will of the Security Council.

In reviewing of the reports of the United Nations, our allies and respected human rights groups, it is clear that the Iraqi regime represents a growing present danger to the United States and its allies and its own people. Given its proximity to Iraq, our allies in Israel probably face the greatest danger. I believe that the disarmament of Iraq is important to the security of the United States but is vital to the security of our allies in Israel.

In my judgment, the existence of Israel hangs on the success or failure of the U.N. efforts to disarm Iraq. This is why the government of Israel, like Her Majesty's government in the United Kingdom, so strongly supports our goal. It is clear that this steadfast, concentrated action by the international community is needed to reduce the danger to the United States and our allies.

While some say that inspections against a government determined to conceal its weapons are certain to fail, I disagree. Unlike the inspectors that we sent into post-war Germany after World War I or even Iraq, a new Security Council resolution could lay out clear rules granting free, unescorted and unannounced access by inspectors to Iraqi programs.

In my work on this issue, I joined with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a representative of the opposite party, to form an Iraq working group here in the House where we have convened many meetings with U.N. weapons inspectors, Iraqis and administration officials to learn more about this issue. Our meetings with the U.N. inspectors have been some of the most fruitful.

Dr. David Kay, the Chief United Nations Weapons Inspector, reported that if he were to return to Iraq he would need a new Security Council resolution with two major changes: one, complete access to all sites, including presidential sites and Northern Iraq, which were denied to previous U.N. inspectors; and, two, the power to grant permanent asylum to any scientist or their families who could be taken out of Iraq and debriefed on the weapons of mass destruction program that employed them.

Dr. Kay reported that President Bush, Sr., and President Clinton both denied him the authority to force access to key sites and failed to grant him the power to bring any Iraqi and their families. He reported to our working group that, with these two changes granted under a new Security Council resolution, he would be willing to return to Iraq and carry out the will of the United Nations to disarm the government.

We have had several conversations with the National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice, and members of our United Nations Mission in New York who report that, without the credible threat of force, Secretary of State Powell has

little chance for passing the kind of Security Council resolution that Dr. Kay outlined would be needed to peacefully disarm Iraq.

I am encouraged that this resolution before the House has the support of senior Democratic and Republican leaders. It underscores the consideration of this issue should be without partisan rancor or advantage, and we should not consider this measure as partisans but as Americans.

This resolution offers the best hope for a new U.N. Security Council resolution to rewrite the rules of inspection to make them more effective. Secretary Powell has asked for this resolution to pass the Congress to give him the tools he needs for U.N. support, and I voted to give him that support.

As a veteran, I see any potential military action first through the eyes of young men and women who volunteered to wear the uniform and would carry out the mission. As I have detailed here, I believe that this resolution unlocks the door for more effective inspections. We must use the opportunities we have to take non-military action through the U.N. to determine if unrestricted inspections of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program can take place. If these inspections succeed, we will have accomplished our objectives without loss of life. And if they fail, it will rally international support against an isolated Iraq, making any more decisive action quicker and more likely to succeed.

Madam Speaker, 140 years ago, a gentleman from Illinois wrote the following passage—one that applies to the question now before this House:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and we shall save our country."

Fellow citizens we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

We say we are for Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve.

We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

Abraham Lincoln wrote those words on the eve of his most important decision of the Civil War. The occasion before us here is also drenched in historical significance.

I am often asked if I am a "Dove" or "Hawk" on the question of Iraq. I prefer to be an "Owl"—one who approaches this with a steady, firm judgment.

I believe that we must deal with the enforcement of the United Nations (UN) Security Council resolution requiring Iraq to disarm as part of an international coalition. Diplomatic efforts must be our primary effort, with a use of armed force only as a last resort. Along well-settled principles of Constitutional and International Law, the United States may declare war only with the formal approval of the Congress and should try to endeavor to operate with the approval of the UN Security Council.

As a veteran myself, I believe that making the decision between war and peace to be the most sacred duty of the Congress. Many people who never saw war are quick to urge military action. Veterans can report with first-hand experience that waging war is a cruel and blunt instrument to be used only by a free people as their last choice. In my own experience, war taught me to be the best friend of our State Department—a place where diplomacy is always the preferred course of action. I used to work in the State Department and I applaud Secretary of State Colin Powell in his efforts to build a large coalition of like-minded nations to enforce the will of the Security Council.

With regard to military force, our founding fathers debated the proper place for the power to make war at the Constitutional Convention and feared it most in a new democracy. They specifically rejected proposals to give such a power to the President and directed that only the elected representatives of the American people in our Congress could declare war. For most of our history, Presidents followed the restrictions of the Constitution when going to war. In the 1950s and 1960s, we deviated from the clear requirements of the Constitution to our profound detriment. I believe that it is far worse to send our uniformed men and women into a conflict the American people do not support than to never send them at all.

In recent years, Presidents Bush and Clinton returned to our historic, constitutional practice of Congress voting before sending uniformed Americans into harm's way. Congress voted on U.S. military actions in Kuwait, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo prior to deployment. As a military officer involved in each of these campaigns, I can report that the long congressional debate and formal approval of our missions made a difference improving our morale and clarity of purpose. The Administration should follow these precedents and obtain congressional sanction to engage in military action against Iraq. Congress must approve any military action against Iraq before it happens. Without such formal approval, no action should be taken.

When the United States and our allies emerged victorious after the Second World War, we remade the ineffective League of Nations into a more effective United Nations. Under the charter of the UN, all member states are required by international law to abide by the decisions of the UN's Security Council. By the terms of the UN Charter, permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, China, Russia, France and Britain—retain the power to veto any proposed action by the Council. While the Council has not always been able to take decisive action, it has moved on many occasions to enforce the will of the international community in Korea, Kuwait, Bosnia and Kosovo.

President Bush's decision to seek approval by the UN Security Council to enforce its previously-passed resolutions underscores a fundamental political and military requirement for the United States military to build allied support and to isolate any potential opponent of the international community. By acting under a UN resolution, U.S. armed forces could join as part of a broad coalition opposing an enemy that has little to no international support. For this key reason, the resolution clearly outlines that the United States should try to act with approval of the UN in dealing with Iraq.

The decision to go to war is the most important decision that I can make as a representative in Congress. As a veteran, I see any potential military action first through the eyes of the young men and women who volunteered to wear the uniform and would carry out such a mission. We must use the opportunities we have to take non-military action through the UN to determine if unrestricted inspections of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction can take place. If these inspections succeed, we will have accomplished our objectives without loss of life. If they fail, it will rally international support against an isolated foe, making any more decisive action quicker and much more likely to succeed.

When we look at the situation in Iraq, we should not take military action until two basic questions are answered:

1. Does Iraq Present a Clear and Present Danger to the United States and Our Allies?

2. Will Non-military Action by the International Community Achieve Our Objectives?

So, does Iraq present a clear and present danger?

With regard to Iraq, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 686 in March of 1991 requiring Iraq to release all prisoners of war, return Kuwaiti property and pay damages. To date, the UN reports that Iraq failed to return 609 prisoners from 14 UN member states, including one American pilot. Iraq also holds over 5,000 Iranian POWs. In total, the respected human rights group Amnesty International reports that Iraq failed to account for 16,000 people held in its custody. The UN staff reported to the Security Council on this issue that "no progress [has been] made on return . . ." Iraq also failed to return Kuwaiti military equipment and items from its state archives.

In April of 1991, the Security Council passed Resolution 687. The resolution required Iraq to "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" all "chemical and biological weapons." The resolution also required Iraq to "unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons usable material" or construct "any research, development or manufacturing facilities." Finally, the resolution also required Iraq to "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 km and related major parts and repair and production facilities.

Despite the requirement not to possess chemical and biological weapons, UN staff reported that Iraq lied to the UN Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) in 1995 after Saddam Hussein's son-in-law defected to Jordan and told of the dictator's still-thriving biological and chemical weapons programs. Iraq then

admitted it produced thousands of liters of anthrax, botulinum toxin and aflatoxin for use with Scud missile warheads, aerial bombs and artillery. UNSCOM reported to the Security Council that Iraq concealed its biological weapons program and failed to account for three tons of growth material for biological agents. The UN also reported that Iraq failed to account for 15,000 artillery rockets filled with nerve gas and 550 artillery shells filled with mustard gas.

In January 2001, our Defense Department reported that Iraq converted Czech L-29 jets into chemical and biological delivery vehicles. Iraq also modified a second jet for use as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (AUV) to spray chemical and biological weapons. We have evidence that Iraq has built a third unmanned aerial vehicle that is much smaller than the larger jets. There are reports that this smaller AUV is the intended final vehicle for use delivering chemical and biological weapons in a way that would not be detected on radar. There is compelling further evidence on this program which remains classified.

Reporting on the violation of commitments on ballistic missiles, UNSCOM disclosed that, contrary to UN resolutions, Iraq had retained a number of Scud missiles. Iraq also began work on two new missiles, a liquid-fueled missile (the al-Samoud) and solid-fueled missile (the Ababil), both capable of flying far beyond the 150 km limit imposed by the UN Security Council. Such missiles could deliver a weapon of mass destruction against Israel in under 250 seconds. Iraq also rebuilt the al-Mamoun missile test facility that had been dismantled by the UN to prevent the construction of longer-range missiles. Work is underway to test a much larger missile engine to support even longer-range missiles.

Despite promises not to acquire or test nuclear components, Iraq has a large nuclear weapons complex. Saddam Hussein regularly makes reference to his "nuclear mujahadeen" and UNSCOM reports over 40,000 Iraqis work on the nuclear weapons program. British intelligence services report that Iraq stepped up purchases of nuclear weapons material over the last 14 months. The New York Times recently reported Iraqi agents attempted to purchase 114,000 parts of a nuclear centrifuge to refine fissile material for a nuclear bomb. In September, the British International Institute for Strategic Studies reported that absent the Gulf War, Iraq would have had nuclear weapons by 1993 and could now possess a weapon within months of obtaining fissile material.

Last year, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri, an Iraqi defector, reported that he visited 20 secret facilities dedicated to producing nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. He supported his report with copies of Iraqi government contracts and technical specifications. It is clear that Iraq is advancing program to develop weapons of mass destruction in violation of its commitments imposed by the UN Security Council.

Following the deployment of UNSCOM to Iraq, Saddam Hussein barred international inspector access to key individuals, sites and equipment necessary to verify compliance with international law. The UN condemned Iraq for failing to comply with UN Security Council resolutions on August 15, 1991. The UN Security Council subsequently passed 12 more resolutions between 1991 and 1999 condemning Iraq and attempting to enforce the will of the

international community. The President of the Council also made 30 statements condemning Iraq's non-compliance.

Beyond commitments to return prisoners and to disarm weapons of mass destruction, the UN Security Council also passed Resolution 688 requiring Iraq to end repression of the Iraqi people "the consequences of which threaten international peace and security." The UN Commission on Human Rights and UN General Assembly reported on "systematic, widespread and extremely grave violations of human rights" citing an "all-pervasive repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination and widespread terror." The Iraqi government blocked all visits by the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights from 1992 to the present.

Amnesty International reported that in October 2000, Iraq executed dozens of women on charges of prostitution. Amnesty also reported the decapitation of numerous women accused of crimes with victims heads displayed in front of homes for several days. They further reported that the female relatives of prisoners are often raped as part of their torture. The UN Special Rapporteur, Max Van der Stoep, reported that hundreds of Iraqi Kurds were used as subjects in Iraq's testing of new chemical and biological weapons. Van der Stoep also reported at least 1,500 executions of political opponents. Sometime between September of 1998 and December of 1999, the town of Albu 'Aysh was destroyed with extensive civilian casualties. UNSCOM also reported on a special prison for the children of adult prisoners. The Human Rights Alliance also reported that over 500 journalists and intellectuals have been executed.

Under Resolution 688, the United States, France and Britain were directed to operate no-fly zones over southern Iraq to protect the Shia minority (Iraq's governing elite is exclusively Sunni) and northern Iraq to protect five million Kurdish citizens of Iraq. The Iraqis of these communities strongly support the no-fly zones and believe that it is the key to safety for their families. I am a veteran of Operation Northern Watch and was proud to serve my country to protect helpless minorities. On September 16th, Iraq offered the UN Secretary General the opportunity to return UNSCOM to Iraq for "unrestricted" inspections. On September 17th, Iraqi armed forces fired on UN aircraft patrolling the no-fly zone. They did so again the following day. To date, the Iraqis have fired on UN aircraft over 60 times since their offer of "unrestricted" inspections.

Iraq is also prohibited from carrying out terrorist acts under the terms of the UN Security Council's Resolution 687. Despite this requirement, agents of the Iraqi Intelligence Service attempted to use a car bomb in 1993 to assassinate former President George Bush. Iraq harbors the Mujahedin-e-Khalq (MKO) that killed several Americans. It also housed the Palestine Liberation Front, best known for killing American Leon Klinghoffer and many attacks against Israel. Iraq also sheltered the Abu Nidal organization and now pays \$10,000 to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers. Defectors report that Iraq operates an international terrorist training camp at Salman Pak, open to Arab and non-Arabs alike. While there is no clear link between the Iraqi government and the September 11th attacks, Iraq now harbors several members of the Al Qaeda terrorist organization.

Much of this activity by Iraq costs money. Iraq must operate under a UN embargo that allows it to sell oil with proceeds going into an account controlled by the UN. Despite protests from average Iraqis, the government of Iraq regularly applies for the use of the UN oil-for-food money to purchase luxury cars, electronic equipment and elite infant diet formula. Much of the funding under the UN program was used by Iraq to construct several "presidential palaces" detailed in a well-covered speech by then Secretary of State Madeline Albright. In order to generate funding for its weapons of mass destruction program and missile development, Iraq exports thousands of barrels of oil on the black market in violation of the UN program, with proceeds controlled by Saddam's two sons, Uday and Qusai. Total proceeds exceed several billion dollars—more than enough to fund a large weapons of mass destruction program.

In reviewing the reports of the UN, our allies and respected outside human rights groups, it is clear that the Iraqi regime represents a growing present danger to the United States, our allies, and its own people. Given its proximity to Iraq, our allies in Israel probably face the greatest danger. I believe that the disarmament of Iraq is important to the security of the United States but is vital to the security of our allies in Israel. In my judgment, the existence of Israel hangs on the success or failure of the UN effort to disarm Iraq. That is why the government of Israel, like Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, strongly supports this goal. It is clear that steadfast, concentrated action by the international community is needed to reduce the danger to the United States and our key allies.

Will Non-military Action by the International Community Achieve Our Objectives?

Between 1991 and 1997, UNSCOM was able to demilitarize a large number of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and missiles. It is clear that UNSCOM was able to delay the expected 1993 date when Iraq was expected to possess a nuclear arsenal. UNSCOM's two chiefs, Ambassador David Kay and Ambassador Richard Butler, emphasize that while inspections yielded results, they had to be supported by strong international action to bolster the authority of the UN. This support waned in 1997 and allowed Iraq to force the withdrawal of UNSCOM in 1998.

There have been no inspections in Iraq for four years and less is known now about the progress Iraq has made on its weapons of mass destruction program. More is known about the resources Iraq spends on this program with indications that Iraq has substantially increased spending on special military projects over the years since UN inspectors were forced to leave. A steady stream of defectors and reports from other UN members indicate that Iraq is accelerating its work on nuclear, biological and missile programs.

Ambassador Kay testified before the House Armed Services Committee that further inspections would not be effective unless the UN was given a *carte blanche* to visit any site with no notice, retaining the right to produce any witness at any time. He advised the Committee that he believed Saddam Hussein would never agree to such an inspection policy.

He was wrong.

On September 16th, Saddam Hussein advised the Secretary General of the UN that

Iraq would permit the redeployment of UN inspectors in Iraq with no restrictions. Many observers are understandably skeptical that Iraq will actually allow UN inspectors to peacefully disarm Iraq of its most deadly and expensive weapons.

Nevertheless, this is an opportunity that we cannot ignore.

The UN should mount an inspection mission to Iraq with the authority to conduct the most aggressive plan possible. It is possible that non-military action by the international community will achieve our objectives in Iraq.

The history of international arms inspection shows some failures. Eighty years ago, the international community imposed an inspection regime on the government of Germany. The League of Nations created an "Inter-Allied Control Commission" for the "complete execution of delivery, destruction, rendering useless of weapons, ammunition and material carried out at the expense of the German government." Inspectors were granted full freedom of movement, all necessary facilities, documents and designs. 337 inspectors were deployed in 11 districts across the country. The Commission reported the following results: Cannons Destroyed, 33,384; Artillery Shells Destroyed, 37,211,551; Machine Guns Destroyed, 87,240; and Poison Gas Cylinders Destroyed, 920 tons.

In sum, they reported that 97% of Germany's artillery and 98% of her men under arms were rendered ineffective.

The Commission's reports on German violations were very controversial. Andre Tardieu, the leading French diplomat for implementing the inspections, wrote to President Wilson on the controversy of inspector reports:

"The pacifist element in each of the nations of the League will be quite naturally inclined to deny reports disturbing to their peace of mind and more or less consciously espouse the cause of the German government which will deny the said reports. We must recall the opposition of these pacifist elements at the time when Germany armed to the teeth and openly made ready the aggression of 1870 and 1914. To sum up:

—Germany will deny.

—Their government will discuss.

—Public opinion will be divided, alarmed, [and] nervous. The League, unarmed, will have brought to pass in the world not general peace but general uncertainty which will give birth to a kind of interior and exterior conflict."

In the end, Germany rearmed under the eyes of over 300 international inspectors. As evidence of violations mounted, the international community lost its nerve to impose the will of the League of Nations. This lesson of history is instructive and we should use it to make sure international inspections in Iraq do not suffer the same fate.

The record of inspections in Iraq is uneven. While the UN Special Commission on Iraq reported an impressive amount of Iraqi weaponry destroyed, its lack of cooperation from the government and failure to achieve a complete accounting show that it was not a complete success.

While some may say that inspections against a government determined to conceal are certain to fail, I disagree. Unlike the inspectors of Germany or even Iraq, a new Security Council resolution could lay out clear rules granting free, unescorted and unannounced access by inspectors to the Iraq pro-

grams. In my work on this issue, I joined with Representative ROBERT ANDREWS of New Jersey—a representative of the opposite party—to form an "Iraq Working Group" here in the House. We have convened many meetings with UN Inspectors, Iraqis and Administration officials to learn more about this issue.

Our meetings with UN inspectors have been some of the most fruitful. Dr. David Kay, the United Nations Chief Weapons Inspector, reported that if he was to return to Iraq, he would need a new Security Council Resolution with two major changes to foster success:

1. Complete access to all sites, including "Presidential sites" and Northern Iraq, which were denied to previous UN inspectors, and

2. The power to grant permanent asylum to any scientist and their families who could be taken out of Iraq and debriefed on the weapons of mass destruction program that employed them.

Kay reported that President Bush Sr. and President Clinton had denied him the authority to force access to key sites and failed to grant him the power to bring any Iraqi and their family members out of Iraq. He reported to our working group that with these two changes—granted by a new Security Council resolution—he would be willing to return to Iraq to carry out the will of the United Nations to disarm the government.

I have had several conversations with our National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice, and Members of our United Nations mission in New York who report that without a credible threat of force, Secretary of State Powell has little chance for passing the kind of Security Council resolution that Dr. Kay outlined would be needed to peacefully disarm Iraq.

They report that two key permanent members of the Council, Russia and France, have clear interests in this question. Russia is owed over \$8 billion by the government of Iraq. She sees a possible war or interfering with debt repayments and—as a good banker—therefore is inclined against it. If the U.S. leads an international coalition to replace the government of Iraq and Russia opposed this move, then Russia would see its debt repudiated. Russia cannot allow that to happen and therefore would have to back an international effort once it forms. France's position is similar. France's number one goal in the region is access to the Iraqi export market. But if a new government is installed and France opposed this action, France would suffer a loss of a key export market. Therefore, if international pressure is formed, France cannot afford to be left out. Diplomats reported to me that this is similar to the situation facing the Council in September of 1990. Most members did not want to rescue Kuwait and preferred to let Iraq administer this former UN member as a new "19th province of Iraq." Once US action was imminent, the Council and many Arab nations supported the United States because they could not afford to offend the newly rescued Kuwaiti government. In similar fashion, if action is inevitable against Iraq, then the support of such nations will come because they cannot afford to be excluded from a new Iraq.

It is for these reasons, I support the action of this resolution. I am encouraged that the resolution has the support of the Senior Democratic and Republican leaders of this House. It underscores that the consideration of this issue should be without partisan rancor or advantage. We should not consider this

measure as partisans but as Americans. This resolution offers the best hope for a UN Security Council resolution to rewrite the rules of inspection to make them effective. Secretary Powell has asked for this resolution to pass the Congress to give him the tools he needs to win UN support. I will vote to support him and this effort.

As a veteran, I see any potential military action first through the eyes of the young men and women who volunteered to wear the uniform and would carry out such a mission. As I have detailed here, I believe this resolution unlocks the door to more effective inspections. We must use the opportunities we have to take non-military action through the UN to determine if unrestricted inspections of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction can take place. If these inspections succeed, we will have accomplished our objectives without loss of life. If they fail, it will rally international support against an isolated Iraq, making any more decisive action quicker and much more likely to succeed.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a former Foreign Service employee of the U.S. government, and a person who recently returned from Iraq to ask questions firsthand.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, the true question before us today is: Why should we go to war with Iraq? This is the last chance we will have before it starts.

The rule has been that the people of this country do not wage war and lay down lives when there might be a threat. The rule has been that the people of this country do not wage war and lay down lives to achieve regime change in another country. With Iraq, we are moving into brand new territory. We are not just demanding disarmament. We are demanding that a ruler be removed.

The President's press secretary publicly suggested assassination. This is new, Madam Speaker. This is new, and we should say no today.

Because, first, their resolution is premature. There has been no showing by the intelligence agencies or the White House of imminent danger to the United States. That Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator who has committed heinous crimes is undeniable. It is likely that he still seeks weapons of mass destruction. But we have a way to thwart his desire: inspection and disarmament.

For regime change, we stand alone. For inspection and disarmament, we have allies, we have a coalition, we have the U.N.

Last March, the Iraq government began discussions with Dr. Hans Blix and UNMOVIC about resuming inspections so that the oppressive sanctions could be lifted. The Iraqi Parliament then invited Members of Congress to come to Baghdad with their own inspectors.

□ 2145

I spoke with Foreign Minister Naji Sabri in September in New York for an hour about the absolute necessity for unfettered inspections. I told him if I went to Iraq, I wanted "my inspectors" to be UNMOVIC, the U.N. inspectors.

As I left he said, "I think the Congress will be surprised soon." Three days later, Sabri wrote to Kofi Annan, accepting the inspectors under the existing U.N. resolutions.

Unfortunately, instead of welcoming the shift in Iraq's position, President Bush could not take "yes" for an answer.

Madam Speaker, we must let these inspections take place immediately, with or without a new U.N. resolution. Let Blix do his job. If, God forbid, the Iraqis return to obstruction, we are ready to return to the Security Council for whatever Dr. Blix needs to get the job done. The stakes are high if we make a hasty decision today.

If we focus on disarmament, we may be able to hold onto the coalition we have built to fight terrorism. But if we do not, we force Middle Eastern countries to choose between their Arab neighbors and us.

If we act alone to achieve regime change, the whole Arab world will wonder, who is next? Our President will become the poster boy for al Qaeda recruiters; and Americans will be less, not more, safe at home and abroad.

If we pass this resolution, we are setting precedents that we will regret, that America can start preemptive wars and that Congress can turn over authority to start a war to the President.

Vote "no" to honor the constitutional principle that only Congress can declare war. War cannot be started, or launched without declaration, on the word of a President whose attention span for diplomacy is exhausted and who notifies Congress 48 hours after the missiles have been launched.

The legacies of wars remain with us forever. I learned that not from a textbook, but from people who fought in a confusing and undeclared war. From 1968 to 1970, I served in the United States Navy as a psychiatrist treating sailors and Marines suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. I saw firsthand the price in grief and anger the troops and their families paid when they were sent into a war whose goals were at best obscure, and at worse deceptive.

Under the terms of this resolution, the United States may attack Iraq solely on the basis of the President's view, and only the President's view, that diplomacy has failed. When Congress was given responsibility for declarations of war, the Founders had just finished a war. They knew the human cost. They decided the responsibility for going to war should not reside in one person, but must be the duty of the whole Congress. We cannot cede this responsibility to any occupant of the White House, no matter how wise or from which party he or she comes.

I have a suggestion. Let us adjourn for an hour right now and go down to the Vietnam Memorial before we commit ourselves and our children to an unknown world in which any President can decide to go to war as long as he or she determines it is in the national interest at the moment. Let us look at the names one more time before we wipe away the efforts of 60 years to weave the world together through the U.N. and international law.

After two World Wars in 25 years, world leaders have remained committed to doing their best to prevent such an event ever given. By and large, they have succeeded. Let us not, in pursuit of oil or power or the blandishments of empire, be the ones who lead the world to failure.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD two articles which expand on my position.

[From the Institute for Public Accuracy]
DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OCTOBER 7 SPEECH BY
BUSH ON IRAQ

Thank you for that very gracious and warm Cincinnati welcome. I'm honored to be here tonight. I appreciate you all coming.

Tonight I want to take a few minutes to discuss a grave threat to peace and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat.

The threat comes from Iraq. It arises directly from the Iraqi regime's own actions, its history of aggression and its drive toward an arsenal of terror.

Chris Toensing, editor of Middle East Report: "This might indicate that Iraq is actively threatening the peace in the region. There is no evidence whatsoever that Iraq is doing so, or has any intention of doing so. Other powers are actively disrupting the peace in the region: Israel is trying to crush Palestinian resistance to occupation with brute force, and the U.S. and Britain have bombed Iraq 46 times in 2002 when their aircraft are 'targeted' by Iraqi air defense systems in the bilaterally enforced no-fly zones. Most of our 'friends' in the region—Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan—have strongly urged us not to go to war, and to tone down the war rhetoric. Aren't they better positioned than we are to judge what threatens their safety?"

Eleven years ago, as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi regime was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, to cease all development of such weapons and to stop all support for terrorist groups.

Rahul Mahajan, author of *The New Crusade: America's War on Terrorism: Resolution 687* also speaks of 'establishing in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction'—which also means Israel's 200-plus nuclear weapons as well as Syria's and Egypt's apparent chemical weapons capabilities, and any nuclear capability the U.S. has placed in the region."

The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons.

As'ad Abukhalil, author of *Bin Laden, Islam & America's New 'War on Terrorism'* and associate professor of political science at California State University at Stanislaus: "The president fails to credit Reagan's and his father's administrations—prominent members of which included Rumsfeld and Cheney—for their help in the construction of Saddam's arsenal, especially in the area of germ warfare."

Toensing: "After being presented with evidence that Iraq had used chemical weapons

to attack the Kurds in 1987-88, the Reagan administration blocked a Senate resolution imposing sanctions on Iraq, and continued to pursue good relations with the regime."

James Jennings, president of Conscience International, a humanitarian aid organization that has worked in Iraq since 1991: "The evidence that Iraq gassed its own people is also not about a current event, but one that happened fourteen years ago. If that did not constitute a good enough reason for going to war with Iraq in 1988 (which the U.S. did not even contemplate at the time), it certainly is not a good enough reason now."

It is seeking nuclear weapons.

Susan Wright, co-author of *Biological Warfare and Disarmament: New Problems/New Perspectives*: "How does Bush know this? It's as if the inspections have already been conducted and we know the outcome. We're expected to accept the administration's word for this without seeing any evidence. We have no way of judging the accuracy of these claims and the only way to do so is to hold inspections. The only country in the region that is known to possess a nuclear arsenal is Israel." [The Administration says that it does not know if Israel has nuclear weapons: www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0521-06.htm]

Mahajan: "There's no evidence that Iraq has gotten anywhere with seeking nuclear weapons. The pitiful status of evidence in this regards is shown by claims in e.g. Blair's dossier that Iraq is seeking uranium from Africa, year and country unspecified. South Africa is, of course, the only country in the continent that has potentially the capacity for enrichment of uranium to bomb quality, and claims not to have supplied Iraq with uranium. Unenriched uranium does Iraq little good, since enrichment facilities are large, require huge investment, and cannot easily be hidden."

It has given shelter and support to terrorism and practices terror against its own people.

The entire world has witnessed Iraq's 11-year history of defiance, deception, and bad faith.

We also must never forget the most vivid events of recent history. On September 11, 2001, America felt its vulnerability—even to threats that gather on the other side of the earth. We resolved then, and we are resolved today, to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America.

Members of the Congress of both political parties, and members of the United Nations Security Council, agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm. We agree that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons, and diseases, and gases, and atomic weapons.

Toensing: "Only two members of the U.N. Security Council would appear to agree with the idea that Iraq threatens, or will threaten, 'America and the world' with Weapons of Mass Destruction, making the next sentence disingenuous at best."

Since we all agree on this goal, the issue is: How can we best achieve it?

Many Americans have raised legitimate questions: About the nature of the threat. About the urgency of action—and why be concerned now? About the link between Iraq developing weapons of terror, and the wider war on terror.

These are all issues we have discussed broadly and fully within my administration. And tonight, I want to share those discussions with you.

Toensing: "Bush may have shared the discussion, but he did not share the evidence, saying, like the British dossier and CIA reports, that intelligence has established the

threat. But Americans apparently will not be seeing it."

First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons. While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone—because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place.

Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant, who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people. This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility towards the United States.

Stephen Zunes, author of "Tinderbox: U.S., Middle East Policy and the Roots of Terrorism" and associate professor of politics at the University of San Francisco: "The hostility towards the United States is a direct consequence of U.S. hostility toward Iraq. Iraq was quite unhostile to the United States when it was receiving support from the United States during the 1980s. The answer is certainly not to appease Iraq's tyrannical regime, as was done in the past. However, to imply this hostility is unrelated to the U.S. destruction of much of Iraq's civilian infrastructure and other actions during the Gulf War which went far beyond what was necessary to rid Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the U.S.-led sanctions and its impact upon the civilian population is very misleading."

AbuKhalil: "If Bush wants to punish nations that 'tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning' then he would have to punish Israel for an occupation of Palestinian lands that lasted far longer than the now famous (yet brief) Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Of course, Iraq did attack Iran and Kuwait, and Israel in the span of 30 years has attacked Egypt, Iraq, Tunisia, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, not to mention Palestine, and not to mention a civilian Libyan airliner that was downed by Israeli forces in 1973."

By its past and present actions, buy its technological capabilities, by the merciless nature of its regime, Iraq is unique.

As a former chief weapons inspector for the U.N. has said, "The fundamental problem with Iraq remains the nature of the regime itself: Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction."

Some ask how urgent this danger is to America and the world. The danger is already significant, and it only grows worse with time. If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today—and we do—does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?

Zunes: "He was far more dangerous in the 1980s when the U.S., was supporting him. It will take many years, assuming military sanctions continue to effect, before he comes close to the strength he was then. If U.N. inspectors are allowed to return, it would be impossible—even if they don't find 100 percent of everything—to get much stronger than he is today."

In 1995, after several years of deceit by the Iraqi regime, the head of Iraq's military industries defected. It was then that the regime was forced to admit that it had produced more than 30,000 liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents. The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced two to four times that amount.

Zunes: "If this is really a concern, then why did the United States supply Iraq with the seed stock of anthrax spores back in the 1980s" [William Blum, "Anthrax for Export: U.S. Companies Sold Iraq the Ingredients for

a Witch's Brew," *The Progressive*, April 1998, p. 18]

This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for, and is capable of killing millions.

Zunes: "This is like saying that a man is capable of making millions of women pregnant. It's a matter of delivery systems, of which there is no proof that Iraq currently has."

We know that the regime has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents, including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas, and VX nerve gas. Saddam Hussein also has experience in using chemical weapons. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran, and on more than forty villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September 11.

Mahajan: "All of this was done with the full support, approval, and connivance of the U.S. government. U.S.-supplied 'agricultural credits' helped fund the sustained counterinsurgency campaign in northern Iraq; the United States supplied military intelligence to Iraq for use against Iran even when it knew Iraq was using chemical weapons in the war; and the United States ran diplomat interference for Iraq at the U.N."

Toensing: "The U.S. restored diplomatic relations with Iraq in 1984, while it was in the midst of fighting the first of these wars of aggression, because the U.S. wanted to contain the Islamic Revolution in Iran. The U.S. and Britain tilted toward Iraq throughout the war, and U.S. allies in the region, chief among them Saudi Arabia, bankrolled the Iraqi war effort. The U.S. was still trying to become closer to Iraq when it invaded Kuwait."

Zunes: "He attacked Iranian troops because he knew Iran had no allies that would defend it. And we now know that officials from the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency assisted Iraq in targeting Iranian forces in the full knowledge that they were using chemical weapons. Saddam used chemical weapons against Kurdish civilians because he knew they couldn't fight back. And the U.S. helped cover up the Halabja massacre and other assaults by falsely claiming the Iranians were responsible. In other words, Saddam is a coward. He will use WMDs when he knows he won't have to suffer the consequences, especially when the world's most powerful country is supporting him."

And surveillance photos reveal that the regime is rebuilding facilities that it has used to produce chemical and biological weapons.

Toensing: "That it 'has used.' The last time Bush made a big deal of this, he claimed that Iraq was again using the facilities in this way, an assertion which the IAEA promptly rebutted as unverifiable. It still is unverifiable."

Every chemical and biological weapon that Iraq has or makes is a direct violation of the truce that ended the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

Mahajan: "There are no credible allegations that Iraq produced chemical or biological agents while inspectors were in the country, until December 1998. The reason we don't know whether they are producing those agents or not since then is that inspectors were withdrawn at the U.S. behest preparatory to the Desert Fox bombing campaign."

Yet Saddam Hussein has chosen to build and keep these weapons, despite international sanctions, U.N. demands, and isolation from the civilized world.

[The U.S. has maintained for years that it would continue the sanctions regardless of Iraq's behavior regarding weapons, see "Autopsy of a Disaster: The U.S. Sanctions Policy on Iraq—Myth: The Sanctions Will be

Lifted When Iraq Complies with the U.N. Inspections": www.accuracy.org/iraq/

Zunes: "Again, the U.S. has yet to produce evidence that Iraq is building such weapons. Also, U.N. Security Council Resolution 687 calls for Iraqi disarmament as part of a region-wide disarmament effort which the United States has refused to enforce or even support."

Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles—far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, and other nations—in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work.

Toensing: "That is a neat rhetorical trick. Bush knows that Turkey and Saudi Arabia themselves do not feel under threat from Iraq's WMD, so he doesn't claim that. Rather, it's the threat to U.S. servicemen and oil company employees based in those countries which should concern us. The questions left unasked are why Iraq would attack Americans, knowing the massive response that would incur, and of course why so many American troops 'live and work' in Turkey and Saudi Arabia. They're partly there in forward deployment against Iraq."

Zunes: "According to UNSCOM, 817 of Iraq's 819 Soviet-built ballistic missiles have been accounted for and destroyed. They may possess up to a couple of dozen home-made versions, but none of these have been tested and it is questionable whether they have any function launchers."

We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical and biological weapons across broad areas. We are concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using UAVs for missions targeting the United States.

Toensing: "Other intelligence experts have disputed that UAVs are a threat, because the agents they released might disperse to basically harmless levels by the time they reached the ground if the UAV was trying to cover such a broad area."

Mahajan: "The claim that these UAVs have ranges that would enable attacking the United States, and that they could reach it undetected, is a startling new one, and entirely untenable. No one has ever produced evidence of Iraqi capability or intent to target the United States directly."

And, of course, sophisticated delivery systems are not required for a chemical or biological attack—all that might be required are a small container and one terrorist or Iraqi intelligence operative to deliver it.

Mahajan: "Bioterrorist attacks and delivery of biological agents aren't that easy—the very limited effects of the anthrax attacks showed that. In fact, the loss of life in the anthrax attacks occurred mostly among the postal workers who were not issued antibiotics, and not among the congressional staff who were. As for chemical attacks with 'a small container and one terrorist,' they would be severely limited in effect."

And that is the source of our urgent concern about Saddam Hussein's link to international terrorist groups.

Over the years, Iraq has provided safe haven to terrorists such as Abu Nidal, whose terror organization carried out more than ninety terrorist attacks in twenty countries that killed or injured nearly 900 people, including 12 Americans.

Michael Ratner is president of the Center for Constitutional Rights: "Although U.S. intelligence agencies have not found a relationship between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, Bush mentions one, but no evidence is shown. Likewise he tries to frighten Americans by talking about the crimes of Abu Nidal, but Abu Nidal is dead. Again it is an attempt to create fear by association with

something from the past, not evidence of a current threat."

Iraq has also provided safe haven to Abu Abbas, who was responsible for seizing the Achille Lauro and killing an American passenger. And we know that Iraq is continuing to finance terror, and gives assistance to groups that use terrorism to undermine Middle East peace.

Toensing: "Yes, but neither of these groups is ideologically anti-American. Their attacks are aimed at Israel and Israeli interests, including the killing of Leon Klinghoffer and other Americans. This is a crucial piece of context."

We know that Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist network share a common enemy—the United States of America. We know that Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some al Qaeda leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq.

These include one very senior al Qaeda leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year, and who has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We have learned that Iraq has trained al Qaeda members in bomb making, poisons, and deadly gases.

Jennings: "The claim that al-Qaeda is in Iraq is disingenuous, if not an outright lie. Yes, the U.S. has known for some time that up to 400 al-Qaeda-type Muslim extremists, the Ansar al-Islam, formerly 'Jund al-Islam,' a splinter of the Iranian-backed Islamic Unity Movement of Kurdistan, were operating inside the Kurdish security zone set up under U.S. protection in the North of Iraq. For some reason this was kept quiet and has not been much reported in the mainstream media. Finally last Spring the Kurds themselves attacked and killed most of the terrorists in their territory, sending the rest fleeing for their lives across the border into Iran. Since this area was under U.S. protection, and not under Saddam Hussein's rule, it's pretty hard to claim that al-Qaeda operates in Iraq."

Mahajan: "Al-Qaeda has carried out no chemical or biological attacks. The anthrax attacks in the fall of 2001 were almost certainly from a U.S. government employee. It's hard to know what, if anything, to make of claims that one 'senior al Qaeda leader' got medical treatment in Baghdad. Giving medical treatment, even to criminals, is not illegal, and with so little evidence given to us, there's no reason to suppose this isn't another story like the one about a meeting between Mohammed Atta and Iraqi intelligence in Prague (now discredited)."

And we know that after September 11, Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America. Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliances with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints.

Mahajan: "Biological or chemical weapons would undoubtedly leave fingerprints, just as the anthrax attacks in the fall did. Even if Iraq couldn't be conclusively shown to be the source of such materials, the U.S. government would assume Iraq was the source. Iraq has been under the gun ever since the Gulf War, and can't possibly assume that it could get away with such an attack. Moreover, Saddam has traditionally seen WMD as his ace in the hole, protecting him from defeat. Paranoid dictators do not give control of something they see as the foundation of their security into the hands of networks, like al-Qaeda, which they can't control."

Some have argued that confronting the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror. To the contrary, confronting the threat posed by Iraq is crucial to winning the war on terror.

When I spoke to the Congress more than a year ago, I said that those who harbor terrorists are as guilty as the terrorists themselves. Saddam Hussein is harboring terrorists and the instruments of terror, the instruments of mass death and destruction. And he cannot be trusted. The risk is simply too great that he will use them, or provide them to a terror network.

Terror cells, and outlaw regimes building weapons of mass destruction, are different faces of the same evil. Our security requires that we confront both. And the United States military is capable of confronting both.

Many people have asked how close Saddam Hussein is to developing a nuclear weapon. We don't know exactly, and that is the problem. Before the Gulf War, the best intelligence indicated that Iraq was eight to 10 years away from developing a nuclear weapon; after the war, international inspectors learned that the regime had been much closer. The regime in Iraq would likely have possessed a nuclear weapon no later than 1993.

The inspectors discovered that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a workable nuclear weapon, and was pursuing several different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb.

Toensing: "Yes, inspectors learned all of this—the inspections worked."

Before being barred from Iraq in 1998, the International Atomic Energy Agency dismantled extensive nuclear weapons-related facilities, including three uranium-enrichment sites.

Robert Jensen, author of "Writing Dis-sent" and an associate professor at the University of Texas at Austin: "Bush at least acknowledged that we know little about Saddam's nuclear capability, but he lied about why. Bush claimed that Iraq barred the inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency in 1998. In fact, the inspectors, along with those from the U.N. Special Commission, were withdrawn by their agencies—not expelled by Iraq—in December 1998 when it became clear the Clinton administration was going to bomb Iraq (as it did) and the safety of the inspectors couldn't be guaranteed. The inspectors also spied for the United States, in violation of their mandate."

This same year, information from a high-ranking Iraqi nuclear engineer who had defected, revealed that despite his public promises, Saddam Hussein had ordered his nuclear program to continue. The evidence indicates that Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.

Saddam Hussein has held numerous meetings with Iraqi nuclear scientists, a group he calls his "nuclear mujahedeen"—his nuclear holy warriors.

Satellite photographs reveal that Iraq is rebuilding facilities at sites that have been part of its nuclear program in the past.

Toensing: "As Lincoln Chafee said on NPR, if these satellite photos exist, then surely the public has a right to see them. Surely mere photos would not compromise sources and methods." [In 1990, after Iraq invaded Kuwait, the U.S. government claimed that Iraqi troops were threatening Saudi Arabia; this turned out to be false.]

Iraq has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

Mahajan: "The aluminum tubes can also be used in conventional artillery, which Iraq is allowed to have. In the past, when Iraq tried to build such centrifuges, they used steel tubes. This is an incredibly weak indicator."

If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy, or steal an amount of highly-enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it

could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year.

Toensing: "Both the CIA report and the British dossier say that this is very unlikely as long as Iraqi remains under sanctions."

Mahajan: "This means only that it has the technological know-how to create the high-explosive 'lenses' necessary to set off the appropriate nuclear chain reaction. As long as it retains its scientists, this will remain the case."

And if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed. Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America. And Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists.

Mahajan: "Again, such an act is not at all consonant with the history or the mindset of Saddam Hussein. One organization hosted by the Iraqi government, which is classified as terrorist by the State Department, is the Iranian Mujahedin-I-Khalq, whose activities are directed against the current government of Iran. They have never had access to any nonconventional resources from the Government of Iraq. Saddam Hussein sees the radical Islamist terrorist networks like al-Qaeda as a huge potential threat to his own rule, something that concerns him far more than any unrealistic ideas of revenge against the United States. Anything that could allow al-Qaeda (which, in its turn, is likely more concerned with replacing regimes in the Middle East with new radical Islamist regimes) to blackmail him would be the last thing he would give them."

Some citizens wonder: After 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now?

There is a reason. We have experienced the horror of September 11. We have seen that those who hate America are willing to crash airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. Our enemies would be no less willing—in fact they would be eager—to use a biological, or chemical, or a nuclear weapon.

Mahajan: "Invoking September 11 without showing any kind of link between the government of Iraq and those attacks is just transparent manipulation. What he really means is that after September 11 he thinks he can get away with such a policy."

Knowing these realities, America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof—the smoking gun—that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud.

As President Kennedy said in October of 1962: "Neither the United States of America nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small. We no longer live in a world," he said, "where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril."

Jacqueline Cabasso, Executive Director of the Western States Legal Foundation: "The hypocrisy in this speech—and in the Bush Administration's overall national security strategy—is monumental. If having weapons of mass destruction and a history of using them is a criteria, then surely the United States must pose the greatest threat to humanity that has ever existed. While Bush warns that 'we cannot wait for the final proof. . . the smoking gun that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud,' his September 2002 National Security Strategy states that 'America will act against. . . emerging threats before they are fully formed. . . by acting preemptively.' And his top-secret Nuclear Posture Review, leaked to the New York Times earlier this year, reveals that 'U.S. nuclear forces will

continue to provide assurance. . . in the event of surprising military developments. . . Current examples of immediate contingencies include an Iraqi attack on Israel or its neighbors. . . ' It doesn't take a lot of imagination to predict that if Iraq is attacked by the U.S. it might launch whatever it has at Israel-itself a nuclear power. Further, while the U.S. is massively expanding its biological weapons research capabilities for example by upgrading its bio research facilities at the Livermore and Los Alamos Nuclear weapons labs to aerosolize live anthrax and genetically modify bioorganisms it is blocking a protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention that would allow international inspectors into U.S. facilities. The Bush Administration's unilateral headlong rush to war threatens to unleash unprecedented regional instability and potentially catastrophic loss of life. It's hard to image a more self-destructive course of action."

Understanding the threats of our time, knowing the designs and deceptions of the Iraqi regime, we have every reason to assume the worst, and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring.

Some believe we can address this danger by simply resuming the old approach to inspections, and applying diplomatic and economic pressure. Yet this is precisely what the world has tried to do since 1991.

The U.N. inspections program was met with systematic deception. The Iraqi regime bugged hotel rooms and offices of inspectors to find where they were going next. They forged documents, destroyed evidence, and developed mobile weapons facilities to keep a step ahead of inspectors.

Eight so-called presidential palaces were declared off-limits to unfettered inspections. These sites actually encompass 12 square miles, with hundreds of structures, both above and below the ground, where sensitive materials could be hidden.

[In fact, there were inspections of these "presidential palaces."]

Zunes: "These are not off-limits. They are open to unfettered inspections as long as an Iraqi official is accompanying the inspectors. Such a proviso is quite legal under U.N. Security Council resolutions authorizing the creation of UNMOVIC, resolutions that were supported by the United States."

The world has also tried economic sanctions and watched Iraq use billions of dollars in illegal oil revenues to fund more weapons purchases, rather than providing for the needs of the Iraqi people.

Toensing: "Yes, and all the while, the U.S. and Britain were undermining the logic of sanctions and inspections by speaking of regime change, giving the regime no incentive to cooperate."

Mahajan: "The government-instituted food ration program in Iraq has been widely praised, characterized as 'second to none' by Tun Myat, current U.N. Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq. Money that comes in under the Oil for Food program cannot, despite constant allegations, be used for weapons purchases—all proceeds from such sales are deposited to an escrow account in New York which is controlled by the U.N. Sanctions Committee. The government of Iraq cannot touch any of this money."

The world has tried limited military strikes to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities only to see them openly rebuilt, while the regime again denies they even exist.

Mahajan: "For 'world' here, read 'United States and its lieutenant, the United Kingdom.' Those military strikes were a blatant violation of international law, done without Security Council authorization."

The world has tried no-fly zones to keep Saddam from terrorizing his own people . . .

and in the last year alone, the Iraqi military has fired upon American and British pilots more than 750 times.

Toensing: "Another remarkable rhetorical trick. The no-fly zones did not protect the Kurds from Iraqi incursions in 1995-96, nor have they protected the Shia or the marsh Arabs from ground-based repression throughout the decade. But rather than mention these somewhat significant failures, Bush concentrates on Iraqi air defenses, which have yet to come close to actually hitting a U.S. or U.K. jet. As with the Saudi-Turkish point above, it appears that U.S.-U.K. attempts to protect the peoples of the region are to be counted as failures because the U.S. and U.K. are in danger."

Francis Boyle, professor of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law and author of *The Criminality of Nuclear Deterrence*: "It is the U.S. government that is violating the United Nations Charter . . . by using military force to allegedly 'police' these illegal 'no-fly' zones that have never been authorized by the U.N. Security Council or by the U.S. Congress, in violation of the 1973 War Powers Resolution as well. Iraq is simply exercising its legitimate right of self-defense under U.N. Charter article 51. The Bush administration has deliberately put U.S. pilots in harm's way in order to concoct a pretext for a catastrophic war of aggression against Iraq. The best way for the American people to protect the lives of our military personnel in the Persian Gulf is to bring them all home."

Mahajan: "Again, the no-fly zones don't involve the 'world,' but are a naked projection of American and British power (France, the third partner in the no-fly zones, withdrew in 1996), unsanctioned by the Security Council."

After 11 years during which we have tried containment, sanctions, inspections, even selected military action, the end result is that Saddam Hussein still has chemical and biological weapons, and is increasing his capabilities to make more. And he is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.

Clearly, to actually work, any new inspections, sanctions, or enforcement mechanisms will have to be very different. America wants the U.N. to be an effective organization that helps to keep the peace. That is why we are urging the Security Council to adopt a new resolution setting our tough, immediate requirements.

AbuKhalil: "Bush also fails to mention American violations of the sanctions regime, by using the inspectors to spy on Iraq, and to obtain information unrelated to the U.N. mandate."

Among those requirements, the Iraqi regime must reveal and destroy, under U.N. supervision, all existing weapons of mass destruction. To ensure that we learn the truth, the regime must allow witnesses to its illegal activities to be interviewed outside of the country.

And these witnesses must be free to bring their families with them, so they are all beyond the reach of Saddam Hussein's terror and murder.

And inspectors must have access to any site, at any time, without pre-clearance, without delay, without exceptions.

Susan Wright: "[The evidence] suggests that the United States and the United Kingdom intend to set such tough conditions for the further arms inspections in Iraq that they would create a double bind. If Iraq rejects the conditions, then war with the United States will follow. If Iraq attempts to comply and an ambiguity triggers action by the security forces of one of the permanent members of the Security Council, which according to this draft, might accompany an inspection team, war could follow anyway.

Other members of the Security Council should reject such traps. It is also essential to avoid a situation in which the inspection force is effectively hijacked by the United States and used for espionage, as was the case with the U.N. Special Commission in the 1990s."

The time for denying, deceiving, and delaying has come to an end. Saddam Hussein must disarm himself—or, for the sake of peace, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Many nations are joining us in insisting that Saddam Hussein's regime be held accountable. They are committed to defending the international security that protects the lives of both our citizens and theirs.

AbuKhalil: "When Bush speaks about 'many nations' supporting the U.S., he certainly means Israel and U.K., although public opinion in U.K. is running solidly against Bush's war."

And that is why America is challenging all nations to take the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council seriously.

Zunes: "There are well over 90 U.N. Security Council resolutions that are currently being violated by countries other than Iraq. The vast majority of these resolutions are being violated by allies of the United States that receive U.S. military, economic and diplomatic support. Indeed, the U.S. has effectively blocked the U.N. Security Council from enforcing these resolutions against its allies."

Those resolutions are very clear. In addition to declaring and destroying all of its weapons of mass destruction, Iraq must end its support for terrorism. It must cease the persecution of its civilian population. It must stop all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. And it must release or account for all Gulf War personnel, including an American pilot, whose fate is still unknown.

Zunes: "Most of these do not fall under Chapter VII, which allows for the UNSC to authorize the use of force."

AbuKhalil: "And Bush's sudden concern for U.N. resolutions should not lead one to believe that he will next move to implement all U.N. resolutions—including those against U.S. allies."

By taking these steps, and only by taking these steps, the Iraqi regime has an opportunity to avoid conflict. These steps would also change the nature of the Iraqi regime itself.

America hopes the regime will make that choice.

Unfortunately, at least so far, we have little reason to expect it. This is why two administrations—mine and President Clinton's—have stated that regime change in Iraq is the only certain means of removing a great danger to our nation.

I hope this will not require military action, but it may. And military conflict could be difficult. An Iraqi regime faced with its own demise may attempt cruel and desperate measures. If Saddam Hussein orders such measures, his generals would be well advised to refuse those orders. If they do not refuse, they must understand that all war criminals will be pursued and punished.

If we have to act, we will take every precaution that is possible. We will plan carefully, we will act with the full power of the United States military, we will act with allies at our side, and we will prevail.

There is no easy or risk-free course of action. Some have argued we should wait—and that is an option. In my view, it is the riskiest of all options—because the longer we wait, the stronger and bolder Saddam Hussein will become. We could wait and hope that Saddam does not give weapons to terrorists, or develop a nuclear weapons to

blackmail the world. But I am convinced that is a hope against all evidence.

As Americans, we want peace—we work and sacrifice for peace—and there can be no peace if our security depends on the will and whims of a ruthless and aggressive dictator. I am not willing to stake one American life on trusting Saddam Hussein.

Mahajan: "Throughout all of this, there has never been any credible evidence introduced to indicate that Hussein has any policy of trying to target Americans. His depredations have almost always been distinguished by actions against people that the Western powers don't care about."

Failure to act would embolden other tyrants; allow terrorists access to new weapons and new resources; and make blackmail a permanent feature of world events.

The United Nations would betray the purpose of its founding, and prove irrelevant to the problems of our time. And through its inaction, the United States would resign itself to a future of fear.

That is not the America I know. That is not the America I serve. We refuse to live in fear. This nation—in world war and in Cold War—has never permitted the brutal and lawless to set history's course.

Zunes: "Then why did the United States support Indonesian dictator Suharto for over three decades, as he oversaw the massacre of over a half million of his own people, invaded the tiny nation or East Timor, resulting in the deaths of an additional 200,000? How about brutal and lawless governments in Turkey, Morocco and Israel that have invaded neighboring countries at the cost of thousands of civilian lives? How about Pinochet and other Latin American tyrants supported by the U.S.?"

Now, as before, we will secure our nation, protect our freedom, and help others to find freedom of their own. Some worry that a change of leadership in Iraq could create instability and make the situation worse. The situation could hardly get worse, for world security, and for the people of Iraq.

The lives of Iraqi citizens would improve dramatically if Saddam Hussein were no longer in power, just as the lives of Afghanistan's citizens improved after the Taliban.

Toensing: "Given what is known about the return of warlordism and chaos to Afghanistan—not to mention the fiction that Afghan women have all thrown away their burqas—this is a debatable proposition, and indicative of the administration's lack of interest in rebuilding Afghanistan. Why would Iraq be any different?"

Mahajan: "On every test of justice and of pragmatism, the war on Afghanistan fails. Worse, every one of these aspects, from an increased threat of terrorism to large numbers of civilian deaths to installation of a U.S.-controlled puppet regime is due to play out again in the war on Iraq. In fact, though it has been little noted, the sanctions regime has made Iraqis dependent on centralized, government-distributed food to survive and relief agencies have already expressed their concerns about the potential for a humanitarian crisis once war starts."

The dictator of Iraq is a student of Stalin, using murder as a tool of terror and control within his own cabinet, and within his own army, and even within his own family.

On Saddam Hussein's orders, opponents have been decapitated, wives and mothers of political opponents have been systematically raped as a method of intimidation, and political prisoners have been forced to watch their own children being tortured.

Jensen: "All of that and more was going on while Iraq was a 'valued ally' of the United States—hence the hypocrisy of the next few sentences."

America believes that all people are entitled to hope and human rights—to the non-negotiable demands of human dignity.

People everywhere prefer freedom to slavery; prosperity to squalor; self-government to the rule of terror and torture.

America is a friend to the people of Iraq.

Anthony Arnove, editor of the book *Iraq Under Siege*: "But the people of Iraq have good reason to feel otherwise. As Nichols Kristof of the New York Times noted in his October 4 report from Baghdad, 'while ordinary Iraqis were very friendly toward me, they were enraged at the U.S. after 11 years of economic sanctions. . . . Worse, U.S. bombing of water treatment plants, difficulties importing purification chemicals like chlorine (which can be used for weapons), and shortages of medicines led to a more than doubling of infant mortality, according to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization.' Another war on Iraq—this time, a 'pre-emptive' attack aimed at 'regime change'—will lead to more civilian casualties and damage to Iraq's infrastructure. And Iraqis are right to worry that the regime Washington installs, in violation of their right to self-determination, will be one that serves U.S. interests, not their own. We should recall the impact of the last war. In the words of Gulf War veteran Anthony Swofford, a former Marine corporal, writing in the New York Times, October 2, 'From the ground, I witnessed the savage results of American air superiority: tanks and troop carriers turned upside down and ripped inside out; rotten, burned, half-buried bodies littering the desert like the detritus of years—not weeks—of combat.' We should be skeptical of Bush's stated concern for the Iraqi people. His real interests in this war are not the Iraqi people, or defending Americans from attack, but expanding U.S. hegemony in the Middle East."

Our demands are directed only at the regime that enslaves them and threatens us. When these demands are met, the first and greatest benefit will come to Iraqi men, women, and children. The oppression of Kurds, Assyrians, Turkomans, Shi'a, Sunnis and others will be lifted. The long captivity of Iraq will end, and an era of new hope will begin.

Jennings: "The president has repeatedly claimed, 'We have no quarrel with the Iraqi people.' In his speech to the nation on Oct. 7, he said, 'America is a friend of the people of Iraq.' Try telling that to a friend of mine in Baghdad who walked out of his house following a U.S. bomb attack to find his neighbor's head rolling down the street; or to a taxi driver I met whose four year old child shook uncontrollably for three days following Clinton's 1998 'Monicagate' bombing diversion. Try telling it to the mother of Omran ibn Jwair, whom I met in the village of Toq al-Ghazzalat after a U.S. missile killed her 13 year old son while he was tending sheep in the field. Try telling it to the hundreds of mothers I have seen crying over their dying babies in Iraqi hospitals, and to the hundreds of thousands of parents who have actually lost their infant children due to the cruel U.S. blockade, euphemistically called 'sanctions.' Are the Iraqi people supposed to rejoice now that a new war is being forced upon them by their so-called 'friends'? It is understandable that people are frightened following the disastrous attacks of September 11. But fear is not a good reason to stop thinking. In fact, when we are in danger is when clear thinking is needed most of all."

Iraq is a land rich in culture, resources, and talent. Freed from the weight of oppression, Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time. If military action is necessary, the United States and our allies will help the Iraqi people rebuild their economy, and create the institutions of liberty in a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

Later this week the United States Congress will vote on this matter. I have asked Congress to authorize the use of America's military, if it proves necessary, to enforce U.N. Security Council demands.

John Berg, director of graduate studies of the government department at Suffolk University: "Our Constitution makes it clear that Congress, not the President, is to 'declare war'—that is, make the decision that war is necessary in a given situation. For Congress to delegate this determination to the President would be an abdication of its Constitutional responsibility.

Zunes: "According to the articles 41 and 42 of the United Nations charter, this can only be done if the U.N. Security Council finds the violator in material breach of the resolution, determines all non-military means of enforcement have been exhausted, and specifically authorizes the use of force. Otherwise, it will be illegal. Members of Congress would therefore be obliged to vote against it since—according to Article VI of the U.S. Constitution—international treaties such as the U.N. Charter are the supreme law of the land. Furthermore, if the United States can invade Iraq for its violations of U.N. Security Council resolutions, then Britain could invade Morocco, France could invade Turkey, Russia could invade Israel, etc."

Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. The resolution will tell the United Nations, and all nations, that America speaks with one voice and is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something. Congress will also be sending a message to the dictator in Iraq: that his only choice is full compliance—and the time remaining for that choice is limited.

Members of Congress are nearing an historic vote, and I am confident they will fully consider the facts and their duties.

The attacks of September 11 showed our country that vast oceans no longer protect us from danger. Before that tragic date, we had only hints of al Qaeda's plans and designs.

Today in Iraq, we see a threat whose outlines are far more clearly defined—and whose consequences could be far more deadly. Saddam Hussein's actions have put us on notice—and there is no refuge from our responsibilities.

We did not ask for this present challenge, but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, we will meet the responsibility of defending human liberty against violence and aggression. By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. By our actions, we will secure the peace, and lead the world to a better day.

Phyllis Bennis, author of the just-released book *Before and After: U.S. Foreign Policy and the September 11 Crisis* and a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies: "President Bush's speech ignored Congress, and instead was aimed at U.S. public opinion (where his support is dwindling) and international allies in the U.N. (where the U.S. is significantly isolated). It was designed to divert attention from the real reason for this coming war: oil and empire. It is a war designed to rewrite the political map of the Middle East, and is not dependent on the particular threat posed by a particular dictator. The crimes of the Iraqi regime are serious and longstanding—back to the days of massive U.S. economic and military support, and U.S. provision of the biological seed stock for the anthrax and other germs President Bush warned us about. But launching a massive bombing campaign against Baghdad, a city of more than 5 million inhabitants—grandmothers, kindergarten classes, teenagers—will not secure human rights for those living and dying under those bombs."

Thank you, and good night.

[From the Guardian, Oct. 8, 2002]

INSPECTION AS INVASION

(By George Monbiot)

There is little that those of us who oppose the coming war with Iraq can now do to prevent it. George Bush has staked his credibility on the project; he has mid-term elections to consider, oil supplies to secure and a flagging war on terror to revive. Our voices are as little heeded in the White House as the singing of birds.

Our role is now, perhaps, confined to the modest but necessary task of demonstrating the withdrawal of our consent, while seeking to undermine the moral confidence which could turn the attack on Iraq into a war against all those states perceived to offend US strategic interests. No task is more urgent than to expose the two astonishing lies contained in George Bush's radio address on Saturday, namely that "the United States does not desire military conflict, because we know the awful nature of war" and "we hope that Iraq complies with the world's demands". Mr. Bush appears to have done everything in his power to prevent Iraq from complying with the world's demands, while ensuring that military conflict becomes inevitable.

On July 4 this year, Kofi Annan, the secretary-general of the United Nations, began negotiating with Iraq over the return of UN weapons inspectors. Iraq had resisted UN inspection for three and a half years, but now it felt the screw turning, and appeared to be on the point of capitulation. On July 5, the Pentagon leaked its war plan to the New York Times. The US, a Pentagon official revealed, was preparing "a major air campaign and land invasion" to "topple President Saddam Hussein". The talks immediately collapsed.

Ten days ago, they were about to resume. Hans Blix, the head of the UN inspections body, was due to meet Iraqi officials in Vienna, to discuss the practicalities of re-entering the country. The US airforce launched bombing raids on Basra, in southern Iraq, destroying a radar system. As the Russian government pointed out, the attack could scarcely have been better designed to scupper the talks. But this time the Iraqis, mindful of the consequences of excluding the inspectors, kept talking. Last Tuesday, they agreed to let the UN back in. The State Department immediately announced, with more candour than elegance, that it would "go into thwart mode".

It wasn't bluffing. The following day, it leaked the draft resolution on inspections it was placing before the UN Security Council. This resembles nothing so much as a plan for unopposed invasion. The decisions about which sites should be "inspected" would no longer be made by the UN alone, but also by "any permanent member of the security council", such as the United States. The people inspecting these sites could also be chosen by the US, and they would enjoy "unrestricted rights of entry into and out of Iraq" and "the right to free, unrestricted and immediate movement" within Iraq, "including unrestricted access to presidential sites". They would be permitted to establish "regional bases and operating bases throughout Iraq", where they would be "accompanied . . . by sufficient US security forces to protect them". They would have the right to declare exclusion zones, no-fly zones and "ground and air transit corridors". They would be allowed to fly and land as many planes, helicopters and surveillance drones in Iraq as they want, to set up "encrypted communication" networks and to seize "any equipment" they choose to lay hands on.

The resolution, in other words, could not have failed to remind Iraq of the alleged infiltration of the UN team in 1996. Both the Iraqi government and the former inspector Scott Ritter that the weapons inspectors were joined that year by CIA covert operations specialists, who used the UN's special access to collect information and encourage the republican guard to launch a coup. On Thursday, Britain and the United States instructed the weapons inspectors not to enter Iraq until the new resolution has been adopted.

As Milan Rai's new book *War Plan Iraq* documents, the US has been undermining disarmament for years. The UN's principal means of persuasion was paragraph 22 of the security council's resolution 687, which promised that economic sanctions would be lifted once Iraq ceased to possess weapons of mass destruction. But in April 1994, Warren Christopher, the US secretary of state, unilaterally withdrew this promise, removing Iraq's main incentive to comply. Three years later his successor, Madeleine Albright, insisted that sanctions would not be lifted while Saddam remained in power.

The US government maintains that Saddam Hussein expelled the UN inspectors from Iraq in 1998, but this is not true. On October 30, 1998, the US rejected a new UN proposal by again refusing to lift the oil embargo if Iraq disarmed. On the following day, the Iraqi government announced that it would cease to cooperate with the inspectors. In fact it permitted them to continue working, and over the next six weeks they completed around 300 operations.

On December 14, Richard Butler, the head of the inspection team, published a curiously contradictory report. The body of the report recorded that over the past month "the majority of the inspections of facilities and sites under the ongoing monitoring system were carried out with Iraq's cooperation", but his well-publicised conclusion was that "no progress" had been made. Russia and China accused Butler of bias. On December 15, the U.S. ambassador to the U.N. warned him that his team should leave Iraq for its own safety. Butler pulled out, and on the following day the U.S. started bombing Iraq.

From that point on, Saddam Hussein refused to allow U.N. inspectors to return. At the end of last year, Jose Bustani, the head of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, proposed a means of resolving the crisis. His organisation had not been involved in the messy business of 1998, so he offered to send in his own inspectors, and complete the job the U.N. had almost finished. The U.S. responded by demanding Bustani's dismissal. The other member states agreed to depose him only after the United States threatened to destroy the organisation if he stayed. Hans Blix, the head of the new U.N. inspectorate, may also be feeling the heat. On Tuesday he insisted that he would take his orders only from the security council. On Thursday, after an hour-long meeting with U.S. officials, he agreed with the Americans that there should be no inspections until a new resolution had been approved.

For the past eight years the U.S., with Britain's help, appears to have been seeking to prevent a resolution on the crisis in Iraq. It is almost as if Iraq has been kept on ice, as a necessary enemy to be warmed up whenever the occasion demands. Today, as the economy slides and Bin Laden's latest mocking message suggests that the war on terrorism has so far failed, an enemy which can be located and bombed is more necessary than ever. A just war can be pursued only

when all peaceful means have been exhausted. In this case, the peaceful means have been averted.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, it is difficult not to respond in full to the comments of the previous speaker. Those of us on both sides of the aisle who support this resolution understand the impact of war as well as the gentleman does, and we walk by with sadness not only at the Vietnam Memorial but also at the Holocaust Museum.

There are risks of action, but there are also risks of inaction. We take our responsibility here tonight seriously, and we face this resolution and the situation that we cannot turn away from.

Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I have a rule, too; and that rule is I will not go to an enemy's country and say that that leader is telling the truth and our President is misleading the American people.

As Winston Churchill said, the price of greatness is responsibility. Today we have the responsibility to do what is right and what is just, and what will provide for the security of the American people. We all without exception seek peace, but not at any price. We seek a lasting, long-term peace. That peace is obtainable because our President has forced Saddam Hussein to the negotiating table. And because we will speak with one voice, lasting peace through disarmament is possible, nothing less is acceptable.

I would first like to highlight the strikes that Iraq fires on our pilots. Acts of Iraqi aggression against our American and British air patrols in the no-fly zone occur on a daily basis. U.S. and allied forces have patrolled the no-fly zone since 1991. In the past 2½ years alone, U.S. fighters have been fired upon more than 2,300 times. In fact, just an hour after the letter was delivered to the U.N. stating that Iraq would again consider allowing weapons inspectors to their facilities, an American jet patrolling a no-fly zone was fired on six times.

Following the Gulf War in April 1991, the United Nations as a cease-fire condition ordered Iraq to completely open themselves to arms inspectors to ensure that Saddam Hussein was not developing weapons of mass destruction. The U.N. Security Council enacted Resolution 687 requiring Iraq to declare, destroy or render harmless its weapons of mass destruction in production infrastructure. Eleven years have passed; nothing has changed. Saddam Hussein continues to defy that order, and there is overwhelming evidence indicating that Saddam Hussein is developing mass quantities of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

Saddam is using weapons against other nations and against his own people. With these weapons Saddam Hussein will become the merchant for weapons of mass destruction for terrorists around the globe. Saddam Hussein is also aggressively trying to build nuclear weapons. He has the technology and know-how to build such devices. All he lacks is the fissile material. Once he acquires that material, he will be months or days away from being able to fire nuclear weapons beyond his own border.

Once he has that technology, he can bind U.S. hands through blackmail and intimidation and rule the Gulf region through threat and coercion. Saddam Hussein and his regime pose serious threats to peace and stability in the world. We cannot stand idly by and watch this happen.

Pursuing Iraq is a continuing of the war on terrorism, and our forces are up to the test. We must ask ourselves what is the responsible course of action for our country. Are we obliged to sit by and idly wait for a chemical, biological or nuclear 9-11? Or is it our responsibility to take steps to deal with the threat before we are attacked?

We have an obligation to defend against an attack on our people. We should be clear on the issue before us. It is not enough to get inspectors in. We have done this before, and we know this mad man has biological weapons.

To quote the wise words of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), we cannot entrust our fate to others, for others may never come. If we are not prepared to defend ourselves and to defend ourselves alone if need be, if we cannot convince the world that we are unshakeably resolved to do so, then there can be no security for us, no safety to be purchased, no refuge to be found.

Today Republicans and Democrats alike are concluding that this resolution needs to be passed to ensure that Saddam Hussein never has the opportunity to use his weapons of mass destruction against the United States. Iraq needs to not only subject itself to full inspections, but also disarm itself of all existing weapons.

The legislation in front of us gives the President the authority he needs to protect the American people and U.S. interests from Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction while at the same time respecting the prerogatives of Congress. We have the responsibility to act.

I encourage all Members to keep the constituents in mind and support this resolution. The way to peace is through strength. As President Bush said on Monday night, war is neither imminent nor inevitable. Compliance without exception to the resolutions in place and total disarmament equals peace. Anything less is an unacceptable risk to the safety and the lives of all Americans.

Without disarmament, we will lead an international coalition that will dis-

arm Saddam Hussein. Churchill said an appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile hoping it will eat him last. A vote for appeasement, not on my watch.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, previous speakers have referenced the fact that supporters of this resolution, supporters of authorizing force as a way of maximizing our chances of putting together meaningful Security Council action and multilateral action for the use of force, if necessary, this is being done on a bipartisan basis.

I simply want to reiterate that because I think our colleagues here and the American people should understand that this is not simply a position that the Bush administration or the Republican Party endorses, that a number of key people in the Clinton administration's national security team agree that an "aye" vote on this resolution is the right vote on this resolution.

Each of the following people have indicated that to me and to other Members of Congress in their visits to the Hill in the last month: our National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger; the Deputy National Security Adviser, James Steinberg; our Ambassador in the Clinton administration to the United Nations and the man rumored as likely to have become Secretary of State if Al Gore had become President, Richard Holbrooke; the architects of the dual-containment policy in the early 1990s who recognized that at this particular time containment of Saddam Hussein is no longer a sensible policy, Martin Indyk, first with the National Security Council and then Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs; Dennis Ross, Special Envoy to the Middle East; and Ken Pollack in charge of implementing the containment policy in the Clinton administration for the National Security Council; and Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Walter Slocum. All of these top Clinton administration officials, dealing with critical national security issues, say that for us building the right vote is an "aye" vote.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the base resolution authorizing the use of military force in Iraq. First and foremost, the administration has failed to demonstrate that we face such an imminent threat to our national security that a unilateral, preemptive strike is critical to our continued well-being.

Yes, we know that Iraq possesses biological and chemical weapons. Yes, we know that Saddam Hussein has used them against the Iranians and the Kurds in northern Iraq. But we also know that Iraq has not demonstrated an intent to use weapons of mass destruction against the U.S., our interests abroad, or any of our allies.

And as a result of expert testimony given before the Committee on Armed

Services, we also know Saddam Hussein is a decade away from acquiring nuclear-equipped ICBMs capable of reaching the United States.

In contrast, we have been presented evidence that a war in Iraq would significantly destabilize the Middle East.

□ 2200

Even worse, it could potentially topple friendly governments in countries such as Pakistan, Kuwait, and Jordan. If President Musharraf were to lose control of Pakistan, nuclear weapons would fall into the hands of a fundamentalist regime.

We have been presented evidence that a war in Iraq would cost the United States between \$100 billion and \$200 billion at the time when funds are desperately needed elsewhere, especially in our fight against Afghanistan and the war on terrorism. And we do know that deterrence has worked. The fact is that Hussein has failed to use his vast arsenal of biological and chemical weapons thus far because the threat of collective, immediate retaliation from the global community has kept Saddam within his own borders. In a worst-case scenario, the threat of his impending downfall could finally compel him to use these weapons, and our troops would be the ones to suffer the consequences.

Thus far, I have not seen evidence that warrants the loss of American lives in Iraq. Under no circumstance should our servicemen and women be asked to risk their lives unless there is no recourse.

Clearly, the United States and the rest of the international community, for that matter, is accurately aware that Saddam Hussein is a brutal, repressive dictator who has ruthlessly tormented his people for decades, but it is evident that any action we take against the state of Iraq, if it is to be successful, will require the help of our allies. It should require the cooperation of the United Nations and its Security Council. These things should be in place before we tilt against our enemy. Otherwise, we risk becoming what we are fighting so hard against, a nation that creates its own rules and does not care about the international community. By taking unilateral action prior to exhausting all diplomatic efforts, the U.S. would set a dangerous precedent and undermine decades of relative international stability.

According to former President Jimmy Carter, one of the most basic principles for making and keeping peace within and between nations is that in political, military, moral and spiritual confrontations there should be an honest attempt at the reconciliation of differences before resorting to combat.

In light of this, I will support the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) amendment. In the event that diplomacy fails, in the event that Saddam Hussein again obstructs access to military facilities, it is imperative

that Congress readdress this issue. If Saddam does not let unfettered inspections in, I will join with my colleagues in Congress to authorize the unilateral use of force, but until then we must act within the boundaries of international law if we expect our allies to emulate our actions when resolving a crisis of their own.

Harry S. Truman once said there is a right kind and a wrong kind of victory, just as there are wars for the right things and wars that are misdirected. And based on evidence that I have received, this potential war is misdirected. Our enemy was named on September 11. It is al Qaeda. Its name is Osama bin Laden.

On March 12, CIA Director Tenet testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that al Qaeda remains the most immediate and serious threat to our country, despite the progress that we have made in Afghanistan and in disrupting the network elsewhere. We have seen what al Qaeda is capable of, that it is al Qaeda, not Saddam Hussein, that has continually restated its desire to continue a wave of crippling, devastating attacks against us. U.S. and military intelligence resources should be focused on seeking out and disbanding the al Qaeda network. We owe it to the loved ones of those lost on 9/11. We owe it to every American family, for that matter, to finish what we have started.

As the most powerful military force in the world, a successful military strike can be easily carried out. Diplomacy, however, is immensely more difficult but shows more strength.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), another member of the House Committee on Armed Services as well as one of the leaders on education in this House.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I also thank her for the great leadership she has provided on this issue and many other issues before us in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here now almost 10 years, and we have heard before from our leadership that this will be the most important vote we take or this will be the most important vote we take, and granted those were important votes but I think they pale in significance to the vote that we will take on this issue. I think that is the reason why our colleagues for the most part have addressed this in a very serious manner, and I want to congratulate my colleagues for the way that this debate has been conducted.

This is something that I think that none of us wants to be discussing. We would much rather live in a world of peace, and none of us would have liked to have happen what happened September 11 or in other places around the world, but we do not have those wishes. We have to deal with reality.

During August and during my other trips home since then, I do not think I

talked to a single person that did not ask, are we going into Iraq and what is happening? As we discussed issue, some of them expressed to me strong reservations against going into Iraq. Some expressed strong support for going into Iraq or whatever we needed to do to defeat terrorism.

Today, we face a dilemma much like the dilemma that challenged Neville Chamberlain in the 1930s. He was confronted with the prospect of waging war against a madman or brokering peace based on thin promises. Chamberlain signed a treaty with Hitler hoping against reason that it would mean peace. Hitler mocked Chamberlain and he mocked the world when he ignored the treaty and broke his promises. Inaction in trying to appease Hitler resulted in ruin. By the war's end, Hitler's death toll had reached over 30 million people.

If we do not learn from history's mistakes, we are doomed to repeat them. Saddam Hussein is one of today's madmen and, like Hitler, he makes promises that last just long enough to quiet international fears. When the eyes of the world are not carefully trained on him, he returns to his evil ways.

The publicly available evidence against Saddam Hussein is compelling:

His aggressive invasion of Kuwait and brutal impression of the Kuwaiti people in 1990.

His record in complying with UN inspections. In total, Saddam Hussein currently stands in violation of 16 United Nations resolutions.

His repeated attempts to gain access to nuclear weapons.

His public praise of the attacks of September 11. While ideologically al Qaeda and Saddam are opposites, their common goal is the destruction of America. These two evils united pose a great threat to our security.

Because of the real threat that Saddam poses, President Bush has petitioned Congress to adopt the resolution before us. And as has been pointed out, leaders on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of this Chamber have worked with the President in drafting this resolution.

Today the debate is not really whether Saddam wants to gain nuclear weapons and use them on the U.S. and our allies. This is a frightening and well-documented truth. The true debate is whether or not America should seek permission from the UN before ridding the world of a regional and international danger.

While the resolution supports the President's efforts to work with the United Nations, it does not require that the U.S. receive U.N. approval before taking military action against Saddam Hussein. President Bush is committed to confronting the Iraqi regime with or without the support of the international community. He is committed and this Congress should be committed because, post-September 11, we know the harm that can be caused by combining Saddam's arsenal with al

Qaeda's will. Evidence of al Qaeda forces in Iraq is growing by the day, which means that the time to act is now.

Throughout our Nation's history, we have always led the cause of freedom, but even with freedom and security so clearly in danger we have treaded lightly when considering whether to wage war. We have treaded lightly because we value human life. Now we must move boldly because Saddam Hussein does not.

I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, last night, our President explained very clearly that Saddam Hussein is a malicious tyrant with weapons of mass destruction and the ability to use them. He has ignored U.N. resolutions more than a dozen times. He has supported terrorism. He cannot be trusted, and he can no longer be tolerated.

I have met with President Bush twice in the past 2 weeks to discuss Iraq and the threat that Saddam Hussein poses to America. President Bush provided me the evidence I need to support this resolution. Saddam Hussein is training terrorists to make and use weapons of mass destruction. He has these weapons, and I believe he will use them against our country and our people.

I have a brother-in-law in the United States Air Force and a first cousin in the United States Army. I do not want war. None of us want war. We all want peace. We all want to know America like we did before September 11, 2001. I do not want war, but what I do want is to prevent another attack on our people.

September 11, 2001, taught us a painful but unforgettable lesson about the evil that our enemies are capable of displaying and, yes, carrying out against our country and its people.

Our world has changed, our enemy has changed, and our approach must also change. This is a decision I never thought I would have to make. It is a difficult decision that has weighed heavily on me. But for the sake of my family, my neighbors, my constituents, and our country, I know it is the right decision, and that is why I will reach across party lines and stand by our President.

This resolution authorizes our President to use military action against Iraq as a last resort. He has said that he will continue to work with the U.N. and that he will seek to form a coalition of allies to disarm Iraq, if necessary.

Our responsibility is clear. We must rise to meet this challenge and pass this resolution so our men and women in the military, our allies across the globe, members of the United Nations, and, yes, even Saddam Hussein himself will know that we are united in our mission to make America safe again.

Our world has changed, our enemy has changed, and our approach must also change.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this will probably be the last time I speak on the floor of the House. It just suddenly dawned upon me. I do not know what the future holds for me, but I am not really worried about me tonight.

We have dealt with weighty issues during my 8 years here but none more important than this. I rise in support of the resolution, and I appreciate all of our Democratic colleagues who made it happen. I know the pressures on some of our friends on the other side are probably a lot more immense than they have been on me, and I applaud their courage.

□ 2215

I applaud your courage. For those who vote "no," I respect you and I understand you are voting your conscience, and that is the way it should be. The resolution, I do believe, is balanced, is firm, and is focused on defending the United States, in my opinion.

People in America need to know the following: this passage is a certainty. Debating is almost over. Action will soon follow.

Please make no mistake about what faces our Nation. The U.N. will act; Saddam Hussein will not comply; the United States and its allies, sooner rather than later, will use force to bring about regime change; U.S. lives will be lost; civilians will be killed and harmed. Victory will come at a very large price.

We are setting in motion tonight forces long overdue. When the smoke clears, the Iraqi people will taste freedom for the first time in decades, the terrorists will have one less ally, the world will be much smaller.

Evil is about to face the forces of good. Thanks to the men and women who serve us and their counterparts worldwide, one more domino will soon fall in the war on terrorism.

Regardless of how we vote, we will pull together soon and we will be one people, supporting our President. I ask for God's protection and guidance of our President and for all who serve under him. With God's guidance and his grace, we will prevail; and the world will soon be a better and safer place.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Government Reform, a person who speaks for truth and justice and has the courage of her convictions.

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

Mr. Speaker, these are the letters and e-mails that I have received from my district, about 5,000 of them. These support authorizing the President to launch a preemptive unilateral war on

Iraq, 14 of them; and all the rest of them are saying no to war.

These are letters from veterans and teachers, mothers and fathers, Republicans and Democrats. In many different voices they are all saying, "War is not just another policy option. It must be the very last resort." These are serious and thoughtful letters from patriots who are deeply concerned, not only about the security of the United States, but the soul of the United States.

One constituent said, "Unilateral behavior is not the example we as Americans should display to the rest of the world. We should support and ensure the United Nations resolutions to the fullest. And, if necessary, we should lead in enforcing the United Nations resolutions."

Many others believe the President has provided no convincing evidence that going to war with Iraq is necessary or is the only option the U.S. has at this time. If the President does have the compelling evidence of imminent threat that my constituents want, he has not shown it to the Congress.

If Saddam is such a grave threat, why has the administration waited until this moment to try to make its case? And why, as recently as 1998, was Halliburton, the company headed by Vice President CHENEY, doing business with Iraq and helping them rebuild their oil fields?

Some of my constituents suggest that oil might have something to do with this, and some suggest it has more to do with November 5 than September 11. Many others raise the concerns of the constituent that says, "There are far too many other things that need to be dealt with in our country today, including health care, the state of the economy, corporate corruption, as well as a host of environmental and international issues, for us to make preemptive war."

The two things never suggested in these letters are, first, that Saddam Hussein is anything other than an evil and merciless dictator, and, second, that the United States should sit back and do nothing to disarm him. Yet the President in his speech dismissed those who oppose a preemptive strike by saying, "We could wait and hope that Saddam does not give weapons to terrorists or develop a nuclear weapon to blackmail the world."

Well, with all due respect, Mr. President, there are no waiters or hoppers in this pile or in this Congress. This is not about action versus inaction, and certainly not about appeasement. No one in this Chamber is a Neville Chamberlain.

As Chicago Tribune columnist Steve Chapman, who wrote a column called "Appeasement Myths," said, since Desert Storm, "No one has been appeasing him. On the contrary, we have let Hussein know that if he ever sets one toe across any of his borders, we will stomp him flatter than a straw hat on the interstate. The policy of containment backed by nuclear deterrent

is the same policy the United States employed against the Soviet Union for 40 years with successful results."

Mr. Speaker, I will include the full article for the RECORD.

A preemptive strike, in my view, puts America and the world in more danger, not less. CIA Director Tenet wrote, "Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions."

To me, this means Israel, our great-est ally in the Middle East, would become a target of those attacks, Saddam would likely unleash whatever chemical and biological weapons it may have on Israel, the Middle East would be in flames and the Arab and Muslim world united against the United States and Israel. The careful coalition that the United States assembled to fight what is an imminent threat, the terrorist threat of al Qaeda, would come apart. The United States would be at war, bearing all the costs and all the cleanup, which could take many years alone.

We would be putting our young men and women in uniform, as many as 300,000 of them in harm's way, in the way of very serious harm.

Information provided by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense raises very serious questions about our ability to adequately protect our troops from chemical and biological weapons. Can we justify sending them off to war with protective suits that may have holes in them when there are viable alternatives?

After World War II, the United States took the lead in creating the United Nations for the purpose of extending the rule of law. We took the lead in creating the United Nations for the purpose of extending the rule of law around the world in order to prevent future wars.

That goal, though too often elusive, is even more compelling today in a shrinking world in which technology makes it possible to virtually destroy the planet. The United States, the undisputed superpower, has the opportunity to use its great strength to lead the nations of the world toward accepting the rule of law; or we can, as the new Bush doctrine spells out, use our power to attack at will those who may in the future pose a threat. This dangerous and contagious idea of preemptive strike will usher in a new century of violence and even catastrophe.

We should vote "no" on this resolution granting the President the power to go to war, but we can vote "yes" for more appropriate and more sensible options. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) have provided us with resolutions that allow us to address the threat from Iraq without first choosing war.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article written by Steve

Chapman, "Appeasement Myths, the Realities of Iraq."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 6, 2002]

APPEASEMENT MYTHS, THE REALITIES OF IRAQ
(By Steve Chapman)

Should we go to war to stop Hitler? That question may surprise you—at least if you operate on the assumption that Hitler is dead and not about to go anywhere.

But conservatives insist that Hitler has been reincarnated in the form of Saddam Hussein. They say that like the British of the 1930s, who had to choose between the concessions offered by Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and the military action urged by Winston Churchill, we have to decide between cowardice and courage.

The Weekly Standard magazine labels all the opponents of this pre-emptive war "the axis of appeasement." The Daily Telegraph of London sneers, "Just as the prospect of invading Iraq provokes clerical and secular hand-wringing now, so did the prospect of taking up arms against Nazism then." When Illinois Sen. Dick Durbin announced he would vote against a resolution authorizing the president to invade Iraq, his Republican opponent Jim Durkin immediately detected the stench of "appeasement."

Exhuming the Nazis to justify war is not a tactic unique to conservatives. Liberals accused the United States of shameless appeasement in refusing to send troops to stop the war in Bosnia. Both sides claim to have learned the lessons of history, but the only episode they can ever seem to remember is the rise of the Third Reich.

But they don't even know much of that history. Anyone trying to apply the experience of Nazi Germany to the case of Iraq can see two obvious things: Saddam Hussein is no Hitler, and our policy over the last 11 years looks nothing like appeasement.

Hitler had been in power just five years when he annexed Austria in 1938. Before that year was over, he had coerced Britain and France to surrender part of Czechoslovakia. In 1939 he invaded Poland. Denmark, Norway, Belgium and France soon followed. In 1941, he marched on Moscow.

It was a plan of conquest breathtaking in its speed and scope. Just eight years after gaining power, Hitler was on the verge of controlling an empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

And where is Saddam's imperial plan? He has been in charge of Iraq for some 30 years, and so far he's initiated hostilities with only two countries, Iran and Kuwait. Hitler dreamed of ruling the world. Hussein's grand vision was to control the whole of the Shatt al Arab waterway and some oil fields to his south.

For all his vicious nature, he has shown no interest in building an empire. In any case, that would be an impossibility for Iraq, which has just 23 million people and is surrounded by bigger nations.

As for his domestic realm, Hussein is unquestionably a ruthless despot willing to kill anyone who stands in his way. But that description would not begin to capture Hitler, who slaughtered innocents across the continent on a gargantuan scale. To equate Hussein with Hitler is like equating a snow flurry with an ice age.

If finding someone to impersonate the Fuhrer is tough, finding a modern-day Neville Chamberlain is even harder. When Hitler demanded the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia, Britain and France meekly gave it to him. When he proceeded to swallow up the rest of the country, nobody tried to stop him. When Hussein invaded Kuwait, by contrast, he unleashed Operation Desert Storm on himself.

No one has been appeasing him since then, either. On the contrary, we've kept the Iraqi regime confined to a tight little cage.

The two no-fly zones enforced by British and American fighters cover most of Iraq. Meanwhile, economic sanctions have kept him from buying weapons and spare parts, or doing much of anything to rebuild his army. "Hitler got more powerful with time, while Saddam has gotten weaker," notes John Mearsheimer, a defense scholar at the University of Chicago.

We've stationed thousands of troops in Kuwait, we have air bases in Saudi Arabia, and we generally keep an aircraft carrier within striking distance of Iraq at all times. In short, we've let Hussein know that if he ever sets one toe across any of his borders, we'll stomp him flatter than a straw hat on the interstate.

"Everyone agrees we have to take action against him," says Mearsheimer, who says the choice is not between war and appeasement, but "containment versus rollback." The policy of containment, backed by our nuclear deterrent, is the same policy the United States employed against the Soviet Union for 40 years, with successful results.

Hawks claim to be rejecting the policies of Neville Chamberlain that brought on World War II. What they're really rejecting is the policy of Harry Truman and Ronald Reagan—which won the Cold War and can win this one.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to my colleague from Illinois. I respect your feelings and your reasons for voting the way that you are going to vote when this resolution comes to a vote, and you are very honest in your expression of them. But I have to say that those who are supporting this resolution have similarly honest feelings and reasons for doing so.

It bothers me a little that you are questioning the motivation of those who support this resolution, and indeed the motivations of the President and the Vice President of the United States, at least indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), also a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. Authorizing the use of military force is not a decision for any Congress or any individual Member to take lightly. I approach the issue recognizing that American service men and women may well sacrifice their lives as a result. I also recognize that American use of force may have strategic repercussions that extend far into the future and into all areas of the globe.

Making this decision may well be the most somber responsibility that any Member of Congress has. Just because a decision is difficult, however, does not mean that we should try to avoid it or that we should automatically look for some option that makes us all feel more comfortable. There are those who seem to think that we should just continue along, waiting for an international consensus or deferring to the

United Nations, and thus avoiding having to make hard choices.

But wishful thinking and further delay will not lessen the dangers we face, but actually will increase them. History is replete with instances where failure to face up to a difficult circumstance in a timely manner ultimately resulted in a far greater price being exacted.

However difficult the choices, however uncertain the future, however alone we feel, we must do our best with the facts before us.

And there are certain facts that are beyond dispute. One is that Saddam Hussein heads an evil, aggressive regime which has brought immeasurable misery upon the Iraqi people and their neighbors. We know Hussein is a merciless killer who does not hesitate to massacre innocent civilians and has an intense hatred of the United States.

Another fact beyond dispute is that Saddam Hussein will stop at nothing to obtain the most deadly, terrifying weapons possible. As one of his former scientists has said, Iraq has been turned into "one giant WMD factory." We know he now has relatively advanced dangerous chemical and biological weapons. We know he is willing to use them, because he has used them before. We know for certain he is actively trying to acquire nuclear weapons, and we should not forget how badly we underestimated how close he was to actually building a nuclear device at the time of the Persian Gulf war.

So we know the character of the man and the regime, we know the kinds of weapons he has and is trying to acquire, and we know he is perfectly willing to use them. The only relevant facts we do not know are when Saddam Hussein will act and exactly what his tactics will be. But those are details that do not really affect the essential choice before us.

That choice is quite simple. On one hand, we can continue the approach of the past 10 years, hoping that Iraq can be contained and that Hussein will not use the weapons he has hungered for and that he has sacrificed so much to acquire. We can hope that one day he will choke on a chicken bone and be replaced by somebody who will voluntarily dismantle Iraqi weapons and weapon-making capability. With that option, we stake our future and our security upon wishful thinking.

The other option is to act. We can act with as many other nations as will responsibly join us to rid the world of the menace that Iraqi's weapons of mass destruction present. And we can act to better prepare our homeland for the kinds of dangers Hussein and those like him present.

There is no doubt that the United States is Hussein's primary target. Acting to eliminate this threat is acting to defend the country and the lives of our citizens. But given the unique position we occupy in the world, acting to eliminate this threat also fulfills a

special responsibility America has, a responsibility to lead, to be a force for good.

Some argue Hussein will not use his weapons, that he wants to possess them only for prestige in the region. They do not believe that he would ever assist terrorist networks like al Qaeda from acquiring and using such weapons against us, in spite of the fact he has a history of relations with these terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot risk the lives of my constituents or my children on guesses about what course this tyrant might take. I believe there are no limits to what Hussein will do if he, in his perverted world view, believes something is in his best interests, and that includes assisting other terrorists in attacking us.

With all of the uncertainties and risks, with less international support so far than we would like, the responsibility to deal with this evil still rests with us. I believe we should authorize the President to use military force to address this threat, and that we should fully support the President and the troops carrying out his commands as they strive to make this a safer, more just world.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get on the record a response to one of the prior assertions about the level of preparedness, equipment and training for U.S. troops who might be sent into harm's way.

□ 2230

I am proud to serve on the Committee on Armed Services, along with many of the Members who are here on the floor at this time. I believe we may be the most bipartisan or nonpartisan committee in the House.

As we led up to this debate, we have been briefed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other leaders of the military who have assured us that every conceivable means of protection, every conceivable tool that can be made available to the men and women who serve in uniform will be made available to them. We, in turn, have assured the military leaders that we as a committee and we as a Congress will spare no expense to make sure that is the case.

I just do not want there to be any misconception that if it is necessary to send these young men and women into combat that they will not have the very finest and best tools of protection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we hear over and over again this reference to preemptive war. I reject the notion that this is under the legal doctrine of preemptive war. We are dealing with a country, Iraq,

under the leadership of Saddam Hussein, that has violated resolution after resolution adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations, including resolutions adopted under Chapter VII, the peacemaking, peace-enforcing provisions of the United Nations charter. To engage in acts to seek to assure compliance with those resolutions and enforcement of those resolutions is not preemptive war in the traditional legal sense of the word; it is the enforcement.

I would remind my colleagues in my own party that this body voted on, and 181 of my democratic colleagues supported, the authorization of the use of air strikes to bomb key targets in Yugoslavia in order to stop humanitarian slaughter of Kosovars without a Security Council resolution, after the bombing had already started, and thought, properly so, that we were engaging in the right position for the United States. I would suggest that not only the humanitarian arguments in favor of dealing with Saddam's regime but the national security arguments, which I would suggest are even greater than those that existed when we authorized the use of force against Yugoslavia, compel a very similar conclusion here in the name of enforcing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for pointing out that fact; and he is accurate, that the Committee on Armed Services has received those assurances.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. HOSTETTLER), another member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for yielding me this time.

Today the question before this body, Mr. Speaker, is not "How shall we respond to the unprovoked attack by a foreign nation upon the United States or its fielded military forces abroad?"

We are not debating "How will we respond to the menace of a political and/or cultural movement that is enveloping nations across the globe and is knocking on the door 90 miles off the coast of Florida?"

Nor, Mr. Speaker, are we discussing a response to an act of aggression by a dictator who has invaded his neighbor and has his sights on 40 percent of the world's oil reserves, an act that could plunge the American economy, so dependent on energy, into a deep spiral.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and this point must be made very clear, we are not discussing how America should respond to the acts of terrorism on September 11, 2001. That debate and vote was held over a year ago; and our men and women in uniform, led by our Commander-in-Chief and Secretary of Defense, are winning the war on terrorism. It is with their blood, sweat, and tears that they are winning, for

every one of us who will lay our heads down in peace this night, the right to wake up tomorrow, free.

No, Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is "Will the House of Representatives vote to initiate war on another sovereign nation?"

Article I, Section 8 of the governing document of this Republic, the United States Constitution, gives to Congress the power to provide for the common defense. It follows that Congress's power to declare war must be in keeping with the notion of providing for the common defense.

Today, a novel case is being made that the best defense is a good offense. But is this the power that the Framers of the Constitution meant to pass down to their posterity when they sought to secure for us the blessings of liberty? Did they suggest that mothers and fathers would be required by this august body to give up sons and daughters because of the possibility of future aggression? Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that they did not.

As I was preparing these remarks, I was reminded of an entry on my desk calendar of April 19. It is an excerpt of the Boston Globe, Bicentennial Edition, March 9, 1975. It reads, "At dawn on this morning, April 19, 1775, some 70 Minutemen were assembled on Lexington's green. All eyes kept returning to where the road from Boston opened onto the green; all ears strained to hear the drums and double-march of the approaching British Grenadiers. Waving to the drummer boy to cease his beat, the Minuteman Captain, John Parker, gave his fateful command: 'Don't fire unless fired upon. But if they want to have a war, let it begin here.'"

"Don't fire unless fired upon." It is a notion that is at least as old as St. Augustine's Just War thesis, and it finds agreement with the Minutemen and Framers of the Constitution.

We should not turn our back today on millennia of wisdom by proposing to send America's beautiful sons and daughters into harm's way for what might be.

We are told that Saddam Hussein might have a nuclear weapon; he might use a weapon of mass destruction against the United States or our interests overseas; or he might give such weapons to al Qaeda or another terrorist organization. But based on the best of our intelligence information, none of these things have happened. The evidence supporting what might be is tenuous, at best.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I must conclude that Iraq indeed poses a threat, but it does not pose an imminent threat that justifies a preemptive military strike at this time.

Voting for this resolution not only would set an ominous precedent for using the administration's parameters to justify war against the remaining partners in the "Axis of Evil," but such a vote for preemption would also set a standard which the rest of the world

would seek to hold America to and which the rest of the world could justifiably follow.

War should be waged by necessity, and I do not believe that such necessity is at hand at this time. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please vote "no" on the resolution to approve force at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a new, strong voice on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to debate an issue that is of great importance, an issue that involves both the known and unknown consequences that only a war can produce, for America, the Middle East, and indeed, the entire world. This will be by far the most difficult vote that I have had to take since I became a Member of this body in 1998. It comes at a time when many Americans, particularly many New Yorkers from the Sixth Congressional District which I am proud and honored to represent, are still in pain from the trauma of the attack on 9/11.

I have no love for Saddam's brutal regime, and I would support any action that the international community and the United Nations and our friends in Europe and Asia and the Islamic world would agree was in the best security interests of the world community. I, however, do have questions about why we must take this vote now. What is different between now, 4 months ago, 12 months ago, 24 months ago, or 48 months ago?

More importantly, I have deep concerns, many echoed by allies and Iraq's neighbors, about the unforeseen consequences and instability which would be caused by the U.S. military attack on Iraq.

At a time when the economy is faltering and so many other domestic issues are being left unattended, this Congress is being forced to consider the authorization of the use of force, perhaps unilaterally, against a regime we have known about for 20 years, a regime which has always been undemocratic and brutal against its own people. Yet our government once ignored those facts because it was felt it was in our best interests to support the regime with the very same capabilities we now say threaten America.

At a time when we are in the middle of a war against terrorism with the help of a number of majority Muslim nations who are protecting American lives against known threats, this authorization of use of force against potential threats could result in the reduction of help from new friends and allies and, thus, put the lives of Americans at risk. Is that what we want to do?

It is not surprising that during a time of mourning and healing and,

most of all, fear, we would speak of the evils of Saddam as a threat to America and a threat to the world but yet not provide this Congress with the evidence to support such claims.

Certainly, when it comes to our security, there is no debating that I stand with all Americans when it comes to protecting Americans, and that is why I fully supported any and all actions to bring those who committed attacks on 9/11 to justice.

Yet, as of last night, no evidence has been offered linking Saddam Hussein to those who attacked us on 9/11.

More importantly, let us not tell the American people and the world that we would use force against Iraq in the name of the world's freedom and security. Let us not say we are authorizing the President to use force against Iraq to protect the credibility of the United Nations by enforcing all U.N. security resolutions pertaining to Iraq.

I have yet to see the world, nor Iraq's neighbors, ask America to protect it from Iraq. In fact, many friends and allies in our own intelligence agencies say a number of other nations pose far greater threats to security.

Others, both inside and outside this administration, speak about "sending a message" and that the "credibility" of our Nation and the world is at risk if we do not stand ready to act with force.

I want every Member to say that they are ready to comfort a loved one of an American soldier who might give their life for their country not to confront a threat but because it was important to send a message. Since when do we authorize the use of force not to address a threat but because not to use the force would hurt our credibility?

It is not surprising that during a time of mourning and healing and, most of all, fear, we would speak of these potential threats from Iraq and mix them with the war against terror as a pretext for bringing back an old approach to national security and call it a new policy.

The ideas of using pre-emptive military strikes against unknown threats and even the ability to potentially threaten, as stated in the administration's new national security strategy on September 20, 2002, are not new. The very same ideas can also be found in the 1992 Draft Defense Planning Guidance document and the 1993 Defense Strategy for the 1990s document. Both of these documents were written under the direction of the current Vice President, the Deputy Defense Secretary and Secretary of State when they served in various Defense Department-related positions in the last Bush administration.

If we truly live in the new world, then why is the Bush administration presenting us with what it calls a "new approach" to national security for Americans in a new world, using the same old ideas that were once rejected by the American people, ideas which even Nelson Mandela said could be a threat to world security?

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that this debate about Iraq raises two fundamental questions for our Nation and for our generation, questions which, depending upon how they are answered, will affect the lives of generations to come.

One, what kind of world do Americans want our children to live in?

Two, in the 21st century, do Americans think the best way to achieve security is by U.S. global military dominance or U.S. global cooperation?

I believe that after 9/11 it is now more important than ever for the American people to have a greater say on whether they believe they will be safer in America and, in an increasingly smaller world, if their government adopts a posture of global military dominance or a posture of global cooperation.

Many Americans feel that increased public diplomacy must be a part of the war against terrorism because one of the reasons why a murderer like bin Laden was able to recruit individuals to attack Americans is because some in the world are isolated and do not know the truth about America.

Fighting terrorism requires global solutions, which can only be obtained through cooperation, not by threatening the world that we will go it alone whenever the world does not see things our way.

The use of the world's greatest military power in a preemptive strike against others is not a foreign policy of strength. It is a foreign policy of fear.

I will always stand for protecting America and given the fact that we will soon begin spending more money on defense than the combined spending of the next 19 nations in the world, I am confident that our military power assures that any nation that attacked us would be defeated in battle.

We were not attacked by any nation on 9/11. When it comes to protecting America from terrorist groups like Al Qaeda, recent history shows that we can beat them as well, when we have the help and cooperation of others.

A pre-emptive strike against Iraq will squander the opportunity to build on the existing cooperation we now enjoy and to create even greater levels of global cooperation on other issues of concern to the world—including issues which are the root causes of terrorism.

We can take action and we should. We can work with others in the same way we are working with the world to combat Al Qaeda. We can demonstrate true leadership by exhausting all diplomatic means rather than by simply falling back on the use of force.

I'm sure that this Administration and this Congress will always reserve the right to pursue a course of action to protect America's national security. However, we must realize that no matter how powerful our military is, our security is linked to the world's security. If this crisis is truly an issue of global peace, I urge America to work with the world to secure the peace for all.

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

Mr. Speaker, much has been said today, and I am sure over the next few days much more will be said, as it

should. The issue of authorizing the use of our Armed Forces is a momentous one, and it demands the thorough consideration of this Congress, and I believe we will be giving this some 30 hours of debate.

September 11 was a cruel wake-up call. After the Cold War, I am afraid our country indulged in the notion that we could shut out the world.

□ 2245

The Soviet military power that existed, coupled with the expansionist ideology of Marxism, had vanished as a threat to the United States. There was exuberance that America could cruise on the international front. During that time, we lowered our defenses and downplayed many troubling developments, including the rise of al-Qaeda and the rise of Saddam Hussein's capabilities, with his development of weapons of mass destruction, to harm our Nation.

September 11 harshly brought home the fact that the world is a dangerous place, it has always been, and that threats must be dealt with before they hit home, as they did hit home last year with such terrible impact.

Last night, President Bush made a powerful case against Saddam Hussein's regime. It has hostile intentions; it possesses weapons of mass destruction; it has means to harm us massively, means that are increasing daily; and that it is only a matter of time before Saddam strikes again against America's interests.

The President spoke even of Iraq possessing, and I am going to quote from his speech, "a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical and biological weapons across broad areas."

Well, that is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We have had a long debate today, and I would like to address a point that was raised earlier.

Iraq was described as an impoverished Third World nation. The suggestion was that there is no threat there. Many Americans may think of Iraq in this way. If so, they must realize that while many Iraqis are suffering under Saddam, his regime is not impoverished. As a matter of fact, our General Accounting Office, our GAO, did a study in which they found that some \$6.6 billion between 1996 and 2001 was siphoned off for use by the regime.

British intelligence, that did their own analysis all the way up until several weeks ago, tells us that between 9 billion and \$10 billion has been siphoned off in surcharges, kickbacks, illegal exports. Let me tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, that \$9 billion to \$10 billion pays for the development of a lot of weapons of mass destruction. One could buy a lot with that amount of money.

It is not improbable that Saddam Hussein is developing nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them. I tell the Members that U.N. inspectors

found plans for a bomb that would require 34 pounds of enriched uranium. I had an opportunity in the Committee on International Relations to ask our former CIA Director, James Woolsey, how long it would take if Saddam obtained the U-235, the enriched uranium, that he is attempting to obtain right now. He said if he had the uranium, it would take them about 4 months before a nuclear weapon was ready.

He may already have that uranium; and as we know from other reports, if he is not able to buy it on the world market, it is only a matter of time, 3 years at the most, before he develops that capability himself. So it is only a matter of time.

The Iraqi regime has long employed very capable scientists and technicians. Those of us who have traveled to Moscow talked to the Russians who ran their program, who have shared with us that some of their very capable scientists are in the Middle East today, some of them working in Iraq.

Iraq has access to a developed infrastructure. The regime has ample resources from its oil wealth, giving it the ability to bid for the considerable scientific and technological expertise. They use front organizations and front companies in order to obtain this technology into Iraq. They have key materials that have been floating around since the break-up of the East bloc.

So this is not a ragtag dictatorship we are dealing with; it is an able tyranny dedicated and capable of doing us real harm. That is why action has to be taken to disarm Saddam Hussein.

I would like to address some of the other concerns that have been expressed on the floor of this House today. Some opponents of this resolution have asked, why now? I would like to point out to my colleagues that it was in 1998, 4 years ago, that Congress concluded that Iraq's continuing weapons of mass destruction program threatened vital U.S. interests. Congress then urged the President to take appropriate action to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations, including relinquishing its weapons of mass destruction.

The Iraqi Liberation Act that Congress passed that year endorsed a change of the Iraqi regime, and that was 4 years ago. Our Nation did not do anything to effectively address this, but Congress recognized it as being a real threat.

By authorizing action to forcefully address this challenge now, we are hardly being rash. If anything, this action is overdue. The fact is that Iraq for years has pursued weapons of mass destruction with great determination. It had a crash nuclear weapons program prior to the Gulf War. It is estimated that were it not for the war, Iraq would have had nuclear weapons no later than 1993.

Neither Saddam's Gulf War defeat nor a slew of U.N. resolutions were a deterrent. In 1998, the International Atomic Energy Agency dismantled extensive nuclear weapons facilities in

Iraq, including three uranium enrichment sites, as President Bush noted last night. This regime has been operating free of inspectors for the last 4 years. Is there any reason to believe that Iraq is not near acquiring a nuclear weapon?

Some have charged that all questions have not been answered. What will a post-Saddam Iraq look like? Yes, it is our responsibility to best anticipate what a post-Saddam Middle East will look like and best account for it, but we cannot allow ourselves to be paralyzed by the uncertainty that is part and parcel of international politics. To resist acting in the face of a mortal threat because we do not have a crystal ball would be folly.

Did we have all the answers when we intervened in Afghanistan? No. We heard that we would get bogged down in a bloody quagmire, as the Russians did a dozen years earlier. We did not. Yes, we have much work left to do in Afghanistan, but our military has performed in the stellar way many of us expected it would. The Taliban was routed, as was part of al-Qaeda.

Those who oppose this resolution based upon concerns about stability in Iraq and the region should ask why their vision of stability in Iraq and the region is based upon Saddam's continued role. Is that the best this region can do?

Some have raised concerns about the Iraqi people, suggesting they will suffer. If war comes, there certainly will be suffering, but I suggest that nothing is harming Iraqis more than Saddam's tyranny. We do have Iraqi children without food and medicine, but let us lay responsibility where responsibility belongs: on this palace-building dictator who squanders his nation's resources.

This is one of the most repressive regimes in the world. Amnesty International has reported that Iraq is the country with the greatest number of people missing or unaccounted for. One human rights group reports that Saddam has killed over 500 journalists and intellectuals, and tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary Iraqi citizens have been subjected to arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, torture, burning, electric shocks, starvation, mutilation, and rape. This is how Saddam's regime makes Iraqis suffer. I can only imagine its disdain for Americans.

Saddam is in possession of weapons of mass destruction. He is working to advance his deadly arsenal. Can there be any doubt that we must act before our Nation is hit?

It is always easier to kick a problem down the road, to deal with it later. We do that too often around here. What is required to beat that syndrome is leadership, leadership willing to deal with an unpleasant situation head on. That is what our President and his national security team are showing.

Critics say that the administration is not exploring all options. It is explor-

ing options. We may avoid war. What option the President has no interest in, though, and I think this is to his credit, is shirking his responsibility for the defense of our Nation. He certainly is not willing to allow the nations of the United Nations Security Council to dictate the terms by which our Nation is defended, which is what some are calling for.

After any military action, it will be incumbent upon our country to stay the course to see that the new Iraq no longer threatens us. That means ridding the country of weapons of mass destruction, but also helping to see that Iraq has a chance of becoming a successful state. This will mean helping the Iraqi people, to whom, it should be emphasized, we hold no hostility.

Helping build stability is our current challenge in Afghanistan, and helping to give Afghanistan and Iraq a chance for stability and a decent government will require a substantial U.S. commitment. Given the threat to our security that Iraq and Afghanistan pose, we must make this investment.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services had a couple of minutes left, but I yield back the balance of our time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in this House, and indeed, in homes across America, we are debating whether to use force to disarm Saddam Hussein if he fails to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, if he fails to submit to unfettered inspections, and even if we must go it alone.

The President has come before the Nation to make the case for strong intervention and to attempt to answer many of the difficult questions being posed by the American people: Why is Iraq unique when other nations possess weapons of mass destruction? Why now, when Iraq has been ignoring the U.N. resolutions for 11 years? What effect will this have on the broader war on terrorism? Will an invasion of Iraq in the end make us safer or more at risk?

All of these questions are legitimate. None admits of a simple answer; and none can be answered completely, depending, as they do, upon the unknowable caprice of a despot. But there are certain facts which I believe are indisputable.

First, Saddam Hussein has chemical and biological weapons, and is developing a nuclear weapons capacity.

Second, an inspection regime in which hundreds of acres of so-called palace grounds are off limits is no inspection regime at all. In fact, it is worse than no inspections, giving, as it does, a false sense of security and effectiveness.

Third, Saddam Hussein will never submit to a real inspection regime without the credible threat of force.

Fourth, we cannot continue to allow Saddam Hussein to fire on American

pilots who seek to enforce United Nations resolutions.

Finally, the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's weapons program will only grow over time; and in time, he will have the atomic bomb.

Of all the dilemmas facing our Nation in light of these facts, the central issue is this: How imminent is the threat to this country from Iraq?

The threats we face after September 11 are different in kind than those we have faced in the past. We will never likely see enemy troops massing on our borders, threatening to dominate Europe, or attacking our bases with large fleets of ships or planes. The predominant threat we must now address comes from terrorists and the states that sponsor them, terrorists who cannot be contained and cannot be deterred, and terrorists that can act with great suddenness and ferocity, causing dramatic loss of life.

It is fair to ask ourselves whether, on September 10, prior to the devastating attacks on this country, we would have adjudged al Qaeda an imminent enough threat to justify the strenuous use of force to rout out the terrorists in Afghanistan. Apparently, we did not. Just as plainly, we cannot wait until 3,000 more Americans lie in their graves to warrant our intervention when other threats materialize.

□ 2300

The narrow question before Congress right now is whether the threat from Iraq is imminent enough to support a resolution authorizing the use of force to compel this armament if persuasion fails. On the basis of information I have received, both classified and unclassified, from meetings with the President, National Security Advisor, Secretary of State, regional experts, defectors and others, I believe it is; and I am concerned that the failure of such a resolution at a time when our Commander-in-Chief is before the United Nations would be deleterious to our efforts to engage that world body.

The original resolution drafted by the President was too broad, and I did not support it. Through negotiation with the Democratic leadership, the resolution was considerably narrowed to require the President to exhaust all efforts through diplomatic and other peaceful means before any resort to force could be made, to limit the scope of his authority to Iraq, rather than the entire region, to require compliance with the War Powers Act and to compel frequent consultation with Congress.

In the House Committee on International Relations on which I serve, I supported amendments to narrow the President's authority further still, including the Biden-Lugar amendment, which contained even stronger language compelling the use of force to compel disarmament. These amendments were unsuccessful, and I supported the bipartisan compromise resolution on final passage out of the committee, and I will support it here on the floor.

My vote in favor of this resolution and my desire to support the administration's efforts that the United Nations should not, however, be taken as an unequivocal endorsement of the administration's handling of Iraq over the last year. It is not. The administration must not go about this alone or unilaterally but redouble its effort to enlist the support of our allies until it is successful, as I believe it can be. The administration must change the nature of its rhetoric, rhetoric which on a host of issue has shown too great a willingness, at times an eagerness, to go it alone on a whole range of issues, a policy and a tone which has made the process of gathering international support much more difficult than it should have been.

I share the concerns expressed by hundreds of my constituents that this country not rush to establish a precedent that every country is justified in unilateral military action against all perceived threats and that the best way to distinguish our conduct from other nations considering their own preemptive actions in the future is to persevere in our determination to build international support for international action.

I hope that military force is not necessary. As the President said in his speech last night, "Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable." But if force is required to disarm Iraq, I have great faith in the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. They will do their job bravely and effectively, and we will be successful. We will win the war.

Let us resolve also to take the longer and no less complex task of winning the peace. We must not risk the lives of American soldiers to replace one Baath party dictator with another, to allow Iraq to disintegrate or degenerate into tribal warfare. We must be committed to the long-term prosperity of the Iraqi people, to the establishment of the democratic institutions, and to the rights of speech and association and the free exercise of religion.

We must embrace a broad vision, one that works to democratize the Middle East, to secure its rebirth and the elevation of its civilization, and a vision comparable to the Marshall Plan at the end of World War II. This will be no minor undertaking and will represent a significant departure from past policies, which have too often favored oil and friendly autocracy over principle and popular democracy. It will also require an investment in the very future of the very nations which now threaten us. But as post World War II Europe has illustrated, with every effort we make and every dollar we contribute, our own peace, security and prosperity will be rewarded.

On September 10, the danger from terrorists was imminent, and we took no action. On September 11, we were devastated. Now it will forever be September 12, the day we realized that our

military might alone, stationary and defensive, could not deter, could not prevent, could not contain the threats against us. And so we must gather the freedom-loving nations of the world and act to disarm Iraq peacefully if at all possible, but to disarm. And in time also to rebuild so that what was once a cradle of civilization can again be a light to the world.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret but strong conviction that I rise today to express my support for House Joint Resolution 114.

No member of this body ever wishes to cast a vote that could ultimately lead to the loss of even one American life. Yet that is exactly what all of us, those who vote for this resolution and those who vote against, are doing today. Those of us who vote for the resolution must know that granting the President the authority to use force could lead to an invasion of Iraq and the possible loss of American troops. Those who vote against the resolution must know that denying the President the authority to use force could allow Saddam Hussein to use his weapons of mass destruction against us, costing untold loss of American lives.

So the question before us is not whether there is a safe course of action that will guarantee no loss of American life. Unfortunately, there is no such guarantee and no such option. Instead, the question is whether the threat posed by Saddam Hussein can best be removed by granting our President the authority to use force against him. In short, is this mission in our vital national interest?

Well, I say there is no interest more vital to the United States than protecting our citizens from the kind of attacks we suffered on 9/11 and could well suffer again at the hands of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

Must we grant the President the authority to use force in order to achieve this goal? In my view, the answer is yes. Force and the threat of force are the only message that Saddam Hussein understands. He is not a rational leader who acts in the interest of his citizenry. He is a despotic dictator who terrorizes his own people, his neighbors and the world community at large.

President Bush put it best in his address to the United Nations when he said that Saddam Hussein has made the case against himself. He has ignored with impunity every promise made, every commitment undertaken and every Security Council resolution passed.

Why has he done this? Because he can. We must grant our President the tools he needs to make it clear to Saddam Hussein that he no longer can. He

no longer can fire at our aircrafts, evade U.N. inspectors or continue his quest for weapons of mass destruction.

If granted this potent authority, will our President do the right thing? I say he will do the right thing.

No President of the United States ever wants to live again a day like 9/11. No President ever wishes to account for a fatal breach in national security. No President ever wishes to send our troops into harm's way for the sake of anything short of our vital national interest. And I have no doubt that no President, least of all this President, will use force unless it is the best means possible to keep America and Americans safe and secure.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on the Judiciary. But, more importantly, for many decades she has been a strong voice for women, for those who have no voice.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me time; and I commend him on the tremendous work that he does in this Congress dealing with the many complicated problems of foreign relations. I thank him for the time that he is allocating to me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution which would authorize the President to use unilateral military force against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the President has provided sufficient evidence to conclude that Saddam Hussein currently possesses significant quantities of weapons of mass destruction. Although I am aware that weapons inspectors found significant amounts of chemical and biological weapons in Iraq between 1991 and 1998, those materials have been destroyed. Since that date, there have been allegations of a growing arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, but there is to date no credible evidence of such an arsenal's existence.

□ 2310

Even if Saddam Hussein does possess weapons of mass destruction, Iraq does not represent an imminent threat to the United States of America. There is simply no evidence connecting Saddam Hussein with the 9-11 terrorist attacks. There is also no evidence to indicate that Saddam Hussein has ever given weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups.

Furthermore, Iraq is 6,000 miles away from the United States and the Iraqi regime lacks the capability to strike the United States from within its own borders.

The ultimate weapons of mass destruction are nuclear weapons. If administration officials are really concerned about other countries having weapons of mass destruction, they should turn their attention to Russia, China, India, Pakistan, and Israel, all

of which are known to possess nuclear weapons.

No one doubts that Saddam Hussein is a potential threat to his neighbors in the Middle East. He has attacked them in the past, and certainly he could do it again. However, Saddam Hussein's neighbors do not support military action against Iraq at this time, and it would be diplomatically and militarily unwise for the United States to initiate a war in the Middle East without the support and participation of a coalition of countries in the region.

If administration officials are concerned about countries that support terrorism, perhaps they should turn their attention to our friend and ally, the most undemocratic country, Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has been financing extremist Islamist madrassahs in Pakistan and other Islamic countries. These madrassahs, or schools, teach young boys an extreme interpretation of Islam, combined with a support for terrorism and hatred for America. But they are our friends, and I do not see talk or discussion from this administration about trying to bring about democracy in Saudi Arabia, or being concerned about the financing of the madrassahs and the things they have been doing for so very long.

The human and economic cost of a war on Iraq are completely unjustified. It has been estimated that a war on Iraq would cost between \$100 and \$200 billion. This would come at a time when we are already spending billions of dollars to wage a war against terrorism in Afghanistan. A war on Iraq could lead to the deaths of thousands of innocent citizens in Iraq and unknown numbers of American servicemen and women.

Mr. Speaker, we would like the President to finish the war on terrorism. While we have had some success in Afghanistan, we still have not located Osama bin Laden. Our servicemen have been fired on in Afghanistan every day, and they are all set to assassinate the President or the leader that we have supported in Afghanistan, and it could happen at any time.

I am deeply concerned that a unilateral war on Iraq would make Americans more vulnerable to terrorist attacks at home. A unilateral war on Iraq could lead to an increase in anti-American extremism throughout the Muslim world. This could destabilize countries in the Middle East and South Asia. It could also provide al Qaeda with an opportunity to recruit additional terrorists within these countries.

Al Qaeda is America's greatest enemy. We should be focusing our efforts on confronting the al Qaeda threat, while encouraging the people of the Middle East and South Asia to support democracy and oppose terrorism.

Instead of authorizing a unilateral war, Congress should support the efforts of the United Nations to resume weapons inspections in Iraq. The resumption of weapons inspections would

allow us to determine whether Saddam Hussein has the weapons of mass destruction that the Bush administration claims he has. Working with the United Nations would also illustrate to our allies and people throughout the Muslim world that the United States respects the rule of law and considers war a last resort.

I urge Members to oppose unilateral use of America's Armed Forces and give United Nations weapons inspectors an opportunity to do their work. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the gentlewoman and to the argument in terms of what has not been found regarding weapons of mass destruction. The Committee on International Relations had a hearing on this very recently.

During that hearing we heard testimony to the fact that Saddam Hussein was on the edge of a precipice with regards to the ability to unleash weapons of mass destruction. I am just going to briefly mention some of the work of Jeffrey Goldberg, who spent many months inside Iraq; and as he says, when Saddam Hussein maneuvered UNSCOM, the weapons inspectors, out of the country in 1998, the weapons inspectors had found a sizable portion of his arsenal, but were vexed by what they could not find. His scientists have produced and weaponized anthrax. They have manufactured botulinum toxin which causes muscular paralysis and death. They have made a bacterium which causes gas gangrene, a condition in which the flesh rots. They have also made wheat-cover smut which can be used to poison crops, and ricin, which, when absorbed into the lungs, causes hemorrhagic pneumonia.

And according to Gary Milhollin, the director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, whose Iraq Watch project monitors Saddam's weapons capabilities, inspectors could not account for a great deal of weaponry that is in Iraq's possession, including 4 tons of nerve agent VX, 600 tons of ingredients for VX, as much as 3,000 tons of other poison gas agents, at least 550 artillery shells filled with mustard gas; nor did they find the stores of aflatoxin which have been manufactured there that have been put on warheads.

I guess I would just echo the words of Jeffrey Goldberg when he says Saddam Hussein's motives are unclear because for the past decade the development of these weapons has caused nothing but trouble for him. His international isolation grows not from his past crimes, but from his refusal to let weapons inspectors dismantle his nonconventional weapons programs.

When Iraqi dissident Kanan Makiya was asked why Saddam Hussein is so committed to these programs he said, "I think this regime developed a very specific ideology associated with power

and how to extend that power, and these weapons play a very important psychological and political part."

So yes, we do have ample evidence.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to talk about what really has happened with the relationship that we have had with Saddam Hussein.

Does the gentleman understand that we are the ones that gave him anthrax?

Mr. ROYCE. No, I do not understand that. I respectfully disagree with the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. I disagrees with the gentleman, also; and I appreciate the time that the gentleman is giving me to counter some of his points.

In addition, would the gentleman agree that our inspectors decided to leave Iraq after it was discovered that they were there doing some of the work of the CIA instead of doing the inspections that they were supposed to be doing?

□ 2320

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Saddam Hussein was very effective in maneuvering our inspectors out of Iraq and has not allowed in our inspectors or any other inspectors for 4 years; and I also understand that during that 4-year time frame he has been developing not only chemical and gas weaponry, biological weaponry, but also nuclear weaponry. That is what I know. And I would commend to the gentlewoman to review our transcript of our hearing on this very subject.

Reclaiming my time, I would just say there may be some debate among arms controls experts about exactly when Saddam will have nuclear capability, but there is no disagreement that Iraq, if unchecked, will have them soon and a nuclear-armed Iraq would alter forever the balance of power in the Middle East. I think there is very little doubt that Saddam, if he had an atomic bomb and with these stocks of biological and chemical weapons, might not use that for the purpose of power.

Because when Jeffrey Goldberg talked about Saddam's past with the medical geneticist Christine Gosden, who has been there on the ground in Kurdistan working with Kurds, some 4 million of which are estimated to have been affected at one point or another by chemical attack, she said one thing. She said, please understand the Kurds were for practice. They were practicing with different types of chemical and biological weapons on the Kurdish population.

I think, under these circumstances, if we do not move forward with a plan to disarm Saddam Hussein, it would be folly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time; and I appreciate being part of this historic debate.

It has often been said that the most difficult decision a Member of Congress will ever have to make is a decision to send people in America to war. We are often told that we ought to approach it as if we are sending our own child to war. I do not have any children old enough to participate in a war at this time, but I do have one family member who will likely participate in this conflict. That adds extra gravity to this debate for me.

Earlier in this debate it was also mentioned that we ought to visit some of the war memorials around town. I did so last night. Late last night, I visited the Vietnam Memorial; and I can tell my colleagues that seeing so many names on that wall adds importance to the debate that we are having tonight, that we will have throughout this week.

We ought to let history be our guide here. But the most recent history in this case that we ought to look at is the vote that took place in this Chamber 12 years ago. During that time, we faced a very similar decision. Should we thwart Saddam Hussein in his attempt to go beyond his boundaries or should we appease him? Fortunately, the majority of this body and the other body agreed we ought to thwart him; and I think we can all agree that, had we not done so, that the biological and chemical weapons that Saddam Hussein possesses would be added to nuclear weapons which he would certainly possess today had he not been thwarted at that time.

We are in this position today, I would submit, because we have no other choice. This is our only reasonable option. War will no doubt come at great cost. When we visit the war memorials, we see that cost, but the cost of appeasement is far greater.

I commend the House leadership for bringing this resolution forward and for shepherding it through process. I especially commend our President who so forcefully pushed for this resolution and who has so deliberately pushed for this resolution.

I urge support for the resolution.

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

I would like to make a short statement that I am not so sure that the attempt to avoid war, the attempt to avoid death and destruction, the attempt to use as a last resort the horrific weapons of destruction and death that we have in our arsenals, weapons, smart weapons, weapons 10 times more accurate and deadly than we used 10 years ago, is necessarily appeasement. I think that we should use every deliberate ounce of strength in our bodies to avoid death and destruction, and to avoid that I think is stretching it when that is considered appeasement.

I yield 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the gentlewoman from North Carolina

(Mrs. CLAYTON), a person who serves on the Committee on Agriculture and whose strong voice we will miss as this is the last term she will be serving in this august body. She has made a strong mark for the great State of North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like most persons of deeply held conscience, I come to the House floor tonight deeply troubled. I am concerned about the threat of national security. I am concerned about the threat that Saddam Hussein poses to the world at large, and I am concerned about Saddam Hussein's willingness to thumb his nose at rest of the world.

However, these are not my only concerns. I am also deeply concerned about the way in which the administration is approaching this state of affairs. President Bush has said that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction, but he has not made a convincing and compelling case that Saddam Hussein poses such a dangerous, verifiable and immediate threat that the President should be granted the authority to attack Iraq preemptively or unilaterally. We have known for years that Iraq possesses chemical and biological weapons and, sadly, that he has used these weapons on people from his own country. We know factually that Iraq has refused to obey the resolutions of the United Nations.

Two troubling questions remain, Mr. Speaker.

First, why, after so many years, do the actions of Saddam Hussein become so immediate and so pressing that they cloud the consideration of any other matter of similar importance, especially on the domestic agenda?

The second question, Mr. Speaker, is who should enforce international law?

The President's latest address to the American people did not provide any new information about Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. Neither did it provide any conclusive evidence of Iraq's ability to develop nuclear weapons or a timetable for such development. We need more evidence. Therefore, I am calling on the United States to work with the United Nations to assure immediate resuming of unfettered inspection of Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons capacity. Only in this way can the President and the Congress make the case to the American people and our friends and allies that Saddam Hussein poses a real and dangerous and verifiable threat not only to his own people and Iraq's neighbors in the Middle East but to the United States and the cause of world peace. Only this way can we demonstrate to the American people and the rest of the world that we are committed to exhausting all potential diplomatic and international efforts before taking violent action.

Committing our Nation to war is a grave action in any circumstances. I

cannot without personal struggle decide to end an effort for peace, send our young people into terrible danger and put the lives of countless innocent citizens at risk. My faith, my humanity requires me to always seek peace over war, diplomacy over military action, compassion over aggression. In the current circumstances, when we have no clear reason to believe that Iraq poses imminent threat, though threat he has, we must act decisively, with all possible caution and humility. This is the only reasonable way to proceed.

Before we move to military action, we must assure that all other methods to resolve the situation has been tried and there is no other alternative. It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that this is the strategy that President Bush followed in getting other nations to join us in the fight against terrorism.

□ 2330

He would be well advised and we would be well advised to follow that same course. A unilateral first strike action would undermine the moral authority of the United States, result in untold loss of life, destabilize the Middle East, and undermine our ability to address pressing domestic needs. The Congress should, therefore, authorize the President to use force only in concert with the United Nations and only if weapons inspections fail.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD an editorial on Patsy Mink. I remind my colleagues that we lost Patsy Mink almost 10 days ago. In the Honolulu Advertiser, the editorial is entitled "Remember Patsy Mink: Slow the Rush to War."

Mr. Speaker, that is very wise advice for us too.

REMEMBER PATSY MINK: SLOW THE RUSH TO WAR

As Patsy Mink is honored today in our state Capitol's atrium, her colleagues in the nation's Capitol begin in earnest a debate on the language of a resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq.

How we wish she were there to participate in that debate.

Thirty years ago, Mrs. Mink, seemingly tilting at windmills, ran for president of the United States in the Oregon primary election in a campaign that made withdrawal from Vietnam its only issue. Ignoring such epithets as "Patsy Pink," she won a scant 2 percent of the vote—and the moral high ground.

Today a handful of voices have been raised in warning as this nation teeters on the brink of war. They warn of "unintended consequences." By 1972, of course, most of the dreadful consequences that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon had failed to foresee in Southeast Asia had become painfully clear. What had begun as a war against a backward peasant nation became in many ways, both home and in Vietnam, a wasted decade.

Mrs. Mink, of course, would not fail to recognize the evil intent of Saddam Hussein. Yet in today's debate, she would not stand for one minute for her party's strategy that says the quicker they can settle the war question, the quicker they can turn the page to the domestic issues on which they think they can get the traction needed to make gains in the upcoming midterm elections.

In this unseemly haste, the debate ignores momentous issues: whether the United States must fight and pay for this war alone, and what it would do to our global standing; whether the Bush administration has any plan at all for a post-Saddam Iraq; whether it has considered the destructive forces that might be released from this nation hastily carved from the Ottoman Empire after World War I, with its disparate population of Shiite, Sunni, and Kurd and Turkmen peoples; whether it has accurately assessed the cost of treasure and young blood in what could become another decade of armed neo-colonialism.

The Democrats have allowed this debate to become so narrowly framed as to be nearly meaningless. The debate, in essence, is over how soon we invade Iraq. That is, if the Democrats get their way, they will need to be assured by President Bush that he has exhausted diplomatic means; that U.N. sanctions and inspections haven't worked; and that the new war won't set back the "old" one—the war against terrorism.

These conditions may slow the coming war by weeks or months, but they won't stop it.

Omitted entirely from the debate is Bush's new National Security Strategy, which advances a doctrine of "pre-emptive" war-making that suggests that Iraq is only the first step in a violent reordering of the world.

Congress has already effectively ceded to Bush the authority to wage a unilateral, pre-emptive war against Iraq, whether or not the United Nations approves.

We urge the rest of Hawaii's congressional delegation to reflect well on Mink's honorable legacy of peacemaking—and to carry it back with them to the debate in Washington.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), a Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114, the resolution to give the President authority to use force against Iraq, if necessary, to protect our vital national security interests and to enforce the multiple resolutions of the United Nations calling for disarmament of that country.

I do not cast this vote lightly, as I know the President does not commit American forces to battle lightly. I have served in the Armed Forces of this country, and I have been in combat in Vietnam. I pray that no young American man or woman will ever have to go to war again.

But if we are to avoid war, we must be prepared to wage it. Iraq is a clear threat to this Nation and to all peaceable nations in the world. Saddam Hussein is a brutal tyrant, whose cruel and evil acts against his own people would make Joseph Stalin proud. But it is the threat he poses to other nations and other peoples that demands action now by this Congress and by this Nation.

He has previously invaded and subjugated other countries. He has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people and those of neighboring Iran. He has launched missiles against other Middle East countries. He has brutalized and starved and murdered minorities and opponents, real and imagined, in his own country. He has defied the United Nations demands

that he submit to inspectors and disarm his ghastly weapons of mass murder. He has supported elements of terrorism operating around the world.

For 10 years, the civilized world has maintained a policy of containment for Iraq that includes economic sanctions, no-fly zones, diplomatic isolation, and a credible military presence in the region. While it has contained Iraqi aggression to this date, it is no longer sufficient. Now we must be prepared to take stronger action.

In his speech Monday evening, President Bush made a persuasive argument for immediate steps to destroy the deadly weapons Saddam Hussein possesses. I will support this resolution, which gives the President authority to use force to accomplish that goal.

We all hope conflict can be avoided, but there should be no doubt in the minds of any here today or any in the world that the best hope of avoiding conflict is for the United States and the United Nations to adopt strong, unequivocal positions, making crystal clear our intentions to destroy those deadly weapons.

There must be no crack in our resolve that allows Saddam Hussein to slip through. There must be no glimmer of equivocation that can give rise to further delay on his part. If war is to be avoided, he must disarm, and he must disarm now.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, I am very conscious of the responsibilities we and other nations in our coalition will assume in the aftermath of conflict. We must be prepared for large movement of refugees, particularly if Saddam Hussein uses chemical and biological weapons against populated areas. We must be prepared to treat victims of his cruel crimes. We must be prepared to provide humanitarian assistance to those who need it.

In the longer term, we will also need to be prepared to deal with the reconstruction of Iraq, physically and politically. The former will be easier, for this is a country with revenues that can be generated from oil and with an infrastructure that is excellent by developing-country standards.

Providing transition to a democracy will be more difficult. This is a country ruled by a tyrant that has brooked no dissent for a generation. It lacks the most rudimentary institutions that can be used to create a pluralistic, multi-ethnic democratic form of government. Achieving this will require a sustained, long-term commitment on our part, as well as from other nations in Europe, in Asia, and most important, in the region surrounding Iraq.

This commitment, if sustained, could have benefits far beyond Iraq's borders and far beyond the events that bring about a new regime. Democracy in Iraq could speed a settlement of the terrible Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It could convince other countries in the region that transition to democracy is pos-

sible without cataclysmic political upheaval.

No one should imagine this will be easy. No one must doubt the difficulties that lie ahead of us, the dangers that lurk at every corner. But if we are prepared to assume the responsibility for the future of Iraq in war, we must also be willing to shoulder that burden in the peace that follows.

My colleagues in this House, not one of us relishes this moment. The burden falls heaviest on the President, but it also falls on our shoulders as we prepare to authorize the use of force. Our men and women in uniform will be put in harm's way. And if there is to be a war, civilians will die.

But the consequences of not acting are much graver, far worse. The prospect of Saddam Hussein having more weapons of death to use is too real, the possibilities of loss of life numbering in the tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands too monstrous to contemplate.

We act with great reluctance, but this Congress will act. We seek peace, but Saddam Hussein must know this President, this Congress, this Nation, will not flinch when called upon to protect our national interests. We will vote to give the President the authority he needs to wage war that we might secure peace.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond briefly to a couple of the comments made by my colleague from North Carolina.

Although we agree on many of the same underlying facts, we have disagreed on the conclusion to be drawn from those facts. But there was one point in particular on which I wanted to note my agreement, and that is the point that I think it would be very important for the administration to show more of the evidence it possesses of Saddam Hussein's possession of weapons of mass destruction.

The President in his speech last night quoted, quite appropriately, from President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis. But probably the most vivid image that most Americans have of that period was the demonstration of the aerial photographs of missile silos in Cuba, the very direct, very unequivocal proof of that threat 90 miles from our shore.

So, too, I think it would be important for this administration to be more forthcoming with the evidence it possesses, to demonstrate unequivocally to the American people, for whom many still have questions that Saddam Hussein does in fact possess chemical and biological weapons, because he does possess them; is in fact working to acquire nuclear weapons, because in fact he is working in that direction.

Now, I realize that that chore is made more difficult in some respects, but easier in others. More difficult in the fact that some of the technology we are talking about is dual-use technology, and from aero-satellite it may

not be possible to determine whether the rebuilding of chemical and biological weapon facilities which is currently ongoing can be argued to be done in the interests of some civilian application.

But while there are those challenges, and, of course the challenge that once we disclose our knowledge of the whereabouts of chemical or biological weapons, those weapons will be moved, thwarting later inspections, while those challenges are, nonetheless, real and great, we also have a commensurate increase in our technological ability. Our ability to gather intelligence is much greater than it was in the early 1960s. And, notwithstanding the cost of sharing some of that evidence, the benefit that would accrue to the administration in making its case to the American people would be substantial.

□ 2340

Iraq, Saddam Hussein, his foreign minister, his spokesman, all unequivocally deny the presence of chemical and biological weapons. Showing the proof of that lie, I believe, is very important for the administration to do and very much within its capability.

The second point I wish to emphasize tonight which I think the administration will be well served to emphasize and which was lacking, perhaps, in the President's speech, and that is the importance of talking more deliberately and more thoroughly about the Iraq that America would like to see in the future, an Iraq with free institutions, an Iraq that is once again prosperous. Our long-term commitment for that is what it will have to be, a prosperous and free Iraq.

This is not only important I think in terms of the American people understanding that this is not about oil, that this is about the long-term peace and security of that region and our own long-term peace and security, but it is also important for the rest of the world to understand. And I think it may be even most important for the Iraqi people to understand, the possibilities that the future holds for the people of Iraq once the regime in Baghdad changes.

So I would urge the administration, notwithstanding the support that I think will come from this body and from the Senate for the resolution, to be more demonstrative in the proof that it does possess of the evidence of weapons of mass destruction now and also to be more thoughtful and more articulate in describing the type of Iraq the administration is committed to seeing.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, over the last weeks I have heard from and spent time with

many of my western Pennsylvania constituents. Some are World War II veterans, Korean veterans, some steelworkers, homemakers, business people, teachers. As I stand here tonight on the House floor, though, foremost in my thoughts is a small group of constituents who marched and prayed in support of peace outside of my office in Bridgewater, Pennsylvania.

I share these individuals' desire for peace.

Following the attacks on September 11, we Members of Congress were asked to do all that we can to prevent anything like that from ever happening again. It is our responsibility to defend this Nation.

America stands as a beacon of freedom to the world, one that blazes even more brightly as a result of our response to last September 11. Unfortunately, we continue to be despised by madmen like Saddam Hussein, a madman who has access to chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and has been increasing his capacity to use them.

Our deliberations on this resolution can follow but one light, the light of experience, and our experience has shown that Saddam Hussein has ignored countless peaceful overtures that would have prevented our current dilemma. He has murdered his own people in barbaric and horrible ways. He has attacked his neighbors and continues to build weapons of mass destruction unchecked. Given this and his stated pathological hatred for America, the devastation he can inflict upon us is a severe risk. Simply allowing this risk to increase is unacceptable.

We cannot continue to deceive ourselves. This is a problem that will not disappear and will not take care of itself.

As this chart shows, Saddam Hussein has ignored the United Nations and the very resolutions to which he agreed following the Gulf War over and over again. Today, 11 years later, he continues to ignore the United Nations, retains chemical and biological weapons, and amasses more offensive weaponry as each day passes.

Our resolution makes it abundantly clear that this must stop.

Patrick Henry once said, "It is natural to indulge in illusions of hope, to shut our eyes to a painful truth." We must, however, open our eyes to the looming threat Saddam Hussein poses to the world.

As I said, I and the rest of this Congress share my constituents' hope for peace. I believe that passage of this resolution can prompt a peaceful outcome by making it clear to our enemy that it is time for him to comply with disarmament requests. In light of this resolution, the U.N. Security Council's resolve can be buttressed. This resolution can guide the U.N. to pass a new set of resolutions, ones that will be tough and effective and, more importantly, resolutions that will be enforced.

This Congress has a responsibility to protect the American people. It is our duty to deal with the threats that face this great Nation and the world. This resolution shows that we are a united America, that we stand firm in our resolve to rid the world of terrorism. It shows the United Nations and the world what leadership means: We prepare for action while pursuing avenues to peace.

Yes, our goal is peace, but a lasting peace, and not continued appeasement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and one who is a strong voice for our Federal employees.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is instructive to review the history of how we got to this debate tonight.

Yes, Saddam Hussein does deserve to be demonized, but after the Shah of Iran was overthrown in the late 1970s, Saddam became our guy in the Persian Gulf. During the Reagan years, we helped train his army and equipped him with weapons we now deplore his using against Iran in their deadly 10-year war. In fact, The New York Times reported back then that our satellites provided the coordinates for some of the deadly attacks against the Kurds and Iranians. We even inadvertently, I trust, gave him some reason to believe that the U.S. would not react if he attacked Kuwait over disputed oil fields.

Well, President Bush did react, but, in retrospect, he reacted in a more responsible manner than what his son now proposes. He waited until just after the mid-term congressional election. He sought and got the support of the other Arab nations. He worked with and through the United Nations Security Council.

When the U.N. deadline for withdrawal arrived, Saddam ordered a retreat out of Kuwait. We attacked the next day. While we killed tens of thousands of retreating Iraqi conscripts, we lost very few American lives, but we did leave a Republican Guard largely intact and Saddam still in charge. He proceeded to massacre the Shiites and the Kurds we had encouraged to rebel from his rule.

We stationed our troops in Saudi Arabia as a residual measure to prevent further Iraqi aggression, motivating a homicidal terrorist, Osama bin Laden, also trained by the United States in the Mujahedin's war against the secular Russian presence in Afghanistan, to attack this country on that infamous day in September.

Now, a decade after the Persian Gulf War, President Bush's son is still stuck with the same demon. This President Bush had followed his father's example in preparing to attack Iraq by working through the United Nations Security Council and getting the support of his Arab neighbors. But Kuwait recently

agreed to a bilateral trade agreement with Iraq, and no other Arab nation thinks it is in their interests or ours to attack Saddam at this time, particularly with the intensity of animosity generated by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

What we should do is lay out the same arguments the President presented to the American people last night to the United Nations and to the rest of the free world. Do we really think that other nations are less concerned about homicidal tyrants in their midst, less protective of their families and their freedoms? But when we go it alone, we create resentment, even among our allies. We become a singular target for vengeance for the deaths that we cause, and it will likely become our principal responsibility to rebuild the human and the fiscal infrastructure we destroy.

We should be focusing on making Saddam weak and irrelevant by discovering and destroying all weapons of mass destruction, their storage and production facilities and any missile capability to deliver them. The President cannot obtain a sufficiently robust, coercive resolution from the United Nations that includes all Saddam's palaces and all 500 to 600 potential sites or, if Iraq again interferes with U.N. inspectors as they did during the 1990s, this Congress will assuredly give our President authority to use all necessary military force on an expedited basis.

□ 2350

But, Mr. Speaker, we should be marginalizing Saddam Hussein, not marginalizing the United States Congress. We should vote for the alternative resolution that has been made in order, consistent with Senator LEVIN's and Senator BIDEN's approach in the Senate.

Preemptive unilateralism is not what made us the undisputed leader of the free world. Constructive cooperation and resolution, principled leadership is what has made us great and is what should guide us in this profoundly important vote.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who is a West Pointer, an infantry officer who was trained as a Ranger and paratrooper, and he still serves as a lieutenant colonel in the Army Reserve.

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

Mr. Speaker, on July 29 I joined with my colleagues on the other side to support the resolution that said the President needed to come to the House, make the case, have a vote, and have a debate. That is what we are doing here tonight.

I supported it for three reasons: the constitutional reasons that we would get more information, we could give that information to the country, and we could help unify the international community with this debate. The

President has done that by the U.N. speech and provided more information to Members.

I have had many briefings since that time; and with his resolution and the changed resolution, I am now convinced that Iraq has not complied with a ceasefire agreement; has weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological; is pursuing the nuclear option; has used mass destruction on his own citizens and his neighbors; and al Qaeda operates in Baghdad.

Many people asked for the smoking gun, but the smoking gun is a gun that has already been fired. We cannot allow the use of weapons of mass destruction on our own citizens.

I would like to quote Geoffrey Goldberg's article in the New Yorker Magazine where he says, "'My uncle said we should go outside,' Nasreen said. We knew there were chemicals in the air. We were getting red eyes, and some of us had liquid coming out of them. We decided to run. Nasreen and her relatives stepped outside gingerly. 'Our cow was lying on its side . . . it was breathing very fast, as if it had been running. The leaves were falling off the trees, even though it was spring. The partridge was dead. There were smoke clouds around, clinging to the ground.'"

We cannot allow that to happen in our country. The primary role of the national government is the protection of its citizens. That is what we are doing with this resolution. We are about that work here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support this resolution. May God bless America.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the most painful and difficult and important decision that any of us here in Congress will ever face is the decision to send young men and women to war, knowing, as we all do, that many will be injured, some will die, as will, sadly, but unavoidably, soldiers and civilians in the country we are fighting.

So we have an obligation to think very long and hard and wrestle with many questions, including those that have been raised by a number of my friends and colleagues who oppose this resolution, and to consider those questions before we take that decision.

I wanted to reflect on two questions that have been raised several times today in this debate. First is the question of whether or not Saddam Hussein poses a sufficient and a sufficiently imminent threat to Americans to justify American military action against his regime. Let us consider what we know for facts.

First, we know he has massive stockpiles of chemical weapons, we know he has huge stockpiles of biological weapons, and we know he has full-scale and

urgent programs under way to develop nuclear weapons, as well. No one disputes that he has these terrible weapons.

So the next question becomes, well, is there much chance that he would ever consider using them against us? Well, consider this is a regime that has invaded its neighbors without provocation, resulting in untold thousands of deaths; that Saddam Hussein has ordered chemical attacks on Iran, and on more than 40 villages in his own country, resulting in the death of his own people.

In the last year alone, the Iraqi military has fired upon American and British pilots more than 750 times. He has repeatedly expressed his deep hatred of the United States. Also, Iraq is and continues to harbor terrorists and to finance terrorism.

Given his weapons, his history, his threats, and his relationships with known terrorists, my question is, How could we possibly sit back and just wait? The first and most important responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect the lives of our citizens, and the catastrophe that would result if he used weapons of mass destruction on Americans is so great that we simply cannot risk that event.

Now, the President has described Saddam Hussein as presenting a grave and gathering threat. I think he aptly invokes the term that Winston Churchill used in the title of the first volume of his seminal series on the history of World War II, which he called "The Gathering Storm."

Hitler and the Nazis were, in the 1930s, a gathering threat; and today Saddam Hussein is a gathering threat, gathering in the sense that it is a growing, accumulating, worsening threat and becoming more and more dangerous as his weapons grow in size and sophistication.

For these reasons, I believe that the threat is sufficient and sufficiently imminent that, should we fail to eliminate that threat, we would be shirking that first and foremost responsibility that we have to protect our fellow citizens.

Others have suggested that, unless we get permission for this action from the U.N., we would basically lack the legal and moral authority to use military force. Mr. Speaker, to that I respond that our Constitution does not delegate to the U.N. responsibility to provide for the common defense of our citizens. That is our responsibility. We would be wrong to abdicate that responsibility.

While I hope that we get a strong resolution from the U.N., and I hope we have a broad international coalition to support this effort, if we cannot get that broad support, our responsibility is to proceed with those allies who will join us.

Still others have suggested that using the Armed Forces to preempt an adversary is without precedent in

American history. That is just factually wrong. On other occasions, including in 1962 when the United States Government imposed a naval blockade of Cuba, it did so to prevent a threat from emerging.

There are many other legitimate questions, Mr. Speaker; and I have tried to evaluate them honestly and dispassionately. The conclusion that I keep coming to is that this is a grave and gathering threat that is simply too dangerous and could result in too many lost American lives, should we ignore it any longer.

We have tried diplomacy, embargoes, inspectors, all forms of political and economic pressure; and all the while the threat has gathered and grown. We cannot afford to wait any longer. Unless Saddam Hussein immediately, completely, openly acknowledges and destroys all of his weapons of mass destruction and allows immediate, unfettered access to really every inch of his country, to weapons inspectors that can operate freely, whenever, wherever, without providing notice, failure to do that means we must achieve this disarmament by force.

That is what this resolution authorizes the President to do. That is why I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of the resolution; not with joy nor with blood lust nor with a sense of vengeance, but instead, with a clear-eyed analysis of the threat that is presented.

Mr. Speaker, I give thanks for the fact that this debate is occurring not via satellite television from Baghdad, but, as it should, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, where people of good will and honest conviction can disagree.

In the preceding few minutes, Mr. Speaker, we have heard some embrace a collective multilateralism as the doctrine and seeming salvation of this new century.

□ 0000

There is one major flaw with that notion, and it is expressed in the first action all 435 of us who serve here take when we raise our right hand and take the oath of office. Because, Mr. Speaker, when we do so, we pledge to uphold not the charter of the United Nations but the Constitution of the United States.

Do not mistake the desirability of coalitions. There is a place. They are desirable. Our own Secretary of Defense has told us in this war there will be many different coalitions. There will be those that come to support us out front. There will be others behind closed doors. There will be different ways different nations will show their support.

But, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, our Founders quite properly, in enumerating the responsibilities of this government in a document of limited and specified powers, first and foremost, we are to provide for the common defense. We do that not by seeking the permission of the Congo or Cameroon or France or Germany. We do that by clearly, unmistakably, and unashamedly protecting the lives and interests of the American Nation.

Make no mistake, this will not be easy. This will not be pleasant. This war has been thrust upon us when, on a beautiful morning a year and a month ago, innocent Americans were attacked and killed by a regime of terror, a regime that our Commander-in-Chief just informed us last night has had repeated contacts with the government of Iraq.

The dictator of Iraq cares not a whit for the world community, and he certainly cares not for the welfare of American citizens, nor our interests.

Mr. Speaker, it is reluctantly but with a sense of resolute faith that I stand in support of the resolution to protect the American people and to protect the American Nation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to see if I could add something to this debate that had not been covered tonight, because I think on both sides of the aisle we have had very articulate arguments. So I have brought with me a book called *The Threatening Storm* by Mr. Kenneth Pollack. Mr. Pollack was the expert on Iraq in the Clinton administration in both the CIA and at the Security Council, and I would like to read a quick passage about the kind of regime that Saddam Hussein imposes on his own people.

"This is a regime that will gouge out the eyes of children to force confessions from their parents and grandparents. This a regime that will crush all of the bones in the feet of a 2-year-old girl to force her mother to divulge her father's whereabouts. This is a regime that will hold a nursing baby at arm's length from its mother and allow the child to starve to death to force the mother to confess. This is a regime that will burn a person's limbs off to force him to confess or comply. This is a regime that will slowly lower its victims into huge vats of acid, either to break their will or simply as a means of execution. This is a regime that applies electric shocks to the bodies of its victims, particularly their genitals, with great creativity. This is a regime that in 2000 decreed that the crime of criticizing the regime, which can be as harmless as suggesting that Saddam's clothing does not match, will be punished by cutting out the offender's tongue. This is a regime that practices

systematic rape against its female victims. This is a regime that will drag in a man's wife, daughter or other female relative and repeatedly rape her in front of him. This is a regime that will force a white-hot metal rod into a person's anus or other orifices. This is a regime that employs thalium poisoning, widely considered one of the most excruciating ways to die. This is a regime that will behead a young mother in the street in front of her house and children because her husband was suspected of opposing the regime. This is a regime that used chemical warfare on its own Kurdish citizens, not just on the 15,000 killed and maimed at Halabja but on scores of other villages all across Kurdistan. This is a regime that tested chemical and biological warfare agents on Iranian prisoners of war, using the POWs in controlled experiments to determine the best ways to disperse the agents to inflict the greatest damages.

"This is the fate that awaits thousands of Iraqis each year. The roughest estimates are that over the last 20 years more than 200,000 people have disappeared into Saddam's prison system, never to be heard from again. Hundreds of thousands of others were taken away and, after unforgettable bouts of torture that left them psychologically and often physically mangled, eventually were released or escaped. To give a sense of scale, just the numbers of Iraqis never heard from again would be equivalent to about 2.5 million Americans suffering such a fate."

Mr. Speaker, not since Hitler and not since Stalin have we seen so much evil delivered by one man. On top of that, these are the least of the reasons why this authorization is needed. This tyrant has amassed a large cache of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and is aggressively seeking nuclear weapons. He sees America as the only obstacle to his perverse ambitions, and that is what he shares with al Qaeda, these terrorists against us, this deep hatred for America. We must not let him share anything else with these terrorists, Mr. Speaker.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it is a painful vote, it is a painful subject, it is a painful issue, but this is a cause that we cannot go unanswered. I urge a yes vote, and I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, these are times that try our souls. These are decisions that all Members of Congress hope they will never have to make. All of us have in our own way prayed for the wisdom of Solomon.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) said earlier in quoting Abraham Lincoln, "We cannot escape history."

Our ancestors understood that negotiation alone would not bring freedom or peace to the colonies. Today we stand on the shoulders of the patriots who knew that freedom is not free. Patrick Henry warned that peace could always be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. He closed with, "Forbid that Almighty God."

Nearly 64 years ago to this very week, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain believed that he could reason and negotiate with a despot. He returned from Munich smiling, waving a paper, touting, "Peace in our time."

A few days later, a wiser Winston Churchill went to the House of Commons and said, "Mr. Prime Minister, you have been given the choice between war and dishonor. You have chosen dishonor, and we shall surely have war."

How much blood? How much treasure could have been spared had we have stopped the despot when all he wanted was *liebensprau*?

Last year I led a delegation of Members from the House to Northeastern Germany. We toured a small camp near the Baltic called Peenemunde. It was there, understand total secrecy, that the Nazi war machine perfected the lethal buzz bomb rockets that set Great Britain ablaze.

We did not know until after the war that they were also working on nuclear weapons and a multi-stage rocket capable of hitting the United States. Our delegation saw a cartoon drawing on the wall of one of labs that showed these rockets raining down on New York City. We liberated Germany just in the nick of time.

Today our intelligence is far from perfect, but it is much better than it was in 1940. We know that Saddam is rebuilding his arsenal of death. We know that he has used chemical and biological weapons to kill thousands of his own people. We know that he is attempting to acquire nuclear capabilities. We know that he has attacked his Arab neighbors. We know that he plotted the assassination of a former U.S. President. And worst and most sobering, we know that he has repeatedly pledged to lead a holy war against the United States.

For more than a decade the terrorists and the rogue states that harbor them have been at war with the United States. They have killed hundreds of innocents at our embassies in Tanzania and Kenya. We launched a few Scud missiles. They killed dozens of our sailors on the U.S.S. *Cole*. We did little. So September 11 they crossed the ocean and killed thousands.

□ 0010

They crossed the line. They attacked we the people on our home soil. We the people will do everything in our power to make sure that this never happens again. Now the battle is joined.

In many respects the confrontation with Saddam Hussein is an important chapter in ridding the world of the vi-

cious hatred which bred those bloody attacks on American soil. In our bones we all know that sooner or later we will have to lead the effort to confront this despot. The only real question is when. It is once again left to the Americans to liberate Iraq.

We must join together and speak with one voice. We must give our President the authority to make the peace, to free the Iraqi people of this despot and leave to all the children of the world a safer planet. No, we cannot escape history; and history expects no less.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, has done extensive work on the issue of terrorism.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, based on all we have learned during 4 years of hearings by the Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and International Relations, it cannot be disputed, Saddam Hussein had a robust chemical, biological and nuclear weapons program before the Gulf War. He had a robust program after the war. And he ejected United Nations inspectors when we had successfully begun to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction, particularly when we got below the weeds to the real roots, the engineers and scientists who sustain the program.

No credible source, public or classified, has met the burden of proof on Iraq to demonstrate Saddam Hussein has stopped pursuing weapons of mass destruction and disarmed. Having learned the hard lesson that we cannot be defeated in conventional combat, he is more determined than ever to deploy chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons against us. His support of terrorist groups also means he is likely to deploy these weapons using surrogates.

Some say until Iraq poses an imminent threat to the United States and until he both has a nuclear weapon and threatens to use it, or until we have smoking-gun evidence Saddam Hussein launched the planes into the World Trade Center, we should be content to contain and deter an Iraqi regime openly amassing weapons of mass death.

I could not disagree more. Saddam Hussein will not be deterred, and he will not be contained. Testifying before our committee all three national commissions on terrorism stressed the need for a real-time threat assessment, a new strategy to confront the threat, and a restructured Federal Government to implement the strategy. Containment, deterrence, and mutually assured destruction no longer assure our national security.

Our policy, and the structure of government to carry it out, must be proactive and preemptive.

As a free and open society, we are vulnerable to catastrophic attack by those who see no moral or political "red line" to constrain them.

As former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu reminded us, September 11, 2001, was a wake-up call from hell. We need to wake up. On that day, quaint Cold War doctrines justifying action only against clear and present dangers died with those 3,000 innocents in the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Pennsylvania.

The dangers we face may never be clear again. The mere existence of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of despots, tyrants, and terrorists constitutes an imminent threat to our security. That threat must be addressed before it manifests itself full-blown in a smallpox epidemic or a mushroom cloud.

Ironically, only the possibility of unilateral action by the United States will draw our allies into effective multilateral action. So we must maintain the right to act in our sovereign security interests, with our allies whenever we can, alone if we must.

Over the course of 41 hearings and briefings since 1999, our Subcommittee on National Security has learned that weapons of mass destruction proliferation possess a grave threat to the United States.

Iraq is both a producer and potential consumer of illicit weapons and materials. Dr. Hamza, a former head of the Iraqi nuclear program, told us recently Saddam Hussein will never yield access to the scientists who sustain his weapons programs.

Dr. Alibek, former deputy director of the Biopreparat, the civilian arm of the Soviet Union biological weapons program, testified he considered it inevitable biological weapons will fall into terrorist hands.

According to the British Government's recent analysis of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program and a similar dossier by the respected International Institute for Security Studies, Saddam Hussein need only acquire a core of highly enriched uranium the size of a single softball to become nuclear capable within a matter of months.

With uncertain controls over the weapons grade material in the former Soviet Union, Saddam Hussein has already tried to go shopping for the missing core of his malevolent nuclear aspirations. Lucky for us, he has fallen prey to black market scam and bought atomic junk. But we cannot base our fundamental security on his continued bad luck.

As proposed, U.N. inspections will never succeed in disarming an Iraqi regime determined to hide or reacquire weapons of mass destruction capability. We heard testimony from former UNSCOM inspectors and U.S. nonproliferation experts who concluded nothing short of utterly unfettered, that is anytime, anywhere unannounced, inspections would ever get close to discerning Iraq's true capabilities.

Even then, without a powerful incentive for Iraq to point inspectors in the

right direction, most conclude even those inspections would not guarantee complete disarmament. Only the option of force authorized in this resolution can provide the incentive for the Iraqi regime to step out of the way and allow the civilized world to assert its rights to security and peace.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent 81 families who lost loved ones in the attacks of 9-11 and the World Trade Center. I have visited with these families, consoled them, wept with them, and each of them share a common thread.

What I heard from these families over and over and over again was a plea, please do everything in your power to prevent this heartache, this destruction, these attacks from ever happening again.

Today we face a tyrant, a cowardly dictator in Iraq who we know is building an arsenal of biological, chemical and, yes, nuclear weapons; weapons that have the potential to deliver untold destruction upon freedom-loving people, and innocent civilians of the United States are clearly in his sights. He has made no secret of his intent to use these weapons of mass destruction on America or Israel or other allies, just as he has brutally used them on his own people.

Saddam Hussein has lied over and over and over again, deceived the international community and the United Nations for 11 years promising to disarm and to allow inspections, and then betraying our trust and our goodwill. He has clear ties to terrorists and to terrorist organizations like Hamas, Hezbollah and, yes, even al Qaeda. His goal, to kill as many people as possible and to force the civilized world to live in fear.

As we heard from the President of the United States last night, we refuse to live in fear. The cost of action may be high, but I would suggest that the cost of inaction is far, far greater. This is a dire situation, and it calls for action. It calls for good and noble action from freedom-loving people around this Nation and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I made a promise to the 81 families in my district to take action, to do all in my power to prevent the devastation of terrorist attacks like those we saw on 9-11.

□ 0020

I will keep that promise by voting in favor of this resolution which will authorize the President and administration and the men and women of our Armed Forces to protect the United States from future 9/11s or worse. Diplomatically if we can, but militarily if we must, we all have an obligation to keep our promise to do all we can to protect those we serve; and I will do it by voting for this important resolution. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I noticed that the clock is ticking past 12, and I shall remember the words of the country preacher who said, blessed be the brief, for they shall be invited back.

I rise to support the resolution to respond to the threat that Iraq poses to us and to most nations of the world. If we adopt this resolution, the position of the President will be strengthened in dealing with foreign nations and those in the Middle East. If we present a strong front and indicate to Saddam Hussein that the United States is resolute in seeing the United States and other nations safe from attack by Iraq, then Iraq may recognize that further stalling and prevaricating are futile and open itself up for unfettered inspections.

Appeasement and ignoring clear violations of past resolutions and agreements does not guarantee peace and safety. It will only lay us open to a sneak assault. As the President said, war should be the last resort.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

As this greatest of all deliberative bodies debates this resolution tonight, we are confronted with the same questions that every nation, every family, and every individual must answer when deciding matters of monumental proportions.

The first question embodies many avenues of inquiry, and that question is, simply, why? After all, Iraq is half a world away and lacks long-range missile capability. Under normal circumstances that would be a valid reason to withhold action. But we all know that chemical, biological, and even nuclear weapons can be delivered through unconventional methods such as suitcases, trucks and cargo containers.

Secondly, the question, why now? Why authorize force before all diplomatic approaches have been exhausted? Unfortunately, for those who expect the United Nations to resolve this issue, thus far the U.N. has failed miserably. If the U.N. expects to maintain the respect of the United States or any other member nation, it must show that its resolutions mean something.

Why did the U.N. not take action when the weapons inspectors were kicked out of the country? Why has the U.N. not responded to the attacks on our aircraft as they patrol the no-fly zones in Iraq? If the U.N. wants to maintain its relevance and prove that it is more than an international social club, now is the time and this resolution gives it that opportunity.

Some have also insisted that any action on our part must occur only if our

allies are with us. That would be nice, but I do not think it is essential. If we are in the right, we should act whether others choose to join us or not.

Throughout this debate both sides have drawn conclusions from the lessons of history. As we attempt to probe the fog of the future, certainly the established facts of the past are relevant; and some of those facts are as follows: Saddam Hussein has refused to abide by the peace agreement that ended the Gulf war. Instead of eliminating weapons, he has continued to build and buy more sophisticated and dangerous ones. Iraq has aided, abetted, and harbored terrorists that intend to harm us or our allies.

How can our future be bright when it is polluted with these alarming facts of history that are consistently being transformed into the realities of the present? The fruit our actions on this resolution may require that they be harvested by our men and women in uniform. That is the reality of a world where old men give speeches while young men wage wars. All of us sincerely pray that force will not be necessary, but those who fail to do what righteousness requires for fear of resistance have sounded the call of retreat before the enemy is engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, for there is another lesson of history that we cannot avoid, and that is that every generation must engage the forces of evil that confront it. We cannot defeat evil by displaying the medals of valor that have been won by our forefathers, nor can we appease evil in the hope that it will behave until our time has passed. So the answers to the questions of why and why not are simple. It is our time and our obligation to make our down payment on our heritage of freedom.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the joint resolution to authorize the use of military force against Iraq. Mr. Speaker, we are a peaceful Nation, a Nation that wants and promotes peace and a Nation that uses force only as a last option. I believe that the President, my constituents, and the American people do not want to wage war against Iraq. Unfortunately, we face a very real and dangerous situation.

The information the President presented to us confirms that Saddam Hussein has and continues to develop weapons of mass destruction. We have the cold, hard facts; and as a Nation we must now decide how we confront this serious threat. Do we proceed with our eyes wide open, or do we wait until Saddam has uses the weapons of mass destruction, killing thousands of innocent people?

Many people are asking the question why now, why can't we wait? We must remember that Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated obligations set forth

by the United Nations Security Council, has ignored 16 U.N. Security Council resolutions and diverts money intended to buy food for his people to purchase lethal chemical and biological materials, missile technology and nuclear fission materials.

Why does Saddam need biological and chemical weapons? While we can only guess his intentions, we must not let Saddam and his regime have the opportunity to use his weapons of mass destruction or sell these weapons to a terrorist group. Therefore, the purpose of this joint resolution is to give Saddam and his regime a clear choice: Allow complete and unfettered inspections or face the consequences of military action. It is that simple. If Saddam allows complete and unfettered inspections and we destroy his weapons of mass destruction, then he can avert military action.

Soon a special independent commission will investigate our intelligence lapses that led to the tragic and horrible events of September 11. If we compare the intelligence information we had before September 11 to the volumes of known information we have today about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities, then the President's case against Iraq is clear and undisputable.

Some still believe that we should take Saddam at his word. That is foolishness. Saddam cannot be trusted. Look at what he agreed to do and what he failed to do. He shoots at our planes, he murders and tortures his own people, and he develops weapons that can only do harm to innocent people.

While I have voted on many important issues, this is the most important vote I will take. I believe the right vote is to support this joint resolution to disarm Iraq. We can no longer allow Saddam to thumb his nose at the U.N., the international community, and at the United States. His madness must end, and we must send a strong message that the world will not tolerate terrorism in any form.

I close by telling you what Lieutenant Colonel Walt Piatt, a constituent of mine from Somerset, Pennsylvania, told me after I visited with him in Afghanistan. Colonel Piatt said the American military strength is not our smart bombs, our state-of-the-art aircraft, or our brave troops. Our support lies in the support and will of the American people.

Let us reflect on Piatt's words, and let us send a message to Saddam that America stands united. We will act if necessary. Vote yes on this resolution and end Saddam's threat to the world and to the American people.

□ 0030

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude tonight by noting that we have spoken

of chemical weapons of mass destruction, and I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention some of the observations of New Yorker writer Jeffrey Goldberg, who traveled to Northern Iraq, spent quite some time there interviewing hundreds of women now barren, hundreds of people now blind, as a result of chemical attack. As he interviewed the survivors of the attacks on the Kurds, he had some observations that I think we should pay attention to, because during his research he found that a biological agent called aflatoxin had been manufactured.

In 1995, the government of Saddam Hussein admitted to UN weapons inspectors that his scientists had weaponized this deadly biological agent. Aflatoxin is unique, because what it does is it causes liver cancer. It produces it particularly well in children. Weapons inspectors found that Saddam was able to load aflatoxin into two warheads capable of being fitted on to Skud missiles.

Americans need a good sense of who we are dealing with. This is a race against time.

In answer to the question, of all the dictatorships, why this one, we have this answer from the man who interviewed all of these survivors of those chemical attacks. He said, "Because this is a figure of singular danger. To review," he said, "there is no dictator in power anywhere in the world who has so far in his career invaded two neighboring countries, fired ballistic missiles at the civilians of two other neighboring countries, tried to have assassinated an ex-president of the United States, harbored al Qaeda fugitives, attacked civilians with chemical weapons, attacked the soldiers of an enemy country with chemical weapons, conducted biological weapons experiments on human subjects, committed genocide, and then there is, of course, the matter of the weaponized aflatoxin, a tool of mass murder, a tool of nothing else except mass murder."

He said, "I do not know how any thinking person could believe that Saddam Hussein is a run-of-the-mill dictator. No one comes close to matching his extraordinary and variegated record of malevolence."

So, Saddam Hussein, in his words, is "uniquely evil, the only ruler in power today and the first one since Hitler to commit chemical genocide."

"Is that enough of a reason to remove him from power?" He asked himself that question, and he says, "I would say yes, if never again is in fact actually to mean never again, because Saddam is a man without any moral limits. That is why it is so important to keep nuclear weapons from his hands."

Well, the current threat posed by Iraq is not like the Gulf War, and I appreciate that the case for action may not appear as clear-cut to some. A hostile army has not crossed a border, as Saddam's did then; an invaded state has not asked us for help, as Kuwait did.

But the battlefield in the new war on terrorism is not the desert of Iraq and Kuwait. Unfortunately, we must now be concerned with the conniving of a relatively few number of terrorists and the regimes that harbor them.

Today's world, with modern technology, sadly, has been transformed. I have no doubts that the regime of Saddam Hussein, its generals, its intelligence service, scientists and technicians, poses a mortal threat to our country, and we must act.

Finally, I would like to commend the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. We hope that they do not have to go into battle against Iraq. We hope to defend Hussein's regime without firing a shot. We hope to disarm him of his chemical, biological and nuclear program.

But if that is not the case, if our troops are dispatched against Iraq, we know that the American people will stand behind the brave Americans wearing the uniform. They have served us well in Afghanistan and in so many other regions of the world, defending our great country and its enduring values. We owe our service men and women and all who have served before a great deal of gratitude.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, tonight, an impending threat to our nation and its allies sits ready to strike at a given opportunity. Weapons of mass destruction, both chemical and biological, have been developed and stockpiled. Saddam Hussein, a dictator who has performed unthinkable atrocities, commands the soldiers who could launch them on Israel, on Saudi Arabia or even a city in the United States.

Tonight, as I see it, there is two very different kinds of hope—hope that is reasonable and hope that is not.

Hope that is reasonable understands the consequences of inaction. By preventing a madman addicted to weapons of mass destruction from slaughtering innocent people, we can imagine a new democratically elected government committed to peace and prosperity.

Hope that is not reasonable relies on a dictator who strives for power and destruction to abdicate his authority and allow unconditional searches of his production plants and palaces by the United Nations and the United States.

Hope that is not reasonable thinks that Saddam Hussein will comply with the 16 U.N. Security Council Resolutions that he has defied for more than a decade.

Hope that is not reasonable will trust this murder of innocent lives to stop gassing, intimidating and killing people that live within his countries borders.

Tonight, I rise to encourage my colleagues to provide reasonable hope to the people of Iraq by granting President Bush the authority to take care of the threat posed by Hussein and his regime, either diplomatically or with our armed forces.

This resolution is one of the most important votes each of us will ever cast. I urge support for reasonable hope and encourage my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Resolution 114, the Authorization for the Use of Military Force

against Iraq and in strong support of President Bush as he leads our nation in this most dangerous time.

We are here today to debate a resolution which would authorize the United States to sue military force to disarm and possibly remove Saddam Hussein from his tyrannical reign in Iraq. But let's be clear, this vote is about whether we, the United States House of Representatives, supports going to war to stop Saddam Hussein. It means putting our brave young men and women in uniform in harm's way and possibly putting them on the most dangerous of battlefields—one where the enemy may resort to weapons of mass destruction in his final desperate hour.

In deciding on how to vote on this resolution we must debate and answer one question; does the Iraqi regime under Saddam Hussein pose enough of an immediate danger to the United States and peace to warrant going to war to end that danger?

In my opinion, the answer is a resolute but somber yes.

To me, these vital facts stand out in this debate.

First, Saddam Hussein possesses chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. He has enough anthrax to kill millions of people. Most of his biological stockpile has never been accounted for. He has thousands of tons of chemical weapons to include VX gas, sarin gas, and mustard gas. And we know, as President Bush revealed on Monday, that he is feverishly working to gain nuclear weapons.

Second, Saddam Hussein has a clear history of using weapons of mass destruction. During the Iraq-Iran war in the eighties, he ordered that chemical weapons be used against his enemy on the battle field. He ordered chemical attacks against his own people and tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children died a horrible death.

Third, Saddam Hussein has unabashedly disregarded the rule of international law and the demands of the United Nations. Since his aggression against Kuwait was stopped in 1991, the Iraqi regime has ignored U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution to disarm. Over a period from 1991 to 1998, the Iraqi regime has lied and deceived in the most systematic way to conceal its collection of weapons of mass destruction. To make matters worse the forces of Saddam Hussein have also aggressively fired on American and British pilots enforcing the United Nation's no-fly zones with the intent to kill over 750 times.

And fourth, and potentially most chilling, Saddam Hussein is working in concert with terrorist organizations around the world including al Qaeda. We know that agents of the Iraqi regime and al Qaeda have held high level contact dating back more than a decade. We know that many al Qaeda members fled Afghanistan and now reside in Iraq. And we know that Saddam Hussein proudly celebrated the terrorist attacks on our Nation on September 11, 2001.

Given Saddam's violent history, the weapons of mass destruction in his possession, his flagrant disregard for the United Nations, and his current association with al Qaeda, the answer to the question I posed earlier is clear. Yes, we must pass this resolution and yes we must be willing to go to war to end the threat from Saddam Hussein once and for all.

It is my hope that the U.N. Security Council will vote to support military action against the

Iraqi regime if it does not submit to international rule and allow U.N. inspectors complete and unfettered access to the country. Although I do not hold out hope that Saddam Hussein, given his duplicitous actions of the past, will submit to the United Nation's will to allow U.N. inspectors in his country to find and dismantle all of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, we must attempt all diplomatic options. I also urge President Bush to continue to work with our allies to build an international coalition in support of any necessary military action. His speech before the United Nations on September 12 of this year laid an excellent groundwork for this coalition.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am supremely confident that if it comes to war that our brave young men and women in uniform will grandly succeed and perform to the highest standards of their proud traditions. I am also secure in the leadership of President Bush and his administration and the counsel he will receive from this body.

Let us go forth with this debate in the spirit that good and honest people—including the Members of this House—can disagree, but with the knowledge that in the end should we go to war we are as one. One voice for peace, one voice for defense of our freedom, and one voice for the security of the world.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I join my many esteemed colleagues today in support of this resolution authorizing the President to use force against Iraq. This is an historic moment for our country—a moment that should not be taken lightly. This is hopefully the last chapter in a long saga of our country's effort to deal with the threats of Saddam Hussein and his cruel regime. We have already given Saddam every chance to prevent war. We have spent ten years working through multilateral institutions, diplomatic channels, and the United Nations, trying to convince him to change. We have tried using sanctions to control his access to weapons. We have tried sending weapons inspectors into Iraq to find and dismantle his weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, none of these efforts have brought any success. On the contrary, Saddam has only continued his brutal oppression of his own people, his weapons of mass destruction programs, and his support for terrorist groups that are committed to attacking America. Over the past ten years, he has made a mockery of the United Nations and multilateral diplomacy. He has systematically undermined United Nations resolutions that were designed to disarm and reform his regime. He threw out weapons inspectors in 1998 and has aggressively rebuilt his weapons of mass destruction programs. And he has targeted America, attempting to assassinate former President George Bush in 1993.

The proverbial "last straw" that pushed us to action was when we realized that Saddam could strike us on our home soil just as easily as Osama bin Laden and the Al Qaeda network did on September 11, 2001. We know that Saddam is all too willing to use weapons of mass destruction against his enemies. To hope that he will keep these weapons as "deterrent" and never use them is to stick our heads in the sand and ignore over 20 years of history. Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to defend ourselves in the face of Saddam's threats. We cannot afford to remain silent while our enemies plot their next attack.

We make this decision because we have exhausted all other options. King Solomon, in his wisdom, wrote, "There is a time for everything: a time to be born and a time to die, a time to kill and a time to heal . . . a time to be silent and a time to speak . . . a time for war and a time for peace." Mr. Speaker, now is the time to break our silence, now is the time to finish the process Saddam himself began in 1990. It is time for the United States to use the full force of its military to remove Saddam and give the people of Iraq the opportunity to live in peace and security. I urge my colleagues to support the President during this critical time in our nation's history and to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a resolution that, without a doubt, weighs heavy on everyone's heart. To cast a vote on whether or not to authorize our President to use military force against an enemy is one of the most important responsibilities we have as Members of Congress.

This is not an easy decision. It is a very complex state of affairs that will have foreign policy and national security implications for many years—beyond the service of many Members here today.

So, we must not simply think about today, but we must also think about what the future holds. With this said, we must look at the big picture. It is a complex picture, but there are several things we do know for sure.

(1) For many years, Saddam Hussein has brutally oppressed his people. He has committed mass murder, mass starvation, and gross violations of human rights.

(2) Saddam Hussein has developed chemical and biological weapons with the capability to attack neighboring countries, like Israel, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia—our allies.

(3) Saddam has already used chemical and biological weapons against his own people and his enemies—we know he is not afraid to use them.

(4) Saddam has vowed to use these weapons against anyone or any country that stands in his way, including the U.S., our allies, and even the Shia population in his own country.

(5) Saddam is seeking nuclear weapons and is not far from obtaining this capability, and

(6) For over a decade, Saddam has routinely disregarded the will of the U.N. and obstructed its weapons inspectors.

I could go on, but the point is clear. Saddam is a tyrant and a madman that poses a direct threat to the United States, our allies, and his own people. His reign of terror must end.

That is why we are here today. And that is why we must pass this resolution and show the international community and Iraq that the United States speaks with a single voice. We should show Saddam and his regime that his days are numbered.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this extremely important resolution, I feel compelled to voice my concerns and those of my constituents who are very uneasy with the way President Bush has presented his case. In the minds of many, President Bush has failed to make a convincing case for using military force against Iraq. Throughout our history, this country has not militarily attacked another nation-state for any other reason except for self defense.

As a member of the House International Relations Committee, I offered an amendment

that would have addressed many of these concerns by making the resolution more narrow and precise in scope. Unfortunately, this amendment was not passed in Committee, and I was not allowed to offer my alternative on the floor today.

Thus, I face what will certainly be the most important vote I will ever cast with a very heavy heart, knowing that my vote could put our men and women in harm's way. While the resolution we are voting on today does not address all of my concerns, it has come a long way since the early days of the Administration rhetoric. Just two months ago, President Bush and his advisors were talking about using force first, rather than last, and taking unilateral action to facilitate regime change in order to confront an imminent threat from Iraq. While the President has not convinced me that Iraq is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States, today, as reflected in this resolution, the President is committed to working with the United Nations to build a coalition to disarm Saddam Hussein. Furthermore, knowing the historical background of Saddam Hussein, only a resolution that gives the President the credible threat of force will give America and the world a chance to disarm him without engaging in war. Thus, I will support House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. Speaker, if force proves necessary, we must forge a coalition of other countries supporting and participating with our armed forces to the greatest extent practical. A formidable, multilateral alliance, similar to the one assembled during the Persian Gulf War, is necessary before, during and after the war, and will help continue the momentum in the international war on terrorism. The United States should resolve the situation using all of the political and diplomatic resources at our disposal, keeping in mind that military action is sometimes the only option available.

Although I will support this resolution, I still have a number of concerns: this resolution will give the President broad authority to make war form any reasons well beyond disarming Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and the resolution's standard to justify going to war is too low.

In an attempt to address this and other concerns, I offered an amendment in the House International Relations Committee, similar to a proposal authored by Senators BIDEN and LUGAR, which makes perfectly clear that the goal of the resolution is disarmament. To that end, the amendment would have limited the President's war-making power by focusing the authorization to use military force on securing the dismantlement of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, not human rights violations, prisoners of war, or the failure to return property as called for under the resolution we debate today.

In addition, my amendment emphasized the importance of international support and encouraged the President to exhaust diplomatic efforts at the UN, while reserving the right to act unilaterally if the UN fails to approve a new resolution requiring the dismantlement of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction in a timely fashion.

Lastly, the amendment would have raised the standard for justification of going to war by elevating the risk assessment from "continuing" to "grave". The U.S. faces many continuing risks but they do not warrant the use of military force. By requiring the President to

inform Congress that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction pose a "grave" risk to the United States, the amendment raised the standard which must be met before placing American men and women in harm's way, something President Bush's resolution fails to do. Remember, President Bush warned that Iraq is a "grave and gathering" danger during his excellent speech to the United Nations General Assembly on September 12, 2002.

Unfortunately, as I mentioned earlier, my amendment did not pass the House International Relations Committee and it was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

The authority this Congress is about to give to the President must be used judiciously. After all, war is the ultimate failure of diplomacy. I expect that after this important authority is granted, Congress and the President will closely work together.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 574, the Chair postpones further consideration of the joint resolution until the legislative day of Wednesday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for October 7 and today on account of official business.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today until 2:00 p.m. on account of official business in the district.

Ms. SOLIS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. FERGUSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution welcoming her Majesty Queen Sirikit of Thailand on her visit to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, October 9, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9540. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make funds available for the Department of the Treasury's Counterterrorism Fund; (H. Doc. No. 107-271); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9541. A letter from the Deputy Congressional Liaison, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Regulation Z; Truth in Lending [Docket No. R-1130] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9542. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of June 30, 2002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

9543. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Passenger Vessels, Portland, Maine, Captain of the Port Zone [CGD01-02-114] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9544. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Lower Mississippi River, Southwest Pass Sea Buoy to Mile Marker 96.0, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-02-005] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9545. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Handling of Class 1 (Explosive) Materials or Other Dangerous Cargoes within or Contiguous to Waterfront Facilities [USCG-1998-4302] (RIN: 2115-AE22) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9546. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Chesapeake Bay, Calvert County, Maryland [CGD05-01-071] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9547. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Shipping; Technical and Conforming Amendments [USCG-2002-13058] (RIN: 2115-AG48) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9548. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department